Notes

2 Albright originally thought Tell es-Safi to be biblical Libnah, before changing his mind in favor of Tel Burna. Cf. W.F. Albright, “Contributions to the Historical Geography of Palestine,” The Annual of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem Vol. 2 (1921), pp. 1–17. Tell es-Safi is now recognized as the biblical Philistine city of “Gath.”
4 Cf. below for the argumentation in full against the equation of Horvat Lavnin for biblical Libnah.
5 Cf. below for the argumentation in full against the equation of Tel Goded for biblical Libnah.
7 Ibid., p. 189.
9 Ibid., p. 232.
11 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
16 This is to say, Sennacherib attacks Libnah in his 46 city Judean campaign. Later, Hamutal from Libnah marries into the Judean royal family.

18 The excavations by Blakely (et al.) at Khirbet Summeily now places a question mark on Yehuda Dagan’s identification for biblical Zenan (Dagan, “Cities,” p. 140; and C. McKinny, *Geography*, pp.188–90). Although, perhaps Eshtaol could fit Dagan’s argument for the first listed city to represent, ideally, the most northern town. This is the case, apparently in Josh 15:33–36’s city list.

19 Cf. also 1 Chr 6:42 (English 6:57).


21 Personal communication with Itzick Shai.

22 The title “Queen” is not specifically given to Hamutal in the biblical texts.

23 The author has not found any other identification in the published literature.


26 Ibid., pp. 234 and 238.

27 Ibid.


30 Ibid.


34 Per personal communication with Itzick Shai.


36 Ibid., pp. 49–50.

37 Ibid., p. 50. The Area A2 square supervisor now questions the identification of the building structure as a typical Israelite “four-room” house. I (the author) would favor Prof. Itzick Shai’s view as a four room house structure. Area A2, in the 2018 season,
yielded a clear ninth century layer and, probably, also (at least) two eighth century phases (updated 08/27/2018; cf. www.telburna.wordpress.com).


42 Late in the 2018 season, Area B2 has provided ample evidence of an Iron IIA destruction layer (perhaps even as early as the Iron 1), which Itzick Shai relates approximately with the famous Khirbet Qeiyafa destruction layer that Yosef Garfinkel has dated to the first third of the 10th century BC. The destruction layer dating is a tentative conclusion from the Tel Burna team that must await $^{14}$C testing for a more precise dating (updated 08/27/2018; cf. www.telburna.wordpress.com).


44 Even if one assumes that later agricultural work (e.g. agriculture performed by Zeitah’s Ottoman period inhabitants) removed much of the ancient city, as Tappy contends (idem, “Tabula Peutingeriana,” pp. 38–40), it is doubtful that the archaeological site would still represent a substantial contender for biblical Libnah. Simply put, Tel Zayit is still too small even if portions of it were removed by agricultural activity.


47 Ibid., p. 381.

48 Ibid., pp. 381–382.

49 Ibid., p. 384.


70 Ibid.


72 Ibid., 142-143; and, more recently, E. Klein and I. Shai, “Burial Caves from the Late Bronze and Iron Ages at Horvat Lavnin in the Judean Shephelah,” Tel Aviv 43 (2016), 225–242, specifically p. 227.


75 Ibid., pp. 142–143.


77 E.g. cf. M.J. Suriano, I. Shai, and J. Uziel, “In Search of Libnah,” Journal of Near Eastern Society (2018), forthcoming. However, Suriano, Shai, and Uziel do not necessarily adhere to the claim that the background for the name of the city of “Libnah” derives from the prevalent white chalk of the region. But, this theory for the origin of the name of “Libnah” is the best one offered in current scholarship.

78 Possibly the name “Libnah” derives from some unknown type of “white” tree or vegetation, such as *populus alba* or possibly *styrax officinalis* and its white material inside the stems (cf. Gen 30:37 and Hosea 4:13). For example, one could note the parallel example of biblical “Rithmah,” whose name is presumably derived from the Semitic/Hebrew name of the Juniper or broom tree (Numbers 33:18–19). Alternatively, perhaps a priestly clan bestowed their family name on the city by rite of their early inhabitation (i.e. the Levitical descendants called “Libnites” mentioned in Exod 6:17; Num 3:18, 21; 26:58; 1 Chr 6:2, 5, 14)? There are many possibilities besides the mundane idea that the ground is white and locals wished to name the city after the white stones and dirt.


McKinny essentially reverses the argumentation of Yehuda Dagan, who posits that Tel Burna represents Ashan, in contrast to McKinny’s choice of Tel Goded. However, aside from the reservations listed above for equating Tel Goded with Libnah, it is not clear that Tel Burna would be a better agricultural or industrial center for the production of wine than the candidate of ancient Tel Goded’s town, although Dagan assumes this postulation without explicit reasoning (Ibid). For his argument, Dagan cites David Ussishkin’s discovery of a decanter sherd with “wine from Ashan” written upon it (Ibid; and D. Ussishkin, “Excavations at Tel Lachish—1973–1977: Preliminary Report,” Tel Aviv Vol. 5:1–2 [1978], pp. 83–84). However, from Tel Lachish in the modern landscape, both Tel Burna and Tel Goded are at similar distance or proximity to Lachish and are clearly visible with the naked eye. Thus, it is difficult to claim one of them is a better choice for Ashan from the standpoint of simply trade of wine. Moreover, the mention of “Ashan” may not be a toponym, as discussed by Ussishkin (ibid., 83–84).


The analogy was suggested to the author in personal conversation with Nadav Na’amani.

