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The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment

A V R A H A M  B I R A N
Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion
Jerusalem

J O S E P H  N A V E H
The Hebrew University
of Jerusalem

The interest aroused in the Aramaic stele inscription discovered at Tel Dan in 1993 prompts us to hasten the publication of two new pieces found in June 1994. These have been designated Fragments B1 and B2; consequently, the fragment found last year is called here Fragment A. The Hebrew Union College excavations at the site in 1994 concentrated on the area of the Israelite fortifications to the east of the square uncovered the previous year. The Israel Antiquities Authority and the Israel Government Tourist Corporation continued their conservation and restoration of the city wall here, and our excavation was extended accordingly along the base of the wall.

While excavating the accumulated debris, a Roman clay pipe was uncovered, under which the tops of standing basalt monoliths appeared. Further excavations revealed a construction, 4.50 × 2.50 m., with three monoliths, 1.17 m., 0.73 m. and 0.50 m. high respectively (Fig. 1). In front of the largest one there was a basalt bowl on a decorated capital set on a flat base (Fig. 2). A large quantity of ash was found around the stones, and there were traces of fire on the inside of the basalt bowl as well. We identified the standing stones as mas'ebot, behind a small flagstone pavement. The construction may well be a hama built on top of the level of the destruction debris of the Assyrian conquest of northern Israel.

1 A. Biran and J. Naveh: An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan, IEJ 43 (1993), pp. 81–98.
2 This year’s expedition, under the direction of A. Biran, included Rachel Ben Dov, R. Barnor, Y. Ben Ephraim, Gila Cook, R. Goren, Malka Hershkovitz, Hanni Hirsch and Morag Kersal. For last year’s excavation, see Biran and Naveh (above, n. 1), p. 82, Fig. 2, and p. 83, Fig. 3.

Figs. 4, 8 and 9 were photographed by Z. Radovan; the others by A. Biran.
in 733/32 B.C.E. This level of destruction also covered the remains of buildings dated to the ninth–eighth centuries B.C.E. (Fig. 3).3

Excavation of the debris south of the stone construction continued, and at a distance of c. 2 m. a basalt stone was found, on which Area Supervisor Malka Hershkovitz recognized an inscription. This was on 20 June, 11 months after the discovery of Fragment A on 21 July 1993. The latter was found some 13 m. to the south-west, in a wall built on the flagstone pavement of the square. The newly discovered stone — Fragment B1 — was found in the debris 0.80 m. above the level of the pavement. This piece is c. 20 cm. long and 1.4 cm. wide, and contains six lines inscribed on a flat surface, 15 × 11 cm. The letters are clearly written and the words separated by dots (Fig. 4).

The excavation along the city wall continued eastward. A stone pavement running along the foot of the wall was uncovered. Approximately 5 m. of the pavement’s width and 25 m. of its length have been cleared, and it appears to extend further to

---

3 These may well represent the ḫūṣōr of Dan (cf. 1 Kings 20:34).
Fig. 2. Basalt bowl on decorated capital set on flat base, in front of monolith.
Fig. 3. Remains of ninth–eighth-century B.C.E. buildings at Tel Dan.
the south and east. At a distance of 40 m. from the outer gate, five mašebot were found (Fig. 5). A probe carried out under the two easternmost ones (Fig. 6) showed that the mašebot were laid at the base of the wall, about 40 cm. below the level of the flagstone pavement, before the area was paved.

A small amount of pottery found in the probe was dated to the end of the ninth/beginning of the eighth century B.C.E. Pottery found in other probes under the flagstone pavement support the dating of the pavement to this period. This is relevant to the dating of a third piece of the inscription, which was found on 30 June, when the flagstone pavement was completely cleared. Surveyor Gila Cook, who had found Fragment A last year, spotted this third piece — designated Fragment B2 — while inserting a measuring rod into the base of the wall, about 8 m. north of the find-spot of Fragment B1. The builders who had laid the pavement had used Fragment B2 as just another flat stone (Fig. 7). Fragment B2 is 10 × 9 cm., and contains four lines inscribed on a 9 × 6 cm. surface. The letters are clear, and the words separated by dots (Fig. 8).
Fig. 5. Five *māṣsebot*, 40 m. from the outer gate of Tel Dan.

Fig. 6. The two easternmost *māṣsebot*, laid at the base of the wall.
Fig. 7. Find-spot of Fragment B2, in the base of the wall, about 8 m. north of where Fragment B1 was found.
This piece, together with the entire pavement, was covered by the debris of the Assyrian destruction. Consequently, it could not have been set in place later than the conquest of northern Israel by Tiglath-pileser III. In an attempt to determine how much earlier, the probe carried out at the find-spot of Fragment B2 was enlarged to remove the entire flagstone pavement in this area. The latest pottery collected is from the end of the ninth/beginning of the eighth century B.C.E., indicating that the pavement could not have been set in place before the beginning of the eighth century B.C.E. By that time the inscription was of no significance to the builders of the pavement, who, in all likelihood, were unaware of the fact that it was part of a broken stele erected by an Aramean king. The excavations have not revealed as yet when the stele was smashed and by whom.

There were, however, two kings of Israel during that period who were independent enough to have destroyed the stele set by a victorious Aramean king: Jehoash, grandson of Jehu, and his son, Jeroboam II. They ruled from c. 800–745 B.C.E., by which time the Assyrians under Adad-nirari III (805–782 B.C.E.) had crushed
the power of Damascus. According to 2 Kings 13:25, Jehoash had recovered the cities that had been taken by the Arameans, and Jeroboam II in turn extended the boundaries of his kingdom far to the north and east (2 Kings 14:25–28). Neither would have tolerated a reminder of the former weakness of their kingdom. Of the two, it is reasonable to assume that Jehoash, who fought the Arameans three times and defeated Ben Hadad, would have been responsible for smashing the stele, which was probably erected by Hazael (see below, p. 17–18).

The two newly discovered pieces were joined together to form Fragment B (Fig. 9). The maximum dimensions of its surface are 19.5 × 12 cm. The surviving letters are as follows:4

```
.1
[תורהא[.2
[周转환.3
[.4
[ל_ANDROID.5
[.6
[.7
[יהודה.8
```

It was clear at first glance that in lines 7–8 of the new fragment, two kings of Israel and Judah, who ruled at the same time, are mentioned. This conclusion is borne out by the unequivocal reconstruction of these lines as follows:

.חיות.ב.אתא.מלך.ישראל.
.אתא.מלך.בר.יהודה.

The only king, either of Israel or of Judah, whose name ends with resh and mem is Jehoram. This was the name both of the son of Ahab, king of Israel, and of the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. The letters רְחָמָי, followed by בֵּית רְחָמָי, 'the son of', must belong to a Hebrew theophorous name. In the ninth century B.C.E., the two royal names ending with רְחָמָי and אַתָּה רְחָמָי were אַתָּה רְחָמָי and (אַתָּה רְחָמָי). The latter became queen of Judah after her son Ahaziah. The name Ahaziah was borne by both a king of Israel and a king of Judah, but only one can be taken into consideration: the son of Jehoram and grandson of Jehoshaphat, who ruled in Judah for one year.

4 A number of articles have appeared in the wake of the publication of Fragment A. This paper does not discuss the views expressed in these articles, since the publication of Fragment B refutes many formerly expressed opinions (including our own) and opens the discussion anew.
(2 Kings 8:25–26) and was the ally of Jehoram of Israel. According to 2 Kings 9:24–28, both Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah were slain by Jehu; this took place after Hazael seized the throne from Ben Hadad II, king of Aram-Damascus, and defeated Jehoram at Ramoth Gilead (2 Kings 8:7–15, 28). Since Hazael fought against Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah (see 2 Chron. 22:5), it becomes apparent that the stele is to be attributed to the time of Hazael.

Fragments A and B cannot be joined in an obvious, unequivocal way. Three possibilities have been considered: 1) Fragment B preceding Fragment A, an unlikely possibility since the reference to the writer’s father normally belongs to the beginning of the stele; 2) Fragment B belonging to the lines below Fragment A; and 3) Fragment B to the left of Fragment A (Fig. 9). The latter placement provided, albeit with some difficulties, a meaningful and continuous text. This solution was corroborated by three experienced restorers, who independently have demonstrated that the stone of both fragments can be joined below the surface at line 5. After placing the fragments next to each other so that the eight lines of Fragment B are the continuations of lines 1–8 of Fragment A, the space between the two fragments at line 5 leaves a space of one letter. The number of letters to be restored in the other lines between the fragments was based on the assumption that the left upper edge of Fragment B and the lower right edge of Fragment A form a straight line of the same break (Fig. 10). Unfortunately, the letters of Fragment B do not constitute a direct continuation of the text of Fragment A in any line, and no line in Fragment B is complete at its end. Nevertheless, in most lines, after restoring some letters between the fragments and at the line ends, a more or less meaningful text was obtained.

The following presentation and interpretation of the inscription is hypothetical. Further discoveries will no doubt lead to modifications, if not major changes, in the understanding of the inscription. We believe, however, that even at this stage we should offer a possible historical scenario for the background of the inscription, on the basis of what we can glean from the two fragments discovered so far. The join below the surface of line 5 allows us to offer the following reconstruction:

5 The restorers were Nili Cohen (Hebrew Union College) and A. Weiner and Ruth Yekutieli (Israel Museum).
6 Thanks are due to Dr. Ada Yardeni for sharing with us her knowledge and experience in reading and reconstructing the text, and to Prof. Israel Eph'al for his valuable remarks on many details in this article. The opinions expressed here are solely the responsibility of the authors.
Fig. 10. Fascimile of the inscription on Fragments A and B (drawn by Ada Yardeni).
Translation
1. [...] and cut [...]  
2. [...] my father went up [against him when] he fought at [...]  
3. And my father lay down, he went to his [ancestors] (viz. became sick and died). And the king of [I[s-]  
4. rael entered previously in my father’s land. [And] Hadad made me king.  
5. And Hadad went in front of me, [and] I departed from [the] seven [...]  
6. s of my kingdom, and I slew [seven]nty kin[gs], who harnessed thou[sands of cha-]  
7. riots and thousands of horsemen (or: horses). [I killed Jeho]ram son of [Ahab]  
8. king of Israel, and [I] killed [Ahaz]iahu son of [Jehoram kin-]  
9. g of the House of David. And I set [their towns into ruins and turned]  
10. their land into [desolation ...]  
11. other [...] and Jehu ru-]  
12. led over Is[rael ...] and I laid]  
13. siege upon [...]  

Commentary
Line 1. The verb זוהי אלן י הגור בר 7 ויהי [va'anei ha'gor] has concluded; just this treaty that Bar-Ga[ya]h has concluded; it also appears in Sfire I [VA:39–40] just as this calf is cut in two, so may Mati'el be cut in two, and his nobles be cut in two; here י gör equals Hebrew במר וגו of Gen. 15:10 (see also Jer. 34:18). Since the distance between רזר and the letters [ ] surviving in the first half of the line, is quite large, any reconstruction would be a mere guess.

Line 2. For אבר see, the publication of Fragment A. The reading [ba'areах]הvertebrates is based on the recurrence of this verb (in hiphtael) in the Mesha inscription: הבתרתמה אכם 'when he fought against me' (line 19); להתרתמה בכר 'and I fought against the town' (line 11); להתרתמה בח ו 'and I fought against it (Nebo)' (line 15); להתרתמה בעור 'go, fight against חורון' (line 32).

It is not quite clear to which letter the diagonal stroke (and the ‘knee’ above it) at the edge of the break, after the aleph of [-], belongs. Two letters may be taken into consideration: beth or pe, although the stroke is too high for a beth (see אבר in lines 2 and 3) and too straight for a pe. Nevertheless, the following reconstructions may be suggested: [ ]'when he fought against my fa[ther]; [ ]'when he fought at A[bel]-Beth-Maacaḥ';

7 Biran and Naveh (above, n. 1), p. 91.
or [when] he fought at Ap[hek]. 8 After there presumably should be [my father attacked [him (the king of Israel)] when] he fought at ... The reconstruction [is] and its interpretation is based on ‘to attack’ in Biblical Hebrew.

**Line 3.** Since רֵיחַ אֲלֵן עָלָהּ is too long and יִכְּרֵא אֲלֵן בִּית עָלָהּ is too short, we suggest reconstructing רֵיחַ אֲלֵן בִּית עָלָהּ, lit. ‘and my father lay down, he went to his ancestors’, cf. the biblical expression ‘he slept with his ancestors’ (passim), as well as Cf. יִכְּרֵא אֲלֵן אֲלֵי ‘I shall go to him (to the deceased)’ (2 Sam. 12:23).

**Lines 3–4.** The reconstruction is מָלְכֵי/אֱלֹא אֲלֵי. Although in Fragment A:8 there is a dot between מָלְכֵי and אֲלֵי, the lack of a word divider in such a compound is natural; see מָלְכֵי ‘king of Byblos’ in the tenth-century B.C.E. inscriptions from Byblos of Ahiram and Yehekimil (KAI, I and 4) and note the relative larger distance between the kaph and the yod in Fragment B:3 is insignificant, unless the engraver left a space for a dot intending to mark it later, but then forgot to return to it.

ירָא ‘and he entered’. יֵשָׁלָהש is the third person imperfect of עָלָהּ ‘to enter, to come in’. This verb may be followed by one of the prepositions ב or ל, but, like other verbs expressing motion towards a place, it also may be followed by an object without any preposition. In the publication of Fragment A, found in 1 Kings, was translated as ‘formerly, of old’; the interpretation of קָרֹא as an adverb ‘previously’ in the phrase יֵשָׁלָהש מָלְכֵי אֲלֵי קָרֹא אֲלֵי still seems preferable. Nevertheless, the rendering of קָרֹא as a geographical name cannot be absolutely excluded. In this case there would...
be some difficulty in the translation of the phrase ‘and the king of Israel entered Qedem (in) my father’s land’. One wonders whether קֶדֶם, ‘Qedem’, equals ‘my father’s land’, or whether the translation should be ‘Qedem in my father’s land’.

*Lines 4–5.* ‘And Hadad made me king’. The appended אַנֶּה after the reconstructed first person [אַנֶּה is for emphasis; see 2 Sam. 12:28; 17:15, but especially Zech. 7:5 ‘was it indeed for me that you fasted’]. Admittedly, the above reconstruction in lines 4–5 is somewhat awkward, but it seems inevitable.

The style of the Zakkur inscription (KAI, 202), I, lines 3–4, is more elegant. This is one of the two other epigraphical occurrences in which a form of the verb מָלֵך for making someone king is used. In 853 B.C.E. Urhila, king of Hamath was an ally of Adad-Idri at the battle of Qarqar (ANET, p. 279a); Urhila, belonged to a neo-Hittite dynasty. At a later date we find Zakkur ruling over Hamath. Zakkur’s father is not named either in his inscription or in the stele of Adad-nirari dealing with the boundary ‘between Zakkur of the land of Hamath and Ataršumki son of Adramu (of Arpad); it is therefore assumed that Zakkur was a usurper.

The other is in the Sam’alian Panamu inscription (KAI, 215:6–7), in which Barrakib relates that Panamu’s father, Baršur, was killed in an insurrection; [...] הבו יָד רָע [...] מָלֵך then my father carried [...] to the king of Assyria, and he made him (Panamu, Barrakib’s father) king over his father’s house. The verb מָלֵך is in the pa‘el, which also serves as a factitive, rather than the haph’el. In the Hebrew Bible, the verb מָלֵך usually occurs when the successor of a king is not the legitimate heir or when there is dissension concerning the throne (e.g., 1 Sam. 15:11, 35; 1 Kings 1:43; 12:1, 20; 16:16; 2 Kings 17:21; 21:24; 23:30, 34; 24:17; Jer. 37:1, etc.).

*Lines 5–6.* [ֹוֵאַשֵּׁבָּךְ me šeḇqōt] מָלֵך. The first word imperfect of the root בָּשַׁבָּך, which is equivalent to the Hebrew אָשַׁב, often used in the sense of ‘to go out to battle’ (e.g., Deut. 20:1; 21:10; Judg. 20:14, 28; 2 Sam. 11:1; 1 Chron. 20:1).

The last word of the sentence obtained from the two fragments, מָלֵך, should be

---

16 R. de Vaux (*Ancient Israel*, London, 1961, p. 101) mentions in this connection that Barrakib king of Sam’al, who was a legitimate heir, says: ‘my lord Rakib’el and my lord Tiglath-pileser seated me upon my father’s throne’ (KAI, 216, II. 5–7).
interpreted as ‘my kingdom’. The abstract noun *malk* occurs in Ugaritic and in the early tenth-century B.C.E. Aḥiram inscription from Byblos (KAI, 1). Seventy is a typological number used to express totality, all-inclusiveness. This is quite common in the Bible, e.g., הַלְוִי (2 Kings 10:1); and מַעֲרִיר (Judg. 1:7); in the Panamu inscription, lines 3–4: הָאָבֶד אָבְדֵי חֶבְרֵי אָבֶד; and he slew his father Barṣur and he slew the seventy kinsmen of his father. The word order, מַעֲרִיר, i.e., the noun preceding the number, is quite common in later Aramaic.

Lines 6–7. הַלְוִי, מַעֲרִיר, מְשַׁבֵּט אַלְפִּים וְאָלֶף רֵעָי, who harnessed thousands of chariots and thousands of horsemen. אַלְפִּים is the construct state of the plural active participle ‘those who harness’, i.e. those who possessed thousands of chariots and horsemen. For אָלֶף see Exod. 14:6; 1 Kings 18:44 and 2 Kings 9:21. As מַעֲרִיר may also mean ‘horse’ (e.g., 2 Sam. 1:6; Ezek. 27:14), the translation ‘those who harness (more) horses’ is also possible.

In the publication of Fragment A, אֶלֶף was translated ‘two thousand’, taken as a definite number in the list of the enemy’s casualties. In the context of the two fragments, however, אֶלֶף should be interpreted as an undefined number ‘thousands of’.

Lines 7–9. See above, p. 9, for the restoration אֶלֶף וַאֲלֹפֵי. It should be noted that after אֲלֹפֵי only four

---

19 This tip was reconstructed by Puech as an aleph. See E. Puech: La stele araméenne de Dan: Bar Hadad II et la coalition de Omrides et de la Maison de David, RB 101–102 (1994), pp. 218–219, 225.
22 Biran and Naveh (above, n. 1), pp. 90, 93. That אֶלֶף could have been the construct state of the dual אֶלֶף יָדְעַנְתָּ is obvious from a stone weight inscribed הַלְוִי אֶלֶף יָדְעַנְתָּ ‘two shekels of Hamath’; see P. Bordreuil and E. Gubel: Bulletin d’antiquités archéologiques du Levant inédits ou méconnues 1, Syria 60 (1983), p. 341.
letters and one dot, [ביבלי], may be restored at the end of line 7 in order to join with מִצְרָיִם in line 8, whereas after [יהוֹרָה הַבֵּית] in line 8 seven letters and two dots, [יְהוֹרָה הַבֵּית], are missing before יְהוֹרָה הַבֵּית at the beginning of line 9. Since no remnants of the left edge of the inscription have yet been found, one wonders whether unlike the beginnings of the lines, the line ends were not aligned, or whether there was another reason for the discrepancy in the number of letters missing, such as haplography of one of the mems in יהוה [ד] לֶא in Fragment A:8 seems to be the repetition of the same verb restored in line 7.

Lines 9–10. This restoration has already been suggested in the publication of Fragment A.24

Lines 11–12. Since the killing of Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah brings the story to the time of Jehu, the suggested reconstruction is הָאָדָם מִלְךָ לְעֵל שְׁעַרָיָל [‘and Jehu ruled over Is[rael].’]

DISCUSSION

Although quite a number of problems remain unresolved, if the above reconstruction is correct in the main, the suppositions based on Fragment A alone should be changed. The text now points to the time of Hazael, whose coup d’état preceded Jehu’s revolt in 842 B.C.E. Moreover, it clearly indicates that the author of the stele was Hazael himself, although his name does not appear in the fragments found to date.25 Hazael was a usurper; this is clearly recorded in the prophetic narrative of 2 Kings 8:7–15 and alluded to in the appellation ‘the son of nobody’ in an inscription of Shalmaneser III (ANET, p. 280b), as well as the use of the verb המֵלָךְ in the phrase המֵלָךְ [וְיֶרְדָּק] in the Tel Dan stele.

It is unusual for a usurper to mention his father in his royal inscription. The writer of the stele, however, mentions ‘my father’ at least three times: his father fought (against the king of Israel?); he died; and a certain land was called ‘my father’s land’, which the king of Israel entered. Hazael’s appellation ‘the son of nobody’ presumably means that as a usurper he did not belong to the lineage of the Damascene

---

23 For scribal errors in monumental royal inscriptions, see, e.g., the Abiram inscription (KAI, 1; אֵל מִלְךָ), the Tibnath inscription (KAI, 13), line 7 (אֵל מִלְךָ וֹדֵעַ) and the Kilamuwa inscription (KAI, 24), lines 5–6.
24 Biran and Naveh (above, n. 1), p. 93 and n. 20.
25 It should be noted that B. Margalit, who suggested an impossible reconstruction of Fragment A, attributed the Dan stele to Hazael; see NABU 1994 (No. 1, March), pp. 20–21.
kings of Ben Hadad I and Ben Hadad II (Adad-idri). Who was Hazael’s father?26

There is a serious contradiction between the Dan inscription and the biblical narrative in 2 Kings 9, which describes in detail how Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah were slain by Jehu. The biblical tradition, also alluded to in Hosea 1:4–5, relates the uprooting of the house of Ahab to Jehu’s rebellion, as predicted in the prophecies of Elijah (1 Kings 19:17) and Elisha (2 Kings 9:6–10). On the other hand, the author of the stele inscription ascribes the slaying of Jehoram king of Israel and Ahaziah king of Judah to himself. Is it possible that Hazael saw Jehu as his agent?

The fragmentary text of the Dan inscription alludes to Hazael as the king who erected the stele, but there is no indication as to when this occurred. The inscription was presumably a memorial stele describing Hazael’s deeds.27 The extant text deals only with the early years of Hazael’s reign, which lasted more than 40 years until the end of the ninth century B.C.E.28 After speaking of his father, Hazael related that after becoming king he went out to war with ‘Hadad going in front of him’. In his wars he killed ‘seventy kings’, among them Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah. The original inscription may have continued to record Hazael’s further activities. At present we have no indication of the form of the stele and its length. We do not know, therefore, whether the inscription was erected shortly after the events it records took place, or whether it included his version of the war with Shalmaneser III, his invasion of Israel and the area across the Jordan (2 Kings 10:32–33) and his attacks on ‘Umqi, Arpad, Hamath and Lu’ash, from whence he took booty marked by his registrars.29 Moreover, the original stele might very well have recounted events not recorded in the extant sources. We may find some indication in the possible mention of ‘seventy kings’. It seems hardly conceivable that a king in the early years of his reign would declare that he had defeated so many kings. We would suggest that the inscription was erected in the later part of Hazael’s reign. ‘I killed “seventy” kings’ is a summary written at the beginning of the inscription, which then goes into details. Although Hazael was active on many fronts, it may be that the inscription erected at Dan deals only (or mainly) with his affairs with Israel and Judah. Until further fragments of the stele are found, questions concerning its exact date, proper meaning and the circumstances of its erection at Tel Dan remain open.

26 One should not exclude the possibility that Hazael belonged to a secondary branch of the royal dynasty in Damascus; cf. the relation of Darius I to the family of Cyrus (see R.N. Frye: The Heritage of Persia, London, 1962, pp. 79, 293). If סננה is a geographical designation, Hazael might have been the son of a ruler in the Land of Qedem; this brings to mind the name Hazael ‘king of the Arabs’ from the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, more specifically c. 689–677 B.C.E. See ANET, pp. 191, 292, 298, 301; Eph’al (above, n. 13, 1982), pp. 112–169, 227.
27 We use the term ‘memorial stele’ in the sense described by M. Miller: The Moabite Stone as a Memorial Stela, PEQ 106 (1974), pp. 9–18.