

THE ARAMAIC OF
DANIEL IN THE LIGHT OF
OLD ARAMAIC

Zdravko Stefanovic





**JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
SUPPLEMENT SERIES**

129

Editors
David J.A. Clines
Philip R. Davies

JSOT Press
Sheffield

This page intentionally left blank

**THE ARAMAIC OF
DANIEL IN THE LIGHT
OF OLD ARAMAIC**

Zdravko Stefanovic

Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
Supplement Series 129



Copyright © 1992 Sheffield Academic Press

Published by JSOT Press
JSOT Press is an imprint of
Sheffield Academic Press Ltd
The University of Sheffield
343 Fulwood Road
Sheffield S10 3BP
England

Typeset by Sheffield Academic Press
and
Printed on acid-free paper in Great Britain
by Billing & Sons Ltd
Worcester

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Stefanovic, Zdravko
Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old
Aramaic.—(JSOT Supplement Series, ISSN
0309-0787; No. 129)
I. Title II. Series
224.506

ISBN 1-85075-351-2

CONTENTS

Preface	7
Abbreviations	8
INTRODUCTION	11
Chapter 1	
THE ENIGMA OF THE ARAMAIC OF DANIEL	13
A Survey of the Debate on the Aramaic of Daniel	17
Evidence from the New Material	20
The Use of Old Aramaic Texts	24
Chapter 2	
LITERARY CORRELATIONS	28
Description of the Texts	28
The Nature of the Texts	31
Structures	36
Vocabulary	47
Chapter 3	
GRAMMATICAL CORRELATIONS	62
Orthography	62
Phonology	71
Morphology	80
Chapter 4	
SYNTACTICAL CORRELATIONS	95
GENERAL CONCLUSION	108
Appendix 1	
LIST OF COMPARABLE EXPRESSIONS	109

Appendix 2

WORDS COMMON TO DANIEL AND THE TELL FAKHRIYAH
INSCRIPTION

112

Select Bibliography

117

Index of References

121

Index of Authors

126

PREFACE

The field of Aramaeology is an ever growing branch of general linguistics, and that is why it offers so much excitement to everyone who is involved in it. The field itself, however, is not just made up of letters and inscriptions, but of real people who are companions to the student in his or her research.

I have personally benefited from a number of such competent personalities to whom I now present my modest tribute. The study is heartily dedicated to the late Professor E.Y. Kutscher, from whose works I have learned much. As an outstanding Aramaist, he has taught us all how to treat the dialect of Biblical Aramaic with respect and care.

I also feel very much indebted to Professor W.H. Shea for his constant support and valuable insights. Lastly I appreciate Professor David J.A. Clines's kindness in accepting my manuscript for publication in the JSOT Supplement Series.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAW	<i>Anzeiger für Altertumswissenschaft</i>
AB	Anchor Bible
AcOr	<i>Acta orientalia</i>
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AION	<i>Annali dell' istituto orientale di Napoli</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
ANET	J.B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i>
AOS	American Oriental Society
ArOr	<i>Archiv orientální</i>
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BA	Biblical Aramaic
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BHS	<i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CIS	<i>Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum</i>
DA	The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel, or (depending on context) the Aramaic Portions of the Book of Daniel
EgA	Egyptian Aramaic
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	G.A. Buttrick (ed.), <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>

<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPOS</i>	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KAI</i>	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i>
<i>KB</i>	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner (eds.), <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i>
<i>Leš</i>	<i>Lešonénu</i>
<i>MDOG</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
<i>MUSJ</i>	<i>Mélanges de l'université Saint-Joseph</i>
<i>OA</i>	Old Aramaic
<i>OfA</i>	Official Aramaic
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i>
<i>OrAnt</i>	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>
<i>OTSt</i>	<i>Old Testament Studies</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>QS</i>	<i>Qirjat Sefer</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RSO</i>	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali</i>
<i>StudOr</i>	<i>Studia orientalia</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZKT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

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 forms only a part of a vast Aramaic corpus representing a world language of ancient diplomacy and commerce. 'Hebrew is tremendously significant for its biblical association, but Aramaic was of even a 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',² 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

1. R.A. Bowman, 'Arameans, Aramaic, and the Bible', *JNES* 7 (1948), pp. 65-66. On Aramaic and BA in general, see: J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 57-84, 183-204; A. Malamat, 'The Arameans in Aram Naharayim and the Rise of their States', *BA* 21 (1958), pp. 96-102; *idem*, 'The Arameans', in *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (ed. D.J. Wiseman; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 123-65; D. Ap-Thomas, *A Primer of Old Testament Criticism* (London: Epworth Press, 1947); D.J. Wiseman, 'They Lived in Tents', in *Biblical and Near East Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 195-200; E.G.H. Kraeling, *Aram and Israel or the Arameans in Syria and Mesopotamia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1918), pp. 1-6; D.C. Snell, 'Why is there Aramaic in the Bible?', *JSOT* 18 (1980), pp. 32-51; E.Y. Kutscher, 'Aramaic', *EncJud* (Jerusalem: Macmillan, 1971), III, pp. 260-87.

2. Bowman, 'Arameans, Aramaic', p. 66.

complicated by different approaches used in the studies on its provenance and character. This subject is in need of a fresh approach because of the material that has surfaced in the field of Aramaeology, and Old Aramaic (OA) inscriptions are noteworthy in this regard.

For a Bible student, DA can be a starting point of interest, whereas OA is 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, to 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 corpus of OA inscriptions, this task seems to be facilitated as never before. Nonetheless, 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 effectively used for the understanding of the text of DA, while also contributing to one's evaluation of the issues on the debate of the origin of DA. To this question, another closely related question deserves to be added: 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 is concerned with questions of this kind, and at the same time it seeks to encourage more diligent work in pursuing solutions to such questions. It points to a new direction, suggesting a fresh approach so needed in this ongoing debate.

Chapter 1

THE ENIGMA OF THE ARAMAIC OF DANIEL

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 question. We can recognize some of the most important ones.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 sixth century BC, it is BA that many scholars take as the *position de référence*, or the starting point, for dating other Aramaic documents. This confusion has been evident in the different dates proposed for certain Qumran documents such as the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and the *Targum to Job* (11Qtg Job).

Another problem related to BA is the fact that we have *no absolute dating technique* in linguistics for Aramaic documents which come from a period of history 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 simply belongs to the past. Two examples may be given here in support of this observation. The first is F.M. Cross and D.N. Freedman's dissertation in which the authors examined selected biblical texts based on their orthographic practices and patterns. In a *postscriptum* added to the dissertation 25 years later, the authors recognized the limitation of their thesis in the light of the presently

1. On this the reader may want to check a number of good articles, the most important being E.Y. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), pp. 347-412, and F. Rosenthal, 'Aramaic Studies during the Past Thirty Years', *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 81-91.

available evidence.¹ The second example is the confusion that has been witnessed in the dating of the 1QapGen. Three prominent scholars in the field have 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 it was Official Aramaic (OfA) mixed with Middle Aramaic (MA);³ while J. Fitzmyer maintained that it was Late Aramaic (LA).⁴ Given such a state of 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 dialects'.⁵ 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 the mysterious Deir Alla inscription. More and more scholars disagree that it can be classified as Aramaic. This conclusion was reached in the studies by J.C. Greenfield⁶ and J.A. Hackett.⁷ Thus, one deduces that there is no criterion for one to decide 'how different Aramaic dialects might originally have been and still be classifiable as Aramaic'.⁸

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 relative 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 since the corpus of texts at his disposal. . . is limited by the paucity of material that has reached us.⁹

1. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Missoula, MT: 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'.

2. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 198.

3. 'The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study', in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), p. 6.

4. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1966), pp. 19-20.

5. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, pp. 19-20.

6. 'Aramaic Studies and the Bible', in *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980* (VTSup, 32; Leiden: Brill), p. 115.

7. *The Balaam Text from Deir Alla* (HSM; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), p. 125.

8. 'Aramaic Studies', p. 85.

9. 'Early Aramaic Poetry', *JANESCU* 11 (1979), p. 45.

Even today, when we possess much more Aramaic material, Greenfield's statements sounds very much like the statement made by P.R. Ackroyd in 1953.¹

Another problem, and this time a special intra-biblical one, is our inability to know how much *scribal updating* was practiced in the transmission of DA. That there was some updating in the process of transmission is widely held by scholars.²

To this one can add a question recently raised on *differences between a written and spoken language* (or phonology versus orthography). A. Díez-Macho has emphasized this phenomenon, and he has given much evidence for it in Qumran Aramaic.³ Without discussing the purpose behind his arguments, we have to recognize this phenomenon as one of the problems in dating Aramaic material. Questions such as the following arise: 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.

Kutscher⁴ 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,⁵ yet Kutscher's argumentation seems valid and convincing. Specialized knowledge, however, is required in order to assess the data and the arguments based on them, and this keeps such a subject within a limited circle of scholars

1. 'Criteria for the Maccabean Dating of the Old Testament', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 113-32.

2. J. Fischer, 'Zur Septuaginta-Vorlage in Pentateuch', *BZAW* 42 (1926), pp. 1-10. Also E. Tov, *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, as in studies of the Targums, we have not been able to solve the starting problem: were the first Targums more literal (like Onkelos and the LXX) and only later expanded, or was it the other way around? On this, see R. le Déaut, 'The Current State of Targumic Studies', *BTB* 4 (1974), pp. 18-22, where the author calls such approaches in this field 'entirely arbitrary' (p. 20).

3. Le Déaut, 'Current State', p. 25.

4. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 347-404.

5. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 20.

capable of making an independent judgment on these matters.¹

The last but not the least problem to be 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 has rightly been recognized by Kenneth Kitchen.² To illustrate this, one might examine two studies on the same subject, each of which makes a comparison between DA and the Aramaic of 1QapGen. Both 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 thinking of the scholars involved:

On linguistic grounds there is nothing to preclude a date in the second century BC, 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*.³

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.⁴

In spite of all these problems, scholars tend to agree on a standardized chronological division of the Aramaic language.⁵ This list was first proposed by Fitzmyer⁶ and was consequently adopted by Kutscher:⁷

1. J. Baldwin, *Daniel* (Wheaton, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978), p. 30.

2. K.A. Kitchen, 'The Aramaic of Daniel', in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965), p. 32.

3. H.H. Rowley, 'Notes on the Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon*', in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies: Presented to G.R. Driver* (ed. D.W. Thomas and W.D. McHardy; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 129.

4. G.L. Archer, 'The Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon* Compared with the Aramaic of Daniel', in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (ed. J.B. Payne; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1970), p. 169.

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

6. The span of OfA does not seem to be well established yet. For S. Segert, the year 612, which marks the downfall of the Assyrian empire, should be taken as the beginning of this phase of Aramaic (*Altaramäische Grammatik* [Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyk., 1975], p. 41). Concerning the end of this period, J.A. Fitzmyer has changed his mind and proposes a lower limit at about 200 BC (*A Wandering*

- a. Old Aramaic (900–700 BC)
- b. Official Aramaic (700–300 BC)
- c. Middle Aramaic (300 BC–200 CE)
- d. Late Aramaic (200–700 CE)
- e. Modern Aramaic (700 CE–the present)

A Survey of the Debate on the Aramaic of Daniel

To date the book of Daniel based on the dating of its section written in Aramaic (the ‘Grecisms’ included) may be considered a practice that has developed mainly from the turn of the century. Even before that time, 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

It is especially from the turn of the century, however, that these studies and analyses have multiplied and assumed a more direct comparative linguistic basis.² Only a short time span elapsed between some of those studies. Often two or more of them appeared in the same year. Such statements and studies have brought different, often opposite, stands to this debated subject.

The dialectal discussion on DA begins about this same time. A.A. Bevan, for example, was not explicit and conclusive on the different problems in DA, such as 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’.³ Bevan belongs to the time of the ‘old dialectal

Aramean, p. 77 n. 32), a proposition that has no solid foundation, and, consequently, may not be accepted by the majority of the scholars. P.T. Daniels in his review of *A Wandering Aramean* accuses Fitzmyer of being arbitrary at this point (*JNES* 39 [1980], p. 218).

7. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, pp. 19–20.

1. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 347.

2. For different overviews of the debate on the subject, the reader may consult the following publications: F. Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung* (Leiden: Brill, 1939), pp. 60–71; Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 361–412; R.I. Vasholz, ‘A Philological Comparison of the Qumran Job Targum and its Implications for the Dating of Daniel’ (PhD dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, 1976), pp. 85–101. K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), pp. 34–54.

3. Noted also by R.I. Vasholz, ‘Qumran and the Dating of Daniel’, *JETS* 21 (1978), p. 315, esp. n. 1. For a detailed list of the scholars involved, see

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.¹ Among others, S.R. Driver assigned his date to Daniel by employing this as a criterion.²

As early as in 1897, Driver spelled out his famous dictum, which was destined to become the starting point for many serious scholarly studies of 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* (BC 332). With our present knowledge, this is as much as the language authorizes us definitely to affirm.³

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 weaknesses in this dictum are that the DA should be related to the western type of Aramaic, and that the circular reasoning produced an analysis that lacked support from external evidence. Driver first finds some Persian words in Daniel, and then, because of the presence of those words in the book, and since DA comes from the West, concludes that DA must come from a period subsequent to the establishment of the Persian empire.⁴ Driver limited his dictum, however, by qualifying it with the words, 'with our present knowledge'. He thus left less room for criticism by those who have had more external evidence at their disposal from later discoveries.

Z. Stefanovic, 'Correlations between Old Aramaic Inscriptions and the Aramaic Section of Daniel' (PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1987).

1. A.A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892), p. viii.

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

3. *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 502ff. He followed T. Noeldeke and W. Wright.

4. *Introduction*, p. 508.

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 by stating that this language belongs somewhere between the second and the third centuries BC.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 J. 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.³

Subsequently, H.H. Rowley⁴ did extensive work on the problem of BA—producing a study that 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.⁵

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.⁶ 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',⁷ yet his study was

1. *Introduction*, p. 501.

2. The following quotation summarizes Wilson's conclusions: 'The evidence derived from forms and inflections and syntax is decidedly and that from the vocabulary is overwhelmingly in favor of an early date'. 'The Aramaic of Daniel', in *Biblical and Theological Studies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1912), p. 303. See also *idem*, *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (New York: Putnam's, 1917). In his article, 'The Date and Personality of the Chronicler', *JBL* 40 (1921), p. 115, W.F. Albright considered Wilson's study to be 'very accurate'.

3. 'Notes on the Aramaic part of Daniel', *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 15 (1990), pp. 280-82.

4. See the introduction to H.H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929).

5. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 98.

6. See P.W. Coxon's introduction in his article, 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel: A Dialectal Study', *HUCA* 48 (1977), pp. 106-107.

7. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. vii.

essentially based only on the first batch of the Papyri (AP) that presented relatively limited evidence for the demonstration of dialects in Aramaic. Although one's conclusion based on the data presented by Rowley may differ from Rowley's own, 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. Coxon, for example, comments that Rowley's study ignored presumably 'late' features in the Papyri themselves,¹ while non-supporting lines of evidence were sacrificed for the sake of the general argument.² For that reason, O. Eissfeldt observed that Rowley could 'occasionally derive precise verdicts from very imprecise evidence'.³

It is of importance to note that a significant number of other scholars, however critical they may be of the thesis, accept the final conclusions and assign a late date to DA. The criticisms, many of which are sound, are nevertheless not radical enough. Their influence has often resulted in some modification, but not in a general abandonment of the thesis. According to Rosenthal's statement made in 1939, the old linguistic 'evidence' for a late date for DA had to be laid aside.⁴

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:

1. 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations in Biblical Aramaic', *ZDMG* 129 (1979), pp. 8-9.

2. For example, see the conclusions in the last section on loan words, where the 'evidence' was replaced by a 'general impression' (*Aramaic*, p. 129), even though facts about the similarities between DA and the Papyri are obvious at times (*Aramaic*, p. 156).

3. *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 519.

4. Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung*, p. 70.

Even if it could be conclusively demonstrated that the Aramaic of our Bibles was from the 3rd cent. BC, 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 preconceived notions as to the characteristic of the Aramaic language will have to be modified.¹

This idea has been taken over by Kitchen. In 1965 Kitchen brought out the most thorough critique of Rowley's thesis written up to that time. In his study, based on both published and still unpublished observations, Kitchen concluded that it is not on linguistic grounds derived from DA that a definite date for the book should be established; in Kitchen's view, there is no way of fixing the date of composition of DA *on the ground of Aramaic* anywhere between broad boundaries of the late sixth and the second centuries BC.² Kitchen's conclusion on the question of the syntax was expanded and revised in much of the work by Kutscher.

Kutscher argued 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.³ According to him, there are precise characteristics of the eastern type of OfA.⁴ One of the things for which Kutscher criticized Rowley was the latter's refusal to accept 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. Thus 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

1. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), p. 23.

2. 'Aramaic of Daniel', p. 79.

3. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 367-68.

4. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 362-69: (1) extensive use of the genitive construction plus *zy* (*dy*); (2) the use of the proleptic suffix of the type *bêteh dî*; (3) extensive use of the possessive pronoun *zyl-*(*dyl-*) 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.

position on the geographic factor of DA: 'The syntactical aspects of biblical Aramaic is [sic] the area where the most telling symptoms of dialectal affinity manifest themselves'.¹ In undertaking the study of the syntax of DA, Coxon once again parts company with the old thesis, because recent discoveries have stimulated a reassessment of DA.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 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, that 'there can be no doubt that the composition of the book of Daniel must be set in the Hasmonean period'.⁵

Fitzmyer's opinion is that the final redaction of the book of Daniel is from about 165 BC, yet he admits that 'it may be that part of the Aramaic portions of Daniel derived from an earlier period'.⁶ 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.⁷

D.C. Snell places 'all or part of Daniel... between 167 and 163 BCE, since Daniel's Aramaic imitates Ezra's'.⁸ If there are some

1. 'The problem of Consonantal Mutations in Biblical Aramaic', *ZDMG* 129 (1979), pp. 8-9.

2. 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of *Daniel*', p. 107.

3. For details, see Vasholz, 'Qumran and the Dating of Daniel', p. 320.

4. The idea first proposed by Driver in *Introduction*, p. 151, and accepted by, e.g., Greenfield, 'Early Poetry', pp. 46-47. Greenfield remarks ('Standard Literary Aramaic', in *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique* [The Hague: Mouton, 1974], p. 285): 'The writers, especially that of Daniel, used earlier material successfully'.

5. Greenfield, 'Early Poetry', p. 47.

6. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 18 n. 56. Also *idem*, 'The Language of Palestine in the First Century AD', *CBQ* 32 (1970), p. 502 n. 4.

7. *A Wandering Aramean*, p. 61.

8. 'Why is there Aramaic?', p. 23.

disagreements between the two books in their Aramaic sections, it is because 'imitators have a tendency to outdo their models'.¹ Snell is aware of the difficulties with his thesis, which he solves by proposing that Daniel's use of Aramaic is in imitation of Ezra's,² with the purpose of using this kind of Aramaic to lend authenticity in reporting the speech of foreigners.³

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 [ch. 7] does not belong to the earliest cycle of traditions.⁴

Unfortunately, Coxon does not spell out those 'reasons'. Rosenthal's statement on the uniformity of DA in its linguistic appearance may go against the assumption that Daniel 7 is not part of the original corpus of DA.⁵

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.).⁶

In concluding his survey of the same debate, K. Koch declares that the radical criticism, which holds to a late date for the book of Daniel on the linguistic ground of the chapters in Aramaic, has 'lost the game' in the last 150 years.⁷ It should be evident from a review of the research on this subject that 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.

1. 'Why is there Aramaic?', p. 38.

2. 'Why is there Aramaic?', p. 43.

3. 'Why is there Aramaic?', p. 36.

4. Coxon, 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of *Daniel*', p. 108.

5. F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 5th edn, 1983), p. 6: 'The Aramaic of the Bible as written has preserved the Official Aramaic character. This is what makes it nearly uniform in linguistic appearance.'

6. *Die aramäischen Texte*, p. 33.

7. *Das Buch Daniel*, pp. 45-46.

The Use of Old Aramaic Texts

Today we are witnessing an awakening of interest in Aramaic studies in general.¹ Many scholars feel that this field, which has been neglected for so long, is now becoming more promising and enriching and that it deserves to be much 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.² 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 is an obvious desideratum.³

In order to elucidate the problem of the dating of DA, this language has usually been systematically and exhaustively compared with the Aramaic documents from the fifth or fourth century BC 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 approach to follow in adding further material to this subject. In fact, it was the discoveries of some of the earliest OA inscriptions that shed light on the problems of the classification of DA.⁴ Greenfield, commenting on the discoveries of important OA documents, makes a remark which illustrates another important point related to OA texts:

1. This 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 30 years, J.C. Greenfield says, 'There has been a quickening of Aramaic studies in recent years because of discoveries in various areas' ('Aramaic Studies and the Bible', p. 110).

2. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 403. The publication of a recent study on word order in DA by E. Cooke was announced by Eisenbrauns in 1986.

3. L.V. Hensley, 'The Official Persian Documents in the Book of Ezra' (PhD dissertation, University of Liverpool, 1977).

4. Like Sefire, which yielded the disputed pronoun 'In from DA.

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, 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 article on the Tell Fakhriyah inscription² contains many parallels between this document and the Hebrew Bible, but it omits some valuable parallels from the book of Daniel. Coxon rightly points out that a fresh examination of the Aramaic of Daniel is 'an urgent desideratum', due to today's availability of a vastly increased corpus of Aramaic texts.³

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 Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions are the ones often referred to in the study of DA.⁴ Yet in these inscriptions, which were mainly destined for posterity, there is a strong *a priori* suspicion that they would be of a more archaic nature than contemporary literature. Therefore, 'older linguistic material found in Nabatean and Palmyrene cannot serve as definite proof that it was actually current in contemporary literature'.⁵ For example, in Nabatean one finds the spelling *zy* and *znh*, which are completely absent from DA. Yet everyone will agree that DA is one or two centuries earlier than these inscriptions.⁶ When it comes to the spellings of the causative and reflexive stems, DA is much older, because we have only two cases in which the prefix *h* is used for the causative stem in the Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions.⁷ Thus it

1. 'Aramaic Studies and the Bible', p. 115.

2. V. Sasson, 'The Aramaic Text of the Tell Fakhriyah Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual Inscription', *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 86-103.

3. 'Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel', p. 108.

4. Rowley (*Aramaic*) refers to these two dialects very frequently.

5. Kutscher, 'The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon', in *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 15-16. Note Fitzmyer's remark on this article: 'His [Kutscher's] data and conclusions have been checked and have proven valid' (*Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 24).

6. Even Rowley in *Aramaic*, p. 7.

7. See *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, pp. 15-16, and *Aramaic*, p. 81.

seems that these 'late' inscriptions, by clinging at times to the archaic forms, exhibit a conservative character.

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

The study here, however, has another important purpose. This work was prompted by an expectation that, whether the question of the origin of DA can be answered or not, fresh insight into the characteristics of DA itself could be gained. The language of one dialect may well 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.

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 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 of which has not as yet been classified with certainty.

The following chapter deals with the literary analyses of the texts. 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

The consequences of this limited approach have been felt in the field of studies on DA. 'Not enough attention has been given to the older literary material preserved in the present text of Daniel.'²

The text of DA that is considered in this study is the Masoretic text in its final stage of transmission, as it is printed in BHS. It is taken as a unit as found in Dan 2.4–7.28.

Whatever the results of one's study may be, it is difficult to give the final statement on DA based purely on linguistic evidence, especially in a field like this, where philological evidence is only one part of the picture available to aid in dating biblical and related documents.³ Thus, even for Kutscher, the 'Sprachbeweis' is often neutralized, and other criteria should be used to date Daniel.⁴

1. H. Tawil, 'Some Literary Elements in the Opening Sections of the Hadad, Zakir and the Nerab II Inscriptions in the Light of East and West Semitic Royal Inscriptions', *Or* 43 (1974), p. 40.

2. Greenfield, 'Standard Literary Aramaic', p. 285 n. 27.

3. Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 9-10.

4. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 402.

Chapter 2

LITERARY CORRELATIONS

Description of the Texts

The OA texts to be considered in this study range from the oldest specimens of the Aramaic language, which come from the ninth century BC (Tell Fakhriyah and Bir-Hadad), to the texts written in what is often termed as Standard OA, from the eighth and seventh centuries BC (Zakkur, Sefire, Hadad and Panammu). To these six, other inscriptions have been added, since they come from the transitional period into OfA (Barrakab, Nerab and Ashur). Scholars tend to include these in the corpus of OA texts.¹

The (Bilingual) Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

Our special attention should be devoted to the Tell Fakhriyah inscription since it is the earliest Aramaic text available, as well as being the longest one that comes from such a remote past. It is also deserving of extra attention as one of the few that come from the northeast. Its discovery can be considered as one of the most important in the Aramaic field. A number of linguistic 'problems' occur in this text, or characteristics that have been unexpected. Two reasons are directly responsible for these features: the antiquity of the text, and the scarcity of other OA material.² Moreover, the inscription

1. A. Dupont-Sommer in *An Aramaic Handbook* (ed. F. Rosenthal; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967), I.1, pp. 8-9; R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh. v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: D.M.G., 1969), pp. 8-9; Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 39; Fitzmyer, in a review of *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. II. Aramaic Inscriptions*, by J.C.L. Gibson, *JBL* 96 [1977], p. 426.

2. A. Abou-Assaf et al., *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Etudes assyriologiques, 7; Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations,

originates from an area which has so far produced very few literary remains in the Aramaic of this period, and thus it enables us to see the nature of the Aramaic dialect used there and its interactions with Akkadian. Yet the fact that the inscription is bilingual gives considerable help in the interpretation of the Aramaic text.¹

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

Prior to the discovery of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription, this was the oldest substantial text available in Aramaic. Written on the Melqart stele, the inscription has only five formulaic lines of text, but it should be included in this study for the sake of completeness. Scholars disagree on the reading of the second line. It needs to be mentioned, however, that almost all the differences in the reading of this text that actually divide scholars pertain to the proper names and their correct historical identification.

The Zakkur Inscription (and Graffiti)

In its complete form, the Zakkur inscription² must have been a relatively long text, for in its present condition it is possible to decipher and reconstruct around 45 lines. It is clear that 'the phonological system and the system of endings in nouns place the language of the inscription firmly among the Old Aramaic dialects'.³

The Sefire Inscriptions

The Sefire inscriptions are the most outstanding representatives of the West OA dialect, mainly because of the length of their texts (around 200 lines). Even though 'the three stelae together comprise the most

1982), pp. i-ii. An up-to-date bibliographical list can be found in W.E. Aufrecht and G.J. Hamilton, 'The Tell Fakhriyah Bilingual Inscription: A Bibliography', *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies Supplement 4* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), pp. 1-7.

1. See Muraoka's five reasons for the importance of this discovery in T. Muraoka, 'The Tell-Fekherye Bilingual Inscription in Early Aramaic', *Abr-Nahrain* 22 (1984), pp. 79-117.

2. The reading of the name Zakkur is now firmly established by a stele of Adad-Nirari III in the Antakya Museum. See A.R. Millard, 'Epigraphic Notes, Aramaic and Hebrew', *PEQ* 110 (1978), pp. 23-28.

3. J.C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. II. *Aramaic Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 7.

substantial stretch of text in Syrian Sem. epigraphy',¹ they scarcely reflect 'all the aspects of Aramaic grammar in the period of "Old Aramaic"'.² Their language is often judged as undoubtedly under Canaanite influence.

Many places in the inscriptions still remain obscure, due to the poor preservation of the text, and also to the use of *scripta continua* as the rule throughout. Fitzmyer's reading and translation are followed closely here. He admits that his study 'has not solved all these problems either',³ but, as Kutscher wrote, this 'comprehensive, clear and very solid work leaves very little room for criticism'.⁴

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

The Hadad and Panammu inscriptions belong to the Samalian dialect that was spoken in far northern Syria, and is 'typologically earlier than the division of Northwest Semitic into Canaanite and Aramaic'.⁵ With regard to age, they are the closest OA relatives to the Sefire inscriptions. Only 57 lines are traceable today, many of which are fragmentary.

Students of these inscriptions have pointed out many of their 'writing errors',⁶ but some of these cases may simply be unclear to us because of some gap in our knowledge of possible forms.

The Barrakab Inscriptions

The first three of the Barrakab inscriptions are dated slightly later than Panammu. They accompany a relief representing Barrakab dressed in an Assyrian style.

The Nerab Stelae

Both of the Nerab stelae come from the vicinity of Aleppo. They accompany the bas-reliefs of two priests of the local sanctuary shaped in the Assyrian manner.

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 19.
2. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1967), p. 139.
3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 4.
4. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 348.
5. P.E. Dion, 'The Language Spoken in Ancient Sam'al', *JNES* 37 (1978), p. 115.
6. For example, Gibson finds nine possible errors in Hadad (*Textbook*, p. 62).

The Ashur Ostrakon

The Ashur ostrakon is a letter, written on a potsherd, and dating from the reign of Assurbanipal. It has been poorly preserved, and at times the reading of the entire set of lines is uncertain. This text shows an important role which Aramaic played in Assyrian correspondence, since it was written in Aramaic by an Assyrian soldier, and contains some Assyrian elements.

The Nature of the Texts

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 Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

This inscription is constructed from two dedicatory texts, one falling 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'.¹ According to Kaufman, almost all of the divine 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'.²

What are the points of interest for DA from this inscription? The inscription is written on a statue (*šlm*), 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 us of another lengthy Aramaic text, from a later period, in which *šlm* 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. J.C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, 'Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye', *Iraq* 45 (1983), pp. 109-16.

2. S.A. Kaufman, 'Reflexions on the Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual from Tell Fakhariyeh', *Maarav* 3 (1982), p. 158.

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, such as that found in the book of Daniel, since Aramaic played an important role in communications at the Babylonian court:¹

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.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 Hadyis'i (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 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,⁴ while the use of

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

2. A.R. Millard, 'Assyrians and Arameans', *Iraq* 45 (1983), pp. 106-107.

3. With the exception of 'Bilingual Statue', where this is not at all clear.

4. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 110.

the Aramaic word *mlk* here points to a wider range of 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 Daniel 6, whose identification and historical role are still debated.¹ In any case, one title of Hadyis'i would be addressed 'to the local population, the other to the suzerain and his representatives'.²

4. *Cultural*. Millard's suggestion for the identification of Shamashnuri, the father of Hadyis'i, is of special interest again:

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 BC. 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.³

Thus, there seem to be some things both interesting and profitable for the study of those comparing the form and content of these two texts: similar ideas are expressed in both; the erection of a *šlm* appears in both; the possibility and fear that a sickness may overtake the king is noted in line 9 and Daniel 4; the threat of punishment for those who profane the temple vessels in line 16 bears comparison with Daniel 5, and so on. Such 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 a basic difference between the two texts in this regard. The former is basically one text presented in two languages, whereas the latter is one text presented partly in one language and partly in another. Both texts use Aramaic as an alternative means of communication of their messages to a wider audience.

1. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel*, pp. 188-93.

2. Millard, 'Assyrians and Arameans', p. 105. See also *idem*, 'Daniel and Belshazzar in History', *BARev* 11 (1985), p. 77. This difference in titles 'was probably motivated by regard to different readers' (S. Segert, Review of *La statue de Tell Fekherye*, by A. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *AfO* 31 (1984), p. 92).

3. Millard, 'Assyrians and Arameans', p. 104 (italics supplied).

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

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 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,¹ in some ways the language itself did not absorb much from this influence. This is evident from words like *nzr*, *nšb'* and *mr'*, which are pure Aramaic words, not Hebrew or Phoenician.

The Zakkur Inscription (and Graffiti)

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

The Sefire Inscriptions

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 format and phraseology of the Sefire inscriptions resemble Hittite and Assyrian treaties of the early first millennium BC.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 probably 'common formulas for the making of agreements current throughout the ancient Near East. . .'⁴

Unfortunately, the content of this text makes it difficult to compare

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 2.

2. W.F. Albright, 'Notes on Early Hebrew and Aramaic Epigraphy', *JPOS* 6 (1926), p. 86. He read '*nh w'mr* in A 2-3, 11.

3. Thus Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, pp. 121-25.

4. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 23.

with DA, since the Sefire inscriptions differ in nature, being treaty documents, while DA is narrative in character.

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

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 owing to the fact that a significant portion is now unreadable.

The Barrakab Inscriptions

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 to the other OA inscriptions. Thus Daniel 4 uses the personal pronoun 'nh extensively to convey the first-person report of King Nebuchadnezzar,¹ and the first inscription here demonstrates a similar use of this pronoun. Moreover, the distribution of the occurrences is analogous. In Daniel 4, it comes in the beginning and at the end of the narrative in order to introduce and close the king's direct speech. Similarly, in the first inscription, the word occurs once in line 1 and once in the last line, line 20.

The Nerab Stelae

The two stelae have sepulchral-memorial inscriptions whose text is somewhat religious in character.

The Ashur Ostrakon

Due to the very fragmentary state of this letter, it is not possible to reconstruct its overall content.

The Text of DA

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 lend DA a composite and colorful writing style.

1. Dan. 4.1, 4, 6, 15, 27, 31, 34.

Structures

Since the structure is a vehicle of meaning, it may point to the similarity in the content and meaning of the documents.

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

It has been mentioned above that the text of the statue is constructed from two parts. The first part is a dedicatory inscription complete by itself (ll. 1-12a). Students of the inscription maintain that the second part (ll. 12b-23) appears to have been composed when the original statue was restored.¹ Typologically, the two parts of the inscription are somewhat unusual, because 'they record two separate dedications; hence, the standard structure of the dedicatory inscription is doubled'.² This text is set out in an ABAB pattern while the book of Daniel follows an ABA pattern.³ This ABA pattern is specifically applied again in the concentric structure in the chapters written in Aramaic.⁴ 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 (l. 1: 'he set up'), and then the purpose (B) (ll. 8-10: 'so that. . .'), and again the fact (A) (l. 10: 'he erected and offered').

Both BA and this inscription betray the authors' love for lists—Daniel⁵ much more than Ezra. Both Daniel and Ezra have been understood by some as influenced by Persian bureaucratic style, or as exemplifying a tendency of later Hebrew court tales.⁶ DA lists 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),

1. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 87, and Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 68.

2. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 158.

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

4. Lenglet, 'La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7,' *Bib* 53 (1972), pp. 169-90.

5. See P.W. Coxon, 'The "List" Genre and Narrative Style in the Court Tales of Daniel', *JSOT* 35 (1986), pp. 95-121.

6. Snell, '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.

synonyms for power and glory (2.37; 5.18), and so forth. Turning to the inscription, we find it also to be full of lists and enumerations: a list of participles, praising the god's merciful activities (ll. 1-5); lists of petitions, with three successive occurrences of *wlšm*, and no less than nine imprecative verbal forms (ll. 7-10 and 13-14); and, when we come to the last part, a list of curses.¹

The Tell Fakhriyah text is a dedicatory inscription. The Aramaic version opens differently from its Assyrian counterpart, having a dedicatory clause similar to those opening the Bir-Hadad and Zakkur stelae.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 (ll. 1-6 and 12-15); (2) purpose (ll. 6-10 and 12-15); (3) erection (ll. 6-10 and 15-16); (4) prayer for restoration and restoration itself (ll. 10-11 and 15); and, finally, (5) curses (ll. 11-12 and 16-23).³ The 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 Daniel 3, which contains a hymn of praise to God (3.31-33).

For such reasons Sasson's analysis of the structure fits the plan of the inscriptions more accurately:⁴ (1) dedicatory clause (l. 1); (2) elaboration on the goodness of the deity (ll. 2-6); (3) presentation clause (ll. 6-7); (4) a list of the king's prayers, which is the concrete

1. Sasson's arrangement (Sasson, 'Aramaic Text') is best for noticing these lists.

2. Noted by A.R. Millard and P. Bordreuil, 'A Statue from Syria with Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions', *BA* 45 (1982), pp. 135-42. See also Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, pp. 68-71.

3. Abou-Assaf, *La statue*, pp. 68-71.

4. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', pp. 8, 92-102.

reason for setting up the statue (ll. 7-10); (5) completion of the presentation clause (l. 10), and the restoration with a threat of curses (ll. 10-12). The second inscription has a different structure: (1) the introduction (ll. 12-13); (2) prayers for the king (ll. 13-15); (3) the deity and the statue mentioned (ll. 15-16); and (4) a group of curses (ll. 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 chiasmic patterns present in the inscription:

D. Climax The King's Prayers (ll. 7-10)	
C. The Presentation Clause (ll. 6-7)	C'. Completion of the Presentation Clause (l. 10b)
B. Goodness of the Deity (ll. 2-6)	B'. Restoration of the Statue (l. 10c)
A. Prologue Dedicatory Clause (l. 1)	A'. Epilogue Group of Curses (ll. 11-12)

Both prologue and epilogue are linked together by two similar expressions which come in reversed order: *qdm hdd* (l. 1) is parallel to *hdd... qblh* (l. 12). In the following block of this chiasmic 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 *hds* (l. 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 plan that is slightly different, but still chiasmic:

- A. A Short *Prologue* (ll. 12-13)
 - B. Prayers for the King (ll. 13-15)
 - C. King and his Gods (ll. 15-16)
 - C'. Gods and King's Adversaries (ll. 16-18)
 - B'. Curses (ll. 19-23)
 - [A'. Epilogue—missing]

In this second part, the prologue is without its expected counterpart, an epilogue. Following the prologue, there is a series of successive verbs in both corresponding parts, with a chiastic pattern on a smaller scale: 'lhn... 'nšn (l. 14) is reversed in lines 22-23 'nšwh... wmwtn... nyrql.

From these brief analyses, one can see that both parts of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription have chiastic structures. Moreover, these structures further chiastic and partially 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 (l. 1)
 - B. Regulator of Waters, Abundance, All Lands (ll. 2, 3)
 - C. All Gods his Brothers (ll. 3b, 4a)
 - B'. Regulator of Rivers, Enriches All Lands (ll. 4b, 5a)
 - C'. A Merciful God (l. 5)
 - A'. Who Dwells in SIKAN (l. 6)

The second example is the structure of curses:

A. GODS

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

B. HARVEST

1. When he sows may he not harvest (l. 19)
2. When he sows barley may he harvest a fraction (l. 19)

C. SUCKLING

1. Sheep—not satisfied (l. 20)
2. Cattle—not satisfied (ll. 20, 21)
3. Women—not satisfied (l. 21)

B'. HARVEST

1. Women baking—poor harvest (l. 22)
2. Men pick up barley from rubbish (l. 22)

A'. GOD

1. Death, the rod of Nergal (l. 23)

The presence of numerical decrease (decrecendo) is to be noted here. The first four statements relate to the person, 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 they are interrelated in the following way:

<i>First Part</i>	<i>Second Part</i>
A. Epithets of God (ll. 1-6)	A. -----
B. Prayers of the King (ll. 7-10)	B. Prayers of the King (ll. 14-17)
C. Curse for Disturbance (l. 12)	C. Curses for Destroyer (ll. 17-23)

It is clear from this comparison that epithets were not repeated at all, while the three prayers were, being phrased differently, but expressing the same idea. The curses, however, which were only stated once in the first part, were elaborated extensively. The content of the two parts is thus mutually complementary, probably by direct design.¹

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

1. One could even look for a quasi-covenant type structure in the inscription. It would include a *Preamble* or identification of king (l. 1), *Prologue* or epithets of the god (ll. 1-6), *Stipulations* or prayers appealing for blessing, in other words what god should do (ll. 7-15), *Witnesses*: Hadad, Sawl and Nergal (ll. 16-23), and *Curses* (ll. 12, 17-23). The absence of *Blessings* is due both to time period (first millennium BC) and to 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 Daniel 2-7 and especially in chs. 4 and 5 are very valuable here.¹ Shea finds the same chiasmic patterns both on large and smaller scales in chs. 4 and 5. His analysis of the same chapters is even more important for the proposed outline here, because Shea also finds that the chiasmic structure of ch. 4 is slightly different from that of ch. 5. When one compares the two studies in detail, one finds structural similarities between the Tell Fakhriyah inscription and Daniel 4 and 5.

In contrast to Ezra, the Aramaic part of Daniel has several short poetic prayers or hymns of praise.² They are scattered evenly through the entire Aramaic text: 2.20-23, 3.28, 3.31-33, 4.31-32 and 6.27-28.³ Almost all of them, after an introduction, open with praise for the beneficence of God. The succession of participles, noted by Sasson in the beginning of the inscription,⁴ 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?',

1. 'Further Literary Structures in Dan. 2-7,' *AUSS* 23 (1985), pp. 193-202, 277-95.

2. Ezra has only one in Hebrew (7.27).

3. See W.S. Towner, 'The Poetic Passages of Daniel 1-6', *CBQ* 31 (1969), pp. 317-26; Snell, 'Why is there Aramaic', pp. 48; Greenfield, 'Early Aramaic Poetry', pp. 45-51.

4. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 92.

and 'why?'. The answers are repeated a second time, and, following the good ancient Near Eastern¹ and biblical² 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 'to whom?' question. The answer contains a *general* name/title of the deity. In the inscription (l. 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 (ll. 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' (ll. 5c-7a) is paralleled to 'You, God of my fathers' in Dan. 2.23a.
4. The universal scenario is narrowed and made 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 (ll. 7b-10a), whereas in Daniel it is already a present experience that deals with the future (v. 23b, c).

A resulting action on the part of the person who is praying or praising concludes both texts in question. Hadyis'i sets up and offers (l. 10b), and Daniel 'went' immediately into action (v. 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

1. The Creation stories and Hittite covenant treaties are two examples of texts using this pattern. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), pp. 22-25, and U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), pp. 90-92.

2. For example, Gen. 1 and 2 (J.B. Doukhan, *The Genesis Creation Story* [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1978], p. 35).

used for expressing different, contrasting and opposite religious beliefs.¹

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

This short inscription can be divided into two parts. First comes the introductory formula including the statement of erection of the statue, the king's name together with his patronymic—which can be *Tbrmn br Hzyn* (Albright), '*zr mšqy*' (Cross), '*zr šmš*' (Lipiński), or else '*zr dmšq 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 king'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* (abbreviation of *mlk qrt*), because when he (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 King Nebuchadnezzar. The first one is in Dan. 2.36-38: Daniel describes the *statue* seen by the king in his dream (v. 36), addresses the *king* whose title is the king of kings (v. 37a), mentions the *God* of Heaven ('*lh šmy*') who is the king's protector (v. 37b), and finally gives the *reason* for the dream (vv. 38-45). The other speech with a similar structure is recorded in Dan. 4.16-24: the king in his dream has seen a *tree* (vv. 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 (v. 21), and then the *reasons* for the dream follow (vv. 22-24).

The Zakkur Inscription

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, and so forth. This stele also carries a warning against anyone attempting to damage it.

This narrative structure is often encountered in different stories of

1. See also Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 102.

DA. It can be traced through various narratives from Daniel 2 to 6. The most striking similarity is between the beginning of section A and Nebuchadnezzar's speech in Dan. 3.31-4.1. In both texts, the same first person report follows the introduction and ascription of power and dominion to the deity.

The Sefire Inscriptions

In his study of the stylistic features of these inscriptions, Greenfield concludes that literary Aramaic was highly idiomatic in expression even in legal documents.¹ He also makes a detailed analysis of the poetic and literary technique represented in the 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'² is very frequent in DA; one example would be *'kl qrš* in Dan. 3.8 and 6.25. This idiom, which literally would be 'eat pieces of', really means 'slander', and, as Kaufman shows, is a loan from Akkadian.³ The grouped idiom is usually formed in DA by the use of two verbs together.⁴

2. The use of different kinds of parallelism (e.g. complementary parallelism) in Sefire is paralleled in DA by such expressions as *'l-ybhłwk r'ywnk wzywyk 'l-yštnw* (Dan. 5.10), *pšryn lmpšr wqtryn l mšr'* (Dan. 5.16), or else *hlm' lsn'yk wpšrh l'ryk* (Dan. 4.16).

3. Greenfield presents several interesting instances of repetition of a set phrase for emphasis, for example, *wšb' X...w'l... (I A 21-24)*. This can be compared with Dan. 5.19:

dy hwh šb' hw' qtl
wdy hwh šb' hwh mħ'
wdy hwh šb' hwh mrym
wdy hwh šb' hwh mšpyl.

1. 'Stylistic Aspects of the Sefire Treaty Inscriptions', *AcOr* 29 (1965), p. 15.

2. 'Stylistic Aspects', pp. 1-18.

3. *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 63.

4. E.g. *bns wqšp* (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 clichés 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 sequence of three animals, the lion, the bear and the leopard, is the same in Sefire II A 9 and Daniel 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 hl* in I A 25, with expressions like *'d dy s'rh knšryn rbh wtpwhy kšpryn* in Dan. 4.30.

5. Both narratives also stress the importance of an oral expression of one's thoughts: *whn ysq 'l lbbk wtš' 'l šptyk* (III 14-15) and *'wd mlt' bpm mlk'* (Dan. 4.28).

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

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 that are characteristics for each section. Following some of those analyses, the following structural plan of the inscription may be proposed.

The text can be divided into six sections. In their original sequence, each of these sections corresponded in its use of key themes to the six successive chapters of DA. The sections, in regard to their thematic organization, can be outlined as follows:

1. The introductory part (ll. 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 Daniel 2 in DA.

1. On this, see T. Wittstruck, 'The Influence of Treaty Curse Imagery on Daniel 7', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 100-102. The name of the second animal is only reconstructed by Wittstruck, and is missing from the text. For the occurrence of *dbh* in Sefire, see Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, pp. 48-49.

2. The next section (ll. 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 Daniel 3.
3. The third section (ll. 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 Daniel 4.
4. In the fourth section (ll. 20-24) the successor is warned of the dire consequences which follow his disobedience, something very similar to Daniel's speech to Belshazzar in Daniel 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 Daniel 7 and its contents.

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

The Barrakab Inscriptions

It is only possible to analyze inscription I, which is complete. The second is only partially preserved, and probably did not exceed 12 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 his 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 (ll. 1-3a and Dan. 4.31a).

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

2. Then follows praise to the superior lord and the reason why this god established the king. This has occurred at the king's initiative (ll. 3b-6a and Dan. 4.31b-32).
3. The establishment of the king is then expressed (ll. 6b-8a and Dan. 4.33a).
4. Great prosperity of the king is recited next, utilizing the key word *rbrbn* in both texts (ll. 8b-15 and Dan. 4.33b).
5. At the end, both texts close with a description of the king's prosperity excelling the past (ll. 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 has learned to ascribe 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

The Nerab Stelae and the Ashur Ostrakon

The texts have no important bearing on a structural comparison with DA.

Conclusion

In the light of what has been seen in the structural analyses above, 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.

Vocabulary

This section points to some statistical data on the percentage of the occurrences 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 fact that the choice of words in one inscription is determined

1. E.g. contrast *'hzt* (l. 11) and *htqnt* with *hwspt* (v. 33).

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 *mšky* (Pan. 18) while the Tell Fakhriyah used the words *šlm'* and *dmwt'*. In West OA, for a stele with a representation of a human being, the word that is used is *nšb'* (Bir-Hadad 1).

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

The inscription has several loanwords, along with other unexpected words and forms, testifying to a possible dual influence from the East and the West, which is a significant similarity with DA. The Akkadian loanwords present in the Aramaic section of the inscription are: *gwgl*, *'dqwr*, *mt*, *prys*, and possibly *'rmwrdt*. The words that seem to be 'Canaanitisms' are: *z't*, *lm'n*, and *'hr kn*.¹

The inscription contains 23 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.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.³ Of these, 65 are also used in DA and 30 are not, although 5 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 (*'rmwrdt* or *lrsrwrdt*).⁴ The result of this counting shows that roughly 70 per cent of the different words from the inscription are also found in DA.⁵

1. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 87.

2. Abou-Assaf *et al.* (*La statue*, p. 8) give a total sum of 198 words, a difference due probably to the division of some proper names.

3. All words counted except the conjunction *w*.

4. Thus Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 167.

5. This is interesting when viewed in the context of the following 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 (Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 68). This had led me to compare the vocabulary of the two parts, which I must admit yields only limited evidence, owing to the 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

These words are evenly distributed in both sections A and B.¹

The list of the same expressions, formulae and phrases has a double relevance for this section and the study of the syntax. The very opening words of the inscription—*dmwt' . . . zy śm*—are paralleled by Dan. 3.2—*ślm' dy hqym*, or Dan. 3.18—*ślm . . . dy hqymt*. *śym* and *hqm* can be interchangeable.² The formula *śnyn w'rq* (l. 2) is found in Dan. 6.28 surrounded by several participles, just as it is 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,³ but he does not give any example form BA. It is interesting to find that in Jer. 10.11 this formula appears twice with slightly different spellings of the word 'rq, it being spelled 'r' the second time.

Although there are Aramaic words that are often viewed as 'hyper-archaisms' (like *gdbyr'* in Dan. 3.2), the fact that 'r' is always spelled this way and not with a *qoph* points out that there is no blind or naïve tendency in DA to imitate Aramaic archaisms. A deeper study of this formula leads one to conclude that the spelling 'rq is more archaic than 'r', because formulae are subject to a certain conservatism against changes. This is well illustrated in Jer. 10.11, where the 'rq spelling is used in the formula, while 'r' seems to be common in that time.

The formula 'god who dwells in X' (ll. 5-6), sometimes 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).⁴ The shortest form of this formula is the euphemism or the metonymic word 'Heaven', which is found, for example, in Dan. 4.8.

words in the two parts of this inscription, therefore, is only 20 per cent of the total number of distinct words. Compared to the 70 per cent of these distinct words which are also to be found in the vocabulary of DA, this is a remarkably low percentage.

1. The list of the words from the inscription that are attested in DA (with a short comment on each word) is found in Appendix II.

2. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 92.

3. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 93.

4. The 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).

'mrt pmh (ll. 10, 14) is another expression often used in the Bible (Ps. 19.15, etc.) This leads to the suggestion that expressions explained as 'Hebraisms' in DA may have alternative explanations. In line 14, wlm'rk hywh is like w'rkh bhyyn in Dan. 7.12. (In l. 7, the two words are used in parallelism.) In the same line, 'l'lh n w'l'nšn could be compared with kol'enaš...min kol'elāh (6.13). In the next line (15), 'l zy is related to 'l dy (Dan. 3.19), in both cases meaning 'more than'. Then m'ny' zy btHdd is identical with Dan. 5.23 (and also Ezra 5.14). In lines 17-18 we have an expression where a verb in the imperfect is used with min ydh, something found again in Dan. 3.15: yšyzbnkwn min ydy (l. 17). Since the subject in line 23, mwtn, requires an explanatory phrase joined to it in apposition, the phrase which appears is šbt zy nyrql. This type of appositional-explanatory phrase using zy for the genitive construction is well known in DA. For example, Dan. 2.14 uses 'aryôkh (rabh tabbāhayyā' dī malkā' or šallīta' dhī malkā'). The connection between ygtzr mn mth (l. 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.

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

A total of 15 different words are used in this inscription. 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 nzzr, 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 in Aramaic texts, and it is similar in form to other OA inscriptions. nsb' zy šm...l is identical with the one in the Zakkur inscription, while the Tell Fakriyah inscription has dmwt'...zy šm

1. nsb', zy, šm, br, mlk, l, mr', šm' and ql.

2. C.F. Jean and J. Hofstijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), p. 174; C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), p. 442.

qdm. In the second part of that inscription, *šlm* is the word used instead of *dmwt'*. The former is used in the introduction to the story of Daniel 3, in an expression similar to what has been pointed out above concerning the OA inscriptions. *šlm' dy hqym nbwkdnšr 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 ch. 3 (vv. 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 nżr lh* (l. 4), on which more is said in the study on syntax, is paralleled by five formulae in DA, all having the same form: *zy* plus a verbal form and plus an *l* with a pronominal suffix (Dan. 2.23, 37; 5.12; 6.17, 21). Also the phrase *šm' 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 *ql*.

The Zakkur Inscription

In its present condition, this inscription has 45 lines. Allowing for repetitions, there are 56 different words in addition to a number of proper names. The analysis and the meaning of one word (*yhg'*, B 16) is not yet settled. We are thus left with 55 different words, 44 (or 80 per cent) 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 (*'dd*, A 12) 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 *'nh* 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. Some scholars translate this word as 'humble',² pointing to Zakkur's humble origins, since he was not born of a royal family. Lipiński³ suggests that this king might have been afflicted or oppressed prior to his taking the throne, and thus this word would emphasize his past

1. J.F. Ross, 'Prophecy in Hamath, Israel, and Mari', *HTR* 63 (1970), pp. 4-8.

2. F. Rosenthal, *ANET*, p. 655.

3. *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), I, p. 22.

situation. For scholars like Gibson,¹ the biblical parallels, together with the parallels from Panammu line 19 and Barrakab I 4 (*šdq* 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 scholars² 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, '*nh w' mr*', 'answered and said'. This proposal has not 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, *b' lšmyn*, is the Canaanite form of the Aramaic title *mr' šmy'* (Dan. 5.23). In A 10 there are two expressions of 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. 7.3.³ 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 5) 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.⁴ But because of its occurrence in OA dialects and in early EgA (*Aramaic Papyri* 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 Targums. Its occurrence here in the partly reconstructed line B 19 assures

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, pp. 9, 12-13.

2. See the summary of these studies given by R. Martin-Achard in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zur Alten Testament* (ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976), pp. 342-43.

3. See also Ahiqar 99: *ky 'zyz 'rb pm mn 'rb mlhm*.

4. *Dictionnaire*, pp. 28-29.

us that its provenance extends to earlier times.

'lhy šmy[n] in B 25 can be compared to several places in Daniel 2 where 'lh šny' occurs (Dan. 2.18, etc.).

The Sefire Inscriptions

Because of the specific literary character of these stelae, their vocabulary is not as familiar 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 per cent of the words of the Sefire inscriptions that 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 the treaty remarkably rich in idiomatic expressions. Many of these have direct Hebrew equivalents. He lists no less than 11 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.²

The following expressions and formulae have parallels in DA: in Sefire I A 5, *zy ysqn b' šrh* can be compared with *wbtrk tqwm* in Dan. 2.39 (7.6, 7), where the preposition 'šr ('tr) takes a pronominal suffix and is used with a verb in the imperfect. *gZR* 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 'l w'lyn* (I A 11), which is parallel to 'lywnyn in DA, a parallel seldom cited in previous studies. It is widely maintained, as expressed by Fitzmyer, that this

1. Greenfield, 'Stylistic Aspects', pp. 2-3.

2. This is probably due to the content and language of those texts.

title, which denotes a 'pair of gods' in Sefire, is West Semitic or Canaanite.¹ Fitzmyer is also right in noting that the relation of the Aramaic *El wa-'Elyān* to the Hebrew *'El 'Elyōn* is complicated by the fact that 'in Ugaritic we have divine names sometimes used alone and sometimes connected by *w-* which apparently denote one god',² note the titles *Qdš wAmrr* or *Kṯr wḤss*, both of which are double names used with a singular verb.

The absence of the *waw* in the Hebrew *'El 'Elyōn* may then clarify the role of the *waw* in its Aramaic form, that is, the *waw* here should be taken as explicative. This fact is strengthened by the use of similar 'pair names' in this section, like *šmš wnr* (I A 9), where *nr* may be related to the Akkadian *nūru*, which serves as an epithet for various gods connected with light.³ In Ugaritic, the same word appears as an epithet of the moon-god.⁴ In Esarhaddon's Vassal Treaties (l. 422), *šmš* and *nr* come together in the expression *nur šamamē u qaqqari*, 'the light of the heavens and earth'.⁵ On the basis of these parallels, *šmš wnr* here might be considered as a title that should be rendered 'šmš which is nr'. *nr* could stand as an appositional noun or an attribute.

If this is accepted, then the Hebrew *'El 'Elyōn* might be taken in the same way, as also its abbreviated form *'lywnyn* in Daniel 7.⁶ Moreover, in Daniel 4 there is a similar problem with *'ṯr weqaddiš* (vv. 10, 20), a double name which takes only a singular verb. For Bauer and Leander,⁷ this is just the case, and the *waw* here is doubtless explicative, so it can be rendered 'und zwar'.

The interesting admonition *pqḥw 'ynykm lḥzyh* (I A 13) is paralleled only in the Hebrew of Daniel, in Daniel's prayer to God

1. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 37.

2. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, pp. 37-38.

3. H. Donner, 'Zur Inschrift von südschîn Aa9', *AfO* 18 (1957-58), pp. 390-91.

4. C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, p. 443.

5. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 35.

6. This form is usually considered as a double plural form or imitating the Hebrew 'Elohim'.

7. H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962), p. 324g: 'w nicht anreihend, sondern explikativ ('und zwar)'. See also Dan. 4.12 for another case of the explicative *waw*.

(Dan. 9.18). Kaufman has made a connection between Sefire I A 24 and a similar idea from the Tell Fakhriyah inscription, in an attempt to improve the reading of 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 a comparative study.

Scholars have been puzzled over *b'š* (I A 35), which is usually feminine, especially in later Aramaic.⁵ Although 'š' of DA is often said to be a feminine singular noun (accounting for a shift from *he* to *aleph*), Fitzmyer is right in saying, 'There is no reason why it could not be the emp. sg. m., related to the form found here'.⁶

There is one case where *mlk* (read *mulk* I B 6 [?]; I C 6)⁷ 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 'yš, which is abundantly attested in later Aramaic⁸ but not in DA, where 'nš is found all the way through the text.

The partially reconstructed *l'lmn* (I B 7) is different from 'd 'lm (III 24, 25), or *lkl' lmy*n of 1QapGen (ll. 12, 20 etc.), but it is identical with *l'lmyn*, found four times in DA (2.4, 44; 3.9; 5.10).

zy y'wrn (II B 4) is translated 'who are watchful', and the context suggests that it is related to divine beings, just like 'yr of Daniel 4. The verb 'št (*wt' 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

1. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', pp. 170-72.

2. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 45.

3. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 39.

4. A. Lemaire and J. Durand, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré et l'Assyrie de Shamshi-ilu* (Geneva: Droz, 1984), p. 13.

5. See examples in *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 53.

6. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 53.

7. Thus Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, pp. 74-75.

8. Thus Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 77.

would fit the context well, and the second is found in Dan. 6.4.¹

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 (l. 12), *mn ydy* comes at the end of the sentence. In Tell Fakhriyah, *mn ydh* occurs twice (ll. 17, 18). In all these cases, *yd* means 'power'. The expression also appears in Sefire III 11 and Dan. 3.15.

wyžhl h' mn (II C 6) can be compared with *wdhlyn mn qdm* from Dan. 6.27.² On *hd* (III 1), Fitzmyer comments: 'The indefinite use of the numeral in the sense of "a" or "one" is frequent in this stele; see lines 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19 (with a suffix), 22'.³ There are at least three interesting expressions in DA where *hd* has the same role: *šlm hd* (Dan. 2.31), *kš'h hdh* (4.16), and *'bn hdh* (6.18).

With regard to *mll mln lhyt* (III 2), it is interesting that both the subject noun and the verb are used in the expression *wmlyn lšd 'ly' ymll* 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 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 lbb* of Dan. 5.20. Koopmans thinks that *mn hd* (read *man had*) in III 9 has to be related to *mn dy* in DA.⁴

br 'nš (III 16) is an expression that has undergone almost numberless studies.⁵ 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,

1. For other occurrences, see Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 87.

2. See also Zakkur A 13.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 102. In 1926, G.R. Driver stated that *hd* used as an indefinite article permitted 'a date as early as the papyrus' but it did not 'disallow a later date' ('The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel', p. 112).

4. J.J. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie, I. Teil: Kommentare* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut, 1962), p. 65.

5. For extensive bibliography on this subject, the reader is referred to two studies: A.J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel 7* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983); Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean*, pp. 143-60.

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.¹ *wkzy* (III 24) is also a compound word, common in the Elephantine Papyri,² and it occurs in DA five times (2.13; 3.7; 5.20; 6.11, 15).

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

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.³

All in all the vocabulary here is rich, and a number of rare and uncertain words are present. When one 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 per cent of the total. Another 62 words are not found in DA.

The following expressions are of interest for comparison: *wntn bydy* (Had. 2) has the same meaning as *yhb bydk* in Dan. 2.38; *hn* (Had. 29) meaning 'if' is used in this text, just as in DA, e.g., Dan. 2.6.⁴ In LA and Syriac this word became 'n. *hqmt nšb* (Had. 1) is to be noted because in Panammu 1 a different verb (*šym*) is used.⁵ Daniel 3 uses *šlm' dy hqym*.⁶ The word *prs* (Pan. 6) has been noted in

1. As well as Syriac.

2. A. Cowley (ed.), *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 291.

3. E.g. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 81.

4. It is also attested many times in Sefire and Nerab (cf. W.E. Aufrecht [ed.], *A Synoptic Concordance of Aramaic Inscriptions* [Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975], p. 44).

5. For the interchangeability of the two verbs, see Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 92.

6. For the interdialectal distribution of this and similar formulae, see Tawil, 'Some Literary Elements', pp. 40-65.

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*. Panammu 23, *qdm 'lhy wqdm 'nš*, has its parallel in Dan. 6.23: *qdmwhy ['lhy]...w'p qdmyk mlk'*. The first part of this expression is just like *qdm '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 in DA.¹ *pmz* in Hadad 3 is explained as a compound of *p*, *mh* and *zy*. The last two particles are found together in Dan. 2.28 and elsewhere.

The Barrakab Inscriptions

The inscriptions together have only 30 short lines with a total of 47 different words that are used. Of these, 36 can be found also in DA, while 11 cannot. This means that 77 per cent of the total different words are attested also in DA.

The following expressions have corresponding phrases in DA:

hwšbny...krs' 'by (I 5-7) is composed of a verb in the causative stem, and the noun *krs'* followed by its modifier. In Dan. 5.20 the same pattern is followed in *hnht...mn krs' mlkwth*.

wbyt 'by 'ml mn kl (I 7-8) is made up of a noun functioning as the subject, a 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 klhwn* (v. 19), or to *dy tšn' mn kl* (v. 23), or *'rb'h mlkyn yqwmwn mn 'r''* (v. 17). All four parallels in DA come from ch. 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'bhyy (I 15-16) has the same word order as *wḥbl l' 'yty bhwn* in Dan. 3.25. Also, *lyšh* (I 16) is often found in Daniel 2, e.g., *l' 'yty* in Dan. 2.11.

h' (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 ḥzh gbryn 'rb'h* (Dan. 3.25); *'nh...šh hwyt bbyty*

1. Jean and Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 225.

(4.1); 'nh bnyth lbyr mlkw (4.27); 'nh...msbh wmrwmm wnhdr mlk šny' (4.34).

The Nerab Stelae

The two inscriptions together have only 24 short lines. One can count 49 different words in them. Thirty-nine are also attested in DA, while ten are not. Therefore, 78 per cent of the words from the stelae occur in DA. Among the ten which do not, there are some loanwords like 'rsth (I 4), which is Akkadian, and lm'n (II 7), which is attested only in Hebrew, and hwm (II 6), a noun not attested anywhere else in Aramaic.

On the other hand, hyn (I 10) is used in the same way as bhyn of Dan. 7.12. 'hrh (I 13) is usually understood as taking the *he* locative, which is temporal here and translated adverbially 'in the future'.¹ In this case the following verb ynšr would have to be in the 'Niphal or Qal passive'² (?). In light of 'hrn in Dan. 2.39-40, I would prefer to read 'hrh as a substantive (abstract?), and to render the entire phrase, 'another will guard yours'. Koopmans seems to suggest this possibility in a similar way.³ šdqty (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,⁴ LA,⁵ and in Syriac.

šym šm ṭb (II 3) is just like šm šmh blš'šr in Dan. 5.12, and both ṭb and blš'šr have the appositional function in these two expressions.

pmy...mln (II 4) is similar to ml' bpm of Dan. 4.28.

m'n ksp wnhš (II 6-7) can be compared with Dan. 5.2, lm'ny dhh' wksp'.

The Ashur Ostrakon

In 21 lines of the fragmentary text, there are 62 different words of which 48 are attested also in DA, while 14 are not. Thus 77 per cent of the words are found in DA.

1. E.g. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 96: 'in the future may yours be guarded'.
2. *KAI*, p. 276.
3. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 93.
4. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 359.
5. E.g. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 209.

Akkadian influence seems to be present in the vocabulary. The following words may be noted in this connection: 'grt (l. 4), ks' (ll. 16, 18), and lbt ml' (l. 19).¹ Some scholars have suggested a possible link between 'rh (l. 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, 'zy (l. 6) is a word similar to 'dyn of DA and EgA. Finally, qrq (l. 9) is a problematic word, and Koopmans, in tracing its development, makes connections between it and qrš of Dan. 3.8, 6.25.²

A number of expressions in our text are similar or identical to those in DA:

lmry mlk' (l. 6) and mr'y mlk' (ll. 7,8) can be paralleled to 'l mr'y mlk' (Dan. 4.21).³

kyz' z' (l. 8) meaning 'this and that' is an asyndeton and reminds one of d' ld' (Dan. 5.6) and d' mn d' (7.3).

wqymt qdmy (l. 9) is similar to qdmwhy yqwmwn of Dan. 7.10.

ydyhm ktbt (l. 9) is to be compared with yd' dy ktbh (Dan. 5.5).

hšd' hny mly' (l. 12) has two parallels in DA: mlt' mny 'zd' hn (2.5) and dy 'zd' mny mlt' (2.8).

Finally, zly (l. 13) is used once like dy lh in Dan. 2.20.

Conclusion

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 DA and the inscriptions under 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 identical and similar expressions, phrases or sentences.

Study of the vocabulary of OA inscriptions reveals that an average OA inscription has over 65 per cent of its vocabulary also attested in DA. Table 1 presents these data for each of the inscriptions under study here. The first number represents the total of different words⁴

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, pp. 98-100.

2. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 83.

3. In a similar way, wmr' mlkyn (Dan. 2.47) is comparable to 'l mr' mlkyn from the Adon Letter from c. 600 BC (Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 113 no. 21, l. 1).

4. 'Words', used here in its wider meaning, is all-inclusive for inseparable prepositions, particles, etc.

in an inscription, the second stands for the number of words that are found also in DA, and the third number is the percentage:

<i>Document</i>	<i>Number of Different Words</i>	<i>Words Found in DA</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Tell Fakhriyah	95	65	68%
Bir-Hadad	10	9	90%
Zakkur	55	44	80%
Sefire	238	134	56%
Hadad and Panammu	150	87	58%
Barrakab	47	36	77%
Nerab	49	39	78%
Ashur	63	48	77%

Table 1. Vocabulary

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. The low percentage is not only attributable to the different nature of this text, but also to the vocabulary, which has a great deal of nature and cult imagery, and legal terminology.

Other interesting points in the lexical field can be particularly instructive for this subject. The word *gbr* in Tell Fakhriyah is distinguished from *'nš* just as was seen in DA. The same inscription uses some rather rare words found in DA: *prys*, *šlh*, *blh* and so on. 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*, *gZR* (in the reflexive stem as *ygtZR*), *dmw*, *lhwy* (its precativ form), *zy* (with its genitive function), *m'n*, *nhr*, *qbl* and *šlh*. This study of vocabulary yields similar results when comparison is made with the common or similar expressions, formulae, and phrases in OA texts.¹ No less than 54 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 number of these in Barrakab and Ashur is noticeable and shows that DA may not be far from Mesopotamian influence.

1. See Appendix 1.

Chapter 3

GRAMMATICAL CORRELATIONS

Orthography

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 BC,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 BC³ (the very time of the Tell Fakhriyah 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 inscriptions of the time. At first this development related to final syllables, but not long afterwards came the development of medial vowel-letters.⁵

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'.⁶ Muraoka agrees with Fitzmyer's modified version of the thesis, but feels that it is in need of further modification, especially because of the new material found in the Tell Fakhriyah inscription. 'As far as our inscription is concerned, the use

1. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1927), p. 18.

2. 'The Oracles of Baalam', *JBL* 63 (1949), p. 209.

3. *Early Hebrew Orthography* (AOS, 36; New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1952), p. 59. See also their supplement to this work, 'Some Observations on Early Hebrew', *Bib* 53 (1972), pp. 413-20.

4. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, pp. 31-32.

5. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, p. 41.

6. *A Wandering Aramean*, p. 64.

of medial vowel letters in it is very much farther advanced than "inceptive"; it is indeed almost fully developed.¹

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

The consonants used as vowel-letters in this inscription are *y, w, h, ' (possibly in z't)*.² The sizable number of these spellings is 'one of the most striking features of this inscription'.³ All OA texts use vowel-letters for indication of final long vowels. Their use to denote internal vowels has generally been considered⁴ to be limited to not more than five or six cases in Western OA. Yet in this relatively short inscription there are no less than 15 such cases, almost 15 per cent of the total number of different words used in it. The following words are considered as being fully spelled: 'dqwr, 'lhyn, dmwt', gwgl, mwtn, prys, š'ryn, tnwr, tšlwth, yšym, Gwzn, Ḥbwr, Nyrql, Ssnwry, 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 had been generally admitted.⁵ 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'.⁶ Kaufman's formulation is even more radical:

In our text every long *ū* and *ī* 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.⁷

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.⁸ Thus 'lhyn is also spelled defectively. Once

1. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 87.
2. See Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 54.
3. R. Zadok, 'Remarks on the Inscription of HDYS'Y from Tall Fakhariya', *Tel Aviv* 9 (1982), p. 117.
4. Zadok, 'Remarks', p. 121.
5. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 42.
6. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 87.
7. See Koopmans, 'Reflexions', p. 156.
8. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 40. See also J.C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, 'Notes on the Curse Formulae of the Tell Fekherye Inscription', *RB* 92 (1985), pp. 55-56.

again the OA corpus does not seem to be as uniform as was once 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'.¹

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.² For Muraoka, 'foreign words and names may have served as a major catalyst for the development of *matres lectionis*, whether medial or final'.³

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

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, *nšb'* (read: *nšiba'*, or *naššebha'*).⁴ This may represent a *qaṭil* type of noun, spelled without a *yod*.

The Zakkur Inscription (and Graffiti)

There are a number of final vowel-letters and at least one internal vowel-letter in this inscription. The *w* in *šwr'* (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 *mḥnwt* (A 9) and *y* in *'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,⁵ 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*.⁶ The same is attested 13 times in Sefire and a few times in Elephantine papyri.⁷ 11QtgJob agrees with DA against 1QapGen and the later Targums.

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 8.

2. See the study by J. Aro, *Abnormal Plane Writings in Akkadian Texts* (StudOr, 19.11; Helsinki: SOF, 1953).

3. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 86.

4. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 20.

5. *KAI*, No. 203. Both the Zakkur inscription and the graffiti come from approximately the same time period.

6. See Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, pp. 209-10.

The Sefire Inscriptions

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 ones. These are the following:² *tw'm* (I A 34; a place name), *š'wt'* (I A 35), *y'wrn* (II B 4), *kym* (III 1), *rwḥ* (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'wrn* could be the simple stem imperfect from the root 'wr with the long *u* fully written. The meaning and function of *rwḥ* 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 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 in Tell Fakhriyah. Fitzmyer thinks that *hmwn* in I A 29 should be identified as a case of *scriptio plena*.⁵ Koopmans makes an observation on *zā* (I A 35), which according to certain scholars contains an early case of *matres lectionis*.⁶ Finally, the interesting form *šybt* (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

7. Vasholz, 'A Philological Comparison', p. 48.

1. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 139.

2. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 20.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 51.

4. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 104.

5. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 48.

6. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 54: 'According to Cross and Freedman, the *aleph* is here still a consonant, but according to Garbini. . . it is already a vowel-letter (see Ner. 9, Had. 17)'.

Aramaic of this period'.¹ Yet in order to explain the very next word in the same line (*wlylh*), 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.² He says, 'A dissimilation of the diphthongs has produced the contraction in the last syllable; which contraction is indicated by *he*'.³

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 at least suppressed in writing. Yet in Sefire I A in three successive lines we have two spellings for the same word occurring three times: '*yk zy*' (I A 35), '*ykh zy*' (37), and back to the first form *w'yk zy* (39). Should this be taken as evidence for the pronunciation of this final long *ā* 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.

The word *r'yš* in the text of DA (2.32, etc.) has the same defective spelling as is found in the text of Sefire (II B 8; III 11), Egyptian Aramaic,⁴ the BA of Ezra (5.10), and 11QtgJob (29.25). A variant spelling *r'yš* occurs in 11QapGen (17.9, 11; 20.3, 29) and in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic.⁵

According to Gibson's conclusion on the orthography, the

1. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 38.

2. *Early Hebrew Orthography*, p. 27; G. Garbini, 'L'Aramaico antico', in *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei Memorie* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1956), p. 260; S. Segert, 'Zur Schrift und Orthographie der altaramäischen Stelen von Sefire', *ArOr* 32 (1964), p. 123.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 38.

4. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 6.1; 10.6, etc.; E.G. Kraeling (ed.), *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), 2.8, 9; 7.22, 25.

5. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Pardes, 1950), pp. 1477-78.

inscription shows a marked advance upon Zakkur in this respect, and the next step in this development is the dialect of Zanjirli.¹ If this line of reasoning is followed, then it is also necessary to state that, in the light of the Tell Fakriyah inscription, we can now trace this line of 'development' chronologically only for the West OA dialect.

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

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 or not there is an unexpected internal full spelling of that word. The words that have internal vowel-letters are: *qyrt* (Had. 10; Pan. 4), *kpyry* (Had. 10; Pan. 10), *yhbty* (Had. 11), *blyl'* (Had. 24), *mwm't* (Had. 24), *mwdy-yh* (Had. 24, 27), *'yhyh* (Had. 27, 28, 30, and *'yhth* in 28, 31), *pl'twh* (Pan. 2), *'bwh* (Pan. 2), *'yhy* (Pan. 3), *hwyt* (Pan. 5), *šwrh* (Pan. 6, 9), *qytyl* and *qnw'l* (Pan. 8), *hy'tbh* (Pan. 9), *mwkrw* (Pan. 10), *mwq'* (Pan. 13, 14) and *yws'* (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); *mšwt* (Had. 21), but *mšt* (Had. 6); *wbywmy/-h* (Pan. 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 20 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 which are very short, such as conjunctions, particles or pronouns. For example, the transition in Samalian from *'nk* (Had. 1) to *'nky* (Pan. 19) did not require centuries, it took place in a matter of decades or years.² *zn* (Had. 1) is also spelled *znh* in Panammu 22.³

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 20.

2. Is *'nky* (Pan. 19) a 'historical spelling', as Gibson would like to have it (*Textbook*, p. 63), or an alternative form of *'nk* used here interchangeably?

'*hkm* (Had. 29) is *plene* in 'yhy (Pan. 3), in 'yhh (Had. 30), and in its feminine form 'yht (Had. 31). 'š (Had. 11, 34) is 'nš in Panammu 23 and 'nšy in Hadad 16 and 30. *p'* (Had. 17) is the conjunction *p* written *plene*,¹ and a third form is *py* in Panammu 11,² like *lbn'* (Had. 30, 31), which can be written as *lbny* (Had. 20).

Dion is correct in his statement on the use of medial vowel-letters, that a simple look at the Samalian texts is sufficient to demonstrate that they used *waw* and *yod* as internal vowel-letters more often than other contemporary inscriptions.³ 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 *hwšbny* (Pan. 19), but the use of such double forms as *bywmy* in Panammu 18 and *wbymy* in Hadad 15 'requires the recognition of a full vowel in contrast to the customary interpretation of similar forms in OA'.⁴

This suggests that some conclusions made in the past on OA represent but partial observations on this dialect, since they have been based on a dialect of OA, rather than encompassing all the 'variations' found in OA. It is to be recalled that in Sefire I, in three successive lines, there were two different spellings of the same word, and to put that together with this evidence from Samalian is to see much less uniformity in orthographical practices used in OA.

The writers of these inscriptions preferred *aleph* or *yod* to *he* in representing long *ê*.⁵ So *hm'* in Hadad 33 could be a feminine form found also as *hmh* in Dan. 3.13, 19. *št'* (Had. 9) has replaced *h* with an *aleph*.⁶

This leads Dion to say that he believes he has enough evidence to suppose that very early in the first millennium '*aleph* was commonly

3. I am not certain what Gibson means by saying that the ending *h* was 'no longer pronounced' (*Textbook*, p. 63).

1. *KAI*, p. 219.

2. See Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 84.

3. P.E. Dion, *La langue de Ya'udi* (Waterloo, Ontario: Editions SR, 1974), p. 68.

4. Dion, *La langue*. This case was for Dion 'most intriguing'.

5. Dion, *La langue*, p. 57.

6. The early interchanges of the *aleph* and *he* are in a word from an inscription dated 725 BC (*CIS II*, vol. 1, pp. 3-4), and in a graffito (*KAI*, No. 203). The letters from Hermopolis (sixth-fifth cent. BC) often use *he* instead of *aleph*.

used not just as a vowel-letter. . . but as the indication of the presence of any vowel'.¹

The Barrakab Inscriptions

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 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 Papyri.² 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 is remote from the practices which become regular in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. There *mr'*, for example, occurs in its absolute state spelled regularly as *mrh*.³

The Nerab Stelae

What has been said for the Barrakab inscriptions 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, but this time they are not found in foreign words. These occur in *yk'lwk* (I 11) and *šmwny* (II 7). The number of these occurrences is smaller than what has been seen in the older texts of the Samalian dialect.

1. Dion, *La langue*, p. 84. Notice also the conjunction spelled as *w'* in Pan. 12.

2. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 6.2.

3. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 213.

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).¹ 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'*.² In the Qumran fragments of DA published thus far, *dnh* cannot be found, but in several other places *aleph* take the place of *he*.³ Finally, in 1QapGen we find only the spelling *dn'*.⁴

The situation is different for our text with regard to the marker of the emphatic state of nouns. In fact, here *he* takes the place of *aleph* twice: *'hrh* (I 13) and *'hrth* (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.⁵ In addition, all seven examples mentioned by Rowley are spelled elsewhere in DA with an *aleph*.⁶

The Ashur Ostrakon

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

Conclusion

The presence of vowel-letters in a sizable number in OA texts is the most significant orthographic feature for our study here. The presence of vowel letters in DA is often viewed as an indication of a late orthography. It is true that—in contrast to OA texts, which were engraved in stone and written down once for all—the text of DA has

1. Bauer and Leander (*Grammatik*, p. 82) erroneously gives *dn'* as a variant found in Dan. 2.18 and Jer. 10.11.

2. Kraeling, 'Aramaic Papyri', p. 9.16, dated at 404 BC.

3. *nhw'* (Dan. 2.4), *'n'* (2.5), *b'tbhlh* (3.24) and *dm'* (3.25).

4. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 209.

5. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 41. Three words may be taken as having a third masculine singular pronominal suffix (*pšrh* in 2.7, *yqrh* in 5.20, and *r'šh* 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).

6. See Dan. 2.25, 37; 5.24; 6.15.

been transmitted through centuries, copied a number of times, and thus exposed to possible alterations. Yet, so far proposed solutions may not have exhausted all alternatives.

Geography must go hand in hand with chronology when Aramaic documents are being dated. Moreover, the inconsistency in spelling encountered in these texts 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.

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 are found only in foreign proper names (I 3, 9).

Nerab stela^e 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.

Phonology

In the area of phonology, the standard OA writing practice is dominant in all of the texts under consideration. Yet, it is clear that this practice was not uniform because exceptions are present in every inscription.

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

The phonology of this inscription is in many ways in agreement with what had already been known from OA. For example, the substitution

of *b* for *p* is confined to the word *npš*; *ḏ* is expressed by *q* in the spelling of two words (*'rq* and *mrq*); and *ḏ* is *z*, except for the verb *lwd*. The difference comes in the use of *samek* to indicate phonetic *t* (interdental) where other OA texts have *šin*. 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 a single sign had to be used for more than one sound (e.g. in Phoenician *t* had merged with *šin*). At Gozan, where there was no Phoenician influence, no such 'Phoenicianizing' was present.

The grapheme *š* was not phonetically univalent in OA. The spelling of the Tell Fakhriyah inscription indicates that. Muraoka can safely conclude that Degen was right in arguing² that a 'principle of polyphony must be postulated'.³

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 was made that DA was much later than OfA. Rowley followed W. Baumgartner⁴ in this reasoning.⁵

The two scholars failed to note the occasional 'late' spellings in the early OfA documents, or some 'early' spellings in DA, such as *zkw* in Dan. 6.23. According to the established norms, this form was earlier than *dkyn* of the Papyri.⁶

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*.

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

1. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 146.

2. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, pp. 33-34.

3. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 90.

4. 'Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel', p. 81.

5. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 38: '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.'

6. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 6.

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 A 15 (written this way and not *mhq*) and argues as follows:

The form as established by Landsberger therefore apparently indicated that at that time (eighth century BC) the PS /d/ was a ready [sic—read 'already'] realized as /ʔ/. But in the parallel OA texts it is still the sign /q/ which is employed for the notation of the PS /d/, 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.² Coxon comes up with the proposal that although there was a tendency for *d* 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 BC, although it found no uniform expression in the script until after the fifth century'.³ He gives similar conclusions for the use of *t* for the interdental fricative *t̥*, and of *ayin* for the etymological *d̥*. In both cases the older OFA texts sustain the transition and remove any doubts about their pronunciation in the sixth and fifth centuries BC.⁴

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 *d* spellings are attested even earlier—for example, in a proper name *šmš'dry* from the sixth or seventh century BC.⁵ In OA, Fitzmyer states that if the root *lwd* that occurs in several places in Sefire is correctly analyzed and 'is related to Hebrew *lwz*,

1. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 353. See also J. Blau, *On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970), pp. 45-49.

2. 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations', p. 8.

3. 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations', p. 11.

4. For the complete lists, see Rowley, *Aramaic*, pp. 26-31, and Coxon, 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations', pp. 15-17.

5. *CIS II*, vol. 1, pp. 88-89.

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 BC.² The spelling of certain 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 use of 'later' spellings would indicate a late influence by the scribes in their revision of the text in order to make it fit the changing pronunciation. The differences between the fragments of Daniel at Qumran and the Masoretic text would support this view.⁴ Occasional hyperarchaisms 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.⁵

One also has to take into consideration the literary genres of the texts under study. The texts of the narrative-didactic style, like the

1. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 76, dated in the eighth century BC.

2. Coxon, 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations', p. 10.

3. Jeremiah's spelling is historical in the archaic formula *šmyn, 'rq*, but contemporary spelling in '*r'* and *kdnh* (Dan. 2.10). Baumgartner, in his extensive work, did not seem to have grasped this distinction between '*rq* and '*r'*: 'Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel', *ZAW* 45 (1927), p. 123. L.F. Hartman and A.A. di Lella (*The Book of Daniel* [AB, 23; New York: Doubleday, 1978], p. 77), with some commentaries, reject Jer. 10.11 as a late gloss, betrayed as such by the non-poetic character of the verse. Snell ('Why is there Aramaic?', p. 42) argues that the verse fits its context. T. Laetsch (*Jeremiah* [St. Louis: Concordia, 1965], pp. 121-22) gives a good poetical analysis of the verse as fitting in its context.

4. The spelling of the Qumran fragments of the DA is closer to the spelling of 1QapGen than to the MT. See the differences noted by D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik (*Discoveries in the Judean Desert: Qumran Cave I* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955], pp. 150-52), and by J.C. Trever ('Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave I', *RevQ* 5 [1965], pp. 323-34).

5. *Iranische Beiträge*, I, pp. 242-45. If this is true, then occasional *d* spellings in other books of the Bible, like those in the book of Job, would have to be explained in the same way. Cf. M. Blommerde, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1969), p. 5.

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, and prefer the traditional archaic terminology and spelling.¹

The only consonantal metathesis in the inscription is found in the word *ygtzr* (l. 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

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

In this text we encounter a normal western OA practice, where the interdental *d* is represented by *z*. This is evident in words like *zy*, *nzr*, and '*zr*. In this regard the phonology of the inscription is different from what we have in DA. Lipiński, 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 BC.³ The root '*zr* is often used in the Onomasticon with such a spelling. The word *nzr* is to be noted, for although the root *nzr* is attested in the *niphāl* and *hiphāl* stems in Hebrew, in the *qāl* stem it is spelled with *ndr*, as in Phoenician and Ugaritic.⁴ On the other hand, if one follows the reading proposed by Cross, one finds a similar phenomenon, to Cross's own surprise, since in 'Old Aramaic we should expect *dī mašq* to be written *zmšq*, the adjective *mšqy*'.⁵ This suggests that *d* spellings are not totally absent from early Aramaic material.

The Sefire Inscriptions

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 'conformss [sic] entirely to that found in the other Old Aramaic inscriptions'.⁶ The treatment of some Proto-Semitic sounds

1. Coxon, 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutations', p. 21.
2. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 55.
3. Lipiński, 'Studies in Aramaic', p. 16.
4. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 4.
5. Cross, 'Stele Dedicated to Melcarth', p. 40.
6. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 419.

has a Canaanite quality, yet it differs from it in a significant number of 'exceptional cases'.

Thus some early consonantal shifts are already noticeable: *yrt* (I C 24) instead of *yrš*, 'which did not take place generally in Aram. till the Persian period';¹ *ḥsr* (I A 28) is written instead of *ḥqr*; *ʔll* (I B 42) for the expected *šll*; *lwd* (I C 18) instead of *lwz*;² *zrpnt* (I A 8) for the Akkadian *Šarpanītu*; *ʔrsmk* (I A 1) looks rather suspicious, and the occasional *b/p* shifts, present elsewhere in OA, are present here too. *yšrn* (I B 8), however, is spelled 'normally', in contrast to *nṯr* in the DA (7.28) and the Elephantine Papyri.³

'šm (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 provenance of the Aramaic of the book.⁵

Finally, a case of the metathesis of the sibilants *t* and *š* occurs in *yšṯt* (I A 32), but not *ytšm'* (I A 29), as is the case in Dan. 7.27.

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

Phonology of this dialect can be judged as rather conservative and close to the Western OA phonology, but not without one exception: 'rq in Hadad 13, but *šry* in Hadad 30 is like *ḥsr* in Sefire I A 28. The

1. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 43. Koopmans comments on this word: 'In this case one still expects *š*, but already in the seventh cent. *t* sometimes takes the place of *š*' (*Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 59).

2. The 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' (Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 76).

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 61.

4. E.g. Baumgartner takes it 'als Beweis für späte Entstehung' ('Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel', p. 88 n. 4).

5. 'A Philological Note on *ISTYW*', pp. 275-76.

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 such words as *ħd/h* (Had. 27; Pan. 5), *ytmr* (Had. 10), *'ħz* (Had. 3),¹ and *brš* (Pan. 12). This change occurs when *aleph* precedes letters *h*, *t*, *š*. In DA there are many words in which *aleph* does not seem to be pronounced any longer according to the Masoretic vowel system.² The most interesting word is *b'tr* (Dan. 7.6, 7), which experienced the elision of the *aleph* in dialects subsequent to DA.³ At the same time, in DA, once it takes a pronominal suffix, it drops the *aleph* in front of the *taw*, yielding *btrk* (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 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.⁴ As in Samalian and other Aramaic texts similar to OfA,⁵ DA does have some cases of interchange between *aleph* and *he* in spelling of the nouns,⁶ but the phenomenon is limited to a certain number of cases, and it is not as frequent as in LA.⁷

In the text of the Hadad and Panammu inscriptions, there seem to be

1. Concerning the pronunciation, contrast Gibson, for whom the absence of a second *aleph* does not mean that this consonant was not pronounced (*Textbook*, p. 70), with Dion, according to whom the *aleph* completing the first syllable was not to be written because it was not pronounced (*La langue*, p. 51).

2. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, pp. 12-13.

3. Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 46-47.

4. In Dion, *La langue*, p. 118, Dion adds other explanations to the one proposed here.

5. 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 ('Philological Comparison', pp. 25-26). He reached the same conclusions in studying the spellings of the words *mh*, *kmh*, *tmh* ('Philological Comparison', pp. 34-36), the spelling of the personal pronoun *'nh* (pp. 53-54), and the endings of the infinitive in derived stems (pp. 57-58).

6. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 23.

7. One example is the text of 1QapGen, where the consonant *he* is rarely found as the ending of a feminine noun. See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 187.

a significant number of words with a prosthetic *aleph*. The most certain case is the word 'šm (Had. 16, 21), but scholars are inclined to consider other words as belonging to this category as well: 'rqršph (Had. 11), 'rqw (Had. 13), 'zh (Pan. 2), 'gm (Pan. 5), and 'snb (Pan. 6). These examples represent quite a few occurrences for an OA dialect, and 'šm 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,¹ and if this is an eastern feature in OfA, as Coxon would have it, it certainly is not only an eastern feature in OA.²

In concluding this section on 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,³ *qtl* in Panammu and Sefire, and *kṭl* in Nerab and Ahiqar. Likewise we have the word *qyṣ* in Hebrew, which is *qyṭ* in DA, and *kys'* in Barrakab. The orthography of the first word has been explained in three different ways: (1) the original *t* was later assimilated to *q* thus giving *ṭ*;⁴ or (2) *kṭl* experienced a shift from *k* to *q*; or (3) *qtl* was the initial form which developed two later forms by the process of dissimilation.⁵ 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 certain specific phenomena.

The Barrakab Inscriptions

The only case of interest here is the *b* in *nbšt* (II 7), which in addition to Sefire is found in this text, too. *k* in *kys'*, according to Gibson, is the 'only clear instance of Akkad. influence on the phonology'.⁶

1. Baumgartner, 'Das Aramäische in Buche Daniel', pp. 88-89.

2. 'A Philological Note on *IŠTYW*', p. 276.

3. See Jean and Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 257.

4. E.g. Degen, in *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 41.

5. E.Y. Kutscher, *Asian and African Studies* 2 (1966), p. 196.

6. Gibson, *Textbook*, 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). Professor Millard reminds me that Mesopotamian influence on the syntax of Barrakab joins this particular form.

The Nerab Stelae

A few cases are worth mentioning in these texts. *yh'bdw* (I 11) has retained *waw* and *he*, like *yhšpl* (Dan. 7.24), both *hwbd* in DA. In the latter word *waw* has taken the place of *aleph*. In phonology *š* takes the place of *q* more often, as in *'ršt*h (I 4, 12). There is a case of phonological dissimilation of *q* in *ykłwk* (I 11).

The *nun* is assimilated in *yšw* (I 9, from the root *nsh*). However, *ynsr* (I 13) and *tnsr* (I 12) show that the assimilation of *nun* is not consistent in this text, and it may even be considered as 'irregular nasalization'. This phenomenon in OfA is called 'nasalization substituted for gemination' by Rosenthal.¹ It is considered a common feature of EgA and BA, and is attributed to Akkadian influence.² DA is similar to our text in this respect, since the process of nasalization is not consistent there either, as can be illustrated by differences between *kethib* and *qere* of the Masoretic text, or by the two forms together from one verse: *lhnsq* is spelled with a *nun*, but not so *whsq* (Dan. 6.24).

The Ashur Ostrakon

In the phonology of this text there is an early instance of *tau* instead of *šin*, and it is found in *yhtb* (l. 11), but not in partly reconstructed *'šwr* (l. 16). The *aleph* in *lmry* (l. 6) has suffered elision, but not in *mr'y* (ll. 7, 8, 17). DA preserves the latter spelling in its written transmission of the text.

ymn appears in line 16 where one would expect *ywmn* in OA. Similar cases of diphthong reduction in DA should probably be explained in the same way, rather than being 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* (l. 20) and *'hz'* (l. 14), just like the alternative spellings of the same forms in DA and EgA.³

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 16.
2. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 96.
3. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 109.

Conclusion

The new insight developed here from OA documents suggests that one should accord much more freedom to the people who wrote OA inscriptions.

Morphology

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

The morphology of this inscription shows an interesting mixture of archaic and innovative features. The precativ with *l* and the demonstrative pronoun *z't* are archaic. The infinitive *pe'al* is always prefixed with *m*, as in OfA, DA and so on, 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 *kethib* cannot be taken as absolutely more authentic than *qere* in DA,¹ 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 *mr'* in the inscription is spelled in accordance with other OA inscriptions.² 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 (*kethib*), the *aleph* is found, as in this inscription, both with and without suffixes. Some changes occur in EgA,³ while 1QapGen elides the *aleph* whenever suffixes are added,⁴ and the same feature is present in later Palestinian Jewish Aramaic.⁵ 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 *lamed* on the jussive precativ is known from Samalian and the Ashur Ostrakon,⁶ and in a unique form, *lhw'*, in DA.⁷ It is not only archaic, but a characteristic of Eastern Aramaic

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 12.

2. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, pp. 105-106.

3. Like Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 34.6.

4. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 235. Without suffixes, it is spelled *mrh*.

5. Baumgartner, 'Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel', p. 104.

6. KAI, p. 233.

7. *lhw'* (2.20, 28, 29 bis, 41, 45; 3.18; 5.29; 6.3), *lhw* (4.22), *lhw*n (2.43 bis; 6.2, 3, 27), *lhwyn* (5.17).

dialect. It is usually understood as coming from Akkadian.¹ Our text gives as many as 12 forms with the precativ proclitic *l*. In the days of Bevan, when the evidence was quite limited, 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.² Bevan 'guessed' that *lhw*' sounds in pronunciation as *lhwh*.³ At first this looked attractive, yet Bevan was forced to contradict his own thesis, stating at the same time that 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 inscriptions⁴ the performative for the prefix tense is regularly *l* instead of *n*. Today scholars argue for this not only as being a trait of Eastern Aramaic, but that '*l* in this position is older than *n*'.⁵

Two characteristics of the OA jussive precativ are: (1) in the second and third masculine plural endings, *n* is absent; (2) in the non-suffixed persons of the verbs *tertiaie infirmae*, *h* is replaced with *y*. In addition to these, our inscription suggests a shortening in spelling of the hollow verbs. Together with the prefix *l*, the first two characteristics are attested in DA, including the rare form *ytqry*, 'let him be called', spelled with a final *yod* that may be the remnant of an old jussive form.⁶ 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

1. S.A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 124-26. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 59: 'partie intégrante de l'araméen de Mésopotamie'. Muraoka ('Tell-Fekherye', p. 94) calls it 'a foreign intrusion'.

2. It is found in Mandaic (Rowley, *Aramaic*, 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 something 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 them.

3. *A Short Commentary*, pp. 35-36.

4. *KAI*, pp. 237-57.

5. Rosenthal, 'Aramaic Studies', p. 87.

6. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 89; Rosenthal, *Grammar*, pp. 44 and 52.

'there is no absolute reason to think that it must have been universal'.¹

Samalian attests to the regular syncope of *h* in the causative imperfect.² Sefire has seven cases with *h* and four without.³ DA spellings have the same ratio (45 cases: 30 with, 15 without). The Tell Fakhriyah inscription retains *h* in the imperfect (*lhynqn*, l. 21) and the participle (*mhnht*, l. 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*.⁴ (2) In DA, 15 different verbal roots take the form of this participle. In ten such forms *h* is retained, against four where it has syncope, and in one (*ydh*) it has both forms. (3) Later documents like 1QapGen have no causative forms with *h* in perfect, imperfect, infinitive or participle forms.

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'.⁵ I cannot comment on Muraoka's challenges to Kaufman and Degen,⁶ which have no direct bearing on this 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 *mhnht* 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 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 BC), which can even be considered an OA text,⁷ 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

1. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 96.

2. Dion, *La langue*, pp. 121-22.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 157.

4. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 14.

5. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 92.

6. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye'. Muraoka challenges Kaufman's statement that 'degemination is a feature of Babylonian Akkadian'.

7. See J.A. Fitzmyer's review of Gibson, *Textbook*, in which he puts forward a critique of Gibson's classification of Aramaic documents (*JBL* 96 [1977], pp. 425-26).

stage in the spelling of the *Pe Nun* verb when the vowelless N is once more assimilated to the following consonant'.¹

The phenomena of nasalization and assimilation in *pe nun* verbs is a complex matter that cannot be solved by one general statement. It has to be studied in respect to a single verb, with each stem examined separately, taking into consideration the kind of second consonant present in the root of that particular verb.² Moreover, Aramaic has been influenced to an extraordinary degree by the fact that it has 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.'³ 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.⁴ In the fifth-century Arsames correspondence, that *nun* is always preserved. This is very similar to EgA, in contrast to the Hermopolis Papyri, where assimilation is the rule with a few exceptions. For J.D. Whitehead, the influence of Babylonian Akkadian (especially Middle Babylonian), as 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. Whitehead says,

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.⁵

1. 'The Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of *IQGA* and *11Qtg Job*', *RevQ* 9 (1977), pp. 255-56.

2. See also an interesting evaluation of Coxon's articles by R.I. Vasholz ('A Further Note on the Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic, *11Qtg Job*, and *1QGenesis Apocryphon*', *RevQ* 10 [1981], pp. 95-96): 'It seems to me better to trace only these 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.'

3. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 57.

4. Jean and Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 188.

5. 'Some Distinctive Features of the Language of the Aramaic Arsames Correspondence', *JNES* 37 (1978), p. 125.

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* lies in the forms *kl̄n* and *kl̄m*, 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 are 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 and Dion says that it is a later development in Aramaic,³ but this would go against the examples in our inscription here. As the earliest Aramaic text, it uses only the prefixed form. Thus Muraoka concludes 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'.⁴ DA, like OfA, uses all prefixed forms of the simple infinitive. Another solution would favor DA more, namely, that the *m* prefixed infinitive was a Mesopotamian Aramaic innovation that would subsequently become a universal Aramaic feature.⁵

The infinitive of the derived stem in the inscription has only one occurrence, *lkn̄nh* (l. 11).⁶ According to the study by Vasholz,⁷ all

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 24.

2. *A Wandering Aramean*, p. 67.

3. Dion, *La langue*, pp. 122-23.

4. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 99.

5. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 99.

6. This is according to the editors. D. Pardee, however, reinterprets this form, and argues that it should be taken 'as precativ 1 + 3m.s. imperfect jussive + 3m.s. pronominal suffix' (review of *La statue*, by Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *JNES* 43 [1984], p. 254). The same has been argued by Kaufman ('Reflexions', p. 150, and review of *La statue*, by Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *JAOS* 104 [1984], p. 572).

7. Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 57-58.

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 *he* 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, *he* being rarely used. The consistency of the spelling in DA in this regard should be noted.

The comparison of the two reflexive forms for *gʒr* in DA and this inscription has already been noted in the Vocabulary section. A troublesome spelling of this form in Dan. 2.45 is *itpe'el* instead of *hitpe'el* as in v. 34. In the apparatus of the BHS, a number of listed manuscripts testify to the existence of this earlier form in Dan. 2.45.

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

The emphatic ending on the word *nšb'* 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, OfA¹ and DA, as against some Qumranic material (e.g. 1QapGen) and Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, where the elision occurs.²

The Zakkur Inscription (and Graffiti)

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. Friedrich³ proposes a combination of what is clear in both lines: *š... 'sr* in A 4, and *šb'...* in A 8. This combination gives *šb't'sr* 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,⁴ Old Aramaic⁵ and DA (Dan. 4.26) are

1. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, pp. 105-106.

2. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, p. 213.

3. Friedrich, 'Zu der altaramäischen Stele des ZKR von Hamat', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 21 (1966), p. 383.

4. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 15; yet Degen accepted it: cf. *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 6.

5. *CIS II*, vol. 1, p. 2.

in agreement with this order in Zakkur. This is in contrast to Cowley's edition of the Papyri¹ and LA² (Palmyrean and Nabatean), which have the opposite word order in numbers, where the units follow 'śr.

The Sefire Inscriptions

In the area of morphology there are a number of points that have been discussed in different studies of 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.

Particular similarities have already been noticed in the previous works. For example, there is a *peil* (impf. type *yuqʔal*) verb stem in *ygzr* (I A 40), *tšbr* (I A 38), *ygzrn* (I A 40), *y'rrn* (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.³ Instead of the later *ittaphal*, the inscriptions have the *huphal* stem (*y'r*, I A 39) formed just as the same stem is treated in DA (*hqymt* in Dan. 7.4 and *hqmt* in v. 5).⁴ *y'r* also 'shows elision of [h] in the imperf., a feature also found with the *hithpeel* and *haphel*, i.e., *ithpeel* and *aphel*'.⁵

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,⁶ and it was only with the publication of the Sefire stelae that Degen was able to distinguish between a 'Kurz' and 'Langimperfekt' in OA.⁷ 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:

1. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 26.10, 11.
2. *CIS II*, vol. 1, p. 76, 228; vol. 3, pp. 50-51.
3. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, pp. 42-43.
4. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 115.
5. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 24.
6. H.L. Ginsberg, 'Notes on Some Old Aramaic texts', *JNES* 18 (1959), p. 144; Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, pp. 96-97.
7. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, pp. 64-65.

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.¹

In a footnote to 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.² The following examples are noteworthy here: *y'r* (I A 39), *yskr* (III 3), *y'brnh* (III 17) and *tšlmn* (I B 24).

If one takes Fitzmyer's exhaustive study seriously, 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.³ This ratio can be compared with the ratio of the two ways of spelling the imperfect in DA, where there are 29 forms with *h* and 16 without. The conclusion seems to be clear at this point, that the ratio of the *haphellaphel* stems of the imperfect in Sefire and DA is very close. Moreover, *yskr* (III 3) is of special interest here, since it has its counterpart form *yhskr* 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 '*qymh* (3.1) and *hqymh* (5.11); the imperfect *yqym* (2.44; 4.14) and *yhqym* (5.21; 6.16); the participle *mhdq* (2.40) and *mdqh* (7.7, 19), *mhhsp'* (2.15) and *mħsp'* (3.22), *mhw'd'* (2.23) and *mwd'* (6.11). Scholars who are ready to explain *yskr* as a mere 'scribal error'⁴ 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*.⁵ In DA, in the same chapter (ch. 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

1. 'Some Distinctive Features', p. 126, based on the author's PhD dissertation.

2. Kitchen, 'Aramaic of Daniel', p. 70; Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 24; etc.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 157.

4. Segert, 'Zur Schrift und Orthographie', p. 121, followed by Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 20, and others.

5. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 157.

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. Energetic *nun* is often found in DA (e.g. 5.7; 2.5; etc.). The variation of *yhw* (II A 4) in I A 25, 32 and II A 6 as *thwy* should also be noted here as an alternative spelling. The verb *hlk* has the assimilation of *l*, as in DA.¹

'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.²

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 recognizes 'fluctuation in this regard as early as the first letter in Cowley's collection (dated 495 BC)'.³ 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 *'ykh* (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'.⁴ So for Fitzmyer 'the preferable vocalization would be *awh* with consonantal *he*'.⁵ But, according to Koopmans, 'The letter *i* in *ôhî* could also be short and needs not be written out'.⁶ For Kutscher there was no doubt that the suffix had a final vowel in Proto-Semitic.⁷

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 with OA in this respect. Moreover, DA has no exception to this rule, in

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 54.

2. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, pp. 12-13. Also *KAI*, p. 263, where 'Laryngal elision' is suggested.

3. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 73.

4. *Early Hebrew Orthography*, p. 29.

5. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 31.

6. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 45.

7. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 350.

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 'the precise wording is not clear' for some scholars.² If the reading is *kl 'l lbyth mlk*, it agrees well with 'l *lbyth* (Dan. 6.11), but 'l in DA has the form of a perfect, while 'l in Sefire seems to be a participle. The second reading proposed, *kl 'll byth mlk*, is also supported by DA, since the reading of the *kethib* gives 'llyn (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 *kethib* 'llt 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 *ls* instead of three. (2) 'll *lbyth* and 'll *byth* are two equivalent forms, optional in writing. (3) The verbal forms with double *l* 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 'll byth mlk* is favored here.

When Rowley made his extensive study of DA in 1929, the form 'ln, taken as a possible form of the demonstrative pronoun in the plural, was attested only in DA and late Palmyrene.⁴ Then the Sefire inscriptions were discovered in 1931, and they yielded new evidence on this point, presenting as many as 16 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.⁵

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

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 either that this is because of the Assyrian influence, or that there was an emphatic

1. Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 28-29, 33-34. The exceptions are: *dhw'* in Ezra 4.9, and *zn* in Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, 17.3 (*bis*).

2. *KAI*, p. 245.

3. See the discussion by Fitzmyer in *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 32.

4. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 56, and Kitchen, 'Aramaic of Daniel', p. 69. For Leander (Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 82), 'lyn occurred 'nur im jüngeren Daniel', in contrast to 'l and 'lh in 'den älteren Jeremiah und Ezra'.

5. Based on the counting in Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 182.

state in pronunciation, but it was not expressed in writing.¹

The importance of the use of the prefix *l* with precativè imperfect in OA in relation to DA has already been pointed out in this study. It turns out not to be a late feature of Aramaic, but rather, as Dion indicates, a free use of the precativè prefix, which can safely be ascribed 'to second millennium Aramaic... features retained by eighth century Sam'alian'.² The following is the list of verbs with a precativè *l*-. There are five such cases: *lytkh* (Had. 23), *lmn'* (Had. 24), *ltgmrw* (Had. 30), *plktšh*, and *plktšnh* (Had. 31). 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 '*t*' in Samalian. 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'.³

The third masculine plural imperfect has only *u* as at Nerab, in some cases in Sefire, in DA and EgA.⁴ Again a certain freedom in spelling is evident in *lbn'* (Had. 13), which is spelled with *aleph*. This can be called a 'false vocalization' of this *tertiæ 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 written without the prefix *h* in Samalian: *lytkh* (Had. 23), *yqm* (Had. 28), *ywq'* (Had. 21), *yzkr* (Had. 16), and possibly *yršy* (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

1. Dion, *La langue*, pp. 13-14.

2. 'The Language Spoken', p. 18.

3. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, pp. 16-17.

4. For DA, see Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 118, and Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 44.

šaf'el formation of *mrđ*.¹ There are four such formations in DA. Some scholars see the *šaf'el* formation as borrowed from Akkadian,² while others such as C. Rabin argue that its source was Amorite.³

The direct object marker in Samalian is spelled *wṭ* (*wṭh* 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 pronominal suffix in both Samalian and DA (*yṭhwn*, Dan. 3.12).⁵

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 DA and EgA as *yt*, and here in Samalian as *wṭ*. 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'.⁶

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'.⁷ Subsequently, however, the same spelling of this pronoun turned up in a fifth-century Brooklyn Papyrus.⁸

In a study published two decades later, Koopmans has 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 *wṭ*. From there on, he follows H. Bauer⁹ in tracing the next development

1. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 354.
2. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 53.
3. 'The Nature and Origin of the *šaf'el* in Hebrew and Aramaic', *Eretz-Israel* 9 (1969), p. 150. Also Dion, *La langue*, pp. 203-204.
4. Qumran, Murabbaat, the Targums and Galilean Aramaic.
5. It occurs only once in Kraeling, 'Aramaic Papyri', §3.22.
6. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 69.
7. 'Aramaic Studies Today', *JAOS* 62 (1942), p. 231.
8. Kraeling, 'Aramaic Papyri', §3.22.
9. 'Semitische Sprachprobleme', *ZDMG* 68 (1914), p. 370.

from *yt* to *'yt*.¹ 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 participle. Should this character be explained here by 'the cumulative evidence of initial *aleph*-*yod* interchange attested in various Semitic languages',² or should 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 BC.³

The Barrakab Inscriptions

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

The Nerab Stelae

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'šw* (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'ħz* (II 4) and *'thmw* (II 6). Gibson says,

There are several examples in the Old Aram. insc. of *h* being dropped in the imperf. Haph., Hithpe., etc., but this is the earliest instance of its omission in a perf.⁴

1. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 39.
2. C.D. Isbell, 'Initial 'Aleph-Yod Interchange and Selected Biblical Passages', *JNES* 37 (1978), p. 236.
3. Dion, *La langue*, p. 84.
4. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 98.

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 *mḥzh 'nh* (II 5). It used to be regarded simply as *oratio directa* in earlier studies. Thus Donner and Röllig's analysis gives two elements of this compound word: *mh*, an interrogative pronoun, and *ḥzh*, an active participle.¹ Yet, as early as 1912, Torrey preferred not to separate this word but to consider its *mem* as a kind of participial preformative.² Thus Fitzmyer goes against Rosenthal's translation—'and with my eyes, what do I see?'³—and suggests that this verb in the *pael* has the *mem* as the sign of the participle and 'should be translated, "and with my eyes I gazed upon my children to the fourth generation"'.⁴ Koopmans is open to both options, but prefers the traditional reading of this word.⁵ Gibson praises Fitzmyer's reading because of 'a more felicitous syntax than the usual interpretation'.⁶

From what we have seen in expressions that 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 the apparently reversed word order, for the purpose of emphasis.

The Ashur Ostrakon

There are three interesting points in the text that are useful for our discussion here:

1. *ydh*n (ll. 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 *šmḥthn* of DA may be of help here, since that same *he* is found preceding the pronominal suffix there, too.

1. *KAI*, p. 276.
2. 'New Notes on Some Old Inscriptions', *ZA* 26 (1912), p. 90.
3. *ANET*, p. 505.
4. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 40.
5. Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 94.
6. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 98.

2. If it is true that the word *hny* (l. 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. *hšd'* (l. 12). The same word in Dan. 3.14 is often 'explained as the interrogative particle with an adverb *šd'*, 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.

Conclusion

In the area of morphology one can see a distinct difference between OA and DA, on the one hand, and many cases of similarity on the other. The latter help us come to a better understanding and explanation of both texts. The cases such as the presence of the precative *l* at Fakhriyah and in Hadad are extremely helpful in that regard.

1. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 40.

Chapter 4

SYNTACTICAL CORRELATIONS

The section on syntax is the most problematic in this study, yet syntax has bearing on the dialectal debate regarding DA, as rightly argued by Kutscher. The different natures of certain documents used for comparison can influence and even determine the syntactical affinities of the given texts.

The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription

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 is significant for this section of the study. Some similarities seem to be very striking. For example, Kaufman comments twice on line 15 and the phrase *'l zy qdm hwtr*, that it is 'a direct calque of the usual Assyrian formula *eli ša maḥri ušātir*'.¹ He then says 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) Aramaic and/or other later Aramaic dialects'.² A strikingly similar 'calque' is to be found in Dan. 3.19, which reads *'l dy ḥzh lmzyh*. This expression, though not easy to analyze, is almost identical in form with the one in the inscription.³

1. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', pp. 152, 168.

2. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 152.

3. Notice that *lmzyh* is an infinitive, and that, formally, *hwtr* in the inscription may be not only a perfect, but an infinitive causative as well, although the Akkadian shows that it is a perfect.

The word 'l 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.'¹ In a similar way the Aramaic is characterized by frequent use of *l* directive.

It is important to note that, in the last two points, a significant syntactical departure of DA from the Aramaic of Gozan occurs, the former approaching the Assyrian (Akkadian) style more closely than its Aramaic relative. Can one conclude that on this point DA is 'more eastern' than the dialect from Gozan?² 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 *l* in front of each of the infinitives (of purpose) in a series, *l* 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 the one in the inscription, namely, the *l* 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 *l'* (e.g. Dan. 6.9). The situation is not so clear for the extensive use of *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 vice-versa were noted. This is paralleled in the inscription (which is much shorter than DA), in the Aramaic part (ll. 11-12) as well as the Akkadian (esp. ll. 13-17). Both are paralleled by the Assyrian royal inscriptions of the first millennium BC.³

As Kaufman has noticed, in three cases an apparently singular form

1. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 111.

2. 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 *La statue*, by A. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *AfO* 31 [1984], p. 93).

3. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 111.

occurs in a plural context: *mt (kln)* (ll. 3, 5); *nhr (klm)* (l. 4) and (*m'h*) *swr* (l. 20). He maintains that 'there is no satisfactory explanation of this strange feature',¹ or else one simply has to assume the use of internal plurals. Sasson's example² from Sefire I A 23, where the singular *šwrh* 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, for example, Dan. 4.22, 30 ('*nš'*, not '*nšym*').

The determinative pronoun *zy* is used as the genitive particle linking two or more noun phrases where a classical Semitic language would have a direct synthetic (and not an analytical) linkage.³ In fact, the construction 'x zy y' is used no less than five times (ll. 1, 13 *bis*, 17, 23). There may be some early attested examples in OA,⁴ although this is more common in OfA.⁵ It has already been noted that this feature is nothing short of a literal translation from Akkadian *ša*.⁶ The idea that the frequency of this usage (the ratio of the use of the construct state to this analytical construction is 11:5) is attributable to Akkadian syntactic influence receives substantial support from this document. Therefore, it seems that 'the use of the genitive *zy* was well a part of the Aramaic language of the ninth century', according to the editors.⁷ Or, to take Muraoka's words, the use of the analytical *zy* had its origin 'in the sphere of Akkadian influence, namely in the East, at a

1. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 148.

2. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 101.

3. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 101.

4. Sefire I A 10 and III 7. See Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, 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' (*Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 353).

5. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, pp. 60-62.

6. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, pp. 130-31. See also M.Z. Kaddari, 'Construct State and Di-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic', *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies* (Jerusalem, 1969), pp. 102-15.

7. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 57.

fairly early period'.¹ A similar conclusion is given by Kaufman, who bases it on examples from the Aramaic that 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 (ll. 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, I 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

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.⁵ Using some of his data I have made a table with the ratios found in the most representative documents of OfA, BA and LA, together with the ratio found in the Tell Fakhriyah. In Table 2 the first number represents the number of construct chains in the document, the second number the occurrences of the analogical *zy*, and the last number the ratio of the two. The Behistun Inscription has the lowest ratio, since it is a rigid 'literal translation from a Babylonian *Vorlage*'.⁶

1. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 102.

2. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 152.

3. Muraoka, 'Tell-Fekherye', p. 102.

4. Along the same lines, cf. F.M. Fales, 'Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye', *Syria* 60 (1983), pp. 242-43.

5. Kaddari, 'Construct State', pp. 242-43.

6. Kaddari, 'Construct State', p. 103.

<i>Document</i>	<i>Number of Construct Chains</i>	<i>Number of zy Constructions</i>	<i>Ratio</i>
Behistun	6	26	0.23
Tell Fakhriyah	11	5	2.20
DA	240	53	4.50
BA of Ezra	147	20	7.35
Cowley's Papyri	526	67	7.85
Ahiqar	92	11	8.36
1QapGen	192	16	12.00

Table 2. Syntactical Affinities

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.¹ Comparing the Papyri and DA on this point, the difference in settings should not be disregarded. DA is a piece of historical narrative, whereas the other texts have legal and diplomatic character, in which, 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*, several nouns may be linked into a semantically unified phrase in both texts under study (Dan 5.5 = Tell Fekhriyah, l. 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 gwzn wzy skn* (l. 13) parallel to Dan. 2.14, 25; 4.23, 26; 7.11, etc.; (2) *m'n' zy bt hdd* (l. 17) parallel to Dan. 2.49; 5.3, 5, etc.

This section on syntax can be concluded with discussion of one of the most important issues for 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

1. 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of *Daniel*', p. 110: 'It is difficult to follow Rowley's argument here since he is implying that Daniel follows a later usage'.

normally in this Akkadian (Assyrian) text;¹ neither is it at the beginning, as in West Aramaic. According to Kaufman, with the exception of lines 14-18,² the standard order is Subject-Verb-Object.³ The Aramaic of the inscription has a free word order, however; something in which it is similar to Akkadian.⁴ Thus, Segert finds that 'the presence of linguistic features which appear much later in Imperial Aramaic supports the hypothesis of its eastern origin'.

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) the object comes 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 the Assyrian than 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 Official Aramaic and the later dialects'.⁵

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.⁶ The direct object can precede the verb.⁷ DA also favors the position of the verb at the end of the sentence.⁸ This confirms Kutscher's view that BA is eastern in origin and also that Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic stands in contrast to this.⁹ For example, 1QapGen has the normal 'Semitic' word order Verb-Subject-Object.¹⁰

1. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', pp. 153-54; Dion, *La langue*, p. 288; Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 362.

2. Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, pp. 70-71, also notices line 10.

3. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 154.

4. Review of Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 94.

5. Coxon, 'The Syntax of the Aramaic', p. 122.

6. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 154. Kaufman dismisses Akkadian influence on this point.

7. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 56.

8. Coxon, 'The Syntax of the Aramaic', pp. 120-21.

9. See also Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 70-71.

10. 'Aramaic', in *Current Trends in Linguistics* (ed. T.A. Seboek; The Hague: Saale, 1970), pp. 33-34, 362-63.

The Bir-Hadad Inscription

The formula of the introduction *nšb' zy šm . . .* has its similar parallel nine times in Daniel 3, and the word order in both formulae is identical. Furthermore, the word order of *lmr'h lmlqrt* (ll. 3, 4) is just the opposite of what we would expect. In other words, it is the rule that *mlk* or *mr'* comes together with a proper name and follows 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 the 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 has 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 OfA 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. Moreover, a new occurrence of this 'reversed' order of the formula is found in the Meissner Papyrus dating from 515 BC,⁵ being but a part of a date-formula.

While the word *zy* has the function of the relative particle two times, it 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 the relative *zy* which creates the ambiguity in syntactical understanding of line 4, which is sometimes translated 'to whom he made a vow', where *zy* stands for Melqarth; other times it is rendered 'which he vowed to him', *zy* standing for

1. On this, see Aufrecht, *Concordance*, pp. 105-106.
2. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 104.
3. Rowley, *Aramaic*, p. 104.
4. Coxon, 'Syntax of the Aramaic', p. 115.
5. 'Syntax of the Aramaic', p. 115.

nšb'. In DA a similar syntactical feature is found at least five times. In four of these cases there does not seem to be any doubt regarding the function of *zy*. In all four cases (Dan. 2.37; 5.12; 6.17, 21) *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, which is similar to an example in this inscription: *dy* may stand for either *'lh* or *'nh*. Since *'nh* has the function of an indirect object in this phrase, which is a smaller part of the complete sentence (where also *'lh* is a direct object), it is more likely that *dy* is related to *'nh*.

If this conclusion can be carried over into the Bir-Hadad inscription, then *zy* in this text would stand for Melqarth (and its resumptive pronominal suffix), rather than for *nšb'*.

The Zakkur Inscription (and Graffiti)

The introductory formula *nšb' zy śm zkr mlk* is very much like the one found nine times in Daniel 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.¹ 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.² This offers a way of explaining this feature within Aramaic.³ 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).⁴ 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.

1. See Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 132 n. 1; also L. McFall, *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982), p. 144, and Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 15.

2. Ezra 4.12; 5.5 and Dan. 4.2, 31.

3. Gibson, *Textbook*, pp. 7-8.

4. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 56.

The Sefire Inscriptions

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.¹ In some sections, such as I A 8-12, the copula and other prepositions are often repeated according to the western dialect style, unlike the narrative of DA.

Commenting on the collective use of the noun *ssyh* (I A 22), Fitzmyer makes the following statement:² '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 (ll. 19-22), just like that which occurs in DA (4.13, 20, 22, 29). Only one of them (*swr* in l. 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 *hw' šlm'* in Dan. 2.32. *kol mlky'* (III 7) is one instance of *casus pendens* which is paralleled by a number of cases in Daniel 5 and 7.³

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 19.⁴ 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 we find the phrase '*m kl'ill byt mlk*, in which there are three construct elements bound together to form a construct chain. Two other instances are *mn ḥd byt 'by* (III 9) and '*dy b'ly ktk* (I A 4).

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

There is only superficial agreement in word order between the West OA and Samalian. Dion clearly takes issue with Degen on this subject.

1. Vasholz, 'Philological Comparison', pp. 70-71.
2. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 42.
3. The most striking examples from both chapters are 5.10 and 7.24.
4. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, p. 89.

He finds more than 20 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 somewhat 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, for example, Dan. 3.29 and 5.14.⁴

'*d yzkr nbš pnmw* (Had. 17) is a temporal proposition that expresses the future. In DA this is the case with '*d dy*, which can have the same function in Dan. 4.20, 22, 29. In Ezra 4.21, on the other hand, '*d* alone is the word which suffices for this purpose.

The Barrakab Inscriptions

The syntax of the Barrakab inscriptions cannot be designated simply as West Semitic. Mesopotamian influence is visible here. The noun can precede the verbal predicate, and thus the word order can be described as rather free.

The best illustration of this is found in line 7: *wbyt 'by 'ml mn kl*. The word order here is just the opposite of West Semitic, which would more likely be *w'ml byt 'by mn kl*. In our study of the vocabulary, we have seen a dozen expressions from DA that 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.

1. Dion, *La langue*, p. 289. This particular point teaches us again that Aramaic studies today are dynamic and bring new light on these well-known texts: 'Degen has formulated his rule and eliminated possible exceptions in a rather rigid way'.

2. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 168.

3. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*, p. 362.

4. Gibson, *Textbook*, p. 70.

The Nerab Stelae

The word order in our texts can again be termed as 'free'. In I 9-10 we have a list of gods as the subject, followed by the verbal predicate and a direct object, then an adverb of place. Likewise, in II 4, 10, the direct object precedes both a non-finite 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 Leander² have noted, that only in a nominal phrase does this *dnh* come before the predicate, and only 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 šlmh w'ršth* (I 3-4) and *znh šlmh* (II 2) in contrast to *šlm' znh w'ršt'* (I 6-7) and *šlm' w'ršt' z'* (I 12). In general, this similarity in word order with DA seems to give support to the description of this dialect as a 'Mesopotamian dialect'. This agrees with the result of Kaufman's analysis that its language is 'Imperial Aramaic'.⁴

The Ashur Ostrakon

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 a genitive relationship: *zybyt 'wrkn* (l. 13), *zy byt 'dn* (l. 14), and in the above-mentioned expression *zly* (l. 13). This points clearly to the eastern provenance of our text. As in DA, the construct state of nouns is present in the text, for example in the case of *mlky '[šwr]* (l. 16), but the *zy*-genitival phrase also serves the same purpose.

1. Dan. 2.18; 7.8; 4.24; 6.29.
2. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, p. 82.
3. Rosenthal, *Grammar*, p. 21. His list may be completed with Dan. 2.36; 4.21, 25.
4. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, p. 10 n. 16.

Conclusion

In the vocabulary section, 54 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 Fakhriyah).
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 BC.
4. The genitival use of the pronoun *zy*, which is attributable 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 its ratio of 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.
5. The three different ways in which this genitival pronoun used at Tell Fakhriyah occurs in the text of DA, with several examples for each case.
6. A cardinal number that can take a noun in plural (at Tell Fakhriyah four times and once at Sefire).
7. The prepositional *l-*, which is repeated in front of two successive infinitives (Sefire, Samalian).
8. The peculiar use of the compound *zly*, which is found in Ashur and DA.
9. The word-order of DA, which is once again found to be eastern in character, and which thus comes closer to the Akkadian version of Tell Fakhriyah than to its Aramaic version. The only other OA texts that show this word order are the documents from the 'transitional period', in which 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 řlmh* (I 3-4), but *řlm' znh* (I 6-7), and *řlm' w' rřt' z'* (I 12).

GENERAL CONCLUSION

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. Yet a study of this type serves a twofold purpose: it contributes to providing an answer to questions of the origin of DA, and it also gives fresh insights into both OA and DA.

The contextual discussion of the literary and grammatical features of OA texts, when brought into contact with DA, yields the following results:

1. The often assumed uniformity of OA cannot be maintained any longer, since a study of the grammar of OA inscriptions gives a different picture of this aspect of OA texts. The Tell Fakhriyah inscription, with its sizable number of unexpected phenomena, points strongly to this—hence Kaufman's proposal to divide OA into three or four dialects.¹
2. This study contributes to the present discussions of DA in that it presents answers to certain objections raised regarding the traditional dating of DA. Three factors must be accounted for in any conclusion on DA: geography, chronology, and the literary character of the text.
3. The text of DA in its present form (including ch. 7) contains a significant amount of material similar to OA texts.

The key *desideratum* coming out of this study is that the search for features in DA of an early date should be pursued more intensively in the future.

1. 'Reflexions', p. 146 n. 22. See also Koopmans, *Aramäische Chrestomathie*, p. 6: 'Im Altaramäischen des 9. und 8. Jahrh. kann man noch verschiedene Dialekte unterscheiden'. Already in 1968–69, Greenfield proposed a dialectal division inside the OA ('Standard Literary Aramaic', p. 281).

Appendix 1

LIST OF COMPARABLE EXPRESSIONS

<i>The Tell Fakhriyah Inscription</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
Expression	Citation	Expression	Citation
<i>dmwt' . . . zy śm</i>	(line) 1	<i>ślm' dy hqym</i>	3.2, 18, etc.
<i>šmyn w' rḡ (+ several participles)</i>	2		6.28
<i>wlm' rk hywh</i>	14	<i>w' rkh bhyyh</i>	7.12
<i>'l 'lhn w' l' nšn</i>	14	<i>kl' nš . . . mn kl' lh</i>	7.13
<i>'l zy qdm hwtr</i>	15	<i>'l dy ḥz' lmzy'</i>	3.19
<i>m'ny' zy bt Hdd</i>	16-17	<i>wlm'ny' dy byth</i>	5.23
<i>ylqh mn ydh</i>	18	<i>yšyzbnkwn mn ydy</i>	3.15
<i>mwtm—šbt zy nyrgl</i>	23	<i>l' rywk—šlyt' dy mlk'</i>	2.15
<i>ygtzr mn mth</i>	23	<i>mt'wr' 'tgzrt</i>	2.45
 <i>The Bir-Hadad and Zakkur Inscriptions</i>		 <i>Daniel</i>	
Expression	Citation	Expression	Citation
<i>nšb' zy śm</i>	(line) 1	<i>ślm' dy hqym</i>	3.2, etc.
<i>zy nzt lh</i>	4	<i>dy . . . yhbt ly</i>	2.23, etc.
<i>šm' lqlh</i>	4-5	<i>dy išm'wn ql</i>	3.5, etc.
<i>whrmw šr mn šr . . . wh'mqw hrš mn hr[šh]</i>	A 10	<i>šnyh d' mn d'</i>	7.3

The Sefire Inscriptions

Expression	Citation
<i>zy ysqn b' šrh</i>	I A 5
<i>wyzhl h' mn</i>	II C 6
<i>ml ml ml lhyt</i>	III 2
<i>rwm nbš</i>	III 5-6
<i>br 'nš</i>	III 16
<i>zy ly</i>	III 20

Daniel

Expression	Citation
<i>wbrk tqwm</i>	2.39, etc.
<i>wđhlyn mn qdm</i>	6.27
<i>wmlyn lšd 'ly' yml</i>	7.25
<i>rwm lbb</i>	5.20
<i>kbr 'nš</i>	7.13
<i>dy-lh</i>	2.20

The Hadad and Panammu Inscriptions

Expression	Citation
<i>wntn bydy</i>	Had. 2
<i>wzkr znh h'</i>	Pan. 22
<i>qdm 'lhy wqdm 'nš</i>	Pan. 23

Daniel

Expression	Citation
<i>yhb bydk</i>	2.38
<i>d' hy' bbl</i>	4.27
<i>qdmwhy ['lhy]</i>	6.23
<i>. . . w'p qdmyk mlk'</i>	
<i>qdm 'lhh</i>	6.11-12

The Barrakab Inscription

Expression	Citation
<i>hwšbny. . . krs' 'by</i>	I 5-7
<i>wby't 'by 'ml mn kl</i>	I 7-8
<i>mr'y mlk</i>	I 9
<i>wby[t] tb lyšh l' bhy</i>	I 15-16
<i>w'nh bnyt byt' znh</i>	I 20

Daniel

Expression	Citation
<i>hnht. . . mn krs' mlkwth</i>	5.20
<i>why' mšnyh mn kl</i>	7.7
<i>dy hwt šnyh mn klhwn</i>	7.19
<i>dy tšn' mn kl</i>	7.23
<i>'rb'h mlkyn yqwmwn</i>	7.17
<i>mn 'r''</i>	
<i>mr'y mlk'</i>	4.21
<i>wđbl l' 'yty bhwn</i>	3.25
<i>h' 'nh hzh gbryn 'rb'h</i>	3.25, see 4.1, 24, 34

The Nerab Stelae

Expression	Citation
<i>zy lk</i>	I 14
<i>šm šm tb</i>	II 3
<i>pmy. . . mlml</i>	II 4
<i>m' n ksp wnš</i>	II 6-7

Daniel

Expression	Citation
<i>dy lh hy'</i>	2.20
<i>šm šmh blš' šr</i>	5.12
<i>mlt' bpm</i>	4.28
<i>lm' ny dhb' wksp'</i>	5.2

<i>The Ashur Ostrakon</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
Expression	Citation	Expression	Citation
<i>lmry mlk' . . . mr' y mlk'</i>	6-8	<i>'l mr' y mlk'</i>	4.21
<i>kysz' z'</i>	8	<i>d' mn d'</i>	7.3
<i>d' ld'</i>	5-6	<i>qdmwhy yqwmwn</i>	7.10
<i>wqymt qdmy</i>	9	<i>yd' dy kibh</i>	5.5
<i>ydyhm kibt</i>	9	<i>mlt' mny 'zd' hn</i>	2.5
<i>hšd' hny mly'</i>	12	<i>dy 'zd' mny mlt'</i>	2.8
<i>zly</i>	13	<i>dy-lh</i>	2.20

Appendix 2

WORDS COMMON TO DANIEL AND THE TELL FAKHRIYAH INSCRIPTION

The following is a list of the words from the Tell Fakhriyah inscription that are attested in DA, with a short comment on each word that may be important for this study.

'*hr* (l. 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 '*hry kn*¹ and DA '*hry 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 attributable to the influence of Old Persian.² In DA it is found in 2.29, 45; 7.24.

'*kl* ('*klw* l. 22). The same form is attested in OfA,³ but there it has a normal *y* prefix instead of a precative *l-* as in this case. In DA it is found in 4.30; 7.7, 23.

'*l* ('not', ll. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23). It is 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*).

'*l* ('to', 'over', ll. [*bis*], 15). In the inscription this directional and comparative preposition is spelled with an *aleph* rather than with an *ayin*, as in DA (Dan. 2.10, 24, 49, etc.). In general, an *ayin* 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 '*l*'.⁴

'*lh* (singular, l. 5; plural, defective spelling, l. 14, and full spelling, l. 4). In DA it is attested in Dan. 2.20; 3.12; etc., in total 51 times.

'*lp* (l. 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).⁵

1. The same in BH: cf. Isa. 1.26, etc.

2. Zadok, 'Remarks', p. 125.

3. Jean and Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 13.

4. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 110.

5. In DA (7.10), one notes a poetic numerical increase because of greatness of scenery described: '*lp*, '*lpyw*, *rbw*, *rbwn*; in this inscription, a poetic numerical decrease is found because of curse ('*lp*, *prys*; *m'h*).

'*mrh* ('*mrt*, ll. 10, 14). In DA this root is used only for verbal forms (2.7, 9; 3.4; etc., in total 66 times).

'*nš* ('*nšn*, l. 14; '*nšwh*, ll. 9, 22). Its 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*, ll. 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).

'*rq* (l. 2). Spelled with a *qoph* as in other OA material,¹ while in DA an *ayin* is used (2.35, 39 *bis*, etc., in total 20 times).

b (l. 22 and *bh*, l. 11). In DA it is used in Dan. 2.28 *bis*, 38, etc.

byt (defective l. 17 and *byth*, l. 8). The editors' discussion should include² 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 occurs in parallelism with 'palace'), or it can be just an abbreviation for *bēth malku* (4.27).

blh/bly (*ybl*, l. 11). Scholars are still divided over the root and correct meaning of this word. Kaufman,⁴ together with Greenfield and Shaffer,⁵ believes the root to be *nbl/npl*. Sasson⁶ prefers the editors' proposition to consider it as coming from the root *ybl*, 'to take away'. The problem is that such a verb, especially in its intensive form (as understood here by its advocates), would require a direct object that is absent in the context. I consider the root *blh/bly* to be another possibility 'which is briefly mentioned only by Kaufman'.⁷ 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 *yebhalle'* of the root *blh*, meaning 'wear down, wear out'. In its simple stem it would mean 'to grow old' and would be intransitive.

br (l. 6). DA occurrences are: Dan. 2.25, 38; 3.26; 5.22; 6.1, 25; 7.13.

gbr (l. 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*.

gZR (*ygtZR*, l. 23). Here the word appears in the reflexive stem with a passive meaning and consonantal metathesis. The root occurs in OA⁸ and OfA,⁹ but never in this stem. Dan. 2.34, 45 has the same root in the same stem, yet no study of the inscription has mentioned this fact thus far.

dmw (*dmwt'*, ll. 1, 15). The first and older reference to the 'statue'. The only previous attestation known was the nominal form meaning 'value' found in *EgA*.¹⁰ It

1. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, p. 17.
2. Abou-Assaf et al., *La statue*, p. 34.
3. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 95.
4. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 166.
5. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 114.
6. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 96.
7. Kaufman, 'Reflexions', p. 166.
8. Sefire I A 7.40 *bis*, etc.
9. Jean and Hofstijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 49.
10. Kraeling, 'Aramaic Papyri', §3.21.

is used here in the introductory lines of the first part, while *šlm* is used in the second part. Other OA inscriptions use the word *ṣṣb'*.¹ It occurs in chiasm with *šlm* in lines 15 and 16.² In the Assyrian version only *šalmu* is used.³ In DA, *dmh* is a verbal root attested in 3.25 and 7.5.

hwy (*lhwy*, l. 12). Sefire II A 6 has *thwy*. This form has a prefixed *lamed* and is the earliest precative form, which is frequently used in DA (e.g. 2.20, 43, etc.).

z't (l. 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 (ll. [bis], 5, 11, 13 [bis], 15, 17, 23). Five times this word expresses genitive relations (ll. 1, 13 [bis], 17, 23), and four times it is used in the relative sense (ll. 1, 5, 11, 15). It has been known with its genitive function in OfA⁴ 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.

zr' (*lZR'*, l. 19 [bis]). Here the word appears as verb in the jussive imperfect with a prefix *l-*, while in DA it is used only as a nominal form (2.43).

zr' (*zr'h*, l. 8).

hy (*lhyy*, l. 7 and *hywh*, l. 14). This word is either a noun or *Pael* infinitive. Scholars such as Greenfield and Shaffer are puzzled by the Aramaic translation of the Assyrian word *palû* (*pališû*) by *hy* (*hywh*) in line 14. They blame the translator's incompetence, a proposition rejected by Sasson.⁵

tḥ (*tḥh*, l. 5). In DA it occurs only once (2.32).

yd (*ydh*, l. 18 [bis]). DA occurrences are 2.34, 38; 3.15; 4.32; 5.23; 6.28.

yhb (l. 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*, l. 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'.⁶ I would complete his list with a good example from DA, '*attiq yômin*' (Dan. 7.9). *ywm* is found 12 times in DA.

yṭb (*tyṭb*, l. 15). This word is usually classified under the root *t'b* in DA (6.24).

ysb (ll. 5, 16). In DA, it is spelled with *t* instead of *s* (Dan. 7.9, 26).

ytr (*hwtr*, l. 15). This is a form of the causative stem. In DA it is used more as an

1. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, p. 111.

2. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Bilingual Statue', p. 111.

3. Greenfield and Shaffer, 'Curse Formulae', p. 49.

4. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, pp. 60-62.

5. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 99 n. 11. I conclude from this case that the Aramaic *hy* in its plural form may have the meaning of 'term of office, reign', and if this is true, then 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.

6. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 95.

adjective (e.g. 2.31; 4.33), but also adverbially (3.22; 7.7, 19).

kl (*klm*, ll. 3, 5, and *klm*, ll. 4, 4). In DA this word is always spelled in the defective way in accordance with OA and OfA and as against 1QapGen. In DA, e.g., see 2.35; 3.29.

kn (l. 10). Beside DA, this is also attested elsewhere in OA and OfA¹ (Dan. 2.24; 4.11; 6.7; 7.5, 23).

krs' (l. 13). This word is attested in OA.² Sefire III 17 should probably read the same way. In DA it is found in 5.20, 29; 7.9.

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

lhm (l. 22 and *lhmh*, ll. 17, 18). This word is found only once in DA (5.1), with the meaning 'meal' or 'feast'.

m'h (ll. 20 [*bis*], 21, 22). This is translated 'hundred'. Like the previous word, this one occurs only once in DA (6.2).

m'n (*m'ny'*, l. 16). In DA this word is found three times in ch. 5 (vv. 2, 3, 23), but it has not been known from OA.

ml' (*yml'nh*, l. 22). Attested elsewhere in OA,³ and twice in DA (2.35; 3.19).

mlk (ll. 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 (ll. 10, 16). Translated 'who, whoever'. In DA it is found in Dan. 3.6, 11, 15; 4.14, 22, 29; 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.⁴ In BA this word is found only in Daniel, and there it occurs four times (2.47; 4.16, 21; 5.23).

nhr (l. 4). This word is not otherwise found in OA or OfA. Dan. 7.10 is the only place where it occurs in DA.

nht (*mhnht*, l. 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.

nšn (*nšwn*, ll. 21, 22). In OA the usual spelling would be *nšyn*. This word is once found in DA (Dan. 6.25).

ntn (ll. 2, 3). The participial form is not used in DA, only the infinitive form (e.g. 2.16; 4.14).

swr (l. 20). Spelled here with *s* and used in the collective sense, just as it is in Sefire I A 23. In DA, see 4.22, 29; 5.21.

'bd (l. 15) 'to do'. Frequently found in DA in both simple (3.1, 22, etc.) and reflexive stems (2.5; 3.29).

pm (*pmh*, ll. 10, 14). Six times it occurs in DA (4.28; 6.18, 23; 7.5, 8, 20).

prys (l. 19). Translated 'half or a part of something'. This is a rare word in DA,

1. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, p. 86.

2. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, p. 87.

3. Aufrecht, *Concordance*, p. 99.

4. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 94.

where it is spelled defectively in contrast to this spelling here (2.25, 28).

šlm (l. 12, *šlmh*, l. 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.).

qbl (*qblh*, l. 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 a derived, metaphorical 'against'.

qdm (ll. 1, 15 [*bis*]). 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, as against its mostly full spellings found in 1QapGen.

rb (l. 6). Rendered 'great'. In DA it is found 15 times (e.g. 2.14, 31, 48).

rhmn (l. 5). Used as an adjective or a noun. In DA *rhmn* is taken as a noun (2.18).

šlh (l. 3). Translated 'peace'. Scholars have overlooked the DA occurrence of *šeleh* (4.1). This root takes a verbal form in Sefire III 3. The Hebrew noun is *šelf*.

šlm (*lšlm*, l. 8 [3×]). 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 *šelāmekōn yišgē'* (Dan. 3.31 and 6.26).

šm (*šmy*, ll. 11, 16, *šmym*, l. 11 and *šmh*, l. 12). The *mem* in *šmym* is considered enclitic, and it could be a sign of the Akkadian influence.² This noun is found six times in DA (2.20, 26; 4.5 *bis*, 16; 5.12).

šm (ll. 1, 16, *yšym*, l. 12, and *lšm*, l. 11). The difference between a normal long imperfect and a precativ-jussive is clear for this verb. In DA it comes in both simple (3.10, 29, etc.) and reflexive stems (2.5).

šmyn (l. 2). It occurs in DA 36 times (2.18, 28; 4.23; etc.).

šm' (*lmšm'*, l. 9). Sasson's biblical list on hearing one's prayer³ 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*, l. 8). Sefire and BA provide further evidence that this word is masculine.⁴ *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.

šlw (*šlwth*, ll. 5, 9). The nominal intensive form whose root *šlh/šly* is known in OfA⁵ and DA (6.10, 11).

1. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 95.

2. So Abou-Assaf *et al.*, *La statue*, p. 32.

3. Sasson, 'Aramaic Text', p. 92.

4. Fitzmyer, *Aramaic Inscriptions*, p. 155.

5. Jean and Hofijzer, *Dictionnaire*, p. 245.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abou-Assaf, A., P. Bordreuil and A.R. Millard. *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne*. Etudes assyriologiques, 7. Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations, 1982.
- Albright, W.F. 'A Votive Stele Erected by Ben Hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth'. *BASOR* 87 (1942), pp. 23-29.
- Aro, J. *Abnormal Plene Writings in Akkadian Texts*. StudOr, 19.11. Helsinki: SOF, 1953.
- Aufrecht, W.E., and J.C. Hurd. *A Synoptic Concordance of Aramaic Inscriptions*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Aufrecht, W.E., and G.J. Hamilton. 'The Tell Fakhariyah Bilingual Inscription: A Bibliography'. *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies Suppl.* 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), pp. 1-7.
- Bange, L.A. *A Study of the Use of Vowel-Letters in Alphabetic Consonantal Writing*. Munich: VUD, 1971.
- Bauer, H., and P. Leander. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962.
- Baumgartner, W. 'Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel'. *ZAW* 45 (1927), pp. 81-133.
- Ben Hayyim, Z. 'Comments on the Inscriptions of Sfire'. *Leš* 35 (1971), pp. 243-53.
- Beyer, K. *The Aramaic Language*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Bordreuil, P., and J. Teixidor. 'Nouvel examen de l'inscription de Bar-Hadad'. *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983), pp. 271-76.
- Bravmann, M.M. 'Genetic Aspects of the Genitive in the Semitic Languages'. *JAOS* 81 (1961), pp. 386-94.
- Clermont-Ganneau, C. 'Nérah'. *Etudes d'archéologie orientale* 2 (1897), pp. 182-223.
- Cohen, D.R. 'Subject and Object in Biblical Aramaic: A Functional Approach Based on Form-Content Analysis'. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 2.1 (1975), pp. 1-23.
- Contini, R. 'Problemi dell'Aramaico antico'. *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 2 (1979), pp. 197-213.
- Cooke, G.A. *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Coppens, J. 'Le dossier non biblique de l'expression Araméenne BR'NS'. *ETL* 56 (1980), pp. 122-24.
- Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*. Paris: Reipublicae Typographeo, 1881-1950.
- Cowley, A. (ed.). *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Coxon, P.W. 'The Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel: A Dialectal Study'. *HUCA* 48 (1977), pp. 107-22.
- 'A Philological Note on 'ŠTYW Dan 5.3f''. *ZAW* 89 (1977), pp. 275-76.

- 'The Problem of Consonantal Mutation in Biblical Aramaic'. *ZDMG* 129 (1979), pp. 8-23.
- 'A Morphological Study of the *h*-Prefix in Biblical Aramaic'. *JAOS* 98 (1978), pp. 416-19.
- 'The Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of *IQGA* and *IQIg Job*'. *RevQ* 9 (1977), pp. 253-58.
- Cross, F.M. 'The Stele Dedicated to Melcarth by Ben-Hadah of Damascus'. *BASOR* 205 (1972), pp. 36-42.
- Cross, F.M., and D.N. Freedman. *Early Hebrew Orthography*. AOS, 36. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Series, 1952.
- Degen, R. *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh. v. Chr.* Wiesbaden: D.M.G., 1969.
- 'Ein neues Wörterbuch für das Biblische-Aramäische'. *Or* 44 (1975), pp. 116-25.
- Dion, P.E. 'The Language Spoken in Ancient Sam'al'. *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 115-18.
- La langue de Ya'udi*. Waterloo, Ontario: Editions SR, 1974.
- Donner, H., and W. Röllig. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Driver, G.R. 'The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel'. *JBL* 45 (1926), pp. 110-19.
- Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Driver, S.R. *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Dunant, M. 'Stèle araméenne dédiée à Mélqart'. *Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth* 3 (1939), pp. 65-76.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1967.
- The Genesis Apocryphon of Cave I*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1966.
- A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Freedman, D.N. 'The Masoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography'. *Textus* 2 (1962), pp. 90-112.
- Garbini, G. 'Le matres lectionis e il vocalismo nell'aramaico antico'. *AION* 19 (1969), pp. 8-15.
- Gibson, J.C.L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. II. *Aramaic Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Ginsberg, H.L. 'Notes on Some Old Aramaic Texts'. *JNES* 18 (1959), pp. 143-49.
- Greenfield, J.C. 'Stylistic Aspects of the Sefire Treaty Inscriptions'. *AcOr* 29 (1965), pp. 1-18.
- 'The Dialects of Early Aramaic'. *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 93-99.
- 'Early Aramaic Poetry'. *JANESCU* 11 (1979), pp. 45-51.
- Greenfield, J.C., and A. Shaffer. 'Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye'. *Iraq* 45 (1983), pp. 109-16.
- 'Notes on the Curse Formulae of the Tell Fekherye Inscription'. *RB* 92 (1985), pp. 47-59.
- Jean, C.F., and J. Hoftijzer. *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Jerushalmi, I. *The Aramaic Sections of Ezra and Daniel*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 2nd rev. edn, 1970.
- Jongeling, B. 'Contributions of the Qumran Job Targum to the Aramaic Vocabulary'. *JSS* 17 (1972), pp. 191-97.

- Kaddari, M.Z. 'Construct State and *Di*-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic'. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies* (1969), pp. 102-15.
- Kaufman, S.A. 'Reflexions on the Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual from Tell Fakhariyeh'. *Maarav* 3 (1982), pp. 137-75.
- The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Kitchen, K.A. 'The Aramaic of Daniel'. In *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*. London: Tyndale Press, 1965.
- Koch, K. *Das Buch Daniel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- Koopmans, J.J. *Aramäische Chrestomathie*. 2 vols. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut V.H.N. Oosten, 1962.
- Kraeling, E.G. (ed.). *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Kutscher, E.Y. 'Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon'. *JBL* 76 (1957), pp. 288-92.
- 'The Language of the "Genesis Apocryphon"'. In C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds.), *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 1-35. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965.
- Hebrew and Aramaic Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977.
- 'HaAramit HaMigra'it-Aramit Mizrahit hi o Maaravit?' *First World Congress of Jewish Studies*. I. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1952.
- Lemaire, A., and J.M. Durand. *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré et de l'Assyrie de Shamshi-ilu*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.
- Millard, A.R. 'Assyrians and Arameans'. *Iraq* 45 (1983), pp. 101-108.
- 'Daniel and Belshazzar in History'. *BAR* 11 (1985), pp. 72-78.
- Montgomery, J.A. 'Some Gleanings from Pognon's ZKR Inscription'. *JBL* 28 (1909), pp. 57-70.
- Muraoka, T. 'The Tell-Fekherye Bilingual Inscriptions in Early Aramaic'. *Abr-Nahrain* 22 (1984), pp. 79-117.
- Naveh, T. 'Old Aramaic Inscriptions'. *AION* 16 (1966), pp. 19-36.
- Pardee, D., and Biggs, R.D. Review of *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne*, by A. Abou-Assaf et al. *JNES* 43 (1984), pp. 253-57.
- Rosenthal, F. (ed.). *An Aramaic Handbook*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1967.
- 'Aramaic Studies during the Past Thirty Years'. *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 81-91.
- A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- Die aramaische Forschung*. Leiden: Brill, 1939.
- Rowley, H.H. *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Sasson, V. 'The Aramaic Text of the Tell Fakhriyah Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual Inscription'. *ZAW* 97 (1985), pp. 86-103.
- Segert, S. *Altaramäische Grammatik*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyk., 1975.
- 'Vowel Letters in Early Aramaic'. *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 111-14.
- Review of *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne*, by A. Abou-Assaf et al. *Afo* 31 (1984), pp. 90-94.
- Shea, W.H. 'Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7'. *AUSS* 23 (1985), pp. 193-202, 277-95.
- 'The Kings of the Melqart Stela'. *Maarav* 1 (1979), pp. 159-76.
- Snell, D.C. 'Why is there Aramaic in the Bible?' *JSOT* 18 (1980), pp. 32-51.
- Sokoloff, M. (ed.). *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1983.

- Tawil, H. 'Some Literary Elements in the Opening Section of the Hadad, Zakir and the Nerab II Inscriptions in the Light of East and West Semitic Royal Inscriptions'. *Or* 43 (1974), pp. 40-65.
- Vasholz, R.I. 'Qumran and the Dating of Daniel'. *JETS* 21 (1978), pp. 315-21.
- 'A Further Note on the Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic, 11Qtg Job and 1QGen Ap'. *RevQ* 10 (1979), pp. 95-96.
- Whitehead, J.D. 'Some Distinctive Features of the Language of the Arsames Correspondence'. *JNES* 37 (1978), pp. 119-40.
- Wilson, R.D. 'The Aramaic of Daniel'. In *Biblical and Theological Studies*, pp. 261-306. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1912.
- Zadok, R. 'Remarks on the Inscriptions of *Hdys*'y from Tall Fakhariya'. *Tel Aviv* 9 (1982), pp. 117-29.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Ezra</i>		2.10	36, 70,	2.37b	43
4.9	36, 88		74, 96	2.38-45	43
4.12	102	2.11	49, 58	2.38	70, 97
4.21	104	2.12	44	2.39-40	59
5.5	102	2.13	57	2.39	53, 77
5.10	66	2.14	50, 99	2.40	87
5.14	50	2.15	87	2.41	80
6.9	36	2.18	53, 70,	2.43	80
7.17	36		105	2.44	55, 87
7.24	36	2.19-24	41	2.45	50, 80,
7.26	36	2.19b-20a	42		85, 87
7.27	41	2.20-23	41	2.46	56, 101
		2.20	57, 59,	2.47	60
<i>Psalms</i>			60, 80	2.49	99
19.15	50	2.20b-22	42	3	37, 46,
		2.21-22	41		51, 57,
<i>Jeremiah</i>		2.23	51, 87,		101, 102
10.11	49, 70,		102	3.1	87
	74	2.23a	42	3.2-3	51
		2.23b	42	3.2	36, 49,
<i>Daniel</i>		2.23c	42		96
2-6	44	2.24	42, 96	3.3	36, 96
2-7	41	2.25	70, 99	3.5	36, 51,
2	45, 52,	2.27	36		96
	58	2.28	49, 58,	3.7	36, 51,
2.2	36		80, 101		96
2.4	55, 70	2.29	80	3.8	44, 60
2.5	56, 60,	2.31	56	3.9	55
	70, 88,	2.32	66, 103	3.10	36, 45,
	94	2.34	85		51
2.6	57	2.36-38	43	3.11	
2.7	70	2.36	43, 105	3.12	51, 91
2.8	52, 60,	2.37	37, 51,	3.13	68
	94		70, 102	3.14	51, 94
2.9-10	96	2.37a	43		

3.15	36, 50, 51, 56	4.25 4.26	105 85, 99	5.25 5.28	58 58
3.18	49, 51, 80	4.27	35, 58, 59, 90	5.29 6	80 33, 46
3.19	50, 68, 95	4.28 4.29	45, 59 45, 103,	6.2 6.3	80 80
3.21	36		104	6.4	56
3.22	87	4.30	45, 97	6.9	96
3.24	70	4.31-34	41, 46	6.11	57, 58,
3.25	58, 70	4.31-32	41		87, 89
3.27	36	4.31	35, 102	6.12	58
3.28	41	4.31a	46	6.13	50
3.29	104	4.31b-32	47	6.15	57, 70
3.31-4.1	44	4.32	49	6.16	87
3.31-33	37, 44	4.33	47	6.17	51, 102
4	33, 35, 41, 46, 54, 55	4.33a 4.33b 4.33c	47 47 47	6.18 6.19 6.21	56 44 51, 102
4.1	35, 56, 59	4.34 5	35, 59 33, 41, 46, 103	6.23 6.24 6.25	58, 72 79 44, 60
4.2	90, 102		59	6.27-28	41
4.4	35, 36, 89	5.2 5.3	99	6.27 6.28	56, 80 49
4.6	35	5.4	36	6.28	49
4.8	49	5.5	60, 99	6.29	105
4.10	54	5.6	60	7	45, 46,
4.12	54	5.7	36, 70, 88		54, 58, 103
4.13	45, 103		89	7.2	60
4.14	53, 87	5.8	44, 55, 89, 96,	7.3 7.4	52, 60 86
4.15	35	5.10	103	7.5	60, 86
4.16-24	43		36, 87,	7.6	53, 77
4.16-18	43	5.11	101	7.7	53, 58,
4.16	44, 56, 80, 96	5.12	51, 59, 96, 102		77, 87
4.18-20	43		96	7.8	56, 105
4.20	45, 54, 103, 104	5.14-16	104	7.9	69
4.21	43, 53, 58, 60, 80, 105	5.15 5.16 5.18	36, 70 44, 104 37	7.11 7.12 7.13	99 50, 59 56, 60
4.22-24	43	5.19	44	7.17	55, 58,
4.22	45, 80, 97, 103, 104	5.20 5.21	56-58, 69, 70 87	7.19	93 58, 87, 97
4.23	55, 99	5.23	36, 49,	7.23	58
4.24	52, 59, 105	5.24	50, 52 70	7.24 7.25	79, 103 56

7.27	76	9.18-19	149	9.18	55
7.28	76				

OA INSCRIPTIONS

<i>Ashur Ostrakon</i>		17	58	28	67, 90,
1	70	20	35, 58		91
4	60			29	57, 68
5	70, 93	<i>Bir-Hadad</i>		30	67, 68,
6	60, 79	1	48		76, 90
7	60, 79	3	101	31	67, 68,
8	60, 79	4	51, 101		90
9	60, 93			33	68
10	70	<i>Esarhaddon Vassal</i>		34	68
11	70, 79	<i>Treaties</i>			
12	60, 93,	1.422	54	<i>Panammu</i>	
	94			1	57, 59
13	60, 105	<i>Hadad Inscription</i>		2	67, 78
14	70, 79,	1-13	45	3	67, 68
	105	1	57, 67	4	67, 68
16	60, 79,	2	57, 104	5	67, 77,
	105	3	58, 77		78
17	79	6	67	6	57, 67,
18	60	9	67, 68		78
19	60, 70	10	67, 77,	7	67
20	79		104	8	67
		11	47, 67,	9	67
<i>Barrakab I</i>			68, 78	10	67
1-3a	46	12	56, 67	12	77
1	35	13-16	46	13	67
3b-6a	47	13	76, 78,	14	67
3	69, 71		90	16	90
4	52	14	90	18	48, 67,
5-7	58	15	68		68
6b-8a	47	16	76, 78,	19	52, 67,
7-8	58		90		68
7	69, 104	17-19	46	21	57, 67
8b-15	47	17	65, 104	22	58, 67
9	58, 69,	20-24	46	23	58
	71	20	68		
10	92	21	67, 76,	<i>Nerab I</i>	
11			78, 90	3-4	105, 107
13	92	23	68, 90	4	59, 79
15-16	58	24-26	46	5	92, 93
16-20	47	24	67, 90	6-7	107
16	58, 92	27	67, 77,	6	92
			90	9-10	105

9	65, 79	35-42	45	7	
10	59	35	55, 65,	9	
11	69, 79,		66, 88	16	
	92	37	66, 88	24	
12	79, 107	38	86		
13	59, 70,	39	66, 87,	<i>Sefire III</i>	
	79		88	1	56, 65
14	59	40	53, 86	2	56, 65
		41	86	3	87
<i>Nerab II</i>				4	56
2	59, 105	<i>Sefire I B</i>		5-6	56
3	59	6	55	5	56
4	59, 92,	7	55	7	56, 97,
	105	8	76		103
6-7	59, 105	24	87	9	56, 103
6	59, 92	30	65	10	56
7	59, 69	42	76	11	56, 66,
9	92				104
10	70, 105	<i>Sefire I C</i>		13	56
12	105	1	88	14-15	45
		6	55	16	56, 65
<i>Sefire I A</i>		18	76	17	56, 87
1	76	21	55	18	66
4	103	22	103	19	56, 103
5	53, 88	24	76	20	57
6	89, 103	25	76, 78	21	66
7	53			22	52, 56
8-12	103	<i>Sefire II A</i>		24	55, 57,
8	76	4	76, 88		65
9	54, 65	6	88	25	55
10	97, 103	7	56		
11	53	9	45	<i>Tell Fakhriyah</i>	
12	65			1-12	98
13	54	<i>Sefire II B</i>		1-12a	36
21-24	44, 45	4	55, 65	1-6	37, 40
21	82	5	55	1-5	37
22	103	7	76, 78,	1	36, 40,
23	97		104		42, 97
24	55	8	66	2-6	37, 38
25	45, 55,	14	56	2-5a	42
	88	16	88	2	39, 49,
27-28	45				82
28	76	<i>Sefire II C</i>		3-6	96
29	65, 76,	2		3	39, 97
	86	3	66	4a	39
30	86	4	88	4b	39
32	76, 88	5	88	5-6	49, 97
34	65	6	56	5	39

5a	39	12b-23	36	21	39, 82
5b	42	13-17	96	22-23	39
5c-7a	42	13-15	38, 39	22	40
6.10	37	13-14	37	23	40, 50,
6-7	38	13	97, 99		75, 97
6	39	14-18	100		
7-15	40	14-17	48	<i>Zakkur A</i>	
7-10	37, 38,	14	39, 50	2-3	34
	40	15-16	37-39	2	51, 55
7b-10a	42	15	37, 50,	4	85
7	50		95	5-8	85
8-10	36	16-23	38, 40	8	85
9	33	16-18	39	9	63, 85
10-12	38	16	33	10	52
10-11	37	17-23	40	11	34, 52
10	36, 48,	17-18	50	12	51
	50	17	39, 50,	13	52, 56
10b	38, 42		56, 97,	15	73
10c	38		99	17	64
11-12	38, 96	18	39, 56		
11	38	19-23	39	<i>Zakkur B</i>	
12-15	37	19-22	103	5	52, 63
12-13	38, 39	19	39	16	51
12	38, 40,	20	39, 97,	19	52
	48		103	25	53

QUMRAN

<i>1 QapGen</i>		<i>11 QapGen</i>		20.29	66
12	55	17.9	66		
20	55	17.11	66	<i>11 QrgJob</i>	
		20.3	66	29.25	66

PAPYRI

<i>Aramaic Papyri</i> (ed. A. Cowley)		<i>Brooklyn Museum</i> <i>Aramaic Papyri</i>		p. 228	86
3.22	91	2.8	66	vol. 3	
6.1	66	2.9	66	pp. 50-51	86
6.2	69, 72	7.22	66		
10.6	66	7.25	66	<i>KAI</i> (ed. H. Donner and W. Röllig)	
17.3	89	9.16	70	No. 203	64, 68
20.10	86			p. 219	68
20.11	86	<i>CIS II</i> vol. 1		p. 233	80
p. 291	57	p. 2	86	pp. 237-57	81
		pp. 3-4	68	p. 245	89
		p. 76	86	p. 276	59, 93
		pp. 88-89	73		

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abou-Assaf, A. 28, 37, 48, 63, 81, 97,
 100, 113, 116
 Ackroyd, P.R. 15
 Albright, W.F. 19, 34, 52, 62
 Ap-Thomas, D. 11
 Archer, G. 16, 24
 Aro, J. 64
 Aufrecht, W.E. 28, 29, 57, 80, 85, 97,
 101, 113, 114, 115

 Baldwin, J. 16
 Barthélemy, D. 74
 Bauer, H. 54, 59, 63, 70, 75, 81, 86,
 90, 91, 105
 Baumgartner, W. 72, 74, 76-78, 80
 Bevan, A.A. 17, 18, 81
 Beyer, K. 16, 23
 Black, M. 14
 Blommerde, A.M. 74
 Bordreuil, P. 37
 Bowman, R.A. 11
 Bravmann, M.M. 97

 Cassuto, U. 42
 Cook, E. 24
 Cooke, G.A.
 Cowley, A. 57, 66, 69, 72, 80, 85, 88,
 89
 Coxon, P.W. 19-23, 25, 36, 72-76,
 82, 83, 99, 101
 Cross, F.M. 13, 14, 62, 65, 66, 75, 88

 Daniels, P.T. 17
 Déaut, R. le 15
 Degen, R. 28, 72, 78, 82, 86, 87, 97,
 103, 104

 Dion, P.E. 30, 68, 69, 77, 82, 84, 90-
 92, 104
 Díez-Macho, A. 15
 Donner, H. 53, 93
 Doukhan, J.B. 42
 Driver, G.R. 56
 Driver, S.R. 18, 19, 21, 22
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 28
 Durand, J. 55

 Eissfeldt, O. 20

 Fales, F.M. 98
 Ferch, A.J. 56
 Fischer, J. 15
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 11, 14-17, 22, 25, 28,
 30, 34, 45, 53-56, 62, 65, 66, 69,
 70, 73, 77, 80, 82, 84, 85, 87-89,
 93, 103, 104, 116
 Freedman, D.N. 13, 14, 62, 65, 66, 88
 Friedrich, J. 85

 Garbini, G. 65, 66
 Gibson, J.C.L. 28-30, 34, 45, 52, 57,
 59, 60, 65-68, 75-79, 82, 85-87,
 92, 93, 102, 104
 Ginsberg, H.L. 86, 91
 Gordon, C.H. 50, 54
 Gowan, D.E. 49
 Greenfield, J.C. 14, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31,
 32, 44, 53, 63, 78, 96, 113, 114

 Hackett, J.A. 14
 Hamilton, G.J. 28, 29
 Hartman, L.F. 74
 Hensley, L.V. 24
 Hoftijzer, J. 50, 52, 58, 78, 83, 113, 116

- Isbell, C.D. 92
- Jastrow, M.A. 66
- Jean, C.F. 50, 52, 58, 78, 83, 113, 116
- Kaddari, M.Z. 97, 98
- Kaufman, S.A. 24, 31, 36, 54, 63, 72, 81, 82, 84, 95-98, 100, 103, 105
- Kautzsch, E.
- Kitchen, K.A. 16, 20, 21, 24, 87, 89
- Koch, K. 17, 23, 33
- Koopmans, J.J. 56, 59, 60, 63-65, 76, 88, 91-92
- Kraeling, E.G. 11, 66, 70, 91, 113
- Kutscher, E.Y. 11, 13-18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 30, 73, 76, 78, 88, 91, 95, 97, 100, 104
- Laetsch, T. 74
- Leander, P. 54, 59, 63, 70, 75, 81, 86, 89, 90, 105
- Lella, A.A. di 74
- Lemaire, A. 55
- Lenglet, A. 36
- Lipiński, E. 51, 75
- Malamat, A. 11
- Martin-Achard, R. 52
- McFall, L. 102
- Mendenhall, L.E. 40
- Milik, J.T. 74
- Millard, A.R. 29, 32, 33, 37
- Montgomery, J.A. 19, 23, 62
- Muraoka, T. 24, 29, 62-64, 72, 81, 82, 84, 97, 98
- Noeldeke, T. 18
- Pardee, D. 84
- Rabin, C. 91
- Röllig, W. 93
- Rosenthal, F. 13, 17, 20, 23, 51, 64, 77, 79-84, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 94, 100, 102, 105
- Ross, J.F. 51
- Rowley, H.H. 16, 19-21, 24, 25, 70, 72, 73, 81, 89, 99, 101
- Sasson, V. 25, 36-38, 41, 43, 48, 49, 97, 113, 114, 115, 116
- Schaefer, H.H. 74
- Seboek, T.A. 100
- Segert, S. 16, 28, 66, 87, 96, 100
- Shaffer, A. 31, 32, 63, 96, 113, 114
- Shea, W.H. 41
- Snell, D.C. 11, 22, 23, 36, 41, 74
- Stefanovic, Z. 18, 87
- Tawil, H. 26, 27, 57
- Torrey, C.C. 19, 93
- Tov, E. 15
- Towner, W.S. 41
- Treuer, J.C. 74
- Vasholz, R.I. 17, 22, 24, 27, 64, 65, 77, 84, 89, 100, 103
- Westermann, C. 42
- Whitehead, J.D. 83, 87
- Wilson, R.D. 19
- Wiseman, D.J. 11, 32
- Wittstruck, T. 45
- Wright, W. 18
- Young, E.J. 20, 21
- Zadok, R. 63