Abstract: Jeffrey R. Chadwick has previously called attention to the name ŚRYH (Seraiah/Sariah) as a Hebrew woman’s name in the Jewish community at Elephantine. Paul Y. Hoskisson, however, felt this evidence was not definitive because part of the text was missing and had to be restored. Now a more recently published ostracon from Elephantine, which contains a sure attestation of the name ŚRYH as a woman’s name without the need of restoration, satisfies Hoskisson’s call for more definitive evidence and makes it more likely that the name is correctly restored on the papyrus first noticed by Chadwick. The appearance of the name Seraiah/Sariah as a woman’s name exclusively in the Book of Mormon and at Elephantine is made even more interesting since both communities have their roots in northern Israel, ca. the eighth–seventh centuries BCE.

In 1993, Jeffrey R. Chadwick noted the appearance of the Hebrew name ŚRYH (שריה), typically rendered Seraiah in English, as a woman’s name on an Aramaic papyrus from Elephantine and dated to the fifth century BCE. As also pointed out by Chadwick, Nahman Avigad has argued that the Hebrew name ŚRYH(W) should be rendered as Saryah(u), rather than the usual Serayah(u) — which would make the English spelling Sariah instead of Seraiah. Thus, according to Chadwick, the attestation of ŚRYH as a Hebrew female name at Elephantine provides strong supporting evidence for the appearance of a Hebrew woman named Sariah in the Book of Mormon (1 Nephi, headnote; 2:5; 5:1, 6; 8:14).

Paul Y. Hoskisson, however, urged caution about this evidence since the papyrus in question (Cowley-22) has a lacuna requiring restoration of both the final hē (ה) in ŚRYH and the bet-resh (בר) of the Aramaic word brt (בת), “daughter,” which is the key indication that the individual in question is a woman. Thus, Hoskisson cautioned, “restorations cannot provide absolute proof but rather at best a suggestion.” He considered it a good sign that “other scholars accept the possible existence of this feminine name in relative temporal proximity to the beginnings of the Book of Mormon,” but Hoskisson ultimately felt “a clear-cut example of the name for a female would be more helpful.”

Chadwick argued, however, that “the comparative context of the papyrus leaves little doubt that the reconstruction is accurate,” and it is really “the extant final t” of brt that “assures us that the person was a daughter, not a son.” In the most recently published translation and transcription of this papyrus, Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni would seem to agree. In their hand-drawing of the Cowley-22 papyrus (see Figure 1), they represented the restoration of the final hē (ה) in ŚRYH and the bet-resh (בר) of brt as being “nearly certain.”
Nonetheless, new evidence that completely satisfies Hoskisson’s call for a more “clear-cut” example has been found. Porten and Yardeni [Page 4] document ŠRYH as a Hebrew feminine name not once, but twice among the Aramaic documents at Elephantine.²⁰ A list of names on an ostracon found there, dated to the second half of the fifth century BCE, includes šryḥ brt […] ([…]שריה בת). The name of Seraiah’s (or Sariah’s) parent is broken off, but both “Seraiah” (šryḥ) and “daughter” (brt) are attested in full,²¹ thus providing an undeniable example of ŠRYH as a female name (see Figure 2).

This would seem to meet Hoskisson’s demands for more “clear cut” evidence. Furthermore, this clear attestation of ŠRYH as a female name at Elephantine provides reassuring evidence that Cowley-22, which comes from the same period, is indeed restored correctly as “Seraiah, daughter of Hosea.”

In light of Lehi’s ancestors coming from northern Israel (1 Nephi 5:14, 16), ca. 720 BCE,²² it is also interesting to note that, according to Karel van der Toorn, the Jewish community at Elephantine ultimately has its roots in northern Israel, ca. 700 BCE.²³ After surveying the evidence from deity names in the Aramaic texts, van der Toorn concludes, “the entire picture of the religious life at Elephantine and Syene strongly suggest that the historical core of the communities came from Northern Israel.” He [Page 5] further notes “the emigrants from Northern Israel would have entered Egypt by way of Judah” and suspects “some of them stayed in Judah for a significant length of time” before migrating to Egypt sometime in the seventh century BCE.²⁴ Therefore, the founders of the Elephantine community were likely contemporaries of Lehi or his parents and were similarly Israelites of northern stock who initially settled in Judah.

These details add to the significance of these two references to women named ŠRYH (Seraiah/Sariah) at Elephantine. In both the Hebrew Bible and the epigraphic evidence from Judah, ŠRYH(W) is only attested as a male’s name.²⁵ While this could simply be due to the limitations of [Page 6] our available data set,²⁶ it is also possible the attestation of ŠRYH as a woman’s name both
in the Book of Mormon and at Elephantine and only in these sources, reflects a specifically northern Israelite practice.

Figure 2. Top, left: Illustration of Elephantine Storeroom 2293, by Jasmin G. Rappleye, based on the drawing by Ada Yardeni in *Textbook of Aramaic Documents* 4:211. Top, right: Same image, with Šryh brt, “Seraiah (Sariah) daughter of,” highlighted. Bottom: Detail of Šryh brt from the ostracon.

In any case, with the certain reference to a woman named ŠRYH on an ostracon from Elephantine, there can no longer be any doubt that Seraiah/Sariah was a Hebrew woman’s name in the mid-first millennium BCE.


**Temple Funds Contributors List**

**Text:** Cowley-22 (C3.15), col. 1, lines 1-4  
**Date:** ca. 419/400 BC  

**Transcription**
Translation

1. On the 3rd of Phamenoth, year 5. This is (= these are) the names of the Jewish garrison who gave silver to YHW the God each person silver, [2] sh(ekels):

Storeroom Names List

**Text:** Elephantine Storeroom 2293 (D9.14), concave lines 1–5

**Date:** ca. 450–400 BC

Translation

1. H[…]
2. Isla[h ...]
3. Abioresh[...] 
4. Jehotal daugh[ter of...]
5. Seraiah daughter of[ ...]

Editor’s Note: Book of Mormon Central ([https://bookofmormoncentral.org/](https://bookofmormoncentral.org/)) has just published a blog post and video that are directly related to this article. See them at VIDEO: New Archaeological Evidence for Sariah as a Hebrew Woman’s Name.


2. See Nahman Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae From the Time of Jeremiah: Remnants of a Burnt Archive* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1986), 46–47. It is noteworthy that although Avigad continues to follow the traditional spelling of the name as Serayah(u) when transliterating the name, in his definitive work on Hebrew seals, Avigad indexed the name under śr(r), meaning “ruler.” If this is the correct etymology of the name, then Saryah(u) is indeed the more correct spelling. See Nahman Avigad, rev. by Benjamin Sass, *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, The Israel Exploration Society and the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997), 538.
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7. Chadwick, “Notes and Communications,” 196. This is because “son” in Aramaic would simply be br (בר), without the t (ת).

8. Based on this illustration, which is from Porten and Yardeni (see Fig. 1 caption), it looks like even most of the tav ([ת]) in brt is missing, which may suggest to some that this restoration is less certain than Chadwick implies. However, the context makes it virtually certain that the text had either br ([בר]), “son” or brt ([ברת]), “daughter,” and the long partial stroke that is present makes just br impossible.
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