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The purpose of this study is to examine the obliteration of polytheistic names in the manifold manifestations of the Bible and its milieu: textual, literary, administrative, and legal. 1 This investigation will, I hope, result in solid conclusions about the religious history of Israel in biblical times. The textual obliteration of names considered to be idolatrous has indeed been noted many times since the first half of the 19th century, 2 yet I believe that additional light can be shed on its historical circumstances by integrating the textual aspect with a study of the other fields of intellectual activity in biblical times.

1. My thanks go to the style editor Mr. Jeffrey Green, to the reader appointed by the editors of this volume, and to my assistant, Mr. Yair Segev, whose notes helped me improve the present essay.

2. O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt*, 2nd ed., KHAT 4 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1864),157 (the 1st ed. appeared in 1842; Thenius refers to Ewald and Böttcher); A. Geiger, “Der Baal in den hebräischen Eigennamen,” *ZDMG* 16 (1862): 728–32; J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871), passim; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, *with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913); F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testamentes dargestellt* (Leipzig: Akademische Buchhandlung, 1891) 250–54; C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; repr., New York: Ktav, 1966) 399–404; E. Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Haarlem: Bohn, 1875; repr., Schaan: Sändig, 1983); I. L. Seeligmann, “Research into the Criticism of the Massoretic Text,” *Tarbiz* 25 (1955–56): 118–39 [Hebrew]; ET “Studies in the History of the Biblical Text,” *Textus* 20 (2000): 1–30; C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament,* OBO 36 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 267–69.
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**Textual-Corrections**

The theological corrections that occurred in the book of Samuel are familiar to every critical student of the Hebrew Bible. We begin with some of the compound names containing the theophoric element *Baal*, as follows:

2 Sam 2:8 and *passim*: איש בשת—1 Chr 8:33; 9:38: אשבעל

2 Sam 9:6 and *passim*: מפיבשת—1 Chr 8:36; 9:40: מריב בעל

2 Sam 11:21: ירובשת—Judg 9:1 and *passim*: ירובעל

2 Sam 5:16; 1 Chr 3:8: אלידע—1 Chr 14:7 בעלידע

2 Sam 23:8ישב בשבת תחכמני:—LXXB: Ιεβοσθε; LXXLuc: Ιεσβααλ; VL: Iesbael ; 1 Chr 11:11: ישבעם בן חכמוני. 3

It is clear that in a manuscript of Samuel from which the Masoretic Text derived (henceforth pre-MT), compounded names formed with Baal were cor- rected in a dysphemistic way: בשת instead of בעל—*boshet* meaning here not “shame” but “disappointment.” 4 The same procedure occurred in the book of Kings: 1 Kgs 18:19, 25: נביאי הבעל were represented in the LXX by προφῆται τῆς αἰσχύνης; plausibly these verses in the Vorlage read \* נביאי הבשת\*. In 2 Kgs 4:42, the MT reads שלשה בעל, the LXX Βαιθσαρεισα; their Vorlage probably had \*שלשה בית\*. In an opposite case, the correction was euphemistic אלידע (2 Sam 5:16; 1Chr 3:8) instead ofבעלידע )1Chr 14:7(. Plausibly, the same correction occurred also in Judges 9. In v. 4, the sanctuary בית בעל ברית is mentioned, but in v. 46 its name has been corrected to בית אל ברית. LXXA† renders it οἴκου τοῦ Βααλ διαθήκης, thus preserving an original בית בעל ברית. In the same direction, another correction was made: הדורם )(1 Chr 18:10) was substituted by ) יורם2 Sam 8:10(. The name of the prince from Neo-Hittite Hamath was a compound, containing either the name הד, an alternative name for Baal in Ugarit, or the name of the Aramean god Hadad. Evidently, in the pre-MT scroll of Samuel, the prince’s name was corrected to יורם, a good theophoric Yahwistic name, as if he were a law-abiding Israelite.5 Another case where a Yahwistic theophoric name was substituted for a Baal compound is found in 1 Sam 14:49. The text lists the sons of King Saul: Jonathan, Ishvi, and Malchishua. This Ishvi never appears elsewhere. It stands to reason that the Hebrew letters ישויresulted from a scribal metathesis of ישיו which again

3. A full Greek documentation for the other passages in Samuel is supplied by Mc- Carthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections,* 214–25. The evidence of the LXX manuscripts disposes of Avioz’s contention that the *boshet*-mutation was due to the author; see M. Avioz, “The Names Mephiboshet and Ishboshet Reconsidered,” *JANES* 32 (2011): 11–20.

4. Many instances in the Hebrew Bible prove this point: see the case of the “young men” who went for water in the cisterns: they came back disappointed, בשו (Jer 14:3).

5. Gordon inverted the direction of the renaming: cf. C. H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (London: Phoenix, 1960), 228 and n. 20. However, one cannot discard the cumulative evidence in the Bible by relying on a random finding in the ancient Near East

represented a euphemistic recasting of the name אשבעל . 6 These euphemistic corrections stand to prove that the other name shifts, from Baal to Boshet, were not intended to introduce an alleged divine epithet *baštu,* 7 but were motivated by the intent to disparage idolatrous names extant in the biblical books. An additional correction has the same effect: in 2 Sam 5:21, the Philistines gods are called עצביהם“their idols,” whereas 1 Chr 14:12 uses the original reading,אלהיהם “their gods.” Again, a corrector of the pre-MT Samuel scroll substituted the original title with a derogatory one.

The presence of theophoric Baal names in the households of Saul and David needs explanation. 8 Apparently, it is not a case of idolatry, since neither king, not even the impious Saul, was accused of this sin. As noted long ago, we are encountering here the name Baal as an ancient appellation of Yhwh.9

This is evidenced in 2 Sam 5:20, where David says: “The *Lord* has broken through (פרץ) my enemies . . . therefore, the place was named *Baal-peraṣim* (בעל פרצים).” Hos 2:18 confirms this thesis: “And in that day, declares the Lord, you will call [Me] my man (אישי) and no more will you call Me my Baal (בעלי).” 10 The situation opposed by Hosea is also attested by such a name asבעליה , again preserved by the Chronicler (1 Chr 12:5). 11

In my view, this phenomenon is best explained as syncretism. The Hebrew tribes who had worshiped their god Yhwh entered Canaan and found a cult of Baal there. At first, they conflated the two gods, transferring qualities from Baal to the Lord. 12 A well-known instance of this process was the appellation of Baal *rkb ʿrpt*, extant in the Ugaritic texts, 13 that was applied to

6אשבעל is a by-form of ישבעל; compare the same mutation in the name of איזבל: N. Avigad, “The Seal of Jezebel,” *IEJ* 14 (1964): 274–76; R. Hestrin and M. Dayagi- Mendels, *Inscribed Seals: First Temple Period Hebrew, Ammonite, Moabite, Phoenician and Aramaic from the Collection of the Israel Museum and the Israel Department of Antiqui- ties and Museums*, trans. I. Pommerantz (Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 1979) 48.

7. M. Tsevat, “Ishbosheth and Congeners: The Names and Their Study,” *HUCA* 46 (1975): 71–87; G.J. Hamilton, “New Evidence for the Authenticity of *bsht* in Hebrew Personal Names and for Its Use as a Divine Epithet in Biblical Texts”, *CBQ* 60 (1998): 228 – 250.

8. To these names, אשבל (Gen 46:21; Num 26:38; 1 Chr 8:1), as derived from אשבעל, has been added; cf. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuels*, xiii.

9. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text,* 120–21, 253–55.

10. The *double entendre* of this verse is exquisite: in the metaphor a more intimate rela- tionship between the husband (Yhwh) and his wife (Israel) is announced: in real terms, the Lord will no more be identified with Baal. This address of Hosea comprises vv. 18, 21–22; vv. 19 and 20 were interpolated. Cf. A. Biram, “Hosea 2:16 –25,” in *Fs E. Auerbach,* ed. A. Biram (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1955) 116 –139, esp. pp. 118–21. [Heb.].

11. Cf. Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen,* 108–32, esp. p. 124.

12. *Aliter*, A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State*, trans. A. H. May; 3 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1882), 1.403–6. In his opinion, Baal was incipiently distinct from Yhwh.

13. Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *The Ugaritic Texts* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1936), 24 [Heb.]; U. Cas- suto, *The Goddess Anat*: *Canaanite Epics of the Patriarchal Age*, trans. I. Abrahams (Je- rusalem: Magnes, 1971), 59, 122. This epithet occurs six times in the “Baal Cycle”; cf.

the Lord in Ps 68:5:סלו לרכב בערבות “extol Him who rides on the clouds.” The syncretistic outlook probably lasted until the mid-9th century b.c.e., when Baal worship was uprooted in Israel and Judah; yet Hosea, later in the 8th century, still protests against the identification of the Lord with Baal, as we have seen.

Is it possible to determine when the corrections of the Baal-Boshet type were introduced into biblical manuscripts? A common expectation would date them sometime in the course of the Second Commonwealth, in the Persian or Hellenistic period. However, it is doubtful that idolatry was much of a concern in those times. It is well known that Rabbinic Hebrew preserved expressions such asשדה בעל “field of Baal” for land that was not watered by man but was rained on from heaven (*m. B. Bat.* 3:1). 14 Clearly, the expression was current in Hebrew throughout the Second Commonwealth, without opposition from pious circles. A good representative of these circles was the Chronicler, and we have seen that he did not hesitate to transmit idolatrous-theophoric names that he found in his sources. Actually, when he intervened in his inher- ited material, he did it for a different purpose: his preoccupation was nomis- tic—to credit righteous leaders of old with law-abiding behavior. Thus in 1 Chr

14:12, he retainedאלהיהם for Philistine idols but insisted on saying that David did not take them as spoils (2 Sam 5:21) but had them burned! This correction was done in compliance with the law in Deut 7:5; 12:3 LXX.

As pointed out by Seeligmann, there is a possible historical link to the Baal- Boshet correction in Jer 3:21–4:2, 15 which is a dialogue between the repentant Israelites and their merciful God. Israel recognizes that its salvation derives from the Lord (3:23) and then admits והבשת אכלה את יגיע אבותינו מנעורינו את צאנם ואת בקרם את בניהם ואת בנותיהם “But *the Boshet* has consumed the possessions of our fathers ever since our youth, their flocks and herds, their sons and daughters” (3:24. This clearly refers to past sacrifices made to the Baal, animal as well as human. Now the penitents declare נשכבה בבשתנו ותכסנו כלמתנו כי לה' אלהינו חטאנו אנחנו ואבותינו “Let us lie down in our *boshet* (shame, disappointment); let our *kelimah* (disgrace) cover us, for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers” (3:25). *Boshet* here is an epithet of Baal. But this time it was not introduced by a copyist; it was used by the author him- self, most likely Jeremiah, because its authenticity is defended by the prosody of v. 25: lying in *boshet* is paralleled by being covered by *kelimah*.

M. S. Smith, “The Baal Cycle,” in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. S. B. Parker, SBLWAW 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 103–4, 111–12, 124, 132.

14. Cf. Nestle, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen*, 126 n. 1. He pointed out survivals of such expressions even in Arabic.

15. Cf. Seeligmann, “Studies in the History of the Biblical Text,” 6 –7, esp. n. 16. As usual in his writings, Seeligmann noted this point very briefly.

If I see it right, the prophet’s words in Jer 3:21–4:2 show that the correction *baal*-*boshet* in copies of the book of Samuel were introduced by scribes of Jeremiah’s milieu—either his predecessors or his disciples—in the 7th–6th century b.c.e. At first, this conclusion appears unbelievable: so early? This would mean that the text of Samuel was reworked before the book was complete! 16 However, this situation is plausible once we recognize that the same tendency, to silence idolatrous names or to substitute them with legitimate ones, occurs in other realms as well, in compositions written toward the end of the monarchic period, and in the documentation of the administrative recasting of place-names. Thus, an early dating will become probable.

An additional prophet of the late 7th century b.c.e. who voiced an anti- Baal polemic is Zephaniah. Zeph 1:4 reads: והכרתי מן המקום הזה את שאר הבעל “I will wipe out from this place every vestige of Baal.” 17 This saying, again, points to the last generations before the exile as the time when the obliteration of the Baal name took place.

**Literary Criticism**

On the literary level, one notes that the D document in Deuteronomy 1–30, in its repeated references to the Sinai event, consistently avoids the use of that place-name, employing instead the name Horeb (nine times). 18 This fact has been explained, 19 rightly in my opinion, as due to the similarity of the name *Sinai* to the name *Sin*, the Mesopotamian moon god. Once this divinity became known in Israel and Judah, with the Assyrian expansion and domination in the 8th–7th centuries b.c.e. some Hebrew scribes avoided the name *Sinai* and adopted the name *Horeb* in its place. The latter was perhaps invented, be- ing derived from the root ,ח.ר.ב.“being arid, desolate.”

No less significant is the story of the revelation to Moses in the burning bush (Exod 3:1–12). The bush (*sĕneh*) is mentioned in the pericope five times (vv. 2 [3×], 3, 4). Moreover, the burning bush functions as a sign for Moses, confirming that he is sent by the Lord (v. 12). 20 Immediately afterward comes

16. Since the story of David and Goliath was composed late, in Persian times; see my *Introduction to the Literature of the Hebrew Bible*, trans. H. N. Bock and J. H. Seeligmann, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 9 (Jerusalem: Simor [Eisenbrauns], 2009), 123–28.

17. The authenticity of this passage is upheld by critics; see, for example, K. Elliger, *Das*

*Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1950), ad loc.

18. Deut 1:2, 6, 19; 4:10, 15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 28:69. The only occurrence of *Sinai* in

Deuteronomy is in 33:2, which does not belong to the D document.

19. L. Perlitt, “Sinai und Horeb,” in *Beiträge zur alttestamentliche Theologie*, ed. H. Donner et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 302–22. For him, however, this explanation was just one of three possibilities; see p. 312.

20. Rashbam, *Commentary on the Torah*, ed. D. Rosin (Breslau: Schottlander, 1882; repr. New York: Om, 1949), ad loc.; S. D. Luzzatto, *Il Pentateuco: Volgarizzato e Commen- tato*, vol. 2: *Esodo* (Padua: Sacchetto, 1872), ad loc.; B. S. Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary,* OTL (London: SCM, 1974), 74.

the interpretation of the purport of the sign: “When you have freed the people from Egypt, you shall worship God at this mountain” (v. 12). This is an evident pun on the words *sĕneh* and *sinai*. However, the name *Sinai* does not appear in this passage. The mountain is referred to here as “this mountain”; and at the beginning of the story, one reads that Moses came “to the mountain of God, to Horeb” (v. 1). 21 This discrepancy between the “leading word,” *sĕneh*, the expected and implied name, Sinai, and the actual name in v. 1, Horeb, sug- gests that the author or editor of the “Call of Moses” adhered to the view that the place-name Sinai should be discarded as being heathen. 22 The evidence from literary compositions thus strengthens the conclusion that the elimination of idolatrous names occurred in the Assyrian period, in the 8th–7th centuries b.c.e.

**Renaming by State Policy**

This conclusion is confirmed by the epigraphic material. The letters from Lachish and Arad, written shortly before the exile, show the absolute prepon- derance of Yhw-theophoric names, in contrast to the Samaria ostraca of the late 9th century, where Baal-theophoric names occur. 23 Tigay rightly noted that all the individuals mentioned in the late Judahite material along with their fathers could hardly have been born after 622 b.c.e. and therefore concluded: “[T]here seems to have been no appreciable change in the prevalence of Yah- wistic names as a result of Josiah’s reformation.” 24 Thus, the epigraphic ono- masticon confirms that the eradication of the pagan names began well before the religious revolution of Josiah; more generally, we may conclude that the latter act was merely the culmination of a long process that began in the King- dom of Judah at the time of the Assyrian invasions.

A consideration of the theophoric place-names confirms this finding. Not a few were compounded with Baal, such as Baal-tamar (Judg 20:33); Baal- shalishah (2 Kgs 4:42); Baal-hazor (2 Sam 13:23); Baal-hermon (Judg 3:3;

21. The “mountain of God” is probably an original appellative; cf. Z. Weisman, “The

Mountain of God,” *Tarbiz* 47 (1977–78): 107–19 [Heb.].

22. Additional mentions of Horeb in non-Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic passages in the Pentateuch are Exod 17:6; 33:6. 1 Kgs 19:8 belongs to a story composed, in my opinion, in the 7th century b.c.e.; see my book *The Prophetical Stories,* trans. D. Levy (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 183–96. Other references are either Deuteronomistic (1 Kgs 8:9 ~ 2 Chr

5:10) or late (Mal 3:22; Ps 106:19).

23. The data are available in S. Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period,* trans. A. F. Rainey (Jerusalem: Carta, 2008), 258–310. See also M. Ratzaby Golub, “The Distribution of Personal Names in Israel during the First Temple Period” (M.A. Thesis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010). In her findings, the *bʿl* element was extant in the Northern Kingdom from the 10th to the 8th centuries.

24. J. H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew*

*Inscriptions,* HSS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 15–16.

1 Chr 5:23). 25 Significant for the vicissitudes of such names in late monar- chic times was the fate of Baal-perazim. 26 The place-name occurs in 2 Sam

5:20 and 1 Chr 14:11 in the story of David’s victories over the Philistines. The other battle won by David was not in Geba but in Gibeon (2 Sam 5:25

LXXB; 1 Chr 14:16). 27 Isaiah ben Amoz referred to these events saying (Isa

28:21): כי כהר פרצים יקום ה' כעמק בגבעון ירגז “For the Lord will arise as on the hill of Perazim, He will shake [himself ] up as in the vale of Gibeon.” Here again, prosody defends the text: the two battles are mentioned in parallelism: the hill of Perazim parallels the vale of Gibeon. Hence, the change of Baal- perazim into Hill of Perazim was not made by a copyist. Most plausibly, it was the prophet who pronounced these words. And since we must assume that the prophet aimed at being understood and therefore was not inventing place- names, we reach the conclusion that Baal-perazim gave way to Har-perazim before the times of Isaiah! 28 This change in name must have been initiated by administrative steps performed in compliance with royal decrees.

This conclusion, though at first sight it seems hazardous, finds confirmation in an explicit statement concerning the cities of Reuben in Transjordan. We read in Num 32:38 that the Reubenites built, among other cities, “Nebo and Baal-meon (their names being changed), 29 and gave names to the cities they built” ואת נבו ואת בעל מעון מוסבת שם, ויקראו בשמות את שמות הערים אשר בנו . The renaming of these two cities finds its explanation in the idolatrous component of their previous names—*Baal*, of course, and *Nebo*, which resembles the Mesopotamian god Nabû (cf. Isa 46:1). 30 It appears that the ancient name of the city of Nebo later disturbed pious circles when they became acquainted with the Mesopotamian deity with a similar name. This process was the same

25. Cf. J. A. Dearman, “Baal in Israel: The Contribution of Some Place Names and Per- sonal Names to an Understanding of Early Israelite Religion,” in *History and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of J. H. Hayes*, ed. M. P. Graham et al., JSOTSup 173 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 173–91. Consideration of this important study goes beyond the scope of the present essay.

26. Mentioned above, p. 65. As far as I remember, the following important point was made by Prof. Seeligmann in one of his classes.

27. On topographical grounds, this reading should be preferred over the MT’s Geba.

28. Cf. A. Dillmann and R. Kittel, *Der Prophet Jesaja erklärt*, 6th ed., KHAT 5 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1898), 255: “er [scil. Jesaja] folgt ohnedem dem Sprachgebrauch seiner Zeit.”

29. Following the RSV primarily; the NJPS is misleading at this point. Doubts have been expressed concerning the originality of the words מוסבת שם; see O. Eissfeldt, “Renaming in the Old Testament,” in *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to D. Winton Thomas,* ed. P. R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 69–79, esp. p. 70. The first to challenge the text was apparently A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 2nd ed., KHAT 13 (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886), 199. However, there are not sufficient grounds for concluding that the peculiar locution מוסבת שםis “eine Glosse, und zwar eine späte.”

30. Cf. A. R. Millard, “Nabû,” *DDD* 607–10.

as the renaming of Sinai as Horeb by the Deuteronomic circles, as we have seen above. Here, however, with Nebo and Baal-meon, the renaming was pre- sumably not made by literates but by a state authority.

A plausible date for this procedure can now be suggested. The renaming of Israelite sites in Transjordan must have occurred before 733 b.c.e., when Tiglat-pileser III exiled these settlements (cf. also 1 Chr 5:6, 26); 31 on the other hand, the displeasure about the name *Nebo* most likely arose when Assyrian predominance was felt in the west, after the campaign of Adad-Nirari III at the turn of the 9th and 8th centuries b.c.e. 32 About the same time, in the wake of Jehu’s coup in Israel (ca. 842 b.c.e.), Jehoiada’s revolt in Judah (ca. 835 b.c.e.), with the eradication of official Baal worship (2 Kgs 10:28; 11:18), a Yahwistic policy was established in both kingdoms. It was also expressed in the expurgation of place-names that had a heathen flavor. Thus, the probable time for this turn of events was the first half of the 8th-century b.c.e.

The name Baal-meon is also attested in the Samaria ostraca that date to the end of the 9th century b.c.e. or the beginning of the 8th. 33 In ostracon no. 27, the sender is בעלא.בעלמעני ., 34 probably the descendant of a refugee from Baal- meon when it was occupied by Mesha, king of Moab (Mesha Stone, line 9). In any case, the name of the town was later turned into בית מעון(Jer 48:23), 35 an event that probably took place with the Israelite *reconquista* during the reign of Joash or Jeroboam II. As for נבו , its new name is not self-evident. However, one notes that this important place—to which the Mesha Stone ascribed a sanc- tuary (lines 14–18)—although it is mentioned in Numbers 32, it is absent from Joshua 13. Here, at v. 20, one finds instead אשדות הפסגה, right between two settlements in the area of Mt. Nebo— בית פעורand בית הישימות. Therefore, a plausible conjecture would be to regard אשדות הפסגה as the new censored/ expurgated name for .נבו 36

31. This reliable information contained in the late book of Chronicles finds only an indi- rect reference in the Assyrian sources; see H. Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy, 1994), 279.

32. The events are summarized by M. Cogan and H. Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Transla- tion with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 11 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988), 151–

52, with references to the Assyrian sources and a rich bibliography.

33. Cf. B. Maisler [= Mazar], “The Historical Background of the Samaria Ostraca,” *JPOS* 21 (1948): 117–33 = idem, *The Early Biblical Period* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1984), 173–88. A concise discussion with a review of the various proposals has been offered by Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past*, 258–61.

34. Ibid., 285–86.

35. The name בען in Num 32:3 (next to ונבו!) may be an abbreviation ofבית מעון .

36. Cf. my essay “Moses’ Blessing, the Sanctuary at Nebo and the Origin of the Le- vites,” in *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East Presented to S. E. Loewenstamm,* ed. Y. Avishur and J. Blau (Jerusalem: Rubinstein, 1978), 409–24 [Heb., with Eng. abstract]. My suggestion that Nebo should be identified with Khirbet ʿUyun Musa has independently been proposed by F. M. Cross, “Reuben: First-Born of Jacob,” *ZAW* 100 (supplementary volume;

Along with אשדות הפסגה, the list of cities in Joshua 13 includes בית פעור(v. 20). Its presence in an official list suggests that the place was renamed by the administration at the beginning of the 8th century. The polemical texts of Hos 9:10 and Deut 4:3 obviously reverted to the old appellation,בעל פעור. Otherwise, late texts refer to it as בית פעור: Deut 3:29; 4:46; 34:6.

In this context, one can explain the double names extant in the lists of tribal portions in Joshua 15 and 18. The town of Kiriath-jearim (קרית יערים) stands there for Baalah (בעלה) in 15:9–10 37 and again for Kiriath-baal (קרית בעל) in

15:60 and 18:14. The author described the place first by its old, accepted, pa- gan name; then he added “that is, Kiriath-Jearim” (היא קרית יערים), the official name imposed by the royal bureaucracy. 38 In these passages, there is no ques- tion of any textual interventions. The geographical descriptions merely express the appellations that were in vogue at their time.

**Textual Corrections vis-à-vis Administrative Renaming**

Nonetheless, names of some sites were corrected, or corrupted, in the course of textual transmission. This is the case with Baalah in 2 Sam 6:2, as indicated by the following variations in the textual witnesses.

MT: אשר אתו מבעלי יהודה להעלות משם את ארון האלהים

4Q51: 39[ת משם]ליהודה להעלו [יערים אשר ת]אתו בעלה היא קרי [ LXXB: ὁ μετ’αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων Ἰούδα ἐν ἀναβάσει, τοῦ ἀναγαγεῖν

ἐκεῖθεν τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ 40

LXXLuc: ὁ μετ’αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων Ἰούδα ἐν τῇ ἀναβάσει τοῦ βουνοῦ, τοῦ ἀναγαγεῖν ἐκεῖθεν τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ 41

1 Chr 13:6ויעל דויד וכל ישראל בעלתה אל קרית יערים אשר ליהודה להעלות משם: את ארון האלהים

2 Sam 6:2 MT presents two problems. One is the unique expression מבעלי יהודה. Usually in the historical books, we findבעלי followed by a city name, and the meaning is “citizens of ”:בעלי ירחו (Josh 24:11), בעלי שכם (Judg 9:2 et

1988): 46 –65, esp. pp. 51–52. Kaswalder still adheres to Musil’s location of Nebo in Khirbet el-Mukhayyet; cf. P. A. Kaswalder OFM, *Onomastica Biblica*: *Fonti scritte e ricerca archeo- logica* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 2002), 105.

37. An additional Baalah, not renamed, appeared in the list of Judean sites in the Negev: Josh 15:29.

38. In my view, the cumulative evidence suggests this to be the right course, in spite of the well-argued strictures of Z. Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel* (London: Continuum,

2001), 596 –97.

39. F. M. Cross et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel*, DJD 17 (Oxford: Claren- don, 2005), 123, pl. 16, frag. 68.

40. *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 2/1: *I and II Samuel,* ed. A. E. Brooke et al. (Cam- bridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927).

41. N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega,*

vol. 1: *1–2 Samuel* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 1989), 105.

passim) בעלי הגבעה(Judg 20:5), בעלי קעילה(1 Sam 23:11, 12), בעלי יבש גלעד(2 Sam 21:12). We never have בעליfollowed by an ethnic name. 42 The second problem is even harder: the text runs להעלות משם , but no place is mentioned to which משם might refer. Both problems are solved by 4Q51, closely followed by 1 Chr 13:5 MT:בעלה or בעלתהinstead ofבעלי יהודה is the primary reading: “David went to Baalah to fetch the ark of God from there.” 43 The reading of 2 Sam 6:2 LXXB, ἐν ἀναβάσει = \*בעליה \* (cf. Late Biblical Hebrew in 2 Chr 9:4 and the Greek equivalent in Neh 3:31–32) supports these texts. 44 MT’sבעלי יהודה is a corrupted text. And in view of the constant onslaught on the Baal perpetrated in the MT of Samuel, there is little doubt that בעלי יהודהis not due to error, but rather yet another theological correction. 45

Another textual divergence that belongs to the same category refers to the location of Joshua’s inheritance and burial.

Josh 19:50 MT: סרח תמנת Josh 24:29 MT: סרח תמנת Judg 2:9 MT: חרס תמנת

Josh 19:50 LXXB: \*חרס תמנת\* Θαμαρχαρης

Josh 21:42b LXXB: \*סרח תמנת\* Θαμνασαραχ

Josh 24:31 LXXB :\* סחר תמנת \* Θαμναθασαχαρα

Judg 2:9 LXXB: \*חרס תמנת\* Θαμναθαρεας

Judg 2:9 LXXA: \*חרס תמנת\* Θαμναθαρεως

The original name probably meant “Effigy of the Sun,” preserving the memory of the cult site dedicated to the sun god. Late scribes inverted consonants in order to read the name as “effigy of the overflowing” (cf. Exod 26:12, 13) or even “effigy of the sprawling.” In this way, they did away with the disturbing remnant of Canaanite (or old Israelite?) sun worship. 46

42. *Pace* Y. Levin, “Baal-Shalishah, Baal Perazim, Baal-Hazor and Baal-Tamar: On

‘Baal’ Toponyms in the Central Hill Country,” *Judea and Samaria Research Studies* 16 (2007): 17–34 [Heb., with Eng. abstract], esp. p. 29.

43. The fact that Baala hosted the ark of the Lord for many years is an additional argu- ment in favor of positing an old syncretism between the Lord and Baal (private communica- tion with Yair Segev).

44. However, LXXB preceded this reading with \* מבעלי יהודה\*; this is a well-known phenomenon of conflation.

45. *Aliter*, S. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*, OBO 57 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 101–4. But his well-argued defense of the MT does not take into account the onslaught on Baal in the MT of the book of Samuel.

46. The proposal for connecting סרח תמנת to the name of Asher’s daughter (Gen 46:17; Num 26:46; 1 Chr 7:30) is unacceptable in view of the readings in Josh 19:50 LXX and Judg

2:9. For this conjecture, see Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*, trans. and ed. A. F. Rainey, 2nd ed. (London: Westminster, 1979) 244.

For an alternative explanation for names referring to the sun god, see Y. Zakovitch, “ ‘Was

It Not at His Hand the Sun Stopped?’ (Ben Sira 46:6): A Chapter in Literary Archaeology,”

In my view, the divergence between the MT and LXX at the opening of Solomon’s short poem in 1 Kgs 8:12–13 belongs to the same context. 47 The MT runs:

אז אמר שלמה: ה' אמר לשכן בערפל

בנה בניתי בית זבל לך מכון לשבתך עולמים

The LXXB reads the poem after 1 Kgs 8:53:

Τότε ἐλάλησεν Σαλωμων ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου, ὡς συνετέλεσεν τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν

Ἥλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ κύριος, εἶπεν τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐν γνόφῳ

Οἰκοδόμησον οἴκόν μου, οἴκον εὐπρεπῆ σαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος

οὐκ ἰδοὺ αὕτη γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ᾠδῆς

אז אמר שלמה על הבית כאשר כלה לבנותו:

שמש ידע בשמים ה', אמר לשכון בערפל

בנה ביתי בית זבל לך לשבת לחדשים

(?)הלא היא כתובה על ספר השיר

1 Kgdms 8:12[53a] (NETS):

Then Salomon spoke concerning the house, when he had finished build- ing it,

A sun the Lord made manifest in the sky;

he said that he should dwell in deep darkness: (8:13) Build my house,

a remarkable house for yourself, to dwell in anew.

And behold, is this one not written in a book of the song?

The Vorlage of the Greek was corrupt or misunderstood, as is evident from line 3 of the poem. However, if we center on the first stich, it submits an interesting text from which we may reconstruct the Hebrew as follows:

ים ה' והוא אמר לשכון בערפל בשמ48 שמש ידע

A sun the Lord assigned to the sky, but He resolved to dwell in a cloud.

*Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*, ed. M. Cogan et al. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 107\*–114\*, esp. p. 112\* [Heb.].

47. Cf. C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (repr., New York: Ktav, 1970), 109–12.

48. ἐγνώρισεν: the verb γνωρίζω “to inform” mainly translates the *hiphil* of ידע . I suggest that here it translated ידע *piel,* which meant “to assign a place”; compare with Job 38:12:ידעתה שחר מקומו; I would read the same in Ps 104:19: מבואו ידע שמש.

The verse, as reconstructed with the help of the LXX, conveys a beautiful con- trast: the Lord established the sun in the sky, but for Himself chose to reside in a tenebrous cloud. This being the purport of the verse, what follows should be read according to the MT: the subject is not a house for Solomon but for the Lord.

What is the reason for the omission of the first half-stich in the MT? Natu- rally, one cannot rule out a textual mishap. However, in view of the efforts to obliterate the mention of the sun in Josh 24:30, I opt here for a deliberate omis- sion. 49 For an ancient Judean literate, the mention of the appointment of the sun in the heavens smacked of myth. Let us recall a similar case: the excerpts of creation poems embedded in Psalms 74 (vv. 12–17) and 89 (vv. 6 –14) are manifestly mythical in character. They are extant in quotations, not as independent psalms. The accounts of creation were not cleansed of their mythical elements until late, exilic times. Deutero-Isaiah is a witness to the completion of this process.

An opposite case is the persistence of the Judean place-name Beth-shemesh, the city of the sun, mentioned some 16 times in the MT and also attested by the LXX. Similar cases are Beth-horon, which preserves the name of a Canaanite deity, Beth-anat and Anathoth (Jeremiah’s birth place), named after the val- iant Canaanite goddess. To the north of Anathoth lay the town of Azmaveth where, probably, the Canaanite god Death had been revered. All these names run against the trend we have detected above. In my view, some names, such as Beth-shemesh, were too well rooted in the popular diction to be changed by of- ficial imposition. In other cases, deities such as Horon and Anath were not felt as a menace to Israelite orthodoxy. It is no coincidence that these two deities, which were so prominent in the ancient Near East, are absent from the Hebrew Bible. (However, Anath appears in compound divine names at Elephantine.)

**Corresponding Biblical Law**

The endeavor to expunge polytheistic names can be found in the legal realm as well. In Exod 23:13, we read:ושם אלהים אחרים לא תזכירו לא ישמע על פיך. The first injunction forbids taking an oath by the names of “other gods.” 50 This becomes clear by the following passages:

49. Cf. A. van der Born, “Zum Tempelweihespruch (1 Kgs VIII 12f ),” OtSt 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 235–44. He ends by saying: “[D]er Grund des Ausfallens ein theologischer Skrupel war.” See also E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige: Das erste Buch der Kö- nige, Kapitel 1–16 übersetzt und erklärt*, 2nd ed., ATD 11/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 85–89.

50. This interpretation was already given by the rabbis: e.g., *Mekilta d’Rabbi Ishmael,* ed. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1970), 332:שלא תשביעו לגוי ביראתו; *b. Sanh.* 63b: הנודר בשמוֹ והמקיים בשמו הרי זה בלא תעשה. הנודר בשמו ןהמקיים בשמן מנלן? דדתניא ושם אלהים אחרים לא תזכירו. Note also Jerome in the Vulgate: *et per nomen externorum deorum non iurabitis* *neque audietur ex ore vestro*.

2 Sam 14:11

′ה יזכר נא המלך את ה' אלהיך...ויאמר חי

Let the king swear by (the name of ) the Lord your God. And he said: As the Lord lives . . .

Isa 48:1

ה' ובאלהי ישראל יזכירו בשם הנשבעים

Those who swear by the name of the Lord

And take an oath by the God of Israel . . .

One more instance of this idiom appears in Amos 6:10:

51הס, כי לא להזכיר בשם ה' Silence! Not toswear by the name of the Lord!

Another relevant passage is Josh 23:7b: ובשם אלהיהם לא תזכירו ולא תשביעו ולא תעבדום. The phrasולא תשביעו is not represented in the LXXB. It should be considered as a gloss to the preceding לא תזכירו (which was not understood by the Greek translator). 52 The command in this verse was: “and by the name of their gods you shall not swear (תזכירו); 53 you shall not serve them or bow down to them.”

This interpretation of לא תזכירוhelps us to understand the sequence of the whole pericope in Exod 23:12–19. It is a short calendar containing Shabbat (v. 12) and the festivals (v. 14), Unleavened Bread (v. 15), Harvest (v. 16a), Ingathering (v. 16b), the three pilgrimages (v. 17), followed by related precepts (vv. 18–19). This sequence is interrupted by v. 13:

ובכל אשר אמרתי אלכם תשמרו ושם אלהים אחרים לא תזכירו

The inception,“Observe all that I said to you” (Exod 23:13) refers to the

precepts already given directly to the people—specifically, the Ten Com- mandments. Thus, it relates the preceding injunction concerning Shabbat (v. 12), to the fourth commandment (Exod 20:8–11). The following precept, not swearing by the name of “other gods,” is related in chiastic order (as usual in biblical quotations and paraphrases) 54 to the third commandment, “You shall

51. Cf. M. Greenberg, “The Hebrew Oath Particle *Ḥay/Ḥê*,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 34–39, esp. p. 35; W. Baumgartner, “חי I,” *HALAT,* 3rd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 1.295.

52. In my opinion, this explanation is preferable to Holmes’s proposal: “ולא תשביעו, not in LXX, may have been omitted by accident”; see: S. Holmes, *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 77.

53. This is also one of the meanings of *zakāru* in Akkadian: “*zakāru* A,” *CAD* Z 16 –22.

54. Cf. S. E. Loewenstamm, “Observations on Chiastic Structures in the Bible,” *From*

*Babylon to Canaan: Studies in the Bible and Its Oriental Background* (Jerusalem: Magnes,

1992), 1–5; Moshe Seidl, “Parallels in Isaiah and Psalms,” *Bible Studies* (Jerusalem: HaRav

Kook, 1978), זצ–א; R. Weiss, “Chiasm in the Bible,” *Studies in the Text and Language of*

not swear falsely by the name of the Lord our God.” Exod 23:13bα adds a related prohibition: do not swear by the names of other gods.

The next half-stich, לא ישמע על פיך “it shall not be heard on your (2nd- person sing.) lips,” does not syntactically agree with the preceding. The Sa- maritan Pentateuch tried to unify the verse:ושם אלהים אחרים לא תזכיר ולא ישמעו על פיך. The LXX reflects an alternative tentative harmonization: οὐδὲ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν = \* ולא ישמע מפיכם\*, and the same adaptation appears in the Vulgate: *neque audietur ex ore vestro*.

These attempts to make the verse coherent only show how well ancient readers sensed the discrepancy inherent in it. Actually, what we have here is an ancient injunction not to swear by the names of other gods, and its expansion, not even to mention their names. 55 This secondary interdiction wholly accords with the distinct efforts to eradicate polytheistic names in the various realms of Israelite life.

What is the origin of this short gloss? It cannot be very late, because it is represented by all the textual witnesses. On the other hand, the syntax על פיך is awkward. 56 Here one would expect to find ולא ישמע מפיך. Usually, על פי פלוני means “following the instructions of someone.” Only rarely does one find this construction with the meaning of “uttering words”: see, for example, Ps 50:16, ותשא בריתי עלי פיך, and Qoh 5:1,אל תבהל על פיך. Should we con- sider this expression late Hebrew? A date in early postexilic times would be plausible. 57

**Conclusion: Early Date of Name Corrections**

All in all, in our attempt to date these efforts toward eliminating the names of other gods, we have reached the following tentative conclusions. The onset appears to have been at the beginning of the 8th century, in the wake of the extirpation of Baal worship, nearly coinciding with the first onslaught of the Assyrians to the west and well before the activity of Isaiah ben Amoz. At this

*the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1981), 259–73, esp. p. 260 and 273 [Heb.]; S. Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook,” *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Col- lected Studies* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2010), 19–84, esp. pp. 53–60; B. D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 35, 219; B. M. Levinson, *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 72–80, with additional references.

55. A. B. Ehrlich commented on the latter part of the verse: אין עיקרו בכתוב והוא תוספת ביאור, דברי מי שלא עמד על משמעו של 'לא תזכירו' *Mikrâ ki-Pheschutô*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1899-1901), 1.184.

56. Therefore, the medieval exegetes interpreted thus in the wake of the discussion in b*.* Sanh. 63b; Rashi:א ישמע מן הגוי על פיך ל; and Ibn Ezra: לא ישמע על פיך – שתשביעו אחרים, לא תזכירו – שתשבעו בהם.

57. On the other hand, the late passages in the prophetic books, where זכר is connected with idols, do not seem to refer to taking an oath. These are Hos 2:19: והסירותי את שמות הבעלים מפיה ולא יזכרו עוד בשמםand Zech 13:2:אכרית את שמות העצבים מן הארץ ולא יזכרו עוד..

stage, site names were changed by the royal administrations in both kingdoms, Israel and Judah. A change of personal names followed suit as attested by the epigraphic nomenclature in Judah in the 7th–6th centuries. These proceedings affected the literary realm, and thus we find that the D document avoided al- leged pagan names, such as Sinai, substituting it with Horeb. Thereafter, copy- ists of ancient books resolved to “correct” the pagan names. A case in point was the Scroll of Samuel: *baʿal* became *bošet*, and so forth. This initiative was taken in the milieu of Jeremiah, probably by his disciples, and therefore should be assigned to the early exilic times, in the first half of the 6th century b.c.e. A final stage is represented by the gloss on the law in the Book of Covenant (Exodus 21–23): an old law prohibiting the taking of an oath in the name of “other gods” was expanded to forbid even mentioning them by name. The incoherent use of pronouns and the clumsy wording of this expansion indicate a relatively late date of composition.

**Later Corrections**

Naturally, with this legacy of detesting pagan divine names, dysphemism was not abandoned, even when, in the times of the Second Commonwealth, idolatry was not considered so dangerous. Thus one finds that names of “other gods” were defaced either in writing or in read- ing. In Jer 46:15, the MT reads מדוע נסחף אבירך , “Why is your stalwart swept away? ” The LXX, however, has the preferred reading (26:15): διὰ τί ἔφυγεν ὁ Ἆπις, ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός σου; “Why has Apis, your choice calf, fled? ” The translators apparently read: מדוע נס חף אבירך. But the MT effaced the name of the Egyptian bull deity. The same lot befell Milkom, the Ammonite principal god. In Jer 49:1 and 3, the LXX (30:17, 19) reads Μελχομ, certainly preferable in v. 3, which goes on to mention “his priests.” The MT, however, has מלכם, “their king.” A similar fate happened to the Queen of Heaven. She is mentioned in Jer 7:18; 44:17, 18, 19, 25, but the MT vocalized the text מְלכת השמים, as though it derived מְלכת from מלאכה. In Jeremiah 44, the LXX properly rendered (51:17, 18, 19, 25) βασιλίσση “queen.” It appears that the MT attempted to disguise the presence of this deity (probably an amalgamation of Ashera and Ishtar) 58 among the Jews of Egypt, even while describing them as sinners. The cult of מלכת שמין among the Aramaic-speaking population of Upper Egypt has been confirmed by one of the letters found at Hermopolis. 59

A significant textual correction obtains in Jer 50:2. The MT has: הביש בל חת מרדך הבישו עצביה חתו גלוליה “Bel is shamed, Merodach is dismayed. Her idols are shamed, her fetishes dismayed” (NJPS); the LXX (27:2) does not represent the last stich (beginning with “Her idols”). Evidently, the latter was

58. A full discussion has been provided by C. Houtman, “Queen of Heaven,” *DDD*,

2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 678–80.

59. E. Bresciani and M. Kamil, *Le lettere aramaiche di Hermopoli* (Rome: Accademia dei Lincei, 1966), 398–403 (letter 4).

a secondary element aiming at either substituting the former stich or glossing it. The Babylonian gods are merely fetishes. R. Goldstein, who dealt with these passages in Jeremiah, highlighted a phenomenon in Isaiah 2 that corresponds to the one we have dealt with here, the various attempts to deny the existence of deities alongside the Lord. 60 We noticed a portion of this endeavor above, where the gods of the Philistines (אלהיהם: 1 Chr 14:12) were termed “idols” (עצביהם: 2 Sam 5:21). Seeligmann, who inspired this direction of research, pointed out the same “correction” in an additional place: השקוצים “detested things” in 2 Kgs 23:24 was substituted for an original קדשים, as proved by the parallel verse in 2 Chr 35:19a LXX, which reads καρασιμ. 61 In my dissertation, I dealt with sundry manifestations of this process. 62

The decision whether to assign the disparagement cast upon foreign deities to the textual or to the literary level largely depends on the date assigned to the particular pericope. Thus, in the story of Elijah and Ahaziah (2 Kgs 1:2–17), the prophet condemns the inquiry made to the oracle-god Baal Zebub of Ekron. The latter name is mentioned in this story four times (vv. 2, 3, 6, 16). It has been suggested, rightly in my opinion, that the real name of this god was Baal Zebul, Baal the prince, since *zbl* is the title of Baal in the Ugaritic texts, and the name Baal Zebul is still extant in the New Testament. 63 Hence, *Zebub* “a fly,” would be a demeaning epithet, used in monotheistic polemics against the pa- gan god. In this case, however, if the arguments I adduced for a late, postexilic date for the story’s composition are sound, 64 then the debasing title “Baal, the fly” did not originate with a copyist but was coined by the author himself. 65

The resurgence of a polytheistic threat with the measures taken by Anti- ochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem and its temple caused a new Jewish wave of disdain for pagan deities. As indicated long ago by Nestle, the establishment of the worship of Zeus Olympus in the sanctuary of Jerusalem was defined as an installation of “an appalling abomination,” שקןץ משומם, a dysphemism for בעל שמים(Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11). 66 There is no question whether this epithet was introduced by a copyist; clearly, it was the original definition coined by the apocalyptic writers.

60. R. Goldstein, “From Gods to Idols: Changes in Attitude toward Other Gods in Bib- lical Literature and the Revision of Isaiah 2:18–21,” *Beer-Sheva* 18 (*On the Border Line: Textual Meets Literary Criticism*; 2005) 113–53 [Heb. with Eng. abstract].

61. Cf. Seeligmann, “Studies,” 9–10.

62. A. Rofé, *Angels in the Bible: Israelite Belief in Angels as Evidenced by Biblical*

*Traditions,* 2nd ed. (Jerusalem: Carmel, 2012) [Heb. with Eng. summary], esp. pp. 39–80.

63. See the discussion by Cogan and Tadmor, *II Kings*, 25.

64. See my “Baal, the Prophet and the Angel (II Kings 1): A Study in the History of Literature and Religion,” *Beer-Sheva* 1 (1973): 222–30 [Heb.], summarized in idem, *The Prophetical Stories*, 33–40.

65. In this case, the reading of Symmachus at 2 Kgs 1:2, Βεελ ζεβουλ, would be due to the late identification of this deity, as found in the New Testament.

66. E. Nestle, “Der Greuel der Verwüstung: Dan 9,27.11,31.12,11,” *ZAW* 4 (1884): 248.

One cannot exclude the possibility that this new wave of antipaganism brought about a renewed trend to rename places that had a Baal component. This explains why evidence appears in late sources, although they might testify to actions that took place hundreds of years earlier. Thus, we find Baal-tamar of Judg 20:33 (LXX: Βααλθαμαρ) located by Eusebius in his *Onomasticon* at a place called Bēth Thamar (Βηθθαμαρ), 67 which may be the בית תמרthat is mentioned in the Copper Scroll. 68 Another instance is Baal-hazor in 2 Sam13:23 (LXX: Βαιλασωρ). The MT readsבעל חצור אשר עם אפרים but LXXLuc transcribes the last term γoφραιμ, 69 thus readingפרים ע. 70 From this comes the identification of Baal-hazor with the mountain called Jabal al-ʿAṣur by the Arabs and the proposal, advanced by Abel, that the Αζωτου ὄρος in 1 Macc 9:15 should be corrected to Αζωρου ὄρος, thus being identified as הר חצורMount Hazor. 71 This could have been a nice analogy to the mutation of Baal-perazim into Har Perazim, but at this point it is advisable to avoid getting carried away with overly elaborate conjectures. Indeed, Abel later retracted his proposal and accepted an old conjecture by Michaelis—namely, that the Hebrew Vorlage at this point read עד אשדות ההר “the slopes of the hill-country.”72 Nowadays we know that the expurgated name of Baal-hazor was different, Ramat-hazor, as extant in the Genesis Apocryphon. 73
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