

JANUARY 1982

VOL.3 NO.1

ISSN 0149-5712

MAARAV

A
JOURNAL
FOR THE
STUDY OF THE
NORTHWEST SEMITIC
LANGUAGES
AND
LITERATURES

EDITORS

Gary A. Tuttle

Bruce Zuckerman

EDITORIAL BOARD

Stephen A. Kaufman

Peter S. Knobel

Charles R. Krahmalkov

Simon B. Parker

Michael Sokoloff

David A. Wortman

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITORS:

Debra A. Chase

Gordon Hamilton

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT:

Elizabeth M. Ely

MAARAV, *A Journal for the Study of the Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures*, is devoted to the rigorous, prudent treatment of the corpus of Northwest Semitic texts. The journal intends to have a strong linguistic, philological and literary emphasis, though articles on history, archeology, religion and culture will be seriously considered, particularly if they have a strong textual interest.

MAARAV is published twice yearly, in October and April. The volume year corresponds with the academic year. Articles appearing in *MAARAV* are indexed in *Old Testament Abstracts*, *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* and *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Annual subscriptions to *MAARAV* are \$10.00 per year (\$12.00 per year outside the U.S.A., payable in U.S. dollars). Standing orders from libraries are accepted. Multiple-year orders for up to three years are also accepted, from individuals as well as libraries. Individuals should prepay their initial subscription.

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be sent to: Subscriptions, *MAARAV*, Suite 510, 2444 Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica, CA 90403, U.S.A.

ARTICLES, STYLESHEETS AND BOOKS FOR REVIEW

MAARAV's stylesheet appears in volume 1/1 (October, 1978). All articles must conform to the stylesheet before they will be considered for publication. A copy of the stylesheet may be obtained by writing to the Editors.

Articles, books for review and all editorial correspondence should be sent to: Editors, *MAARAV*, Suite 510, 2444 Wilshire Boulevard, Santa Monica, CA 90403, U.S.A.

MAARAV

A JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

VOLUME III

1982

WESTERN ACADEMIC PRESS
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA

©Western Academic Press, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

■ WAYNE T. PITARD Amarna <i>ekēmu</i> and Hebrew <i>nāqam</i>	5
■ MOSHE WEINFELD The Counsel of the “Elders” to Rehoboam and its Implications.....	27
■ GAD B. SARFATTI Hebrew Inscriptions of the First Temple Period— A Survey and Some Linguistic Comments	55
■ JAMES C. VANDERKAM Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik’s <i>The Books of Enoch</i> : <i>Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4</i>	85
■ DANIEL BOYARIN Review of Y. Sabar, <i>Pəšaṭ Wayəyi Bəšallah</i> , <i>A Neo-Aramaic Midrash on Bəšallah (Exodus)</i>	99
■ ROBERT I. VASHOLZ An Additional Note on the 4QEnoch Fragments and 11QtgJob	115
Books Received	119

COMPOSITION BY FOUR QUARTERS PUBLISHING CO.
28 HIGH STREET, GUILFORD, CONNECTICUT 06437

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A NOTE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to simplify librarians' lives and to redeem our publication schedule, the editors of *MAARAV* have determined to change the volume year from the academic year to the calendar year. In addition, we have decided to face the realities of the newly elected volume year and therefore Volume 3 is dated 1982. We wish to assure our readers that all subscriptions will be advanced accordingly, so that each subscriber will receive the number of volumes to which he is entitled. We appreciate your understanding, and trust that this change will allow us to serve our constituents more efficiently.

AMARNA *ekēmu* AND HEBREW *nāqam**

WAYNE T. PITARD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

Archaeological discovery over the past century has uncovered a phenomenal amount of information about the ancient Near East. The importance of much of this material for illuminating the culture of ancient Israel as reflected in the Hebrew Bible is obvious, and the study of extrabiblical and cross-cultural parallels to law, covenants, customs, architecture, religious beliefs, language and vocabulary has gone far to create a clearer understanding of the nature of Israel's culture and history. However, it sometimes happens that a certain proposed parallel, thought to be quite valid, will be shown, upon further careful study, to have been unfounded. It is important that such inappropriate parallels be recognized and dismissed as early as possible. This paper will discuss one such mistaken cross-cultural parallel, which George Mendenhall has proposed in his book *The Tenth Generation*:¹ that of Hebrew *nqm* with a verb from the Amarna letters which he believes to be derived from the same root.

Mendenhall first published an article on this topic in 1948,² but the 1973 treatment is by far the more detailed. His ideas on the

* I would like to thank my professors, Frank M. Cross and William L. Moran, of Harvard University, for reading this paper and making several helpful comments and suggestions. Any errors, of course, remain my own.

1. George E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ., 1973): 69-104.

2. Idem, "God of Vengeance, Shine Forth!" *Wittenburg Bulletin* 45 (1948): 37-42.

subject have gathered a rather wide following,³ to such an extent that they are now appearing in more popular literature, such as the *IDB* Supplementary volume.⁴ Even the *CAD* agrees with Mendenhall's etymological study of the Amarna verb that is the keystone to his hypothesis.⁵ But there are some very grave problems which call Mendenhall's conclusions seriously into question, and we will look into them here. First, however, it is necessary to summarize Mendenhall's views, as found in *The Tenth Generation*, chapter 3.

Mendenhall believes that the translation of the Hebrew nominal *nqm(h)* as 'vengeance' and verb as 'to avenge' is incorrect and distorts the view of God which the ancient Israelites held. Scholars have usually connected the root *nqm* with blood vengeance of the type that is practiced by the bedouin tribes even today. Mendenhall does not believe that blood vengeance was ever sanctioned in early Israel, nor does he believe that *nqm* had anything to do with blood vengeance by the time Israel became a nation. Indeed, he thinks that in Israel *nqm* was used as a covenant term. In this context it meant the use of executive action by a sovereign to correct a situation of danger for the sovereign's faithful vassals when all regular and normal legal processes to clear up the danger had been tried and had failed.⁶ In the Bible, then, Mendenhall sees *nqm* as connoting extralegal but legitimate intervention by Yahweh during a crisis situation in his vassal territory, Israel. This intervention, when looked at by the sovereign's faithful vassal, is thought of as deliverance or rescue; but looked at by the forces of those who have broken the covenant and are causing the trouble, it appears as punishment or defeat.

3. See, for example, E. F. Campbell, "Sovereign God," *McCormick Quarterly* 20 (1967): 179; idem, "Two Amarna Notes," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (G. E. Wright Festschrift; F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke, P. D. Miller, eds.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976): 48-49; G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds.; New York: Harper, 1962): 31, n. 19; W. F. Albright, "Archaeological Discovery and the Scriptures," *Christianity Today* 12 (June 21, 1968): 3; J. Sasson, Review of *The Tenth Generation*, *JBL* 93 (1974): 295.

4. J. E. Lindsey, "Vengeance," *IDBSup*, 932-933.

5. *CAD* E: 69. See the note at the end of the *ekemu* article. S. Izre'el, "Two Notes on the Gezer-Amarna Tablets," *Tel Aviv* 4 (1977): 164, n. 20, disputes Mendenhall's etymological arguments briefly.

6. Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 76-77, 78, 82.

Mendenhall labels these two aspects of *nqm*, "Defensive Vindication" and "Punitive Vindication."⁷ In regard to defensive vindication, he calls on evidence from the Amarna tablets to set up his definition. Indeed, this is the foundation for his entire interpretation of *nqm*. In the El Amarna correspondence he finds eight occurrences in six letters of what he believes to be the verb *naqamu*. In these passages the letter writers are asking the king of Egypt to rescue their cities or themselves from attackers. The verb in question is clearly to be translated 'to rescue' and never implies a meaning approaching 'to avenge.' Mendenhall sees evidence, in the similarity of grammatical structures and vocabulary of some of these same passages, that the phrases are stereotyped and that *nqm* in the Amarna letters is the technical covenant term for the intervention of the sovereign, as defined above.⁸ From this starting point Mendenhall moves into biblical material and culls examples of the use of *nqm* in cases of defensive vindication from early OT literature and suggests a close relationship between several examples and those from Amarna.⁹ He then expands the discussion by looking at examples of what he calls punitive vindication, for which he has no parallel in Amarna, but which can be covered under his general definition.¹⁰ While, according to Mendenhall, the root rarely appears in writings of the divided kingdoms, it does come to the fore again in the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for the most part retaining the same meaning as before. However, now and then *nqm* begins to pick up the nuance 'revenge' or 'vengeance,' though only in contexts where the enemies of Israel and Yahweh are speaking.¹¹ Still, the word continues to retain its ancient meaning all the way into the New Testament (as *ekdikeō*).¹²

Mendenhall's argument, then, runs from the Amarna evidence to proposed biblical parallels to the Amarna usage, to extended, syntactically different and ultimately antonymous usages of the word (from 'deliver' to 'defeat'). All of this is subsumed under the general definition "extralegal executive action by the sovereign."

7. See *ibid.*, 77, 88; cf. 83.

8. *Ibid.*, 77-82.

9. *Ibid.*, 82-88.

10. *Ibid.*, 88-95.

11. *Ibid.*, 95-98.

12. *Ibid.*, 98-104.

The words used by Mendenhall to translate *nqm* include: for defensive vindication—‘to rescue, deliver, defeat, vindicate’ (verb); and ‘imperium, deliverance, vindication’ (noun). For punitive vindication—‘to redress, vindicate, obtain satisfaction’ (verb); and ‘redress, vindication’ (noun).

This is his thesis. But there are many problems with it, and a careful review of his arguments is in order.

EXTRABIBLICAL USAGE OF *NQM*

There are only three extrabiblical sets of documents that are earlier than or contemporary with the Hebrew Bible which have (or purportedly have) attestations of the Semitic root *nqm*:¹³ an Old Babylonian tablet from Mari, the Amarna tablets and the Aramaic Sefire inscriptions. As noted above, the Amarna tablets are the prime basis for Mendenhall’s thesis; the other two documents are mentioned briefly.¹⁴ We shall look at them here because of their importance to the discussion below. The Mari text has not been published in full, the only line quoted so far being, *be-el ni-iq-mi-su[sic!] i-du-uk-šu*.¹⁵ Although we do not have the context of this clause, it is probable that the word *niqmu* means ‘vengeance’ or ‘retribution,’ and the phrase could be translated, “his avenger killed him.” All but one of the Aramaic occurrences appear together in a single section of the Sefire treaty, III [= *KAI* 224]: 11-12. The text reads:

הן אִתִּי יִקְתְּלֵנִי אֵת תַּאֲתָהּ וְתִקֶּם דָּמִי מִן יַד שְׂנְאָי וּבְרַךְ יֵאֲתָהּ יְקָם דָּם
 בְּרִי מִן שְׂנְאוֹהָ וּבְרַךְ בְּרַךְ יֵאֲתָהּ יְקָם דָּם בְּרִי יַעֲקֹרֵךְ יֵאֲתָהּ יְקָם דָּם עֲקָרִי

If they kill me [the sovereign], you shall come avenge my blood upon [lit. from the hand of] my enemies, and your son shall come

13. This excludes personal names, such as the Ugaritic *nqmd* and *nqmp^c*, etc., as well as an ostrakon found in Jerusalem during the K. Kenyon excavation, which reads *nqm . gd[?]*; cf. J. Prignaud, “Notes d’epigraphie hébraïque,” *RB* 77 (1970): 50–59.

14. For the Mari text, see Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 73–74. The Sefire treaty is mentioned, p. 72, n. 9 and p. 79, n. 33. It is not discussed in detail because it does not antedate the biblical texts.

15. C.-F. Jean, “Les noms propres de personnes dans les lettres de Mari,” *Studia Mariana* (A. Parrot, ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1950): 87. The problematical *ni-iq-mi-su* is corrected to *niqmišu* by Mendenhall (*Tenth* [N 1]: 74).

¹²avenge the blood of my son upon his enemies, and your grandson shall come avenge the blood of my [grand]son, and your descendants shall come avenge the blood of my descendants.¹⁶

The other occurrence, Sf. III: 22, is similar, ויקם חר [דמי] “Someone will avenge [my blood].”¹⁷ The meaning of the verb *nqm* is quite clear. This inscription has key parallels to Hebrew passages that will be discussed later.

For Mendenhall the most significant set of attestations is the occurrences in the Amarna letters of the verb forms *yi-KI-im*, *yi-IK-KI-im* and *li-IK-KI-im*,¹⁸ which appear eight times in six letters,¹⁹ and which Mendenhall believes come from the root *nqm*. He translates this verb as ‘to rescue’ in all eight of the Amarna contexts, and from them he infers the meaning “defensive vindication” for *nqm*, which is the foundation of his entire argument.²⁰

16. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome: PBI, 1967): 98.

17. *Ibid.*, 100.

18. The system for transliteration of the cuneiform material is as follows: small italic characters—Akkadian syllables; Roman characters, small caps—Sumerian logograms; italic characters, all caps—Akkadian sign is clear, but the exact transliteration value in the particular instance is uncertain. To illustrate the latter, *yi-KI-im* signifies that the middle sign is the *KI* sign, but that it is uncertain at this point whether the correct transliteration of the sign should be *ki* or *qi* (depending on whether the verb comes from the root *ekemu* or *naqamu*).

19. For all the references to the Amarna letters below, see J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915, reprinted Aalen: Zeller, 1964). The syllabic values have been updated with the aid of Anson Rainey’s convenient collection of facsimiles of the Amarna tablets, *Collected Autographs of the El-Amarna Tablets* (unpublished). Wherever Knudtzon read something different from the drawer of the facsimile, Knudtzon was followed.

20. The eight passages read as follows: EA 244:25–29: *ù lu-ù-mi li-ik-ki-im-mi LUGAL-ru URU^{ki}-šu la-a-mi yi-iš-bat-ši¹ la-ab-a-ya*, “So may the king rescue his city lest Labaya seize it.” EA 250:20–22: *yi-ki-im-ni-mi DINGIR-lim ša LUGAL EN-ia aš-šum i-pi-iš nu-kur-ti i-na L[Ü]MEŠ. KUR GI-na IR MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia*, “May the god of the king my lord rescue me from making war on the men of the land of GIna, the servants of the king my lord.” EA 250:48–50: *ù ip-pal-šu-ni yi-i[k-k]i-im-ni-me DINGIR-lim ša LUGAL EN-ia a[š]-šu[m] i-pi-iš nu-kur-ti i-na LUGAL EN-ia*, “But I answered them, ‘May the god of the king my lord rescue me from a deed of hostility against the king my lord.’” EA 271:13–16: *ù yi-ki-im LUGAL be-li KUR-šu iš-tu qa-at^{LÜ.MEŠ} SA.GAZ.MEŠ*, “So let the king my lord rescue his land from the hand of the Hapiru.” EA 274:10–13: *yi-ki-im LUGAL be-li KUR-šu iš-tu*

But the key question is: does the word written *yi-KI-im*, *yi-IK-KI-im* and *li-IK-KI-im* actually come from the root *nqm*? In the glossary to J. A. Knudtson's edition of the Amarna tablets, E. Ebling related these forms to the Akkadian verb *ekēmu*,²¹ which usually means 'to take away (by force), to annex, to conquer.'²² In his 1948 article, Mendenhall stated that the form *yi-IK-KI-im* "is grammatically impossible to connect with the Babylonian root (*ekēmu*)."²³ Although he does not explain why it is impossible, presumably the cause is the doubled middle radical in some of the forms,²⁴ which in good Akkadian would not appear in the preterite or precative form of I-³*alep* roots. The doubled middle radical would appear, however, in a I-*n* verb since, in the preterite, the *n* would assimilate to the middle radical. Thus the root of *yi-IK-KI-im* should be *nkm* or *nqm*; and since *nakāmu* 'to heap up' does not fit the context, it must be *nqm*. This would be a suitable argument if we could assume that the Amarna corpus was consistently written in good Akkadian, but this is not so. The Palestinian letters of the Amarna archive, from which these six letters come, are written in an Akkadian that is notoriously bad—both in regard to grammar and orthography. An examination of the forms of I-³*alep* verbs found in the vassal letters shows that the doubling of the middle radical in preterite/jussive forms was not unusual at all. For example, *li-ip-pu-š[u-nim]*, "let them do," EA 156:11 (cf. our *li-ik-ki-im-mi*, 244:26); *ip-pu-uš-ti*, 'I have made,' EA 280:12; *ip-pu-šu*, "they have done," EA 287:19; also in EA 313:12; [*ú-u*] *iz-zi-ib*, "I have [no]t abandoned," EA 88:29; *iz-zi-ib-mi*, "Leave!" (imv.), EA 294:29; and a crowning example from EA 250:48-49: *ú ip-pal-šu-ni yi-i[k-k]i-im-ni-me*

qa-te LÜ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ, "Let the king my lord rescue his land from the hands of the Hapiru." EA 282:10-14: *yu-uš-ši-ra* LUGAL-ri EN-ia ERIN.MEŠ *pi-ta-ti ma-aḥ-da ma-gal ú yi-ki-im-ni/ia-ZI-ni*, "Let the king my lord send the archers in great number so that he may rescue me." EA 283:15-17: *sum-ma mi-la-an-na i-ia-nu* ERIN.MEŠ *pi-ta-ti yi-ik-ki-mi-ni* LUGAL-ri EN-ia, "If there are no archers at this time, let the king my lord rescue me." EA 283:25-27: *yu-uš-ši-ra* LUGAL-ri EN-ia ERIN.MEŠ *pi-ta-ti yi-ik-ki-<im>-ni* LUGAL-ri EN-ia, "Let the king my lord send the archers; let the king my lord rescue me."

21. Glossary by Erich Ebling in Knudtson, *Amarna Tafeln* (N 12): 2.1400.

22. See CAD E: 64-69.

23. Mendenhall, "God of Vengeance" (N 2): 38.

24. It is doubled in four of the eight occurrences: EA 244:26; 250:48; 283:16; 26.

DINGIR-*lim ša* LUGAL EN-ia,^{24a} "And I answered them, 'May the god of the king my lord re[sc]ue me.'" Thus, in the same line where we have a doubled middle radical in our verb, we have a doubled middle radical in a preterite form from *apālu*. It is clear then that the orthography does not rule out a root *ekēmu* for our verb;²⁵ thus, on orthographic grounds, we cannot decide whether *yi-IK-KI-im* derives from *ekēmu* or *naqāmu*.

The main reason why Mendenhall rejects *ekēmu* as the root for our verbs is that the Akkadian term normally means 'to take away unlawfully' and, he claims, is never used to mean, 'to take away (from danger),' i.e., 'to rescue.'²⁶ But while he is correct that *ekēmu* is used in a pejorative sense quite often, there are in fact several cases where *ekēmu* does mean 'to rescue,' ranging in date from the Isin-Larsa period to the Neo-Babylonian period.

From the Isin-Larsa period we have an entry from the Sumerian-Akkadian lexical text *ana ittišu* (tab. III:34-35).²⁷ The

24a. Both the *ik* and *ki* signs of *yi-i[k-k]i-im-ni-me*, though partially preserved, are virtually certain.

25. Mendenhall shows an awareness of this in his 1973 study (*Tenth* [N 1]: 79), when he suggests that the scribes of the Amarna letters were actually writing the verb *ekēmu*, but using it as a cognate of the West Semitic *nqm*. He says:

... the scribes of the Amarna letters probably thought they were writing good Babylonian in using the forms *yiqqim*, from Babylonian *ekēmu*, but were actually, as argued here, using it in a way which corresponded to West Semitic *NQM*. There certainly can be no doubt that there is a very considerable semantic overlap between the two words. The most common meaning of *ekēmu* is "to take away by force," but it is not used in the type of contexts found in the Amarna letters. If the scribe wished, then, to give what he felt to be the proper West Semitic gloss to the word *yiqqim*, West Semitic root *NS'* was actually the proper one to use. Several texts speak of *ekēmu* in reference to the removal of kingship; ... In both cases, the idea "to remove by force" fits well the Babylonian usage of *ekēmu*, and may reasonably be assumed to have been the word which the scribes felt to be the appropriate synonym.

This section, which attempts to explain why the scribe of EA 282 felt the need to give a West Semitic gloss for *yi-ki-im-ni* (see below) is very confused and clashes significantly with the rest of the article (e.g., after suggesting that the scribes are using the verb *ekēmu*, he still transliterates the Amarna verb *yiqqim* and assumes throughout the rest of the article that it is actually *naqāmu*).

26. Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 79-80.

27. B. Landsberger, *Die Serie ana ittišu. Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon* (Rome: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1937): 1. For the date of this text, see pp. II-III.

section from which our entry comes consists of clauses from legal documents dealing with adoption,²⁸ first in Sumerian, then translated into Akkadian. The relevant passage reads, KA UR.[G17].TA BA.AN.[DA].KAR = *i-na pi-i kal-bi e-ki-im-šu*, both to be translated, "From the mouth of the dog he snatched (i.e., rescued) him [= a foundling]." This is clearly a benevolent action.²⁹

Probably from the Kassite period comes a work closely related to the poem *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*, and perhaps actually part of that work (which is known from some fragments from Assur and Sultantepe).³⁰ The fragment VAT 9442 from Assur, lines 2-5 reads, ²[be-l]i ú-ša-bit-an-ni ³[be-l]i ú-pat-[in]-an-ni ⁴[be-l]i ú-bal-liṭ-an-ni ⁵[ina haš-t]i e-kim-an-ni, "My [Lord] seized me; My [Lord] streg[the]ned me; My [Lord] gave me life; He snatched (i.e., rescued) me [from the pit]."³¹

In a Neo-Babylonian letter published by R. F. Harper,³² the writer is urging action to oust the enemy from Babylon, ABL 571: rv. 1-7: ¹min-di-e-ma bābili (TIN.TIR)^{ki} la-pa-an ²da-a-ki in-ni-ṭi-ir en-na ³a-du-ú al-tap-rak-ku-nu-ši ⁴hu-us-sa-ma dib-bi-ku-nu a-ga-nu-tu ⁵al-ka-ma šu-uṭ-ṭir-a-ma ⁶it-ti aḥḥē (ŠES.MES)-ku-nu du-ub-ba ⁷āla (URU) ina qātē (ŠU^{II})^{amel} nakri (LÜ.KÜR) ni-ki-ma, "Perhaps Babylon will be saved from a massacre. Now then I have written to you. Consider these matters of yours. Go and write and speak with your brothers. Let us rescue the city from the

28. Ibid., XV.

29. A similar clause is found in the lexical series *ḪAR-ra = ḫubullu* (B. Landsberger, *The Series ḪAR-ra = ḫubullu. Tablets I-IV. Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon V* [Rome: PBI, 1957]: 50). Tablet II:5—KA.UR.G17.A.NI.ŠE BA.AN.DA.KAR = *i-na pi-i kal-bi e-kim*, "It (the child) has been rescued from the mouth of the (Sum. his) dog."

30. W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960): 58. For discussion of these fragments, called Tablet IV(?) in the book, and their relation to *Ludlul*, see pp. 24-26.

31. A text similar to *Ludlul* has been discovered at Ugarit (J. Nougayrol, et al., *Ugaritica 5* [1968]: 265-273) and it also contains an occurrence of *ekēmu* with the meaning 'to rescue.' While it has a few traces of peripheral Akkadian, it appears to be a fourteenth-century copy of an Old Babylonian poem (265-267). Lines 40-41 read: *ul-tu pi-i mu-ti i-ki-ma-an-ni / ul-tu er-še-ti ú-še-la-an-ni*, "From the mouth of death he (= Marduk) rescued me / From the underworld he raised me up."

32. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (London: Univ. of Chicago, 1902): 6, no. 571.

hands of the enemy." Cf. also lines obv. 17-19 of the same letter.³³

These examples show clearly that the verb *ekēmu* can have the meaning 'to rescue' in Akkadian. This should occasion no surprise—the other common word for 'to save, rescue,' *eṭēru*, also means 'to take away.' The close semantic relationship between the two meanings is quite clear—to take or snatch away from danger is to rescue. This semantic combination can be found in several languages, including Latin (*eripio*), English (to snatch), and the Hebrew verb *hiššil* (*Hip^cil* from *nšl*) which is, in fact, the Hebrew equivalent to Akkadian *ekēmu* (see below, footnote 48).

One final piece of evidence seems to point decisively towards an assumption that *yi-IK-KI-im* derives from *ekēmu* rather than *naqāmu*, namely the occurrences in EA 282:13-14 of a gloss of this verb by West Semitic *ia-ZI-ni*. This appears to come from the verb *nš^c*, a verb which in Hebrew means 'to pull out, pull up'; *Hip^cil*, 'to remove' and is thus a logical gloss for *ekēmu*.³⁴ (If the ambiguous gloss is to be read as a *Hip^cil* from *yš^c* 'to bring forth,' as Campbell suggests,³⁵ this would also be an appropriate equivalent of *ekēmu*.)

A few other comments about the Amarna references are desiderated. One major point that Mendenhall makes is that his proposed *nqm* is apparently a technical covenant term to be used when the vassal, in extreme danger, requests "the executive exercise of power by the highest legitimate political authority for the protection of his own subjects."³⁶ This point, which is an important part of his argument, has been elaborated upon recently

33. Also relevant are some personal names of the form, GN-*e-ki-im*, in *YOS VI*: 102:14 and 132:17, where 'to rescue' is the most likely translation of the verbal element (see *AHW*: 194b).

We should further note that the Sumerian verb *KAR*, which is translated into Akkadian with *ekēmu* in *ana ittišu*, is elsewhere translated by *eṭēru* and *sūzubu* (see *CAD E*: 401, s.v. *eṭēru*), both of which mean 'to save, rescue.'

Finally, there are cases where *ekēmu* means 'to take away legitimately.' See, for example, Enuma Elish IV:121, *ikimšuma tupšimāti*, "(Marduk) took the tablet of destiny away from him (= Kingu)," and a line from the commentary on *Ludlul* tablet III (cf. Lambert, *Wisdom* [N 23]: 56), ^d*Marduk ša mu-kaš-ši-di-ia i-kim as-^fpa^l-šú*, "Marduk took away the sling of my persecutor." Cf. *CAD E*: 66. The verb *ekēmu* is by no means merely a verb with negative connotations.

34. Mendenhall agrees with this, *Tenth* (N 1): 79.

35. Campbell, "Two Amarna Notes" (N 3): 48.

36. Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 78.

by Edward Campbell.³⁷ But what is the evidence for this? First one can notice that the subject of the verb is the king in six of the occurrences and the god of the king in the other two.³⁸ But this can hardly prove that we have here a technical word loaded with treaty overtones. The Amarna letters are, after all, a royal archive. There is no reason to suppose that every verb that requests action by the king is a technical covenant term. Further, in the well over two hundred vassal letters from Syria-Palestine, many of which are asking for protection from marauding bands, we might expect to find a widely recognized covenant term in more than just these six letters.

Mendenhall also suggests that the grammatical structure and vocabulary of the clauses in which our verb appears seem to be scribal clichés, thus indicating a technical usage, in what he thinks are covenant contexts.³⁹ There is little strength to this argument. The phrases are only stereotyped insofar as they normally take the form: (transitive) verb, subject, object (e.g., *li-ik-ki-im-mi* LUGAL-*ru* URU^{ki}-*šu*, EA 244:26-27), or verb, subject, object, prepositional phrase (*ù yi-ki-im* LUGAL *be-li* KUR-*šu* *iš-tu qa-at* LÚ.MEŠ^{SA.GAZ}^{MEŠ}, EA 271:13). In other words, they are stereotyped only insofar as they have the simple grammatical form regularly found in the Palestinian letters in which the writer uses a transitive verb when asking the king to do something. While there are many clearly stereotyped passages in this corpus from many different cities which are repeated quite often, they are neither this rare nor this short. In fact, there are no more than two letters with our verb which actually repeat the same clause (EA 271:13 and 274:10—*yi-ki-im* LUGAL *be-li* KUR-*šu* *iš-tu qa-at (qa-te)* LÚ.MEŠ^{SA.GAZ}^{MEŠ}). There are three uses of *yi-ki-im-ni*, but they all come from two letters of Šuwardata (EA 282:13; 283:16, 26), and thus the similarity is insignificant. The supposed scribal cliché of *yi-ki-im-ni-mi* DINGIR-*lim ša* LUGAL EN-*ia aš-šum i-pi-iš nu-kur-ti*, appears twice, but in a single letter (EA 250:20-22, 48-50). There simply is no stereotyped usage of this verb evident in the Amarna correspondence. The writers are using the word that to them means ‘to rescue,’ not because it is a covenant term, but simply because they want to be rescued. Other writers will use a

different wording to ask for the same thing: cf. EA 318:8-15, also to the king: *še-zi-ba-an-ni iš-tu* KUR.MEŠ *da-n[u-ti] iš-tu* ^{ŠU}*qa-ti* LÚ.MEŠ^{SA.GAZ}^{MEŠ} [*Z*^{MEŠ} LÚ.MEŠ^{MEŠ} *ha-ba-ti ù* LÚ.MEŠ^{MEŠ} *šu-ti-i ù še-zi-ba-an-[ni]* LUGAL GAL *be-li-i[a]*, “Save me from the powerful enemy, from the hand of the Hapiru, the robbers and the Suti; save me, O Great King, my lord.”⁴⁰

So there is little evidence in the Amarna letters to support Mendenhall’s assumption that this word is a technical covenantal term. Likewise, the evidence to back an assumption of any wide ranging meaning like ‘executive action of a sovereign’ is lacking. All we can really say is that the term has the meaning ‘to rescue,’ and that it is used in letters addressed to the king, as one would expect for correspondence from a royal archive.

To summarize: Mendenhall bases his arguments concerning the root *nqm* on his study of the Amarna verb that he believes to be derived from *nqm*. The evidence, however, fails to support Mendenhall’s etymology of the Amarna verb. We noted the Aramaic usage of *nqm* at Sefire, where its meaning is clearly ‘to avenge’ in a legal sense. An Akkadian fragment from Mari, while uncertain and without context, suggests a similar meaning for the root. Mendenhall’s identification of the Amarna verb *yikim* as deriving from *nqm* has been shown to be very doubtful. We have seen that the verb means ‘to rescue’ and that there is no evidence that it is any kind of special technical covenant term. We have noted that the orthography of the verb in Amarna allows it to be derived from either *naqāmu* or *ekēmu*. While we have found no other extrabiblical evidence that *nqm* can mean ‘to rescue,’ we have shown that *ekēmu* in fact does have that meaning in several cases. Finally, we have seen that the Canaanite gloss of our word in EA 282:13-14 (*ia-ZI-ni*) fits with *ekēmu* quite naturally. The evidence so far strongly suggests that our verb comes from *ekēmu*, and not *naqāmu*; and if this is so, then the underpinnings of Mendenhall’s thesis collapse. However, examining the Hebrew evidence will be crucial; for, if there are Hebrew examples where *nqm* is to be translated ‘to rescue,’ parallel to the usage of *yikim*

37. Campbell, “Two Amarna Notes” (N 3): 48-49.

38. Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 77, 81.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79, 80.

40. See also the text RS 17.340 from Ugarit (*PRU* 4, p. 49), lines 10-11: *a-na iš-ù-pi-lu-li-ma* LUGAL GAL *iš-pu-ra-ma ma-a* ^{DU}*tu-šu* LUGAL GAL EN-*ia iš-tu qa-ti* LÚ^{DU} KUR *lu-še-zi-ba-an-ni*, “He wrote to Suppiluliuma the great king, ‘Let the Sun, the great king my lord, save me from the hand of the enemy.’” See also 2 Kgs 16:7.

all the cases, a just recompense has been assigned. Now, in vv 20-21, the rather delicate question of the death of a slave at his master's hand is considered. There had been no question in the earlier cases as to whether the offender should be punished; but here, in the minds of many people, it is not so clear whether punishment should be dealt to the master. The law, however, states that if the slave dies during a beating, the master intended to kill him; therefore it is murder, and the dead slave shall be avenged. But if the slave survives a few days and then dies, the death was unintentional, especially since the death is a financial loss to the owner; and the slave in this case has no right to be avenged.

In Lev 26:25, in a list of curses that will befall the Israelites if they break their covenant with Yahweh, we find: והבאתי עליכם חרב ונקמת נקמ-ברית, “And I will bring a sword upon you which will execute the retribution of the covenant (*nōqemet nāqam bərīt*).” Here Yahweh is clearly threatening the Israelites with the just penalty that they must pay for breaking their covenant. This is not extralegal intervention by the sovereign, but rather the standard legal consequence of breaking a contract. It reflects and assumes Yahweh's legal right to exact retribution in the case where his rights as sovereign have been violated.

In poetic contexts, we find *nqm* employed in passages depicting trials in progress. For example, Isa 1:21-26 presents an indictment of Jerusalem (vv 21-23), in which her crimes are set forth, followed by Yahweh's judgment on the criminal of Jerusalem (vv 24-26), beginning (v 24b): הוֹי אֲנַחֵם מִצְרֵי וְאֲנַקְמָה מֵאוֹיְבֵי, “I shall be relieved from my foes, and I shall exact recompense (*wəʾinnāqəmā^h*) from my enemies.” This recompense will punish the wicked and will heal the community. Again this is clearly viewed as a normal legal intervention after “due process” has been observed.

A like situation prevails in Psalm 94, which begins:

אל נקמות יהוה אל נקמות הופיע¹
הנשא שפט הארץ השב נמול על-נאים²

¹ O God of vengeance (*ʾēl nāqāmōt*), O Yahweh,

O God of vengeance, shine forth!

² Arise, O Judge of the earth,

Return recompense (*gəmūl*) unto the proud.

The psalmist then goes on to describe the evil of the wicked and

the just retribution that they will receive. Here it is God as Judge who is called upon to bring justice upon the evil in what can only be a legal context.

Another excellent example is Jer 51:34-37, where Jerusalem is told to bring its charges against Babylon into court. Upon hearing the charges (vv 34-35), Yahweh says (v 36): הַנִּירְבֵּי אֶת־רִיבְךָ וְנִקְמְתִי, “Behold I will argue your case, and I will obtain your recompense (*wəniqqamtī ʾet-niqmātēk*).” Again no extralegal connotations here; on the contrary, the *niqmā^h* is specifically applied within the legal sphere.

Other examples could be cited, but the above should make the point clear enough.⁴⁷ If, then, the primary usage of *nqm* is ‘to avenge, render recompense,’ we should keep this in mind when we look at the passages which Mendenhall proposes as parallels to the Amarna usage of *yi-ki-im*, ‘to rescue.’

There are in fact only five passages in which Mendenhall translates *nqm* as ‘to rescue, deliver,’ although there are two other passages where he strongly hints that this root should be translated similarly. This small number is rather surprising, since Mendenhall seems to suggest that there are many more.⁴⁸

47. Another confirmation of the correct meaning of *nqm* can be found by noting its parallels in OT poetry: Deut 32:35,41, *nqm/šlm*; Isa 1:24, *ʾnhm/ʾnqmh*; Isa 34:8, *ywm nqm/šnt šlwym*; Isa 35:4, *nqm/gmwł*; Isa 61:2, *šnt ršwn/ywm nqm*; Isa 63:4, *ywm nqm/šnt gʾwly*; Jer 51:6, *ʿt nqmh hyʾ/gmwł hwʾ mšlm*; Ps 149:7, *nqmh/twkht*; Lam 3:60, *nqmtm/mḥšbtm*.

48. In many of the ‘defensive vindication’ passages which Mendenhall cites as parallel to Amarna usage, he has to translate *nqm* as ‘to defeat’ or ‘to vindicate’ rather than ‘to rescue.’ He tends to overstate the similarities between the Hebrew and Amarna evidence. An example is the following statement (*Tenth* [N 1]: 78):

The specification of the peril from which rescue is requested is designated by the preposition *ištu* with *qāt*, which is a precise analogy to the later Hebrew *nqm myd*, and thus demonstrates that both the grammatical construction and semantic range of meaning are closely related historically as well as linguistically.

In fact, I could find only one case in the OT where the words *nqm* and *myd* appear in the same sentence, and this case cannot be connected with the semantic meaning of the Amarna term. The passage is 2 Kgs 9:7, part of the commission of Jehu, and reads: והכיתה את-בית אחאב אדניך ונקמתי דמי עבדי הנבאים ורמי, “And you shall smite the house of Ahab your lord, so that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets and the blood of all the

The first passage is 1 Sam 24:13: שפט יהוה ביני ובינך ונקמני יהוה: מִמֶּנִּי וְיָדִי לֹא תְהִיָּה כִּי. Although he does not translate this passage, Mendenhall calls it “the classical illustration of defensive vindication in the Bible,” citing it as his first example of a Hebrew parallel to the Amarna verb and noting that “the grammatical construction of the account has been identified as that characteristic of the Amarna letters.”⁴⁹ But to translate this occurrence of *nqm* with something like ‘to rescue’ (e.g., “may Yahweh rescue me from you”), is to lose much of the context of the passage. David has cut off the skirt of Saul’s robe while Saul slept to show that, although he could have killed Saul, he did not, since he is faithful to Yahweh’s anointed. As Saul is going his way the following morning, David calls to him from a distance, protests his innocence and points out the wrongfulness of Saul’s hostility towards him. After stating his case, he calls upon Yahweh to judge between the two men to decide who is in the wrong: “Let Yahweh judge between me and you, and may Yahweh give me recompense from you,” i.e., may Yahweh find in my favor and impose upon you a just compensation for me.

A second example is Judg 11:36b: עֲשֵׂה לִי כְּאֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִפִּיךָ אַחֲרַי אֲשֶׁר: עֲשֵׂה לְךָ יְהוָה נִקְמוֹת מֵאִיבֶיךָ, which Mendenhall translates, “Do to me just as that which went forth from your mouth, since Yahweh has done for your vindication from your enemies.”⁵⁰ In the context of this section of his article, Mendenhall seems to understand this “vindication” as rescue.⁵¹ But here too the legal usage of

servants of Yahweh upon (lit. from the hand of) Jezebel.” This shows no continuity with the Amarna usage of *ykim istu qati*, “to rescue from the hands of,” but rather finds a close parallel in the Sefire usage in III:11. The clear parallel to the Amarna usage in Hebrew is *hiššil miyyad*, which occurs numerous times in the OT, e.g., Gen 37:21; Exod 2:19; 3:8; 18:9,10; Num 35:25; Judg 6:9; 1 Sam 4:8; 7:14; 10:18. On the use of *miyyad* in 2 Kgs 9:7, see also 2 Sam 4:11.

49. Mendenhall, *Tenth* (N 1): 83-84.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 85.

51. The section from which the first five examples discussed here come, pp. 82-88, is titled, “Defensive Vindication in the Bible.” Its function is delineated on p. 83: “Here the primary concern is with those few biblical occurrences of the root *NQM* that are analogous to the Amarna use of the word.” In discussing how the word is to be translated in cases of defensive vindication, he says (pp. 84-85):

It is a classical illustration of the thesis presented above, that the verbal root and derived nouns designate the use of force by legitimate sovereign authority, and that where such force is used in a situation involving armed

‘vengeance, just punishment’ fits more logically into the story. From the time Jephthah takes over as ruler in Israel, the war with Ammon takes on a legal connotation. Letters go back and forth between Jephthah and the king of Ammon, in which each states his case for having legal possession of Israel’s Transjordanian territory. What is pointed out throughout chapter 11, especially in the long legal defense of Israel’s claim to the land in vv 14-27, is that the Ammonites have no legal right to attack Israel. Note especially verse 27: “So I have not transgressed against you, but you are doing wrong to me by fighting against me. May Yahweh the Judge judge today between the sons of Israel and the sons of Ammon.” Thus Ammon’s defeat in battle is seen as the judgment and retribution imposed upon Ammon by Yahweh, and it is better to translate the latter part of v 36, “since Yahweh has given you vengeance upon your enemies.”

1 Sam 14:24 is another example. It reads: וְאִישׁ־יִשְׂרָאֵל נִגַּשׁ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וַיֹּאֵל שְׂאוּל אֶת־הָעָם לֵאמֹר אֲרוּר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יֹאכַל לֶחֶם עַד־הָעֶרֶב וְנִקְמָתִי מֵאִיבֵי וְלֹא־מָעַם כְּלִהָעָם לֶחֶם. There are textual problems with the beginning of the verse, but the part with *nqm* is clear. Mendenhall translates it, “Cursed be the man who eats food before evening, and I am rescued from my enemies.”⁵² But again the context of the passage suggests the traditional rendering, “and I am avenged on my enemies.” Jonathan and his armor bearer have created a tumult in the camp of the Philistines and the Israelite army takes advantage of the confusion to attack. The attack becomes a rout and the Israelites chase the Philistines well into Ephraim (see the LXX of v 23). Saul, apparently in order both to press his advantage in the attack and to try to please Yahweh, forbids anyone to stop and eat until nightfall necessarily brings the fighting to an end. It is clear that Saul and his forces are not in need of rescue here. Rather, Saul urges on his army “until I have been avenged upon (or: have received recompense from) my

attack, the usage of the verb may demand a translation into English by the word “defeat” or “rescue,” depending on the context. If one views the situation as the hostility between sovereign and enemy, the word must be translated as “defeat” or “punish” . . . if one views it as the relationship between sovereign and faithful subject, the same act is to “rescue” or “deliver.”

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

enemies”—enemies who have invaded the land of Israel and who are clearly in the wrong and deserve punishment for their encroachments. A similar usage of the *Nip'al* of *nqm* in the material dealing with Saul may be found in 1 Sam 18:25. In this passage there can be no doubt that *nqm* is being used to refer to retribution: ויאמר שאול כה תאמרו לדוד אינ-הפץ למלך במהר כי במאה ערלות ופלושתים להנקם באיבי המלך, “And Saul said, ‘Thus you shall say to David, ‘The king desires no bride-price except one hundred Philistine foreskins, so that he may be avenged upon the enemies of the king.’”⁵³

The fourth passage Mendenhall uses is 2 Sam 4:8, the key portion of which reads: הנה-דראש איש-בשת בן-שאול איבך אשר בקש את-נפשך ויתן יהוה לאדני המלך נקמות היום הזה משאול ומזרעו. Mendenhall translates the latter part of this, “And Yahweh has given to my lord the king deliverance this day from Saul and from his dynasty.”⁵⁴ Here the sense ‘deliverance’ for *nqm* is possible, but less likely than the meaning ‘recompense.’ The two men who have murdered Ishboshet are presenting their interpretation of the deed as punishment on the house of Saul, which had evilly sought the life of David. They present themselves then as instruments of Yahweh’s judgment on Ishboshet. Thus, “Here is the head of Ishboshet, the son of Saul, your enemy who sought your life. Yahweh has given to my lord the king vengeance this day upon Saul and upon his descendants.” David, however, has had no official legal quarrel with Ishboshet and cannot consider this deed as a just recompense or retribution. So he condemns the murderers to death. One other consideration is that David was obviously in very little danger from Ishboshet and the family of Saul by this time—hardly a case of jeopardy like those found in the Amarna letters.

We now turn to the poem in Jer 20:7-12. The key verses are 10 and 12. In v 10, Jeremiah portrays his enemies as scheming and planning, saying at the end of the verse: אולי יפתה ונוכלה לו ונקחה, “Perhaps he will be deceived and we will prevail over him and take our vengeance upon him (*niqmātēnū mimmennū*).”

53. Mendenhall does not translate this passage, but vaguely hints that *nqm* means ‘rescue’ here too (p. 86): “The second usage from the time of Saul occurs at I Samuel 18:25 [the first usage is 1 Sam 14:24, which he translates ‘rescue’], and adds no further information.” But killing a hundred Philistines will not rescue Saul from his enemies!

54. Ibid., p. 86.

This may be taken as a use of the term *nqm* in the sense of unjust revenge, as Mendenhall himself recognizes.⁵⁵ But Jeremiah places his trust in Yahweh and asks in v 12, “Let me see *niqmātākā mēhem*, for to you I have made known my case” (אראה נקמתך מהם כי אליך גליתי את-דריבתי). Mendenhall translates *nāqāmā*^h here as ‘deliverance.’ His argument against ‘vengeance’ or the like is that the enemies of Jeremiah have not done their evil deed yet, and a deed not done cannot be avenged.⁵⁶ But such an argument is simply not applicable to biblical thinking on justice. In place after place it is clear that an evil intention is as serious a crime as actual commission of the deed. The idea of the wicked falling into his own trap is part of the whole concept of a just retribution. Yahweh will not wait until the enemies of Jeremiah have succeeded in killing him before he punishes them. Here in chapter 20, the parallel use of *niqmātēnu* and *niqmātākā* indicates that Jeremiah is asking Yahweh to do unto his enemies exactly what they would do unto him. It may be pleasant to think of the prophet refraining from seeking punishment for his enemies and only asking for deliverance, but Jeremiah is a child of his times, and this response is characteristic. One need only look at Jer 17:18 and 18:21-23 to see that.

Mendenhall’s sixth example is Isa 35:4b: הנה אלהיכם נקם יבוא גמול אלהים הוא יבוא וישעכם. Mendenhall says,

... the usual translation, “Behold, your God will come with vengeance, with the recompense of God. He will come and save you,” is highly jarring and completely inaccurate. It is a description of the expected deliverance from a long-continued situation of want and misery by the “selling right of an unjust situation” or by remedying or relieving suffering. There is not a hint in the poem of satisfaction in the form of seeing opponents or oppressors punished or exterminated.⁵⁷

But the judicial vengeance and recompense of God is part of the “setting right an unjust situation.” The word *gāmūl* is a judicial term, which suggests that the parallel *nāqām* should be understood judicially as well.

55. Ibid., p. 97.

56. Ibid., pp. 97, 98.

57. Ibid., p. 100.

The final Mendenhall reference that we will consider is Esth 8:13b, ולהיות היהודיים עתודים ליום הזה להנקם מאיביהם. Mendenhall translates the passage, "The Jews were to be prepared from this day to deliver themselves from their enemies."⁵⁸ Again, it is important to look at the context. In this chapter the Jews have been given the right to fight anyone who attacks them on the thirteenth of Adar. The edict that allowed people to attack the Jews on the thirteenth of Adar has, of course, been viewed throughout the story as something evil and illegal, and those who would take part in such a thing are in a real sense committing a crime. In the edict described in v 13, the Jews are given the right to avenge themselves legally on those who commit evil against them. It is, in fact, a government sanctioning of private justice for this one day only.

It becomes clear then that there are no usages of *nqm* in Hebrew that are equivalent to the Amarna usage of *yi-ki-im*. This is true both in regard to their respective meanings as well as their syntactical environments (only 1 Sam 24:13, among Mendenhall's group of seven biblical passages, even comes close to a similar syntactical construction).

Time, space and the tolerance of the reader forbid the examination of all the other passages which contain the root *nqm*. But those who wish to undertake such a survey will find that the term covers a limited class of meanings: 'to avenge, to give recompense, retribution, to be avenged, avenge oneself (*Nip'al*)' and the like for the verb; and 'vengeance, recompense, retribution' for the noun. The term *nqm* in all such contexts is not pejorative, but rather connotes the bringing about of just punishment for the guilty and compensation for the victim; and also 'to take revenge' (verb) and 'revenge' (noun), in cases of evil intent by the subject. There are no specific occurrences of *nqm* where one may apply Mendenhall's general definition, 'use of executive exercise of power by the highest legitimate political authority for the protection of his own subjects.' The idea that this executive action occurs only in cases where normal legal authority is helpless has been shown to be quite mistaken, since the term *nqm* appears to be part of the standard legal terminology of ancient Israel. The meanings which we have seen for the Hebrew root *nqm* agree with

58. Ibid.

the cognates in the Aramaic from Sefire and probably the Akkadian from Mari. Thus we have Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian *nqm* on one side, and the Amarna verb *yi-ki-im* on the other, the former meaning 'to avenge' and the latter, 'to take away, to rescue.' It is clear that Mendenhall's attempt to tie the Amarna word and Hebrew *nqm* into a general covenantal continuum is a failure. In the case of the Amarna verb, we must agree with the older and original understanding of the verb as deriving from *ekēmu*. And, as for *nqm* in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, we return to the older view of its use to designate retributive justice.

THE COUNSEL OF THE “ELDERS” TO REHOBAM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS*

MOSHE WEINFELD

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

In the biblical account of the “elders’ ” counsel to Rehoboam we read: “If you will be a servant (עבד) unto this people this day and will serve them (ועבדתם) and respond to them and speak good words unto them, then they will be your servants forever” (1 Kgs 12:7). The Chronicler modified the phraseology out of respect for the Davidic house and read: “If you be kind (לטוב)¹ to this people, and please them (ורציתם), and speak good words to them, they will be your servants forever” (1 Chr 10:7). He considered the formulation in the book of Kings to be obsequious and degrading to a king of Davidic descent; so he softened it, speaking about a king who will be kind and pleasing to his people rather than a servant and thus subservient, as he appears in the book of Kings. By changing the phrase: “You will be a servant unto this people this day and will serve them” into: “if you be kind to this people,” the Chronicler removed the basic import of the verse: because the intent of the “elders,” as it is expressed in the original version in Kings, is “if you concede and be their servant *today*, they will be your servants for *all the days*.” The same applies—as will be seen later—to the

* This is an expanded version of my article in Hebrew in *Leshonenu* 36 (1971): 3-13.

1. The addition of the ל to the predicate (תהיה לטוב instead of תהיה טוב) is characteristic of the Chronicler’s style; cf. 1 Kgs 22:22: והייתי רוח שקר with 2 Chr 18:21: והייתי לרוח שקר and see A. Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik* (BZAW 16; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1909): 14.

change of "if you respond to them" in the verse in Kings into "if you please them" in Chronicles.

I

The notion of the *king as the servant of the people* seemed extraordinary to some commentators;² however, this is not the only verse in the Bible which presents such an idea. In 1 Sam 12:2 we hear that the new king, as well as the Judge Samuel who preceded him in the leadership, "walk about before the people," (עם) *התהלך לפני* (עם) that is, serve them.³ It is no coincidence that the latter verse appears within the framework of an anti-monarchic polemic.

The idea finds its continuation in Rabbinic literature. Rabban Gamliel turns to those to whom he is offering his leadership and says: "Do you imagine that I offer you rulership? It is servitude that I offer you; as it is said, 'And they spoke to him saying: "If you will be a servant unto this people this day"' " (B. Hor. 10a-b), and there (page a) one learns from the verse concerning Uziah *וישב בבית החפשי* (2 Kgs 15:5) that only by his becoming a leper was he free (*חפשי*), previously being a slave to his kingship.⁴

2. See, e.g., J. Gray, *1-2 Kings* (3rd ed.; Old Testament Library; London: SCM, 1970): 305: "The use of 'ebed and 'abad of the king in relation to the people is somewhat strange."

3. For the understanding of the expression and its parallels in Akkadian, see below, pp. 31, 41.

4. See the words of Maimonides in *Hilkot Melakim* 2:6.

Just as the scripture honored him (the king) and commanded everyone to honor him, so it commanded him to have a meek and humble heart, as it says (Ps 109:22), "for my heart is pierced within me," and he may not be overly haughty to a fellow Israelite, since it says (Deut 17:20), "Thus he will not act haughtily toward his brothers." And he should be merciful and pitying toward the weak and powerful, and he should come and go in a way that satisfies them and that they find becoming. And he should respect the honor of the least significant among them, and when he speaks to the assembled community in plural language, he should speak tenderly, as it says (1 Chr 28:2), "Hear me my kinsmen and my people," and it also says (1 Kgs 12:7), "If you will be a servant to these people today . . ." He should always be exceedingly modest, as there was no one greater than Moses our teacher, and he says (Exod 16:8), "What is our part? Your grumbling is not against us." And he shall tolerate their troubles and their burdens and their complaints (Num 11:12) "as a nurse carries an infant."

The text of 1 Kgs 12:7 not only brings up the matter of the service of this king towards the people, but also emphasizes—and this is in fact the real intention of the verse—the benefit to be bestowed upon the king as a result of his service, that is, the loyalty of the people to the king: should the king demonstrate loyalty to his subjects, they likewise will respond with loyalty towards him.

In this vein, indeed, Josephus portrays the negotiations between king Rehoboam and the people in *Antiquities* viii, 213-214. According to his account, the people demand an easing of servitude (*δουλεία*) and if the king would lighten the yoke of the kingdom, they would be loyal (*εὐνουστέροι*) to him,⁵ "and will lovingly accept upon themselves servitude⁶ if treated with kindness⁷ than if made to fear him." The advice of the elders to Rehoboam (*ibid.*, 215-216) is portrayed accordingly. These elders advise the king to respond graciously to the people, since in this manner he will assure their loyalty, and since it is only natural that subjects cherish generosity and equanimity on the king's part.

The scriptures called him a shepherd (Ps 78:71), "To the shepherd of his people Jacob."

For a similar conception of Moses as a humble king see Philo, *De Vita Mosis* I, 148-162; II, 48-51.

Moses does indeed view the leadership as a burden in Num 11:14,17; Deut 1:9, similar to *βάρος τῆς ἡγεμονίας* mentioned by Josephus in connection with Vespasian in *Jewish War* IV, 616 (see n. 9 below).

5. On *εὐνοέω* meaning 'to be loyal,' see my article "The Loyalty Oath in the Ancient Near East," *UF* 8 (1977): 383-384.

6. *καὶ ἀγαπήσειν τὴν δουλείαν*. The intention is to willing responsiveness and not by force, as shown by the continuation. On love and joy as expressions of willingness in ancient Hebrew and cuneiform literature, see Y. Muffs, "Joy and Love as Metaphorical Expressions of Willingness and Spontaneity in Cuneiform, Ancient Hebrew and Related Literatures," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (J. Neusner, ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1975): 1-36. Compare also in the Jewish evening prayer: "His kingdom they accepted willingly" (S. Singer, *The Standard Prayer Book* [New York: Bloch, 1943]: 135) and see my comments (N 1): 407 n. 254 and in "Pentecost as a Festival of the Giving of the Law," *Immanuel* 8 (1978): 11.

7. *ἐπιεικεία* appears frequently in the Hellenistic literature in relation to the ideal quality of the king; see O. Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," *JTS* NS 18 (1967): 353, and G. Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies I," *JSS* 4 (1959): 28. In his terminology Josephus is influenced by Hellenistic literature. Compare the Letter of Aristeas, §188.

Students of Hellenistic culture found the concept of the *king as servant of the people* expressed for the first time by king Antigonos Gonatas, the Macedonian philosopher (320-239 B.C.E.) who, in his rebuke to his son concerning the oppression of the citizens, says: "Do you not understand, my son, that our kingdom is held to be a noble servitude?" (εὐδοξος δουλεία).⁸ The idea of "a noble servitude" is thereafter reflected in the words of Stoic authors and philosophers,⁹ and the Principat of Augustus, Caesar of Rome, was described in the spirit of this notion.¹⁰ Moreover, even the words of the Jewish elders in the Letter of Aristeas in regard to the true function of the kingship and the obligations of the king toward the people have been interpreted against the background of this canon of Stoic philosophy.¹¹

The formulation of the most sublime conception of kingship was thus attributed to Antigonos Gonatas, as for example W. W. Tarn in his book on Antigonos Gonatas puts it: "It was he who laid down the highest view of kingship that the ancient world ever saw."¹² For some reason, scholars have failed to notice that the concept of the king as the servant of the people is found fully expressed in the Old Testament, especially in 1 Kgs 12:7. This verse, which describes the king as the servant of the people, appears in the context of rebellion on account of the heavy taxation. It serves to instruct that the king, who is not submissive to the will of the people and who burdens them with taxes, is destined to fail (see below). The Stoic philosophy also determined

8. Aelian, *Varia Historia* II.20.

9. See, e.g., the words of Seneca on the subject: *tu non experiris istud nobilem (not nobis, cf. U. Wilamowitz, "Lesefruechte," Hermes 37 [1902]: 307) esse tibi servitutem (De Clementia VIII.1)*. Cf. E. Kostermann, "Statio principis," *Philologus* 87 (1932): 436, and compare Suetonius in connection with Tiberias (24), who relates that a rigorous and encumbering servitude is cast upon him (*miseram et onerosam injungi sibi servitutem*). Note also the words of Josephus in regard to Vespasian, who takes upon himself "the burden of Rule" τὸ βάρος τῆς ἡγεμονίας (*Jewish War* IV, 626); see also Dio Chrysostomos, *περὶ βασιλείας* III.55.

10. See L. Delatte, *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Épiphane, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liege, fasc. 97; Liege: Faculté de la philosophie, 1942): 123-163.

11. See recently the various references on this matter in the article of D. Mendels, "'Kingship' in the Temple Scroll and the Symposia in the Letter of Aristeas," *Shaton* 3 (1978): 245-252 (Hebrew).

12. W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913): 253.

that taxes must be imposed with the agreement of the people, since the property of the people is not the property of the king. On the contrary: the kingdom is the property of the people.¹³

In Mesopotamia we do not hear that the king is considered the servant of the people. However, from a Mesopotamian document from the first millennium B.C.E. we learn that also in Mesopotamia it was endeavored that the king submit to the will of the people. So, for example, we read in the so-called "Advice to a Prince":¹⁴

A king who does not heed justice, his people will be thrown into chaos and his land will be devastated, (a king) who does not heed his nobles, his life will be cut short, (a king) who does not heed his adviser, his land will rebel against him.¹⁵ If he heeds a rogue his land will get into a state of confusion. . . .¹⁶ If citizens of Nippur (the holy city) are brought to him for judgment, and he accepts bribes from them and treats them with disrespect, Enlil, lord of the lands, will bring forth a foreign army against him. . . . If he mobilized the whole of Sippar, Nippur and Babylon and imposed forced labor on the people . . . Marduk, the sage of the gods . . . will turn his land over to his enemy. . . .

Similarly, we hear about the Assyrian king Shalmaneser V (726-722 B.C.E.) who failed and lost his kingdom because he imposed a heavy tax on the city of Asshur¹⁷ (see below).

Diodorus Siculus, who describes the practices of the kings of ancient Egypt, drawing upon Hecataeus of Abdera,¹⁸ also extols

13. Such things are said in regards to Antigonos Gonatas, *ibid.*, 255, n. 120.

14. W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960): 112-115.

15. Cf. below, pp. 35-36.

16. In 1 Kgs 12 we find good advisors and bad advisors; the king's failure is due to his heeding the bad advisors. The relation of a king to his good and bad advisors is reflected also in the proverbs related to the king in Prov 16:12-13: "Wickedness is abhorrent to kings, for a throne rests firm on righteousness. Honest speech is the desire of kings, they love a man who speaks the truth," and also Prov 29:12: "A prince who listens to falsehood, all his servants are wicked." On the ideal advisor to the king see also Ps 101:6-7: "My eyes are on the trusty men of the land, to have them at my side . . . he who speaks untruth shall not stand before my eyes." Cf. also the testament of Darius in W. Hinz, *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969): 56-57, §8b.

17. See M. W. F. Saags, "Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon of Assyria: I. The Assur Charter," *Iraq* 37 (1975): 11.

18. On the reliability of Hecataeus' account see F. Jacoby, *PW* 7.2764; E.

the reciprocal relations between the king and the people in Egypt. After describing the ideal relations between the king and his people (Book I, 70) he relates that, because the kings followed a righteous course dealing with their subjects, the people demonstrated loyalty (εὐνοια) to them (ibid., 71,4).¹⁹

The concept of the kingdom as an institution subservient to the people is not, therefore, the innovation of Stoic philosophy. Its roots are in the Near East. In the light of the identity found between 1 Kgs 12:7 and the saying of Antigonos Gonatas concerning the kingship as servitude, the question is, of course, raised if perhaps this notion reached the Stoics from the Orient. It seems to me that we can answer this question in the affirmative. Antigonos Gonatas was the pupil of Zenon, the founder of the Stoic school,²⁰ who came from a Phoenician settlement in Kition in the isle of Cyprus.²¹ It is then not impossible that Zenon imported this canon from the East.

In another place, I endeavor to show that the literary genre of advice for the king, *περὶ βασιλείας*, which was so popular in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, is rooted in the East.²² If so, it is surely reasonable that the view of *the king as the servant of the people* also, which stands behind these rules, was not necessarily born in Greece.

II

Up to now we have discussed the general idea of the king as servant of the people expressed in the first part of 1 Kgs 12:7.

Meyer, "Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft und Standeswesen in Agypten," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Philosophische-historische Klasse, 1928): 529. On the reliability of the first book of Diodorus, see A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus I, Commentary* (Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 29; Leiden: Brill, 1972).

19. On a parallel to Diodoros' ideal description of the Egyptian king in the Temple Scroll from Qumran, see my article, "The Royal Guard According to the Temple Scroll," *RB* 87 (1980): forthcoming.

20. On Zenon as the teacher of Antigonos see Tarn (N 12): 31-36.

21. His father was Mnaseas = Manasses (see U. Wilamowitz, *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen und Römer* [Die Kultur der Gegenwart, T. 2, Abt. IV, 1; Berlin: Teubner, 1910]: 167), which is Hebrew "Menasseh" and in Phoenician *mnsy*. On *mnsy* in Phoenician see recently F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Studia Pohl 8; Rome: PBI, 1972): s.v.

22. See my article "Temple Scroll," *Shnaton* 3 (1978): 224-231.

Now we pass to the second part of this verse, which, as will be shown, refers to the practical side of the issue: grants and exemptions established by the king. The phrase *ועניתם אליהם ודברתם אליהם* should be rendered "and you will respond to them and set good conditions." Let us adduce the evidence for this rendering.

The form *ועניתם* was dropped not only in Chronicles but in the LXX translation of 1 Kgs 12:7 as well²³—apparently due to the translator's difficulty in understanding it.²⁴ Exegetes and linguists rightly felt that this term expresses responsiveness and appeasement,²⁵ but thus far, no evidence for this usage has been found

23. It was restored to the Greek version by Origen in the Hexapla, following Aquila and Symmachus: *καὶ εἴξεις αὐτοῖς* (cf. F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* [2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875]: 1.620; J. Reider, N. Turner, *Index to Aquila* [VTSup 12; Leiden: Brill, 1966]: 67) and from there it seems to have entered the Vulgate: *et petitioni eorum cesseris*, "and submit to their request," a translation which is exactly in accord with the Greek *εἴκειν*. (This verb is not found in LXX to any canonical book; cf. E. Hatch, H. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* [2 vols.; Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1954]: 1.377.) Even though the rendition in the LXX and Vulgate makes sense in the present context, it does not reflect the Hebrew *Vorlage* because *ענה*, meaning 'submit,' appears with the preposition *מן* (Isa 31:4) or *מפני* (Exod 10:3) and not with the accusative.

24. E. L. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischer Bibel* 7 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914): 244, emends the passage to *וענית ודברת*. But this is a purely arbitrary correction. In addition, it should be pointed out that *ענה ודבר*, in contrast to *ענה ויאמר* is a rare expression in the Bible; and, where it does occur (Josh 22:21; 2 Kgs 1:12), it introduces direct speech.

25. Cf., e.g., W. Gesenius, F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (17th ed.; Berlin: Springer, 1949): 603: "auf seine Wünsche eingehen." *BDB*: 772: "be responsive, answer kindly, grant request." Perhaps somewhat similar is Eccl 10:19 *הכסף יענה את הכל* (see H. L. Ginsberg, *Qohelet* (Tel-Aviv/Jerusalem: Newman, 1961): 124 (Hebrew), where he interprets the passage: "as one who complied with a request." However, his comparison with Hos 2:23-24 (following Ibn-Ezra on Hosea) is not cogent in my opinion. It seems to me that Hosea is speaking of responsiveness with erotic overtones and against the background of fertility imagery, for which compare Sultantepe Tablet 136 in the incipit of an incantation: *ktma šamū u ersetu ana aššūti innaḥazū* "as heaven and earth were joined in marriage" (O. R. Gurney, P. Hulin, *The Sultantepe Tablets* 2 [London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1964]: no. 136). Compare also in connection with marriage between heaven and earth: "Heaven spoke with the earth and the earth spoke with heaven" (V. Dijk, "Le motif cosmique dans la pensée Sumérienne," *AcOr* 28 [1964]: 36-37, lines 10-15). On the concept of cohabitation of heaven and earth for fertility purposes (*hieros gamos*) in Greece see M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechisch Religion* 1 (3rd ed.; München: Beck, 1967): 120-122.

elsewhere in the Bible. The clause ודברת רברים טובים “and speak good words unto them,” has also not been sufficiently clarified. Usually the phrase is translated by some form of “speaking kindly to them.” But would the king actually appease the people with pleasant words? Do not people rather demand concrete action to relieve their plight? Our discussion will therefore revolve around these expressions and attempt to clarify them with reference to the relationships of a king to his subjects, as expressed in ancient Near Eastern royal documents.

To begin our search for a solution to the problem we will refer to an Assyrian text, which reflects a special situation very reminiscent of 1 Kgs 12:7 and its context. This text is one of a series of documents of exemptions and grants awarded by the Assyrian king to his loyal servants.²⁷ Part of it reads as follows:²⁸

I, Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, . . . who responds in goodness / in kindness ([*ina*] *damqāt[ī]*) to courtiers who serve him [lit., stand before him] and returns kindness to the reverent who keeps his royal command . . . PN . . . who served wholeheartedly his master served me [lit., stood before me] with truth, acted perfectly [lit., walked in perfection]²⁹ . . . and kept the guard of my kingdom . . . I

27. On this matter see J. N. Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (Studia Pohl, Series Maior 1; Rome: PBI, 1969): 27-38. On grants at Ugarit, see A. F. Rainey, “The System of Landgrants at Ugarit in its Wider Near Eastern Setting,” *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1 (1967): 187-191; and for the Middle Babylonian period, see F. R. Kraus, “Ein mittelbabylonischer Reschtsterminus,” *Symbolae Martino David dedicatae* 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1968): 9-40.

28. See texts 9, 10, 11 in Postgate (N 27): 27-34. Postgate newly edited the texts published in cuneiform by C. H. J. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* 4 (Cambridge: Bell, 1924): 164-170, nos. 646-648; transliteration by L. Köhler, A. Ungnad, *Assyrische Rechtsurkunden* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1913): nos. 15-18. The texts are identical in content and our text citations are from Postgate (N 27): no. 9, lines 4-35, 10:4-35, 11:4-32. For clarification of the terms for loyalty and the typological parallels in the OT to those texts, with particular reference to the covenants with Abraham and David, see my article, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East,” *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184-203, and my book, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (London: Oxford Univ., 1972): 75-81.

29. On the meaning of this idiom and its biblical parallels see my “Covenant of Grant” (N 28): 185-186.

took favorable thought for him³⁰ and I have established his gift.³¹ Fields, orchards and people, which he acquired under my protection, . . . I have exempted (from taxes), wrote down and sealed with my royal seal; . . . corn taxes of that land shall not be collected, the levy on their herds and flocks shall not be levied. The (people) of the fields and orchards shall not be called up for corvée labor (*ilku tupšikku*) and for military conscription (*dikūt māti*).

The special privileges granted here to servants of the king of Assyria, especially exemption from corvée labor, were in fact also given to entire cities in Mesopotamia, and particularly to temple cities.³² Cancellation of these privileges was seen as sufficient cause for the breakdown of authority and the overthrow of the royal dynasty. Thus, Sargon, king of Assyria, recounts³³ that his predecessor (Shalmaneser V, 727-722 B.C.E.), who did not fear the gods, imposed on the city of Asshur *ilku tupšikku* (= corvée)³⁴ obligations. For this the god Asshur decided to put an end to his reign and replace him with Sargon, who returned to Asshur its *zakūtu* (exemption from royal obligations). Besides the exemption from corvée work, the *zakūtu* included exemption from military conscriptions (*dikūt māti*),³⁵ from the herald’s cry

30. According to Postgate’s new reading (after collation): [*ta-a*] *b-ta-šu aḥ-su-us-ma* ([N 27]: pl. 7, line 22) in place of the earlier reading *inā at-ta-šu aḥsusma* (Köhler-Ungnad [N 27]: no. 16).

31. I suggested the reading *ši-ri-[ik]-šu* even before the appearance of Postgate’s book (“Covenant of Grant” [N 28]: 188, n. 32). Postgate suggests *ši-ri-i[k-ta-šu]* ([N 27]: 28, line 22), but also *širku* occurs as a grant in Neo-Assyrian texts; cf. my article “Covenant Terminology in the Ancient Near East and its Influence on the West,” *JAOS* 93 (1973): 195, n. 77.

32. See H. Tadmor, “Temple Cities and Royal Cities in Babylonia and Assyria,” in *The City and Community, Collected Lectures Presented at the Twelfth Congress of Historical Study* (1968): 179-205 (Hebrew); cf. also most recently H. Reviv, “Kidinnu, Observations on Privileges of Mesopotamian Cities,” *Shnaton* 2 (1977): 205-216 (Hebrew).

33. Cf. Saggs, “Historical Texts,” (N 17): 11.

34. For *ilku tupšikku* and the nature of *ilku* service, cf. J. N. Postgate, *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire* (Studia Pohl, Series Maior 3; Rome: PBI, 1974): 80-81.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 218.

(*šišīt nāgiri*)³⁶ and from dues on quay and crossing (*miksi kārī nēbiri*).³⁷

In another Mesopotamian document, "Advice to the Prince," quoted above, which consists of a list of warnings to the king who oppresses and suppresses his people, we read:³⁸ "if he mobilized the whole of Sippar, Nippur and Babylon and imposed forced labor (*tupšikku*) on the people, exacting from them a corvée (*ilku*) at the herald's proclamation, Marduk . . . will turn his land over to his enemy" (lines 23-27). These warnings, especially the threat of the country rising up against the king, are most helpful for illuminating the pericope with which we are dealing in 1 Kgs 12:7. Note that in v 4, preceding the pericope, Rehoboam, the new king, is called upon to free his people from his father Solomon's heavy yoke (מעלו הכבד) and the hard labor (עבדת אביר) involved with corvée. The "heavy yoke" and "hard labor," which Solomon imposed (נתן) upon the people and from which they wish to be freed, are none other than forced labor: סבל and סם, about which we are told in the preceding chapters (1 Kgs 5:27-29; 9:21; 11:28), and which are of a type now known from the cuneiform sources in the West (Alalah, Mari and El-Amarna³⁹). Furthermore, the idioms used for the imposition of corvée also appear in their Akkadian forms in Mesopotamia in

36. The phrase *šišīt nāgiri* is equivalent, in my opinion, to *qōl nōgēš* in Job 3:18. The *nōgēš* in the Bible is one who (usually in the name of the authorities) exacts forced labor (cf. the *nōgēšim* assigned to oversee the סבלות 'burdens' (= corvée) of the Israelites in Exod 5:6,10,13,14) and payment of taxes (2 Kgs 23:35 and cf. Isa 3:5,12). In the Old Babylonian period this task is carried out by the *mušaddinu* (one who causes one to give) who, like the *nāgiri* also "calls" (*šasū*) for the payment of a debt (cf. F. R. Kraus, *Ein Edikt des Königs Ammisaduqa von Babylon* [Leiden: Brill, 1958]: §4, pp. 28, 50-56).

37. For these, see references in Postgate, *Taxation* (N 34): 131-133.

38. See Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (N 14): 112-115. The tablet bears a colophon which states that the text was selected for the perusal of the king (cf. I. M. Diakonoff, "A Babylonian Political Pamphlet from about 700 BC," in *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger on his Seventy-fifth Birthday* [M. G. Güterbock, Th. Jacobsen, eds.; Assyriological Studies 16; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1965]: 349, n. 24), which reminds us of the Law of the King (Deut 17:14-20), which is destined for his reading (vv 18-19).

39. See P. Artzi, "Sablum = סבל," *BIES* 18 (1954): 66-70 (Hebrew); M. Held, "The Root ZBL / SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *JAOS* 88 (1968): 90-96; A. F. Rainey, "Compulsory Labour Gangs in Ancient Israel," *IEJ* 20 (1970): 191-202.

connection with the laying on and freeing from a yoke. The "heavy yoke" (עלו הכבד in 1 Kgs 12:4) is the equivalent of *nīru kabtu* encountered in Akkadian literature in connection with carrying the yoke of domination,⁴⁰ i.e., the yoke of tribute and forced labor.⁴¹ The "hard labor" (עבדת אביר הקשה in 1 Kgs 12:4) is equivalent to *dullu dannu*.⁴² The 'ol 'yoke' and 'ābōdā^h 'labor,' when objects of the verb נתן, are semantically equivalent to *dulla/nīra emēdu*.⁴³

It seems quite reasonable then that the Israelite assembly (קהל ישראל) and especially the people of Shechem, the capital of Ephraim, demanded exemption of the type granted to important

40. Cf., e.g., *nīr belūtiya kabta elišunu ukīn* "I placed the heavy yoke of my overlordship upon them" (*The Annals of the King of Assyria* [L. W. King, E. A. Wallis Budge, eds.; London: Longmans, 1902]: 57, col. 3, lines 85-86 [Tiglath-Pileser II]); cf. also R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien* (AfO, Beiheft 9; Graz: Selbstverlag des Herausgebers, 1956): 51, line 55; also S. Langdon, *Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912): 68, line 18: *ina nirišu kabti ušazziqu nišim māti* "(the Assyrian king who) has made the people of the country suffer from the heavy yoke," to which compare Isa 47:6-7: "You showed them no mercy . . . you made your yoke very heavy (הכבדת עלך סאר); you thought 'I shall always be the mistress'" (applied here to Babylon).

41. Cf., e.g., in the Ashurbanipal annals: *nīr Aššur emissunūti . . . biltu maddattu belūtiya . . . emissunūti*, "I imposed on them the yoke of Aššur . . . the tribute of my overlordship I imposed on them" (M. Streck, *Assurbanipal 2* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916]: 40, IV, lines 103-104). Compare also 'ol 'yoke' in connection with סבל of Assur in Isa 9:3: "the yoke of his load (סבל = 'basket'), the shackle (read סקת; cf. Lev 26:13; Ezek 34:27) of his shoulder" (cf. Ps 81:7: "I relieved his shoulder of the load (סבל); his hands were freed from the basket"); also Isa 14:25: "his yoke shall drop off them, and the load (סבל) shall drop from his shoulder." For the idiom "carrying the yoke of the king," cf. El-Amarna 296:38: *giš niri* (gloss *hullu* = 'ol) *šarri beliya ana k[iš]ādiya u ubbalušu*, "the yoke of the king my lord is upon my neck and I carry it"; cf. also 257:15 (*Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* [J. A. Knudtzon, ed.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915]).

42. L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1930): 336-337, letter no. 479, reverse, line 2; E. Ebeling, *Neubabylonische Briefe* (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse N.F. Heft 30; München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1949): *passim*; cf. Index in E. Ebeling, *Glossar zu den Neubabylonischen Briefen* (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahr 1953, Heft 1; München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1953).

43. See references in *CAD* E, pp. 142-143 in connection with the idioms *dulla emēdu*, *kudurra emēdu*, *nīra emēdu*, *tupšikka emēdu*, and cf. Held (N 39): 94-95.

and sacred cities in the ancient Near Eastern world and apparently also to Jerusalem and other parts of Judah.⁴⁴

Exemption of cities from taxes, corvée and military services are known to us in Mesopotamia from the beginning of the second millennium onwards. Thus we hear that Išme-dagan, the king of Isin (1953-1935 B.C.E.), freed Nippur, the holy city, from taxes and that he put down the weapons of the army (UGNIM-BI GIŠ TUKUL-BI-HĒ-GA-AR).⁴⁵ In other documents we hear about exemption from military obligation (EREN-BI KASKAL-TA).⁴⁶ Lipit-Ištar, king of Isin (1934-1924 B.C.E.), tells us in the prologue to his Code that he summoned brothers of the "paternal house" for only 70 days yearly (see below), whereas from the "house of the young men" he summoned for 10 (days) monthly.⁴⁷ Another king of Isin, whose identity is not established, proclaims: "In Isin I established equity . . . the grain taxes, which reached to one fifth, I reduced to one tenth; I imposed on the *muškenum* 4 days' work monthly. . . ."⁴⁸

Such exemptions were sometimes integrated within a reform applied to the whole country, the so-called *mīšārum* and *andurārum*.⁴⁹ Thus we find in the Edict of Ammišaduqa⁵⁰ that the

44. The district of Judah is not mentioned in the list of the twelve districts burdened with provisions for the king (1 Kings 4). For the favoritism shown to Judah by David and its consequences (i.e., the revolt of the North), see most recently F. Crüsemann, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978): Part II.

45. D. O. Edzard, *Die Zweite Zwischenzeit Babyloniens* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957): 80, B, line 47.

46. Ibid., p. 81 (cf. R. J. Stephens, *Votive and Historical Texts from Babylonia and Assyria* [YOS 9; New Haven: Yale Univ., 1937]: 25, line 11).

47. Edzard, *Zwischenzeit* (N 45): 96.

48. Cf. D. O. Edzard, "Soziale Reformen" in *Zweistromland*, *Acta Antiqua* (Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae) 22 (1974): 151.

49. See J. Levy, "The Biblical Institution of *Deror* in the Light of Akkadian Documents," *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958): 27-31; F. R. Kraus, *Edikt* (N 36): 224-247; J. Finkelstein, "Amisaduqa's Edict and the Babylonian 'Law Codes,'" *JCS* 15 (1961): 91-104. On *andurārum* see *CAD* A/2, s.v. That the corvée exemptions were associated with the *andurāru* may be learned from the royal title of Merodach Baladan II: *šākin andurāri, ḫātin šabē kidīni* = "(he who) establishes freedom, protects the people with the *kidinnu* privileges" (see Reviv, "Kidinnu" [N 32]: 208); for *kidinnu* see below.

50. F. R. Kraus, *Edikt* (N 36): 39, §17 and J. Finkelstein in *ANESTP*: 526-527, §19. Finkelstein has published two additional paragraphs of the Edict (see "The Edict of Ammisaduqa: A New Text," *RA* 63 [1969]: 45-46) and thus the numbers of the paragraphs have changed.

soldier and the fisherman should be exempted from the *ilku* service, following the proclamation of the *mīšārum*. Similarly, we hear that Samsuiluna (within the framework of a reform) freed the soldier and the fisherman from their debts to the crown.⁵¹ Exemption of major religious cities from tax and corvée, the so-called *kidinnūtu* and *zakūtu*, are known to us from the Kassite period⁵² onward. In the first millennium B.C.E. *kidinnūtu* marks the special rights of sacred cities in Mesopotamia.⁵³

Similar exemptions were apparently demanded by the people of northern Israel in Shechem. The corvée imposed by Solomon on the Israelites and especially the corvée of בִּית יוֹסֵף (cf. 1 Kgs 11:28) may be exemplified by 1 Kgs 5:27-32. Thirty thousand people were subject to מַס and were sent to work in Lebanon, while another 150 thousand were engaged in סַבֵּל and in "quarrying." It seems that מַס and סַבֵּל are to be identified with the two Mesopotamian terms for compulsory service, *ilku* and *tupšikku*. The former denotes service for the state in general—military or civilian—and, as may be learned from the etymology of the word *ilku* (< *alāku*) and from its combination with *ḫarranu*,⁵⁴ it originally denoted the service involved in going on a campaign.⁵⁵ The latter term, *tupšikku*, however, is limited to work connected with "carrying the basket," i.e., building construction. Similarly, *mas* in Hebrew and *massu* in the cuneiform documents from the West⁵⁶ imply general service,⁵⁷ like *ilku*, usually performed far from home;⁵⁸ while סַבֵּל, like *tupšikku* is limited to building

51. Cf. Kraus, *Edikt* (N 36): 226.

52. See J. A. Brinkman, "The Monarchy of the Kassite Dynasty," *Le Palais et la Royauté, XIX^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Paris: Geuthner, 1974): 407 and n. 37.

53. Cf. Reviv, "Kidinnu" (N 32): 205-216.

54. Cf. *ilku ḫarranum* (*CAD* H, p. 112) and *alik ḫarrani* (*CAD* A/1, p. 342). See also in the Advice to the Prince: *ana ḫarrāni ušēṣṣuṣunūti*, "(if) he sends them on a campaign," Lambert, *Wisdom* (N 38): 114, line 52.

55. In later Neo-Assyrian times the distinction between *ilku* and *tupšikku* was blurred, and they became a kind of hendiadys denoting work for the crown in general. Cf. Postgate, *Taxation* (N 34): 81.

56. Cf. Rainey, "Labor Gangs" (N 39): 192-202.

57. *Massu* in Alalah was used with the verb *alāku* (cf. D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* [London: British School of Archaeology, 1953]: *169:18, *259:15-17, and see Rainey, "Labor Gangs" [N 39]: 192-193) which, like *ilku alāku*, means to perform corvée work.

58. Compare 1 Kgs 5:27-28: "King Solomon raised *mas* from all Israel and the *mas* was thirty thousand men. He sent them to Lebanon . . ."

activity⁵⁹ and was associated with carrying on the "shoulder."⁶⁰

The demand for release from the heavy yoke of Solomon may be put in perspective by comparing it with the alleviation of the corvée by Lipit-Ištar, referred to above. Lipit-Ištar boasts that he summoned the men of the paternal house for seventy days a year (approximately a fifth of the year) while Solomon's summons were for a third of the year.⁶¹

In sum: the assembly of Israel demands release of the "heavy yoke," that is, exemption from *mas* and *sēbel* which Solomon had imposed upon them. These terms are equivalent to *ilku* and *tupšikku*, from which important Mesopotamian cities were exempted, not only on behalf of the king, but also on behalf of the gods.⁶² This manner of forced labor for the king was considered a religious crime in Israel, as may be learned from Jer 22:13-14. In these verses Jehoiakim, who is known from elsewhere in exacting heavy tribute from the people (2 Kgs 23:35), is accused of constructing his palaces by making his fellow men work without pay.⁶³ He thus violates "righteousness and justice" (v 13)⁶⁴ which constitute "knowledge of God" (v 16).

Let us now turn to our comparison of the passage from 1 Kgs 12:7 with Ashurbanipal's exemption document; for, in light of our discussion, we can learn more now about the answer of the *zaqēnim* to Rehoboam.

59. Cf. Held, "ZBL/SBL" (N 39): 90-96. note that *sablum* at Mari is associated with 'youth' *šeḫrum* (cf. Rainey, "Labor Gangs" [N 39]: 195). This may explain the specification of Jeroboam as נער in connection with commissioning him "over all the *sēbel* of the house of Joseph" (1 Kgs 11:28).

60. Cf. note 41 above.

61. "One month in Lebanon and two at home" (1 Kgs 5:28). Compare a Hittite document concerning feudal obligations: "PN will work four days for the king's land and four days for his house (ē-ti-šū); see R. K. Riemschneider, "Zum Lehnswesen bei den Hethitern," *ArOr* 33 (1965): 337-338, lines 2-7. For the expression לביתו (= ē-ti-šū) in the context discussed here, compare Deut 24:5 "he shall be exempt one year for his house (לבייתו)."

62. Cf. my forthcoming monograph on *Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations; Equality and Freedom in Israel in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Concepts of Social Justice*.

63. For wages paid to corvée workers compare *idi* LÜ MEŠ *massi* and *igir* LÜ MEŠ *massi* in Alalakh (cf. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* [N 57]: 15-17, 269:18, 268:14, and Rainey, "Labor Gangs" [N 39]: 192-193).

64. For משפט וצדקה and its connection with royal exemptions, cf. my forthcoming study on the subject (N 62).

Of crucial importance is the first sentence of the Assyrian document: "Who answers (constantly = Gtn)⁶⁵ in goodness (or kindness)." The word translated as "answers" is *it-ta-nab/p-ba/pā-lu*. It is generally associated with the verb *abālu* ('to carry'); and, in the present context, it is given the meaning 'treat, behave,'⁶⁶ even though there is no concrete evidence for this interpretation.⁶⁷ I suggest reading the word with the alternate sign values *it-ta-nap-pā-lu*,⁶⁸ and deriving it from *apālu* ('to answer'). This reading is supported by two passages from Esarhaddon's vassal treaty with the Medes.⁶⁹ Although Wiseman reads *tatanabbalšūni* therein,⁷⁰ R. Borger correctly realized that this form should be read *tatanappalšūni*.⁷¹ Thus we read: "If you do not hold fast perfect truth,⁷² if you do not respond to him (*tatanappalšūni*) (with) uprightness and integrity,⁷³ speak with a

65. Compare ענייתם in 1 Kgs 12:7, which follows an imperfect, תהיה (ם), and expresses a repetitive action; see S. R. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892): 127, §113 (4a).

66. See, for example, *CAD* A/1, p. 23, n. 7b: "who treats (graciously)," and also Postgate's translation of this sentence: "who behaves (kindly)" (*Taxation* [N 34]: 36).

67. It is interesting that the meanings assigned to *abālu* in the paragraph under discussion in *CAD* A/1, p. 23, n. 7b are: *to direct, manage, organize*, while in the translation of our passage the form is read "treats," thus deviating significantly from the definitions given initially.

68. In the Neo-Assyrian syllabary *ba* has the value *pā*; cf. W. von Soden, W. Röllig, *Das Akkadische Syllabar* (2nd ed.; AnOr 42; Rome: PBI, 1967): 2.

69. D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq* 20 (1958): 35, line 98; 47, line 236.

70. Cf. also *CAD* A/1, p. 23, n. 7b.

71. See on these lines R. Borger, "Zu den Asarhaddon-Verträgen aus Nimrud," *ZA* 20 (1961): 177, 182. E. Reiner's objection in *ANET*³: 99, n. 7 (= *ANET*³: 535) is not substantiated.

72. *Kitu šalmitu la tukallani*. *CAD* contradicts itself in the translation of this phrase: in K, p. 469 we read: "(if) you do not report the full truth," whereas on p. 515 of that volume the phrase occurs under the meaning "to grant a boon," which might be reflected in E. Reiner's translation "to offer complete truth" (*ANET*³: 99 = *ANET*³: 535). Wiseman's translation is still the best: "You will hold perfect justice" and a similar rendering may be recognized in *AHW*: 503: "Recht einhalten," which is to be compared to החזיק בצדקה/בתום; cf. Job 2:3,9; 27:6.

73. *Kināte taršāti* like *damqāti* (see below) are plural substantives which express the attributes of loyalty and integrity; cf. Hebrew מוֹבוֹת, צְדָקוֹת, יִשְׁרִים, and especially הַלֵךְ צְדָקוֹת וְדָבַר מִיִּשְׁרִים in Isa 33:15 "he who walks in righteousness and speaks uprightly."

the Sabbath. In fact all the three stipulations in this verse—מצא חפץ, עשות דרך, רבר רבר—are associated with business transactions. Like רבר רבר (see below), מצא חפץ and עשה דרך have their semantic equivalents in Akkadian expressions that are clearly connected with business transactions and business journey, and it even seems that we meet here with Babylonian influence on the rhetoric of the prophet.

Both עשות חפץ and מצא חפץ (cf. also Isa 58:5) are equivalent to Akkadian *epēš šibūti* “doing business” and *kašād šibūti* “completing the enterprise.”⁸² On the other hand, עשות דרך finds its

לעשות את עבודת חפצו השבת (CD 10:18-21) and see L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976): 59, 108-109; cf. further the Rabbinic sources: *M. Šabb.* 23:1-3; *T. Šabb.* 17(18):10; *B. Šabb.* 150a, and cf. also R. Weiss, “Two Notes,” *Leshonenu* 37 (1972-1973): 306 (Hebrew). One must add, however, that in Qumran, as well as in Rabbinic sources, the verse was also understood in the sense “to refrain from uttering mean words”: CD 10:17-18: אל ירבר איש רבר נבל ורק “let no man speak a lewd or villainous word” (or “a vain [נבל instead of הבל] or empty word,” cf. Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1958]: 52). Compare Tg. Jon. Isa 58:13: למלא מלין ראונים “to utter words of violence.” Compare further v 9 there, where רבר און is translated by באונים. For the Rabbinic sources cf. *Y. Šabb.* 15a; compare also *B. Šabb.* 113a-b, and see Leviticus Rabbah (*Midrash Leviticus Rabbah* [M. Margulies, ed., 5 vols.; Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1953-1960]) 34,16 (pp. 814-815) and the references cited there. This tradition has penetrated the Christian sources. Thus we read in the Apostolic Constitutions vii, 36:5: “That no one may desire to utter a word in anger on the day of Sabbath,” ὅπως μηδὲ λόγον τις ἐκ ὀργῆς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ προέσθαι θελήσῃ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββᾶτων (F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* [Paderbornae: Schoeningh, 1905]: 434). For uttering a word in anger (ἐν ὀργῆς) compare 1QS 7:2 רבר בחמה. In the same section (7:9) we have רבר בפיהו רבר נבל, a phrase virtually identical with the one in CD 10:17-18 quoted above.

82. For חפץ in the sense of business and commerce see especially 1 Kgs 5:22-24; 10:13 and cf. M. Eilat, *Economic Relations in the Lands of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1977): 191 (Hebrew), and for *šibūtu* cf. *CAD E*, p. 218; §, pp. 169-170. The phrases *epēš šibūti* and *kašād šibūti* occur often in Neo-Babylonian letters and contracts and strengthen our supposition that Babylonian-Aramaic influence may be reflected in Isaiah 58. Aramaic צבו/צבותא equals Hebrew חפץ; cf. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965): 31-32; J. C. Greenfield, “Studies in Legal Terminology of the Nabatean Funerary Inscription,” in *H. Yalon Memorial Volume* (E. Y. Kutscher, S. Lieberman, M. Z. Kaddari, eds.; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Univ., 1974): 67. For צבו as business, cf. especially in the Palmyrene inscriptions: *wsy^c tgr^y bkl šbw* “and he helped the merchants with everything (= with all the business),” (*Inventaire des inscriptions de Palmyre* fasc. 10 [J.

equivalent in Akkadian *ḥarrānu epēšu* “to undertake a business journey.”⁸³ Furthermore, in the Neo-Babylonian sources we find side-by-side the expressions for undertaking a journey and doing business in the same vein as Isa 58:13. Thus, for example: “You went on a journey with me but you were not doing my business”⁸⁴ or “this day is favorable for taking a journey . . . and undertaking a business enterprise.”⁸⁵ The prophet’s admonition about refraining from business activities on the Sabbath is to be seen against the background of the Exile and Restoration when there was apparent laxity in this matter. This may be deduced from the admonition in Jer 17:19-22 and the rigorous action of Nehemiah, as described in Neh 13:15-22.

The expression רבר רבר in the sense “make an agreement” occurs in 1 Sam 20:23: בני ובינך ער והרבר אשר דברנו אני ואתה הנה ה' ביני ובינך ער. Here רבר רבר refers undoubtedly to the covenant⁸⁶ and oath which were exchanged according to vv 14-17 of the same chapter. The *NEB* rightly translates this verse: “the Lord stand witness between us forever to the pledges we have exchanged.” This is also the case of Hos 10:4: “Uttering words (רברו רברים), swearing falsely, making a covenant”; where the רברים, as explained by the context, mean reaching an agreement and making a covenant, similar to רבר רבר in Isa 8:10, which we discussed above.⁸⁷ In Akkadian, too, *awātam dabābu* connotes reaching an agreement, as in *īštu awātum ša idbubu ibbalakkitu* “(if) he breaks his word which he spoke (namely, the agreement which he made).”⁸⁸

Starcky, ed.; Damascus: La Direction Générale des Antiquités de Syrie, 1949]: 31, no. 44, line 6). A striking parallel to “(refrain) from pursuing business on my holy day” can be found in the Assyrian hemerologies which specify the days which are not fit for any enterprise (*ana epēš šibūtu la naṭu*); cf. *CAD E*, p. 218.

83. Cf. *CAD H*, p. 110-111 and *E*, p. 208.

84. *ḥarrāna ittiya tattalak šibūtā ul iēpuš*; see *CAD E*, p. 218.

85. *ana alāk ḥarrāni . . . u epēš šibūtu šalmar*; see *CAD E*, p. 218.

86. For רבר in the sense of covenant cf. Hag 2:5: והרבר אשר כרתה; Deut 9:5: הרבר את בריתו; which is to be compared with הרבר את בריתו in 8:18; Ps 105:8 where רבר parallels ברית. See my article “ברית” in *TWAT*: 1.786.

87. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974): 175: “The phrase ‘uttering (empty) words’ denotes meaningless political agreements also in Is 8:10 (cf. Is 58:13).”

88. E. A. Speiser, R. H. Pfeiffer, *One Hundred New Selected Nuzi Texts* (AASOR 16; New Haven: J. D. Nies Publication Fund, 1936): 55, line 44.

In an Aramaic legal settlement between two persons from the Seventh Century B.C.E.⁸⁹ we read similarly about an m , i.e., a 'word' (= 'settlement')⁹⁰ that the parties made: $\text{mhm } \text{šmw}$. As in the Akkadian text quoted immediately above, this Aramaic text contains a warning clause against withdrawal or "return to suit one against the other": $\text{mn } \text{cl } \text{mn } \text{yšb}$.⁹¹

We have spoken thus far only of *dibber dābar*, but the expression which actually appears in 1 Kgs 12:7 is דברת... דברים . One might rightfully disagree, therefore, with our suggested explanation and claim that, nonetheless, appeasement is spoken of, as it is with the angel speaking in Zechariah: "good words, comforting words" (1:13). However, we shall see immediately that the qualification of דברים by טובים does not invalidate our proposed understanding, but, to the contrary, advances it even further. In a detailed treatment of the word טובה in the Aramaic Sefire treaty, W. L. Moran rightly claimed⁹² that this word means "amity established by treaty."⁹³ In the course of his discussion he also touched on the Akkadian evidence. There he found that "good words" or "good things" can have a specific connotation of treaty and covenant. So, for instance, a Mari text states:⁹⁴ *awātim damqātim biritiya u biritišu niš ilim u riksātim dannātim nišakkan* "We will establish 'good things,' a divine oath and a binding [lit., strong]⁹⁵ covenant⁹⁶ between me and him." Moran

89. Cf. P. Bordreuil, "Une tablette araméenne inédite de 635 av. J. C.," *Semitica* 23 (1973): 96-102; S. A. Kaufman, "An Assyro-Aramaic *egirtu ša šulmu*," in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (Maria de Jong Ellis, ed.; Hamden: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1977): 119-127.

90. Aramaic m here equals Akkadian *amātu* 'word,' although the form is not necessarily cognate; see Kaufman, "*egirtu*" (N 89): 122.

91. Cf. Kaufman, "*egirtu*" (N 89): 124, who compares it with Akkadian *mannu ša ina eli mannu ibbalakkatuni*.

92. W. L. Moran, "A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas," *JNES* 22 (1963): 173-176 to Sefire I C:4-5, 19-20; II B:2; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (BibOr 19; Rome: PBI, 1967): 73-74.

93. On 'brotherhood' and 'friendship' expressing covenantal relationship in the ancient Near East as well as in the Greco-Roman sphere see my "Covenant Terminology" (N 31): 190-193.

94. G. Dossin, "Iamhad et Qatanum," *RA* 36 (1939): 57, lines 7-10.

95. Akkadian *danānu* and Hebrew דָּאָן have implications of both strength and validity; but in Akkadian the element of strength supercedes the element of validity, while in Hebrew just the opposite is so. For דָּאָן as 'strong' see, e.g.,

believes that the "good things/words" (*awātim damqātim*) are the friendly relations established by covenant and oath. He finds similar expressions in the Amarna letters, e.g.: "Between kings (there should be) brotherhood, friendship, peace and nice

מסכות (נדרלותו) נאמנות (Isa 22:25, cf. v 23) and מסכות (Deut 28:59) which should be compared with Akkadian *mīḫiṣtu dannat* (cf. Lambert, *Wisdom* [N 38]: 44, line 99). For *dannu* in the sense 'stable, valid,' cf. *našpāru dannu* (S. Langdon, *Die Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919]: 277, lines 17-18) which should be translated "faithful messenger," or in the language of Proverbs, צִיר אֱמוּנִים (13:17). Also see on this issue J. J. Rabinowitz, "Neo-Babylonian Legal Documents and Jewish Law," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 13 (1961): 148. We therefore suggest changing E. Sollberger's rendition of *našpāru dannu* ("Samsuiluna's Bilingual Inscriptions C and D," *RA* 63 [1969]: 33, line 33) from "strong" to "reliable" messenger. It is interesting to compare *dannatu* (= contract) with Hebrew אִמְנָה (see my "Covenant of Grant" [N 28]: 191, n. 58) and Nabatean תִּקְהָ תִּקְהָ (see Y. Muffs, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine* [Leiden: Brill, 1969]: 208; J. C. Greenfield, "Legal Terminology" [N 82]: 73-74). In "The Counsel of the Elders to Rehoboam," *Leshonenu* 36 (1971): 9 I have noted that תִּקְהָ in Esth 9:29 means "valid document" and this was independently stated by S. E. Loewenstamm, "Esther 9:29-32: The Genesis of a Late Addition," *HUCA* 42 (1971): 119. Following this recognition, many misunderstood legal expressions may be correctly comprehended. Thus, *riksu dannu* is the semantic equivalent of $\text{בְּרִית נְאֻמָּנָה}$ (cf. Ps 89:29) and עֲדוּת נְאֻמָּנָה (cf. Ps 93:5; 19:8; also *adē* in Akkadian and עֲדָן in Aramaic; see my article "ברית" (N 86): 785-786. These equivalent expressions connote a covenant of lasting validity; cf. Isa 55:3: $\text{בְּרִית עוֹלָם חֲסֵדִי דוֹר הַנְּאֻמָּנִים}$. (For בְּרִית and חֲסֵד as a hendiadys cf. my "Covenant Terminology" [N 31]: 191-192.) Similarly, *māmītu* (NAM.ÉRIM) *dannu* in the Idrimi inscription, line 50 (cf. recently E. L. Greenstein and David Marcus, "The Akkadian Inscription of Idrimi," *JANES* 8 [1976]: 59-96) is not a "mighty oath," as translated by S. Smith (*The Statue of Idrimi* [Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara I; London: British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, 1949]: line 50), but a "binding (valid) oath." By the same token *tuppu dannu* (cf. *AHW*, s.v. *dannu* 7, p. 161; *dannatu* 3, p. 160) is certainly not a "feste Tafel" but a "reliable, valid document." Therefore also *dunnunu*, which appears in context with a covenant, is not to be rendered "to strengthen" but "to validate" (see, e.g., M. Streck, *Assurbanipal* [N 41]: II, p. 4, lines 20-23; Wiseman, *Vassal Treaties* [N 69]: lines 23, 65). Hittite *daššu*, which appears along with NI-İS DINGIR MEŠ (= divine oath) is *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 36 (1955): 106, lines 9'-10' (transliteration and translation in H. Otten, "Zwei althethitische Belege zu den Hapiru (SA.GAZ)," *ZA* 52 [1957]: 217) and also *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 30 (1939): 45, 110:10 (Otten, "Belege," p. 220) in connection with *lingäiš* ('oath'), also expresses strength and legal validity; cf. E. Forrer, *Forschungen* Band 1, Heft 1 (Berlin: Selbstverlag, 1926): 32. The Aramaic expression that corresponds to Akkadian *riksa dunnunu* is לְתַקְפָּה אִסַּר , which occurs in parallel to לְקִיּוּמָה קִים in Dan 6:8. The term *riksu*,

words.⁹⁷ Likewise: "I and my brother pledged each other friendship⁹⁸ and thus declared: 'as our fathers were friends (*ṭābu*) with each other we shall be friends too.'⁹⁹ That "nice/proper words" (*amātu banātu*) refer to friendly political relations while "improper words" connote "rebellious deeds" may be learned from the letter of Tušratta to Amenopis III:¹⁰⁰ "Tuhe did 'improper things' (*amāta la panīta*) against my country and has killed his ruler." "Bad things" are rightly translated by the CAD as "hostile acts."¹⁰¹

Covenantal relations are expressed not only by "proper, friendly words" but also by "upright words." Thus in another Mari text we read:¹⁰² "Kill a donkey-foal of peace (= conclude a

as well as ברית and קים, basically denote 'obligation' or more precisely, 'obligatory bond'; cf. Weinfeld, "ברית" (N 86): 784-785. In Ugaritic *sr* and *šmt* (*šmd* = 'bind') signify covenantal relationship (cf. 2.1[137].37, 64[118].17); see J. C. Greenfield, "Some Aspects of Treaty Terminology in the Bible," *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1 (1967): 117.

96. For the word pair *nīš ilim, riksātum* ("oath and bond") cf. my "Covenant Terminology" (N 31): 190-191.

97. *šarrāni aḥḥātu ṭābātu šaltmu . . . u amātu [banītu]*, El-Amarna 11:rev. 22 and see Moran, "Treaty Terminology" (N 92): 175, n. 20 for the plural of *amātu*.

98. El-Amarna 8:8-9, *anāku u aḥiya itti aḥameš ṭabūta nidabbub*. Note Moran's comment to the translation: "The two parties did more than discuss (CAD III 8) friendship; they spoke, that is, *pledged* to each other. This meaning seems required by context" ("Treaty Terminology" [N 92]: 175, n. 99).

99. El-Amarna 8:8-12, cf. 9:7-9: "Since the time when my ancestors and your ancestors pledged each other friendship, and sent each other gifts (*šulmānu*)." For *šulmānu* in connection with covenant at Ugarit, see Greenfield, "Legal Terminology" (N 82): 119, n. 74.

100. El-Amarna 17:12-13.

101. CAD B, p. 82, n.4', s.v. *banū*.

102. *ḥayaram ša salīmim qutulma . . . išariš dub[u]b, nawūšu šalmat . . . sartum u gullultum ul ibaše* (G. Dossin, "Les archives épistolaires du Palais de Mari," *Syria* 19 [1938]: 109, line 23), and cf. Job 5:23-24: "for you have a covenant with the stones of the field and the beasts of the field concluded peace with you [cf. Hos 2:20], then you will know that it is well in your tent, you will look around your encampment and find nothing amiss" *כי עם אבני חשרה ברייתך* *והיה חשרה השלמה לך וידעת כי שלום אהלך ופקרת נור ולא תחטא* Job 8:6: "if you are innocent and upright, then indeed will he protect you and will grant well-being in your righteous abode" *אם זך וישר אתה כי עתה יעיר עליך* *ושלום נות צרקה* (compare the Ugaritic standard greeting formula: *ilm tgrk tšlmk*). For *קרחה נאמנה* is parallel in meaning to *נוה צרק* Jer 31:23 where *נוה צרק* is parallel in meaning to *עיר הצרק* Isa 1:26. In these contexts *צרקה* means 'loyalty' (see my "Covenant of Grant" [N 28]: 186, n. 17). As in the passage from Mari, so the verses in Job speak therefore about good reward for true covenantal relations.

covenant)¹⁰³ and speak with *uprightness* (or speak *correctly*, i.e., come to a formal agreement);¹⁰⁴ his encampment¹⁰⁵ is peaceful, and there is neither fraud nor felony." In another text: *anāku u [att]a išariš ni[db]ubbu* "I and [yo]u have sp[ok]en with uprightness/correctly," with the meaning: "we have come to a formal agreement."¹⁰⁶

In the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon we often find the words *ṭābtu* 'good,' *damiqtu* (SIG₅-tu) 'proper,' *tarišu* 'right, straight' and *banītu* 'nice' describing the relations with the sovereign. The "good thing" (*amātu ṭābtu*), which the vassals are asked to keep, is loyalty, whereas disloyalty is expressed by the opposite: "not good" (*lā ṭābtu*), "not proper" (*lā damiqtu*), "not right" (*lā tarišu*) and not nice (*lā banītu*).¹⁰⁷

103. Cf. M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," *BASOR* 200 (1970): 33.

104. See CAD I-J, p. 223-224, n. 2'd, s.v. *išariš; myšrym* in Dan 11:6 and *yšrym* in v 17 mean 'treaty'—cf. the LXX translation of these terms by συνθήκη in both verses (also in Theodotion's translation of v 6). It has not been recognized that *δικαία* ('just things') appears in the Book of the Maccabees in the sense 'treaty'; cf. 1 Macc 7:12; 11:33 (cf. 10:26); 2 Macc 10:12 (τὸ δικαίον); 11:14; 13:23.

105. For *nawū* cf. A. Malamat, "Mari and the Bible: Patterns of Tribal Organization," *JAOS* 82 (1962): 146; P. Artzi, *Encyclopedia Miqravit* 5.791-794, s.v. נוה.

106. Cf. CAD I-J, p. 223, n. 2'c, s.v. *išariš*, and see now *Archive Royale de Mari* vol. 10; *Correspondance féminine* (G. Doisson, A. Finet, eds.; Paris: Geuthner, 1978): 11, line 20; 177, line 9 (for the latter cf. W. H. Ph. Römer, *Frauenbriefe* [AOAT 12; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1971]: 42).

107. Cf. Wiseman, "Vassal Treaties" (N 69): lines 296-297 and in the negative, lines 67-68, 73-74, 108-109, 125. See further M. Weinfeld, "The Loyalty Oath in the Ancient Near East," *UF* 8 (1976): 412 with notes 289, 290. Cf. also the phrase "the word which is not good" (*amat lā ṭābtī*) meaning "betrayal" in the fealty oath pledged by the Assyrian officials (to Ashurbanipal): "If any guard . . . or plotter speaks a word that is not good" (L. Waterman, *Royal Correspondence* [N 42]: no. 1105:12-13). Compare also "bad deed" (*epšu lemnu*) in the sense of rebellious activity in El-Amarna 287:71; Borger, *Inschriften* (N 40): 43, 1:55; 47, 2:50; cf. CAD L, p. 121, n. 2'. The same applies to *עושה רעה בעמו* in the Temple Scroll (Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* [3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society]: cf. col. 64, line 7. Identical terms in the context of seditious agitation are found in the Hittite treaties (*idaluš memiyaš* = "bad words") and in the Sefire treaty לחית סלין ("bad words"); see J. C. Greenfield, "Stylistic Aspects of the Sefire Treaty Inscriptions," *AcOr* 29 (1965): 8-9. For "speaking kindly" (ΚΑ.ΚΑ DÜG.GA) in the sense of making an agreement, cf. Postgate, *Taxation* (N 34): 390, line 4, in connection with allowing

The expression *dibbēr ṭōbā^h* with the meaning “establish a covenant relationship” is found explicitly in the Bible. A. Malamat has already observed¹⁰⁸ that ותרבר אל עבדך את הטובה הזאת “you have spoken this *good thing* to your servant” in 2 Sam 7:28 refers to the covenant which the Lord made with David (cf. 2 Sam 23:5; Ps 89:4,29,34,50) concerning dynasty, and that David here acknowledges it. It should be added that this matter is also referred to when Abigail says to David: והיה כי יעשה ה' לאדני בכל אשר דבר הטובה עליך וצורך לנניד על ישראל “When the Lord has made to my master all the ‘good thing’ that God has spoken about you and has made you prince over Israel” (1 Sam 25:30).¹⁰⁹

To be sure, exegetes¹¹⁰ were at a loss to explain which “good thing” is referred to, but after the new interpretation of 2 Sam 7:28 there is no doubt that it is the dynastic promise, as expressed in Nathan’s prophecy. That the address of Abigail in 1 Sam 25:25-31 contains motifs from the dynastic oracle of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7 may be deduced from 1 Sam 25:28. In this verse Abigail refers to the promise of establishing a בית נאמן for David, a promise which occurs again in 2 Sam 7:16 and is alluded to in the oracle of the “man of God” in 1 Sam 2:35.¹¹¹

M. Fox¹¹² has provided additional evidence for דבר טוב and טוב in the covenantal sense in the Bible; and I have endeavored to show elsewhere¹¹³ that דבר טוב in the *Emet weYašib* liturgy,

the Tyrians to cut wood on Mt. Lebanon; see also B. Oded, “Assyria and the Cities of Phoenicia during the Time of the Assyrian Empire,” in *Beer Sheva* 1 (Y. Avishur, S. Abramsky, H. Reviv, eds.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1973): 148, n. 80 (Hebrew).

108. A Malamat, “Organs of Statecraft in the Israelite Monarchy,” in *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader* 3 (E. F. Campbell, D. N. Freedman, eds.; New York: Doubleday, 1970): 195-198.

109. This verse should be interpreted by rearranging the words to read בכל את הטובה בכל אשר דבר עליך or הטובה אשר דבר עליך. See S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1912): 202; M. H. Segal, *Siphre Shmuel* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1976): 200 (Hebrew).

110. See, e.g., H. P. Smith, *The Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark): 226.

111. As in other biblical speeches (see my book *Deuteronomy* [N 28]: 51-58), here too the scribe (apparently from the Davidic house) used Abigail as a means of presenting his own ideology.

112. M. Fox, “Ṭōb as Covenant Terminology,” *BASOR* 209 (1973): 41-42.

113. Weinfeld, “Loyalty Oath” (N 107): 412-413.

received after the *Shema^c*, refers to the fealty oath to God, the King, which this liturgy actually represents. This corresponds to the “good thing” in the fealty oaths’ pledges by the subjects to their sovereign in the ancient Near East.

Alongside “good word” (הטובה), we find in 2 Sam 7:28 also allusion to “words of truth” (ודבריך יהיו אמת). These two expressions, “goodness and truth,” appear in their Akkadian form in a letter to the king of Ugarit as a hendiadys (*kittu ṭābūtu*), meaning covenant.¹¹⁴ One can further compare אמת, an expression which also serves to indicate covenant relationships.¹¹⁵

In the light of all this, the “good words” in 1 Kgs 12:7 have to be understood as a legal arrangement according to which the northern population will be exempted from corvée work and heavy taxes imposed on them. A release proclaimed by a king and expressed by דבר טובה may be found in 2 Kgs 25:28. In connection with the release of Jehoiachin during the accession year of Evil-Merodach we find the sentence וידבר ארתו מכות which should also be understood as an official privilege formula.¹¹⁶ We are told here that Evil-Merodach decreed the release of Jehoiachin at the beginning of his reign (apparently in the framework of an *andurārum*): “He exalted his throne above those of other kings . . . and he (Jehoiachin) ate ‘bread’ regularly”¹¹⁷ in his presence all the days of his life” (2 Kgs 25:28-29), וארחתו ארחת “and a regular daily allocation of food was given him by the king as long as he lived” (v 30).

The act of Evil-Merodach may be paralleled by Sargon’s act towards Ullusunū, the king of the Manneans, as told in Sargon’s

114. See Moran, “Treaty Terminology” (N 92): 174 and notes 17 and 30.

115. See my “Covenant Terminology” (N 31): 191-192.

116. This has been raised as a possibility by Malamat, “Organs” (N 108): 197.

117. The לחם of the king (cf. 1 Sam 20:24,27,34; 2 Sam 9:7,10; 1 Kgs 5:2) is “the king’s meal”; compare Aḥīqar col. 3, line 33 (cf. A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1923]: 213): [נבוטמסכן חן מן רבי] “[Nabu-šum-iškun, on]e of my father’s big officials who din[ed] with my father,” The phrase בא אל הלחם in 1 Sam 20:27 is to be compared with *ana naptēni erēbu* “to enter for the meal” (cf. K. F. Müller, *Das assyrische Ritual* [MVAG 41/3]: 59-60; and see J. Kinnier Wilson, *The Nimrud Wine Lists* [London: British School of Archaeology, 1972]: 43). Another expression for the “king’s meal” is שלהן המלך (cf. 2 Sam 9:13), which is the equivalent of *paššur šarri*. For the “king’s meal” in Assyria cf. recently Wilson, pp. 34-35.

account of the eighth campaign:¹¹⁸ "Before Ullusunu (who expressed his submission to the Assyrian king) I spread a heavy table and made his throne higher than that of Iranzu, the father who begot him.¹¹⁹ I seated Ullusunu and his men with the people Assyria at a joyous table (*paššur hidāti*)."¹²⁰

Eating at the king's table or at his expense was a privilege of high officials and the palace staff.¹²¹ Thus we read in the Aḥīqar story that Nabušumiškun was one of Sennacherib's high officials (חר מן רבי) who "ate his bread."¹²² Similarly, we hear about Mephibosheth, the grandson of Saul, who was privileged to eat at the king's table (2 Sam 9:7; 19:29). The sons of Barzilai the Gileadite, whom David wanted to reward for his loyalty towards him (2 Sam 19:32-33), also were given a place at the king's table (1 Kgs 2:7). These royal acts are defined as חסר (עשה), which, like טובה, expressed a formal grant (see above).

Those who were privileged to sit at Solomon's table, כל הקרב אל שלחן המלך שלמה¹²³ (1 Kgs 5:7 [Hebrew]) were apparently high officials of a similar type. In Ugarit we encounter the term *ṭrm* "the diners (of the king)" who have their estates in the province.¹²⁴ In 2 Kgs 25:30, which continues the privilege formula of v 28, יום ביומו רבר, תמיר, are equal in meaning to *riksu ša ūmi*¹²⁵ *gimū* and *sadru* (*sadrūti*), found in the Assyrian

118. F. Thureau Dangin, *Une relation de la Huitième Campagne de Sargon* (Paris: Geuthner, 1912): 12, lines 62-63.

119. *paššur takbitti maḥaršu arkusuma, eli ša* ^m*Iranzi abi ālidišu ušaqqi kussāšu*.

120. A nice illustration of participating at a royal "joyous table" is the scene from the Khorsabad reliefs (see now Wilson [N 117]: pl. 2), where we see Assyrian officers sitting on high chairs before a table with food and holding their rhytons aloft.

121. Cf. Wilson (N 117): 78-79.

122. See note 117 above.

123. Compare in connection with Barzilai in 1 Kgs 2:7: כי כן קרבו אלי כברחי. מפני אכשלו. It seems that קרב here expresses the privileged of the king (the ones who are close to him); cf. Assyrian *qurubūte* (for which see Wilson [N 117]: 48-49). We should then translate the verse "they became my close (friends) when I was fleeing from Absalom."

124. See A. Rainey, *The Social Structure of Ugarit* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1967): 51-53 (Hebrew); idem, "Institutions: Family, Civil, and Military," *RSP* 2.89.

125. For the meaning of this term and its Hebrew equivalent ערך, cf. M. Weinfeld, "Recent Publications: A Survey," *Shnaton* 2 (1977): 249.

lists of regular daily delivery for palace personnel or for the temple.¹²⁶ As in 2 Kgs 25:30 so in Dan 1:5 the daily ration of food and wine for the Jews of royal descent in the Babylonian king's palace is defined as יום ביומו רבר.

The phrase יודבר טבות in 2 Kgs 25:28 is then to be understood as a formal act establishing a grant, and not just "speaking kindly." This demonstrates that ודברת דברים טובים in 2 Kgs 12:7 refers to concrete royal acts formulated in written agreements of the *zakūtu* or *andurārum* type known also from the Neo-Assyrian period. Whether this meant exemption from corvée of the whole northern Israelite population or of the city of Shechem only cannot be established because of lack of evidence.

126. Cf. J. N. Postgate, *Neo-Assyrian Royal Grants and Decrees* (N 7): 92-93 for *sadrūti* and Wilson (N 117): 112-113 for *ginū*. Note that Hebrew ערך which equals Akkadian *riksu* (see note 125) is translated in *Tg. Onq.* to Exod 40:23 by סדר.

religious humanism



A Quarterly Journal Published By The Fellowship of Religious Humanists

Religious Humanism is a quarterly journal dedicated to the presentation of insights and concerns of a humanistically oriented religious expression in naturalistic frame.

Examples of articles appearing in *Religious Humanism* include the following:

Humanism: American Democratic Faith?	Khoren Arisian
Protagoras: The Maligned Philosopher	Paul H. Beattie
An Odyssey: Theology to Humanism	Joseph Fletcher
John Dewey's World View	Lewis E. Hahn
Authority in Religious Humanism	William R. Jones
Humanism and Sexual Morality	Lester Kirkendall
Diverse Sources of Religious Humanism	Leonard Mason
If Humanism is a Religion	Sherwin Wine

Each new member joining the Fellowship of Religious Humanists will receive, free, an issue containing one of the above mentioned articles. Please specify which one you would like to receive. Mail your check or money order, with the form below, to: Fellowship of Religious Humanists, P.O. Box 278, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

order form

Membership* and Subscription	<input type="checkbox"/> One Year \$12.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Two Years \$20.00
Subscription Only	<input type="checkbox"/> One Year \$ 8.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Two Years \$15.00

name _____

address _____

city _____ state _____ zip _____

*Full rights of membership also include the bi-monthly newsletter, THE COMMUNICATOR.

HEBREW INSCRIPTIONS OF THE FIRST TEMPLE PERIOD—A SURVEY AND SOME LINGUISTIC COMMENTS*

GAD B. SARFATTI
BAR ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL

1. COLLECTIONS

1.1 The small corpus of Hebrew inscriptions of the First Temple Period has grown gradually since the discovery of the Siloam inscription in 1880. This growth can be conveniently measured by an examination of the manuals published since that time. In 1903, when G. A. Cooke published his *Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*,¹ the Siloam inscription was the only

* This is a revised and updated translation of a paper originally published in Hebrew in the *David Kothar Jubilee Volume* (A. M. Rabello, ed.; Tel Aviv: Am Hassefer, 1975): 104-122. I would like to thank my colleague, Dr. M. Sokoloff, for improving the language of the English version and for his valuable suggestions. When not otherwise stated, the references to the inscriptions are by the number and line according to the following sources: for the Lachish ostraca, H. Torczyner, *Te'udot Lachish* (Jerusalem: Jewish Palestine Exploration Society, 1940); for the Arad inscriptions, Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Israel Exploration Society, 1975); for the Samaria texts, D. Deringer, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1934); Khirbet El-Kom, W. Dever, "Iron Age Epigraphic Material from the Area of Khirbet el-Kôm," *HUCA* 40-41 (1969-1970): 139-204; other inscriptions, J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions; Volume 1, Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971). All transliterations and vocalizations for the inscriptions are normalized according to Masoretic vocalization practices. These vocalizations are intended only to clarify the interpretation and are not intended as historical phonetic reconstructions.

1. G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903).

Hebrew text which he could publish. In 1934, when D. Diringer published his classic *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (supplemented in 1951 by S. Moscati under the title *L'epigrafia ebraica antica*²) the corpus had grown to include the Gezer Calendar, 63 Samaria ostraca, the Ofel ostrakon, the Siloam inscription, 164 seals and stamps, several weights and some fragmentary measuring vessels.

1.2 During the 1935-38 Lachish excavations, 21 inscribed Hebrew ostraca were discovered. Many are relatively long texts, and some of them were fairly well preserved.³

In 1962 H. Donner and W. Röllig included in the first edition of their *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften (KAI)*, a small selection of these texts. They published only inscriptions containing at least some connected words with a comprehensive context. While only a few texts were selected from each related group (e.g., the Samaria ostraca), nevertheless, the book contains 18 Hebrew inscriptions.

1.3 The most recent book of this type is J. C. L. Gibson's *Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*, which appeared in 1971 as the first volume of his *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*.⁴ Although the character and criteria for selection of this work is similar to that of Donner-Röllig, it does include some fragmentary and nearly unintelligible inscriptions as well as a selection of seals, jar-handle stamps and weights. The Yavneh-Yam ostrakon, ten of the Lachish letters, three of the Arad ostraca, the jar-handle inscriptions from Gibeon and the graffiti of Khirbet Bet Lei, which Gibson includes, were all discovered after the publication of Diringer's collection.

1.4 During the winter of 1973 the Israel Museum held an exhibition of 269 Jewish inscriptions: 142 from the First Temple Period and 147 from the Second Temple, Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods. The catalogue of this exhibition, *Inscriptions Reveal*,

2. Diringer (N*); S. Moscati, *L'epigrafia ebraica antica 1935-1950* (Rome: PBI, 1951).

3. Cf. H. Torczyner, *Lachish I; The Lachish Letters* (New York, London, Toronto: Oxford Univ., 1938); *Te'udot* (N*); O. Tufnell, *Lachish III; The Iron Age* (Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1953).

4. Cf. Gibson (N*).

which reproduces and describes each item, is presently the most complete manual in this field.^{4a}

1.5 In 1975, Y. Aharoni collected all the Arad ostraca in his *Arad Inscriptions*.⁵ They were discovered during the various seasons of the Arad excavations and some had been previously published in various journals. The book includes 89 ink inscribed ostraca, 16 ostraca and vessels bearing graffiti, and 5 seals. Some are very well preserved. The total collection contains more than 50 clearly readable lines and hundreds of words.

1.6 In 1970, W. G. Dever published several inscriptions from the burial cave at Khirbet el-Kôm near Hebron;⁶ recently Z. Meshel provisionally published an interesting group of inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud on the Sinai border.⁷ If very short and fragmentary inscriptions containing only a word or two or even just a few letters, are included, there is almost no end to the epigraphic material. New material is found in almost every excavation.

1.7 The seal inscriptions provide important information despite their limited length. In 1969, F. Vattioni published a survey of 252 Hebrew seals and seal impressions, containing more than three hundred words and several hundred proper names.⁸ Most of the personal names were already known from the Bible, but there were also some non-Biblical names.

Since Hebrew proper names are usually a combination of a theophoric element and a nominal or verbal root, they often provide important linguistic (especially lexical) information. R. Hestrin and M. Dayyagi-Mendeles recently published *Ḥōtāmōt mīmē Bayit Rīšōn*, which is particularly useful.⁹ It contains

4a. R. Hestrin, Y. Israeli, Y. Meshorer, A. Eitan, *Inscriptions Reveal* (Catalogue 100; Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 1973).

5. Aharoni (N*).

6. Dever (N*).

7. Z. Meshel, *Kuntillet 'Ajrud; A Religious Centre from the Time of the Judaean Monarchy on the Border of Sinai* (Catalogue 175; Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 1978).

8. F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Biblica* 50 (1969): 357-388; cf. further, "I sigilli ebraici, II," *Augustinianum* 11 (1971): 447-454 and "I sigilli ebraici, III," *AION* 38 (1978): 227-254.

9. R. Hestrin, M. Dayyagi-Mendeles, *Ḥōtāmōt mīmē Bayit Rīšōn* (Jerusalem: Israel Museum, 1978); cf. also L. G. Herr, *The Scripts of the Ancient Northwest Semitic Seals* (HSM 18; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1978).

reproductions and brief illustrations of 96 Hebrew seals and of 40 others in Ammonite, Moabite, Phoenician and Aramaic. Special mention should be made of the continuing activity of N. Avigad in publishing seals found in excavations or appearing on the antiquities market.¹⁰

1.8 At first glance the language of these documents appears to be identical with the Biblical Hebrew of the First Temple Period. Passages from the Lachish Letters could be interpolated into the Book of Jeremiah with no noticeable difference. Nevertheless, this linguistic material has not yet been the object of a comprehensive and thorough investigation. Such a full investigation cannot be attempted here, but the following short remarks and considerations can at least focus upon some salient linguistic issues.

2. ORTHOGRAPHY

2.1 The use of *matres lectionis*

2.1.1 The classic monograph on this subject, *Early Hebrew Orthography (EHO)* by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, appeared in 1952.¹¹ They summarized their conclusions as follows:

The final vowel *ī* was represented by *yodh*. . . The final vowel *ū* was represented by *waw*. . . The final vowel *ā* was represented by *he*. . . The final vowel *ē* was represented by *he*. . . The final vowel *ō* was represented by *he*. . . Final vowels are always indicated in the orthography, medial vowels almost never. The few exceptions, where medial *matres lectionis* seem to appear, all date from the 6th century. Since internal *matres lectionis* already had appeared sporadically in Aramaic inscriptions more than 100 years earlier, the possibility of their use in Hebrew must be recognized. None of the following examples, however, is absolutely certain: Nos. 42 [*zyp*, “Ziph”; cf. *EHO* p. 51], 60 [*yš*, “man”; cf.

10. For a list of Avigad's studies on ancient Hebrew seals, one can refer to Herr's bibliography, *ibid.*, pp. 220-221. We should note in passing that A. Lemaire's *Inscriptions Hébraïques; Tome I, Les Ostraca* (Paris: Cerf, 1977) contains a French translation of all 170 Hebrew ostraca published to that date (excluding only the most fragmentary of inscriptions). The translation is accompanied by a commentary which deals particularly with the historical and geographical aspects of the texts.

11. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography, A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952).

EHO p. 54], 76 [*h^cyrh*, “to the city”; cf. *EHO* p. 55], 96 [*btš^cyt*, “in the ninth”; cf. *EHO* p. 56]. It is to be noted that in every case, the medial vowel is *ī*, designated by *yodh*.¹²

2.1.2 Until recently, scholars have generally accepted these conclusions without reservations and endeavored to explain every text according to them; however, some objections have been raised, and today it is quite clear that Cross' and Freedman's view cannot be accepted unconditionally. While we cannot deny that internal *matres lectionis* are rare in the inscriptions of the First Temple Period, their existence can no longer be denied. The classic case is the word *ʾrwr* (= *ʾārūr*), a passive participle of the *qātūl* pattern written with a medial *waw* for the vowel *ū*. This form occurs in the Siloam Tomb inscription, which was discovered in 1870 and first published and deciphered by Avigad in 1953.¹³ On paleographic grounds it is contemporary with the Siloam Tunnel inscription (701 B.C.E.), somewhat later according to Avigad (1954),¹⁴ somewhat earlier according to others.¹⁵ This example of *scriptio plena* clearly challenges Cross' and Freedman's theory.

2.1.3 Other unequivocal examples of the internal *mater lectionis* are *hbqydm* (*hibqīdām* = *hipqīdām* [cf. §4.1] “he entrusted them; Arad 24:14-15) and *lh^cyd* (= *lāhā^cīd* “to warn”; Arad 24:18), two verbs in the *Hip^cil* conjugation with the letter *yod* in each case representing the vowel *ī*. Aharoni dates the ostrakon to the end of the First Temple Period.¹⁶ In all these cases the *matres lectionis* are not part of the verbal root.

2.1.4 The *yod* in the already mentioned toponym *zyp* (cf. §2.1.1) is also a *mater lectionis*. In the *lmlk* jar handle stamps this name appears in two different spellings *zyp* and *zp*. The defective spelling clearly points to a reading *zīp* rather than *zayp*. Therefore, the *yod* must be a *mater lectionis*. The Arabic toponym *Tel Zif* also points to an original form *zīp*.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

13. N. Avigad, “The Epitaph of a Royal Steward from Siloam Village,” *IEJ* 3 (1953): 137-152.

14. N. Avigad, *Ancient Monuments in the Kidron Valley* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1954): 16.

15. Cf., e.g., Gibson (N*): 23.

16. Aharoni, *Arad* (N*): 48.

2.1.5 Gibson offers an alternative explanation.¹⁷ Royal stamps are generally divided into three groups according to the figure engraved on them: 1) a beetle in a naturalistic shape; 2) a beetle in a conventionalized shape; 3) a two-winged object which some scholars interpret as the solar disc and others as a flying scroll (cf. Zech 5:1). On paleographic grounds the first group is believed to be the earliest (Eighth Century), the second about a century later (beginning of the Seventh Century) and the third about two centuries later (beginning of the Sixth Century).¹⁸ Gibson points out that in a stamp from the first group the toponym is spelled *zyp*, while in stamps from the latter two groups it is spelled *zp*. He concludes, “ זׁפ = [zīp] with internal mater lectionis, or perhaps [zayp], later as on the class II and III stamps (*zēp*), an early example of diphthongal reduction.”¹⁹ If Gibson’s conclusion is correct, these examples may document the development of diphthong contraction. However, a significant weakness in this argument is that the spelling *zyp* is also found in Group 3 stamps.²⁰ Therefore, the most likely conclusion is that the name is *zīp* and that the *yod* is an internal *mater lectionis*. A similar example of full versus defective spelling is ׁוּרַיְחַו (Arad 31:2) / ׁוּרַיְחַו (Khirbet el Kom 3:1). This long explanation has been made necessary by the refusal of scholars to concede that evidence no longer bears out Cross’ and Freedman’s theory.

2.1.6 The question of *plene* and defective spelling is closely connected to the question of the preservation and contraction of the diphthongs *aw* and *ay*. Thus, in words such as ׁוּד and *byt* (construct state), if the diphthongs were already contracted (i.e., ׁוּד and *bēt* as in the Tiberian pronunciation), the *waw* and *yod* are *matres lectionis*; but if the words were still pronounced ׁוּד , *bayt* and contraction had not yet taken place, then the letters *waw* and *yod* represent consonants. Cross and Freedman have taken the latter viewpoint, claiming that contractions of diphthongs occurred only after the First Temple period.²¹ But this is a case of circular reasoning: on the one hand, they claim the letters *yod* and *waw* indicate consonants and prove that diphthongs were not yet

17. Cf. Gibson (N *): 65.

18. Cf. Moscati (N 2): 90.

19. Gibson (N *): 66.

20. Moscati (N 3): 94.

21. Cross and Freedman (N 11): 52, n. 37.

contracted; on the other hand, they state that since contraction of diphthongs had not yet taken place, *yod* and *waw* are not *matres lectionis* but indicate consonants. This issue may be resolved only by the use of external sources. A. S. Rainey collected evidence on this subject from Akkadian transliterations. However, the results were mixed. For example, he found uncontracted URU *ba-na-ay-bar-qa* (= *bānē bēraq*) and ׁוּ-סִי-ׁוּ (= *hōšē^a*) on the one hand, but contracted ׁוּ-סִי-ׁוּ or ׁוּ-סִי-ׁוּ (= *hōšē^a*) on the other.²² In addition one must remember that besides diachronical differences there are also dialectal differences. Furthermore, the history of the two diphthongs *ay* and *aw* need not necessarily be the same; and, finally, personal and geographical names which constitute a large part of the linguistic material in this field, do not always follow the general phonetic and morphological behavior of the language, but sometimes lag behind it or represent particular dialects. A case in point is the inscription on the Tell Qasile ostrakon:²³ *zhb lbythrn*. Therein we find *byt*, in the construct state, with *yod*, but also *hrn* without *waw* (cf. *hwrnn* in the Meshā’ inscription lines 31, 32). A similar instance is the spelling of *tld* without *waw* in line two of the Beer-Sheva ostrakon,²⁴ cf. *tōlād*, PN in 1 Chr 4:29 (also ׁוּל תֹּלָד in Josh 19:4); this over against *byt* with *yod* in the compound *byt ׁmm* (called simply *ׁāmām* in Josh 16:20).

2.1.7 In addition to the limitations Cross and Freedman claim for the use of medial vowel letters, they further deny the possibility of employing *waw* to designate *ō* (for which vowel, in final position, these texts use *he*) during the whole First Temple Period.²⁵ Nevertheless, they are forced to transliterate ׁוּשׁ (Lachish 2,1; 6,1) as *ya^oōš*, which they explain as a compromise spelling between ׁוּשׁ = *ya^oōš*, the correct form from a historical point of view, and *yawš* = *yawš*, the then current pronunciation (cf. the name ׁוּשׁיְחַו in Jer 27:1 with the *Qere yōšīyāhū*).²⁶

2.1.8 On this point one should consider four seal inscriptions which have a *waw* to indicate the vowel *ō* in proper names with

22. A. F. Rainey, “The Word ‘Day’ in Ugaritic and Hebrew,” *Leshonenu* 36 (1972): 186-189.

23. Gibson (N *): 17.

24. Hestrin, et al., *Inscriptions Reveal* (N 4a): 81 no. 74 (see also p. 40 in English text).

25. *Ibid.*, p. 81, n. 21.

26. Cross and Freedman (N 11): 51-52.

the *qōṭēl* pattern, where it cannot be interpreted as an element of an historical diphthong. The seals are:

1. *lḥwnn bn yʿznyh* = *lḥōnēn ben yaʿāzanyā*²⁷
2. *lḥwrš bn pql* = *lḥōreš ben paqlū*²⁸
3. *lšwḥr hnss* = *lšōḥēr hannassās*²⁹
4. *mnḥm bn šwḥr* = *mānahēm ben šōḥēr*³⁰

Only the second of these seals is Hebrew. The first is Aramaic (on paleographical grounds) and the third and fourth are Ammonite. Avigad³¹ dates the first two from the early Sixth Century. About the third, he writes that its script "is characteristic of the cursive hand of the Persian period, but it makes its first appearance in Aramaic documents from Assur of the seventh century BC";³² Hestrin and Dayyagi-Mendeles date it to the Seventh Century.³³ Because of their uncertain and possible late date and their different sources, these seals do not provide ironclad evidence for the use of *waw* as a vowel letter for *ō* in Hebrew writing of the First Temple Period, but they may hint in that direction.

2.1.9 The many facets of the problem and the scarcity of the epigraphic material do not permit us to reach a final decision. Nevertheless, it is clear that strict adherence to Cross' and Freedman's theory obliges us to invent so many *ad hoc* explanations that it cannot be accepted. There is no compelling reason to vocalize *ʿawd*, *mawṣa* in the Siloam tunnel inscription³⁴ or *yayn ha-ʿaganot* and *bayt Y-H-Ḥ-H* in the Arad ostraca (respectively, Arad 1:9-10, 18:9).³⁵ In the latter case there is also

the possibility that the *yod* was retained in the spelling of the construct state on analogy to the absolute state.

2.1.10 On one point at least Cross' and Freedman's conclusions can be safely corrected. In addition to their regular use as final *matres lectionis*, *waw* and *yod* are used from the beginning of the seventh century to denote *ū* and *ī* respectively, even when these are not root letters. However, this is neither frequent nor consistent.³⁶

2.1.11 As to the use of *yod* and *waw* to denote *ê* and *ô* respectively, as well as the connected problem of reduction of these diphthongs, nothing definitive can be said. However, it has not been proved that such a usage did not exist and that diphthongs did not contract in First Temple Jerusalem Hebrew as in other Canaanite dialects. Perhaps, as Z. Harris believes, this reduction occurred at a very early period.³⁷

2.1.12 The orthography of the inscriptions may prove useful in reconstructing the history of the biblical books and the time and place of the redaction of the Masoretic Text. Indeed, the gap between the inscriptions and the MT is beginning to close due to the insights gained from Hebrew epigraphic material of the Persian period and from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the earliest of which are dated to the 3rd Century B.C.E.³⁸ W. F. Albright and others have begun this research and obtained some interesting results.³⁹ But this subject is beyond the scope of this paper.

2.2 The spelling of the word *ym*

2.2.1 In the Siloam tunnel inscription (*KAI* 189), there are inconsistent orthographic practices. On the one hand, there are the *plene* spellings *ʿwd* and *mws*, where the *waw* may represent a vowel or semivowel, the second element of the diphthong; and on the other hand, the defective spelling of *ym* (line 3, misprinted in *KAI* as *ywm!*). For this reason Torczyner⁴⁰ read here *yām* 'pool.'

36. D. N. Freedman, "The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography," *Textus* 2 (1962): 88.

37. Z. Harris, *The Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1939): 29-32; cf. G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1918): 1.97-98, §17g; 164, §30f.

38. F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East; Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961): 179.

39. Freedman, "Massoretic Text" (N 36): 87-102.

40. H. Torczyner, "The Siloam Inscription, the Gezer Calendar and the Ophel Ostrakon," *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 7 (1940): 3.

27. Diringer (N *): 180-181 no. 21.

28. Ibid., pp. 181-182 no. 22.

29. Hestrin and Dayyagi-Mendeles (N 9): 24 no. 10.

30. N. Avigad, "Two Ancient Seals," *Sefer Tur-Sinai* (M. Haran, B. Z. Luria, eds.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1960): 319-324.

31. N. Avigad, "Ammonite and Moabite Seals," *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century; Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck* (J. A. Sanders, ed., Garden City: Doubleday, 1970): 286-287.

32. Ibid., p. 287.

33. Hestrin and Dayyagi-Mendeles (N 9): 24 no. 10.

34. Cross and Freedman (N 11): 50, 51.

35. D. N. Freedman, "The Orthography of the Arad Ostraca," *IEJ* 19 (1969): 52-56.

Nöldeke,⁴¹ on the basis of Hebrew plural forms such as *yāmim*, *yāmē*, *yāmōt* and similar forms in Arabic dialects, suggested the existence of an original stem *yam* and a secondary stem *yōm*. Nevertheless, he also read here *yōm*. H. L. Ginsberg⁴² accepted Nöldeke's suggestion and proposed reading *yam* here. Subsequent epigraphical finds have revealed many other instances of the defective spelling of this word:

1. Lachish 2:3 (*bis*), 4:1—as against *yʷwš* (2:1, 6:1), *hwšcyhw* (3:1), *ywšʷ* (21:3–4), and a doubtful *byw(m)* (20:1).
2. Arad 1:4; 24:19—as against *ʿwd* (1:5; 2:7; 5:3), *qrbʷwr* (24:14).

It is hard to believe that the lack of *waw* in the word *yōm* in all these instances is due simply to happenstance.

2.2.2 In *Ugaritica* 5, J. Nougayrol published fragments of multilingual vocabularies in the Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian and Ugaritic languages. In the Ugaritic column (written in Akkadian syllabary) he twice found the word *ya-mu* = 'day'.^{42a} E. Y. Kutscher saw here a new proof of the original two-consonantal form of this noun in Hebrew and other Semitic languages—and as it appears in our inscriptions.⁴³ But A. F. Rainey disputed this proof,⁴⁴ claiming that Nougayrol had not been sufficiently meticulous in his transliteration: the first syllabogram of the word being polysemic; one could read *iu-mu* as well as *ia₈-mu*. Hence, this noun gives no basis for a decision. In Rainey's opinion there are some words such as this one which anticipated others with regard to the contraction of diphthongs.⁴⁵

2.2.3 Since *yōm* is written in the Siloam tunnel inscription without *waw*, Cross and Freedman also see in this word the

41. T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1910): 133.

42. H. L. Ginsberg, "The Lachish Letters," *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 3 (1936): 79.

42a. J. Nougayrol, "Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit," *Ugaritica* 5 (C. F. A. Schaeffer, ed.; Paris: Geuthner, 1968): 1–446; cf. p. 248 (text no. 137, IVa, line 17) and p. 249 (text no. 138, line 2').

43. E. Y. Kutscher, "Ugaritica Marginalia," *Leshonenu* 34 (1970): 18–19.

44. A. F. Rainey, "The Word 'Day'" (N 22).

45. Cf. also J. Blau, "The Second Volume of the New Lexicon for the Bible," *Leshonenu* 41 (1976): 56.

variant form *yām*. Likewise, they vocalize the defective *ql* (line 2) as *qāl* rather than *qōl*.⁴⁶

3. THE LANGUAGE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS AND THE BIBLICAL *KETIB-QERE*

3.1 In a large number of examples forms found in these inscriptions agree with the biblical *Ketib* as opposed to the *Qere*. An examination of the inscriptions and comparisons with the lists of *Ketib-Qere* compiled by R. Gordis⁴⁷ yield the following:

1. The divine name: This is always spelled *Y-H-W-H* (Lachish 2:2, 5; 3:3, 9; 4:1; 6:1, 12; 9:1; Arad 16:3; 18:2, 9; 21:4; Kh. Bet Lei 1:1; Kh. el Kom 3:2). In the Bible the tetragrammaton always appears as the *Ketib* while the *Qere* is *ʾādōnāy* or *ʾēlōhīm* (Gordis, list 1).
2. Third m.s. suffix added to plural endings, *-w*: *ʾnšw* "his men" (Lachish 3:18); *ʾlw* "unto him" (Yavneh-Yam 13). According to Gordis (list 3), there are 158 words in the Bible in which the 3 m.s. pronominal suffix appears in the *Ketib* with the defective spelling *-w*, while the *Qere* is *-yw*. We can also note *bšptw* (*Ketib*), *bšpātāw* (*Qere*) (Prov 26:24), which appears in list 61. The purpose of the *Qere* is not to correct the text (i.e., *yādāw* instead of *yādō*), but to point out the vocalization tradition followed by the Masoretes (read *yādāw!*). Note also *Ketib* *wʾnšw*, *Qere* *wʾnšyw* (1 Sam 23:5); *Ketib* *ʾlw*, *Qere* *ʾlyw* (e.g., 1 Sam 22:13). Since the historical development of this suffix is **-ayhu* > **-āhu* > **-āu* (e.g., **yādayhu* > **yādāhu* > *yādāu*), the defective spelling (= MT ʾ) is phonetic, while the *plene* spelling (= MT ʾ) retains the etymological *yod*.^{47a}
3. Third m.s. suffix added to singular endings: *-h*: *ʿbdh* ("his servant" Yavneh-Yam 2; Lachish 2:5), *ʾmth* ("his maid-servant" Siloam Tomb 2), *ʾth* ("with him" Siloam Tomb 2; Lachish 3:12; Arad 17:6), *lqh^ch* ("he took him" Lachish 4:6), *šlh^ch* ("he has sent it" Lachish 3:21), *ydc^cth* ("you have [not] known it" Lachish 2:6). Gordis (list 4) gives 52 instances of words (27 lexemes) ending with the 3 m.s. pronominal suffix with *h* in the *Ketib* and *w* in the *Qere*. Cf. *Ketib* *ʾhlh* *Qere* *ʾhlw* (e.g., Gen 9:21). The historical development of the suffix is

46. Cross and Freedman (N 11): 53 (for *ym*), 50 (for *ql*).

47. R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making* (2nd. ed.; New York: Ktav, 1971).

47a. Cf. *GKC* §91i; Bergsträsser (N 37): §16e.

*-ahu > *-au > -ô; e.g., **abdahu* > **abdau* > *abdô*. The suffix ending -h retains the historical spelling of the suffix and thus becomes the *mater lectionis* for the vowel ô. The spelling of the suffix with waw is later, appearing when, through the contraction of the diphthong in forms such as **šawr* > *šôr*, waw became the *mater lectionis* for the same vowel.^{47b}

4. Conjoining of contiguous consonants in successive forms: *wky²mr* (= *wky y²mr*, perhaps *wky y²mr*, Lachish 3:8), *hyhwh* (= *hy Y-H-W-H* Lachish 3:9). The last letter of the first word is identical with the first letter of the second word, and one letter is written instead of two; Gordis (list 7) notes 12 such cases. E.g., *Ketib ky^cbr*, *Qere ky y^cbr* (Isa 28:15).
5. Defective spelling *‘t* (= *‘attâ*): Muraba‘at 17A:2; Lachish 2:3 (*bis*); 4:1, 2; Arad 1:1-2; 2:1; 3:1; 5:1-2; 7:1-2; 8:1; 10:1; 11:2; 16:3; 17:1; 18:3; 21:3; 40:4. E.g., *Ketib ‘t*, *Qere ‘th* in Ps 74:6; Ezek 23:43 (Gordis' lists 8 and 83).
6. Defective spelling of *yršlm* (biblical vocalization always: *yərūšalayim*): Kh. Bet Lei 1:2; this spelling also appears in seals of the Persian period.⁴⁸ The *Ketib* in the Bible is always defective in the last syllable, the *Qere* being *ywršlym* (for the few exceptions see *BDB*: 436). (See Gordis' list 12.)
7. Defective spelling (= *hāyētā*ⁿ "she was"): Siloam Tunnel 3. Cf. the *Ketib hyt*, *Qere hyth* (2 Kgs 9:37, in Gordis' list 19).
8. Defective spelling *ktym*: Arad 1:2; 2:2; 4:1; 7:2; 8:2; 10:2, 5; 11:2; 14:2. According to the spelling in the inscriptions this word must be vocalized *kittiyyīm*. Cf., e.g., *Ketib ktyym*, *Qere ktyym* in Isa 23:12. Gordis notes 12 more examples (list 37). The only contrary case is in Ezek 27:6: *Ketib ktyim*, *Qere ktyym*. Although the orthography of the biblical *Qere* is identical with those of the inscriptions, the former represents the reading *kittīm*, while the *Ketib* represents the more original vocalization as found in the inscriptions.⁴⁹
9. Defective spelling *r^cw* (for biblical *rē‘ēhū* "his companion"): Siloam Tunnel 2, 3, 4. Cf. the single instance of *r^cw* (Jer 6:21), in contrast to *r^chw*, which appears in the Bible more than a hundred times. This is perhaps an archaic spelling which was

47b. Cf. *GKC* §91e; Bergsträsser, *ibid.*; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913): xxxii.

48. N. Avigad, "Ḥotam," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (E. L. Sukenik et al., eds.; 7 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950-1976): 3.68-84.

49. H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922): 217 §22f.

vocalized on analogy to regular singular nouns with 3 m.s. suffix (*rē‘ô*) in contrast to the normative biblical spelling and vocalization as *rē‘ēhū*. Compare the *Ketib wy²hbw* and *Qere wayye²ēhābēhū* (1 Sam 18:1). Cf. Gordis' list 60.

10. Proper name *‘wpy*: Kh. el-Kom 1:1; Cf. *Ketib ‘wpy*, *Qere ‘ypy* (*‘ēpay*) (Jer 40:8; cf. Gordis' list 85).^{49a}

3.2 Against all these instances the name *hwdwyhw* (Lachish 3:17) is identical with the *Qere* in 1 Chr 3:24 against the *Ketib hdywhw* (Gordis' list 85), but the Lachish form is also found in the Bible (1 Chr 5:24; 9:7). With respect to the word *lqrt* (Siloam Tunnel 4), there are different opinions. E. Y. Kutscher⁵⁰ wrote: "The root of *lqrt* is *qrh*; the form *lqr²t* of the Biblical text is a blending of the roots *qrh* and *qr²*." Therefore, he concludes that the spelling of the inscription is the original one. Albright's view is different;⁵¹ he writes: "In the Siloam inscriptions we find *liqrât* (*lqr²t* in the Bible) written phonetically *lqrt*, i.e. the Hebrew Bible preserves the older spelling." *BDB* also attributes *lqr²t* to a root *qr²* equivalent to the root *qrh*.⁵²

3.3 The general agreement of the spelling of the inscriptions with that of the *Ketib* is worthy of investigation: Are the *Ketib* writings more popular forms as against literary forms of the *Qere*? Are the *Ketib* forms older than those of the *Qere*? Each case has to be evaluated on its own merits.⁵³

3.4 The 2 m.s. verbal and pronominal suffixes

3.4.1 This is the proper place to discuss the orthography of the 2 m.s. pf. verbal suffix and the 2 m.s. pronominal suffix. The MT presents a type of *Ketib* and *Qere*. The *Ketib*, i.e., the consonantal text, reads the 2 m.s. pf. verbal suffix as -t, e.g., *qilt*; the 2 m.s. pronominal suffix as -k, e.g., *dbrk*. Since the final vowels are

49a. If *klt* (Yavneh Yam 8) and *šlht* (Muraba‘at 17A:1) are correctly interpreted as the first person singular perfect without final *yod*, then cf. the *Ketib bāntt*, *Qere bāntt* (1 Kgs 8:48) and three more similar cases in Gordis' list 8; cf. also *GKC* §44i.

50. E. Y. Kutscher, "Inscriptions of the First Temple Period," *Sepher Yerushalayim* (M. Avi-Yonah, ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1956): 169.

51. W. F. Albright, "A Reexamination of the Lachish Letters," *BASOR* 73 (1939): 21 n. 35.

52. *BDB*: 896.

53. Compare the individual evaluations given by Cross and Freedman in *EHO* (N 11): 50 (on *hyt*), *ibid.*, n. 28 (on *r^cw*), 52-53 (on *‘t*).

generally indicated in the MT by *matres lectionis*, this spelling points to the vocalizations *-t* (verb), i.e., *qāṭalt*, and *-āk* (pronominal suffix), i.e., *dābārāk*. But the *Qere*—the Masoretic vocalization—has a final *qāmeṣ*, requiring the reading *-tā* (verb), i.e., *qāṭaltā*, and *-kā* (pronominal suffix), i.e., *dābārākā*. Cross and Freedman offer the following explanation:

The longer form of the suffix was native to old Hebrew and survived in elevated speech and literary works. The shorter form developed in the popular speech at a very early date. . . . The present Masoretic text represents a mixture of these forms, both of which have been extended throughout the Bible. The short form is preserved in the orthography, the long form in the vocalization. The orthography is standardized, clearly on the basis of manuscripts in which the short form predominated. The vocalization, however, was based on manuscripts in which the long form was common.⁵⁴

3.4.2 The inscriptions present the following picture.

1. Verbal suffixes: on one hand, *yd^cth* (Lachish 2:6; 3:8; Arad 40:9), *šlḥth* (Lachish 5:4, reading uncertain), *ktbth* (Arad 7:6); on the other hand, *šlḥt* (Muraba^c at 17A:1, reading uncertain), *wntt* (Arad 2:7-8), *wlḥt* (Arad 17:3-4), *wsrri* (Arad 3:5). The verbal affirmative is always *-th* in Lachish, while in Arad *-th* is found twice and *-t* three times. Torczyner⁵⁵ identified these forms in the Lachish ostraca as pronominal suffixes, but Ginsberg⁵⁶ claims that *h* represents the final vowel, as is found many times in the MT. This opinion seems more likely.
2. Pronominal suffix: The inscriptions, with one possible exception, always have the form without the final *mater lectionis*. The exception may be *ḥkh* in Kh. Bet Lei 1:1, according to Cross' reading rather than *ḥy kl*.⁵⁷ Otherwise we consistently find *-k*; e.g., *ḥdk* (Yavneh-Yam 2 and *passim*: Lachish 2:3-4 and *passim*), *bytk* (Muraba^c at 17A:2; Arad 16:2, 4; 21:2), *ḥtk* (Arad 5:2; 6:2; 16:7; 40:8).

54. Ibid., p. 66. The quote actually comes from a discussion of the pronominal suffix only. However, on p. 67 Cross and Freedman further state: "What has been said about the 2nd person s. suffix applies equally well to the perfect 2nd person m. s. of the verb."

55. Torczyner, *Te'udot* (N*): 37-42.

56. H. L. Ginsberg, "Lachish Notes," *BASOR* 71 (1938): 26.

57. F. M. Cross, "The Cave Inscriptions of Khirbet Beit Lei," *Near Eastern Archaeology* (N 31): 301.

3.4.3 Following Cross and Freedman, one can propose that the inscriptional forms such as *ḥdk*, which are identical with the usual Masoretic consonantal text, represent the later or popular speech, as do the verbal forms *šlḥt*, etc. The longer forms such as *yd^cth*, *šlḥth*, etc., identical with the Masoretic vocalization, represent the vocalization in older or literary language. For the pronominal suffix, the inscriptions completely coincide with the Masoretic *Ketib*. The verbal suffix coincides with the Masoretic *Qere* in the Lachish sherds, and is divided between *Ketib* and *Qere* in Arad.

3.4.4 Note, however, that the relationship between the forms *qāṭalt/qāṭaltā*, *dābārāk/dābārākā* is viewed differently by Ben-Ḥayyim.⁵⁸ He concludes that Biblical Hebrew actually knows only the forms with the vocalic ending, and the shorter forms are due to late Aramaic influence. His argumentation is very convincing, and he also offers an acceptable explanation of these apparently exceptional forms (to which a few others must be added) having a final vowel without a *mater lectionis*.⁵⁹

3.4.5 As to the relation of the two forms, one with final vowel and one without it, to proto-Semitic, one has to bear in mind that the parallel forms in the other Semitic languages suggest the conclusion that the final vowels of *qāṭaltā* and *dābārākā* were originally short. However, in order to explain their continuation in the Masoretic vocalization (where all originally short vowels in final, open, unaccented syllables were lost), grammarians have been obliged to propose that they were *incipites*.^{59a} From these *incipites* vowels, the longer form of the suffix with the final vowel as well as the short form can, of course, be derived.

4. THE VARIATION B/P

4.1 In one of the Arad ostraca we find *bnbškm* (Arad 24:18) instead of *bnpškm* and *whbqydm* (lines 14-15) instead of *whpqydm*. The *nbš* spelling also appears in all the Zinjirli inscriptions, i.e., in the Phoenician Kilamuwa inscription (*KAI*

58. Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "The form of the suffixal pronouns *-kā*, *-tā*, *-hā*," *Sepher Assaf* (M. D. Cassuto et al., eds.; Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1953): 66-99.

59. Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "Masoret ha-šomronim we-ziqqatah le masoret ha-lašon šel megillot yam ha-melaḥ u-li-lešon ḥazal," *Leshonenu* 22 (1958-1959): 230 n. 17.

59a. Bauer and Leander (N 49): 231 §26a; 255 §29j; 308 §42d.

24:13 [*bis*]); the so-called Ya^cudic stelae, Hadad (*KAI* 214:17 [*ter*]), Panammu (*KAI* 215:18) and in the Old Aramaic Barakkab inscription (*KAI* 217:7). The form also is found in the Sefire inscriptions (*KAI* 222A:37; 222B:39, 40, 42; 224:5-6, 6-7). J. Friedrich⁶⁰ presumes that *nbš* is a Ya^cudic dialectal form; R. Degen⁶¹ writes that no acceptable explanation has as yet been given for the change *p* > *b*. In any event, it does not seem reasonable to link the Arad inscriptions with north-Syrian dialects. Since this shift appears twice in the same ostrakon, Aharoni's suggestion that it is a general phonetic phenomenon, seems likely; however, since it is not attested elsewhere in these ostraca, it is possible that it is an idiosyncrasy of the scribe. It should be noted that in both cases the unvoiced *p* has changed to the voiced *b* in contiguity with an unvoiced sound, *š* or *q* in Arad 24. Note, in this connection, that Friedrich concluded⁶² that in *nbš* an anaptyctic vowel separated *b* and *š*. J. N. Epstein⁶³ collected 15 words from Mishnaic Hebrew showing variants between *b* and *p*: *hbqr/hpqr*, *bq^ct/pq^ct*, *bwš^c/pwš^c*, *bss/pss*, *tbwsh/tpwsh*, etc. Two examples from biblical Hebrew may be added to those noted above: *šbt^y* (2 Sam 7:7)/*špt^y* (1 Chr 17:6) (if we consider the different vocalization as Masoretic correction), and the proper name *šwbk* (2 Sam 10:16,18)/*šwpk* (1 Chr 19:16,18). M. Dahood⁶⁴ assumes that the root *b^cl* is occasionally written in the MT instead of *p^cl*: e.g., *wəlō³ yəmallēt reša^c 3et bə^cālāw* (read *pə^cālāw*); and similarly, he proposes to correct Isa 54:5, Job 31:39 and Prov 3:27. He also pointed out Ugaritic and Hebrew forms showing the variance *p/b*, e.g., Ugaritic *3rpt* corresponding to Hebrew *3rbt*. In the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine (*AP*) we find *mpth*, *mpthyh* alongside *mbth*, *mbthyh*.⁶⁵

60. J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (Rome: PBI, 1970): 17 §40 n. 1.

61. R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1969): 31.

62. Friedrich and Röllig (N 60): 38 §96 n. 1.

63. J. N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Text of the Mishnah* (Jerusalem: privately published, 1948): 1220-1223.

64. M. Dahood, "Qoheleth and Northwest Semitic Philology," *Biblica* 43 (1962): 361-362.

65. Cf. *AP* 8:2 versus 13:2 and 8:36 versus 22:83, 88, 106; cited from A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923). See further, P. Leander, *Laut- und Formenlehre des Ägyptisch-Aramäischen* (Göteborg: Univ. of Göteborg, 1928): 13 §3i.

4.3 In general, one may suppose that *p* and *b* coalesced in certain layers of Hebrew and other Semitic languages through the neutralization of the voiced/unvoiced opposition. Perhaps *b* changed frequently to *p* before an unvoiced consonant due to assimilation, and the spelling of our words is a hypercorrection. A similar case of hypercorrection is found in the Mishnah: the word *nškr* in the sentence *ma^h šenniškar hū mapsīd* (^cErub. 5:7) is written *nzkr* in a Geniza fragment.⁶⁶

5. THE IMPERATIVE *NTN*

5.1 In the Arad ostraca, besides the usual imperative *tn* (Arad 3:2; 4:1, 3; 12:2; 18:4; 60:4; 71:1), the *ntn* with imperative force occurs five (perhaps seven) times: *ntn lktym* "give to the Kittiyim" (1:2; 2:1; 7:2; 8:1; 11:2; presumably also to be restored in 10:2 and 14:2). Aharoni sees in this form an infinitive absolute used as imperative, as in *šāmōr 3et yōm haššabbat* (Deut 5:2). Although this is a reasonable argument, nevertheless, we have to consider the fact that this emphatic use belongs to high, literary, biblical style, and does not seem to fit administrative correspondence. We may perhaps assume that, just as the verb *ntn* possesses two forms of infinitive construct, *tt/ntn*, so also it possesses two forms of the imperative, one with the aphaeresis of initial *n* (cf. *gaš* from *ngš*) and one retaining this *n* (cf. *nəpōl* from *npl*). The former is usual in the Bible, while the latter appears in these documents. We should also bear in mind that the root *nš³* has, besides the more common imperative *ša*, a second form *nəšā³* (Ps 10:12).

5.2 It is important to note that the Arad ostraca (as pointed out by Gibson)⁶⁷ employ three (or four) alternatives to express commands: 1. imperative, e.g. *w^ct tn mn hyyn* (3:1-2); 2. future, e.g., *w^ct tn lšmryhu . . . wlqrsy ttn* (18:3-6); 3. perfect consecutive, e.g., *b³ byth 3lyšb . . . wlqht m(šm)* (17:1-4); and, according to Aharoni, 4. infinitive (see above).

6. OMISSION OF THE DETERMINING ARTICLE

6.1 It is interesting to compare the expression *šr h^cr*, i.e., *šar*

66. A. I. Katsch, *Ginze Mishna* (Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1970): photostat no. 24.

67. Gibson (N*) : 50.

hā^cir on two bullae from the middle of the 7th Century⁶⁸ with the inscription *lśr^cr*, i.e., *lāśar^cir* incised on four storage-jars from Kuntillet 'Ajrud⁶⁹—the former having the determinative article, the latter lacking it. This recalls the expression *bēt hammelek*, which appears in the Bible over 60 times;⁷⁰ while we once have ²*et bēt melek* without the article even though it is preceded by the particle ²*et* (1 Kgs 16:18), and three times the *Qere bēt hammelek* with the *Ketib bēt melek* (1 Kgs 15:18; 2 Kgs 11:20; 15:25). Gordis⁷¹ records these instances of *Ketib-Qere* among the 19 instances of "Use or omission of the definite article," 12 of which occur in the context of construct phrases. Gordis remarks⁷²: "Perhaps there existed in Hebrew an assimilation of the article in common phrases like a construct relation." Besides this phonetic explanation, one can suggest a syntactic one: In the construct phrase, the *nomen regens* is partly determined by the *nomen rectum*, so that the article becomes redundant. Another possible explanation is based on rhythmic considerations, but this is a complex question which cannot be dealt with here. In any event, the omission of the article can be clearly shown in a large number of similar cases, e.g., *śar śābā²* (2 Sam 2:8; 19:14; 1 Kgs 16:16) as against the more common *śar haśśābā²*; *rab ṭabbāḥīm* (2 Kgs 25:8 + 23 times) as against *śar haṭṭabbāḥīm* (Gen 37:36 + 29 times); ²*ohel mō^ced*, which never occurs with the article, even when it is explicitly determined as in the phrase ²*et^c ṭohel mō^ced* (Exod 29:44).⁷³ We can also note that, in a comparison, the article always accompanies a noun, but not in a genitival relation,⁷⁴ e.g., *wəyak śorāšaw kallābānōn . . . wərə^aḥ lō kallābānōn . . . zikrō kayēn lābānōn* (Hos 14:6–8).

6.2 This omission seems to be particularly common in non-literary or popular speech, and this explains why it appears rarely in the Bible, sometimes in the *Ketib* only (corrected in the *Qere*).

68. N. Avigad, "The Governor of the City," *IEJ* 26 (1976): 178–182; cf. also, G. Barkay, "A Second Bulla of a 'Sar Ha-^cIr,'" *Qadmoniot* 10 (1977): 69–71.

69. Cf. Z. Meshel, "Kuntillet 'Ajrud—An Israelite Site on the Sinai Border," *Qadmoniot* 9 (1976): 122; also *Kuntillet 'Ajrud* (N 7): 9 and illustration 21.

70. Cf. A. Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1977–1980): 1.169.

71. Gordis (N 47): 147, list 77.

72. *Ibid.*, n. 451.

73. P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique* (Rome: PBI, 1923): 427.

74. *Ibid.*

For the same reason this tendency is much more common in Mishnaic Hebrew, which is generally assumed to be an outgrowth of the popular language spoken during the late biblical period.

6.3 As to the expression *śar hā^cir*, it is always found with the article in the Bible (Judg 9:30; 1 Kgs 22:26; 2 Kgs 23:8; 2 Chr 18:25; 34:8). However, in Mishnaic Hebrew there is a similar expression *heber^cir* (*M. Ber.* 4:7; *T. Pe^a.* 4:16; *B. Roš. Haš.* 34b; *B. Meg.* 27b), which is never determined; though, in the majority of its occurrences, it is understood as potentially definite: Ovadya Bertinoro⁷⁵ explains: *bā ḥābūrat hā^cir*; the *Arukh*:⁷⁶ *gādōl hā^cir*; S. Lieberman, in his brief commentary to the *Tōsefta*: *ḥākam hā^cir*,⁷⁷ and in *Tōsefta kipāšuta*: *wa^cad hā^cir*.^{77a}

6.4 In conclusion, the determinate form in the bullae agrees with standard Biblical Hebrew, while the indeterminate form of Kuntillet 'Ajrud reveals a more colloquial style, which occurs rarely in the Bible, more frequently in the *Ketib* and even more frequently in Mishnaic Hebrew.

7. THE LEXICON

7.1 The contribution of the inscriptions to the lexicon of Biblical Hebrew is quite modest. From the Siloam tunnel inscription we have the word *zdḥ* (line 3), which derives from an unknown root and which has not yet been convincingly explained. Two words found on weights are worthy of note. The first, *nsp*⁷⁸ is not attested in the Bible. It likely means 'half' and can be compared to Arabic *niṣf* 'half'⁷⁹ and Ugaritic *nsp* 'half.'⁸⁰ The second, *pym*⁸¹ should probably be read *payīm* 'two parts,' i.e., 'two-thirds' of a standard weight, an abbreviation equivalent to the biblical expression *pī śnayim* (Zach 13:8).⁸² Biblical *pīm* in 1

75. Cf. the references here cited in the Mishnah.

76. A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum . . .*, s.v. *hbr*.

77. S. Lieberman, *Tosefta* (4 vols.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary): 1.59.

77a. S. Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-Fshuṭah* (8 vols.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1955–1973): 1.190.

78. Hestrin et al. (N 4a): 105 no. 98.

79. E. Stern, "Weights and Measures," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (N 48): 4.869–870.

80. *UT*: 1.50.

81. Hestrin, et al. (N 4a): 105 no. 97.

82. Stern (N 79): 870–871.

Sam 13:21 is probably to be identified with *pym*, and therefore, it has been proposed to read the biblical passage: *wahayatā^h happaširā^h payīm lammahārēšōt wālā^hētīm ūšališ haššeql ləhaqqardummīm*.⁸³ Opinions vary concerning the unit of weight of which *pym* and *nšp* are subdivisions.^{83a}

7.2 Several words are derived from biblical roots according to new patterns, such as *nqbh* 'tunnel, breach' (line 1, etc.) in the Siloam tunnel inscription, though Albright,⁸⁴ following A. Fischer,⁸⁵ interprets all the occurrences of this word in the inscription as the *Nip^cal* infinitive (*hnqbh*) rather than as a noun with definite article. Note as well *rpđ* (*reped?* 'padding'; Lachish 4:5) and *btsbth* (*bītsibbatō?* "in his patrol"; *ibid.*, 9).

7.3 In addition, a careful examination of the meaning of biblical words, as they appear in the inscriptions, may reveal different nuances or usages. This may even change an established opinion of the sense of a known biblical word. Thus *wd* (*ōd*), is an adverb in the Bible ('still, again'), but in Arad 1:5 and 5:3 (cf. also 2:7, 21:8) it occurs as a noun (= 'remainder'): *m^cwd hqmh hr^hšn* "from the remainder of the first flour." Only in the Mishnah is this word used in a somewhat similar way: "Heave-offering . . . (which has been mixed with other fruits) may be separated (from the other fruits) if it was (mixed with a quantity) a hundred times and something more (*mē^hā^h wā^cōd*) (of the quantity of heave)." The Mishnah continues: "This *wā^cōd* has no exact measure; Rabbi Yose ben Meshullam says *wā^cōd* is one *qab* for every hundred *seahs*" (*M. Ter.* 417).

7.4 In the inscriptions we also find *dm* (i.e., *ādām*) employed as an indefinite pronoun 'somebody, anybody,' as in the Mishnah⁸⁶ and in Phoenician,⁸⁷ while in the Bible *š* usually has this sense.⁸⁸ Thus, for example, *rw^r h^hdm š^r yph^h t z^t* "cursed

83. M. S. Segal, *Sifre Shemuel* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964): 101, 405, 409.

83a. Stern (N 79): 4.869-871.

84. W. F. Albright, "Review of A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*," *JBL* 62 (1943): 370.

85. A. Fischer, "Zur Siloahschrift," *ZDMG* 56 (1902): 808-809.

86. M. S. Segal, *Diqduq leshon ha-Mishna* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1936): 64; H. Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishnah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1964): 46.

87. Friedrich and Röllig (N 60): 295.

88. Cf. *GKC* §139d.

(be) anyone who would open this" (Siloam Tomb 2-3); *yn šm dm* "no one is there" (Lachish 4:5-6), but *m nsh yš* "no one has dared" (Lachish 3:9-10).⁸⁹

7.5 The vocalization and interpretation of the *rhš* in the phrase *šmn rhš* in the Samaria ostraca (16:3 and *passim*) is problematic. The majority of scholars take it as the passive participle *rāhūš* and the expression as meaning "washed (i.e., purified) oil."⁹⁰ If this is correct, then we have here a usage of this verb unknown to Biblical Hebrew; for biblical *rhš* is used only in connection with the human or animal body and its parts or with garments. Others read *rahaš* 'washing, ablution' as in *sīr rahašī* (Ps 60:10). In line with this argument, *šemen rahaš* can be compared to *mē rahaš* "waters of ablution" of the "Manual of Discipline" (1 QS 3:5).⁹¹

7.6 The word *āšērā^h* in the inscription *brkt tkm lyhwh šmrn wl^hšrth* (*bēraktī etkem ləY-H-W-H šōmārēnū wəla āšērātō*) "I will bless you by the Lord, our guardian, and by his Asherah" from Kuntillet 'Ajrud is problematic. Z. Meshel suggests translating it "cella" (i.e., 'sacred place,' evidently linking *āšērā^h* with Aramaic *ātar*) or 'symbol' (as biblical *āšērā^h* = 'sacred tree,' 'pole').⁹²

7.7 Y. Yadin⁹³ has made the interesting suggestion that the *lamed* prefixed to personal names does not stand for "to" (dative, destination), but for "of" (genitive, ownership). Such a view entails a completely new interpretation of the Samaria ostraca. Thus, the formula *bšt h^cšrt mḥšrt lgdyw nbl šmn rhš* (Samaria 18) would be understood: "In the tenth year. From Haserot, (from the estate) belonging to Gaddiyau, a jar of oil for washing," and not "(sent) to Gaddiyau." Note also that according to the Arad ostraca, destination is indicated by the particle *el*. Still, even though Yadin's thesis has been rejected by Rainey⁹⁴ and Aha-

89. Note that Cross and Freedman draw back from definitely interpreting *yš* as 'man'; cf. their remarks (N 11): 54.

90. See, e.g., R. M. Savignac, quoted by Lemaire (N 9): 47 n. 5.

91. F. Israel, "L'olio da toeletta negli ostraca di Samaria," *RSO* 49 (1975): 17-20.

92. Meshel, *Kuntillet 'Ajrud* (N 7): 11.

93. Y. Yadin, "Recipients or Owners—A Note on the Samaria Ostraca," *IEJ* 9 (1959): 184-187; "A Further Note on the Samaria Ostraca," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 64-66; "A Further Note on the *lamed* in the Samaria Ostraca," *IEJ* 18 (1968): 50-51.

94. A. F. Rainey, "Administration in Ugarit and the Samaria Ostraca," *IEJ* 12

roni,⁹⁵ considerable biblical evidence may be added to that already noted by Yadin. Here is one further example. In the passage, *wə'ēlle^h ṭəḥore hazzāhāb ṽāšer hēšībū pəlišṭīm ṽāšām la Y-H-W-H lə'āšdōd ṽeḥād lə'azza^h ṽeḥād lə'āšqəlōn ṽeḥād . . .* (1 Sam 6:17) it is clear that the atonement offering was not being sent to *Ashdod* and the other cities, but rather from assets belonging to them.

7.8 A surprising feature is the small number of words and roots found in the inscriptions which were not already known to us from Biblical Hebrew. It is commonly thought that, on account of its limited scope and of the particular subjects treated in the Bible, the lexicon of the biblical period contained far greater vocabulary than that preserved in scripture. Thus far, this opinion cannot be sustained by the inscriptional evidence.⁹⁶ This may be partially accounted for by the fact that the majority of the inscriptions which have reached us are official or quasi-official documents of the Judaeen kingdom, hailing from the same chancery surroundings where the books of the Bible were likely composed or edited.

8. PHRASES

8.1 Considering the limited scope of our corpus, it is surprising the large number of biblical phrases found in it. The following are a sample:

1. *nbl yn* (Samaria ostraca *passim*) "jar/skin of wine" = *nēbel yayin* (1 Sam 1:24; 10:3; 25:18; 2 Sam 16:1). On the other hand, *yn yšn* "old wine" (also in the Samaria ostraca *passim*) is only attested in Mishnaic Hebrew, e.g., "He who learns from the old, to what is he like? To one who eats ripe grapes and drinks old wine (*yayin yāšān*)" (*M. Abot* 4:20); "Old wine (*yayin yāšān*) with which old men are pleased" (*B. Meg.* 16b; cf. *M. Šeb.* 7:7; *M. Ṭ. Yom* 1:2). Mention should also be made of the inscription on a wine jar *lyḥzyhw yyn khl* from the Eighth or the Seventh Century B.C.E. published by Avigad. He translated it: "Belonging to Yaḥzeyahu, wine of *Khl*," explaining *khl* as a toponym.⁹⁷ A. Demsky, however, has

(1962): 62-63; "Private Seal-Impressions: A Note on Semantics," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 187-190; "The Samaria Ostraca in the Light of Fresh Evidence," *PEQ* 99 (1967): 32-41.

95. Y. Aharoni, "The Samaria Ostraca—An Additional Note," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 67-69.

96. Cf. J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968): 225.

97. N. Avigad, "Two Hebrew Inscriptions on Wine-Jars," *IEJ* 22 (1972): 1-9.

suggested reading *yayin kāḥōl* "dark wine" based upon the meaning of *kāḥōl* 'dark, nearly black' in Mishnaic Hebrew, and on the biblical expression *ḥaklilī 'ēnayīm miyyayin* "eyes darker than wine" (Gen 49:12).⁹⁸

2. *zḥb ṽpr* (Tell Qasile B:1) "gold of Ophir" = *zāhāb ṽōpīr* (1 Chr 29:4; but in Isa 13:12; Ps 45:10; Job 28:16 we have *ketem ṽōpīr* "gold of Ophir").
3. *ṽš ṽl r'w* (Siloam Tunnel 2) "one to another" = *ṽš ṽel rē'ehū* (Gen 11:3; 43:33; etc.).
4. *ṽsr ṽl hbyṭ* (Siloam Tunnel 1) "royal steward" = *ṽāšer 'al habbayit* (1 Kgs 16:9; 18:3; 2 Kgs 10:5; 18:18; Isa 22:15; 37:2).
5. *ksp wzḥb* (Siloam Tunnel 1) "silver and gold" = *kesep wazāhāb* (Num 22:18; 24:13, etc.).
6. *šr ḥšb* (Lachish 3:14) "commander of the army" = *šar haššābā* (1 Sam 17:55; etc.).
7. *lb ṽ mšrymh* (Lachish 3:15-16) "to enter Egypt" = *lābō ṽ mišraymāh* (Gen 12:11).
8. *ḥy yḥwh ṽlhyk* (Lachish 6:12-13) "As the Lord your God lives" = *ḥay Y-H-W-H ṽēlōhēkā* (1 Kgs 17:12; 18:10).
9. *šmd ḥmrm* (Arad 3:4-5) "a yoke of asses" = *šemed ḥāmōrīm* (Judg 19:3; 2 Sam 16:1).
10. *ntn . . . byd . . .* (Arad 17:8-9) "given over to" = *nātan . . . bəyad . . .* (Josh 2:24; 2 Kgs 18:30; etc.).
11. *byṭ yḥwh* (Arad 18:9) "house of the Lord" = *bēt Y-H-W-H* (179 times in the Bible).
12. *šlḥ . . . [by]d . . .* (Arad 24:13-14) "sent in the charge of" = *yāšallah . . . bəyad . . .* (2 Sam 18:2).
13. *dbṛ ḥmlk* (Arad 24:17) "the king's order" = *dəbar ḥammelek* (1 Chr 21:4).
14. *ṽlhy kl ḥ'rṣ* (Kh. Bet Lei A:1) "God of all the earth" = *ṽēlōhē kōl ḥā'āreṣ* (Isa 54:5).
15. *ṽ[ḥ]y yršlm* (Kh. Bet Lei A:2) "God of Jerusalem" = *ṽēlōhē yārūšālayim* (2 Chr 32:19).

8.2 Occasionally a complete phrase appears in the Bible and in one of the inscriptions in the same or in a very similar form. The similarity may be either lexical or syntactic. Here are a few examples:

98. A. Demsky, "'Dark Wine' from Judah," *IEJ* 22 (1972): 233-234. We might also note in passing that a decanter from Lachish bears the inscription *yyn 'šn* (*yayin 'āšān*); cf. *ḥāmar 'āšān* in the Targum of Ps 75:9; see D. Ussishkin, "Excavations at Tel Lachish," *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 83.

1. yn [p]h ksp wzhb (Siloam Tomb 1) "There is no silver or gold [h]ere" = $\text{en li [Ketib] kesep wazahab}$ (2 Sam 21:4).
2. $\text{rwr h}^{\text{dm}} \text{sr ypt}^{\text{h}}$ (Siloam Tomb 2) "cursed be the man who opens . . ." = $\text{arur ha}^{\text{is}} \text{aser ya}^{\text{aseh}} \text{pesel}$ (Deut 27:15).
3. $\text{ysm}^{\text{c}} \text{dny hsr}^{\text{t}} \text{dbr}^{\text{c}} \text{bdh}$ (Yavneh Yam 1-2) "May my lord the official hear his servant's plea" = $\text{wattah}^{\text{h}} \text{yisma}^{\text{c}} \text{na}^{\text{t}} \text{adoni hammelek}^{\text{t}} \text{et dibre}^{\text{c}} \text{abdoh}$ (1 Sam 26:19).
4. $\text{qsr hyh}^{\text{c}} \text{bdk bh}^{\text{sr}} \text{sm}$ (Yavneh Yam 3-4) "your servant was reaping in Hašar Asam" = $\text{roeh}^{\text{h}} \text{hayah}^{\text{h}} \text{abdaka}^{\text{h}} \text{labiw baššod}^{\text{n}}$ (1 Sam 17:34).
5. $\text{my}^{\text{c}} \text{bdk klb ky zkr}^{\text{t}} \text{dny}^{\text{t}} \text{[c]bdh}$ (Lachish 2:3-5; cf. *ibid.* 5:3-4; 6:2-3) "Who is your [se]rvant but a dog that my lord remembers his servant?" = $\text{ki mah}^{\text{h}} \text{abdaka}^{\text{h}} \text{hakkeleb ki ya}^{\text{aseh}} \text{haddabar haggadol hazze}^{\text{h}}$ (2 Kgs 8:13; see also 2 Sam 9:8⁹⁹).
6. $\text{sh}^{\text{h}} \text{lhgd}^{\text{d}} \text{Pd}^{\text{ny}}$ (Lachish 3:1-2) "he sends repo[r]t to] my [lor]d" = $\text{waeshlah}^{\text{h}} \text{lhaggid}^{\text{d}} \text{ladoni}$ (Gen 32:6).
7. $\text{kl}^{\text{t}} \text{sr sh}^{\text{h}} \text{dny}^{\text{t}} \text{kn}^{\text{c}} \text{sh}^{\text{c}} \text{bdk}$ (Lachish 4:2-3) "Your servant has followed all my lord's instructions." = $\text{kakol haddabar aser yishlahaka Y-H-W-H}^{\text{h}} \text{eloheka}^{\text{h}} \text{elenu ken na}^{\text{aseh}}$ (Jer 42:5).
8. $\text{yn sm}^{\text{t}} \text{dm}$ (Lachish 4:5-6) "no one is there" = $\text{en sam}^{\text{t}} \text{is}$ (2 Kgs 7:10).
9. $\text{ktb sm}^{\text{t}} \text{hym}$ (Arad 1:4) "write the date" = $\text{kato}^{\text{b}} \text{laka}^{\text{h}} \text{sem hayyom}$ (Ezek 24:2).
10. $\text{ml}^{\text{p}} \text{h}^{\text{hmr}} \text{yyn}$ (Arad 2:5) "a homer-full of wine" = $\text{maloh}^{\text{d}} \text{hahomer man}$ (Exod 16:33).
11. $\text{ms}^{\text{p}} \text{sm}^{\text{d}} \text{hmrm}$ (Arad 3:4-5) "the load of two asses" = $\text{masa}^{\text{a}} \text{šemed paradim}$ (2 Kgs 5:17).
12. $\text{wh}^{\text{tm}} \text{th}^{\text{t}} \text{b}^{\text{h}^{\text{tmk}}}$ (Arad 17:5-7) "seal it with your seal" = $\text{watahtom bahotamoh}$ (1 Kgs 21:8).
13. $\text{yslm yhw}^{\text{h}} \text{Pd}^{\text{ny}}$ (Arad 21:4) "May the Lord render to [my] master" = $\text{yašallēm Y-H-W-H}^{\text{h}} \text{loseh}^{\text{h}}$ (2 Sam 3:39).
14. $\text{pn yqrh}^{\text{t}} \text{h}^{\text{c}} \text{yr}^{\text{t}} \text{dbr}$ (Arad 24:16-17) "lest something befall the city" = $\text{pen yiqra}^{\text{d}} \text{ennu}^{\text{t}} \text{asohn}$ (Gen 42:4).
15. $\text{lh}^{\text{yd}} \text{bkm}^{\text{t}} \text{hym}$ (Arad 24:18-19) "to warn you today" = $\text{hah}^{\text{t}} \text{doh}^{\text{t}} \text{bakem hayyom}$ (Jer 42:19; see also Deut 32:46).
16. $\text{ny yhw}^{\text{h}} \text{lh}^{\text{ykh}}$ (Kh. Bet Lei, according to Cross' interpretation¹⁰⁰) "I am the Lord your God" = $\text{anokh}^{\text{t}} \text{Y-H-W-H}^{\text{h}} \text{eloheka}^{\text{h}}$ (Exod 20:2).
17. $\text{brk}^{\text{t}} \text{ryhw}^{\text{t}} \text{lyhw}^{\text{h}}$ (Kh. El-Kom 3:2) "Blessed is Uriyahu to the Lord" = $\text{baruk banh}^{\text{t}} \text{laY-H-W-H}$ (Judg 17:2; see also 1 Sam 15:13; 23:21; 2 Sam 2:5; Ps 115:15; Ruth 2:20; 3:10).

99. Cf. Torczyner, *Te'udot* (N *): 31-33.

100. *Ibid.*, n. 57.

9. FORMULAE OF SALUTATION

9.1 Some of the Lachish letters open with a more or less stereotyped greeting formula, which occurs with only minor alterations. In ostraca 2:1-3, 3:2-3 and 9:1-2 we find: $\text{ysm}^{\text{c}} \text{yhw}^{\text{h}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{dny}^{\text{t}} \text{sm}^{\text{c}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{slm}$. The first adds $\text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{kym}^{\text{c}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{kym}$ (line 3). In ostraca 4:1-2 and 8:1-2 the greeting formula is slightly varied; notably, instead of $\text{šamū}^{\text{c}} \text{ot}^{\text{t}} \text{šalōm}$ we have $\text{šm}^{\text{c}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{tb}$. In ostracon 5:2-3 the fuller formula (partially restored) seems to occur: $\text{šm}^{\text{c}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{šlm}^{\text{t}} \text{w}^{\text{t}} \text{b}$, while ostracon 6:1-3 has the slightly different wording: $\text{yr}^{\text{t}} \text{yhw}^{\text{h}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{dny}^{\text{t}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{h}^{\text{c}} \text{t}^{\text{t}} \text{hzh}^{\text{t}} \text{šlm}$.

9.2 These formulae are not known from Biblical Hebrew. The most similar expressions are $\text{mašmī}^{\text{ac}} \text{šalōm}$ (Isa 52:7; Nah 2:1), $\text{mašmī}^{\text{ac}} \text{yašū}^{\text{c}} \text{āh}$ (Isa 52:7), $\text{šamū}^{\text{c}} \text{āh} \text{rā}^{\text{c}} \text{āh}$ (Jer 49:23; Ps 112:7), $\text{šamū}^{\text{c}} \text{āh} \text{tōbā}^{\text{h}}$ (Prov 15:30; 25:25).

9.3 The Arad letters usually begin simply with the name of the addressee preceded by the preposition el , after which the content of the letter is introduced by the adverb w'at . The same adverb is found in Lachish 4:2 (and probably should be restored in 3:4), in Muraba'at 17A:2 and in the Bible (w'attā^{h} 2 Kgs 5:6; 10:2) and is parallel to Aramaic $\text{kā}^{\text{c}} \text{enet}$ (e.g., Ezra 4:11; AP 37:2¹⁰¹) and $\text{kā}^{\text{c}} \text{et}$ (e.g., Ezra 4:17; AP 17:3¹⁰²). Note $\text{el}^{\text{t}} \text{elyāšib}^{\text{t}} \text{w'at}$. . . (Arad 1:1-2, 2:1, 3:1, 5:1-2, 7:1-2, 8:1, 10:1, 11:1-2), $\text{el}^{\text{t}} \text{Nāhūm}^{\text{t}} \text{w'at}$. . . (17:1), and the formula without w'at (4:1, 12:1).

9.4 Only four of the Arad letters open with a fuller greeting formula (16, 18, 21, 40). Ostracon 18 reads: $\text{el}^{\text{t}} \text{adoni}^{\text{t}} \text{elyāšib}^{\text{t}} \text{Y-H-W-H}^{\text{h}} \text{yišal}^{\text{t}} \text{lišlōmākā}$. Although $\text{šā}^{\text{d}} \text{al}^{\text{t}} \text{lišlōm}$. . . "to inquire about (somebody's) welfare" is a common biblical phrase (cf., e.g., Judg 18:15; 1 Sam 10:4), it is never found in the Bible with God as subject.¹⁰³ In such a case, as in our ostracon and in the El Amarna texts quoted by Rainey,¹⁰⁴ $\text{šā}^{\text{d}} \text{al}$ cannot mean "inquire about" but rather "seek after." Similarly, in one of the Aramaic letters from Elephantine, we find: $\text{šlm}^{\text{t}} \text{mr}^{\text{t}} \text{n}^{\text{t}} \text{lh}^{\text{t}} \text{šmy}^{\text{t}} \text{yš}^{\text{d}} \text{l}^{\text{t}} \text{šgy}^{\text{t}} \text{bkl}^{\text{t}} \text{dn}$, which A. Cowley correctly translated, "The health of your lordship may the God of Heaven seek after exceedingly at

101. Cowley (N 65).

102. *Ibid.*

103. S. E. Loewenstamm, "Reply to A. F. Rainey," *Leshonenu* 37 (1972): 70.

104. A. F. Rainey, "Linguistic Method—May They Preserve It," *Leshonenu* 35 (1971): 14-15.

all times."¹⁰⁵ Note also *ša^ʔālū šālōm yərūšālāyim* (Ps 122:6), "seek after (or: pray for) the peace of Jerusalem."¹⁰⁶

9.6 The greeting formulae of the remaining Arad letters (16:1-3, 21:1-2, 40:1-3), as read by Aharoni, follow the same pattern PN₁ *šālah lišlōm* PN₂ *ūlišlōm bētākā, bēraktūkā l-Y-H-W-H*. The phrase *šālah lišlōm* does not appear in the Bible. It is found in Muraba^cat 17A:1, *šlht ʔt šlm bytk*, and in the Aramaic of Elephantine, *hwyt ʔšlh šlmk*.¹⁰⁷ In Akkadian letters we have the corresponding expression *ana šulmīkā āšpuram*.¹⁰⁸ Similarly, *bēraktūkā l-Y-H-W-H* is not found in the Bible, though we have *bārūk . . . l-Y-H-W-H* (cf., e.g., Judg 17:2). Also note *brk ʔryhw lyhwh* (Kh. El Kom 3:2). Similar expressions also occur in other languages. A Sixth-Century B.C.E. Phoenician inscription from Saqqara reads: *brtk lb^cl spn wkl ʔl thpnhs* (KAI 50:2-3). An Aramaic ostrakon from Elephantine reads: *šlm whyn šlht lk brtk lyhh wlhn*.¹⁰⁹ In the latter text the first part of the sentence is also very close to the basic pattern of the Arad letters. The exact phrase has recently been found in Hebrew texts. Two large jars from Kuntillet ʔAjrud bear the inscriptions: *brkt ʔtkm lyhwh* and *brtk lyhwh*.¹¹⁰

9.6 The remarkable fact is that these phrases of greeting, though conforming to Biblical Hebrew, are not found in their exact form in the Bible. They occur in Hebrew inscriptions from different places and times as well as in other Semitic languages. They belong to a chancery epistolary style, which was apparently not deemed worthy of being mixed with the literary style of the books of the Old Testament.

10. HEBREW DIALECTS OF THE FIRST TEMPLE PERIOD

10.1 There is no doubt that the Hebrew language was not the same in every location in which it was spoken. On the contrary, it

105. AP 30:1-2; cf. Cowley (N 65).

106. Cf. Tur-Sinai's note in E. Ben-Yehudah, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* (8 vols.; Berlin and Jerusalem: Yoseloff, 1908-1959): 6802.

107. AP 41:3; Cowley (N 65).

108. E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Hoflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen* (Studia Orientalia 38; Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967): 21.

109. S. E. Loewenstamm, "Miktav," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (N 48): 4.971.

110. Meshel, "Kuntillet ʔAjrud" (N 69) and *Kuntillet ʔAjrud* (N 7): 11.

was definitely divided into different dialects. The Bible contains only very scanty testimony to this geographical differentiation, which was levelled by the written literary language.¹¹¹ To the few traces of dialectal differences culled from the biblical texts, we may now add the evidence from the Samaria ostraca on the contraction of the diphthongs (*yn* as against *yyn* as found in the Bible and in the Arad ostraca; cf. also *qš* in the Gezer tablet instead of *qyš*) and the assimilation of *n* (*št = šnh*) in Israelite Hebrew, both features being present in Phoenician.

10.2 Also in the Samaria ostraca we can note the ending *-yw* of theophoric names (*yd^cyw* [e.g., 1:8], *gdyw* [e.g., 2:2], *bdyw* [50:2], *ryw* [52:2], *šmryw* [e.g., 1:1-2], *glyw* [41], *mrnyw* [e.g., 42:3]), as against the ending *-yhw* in the Bible, the Lachish letters, the Arad ostraca and seal inscriptions. This testifies to the elision of *h* in the Northern dialect. According to Torczyner¹¹² this *-yw* ending is particular to Israelite Hebrew, while *-yhw* belongs to Judaeon Hebrew. H. L. Ginsberg¹¹³ opposed this view, relying on the readings *lšbnyw ʔbd ʔzyw* and *ʔbyhw ʔbd ʔzyw*,^{113a} where the ending *-yw* appears in the name of the Judean king Uzziah and in those of two of his officials. In his opinion the spelling *-yw* was used in the Eighth Century and the spelling *-yhw* in the 7th-6th Centuries, and there is no geographical difference whatsoever. Other seals, e.g., *mqnyw ʔbd yhw*,¹¹⁴ provide additional backing to Ginsberg's approach. Ginsberg, however, did not explain how the longer ending developed from the shorter one. One might contend that the longer forms developed under the influence of the tetragrammaton, an influence which operated according to Bergsträsser,¹¹⁵ in a much later time, in such proper names as *ywn^ctn > yhw^ctn*. Aharoni sustained Torczyner's opinion adducing seal inscriptions from the 9th and 8th Centuries bearing such names as *dršyhw, nknyhw, šbnyhw* and others. His

111. Bergsträsser (N 37): 11 §2g.

112. Torczyner, *Teʔudot* (N *): 5.

113. Ginsberg, "Lachish Notes" (N 56): 24-25.

113a. Cf. Diringer (N *): nos. 65 (p. 221) and 67 (p. 223).

114. F. M. Cross, "The Seal of the Miquenyaw Servant of Y-H-W-H," *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, 1973* (forthcoming).

115. Bergsträsser (N 37): 94 §16c. Bergsträsser's theory has been proved wrong by seal inscriptions containing such names as *yhw^cndb, yhw^czr* (cf. Hestrin [N 9]: 92, 61).

conclusion is: "Now it is clear that the forms *-yw* and *-yhw* belong to different dialects which existed at the same period in the Israelite and in the Judaeen kingdoms, respectively. The *ʿzyw* seals are exceptions, and they were probably produced in a northern workshop."¹¹⁶

10.3 The *-yw* ending became widespread in the Persian period, among Palestinian as well as Babylonian Jews, as shown by the seals *nhm br hlqyw*, *ʿbnr pqdyw*, *yhw d ʿwryw* and by certain Akkadian transliterations.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, none of the names of Babylonian Jews mentioned in the Bible ends in *-yw*, except for *ʿhyw* (e.g., 2 Sam 6:3), which is not theophoric.¹¹⁸ In the biblical books of the Second Temple period, the ending *-yhw* was shortened to *-yh*,¹¹⁹ but one must bear in mind that in many instances this ending is not a theophoric element but the parallel of the Akkadian hypocoristic ending.¹²⁰

11. THE LANGUAGE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS AND MISHNAIC HEBREW

11.1 It is worthwhile to bring together the linguistic features of the language of the inscriptions which are found sometimes in a much larger measure in Mishnaic Hebrew, as have been pointed out in several places in this paper. These are: the variation *p/b* (para. 5), the tendency to omit the determinate article (para. 6), the use of *ʿōd* as a noun and of *ʿādām* as an indefinite pronoun (paras. 3, 4), and the phrase *yayin yāšān* (para. 8). To these features two others may be added, namely the spelling of the 2 m.s. verbal suffix with a final *he* (e.g., *qtlth*) and the spelling of the 2 m.s. pronominal suffix without the final *mater lectionis*

116. Y. Aharoni, "The Arad Ostraca," *Qadmoniot* 1 (1968): 101.

117. N. Avigad, "A New Class of Yehud Stamps," *BIES* 22 (1958): 3-10; "Some New Readings of Hebrew Seals," *Eretz-Israel* 1 (1951): 32-34; "Two Ancient Seals" (N 30); Torczyner, *Te'udot* (N*): 6; M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928): 105.

118. Ginsberg, "Lachish Notes" (N 56): 25 n. 3; Noth (N 117): 222; *BDB*: 26; *KB*³: 32.

119. E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isa^a)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974): 4.

120. Noth (N 117): 105; B. Z. Eshel, "The Ending -YA(H) in Proper Names in Biblical Hebrew—Is It Theophoric?" *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, 1969* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972-1973): 4.137-149.

(e.g., *dbrk*) indicating a vocalization *-āk*. The former feature is very frequent in our inscriptions and the latter quite general (cf. §3.4.2). We frequently find the spelling *qtlth* for the 2 m.s. perfect in Mishnaic Hebrew,¹²¹ and the form of the 2 m.s. suffix is always *-āk*¹²² (except when the noun or the verbal form bearing the suffix has a vocalic ending).

121. E. Y. Kutscher, "Mishnaic (Hebrew)," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (C. Roth, ed.; 16 vols.; Jerusalem: Keter, 1972): 16.1598; G. Haneman, *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Univ., 1980): 34.

122. Kutscher, *ibid.*, p. 1596; H. Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishna* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1964): 13-15.

SOME MAJOR ISSUES IN THE
CONTEMPORARY STUDY OF 1 ENOCH:
REFLECTIONS ON J. T MILIK'S *THE BOOKS
OF ENOCH: ARAMAIC FRAGMENTS OF
QUMRÂN CAVE 4**

JAMES C. VANDERKAM

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, RALEIGH, NC 27650

1 Enoch or the Ethiopic Book of Enoch has rightly been recognized as one of the most important Jewish pseudepigraphs ever since James Bruce inaugurated modern western study of it by bringing three mss of the book from Ethiopia to Europe in 1773.¹ Among other features, its stories about angels who mated with women, the fact that the Epistle of Jude 14-15 cites 1 Enoch 1:9 and its use of "son of man" as a title for an eschatological figure have attracted considerable attention from scholars in various disciplines. But a measure of frustration has always accompanied study of the book because all extant witnesses to its text were either translations of the original or translations of translations.

* Editors' note: In *MAARAV* 1/2 (1979): 197-224, Michael Sokoloff's "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4" appeared. That study was essentially a grammatical analysis and review of the Aramaic Enoch fragments. The following study deals with the contributions of Milik's publication to the study of the Book of Enoch itself.

1. See M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; vol. 2: *Introduction, Translation and Commentary*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978): 1. In the Abyssinian Church 1 Enoch enjoyed canonical status; on this, see A. Dillmann, "Ueber den Umfang des Bibelcanons der Abyssinischen Kirche," *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 5 (1853): 144-151.

As nothing had surfaced of its presumed Semitic original—whether its language was Aramaic, Hebrew or both—experts were forced to base their research on fragmentary remains of Greek translations,² Greek citations from the book³ and the granddaughter Ethiopic version which offers the only complete text.⁴

2. The plural is used advisedly, since the diversity of the extant witnesses hardly suggests that a single Greek translation of 1 Enoch was made and used in different regions. No copy of a complete translation of the book has been found, but the following fragments are now available: a) Codex Panopolitanus (chaps. 1-32, with a second copy of 19:3-21:9). This sixth-century MS, which was found at Akhmim in Egypt in 1886/87, is also called the Gizeh Fragment. b) Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1809 (89:42-49). The ms. dates from the eleventh century. c) The Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus (97:6-107:3). Chap. 105 is lacking from this fourth-century MS. J. T. Milik ("Fragments grecs du Livre d'Hénoch [P. Oxy. xvii 2069]," *Chronique d'Égypte* 46 [1971]: 321-343) now claims that he has identified on Oxyrhynchus Papyrus xvii 2069 these passages: fr. 1r + 2r = 85:10-86:2; fr. 1v + 2v = 87:1-3; fr. 3v = 77:7-78:1; fr. 3r = 78:8. The small size of the fragments and the need for extensive textual restoration make this identification tenuous; but, if he is correct about the latter two fragments, they would be our first evidence for a Greek text of the third section of 1 Enoch—the Astronomical Book (chaps. 72-82). For detailed discussion and bibliography on each of the Greek texts, see A. M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970): 17-21; and Knibb (N 1): 16-21. All of the Greek material that was published at the time can be consulted in M. Black *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

3. There are several citations from and allusions to 1 Enoch in patristic literature in addition to Jude 14-15 which quotes 1 Enoch 1:9. For these see Black (N 2): 10-14. The most extensive extracts from 1 Enoch appear in the *Chronology* (early ninth century) of the Byzantine writer George Syncellus. His quotations contain these passages: 6:1-9:4; 8:4-10:14; 15:8-16:1; and another passage which he attributes to Enoch but for which no parallel appears in Ethiopic. Black (N 2) prints the Syncellus material separately in his edition; it departs significantly from the parallel portions of Codex Panopolitanus, which is the only other witness to these passages in Greek (see Knibb [N 1]: 19-20). Cf. also Denis (N 2): 17-18.

4. The first edition of the Ethiopic text was prepared by R. Laurence (*Libri Enoch prophetae versio aethiopica* [Oxford: University, 1838]), but his text was simply a transcription of one of the MSS that Bruce had brought from Ethiopia. A. Dillmann edited the first critical text in 1851, using five MSS (*Liber Henoch aethiopice* [Leipzig: Vogel]). The two most noteworthy editions have been produced in the Twentieth Century: J. Flemming, *Das Buch Henoch, äthiopischer Text* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des altchristlichen Literatur, neue Folge 7/1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902); and R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Anecdota oxoniensia, Semitic Series 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1906). Flemming knew of 26 MSS and used 14 in his edition, while Charles knew

This unsatisfactory situation changed drastically in 1976 when J. T. Milik published the large majority of the fragments of Enoch that had been found at Qumran. Already in 1952 he had identified the first fragment of the book among the thousands of scraps that were unearthed in Cave 4, and during the 1950's he succeeded in identifying many more. Eventually he found representatives of 11 MSS, each of which was written in Aramaic. In the years that followed he dribbled out a few of these texts and some dazzling theories about them into print,⁵ but now in *The Books of Enoch* scholars have access to most of the new textual evidence.⁶

The first 135 pages of the book are an introduction in which Milik deals with "Aramaic Books of Enoch in Persian and Hellenistic Times" (1 Enoch 72-82; 1-36; 83-90; 91-108; the Book of Giants; and other related Qumran texts); "Early Versions of the Books of Enoch" (Greek, Latin, Coptic, Syriac and Ethiopic); and "Works Attributed to Enoch in Romano-Byzantine and Medieval Times" (1 Enoch 37-71; 2 or Slavonic

of 28 and used 23. Flemming divided the MSS into two categories (Groups I and II) and saw a superior text represented in the former. Charles assigned the MSS to the same two categories, though he called them α and β , and also preferred the first group. Since the time of these two editions, more MSS have been found; in his book, Knibb ([N 1]: 23-27) lists 33 MSS and notes that others are now known to exist. Knibb's text (vol. 1: *Text and Apparatus*) is technically not a critical edition because he publishes in photograph form one MS (Rylands Ethiopic MS. 23) and collates variants from many other MSS against it. His choice of base MS is somewhat surprising in that it belongs to the second group of MSS; but it is, as Knibb notes, an excellent representative of what became the standard text of the book. For some statistics comparing Charles' critical text and Knibb's one MS, see my review in *JAOS* 100 (1980): 360-362. There it is shown that the two actually differ insignificantly despite their different purposes.

5. "Hénoch au pays des aromates (ch. xxvii à xxxii): Fragments araméens de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 65 (1958): 70-77; "Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 (1971): 333-378 (much of this essay reappears in *The Book of Enoch*, Introduction, section I); and "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen" in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt: Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (G. Jeremias, et al., eds.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971): 117-127 (and plate 1).

6. Neither the text nor photographs of 4QEnastr^a, the oldest MS among the Enochic works, are published, nor does one find all of 4QEnastr^b. The evidence for the Book of Giants, only part of which belongs to Milik's lot, is also incompletely presented.

Enoch; Enoch in Cabbalistic Literature).⁷ Naturally, the bulk of the volume consists of transcriptions and translations of the texts and copious textual and epigraphic notes on them.⁸ At the end of the book one finds diplomatic transcriptions of 4QEn^{a-e}; several indexes (passages preserved in Aramaic; Aramaic-Greek-Ethiopic glossary; Greek-Aramaic and Ethiopic-Aramaic glossaries; quotations, texts and manuscripts; and a general index); and 32 plates of the Aramaic fragments.

A book as large and important as this one has, of course, elicited many and varied reactions.⁹ In general one can say that scholars have usually praised Milik's textual work (though many question the value of his large-scale restorations of fragmentary texts), but the response to several of his proposals about introductory matters have been universally negative. Before turning to some of these latter problematic issues, it would be appropriate, however, to acknowledge the significant contributions that he has made to the study of 1 Enoch and related literature. First and most obviously, he has made available the oldest texts of the book that are known to exist. Through these fragments scholars have at last gained a glimpse at the book in its original language; and, since all of the MSS were written in

7. It is difficult to understand why a treatment of Slavonic or 2 Enoch, medieval Enochic literature and Enoch in Cabbalistic literature was included in a book that was supposed to be devoted to a publication of the Aramaic texts from Qumran.

8. The texts that he publishes are: 4QEn^{a-e} (presented fully); parts of 4QEnastr^b and all of 4QEnastr^{c,d}; and 13 fragments of 4QEnGiants^a, a few sections of 4QEnGiants^b, and two passages from 4QEnGiants^c. In his discussion of the Book of Giants, Milik also notes that several previously published fragments belong to this work: 6Q8 1; 1Q23 1, 6, 22, 9, 11, 27, 14 and 15. He also mentions five other MSS that are too damaged to allow certain identification but which may belong to the Book of Giants (pp. 298-317).

9. The following reviews and review articles should be noted: J. Fitzmyer, "Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran," *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 332-345; E. Ullendorff and M. Knibb in *BSO(A)S* 40 (1977): 601-602; T. W. Fauxman in *Biblica* 52 (1977): 432-436; P. Grelot in *RB* 83 (1976): 605-618; J. Licht in *Kiryat Sefer* 52 (1977): 148-152; G. W. E. Nickelsburg in *CBQ* 40 (1978): 411-419; J. A. Sanders in *JBL* 97 (1978): 446-447; J. Barr in *JTS* 29 (1978): 517-530; S. Brock in *JJS* 29 (1978): 98-99; J. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch," *Numen* 26 (1979): 89-103. See also the seminar report of J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch," *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 315-323.

Aramaic, the old debate about whether 1 Enoch was written in Hebrew or Aramaic should end for those parts of the book that are attested at Qumran (regarding the special case of chaps. 37-71, see below). Second, Milik's painstaking labors at identifying fragments, many of which are very small, and at locating them within 1 Enoch and in relation to one another have provided an invaluable service to all students of the book. Third, his expert paleographical analyses of the texts offer firm points of departure for dating the first and third sections of 1 Enoch (chaps. 1-36 and 72-82) to times that are far earlier than most scholars had previously suspected (see below). And fourth, by identifying an Aramaic Book of Giants that was associated with Enoch, Milik has furnished experts yet another composition that deals with the very popular theme of the union between angels and women.

Once his undeniable contributions have been recorded, though, one must say that Milik has been roundly and properly criticized for several of the more exciting hypotheses that he has advanced in the introductory section of the book. While he defends many interesting and often controversial positions, I will confine my attention to what now appear to be the major issues which he and his texts have raised: 1) the complex of problems that center about the Book of Parables and the newly isolated Book of Giants; and 2) the remarkably early dates which Milik has posited for the Astronomical Book and the Book of Watchers and the implications of these datings.

THE COMPLEX OF PROBLEMS THAT CENTER ABOUT THE BOOK OF PARABLES AND THE NEWLY ISOLATED BOOK OF GIANTS

The only complete version of 1 Enoch remains the Ethiopic, which, according to many experts,¹⁰ is a translation of a Greek rendering of what is now known to have been an Aramaic original. In the literal sense of the word, the Ethiopic 1 Enoch is a pentateuch consisting of: the Book of Watchers (BW in future references; chaps. 1-36); Book of Parables (BP; chaps. 37-71); Astronomical Book (AB; chaps. 72-82); Book of Dreams (BD;

10. E.g., Charles (N 4): x, xiii-xvi. However, Ullendorff and Knibb have recently maintained that the translators of Ethiopic 1 Enoch had access not only to a Greek translation but to an Aramaic one as well. For their evidence and bibliography, see Knibb (N 1): 37-46.

chaps. 83-90); and Epistle of Enoch (EE; chaps. 91-108). Milik maintains that this arrangement, far from being the pristine Enochic pentateuch, originated in the sixth or seventh century C.E. (cf. p. 77); the first Enochic pentateuch consisted rather of all these books less the BP, in whose place there appeared a work called the Book of Giants (BG; cf., e.g., pp. 89-98, 310).

An initial caveat should be expressed before the specifics of Milik's case are reviewed. Though 1 Enoch is pentateuchal, one ought not to assume immediately that at Qumran as well five books and only five belonged to the Ethiopic collection, thus implying that the absence of any of the Ethiopic five from the Qumran Enochic literature entails that an earlier book was at some point in the tradition willfully removed in favor of a later one. We do not know that at Qumran there was an Enochic pentateuch other than in the obvious sense that five books of this sort have now been identified. Milik argues that 4QEn^c included four books—BW, BG, BD and EE—which show signs of common editing (cf. p. 22) but that the lengthy AB was copied on separate scrolls because it could not be fitted onto the same scroll as the other four (cf. p. 8). This means that the mss themselves do not evidence a pentateuchal arrangement. Rather, they present a picture of four more closely associated booklets and one additional one. These data do not, of course, exclude Milik's thesis, but they are consistent with the view that at Qumran there was no pentateuch which had been subjected to a unified redaction. One cannot exclude the possibility that other Enochic works, which have not yet been found or identified, belonged in this Essene library. Moreover, there is reason to suppose that, even if there were no more Enochic books than these five at Qumran, others were current in Jewish communities in the second century B.C.E. and later. The Book of Jubilees (4:15-26), for example, contains some Enochic traditions that have not been incorporated into 1 Enoch, and these may have derived from written sources.¹¹ As will be seen, this point, though it may seem trivial, has some bearing on the dating of the BP and on assessing the development of the Enochic tradition.

Milik's claims in our category 1 can be divided into three propositions, each of which should be scrutinized. a) The BP,

11. On this pentateuchal issue, see J. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Ethiopic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977): 51-55.

which is the longest segment of the Ethiopic 1 Enoch, was not part of the Aramaic Enochic pentateuch. His case for this thesis is largely negative: not a single scrap of this book has been identified at Qumran (cf. p. 91). All other parts of the Ethiopic pentateuch are represented: BW in 5 mss; AB in 4; BD in 4; and EE in 2. One could argue that natural decay or the appetites of worms, etc., are the cause of its absence, but the situation remains curious, nevertheless. One should remember, though, that even if the BP had never existed at Qumran, it could still be a Semitic composition that dates from early times, because it could have been written and transmitted by groups other than the Essenes of the Qumran community.¹² Moreover, there is, as has been noted, insufficient warrant for automatically assuming that the Qumran Enochic books were five in number.

b) The BP is rather a (1) Christian work, (2) similar to the Christian Sibylline Oracles in genre and (3) written ca. 270 C.E. under the immediate impress of the Parthian invasion of the West at that time. While many scholars have been willing to concede that the BP was not part of the Qumran library, point b) has elicited universally negative responses—and for solid reasons. That the BP was written in Greek seems vastly unlikely; on the contrary, it furnishes a number of indications that its original language was Semitic.¹³ The BP would have, furthermore, several bizarre traits were it a Christian document: it not only fails to mention the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, but even identifies the judging Son of Man as Enoch (71:14-16).¹⁴ Milik has also asserted that the BP has taken elements regarding the Son of Man and the Elect from the Synoptic Gospels (cf. p. 92),

12. D. Flusser has observed that the BP would have been objectionable to the Essenes of Qumran because in chap. 41 the sun and moon are treated equally—something that diehard adherents of a solar calendar could not tolerate (see Greenfield and Stone [N 11]: 56). However, it seems to me that a similar situation prevails in the AB which the sectarians found acceptable (cf. chap. 74). Polemical references to the role of the moon in reckoning time are absent there as well.

13. Knibb (N 1): 41-42; and Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch," *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 350-351.

14. Charles (*APOT* 2.237) boldly changed the text at this point. Where the Ethiopic reads *'anta we'etu walda be'si* ("you [i.e., Enoch] are the son of man"), he emended it to read "This is the Son of Man" (i.e., someone other than Enoch). Whether this section is an original part of the BP is quite irrelevant to the point at hand.

but he has drawn attention only to similarities between them without establishing that the Gospels must be regarded as prior to or as the source of the material. In fact, it appears that the teachings of the BP on this subject can be explained adequately on the assumption of an OT base alone.¹⁵

Milik has also failed to provide compelling reasons for seeing the Christian Sibylline Oracles as the genre to which the BP is most nearly related and as the source that inspired its composition. The common elements which he adduces ("clear division into sections," "confusion in sequence of ideas," repetitions, lacunae, "mixing up of historical and eschatological plans within each part," etc. [cf. p. 92]) are surely too imprecise and too frequently attested in various kinds of literature to sustain his point. In addition, the two "striking parallels" that he cites (Sibylline Oracles 2:233-237 // 1 En 61:6; 5:104-110 [probably not Christian material, as Milik claims, which "obviously inspired the author of the Parables [En. 56:5-7] . . ." (cf. p. 95)]) are too general in nature either for determining priority or for ascertaining whether the texts are even directly related rather than two expressions of a common tradition.

Finally, his hypothesis that the BP dates from ca. 270 C.E., while he states it tentatively (cf. p. 91), is simply unconvincing. The crucial text for his case is 1 En 56:5-7, in which he sees a reflection of the Parthian Sapor I's invasion of Syria and the role of the Palmyrenes:

And in those days the angels will gather together, and will throw themselves toward the east upon the Parthians and Medes; they will stir up the kings, so that a disturbing spirit will come upon them, and they will drive them from their thrones; and they will come out like lions from their lairs, . . . And they will go up and trample upon the land of *my* chosen ones, and the land of *my* chosen ones will become for them a tramping-ground and a beaten track. But the city of my righteous ones will be a hindrance to their horses, and they will stir up slaughter amongst themselves, and their (own) right hand will be strong against them; . . .¹⁶

In any such apocalyptic text, identifying the historical referents is treacherous in the extreme; but at least the Parthians are clear

15. So Knibb, "The Date" (N 13): 351-352.

16. Translation of Knibb (N 1): 140.

enough. However, they were a military threat to the Syro-Palestinian area for a long period (at intervals), beginning already in 40 B.C.E., when Pacorus invaded, took Jerusalem and eventually met defeat at the hands of the Roman-backed Herod (cf. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 14.13,3-15,7 §§ 330-434). I think Milik rejects this as a referent because Jerusalem was taken and thus hardly proved a "hindrance." However, Jerusalem was later freed from Parthian control, a fact which may be reflected in this passage.¹⁷ Also, very little is known about the fate of Palestine or Jerusalem in the years 260-270 C.E.; in fact, there is no proof that Jerusalem was called upon to be a hindrance to any army in that period.

Thus all of Milik's theses under b) fall due to lack of evidence. He has made a likely case that the BP was not part of the Qumran library, but it remains more likely that its language was Semitic rather than Greek, its author Jewish rather than Christian and its date in the first century C.E. rather than in the third.

c) Where the BP now stands in Ethiopic 1 Enoch, the BG once appeared in the original Aramaic pentateuch (cf. esp. pp. 57-58, 298-339). In this thesis one encounters a novel and well documented contribution to the study of Enochic literature. Basing himself on the pioneering essay of W. B. Henning,¹⁸ Milik has shown that a Manichean canonical Book of Giants, written by Mani himself, had a Jewish, Aramaic base or source, several fragments of which he has located at Qumran. The book derived its name from its concern with the gigantic offspring of the fallen angels and daughters of men—the story that figures so prominently in the BW. This assures its Enochic affiliation; but, whereas the BW mentions the giants as a group, "the Book of

17. The word translated "hindrance" above (*ma'qefa*) means, according to Dillmann (*Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* [Leipzig: Weigel, 1865; rpt. New York: Ungar, 1955]: col. 983): *causa offensionis et lapsus, offendiculum, scandalum*. If the text is correct, then *stumbling-block* may be a better rendering. At any rate, there is nothing here that is inconsistent with the outcome of events in 40-38 B.C.E.

There appears to be a growing consensus that the BP in its final form was written at the end of the first or beginning of the second century C.E. See, e.g., J. C. Findley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967-1968): 551-565; Greenfield and Stone (N 11): 58-61; Knibb (N 13): 358-359; and C. L. Mearns, "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch," *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 360-369.

18. "The Book of Giants," *BSO(A)S* 11 (1943-1946): 52-74.

Giants . . . gave personal names to the sons of the Watchers, related their exploits with a profusion of detail, and finally foretold their future extermination by the waters of the flood and by eternal fire" (p. 299). Shared and otherwise virtually unattested names such as 'ōhyā' offer strong evidence that the Qumran and the Manichean Books of Giants stand within the same tradition.

Milik maintains further that the BG was the original second member of an Aramaic pentateuch and that it was removed a number of centuries later in favor of the BP when the BG fell from grace because of the Manichean fondness for it. It seems to me that Milik has made a plausible case that the BG was copied on the same scroll as three other works: BW, BD, and EE, i.e., 4QEn^c, on which these three were copied, is the same MS. as 4QGiants^a (cf. p. 310). If this was the case, it demonstrates the close association of the BG with these other Enochic writings, though it does not, of course, prove the existence of a pentateuch. These four booklets may well have been only part of a larger group of Enochic works.

THE REMARKABLY EARLY DATES WHICH MILIK HAS POSITED FOR THE
ASTRONOMICAL BOOK AND THE BOOK OF WATCHERS AND THE
IMPLICATIONS OF THESE DATINGS

While much of the early debate about Milik's book has centered on the Parables issue, this second topic may prove of more importance in future Enochic studies. If he is correct in his datings of these books, then scholars have new windows opening on hitherto hardly accessible historical periods of second-temple Judaism. Therefore, his arguments for the dates of these two works and their consequences should be more closely examined.

a) Milik believes that at least parts of the AB are the oldest literature associated with the name Enoch (cf. p. 8); also, he takes the radical step of claiming that

an indirect allusion is already to be found in Gen. 5:23, where the writer, having fixed the age of the patriarch at 365 years, implies, in guarded terms, the existence of astronomical works circulating under the name of Enoch. It is highly likely, indeed, that the whole chronology of the Bible, in particular that of the Mosaic Pentateuch, was elaborated by priestly redactors of the Persian era, taking as their point of departure the calendar with fixed days and festivals composed of 364 days (p. 8).

I think that there are some confusions expressed here. First, Enoch's biblical age is certainly conditioned by the solar associations of the seventh head of humanity, but this is not to say that there were Jewish Enochic works that dealt with calendrical issues and that P referred cryptically to these. The solar connections of the seventh man are more likely a borrowing from Mesopotamian traditions about the seventh antediluvian king Enmenduranna.¹⁹ Second, though one may be able to say that a 364-day calendar was known to and used by late priestly editors of parts of the Bible, that does not mean that this calendar was associated at this early time with Enoch. Consequently, there is no clear evidence for a pre-P Enochic astronomical work.

There is, nevertheless, far better evidence for a third-century date. The strongest support for this argument is the paleographically determined date of the earliest MS of the AB—4QEnastr^a, viz., the end of the third or beginning of the second century (cf. p. 7).²⁰ Moreover, the linking of Enoch with astronomy and probably with the AB is rather clearly expressed in a fragment of Pseudo-Eupolemus, who probably wrote ca. 200 B.C.E.²¹ As a result, it seems safe to say that an astronomical book of Enoch, which is almost certainly the AB (perhaps without chap. 81 [cf. pp. 13-14]), existed in the third century, while an earlier date, though not excluded, cannot be verified at this time.

Not surprisingly, this early work shows strong affinities with and borrowings from Mesopotamian traditions. Milik draws attention to the AB's similarity with the sapiential epistles that antediluvian wise men wrote to their kings (p. 13) and to the marked resemblance between the world map of 1 Enoch 77 and a Babylonian map dating from a time somewhat after the ninth century (p. 15). These parallels and indeed the character of Enoch himself document the interest that at least one group of third (or earlier)-century Jewish scholars showed for ancient

19. See H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung" in E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; 3rd ed.; H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, eds.; Berlin: Reuther Reichard, 1902-1903): 2.530-543.

20. It is regrettable that Milik has not published a photograph of this ancient MS; see note 6.

21. For a discussion of the date of Pseudo-Eupolemus, see B. Z. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham" in his *Essays on Jewish Chronology and Chronography* (New York: KTAV, 1976): 77-79.

Mesopotamian traditions. Another implication of the early dating of the AB is that its calendar of 364 days far antedates the founding of the Qumran community (perhaps by more than a century). I see no hint that it is sectarian at this time nor that its adherents oppose use of the moon in reckoning time, since both systems are presented in an objective way. It seems to me that this lends added credence to the supposition that this 364-day calendar was the official cultic calendar in the early centuries of the second temple.

b) Milik likewise assigns a very early date to the BW, particularly to a source in it which he terms the Visions of Enoch (chaps. 6-19). Paleographically the earliest exemplar of the book—4QEn^a “. . . dates from the first half of the second century B.C. It was, therefore, like the second copy, En^b (mid-second century), brought to Qumran from elsewhere” (p. 22). This implies that the developed story of the angelic watchers' marriages with women, their grotesque offspring, their punishment and Enoch's extensive travels was known before the Qumran community was founded. But Milik moves the date of composition for the book even earlier and finds the earliest reference to it in 4QTestLevi^a 8 iii 6-7, which reads at the important place:

א הלא קבל הַנְּזֵר]
נַא וְעַל מִן תְּהוּא חֻבְתָּא]

Did not Enoch accuse [. . .]?

[. . . And with whom will the blame lie . . . ? (cf. pp. 23-24)

If the letters are properly read (note the uncertainty for the consonants of the name Enoch) and understood (there are other possibilities for קבל), then this is a reference to a function that Enoch exercised in chaps. 13-16. Milik believes (though he promises to demonstrate it later) that this Aramaic Testament of Levi dates from the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century B.C.E., which, if true, would mean that the BW (or part of it) is even older. But, as the evidence is not yet available, his case for this remarkable dating cannot be evaluated. Consequently, he expresses himself somewhat more cautiously: “For the moment we will maintain that its attestation of the Book of Watchers (or more precisely of the Visions of Enoch, chs. 6-19) dates from towards the end of the third century.” (Cf. p. 24; see also p. 28 where he dates the BW to the mid-third century.)

I question whether Milik has correctly delimited the Visions of Enoch within the BW. It certainly seems as though a new section begins at 12:1 (on pp. 34-35 he divides his source into chaps. 6-13 and 14-19) and that one source is 6-11, which is not associated with Enoch but with Noah (10:1). Regarding his source (which I would define differently) Milik argues that it antedates the definitive redaction of the corresponding material in the first chapters of Genesis (p. 31). He thinks that the shorter version in Gen 6:1-4 of the marriage of angels and women is an “abridged and allusive” (p. 31) version of the story in the Visions and that Genesis even quotes a few phrases from it. He may be correct, but he has not established the point. A fundamental problem is that the longer form in the BW certainly seems to be an expansion of the Genesis story and one in which its connection with angelic beings is made more explicit. It is difficult to believe that a later biblical editor changed the clear statement in the BW, that angels (who are named) were involved, to the less explicit *bənê hāʾēlōhim* of Gen 6:2, 4.

The dates at which the BW was written and the AB composed were very early—at least the third century for both—but no firm *terminus a quo* has yet been established for either. It is most significant that scholars now have access to sources for this little-charted era of post-exilic history and that these sources reveal a group or groups (of whatever size) which manifested a keen interest in astronomical, geographical and other scientific matters along with a fondness for ancient, non-Jewish traditions. The story of the heavenly watchers also illustrates theological reflection on the origin of human sin. Judaism in this period now appears more variegated than had previously been known.²²

22. For a more extensive discussion, cf. M. Stone, “The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 479-492.

REVIEW

Y. SABAR, *Pəšaṭ Wayəhi Bəšallah, A Neo-Aramaic Midrash on Beshallah (Exodus)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1976): xlviii + 178 pages, 1 plate.

DANIEL BOYARIN

BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, BEER SHEVA, ISRAEL*

0. It is rare that a scholar has the opportunity and skill to open up an entire genre of literature to the scholarly world. Such an opportunity presented itself to Professor Yona Sabar, and the challenge was taken up with authority, competence and elegance. *Pəšaṭ Wayəhi Bəšallah* (hereafter *Pəšaṭ*) is the first publication of the Neo-Aramaic *midrašt*m of the Jews of Kurdistan. This text and its companion pieces represent the homiletical literature of the Jews of Nerwa and ʿAmidyā (cf. p. xxi) in northern Iraq, near the Turkish border, of ca. the 17th century. They provide a near unique glimpse into the spiritual world of the Jews of that time and place. Moreover, they afford us an earlier and more archaic form of Neo-Aramaic than the present spoken dialects and thus form, in various cases, a sort of “missing link” between “classic” Mesopotamian (Eastern) Aramaic and the modern dialects (p. xxix). In what follows, we shall attempt to evaluate the significance of this text for research in Jewish literature and

* This review was written while its author was a Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Studies, Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem. He would like to thank the Institute and also the Ben Zvi Institute for their support and encouragement of his work. Professors Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, G. Goldenberg, Dr. A. Tal, having read a draft of this review, made very useful comments, for which the author is grateful.

Aramaic language and continue, in regard to some matters, the scholarly discourse which Sabar has begun.

0.1 The review will be divided into three main subdivisions:

1. a discussion of the introduction to the book and particularly the linguistic sections thereof;
2. remarks on the presentation of the text itself and its accompanying commentaries by Sabar, followed by a synopsis of one homily from it with its Talmudic source for purposes of comparison;
3. some isolated remarks on the language of the *Pəšaṭ*, attempting to demonstrate the mutual interdependence of Neo-Aramaic and classical Aramaic—particularly Babylonian Jewish Aramaic—studies.¹

1. The Introduction

1.0 Four chapters comprise the extensive introduction to the work.

1.1 Chapter 1 is a discussion of the literary character and origin of the Nerwa texts. Sabar opens his analysis by stating, "The original text, of which this Midrash may be a translation, as well as its author and redactor, remain unknown" (p. xxi). However, the implications of this agnosticism are never made clear. Does Sabar mean to imply that the original text may have been brought to Kurdistan from elsewhere? This would seem to be the inference one would draw from his next sentence: "It was probably compiled from different old (i.e., *Mekhiltot*, *Midrash Rabba*, etc.) and new, some with qabbalistic influence, midrashim, ca. the 14th century, when a number of similar Bible homiletic commentaries, such as Bahya Ben Asher's (d. 1341) . . . , were redacted by the Rabbis of Spain." What is not clear is whether Sabar would contend that the *Pəšaṭ* is a translation of one of these homilies, used one or more of them as sources or was merely inspired by their example. This question is of no small importance, for on it turns the issue of whether or not the Nerwa texts are "an excellent example of the continued creativity of a remote corner of this Jewish community" (p. xxii, quoting Lou J. Silberman).

In fact, however, one sees no evidence that the *redacted* text is

1. Cf. K. Tsereteli, "The Aramaic Dialects of Iraq," *AION* 32 (1972): 245.

a translation of either a Rabbinic Hebrew-Aramaic or an Arabic original, as suggested by Sabar (p. xxv). The individual pericopae are adaptations of their sources—not literal translations, and there seems to be wholly original homiletic material as well (p. xxii). These could have been composed directly in Neo-Aramaic as easily as in any other language. In section 2 below, we shall, *dv*, exemplify and buttress this point.

The question of date should be pursued in more depth by Sabar. On p. xxix he indicates that the language of the Nerwa texts reflects "substrata of about 200 years earlier (see ch. IV)" than the period 1647–1670 when the attested copies were made. However, in chapter 4 all he says is, "Certain archaic spellings and some isolated words and forms may be explained either as belonging to older strata or mss., probably 100–200 or more years earlier, or as variants from other dialects" (p. xlv). In short, on two crucial points, Sabar is overcautious (the opposite sin would be worse!). From the evidence presented one is left quite unconvinced of the necessity of raising even the possibility of a non-Neo-Aramaic *Vorlage* or of a very early date for the Nerwa texts. If there be good reasons for Sabar's doubts, let us hear them.² If not, Occam's razor should be applied, and we should accept these texts as having been composed originally in Neo-Aramaic and fairly close to the date of the earliest mss.

1.2 Chapter 2 is a clear and concise placement of the Nerwa texts within the history of Aramaic and within the Neo-Aramaic dialects. Only two slight (and probably mechanical) inaccuracies need be noted. One could easily infer from the first paragraph of p. xxvi that Aramaic survives only in Kurdistan, which is not so, as Sabar makes clear himself on the next page (where, incidentally, Neo-Mandaic should also be mentioned). Also, in the catalogue of Middle Aramaic dialects, Samaritan has been, no doubt inadvertently, omitted.

1.3 Chapter 3, entitled "Nerwa Texts: Basic Grammatical Features," is of major importance. One would wish, however,

2. In fact, in a later work ("Kurdistani Realia and Attitudes as Reflected in the Midrashic-Aggadic Literature of the Kurdish Jews," *Proceedings of the AJS Conference on Jewish Folklore*, forthcoming), Sabar cites evidence for precisely the reviewer's view, namely, that these texts were originally redacted in Neo-Aramaic and not long before our earliest copies. It may be assumed, then, that he has abandoned his earlier skepticism.

that the principle of synchronic analysis had been adhered to more strictly. For instance, "The Relation of the Consonants to Old Aramaic / Old Syriac and Other Semitic Languages" is hardly "Basic Phonology," as claimed on p. xxxiii. This chapter is most useful to a Semitist or Aramaist approaching the Nerwa texts or Neo-Aramaic altogether for the first time, but where is the "Basic Phonology" we are promised? We need, at least, an inventory of phonemes and some basic morpho-phonological rules. It is indeed beyond the scope of the book, as Sabar notes, to indicate the "changes and modifications" of the vowels "in comparison to Old Aramaic" (p. xxxiv); but a synchronic statement of the vowel system and its synchronic rules and changes is a desideratum, if not a necessity, in such a grammatical survey. For example, we are given hints of a system of three vowel lengths (p. 35), but never a statement as to the phonological (phonetic? phonemic?) status of vowel length.

1.3.1 The paragraph on "Nünation" (p. xxxiv) is similarly plagued by the lack of distinction between synchronic and diachronic analysis. Sabar writes, "The consonant *-n* may be suffixed to preserve a preceding long vowel of a closed or open syllable, e.g.:

- (1) *mīr/mīrin*³ 'was said' (A 34 [cf. p. 40])
- (2) *ʔōḏin* 'make!' (A 448 [cf. p. 82])
- (3) *ḥakm-ētin* 'you (m.sg.) rule,' but also *maḥkim-it*;
- (4) *ʔiṭin, liṭin / ʔiṭ liṭ* 'there is,' 'there is not' (A 90 [cf. p. 46]); . . ."

This formulation is difficult in several ways. First of all, analysis of the alternations leads one to the conclusion that it is not */n/* which is "suffixed" but the syllable */in/*. Secondly, we are not told here when the */in/* must or may be added and to which forms. Instead we are given a quite confusing *diachronic* explanation, namely, that the */in/* is added "to preserve a preceding long vowel of a closed or open syllable." What is one to make of this sentence when, in fact, in the examples given, there are no vowel-length alternations exhibited between the long and short forms (except in example number 3)?

The paragraph should be rephrased as a strictly synchronic statement encompassing the following elements:

3. In citing forms in transcription, I have followed Sabar's transcription practices; cf. further pp. xxxi-xxxiii and 34-36.

- (1) Statement of conditions in which the forms with and without */in/* alternate.
- (2) Statement of any vowel-length (and other?) alternations entailed by this process.
- (3) Examples.

Synchronic analysis must be employed, especially when the grammar must perform remain a sketch.

1.3.2 "Basic Morphology," beginning on p. xxv, is much better; indeed, it is excellent. Sabar has untangled the spider's web of Neo-Aramaic verb morphology and presented the essential structures clearly. However, in one area of particular interest to this reviewer, it seems that Sabar has again confounded the synchronic and diachronic to the detriment of his analysis. I am referring to paragraphs 14 and 15 (pp. xxxviii-xxxix), entitled "The Passive Voice." He writes:

The Passive Voice is expressed by the passive participle (absolute state): m.sg. *qṭil, qṭilin* . . . With addition of the preposition *l-* "to, by" attached to suffixed pronouns . . . the passive voice functions as *active voice*, i.e.: *ṣqil-la* "she took (him)", lit. "he was taken by her" . . . This is applied to intransitive verbs as well, e.g. *ṣtiq-le* "he held his peace", lit. "it (impersonal) was quiet to him."

There may be little doubt that synchronically two completely different structures are combined here. The Nerwa texts have a true synthetic passive (an archaic feature *vis à vis* Neo-Aramaic as a whole), as in *xāl ʔillid kalwe* "eaten by dogs" (p. 40, and nn. 31 and 32 there). However, the *ṣqil-la* form has virtually no characteristics of a passive, only what must be seen synchronically as an accidental morphological similarity with it. Here is the support for this judgment. The direct object in an active sentence becomes the subject if the sentence is transformed into a passive. It follows, therefore, that a defining characteristic of the passive is that the receiver of the action must be expressed as subject in the surface passive construction. In other words, in a passive construction, the agent (= logical subject) is optional⁴ but the patient (= logical object) is obligatory. But in Neo-Aramaic

4. Some languages, to be sure, do not allow passives without expressed agents, but this is a language-specific, not a defining characteristic of the passive. Indeed, there are languages which do not allow passivization when the agent is expressed.

(including the Nerwa texts), the patient is optional and the agent is obligatory, as witness such forms as *pliṭ-lu* (cf. p. 41) "they went out." The pronominal element in the suffix must be analyzed, therefore, as the subject of an active construction, and there is no synchronic connection between this form and the passive, whatever the diachronic origins of the construction. This is supported as well by the fact that in Neo-Aramaic this structure is the normal preterite, and indeed in the Nerwa texts, the only preterite construction (cf. p. xl). It must, therefore, be viewed as an unmarked active, rather than as Sabar views it, the marked passive (which "functions as an active").

To be sure, Sabar's statement, "the passive voice functions as *active voice*" may be given a diachronic reading as well, i.e., that an originally passive construction has been reinterpreted and therefore functions as active. This is a claim worth making and worth taking up, but it is by no means so obvious as might appear at first glance. The structure in question is first attested in the Official Aramaic of the fifth century B.C.E., in the so-called "Driver Letters."⁵ It has been argued forcefully by E. Y. Kutscher⁶ that it is a calque on the Old Persian *manā kartam*, "I have done." Moreover, in the manner of this Persian construction, E. Benveniste⁷ had shown that it was not a passive and dative (agentive) construction, but a possessive construction equal to the Latin *habeō factum*. Since the Aramaic form is a translation of the Persian form, Kutscher concluded that it should be similarly analyzed. The pronominal element in *-l-* is a *genitive*, not an *agentive*, and the participle here is a *past* not *passive* one. Past participles often develop from passive participles, as witness, e.g., English "The deed is done"—"I have done the deed," etc.⁸

5. Cf. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954; rpt., Ösnabrück: Zeller, 1968; 2nd abridged and revised edition, Oxford: Clarendon, 1957).

6. E. Y. Kutscher, "Two 'Passive' Constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian," in idem, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977): [70]-[89].

7. E. Benveniste, "La construction passive du parfait transitif," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 48 (1952): 52-62. Cf. G. Cardonna, "The Indo-Iranian Construction *mana (mama) krtam*," *Language* 46 (1970): 1-12.

8. Cf. the statement of K. Tsereteli, quoted below.

Then, according to Kutscher at least, the Aramaic form did not have passive connotation even diachronically. However, Sabar's view has been held by other writers on Neo-Aramaic. Thus, R. Hetzron writes in his article on the morphology of the verb in Modern Syriac:⁹

The major change in the verbal system in relation to more classical types of Aramaic consists of the disappearance of most of the active forms. Thus "I saw" has been replaced by "it was seen by me." Even intransitive verbs have undergone such a change: "I went" has become "it was gone by me". As the concurrent active forms have disappeared, these already unique forms have ceased to be passive. Their subjects have been put in the nominative case, and their objects in the accusative (only positionally marked, as in English).¹⁰

K. Tsereteli, on the other hand, proposes yet another model of the origin of this structure:¹¹

... inasmuch as the passive participle is, from the standpoint of time, a past participle, its use for rendering a verb of the past tense is a common occurrence and is also in evidence at the earlier developmental stages of the Aramaic language. When this is the case the participle loses its passive meaning, retaining its temporal meaning only—here of the past tense. Thus, in all modern Aramaic dialects in the simple forms we have: *ptihli* "opened"; hence, its past perfect *ptihvali*.

Tsereteli's view is similar to Kutscher's in that he denies even an original passive sense to the construction of *qṭil + l-*, but it is different in two other respects. Tsereteli sees this as an inner-Aramaic development from the passive participle as perfect (and presumably interprets the pronoun as a dative of reference, i.e., *it is open with respect to me = I opened it*), while Kutscher denies

9. R. Hetzron, "The Morphology of the Verb in Modern Syriac (Christian Colloquial of Urmi)," *JAOS* 89 (1969): 112.

10. I fail to understand the statement that the case is "positionally marked," since as Hetzron himself avers, "Both orders, Object-Subject and Subject-Object occur"; *ibid.*, 113. Moreover, it is not only the old active forms which have disappeared, but indeed all the old finite verb forms.

11. K. Tsereteli, "Compound Tense Forms in Modern Aramaic Dialects," *AION* 28 (1968): 249-250.

explicitly that these two forms are related and insists on the Persian connection.

Here the issue stands. One view (Hetzron's and apparently Sabar's) has it that an originally passive structure lost its passive semantic content as, for whatever reasons, it usurped the place of the original active past tense. The other view (Kutscher's) is that this structure never had passive semantic content—just as English "I have done it" never had passive significance—but originated in a nominal/possessive sentence type. It should be noted that both of these etiologies are attested as origins of perfect tenses in other languages, the first in Indic, and the second in Iranian, as shown by S. Anderson (following Benveniste) in a recent paper.¹² The question deserves extensive further research, which should focus on three points: 1) Can it be taken as established that the Aramaic development resulted from Iranian influence? 2) Whatever the answer to 1), what structural role did this construction play in its original Aramaic context? 3) What structural changes were wrought in the various Aramaic dialects, owing to the integration of this form,¹³ including ergativization and de-ergativization?¹⁴

1.3.3 All in all, Sabar's grammar is very stimulating and full of information, and one hopes that he will in turn be stimulated to attempt a fuller grammar of the Nerwa texts as he continues his research.

1.4 Chapter 4 of the introduction describes the MSS themselves and their mutual inter-relationships (stemma), as well as consistent differences between them.

2. The Edition of the Text

2.0 The text edition itself comprises three sections: an eclectic text of the homily in Hebrew characters, based on three MSS,

12. S. Anderson, "On Mechanisms by which Languages Become Ergative," in *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change* (Charles Li, ed.; Austin: Univ. of Texas, 1977): 330-341.

13. Cf. Kutscher, "Two 'Passive' Constructions" (N 6): [83]-[85].

14. It may be said that the reviewer's researches on this question confirm the views of Anderson, as expressed in his above-mentioned (N 12) paper. Indeed, the reviewer had arrived at nearly identical conclusions regarding the ergativity from his Neo-Aramaic researches, before reading Anderson's paper.

together with an apparatus of variant readings (pp. 1-33, and see pp. xlvii-xlviii); a "phonetic transcription" of the text (pp. 37-82), with philological-linguistic commentary A; and an English translation (pp. 85-125), with source-critical commentary B. The ease of use of the book would have been enhanced considerably had the text and its philological notes been printed in parallel columns (on facing pages) with the translation and its commentary. As it is, even the student who reads the Neo-Aramaic text fluently (which this reviewer does not) must constantly flip back and forth between the "phonetic transcription" and the translation in order to find out what Sabar has to say on any given passage, *a fortiori* one who uses the English translation as a "pony." The reviewer finally resorted to the expedient of borrowing a second copy, a luxury most readers will not have. One hopes that Sabar will correct this technical fault in his future editions of these texts.

2.1 "Phonetic transcription" is something of a misnomer, giving the impression that there is an oral "reading tradition" for these texts, such as the Mandaeans or Samaritans have for theirs. But what we actually have here is Sabar's reconstruction of the "pronunciation" of the language of the Nerwa texts based on "common sense, knowledge of the Zakho dialect and information gathered from three informants, Mssrs. Shilo Kāle and Khodeda Shalom of Nerwa and Ḥakham 'Alwan Avidani of 'Amīdyā (all now in Jerusalem), as well as grammars and dictionaries" (pp. 34-35). One has no quarrel whatever with this procedure. Sabar carried out this work diligently and well, explaining his decisions on difficult points in the notes. The *matres lectiones* have been well exploited for establishing vowel qualities, but again, because of the brevity of the grammar, one does not know the basis for the vowel-length markings. The philological commentary is superb.

2.2 As for the English translation and source commentary, they too are excellent. The English is clear, exact and elegant. A great deal of effort has been expended on the gathering of Midrashic sources and parallels. Sabar has made good (and acknowledged) use of modern aids to such research and has himself provided a *vade mecum* for further research into the composition of the text. Although Sabar modestly admits that he "may not have exhausted all the available Midrashic sources" (p. xxiii, n. 15), the scholar would have to work hard to find parallels he has missed.

2.2.1 It seems that the Nerwa texts provide us with Midrashic material previously unknown to us. For instance, the Hebrew *waḥāmušim* of Exod 13:18 is interpreted as “formed into five camps” (p. 89), an interpretation otherwise unknown (n. 27), but which somehow bears the stamp of Midrash. Our text, then, can join with the *Yalquṭim*, *Midrash Haggadol*, etc. as a source for “lost” Midrashim.

2.2.2 However, the Nerwa texts not only gather and combine sources, but also expand them and enhance them. This point may be illustrated by a synopsis of a Talmudic aggada with the version of the story in the *Pəšaṭ*. Although the procedure will be somewhat lengthy, only the full synopsis will exhibit the extent and artistry of the work of the Nerwa text’s redactor.

B Abod. Zar.

Onkelos the son of Kalonikos converted.

Caesar sent a battalion of Romans after him. He attracted them with verses and converted them.

Again he sent another battalion after him. He said to them, “Don’t say anything to him.”

Pəšaṭ, quoted from Sabar, pp., 92–94

[Detailed story of his conversion drawn from other sources.]

Finally, when the wicked Caesar heard about what happened he sent men after him to Jerusalem (saying): “Go at once and bring him to me, fettered!”

When the armed soldiers of Caesar came to Jerusalem, and saw Onkelos among the sages—Divine light surrounding him, as he shed light on the sages—they were astonished at him. He summoned them and had them seated near him, and told them of the meanings of Torah, and the commandments, and of the reward for (keeping) them. (Thereupon,) they, too, proclaimed that the religion of Israel was true and acknowledged their belief in it, and through him they were converted to Judaism.

(When) Caesar heard about this, he sent still other men, more numerous and more violent (than

the preceding ones) to look for him.

When they took him and went, he said to them, “I would tell you something. In general, the *Agipra* carries the lamp for the *Apifyora*, and the *Apifyora* for the *Ducas*, and the *Ducas* for the *Hegemon*, and the *Hegemon* for the *Koma*. Does the *Koma* carry for anyone? Whereas the Holy One, Blessed be He, was carrying the light for Israel, as it says, ‘the Lord goeth before you by day . . .’” And they were converted.

Again, sent he another battalion. He said to them, “Don’t speak to him at all.” When they grabbed him and went, he saw the *mezuzah*. He placed his hand on it and said to them, “What is this?” They said to him, “Please tell us.” He said to them, “In the way of the world, a king sits inside and his slaves guard him from without, but the Holy One, Blessed be He, is not so. Rather he guards Israel from without, as it says, ‘The Lord will guard your going out and coming in.’” They were converted, and he sent not again after him.

They also came to him and he converted them, too, as (he had) the others, by the sweetness of this teaching.

(Of this), too, Caesar heard. This time, (however,) he forwarded dire threats to Israel through very strong men, and he ordered them: “You must not speak with him either good or evil. Simply seize him as he is and bring him to me!” When those strong men came, they did just that; they seized him by force and took him to carry him off. When they arrived with him at the gates of Jerusalem and were about to take him out, he put forth his hand onto the *mezuzah* of Jerusalem, saying: “O you stupid men of Caesar, have you any idea of the benefit (to be derived from) the *mezuzah*?” They said, “No!” He said, “O you fools; this is the mighty Name of the God of Israel. We write It down and put It on our gates, and It protects us from all the harmful powers: no destroyer or demons dare to come into the houses of Israel. On the contrary, they (live) in tranquility and comfort in their houses and God protects them from all misfortunes. We are not like you, for you have

to protect your master, Caesar. Night and day you maintain watches for his benefit, and still he is not at peace. On the contrary, he goes to sleep in fear and rises in fear.

“Moreover, when your Caesar takes you into the army, you fight for him and you get killed while he looks on from afar. As for us, Israel, this is not the way of our God. Instead, while Israel remains at ease, *as it is said: The Lord will battle for you etc.* (Ex. 14:14).

“Not only that, but you wear yourselves out day and night for the benefit of Caesar. In the daytime you (have to) light candles for him; he is at ease and you are put to pains. But as for us, Israel, our God provides us with shade in the daytime and in the night, by means of His illuminations, He furnishes us with light, *as it is said: The Lord went before them etc.* (Ex. 13:21).

“And do not say, only on that day this happened, but each and every day, until the Messiah (arrives), God will do the same for Israel. All the other nations He leads in darkness and gloom, but Israel He illuminates with His lights, *as it is said: For behold, darkness shall cover the earth (etc.)* (Is. 60:2).”

When these strong men heard this, they (too) expressed their belief in the religion of Israel and were converted by him. Thereupon On-gelos sent back an answer to Caesar (saying): “O Caesar, all that I have done was only upon the advice of my maternal uncle Titus. Now, then, you know—and Titus

(too) —that I took hold of a lowly hand (?) and went to a nation of low estate. In the end God will raise us up higher than all the nations”. When Caesar heard this, he held his peace and left him alone.

(*The Pillar . . .*) *did not depart* (Ex. 13:22). By day the shade (provided) by the pillar of the cloud never departed from Israel, nor at night did the light from the pillar of illuminations (depart) from before the people of Israel.

It is not, of course, within the scope of this essay to attempt a full literary analysis of the work of our redactor. However, some few points can be quickly made. First of all, we see how the redactor has left out details not likely to be clear to his audience, viz. the list of Roman officials. Secondly, he has added much interesting detail to the story; “the verses” of the Talmud’s version are here “the meanings of Torah, and the commandments, and the reward for (keeping) them.” All this is designed to increase the relevance and persuasive power of the homily for the preacher/writer’s audience.

Third, he has incorporated a further homiletical use of Exod. 14:14, most appropriate indeed in its present context, and assured his audience—a quite oppressed and insecure one—that God continues to protect them similarly forever.

Finally, the detail regarding the carrying of light has been moved from its position in the Talmudic version to near the end, so as to blend the story into its homiletic context and provide continuity with the following *pericope* having to do with the “pillar of cloud” and the “pillar of light.” Moreover, “the pillar of cloud” has itself been made part of the comparison between the earthly and heavenly kings, a point absent from the Talmud. The author is thus seen to be not merely a translator or redactor but an actual and living continuation of the Midrashic process. We have already said (above 1.1) that we see no reason to assume that the creator of this Midrash is anyone but the Nerwa author himself. He may have had something like *Yalquṭ Shimʿoni* before him, but his work was much more than that of a mere translator.

2.3 The fine glossary which completes the text edition (127-158) is much more than an aid to study of the text, since it contains references to the scientific literature for the cited lexical items. There are also indices of proper names and biblical verses (158-160).

3. The Importance of Neo-Aramaic for "Classical" Aramaic Studies

3.0 After working through the *Pəšaṭ*, one is convinced more than ever of the integral relevance of Neo-Aramaic to the field of Aramaic studies in general. Particularly, it seems, one who toils in the vineyard of Babylonian Aramaic will find much of importance in these Kurdistani dialects, which are, after all, descended from sister dialects. Some tentative suggestions of points of possible mutual elucidation between the Nerwa texts and Babylonian Jewish Aramaic will now be offered.

3.1 *hādax* (cf. p. 138 in glossary, s.v. *hādax*): Sabar translates this form as "thus, (just) like that, as follows," and derives it hesitantly from "OS [i.e., Old Syriac] *hāde* 'this' + *ʔa(y)k* 'as' (?) but see *GVS* [= A. J. MacClearn, *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac* (Cambridge: Clarendon, 1895; rpt. 1971) 160; A 6." In note A 6 (i.e., n. 6 in commentary A [p. 37]), Sabar discusses "velarization" of vowels as expressed in the orthography by the letters <*k*> and <*g*>. He, therefore, seems to be suggesting that we have here merely the feminine demonstrative and that the /*x*/ is a purely phonetic phenomenon. MacClearn in his grammar leaves the form without any etymology but implies that /-*xa*/ is original and /-*ax*/ secondary.

Another solution may be suggested. In Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, the fem. sg. far demonstrative is *hax*. Now, a whole series of demonstratives in Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic must be derived from forms with medial /*d*/, e.g., the near demonstratives *hay* from *hāden* and *ha* from *hāda*. Therefore, the form *hax* suggests a derivation from **hādax*. Indeed, one finds a trace of evidence for *hādax* in *B. Nazir*, where the forms *hāden* and *hāda* are also common.¹⁵ Therefore, one may suggest that the form

15. See my forthcoming "Three Philological Notes on Babylonian Talmud, Tr. Nazir," *Təsiuda* 3.

hādax in the Nerwa texts may be simply an archaic feminine demonstrative. "That" seems to work as a gloss for *hādax*, as, e.g., *kīman ʔxe-le parʔo hādax* (p. 37), "When Pharaoh saw that."

This explanation does not account for the variant *hadxa* (p. 68, n. 307), but then neither do the previous etymologies, except for MacClearn's (which is unsatisfactory for other reasons). If our hypothesis is correct, it would seem to support the etymology of Babylonian Jewish Aramaic *hax*, as well as the likelihood that *hādax* is a correct form in *Nazir*.

3.2 *ʔay* and *ʔādi* as masculines:

3.2.1 Sabar remarks (p. 42, n. 51), "ʔy /ʔay/ 'that' (f.) (OS *hāy*). F. demonstrative pronouns before m. nouns, e.g. *xabra* 'matter', *pāsūq* 'verse' are common in [the] N[erwa] T[exts]." It should be mentioned that in Babylonian Jewish Aramaic, to be sure in different sub-dialects, *hay* may be masculine or feminine. In the former case, it is derived from *hāden* (see 3.1 above), and in the latter from *hāhī*. Since all of the examples of f. demonstratives before masculine nouns cited by Sabar involve this form, might we not say that *ʔay* in the Nerwa texts derives from these two older forms and may thus be m. or f. as in Babylonian Jewish Aramaic?

3.2.2 Another possible case is *ʔādi*, of which Sabar avers (p. 40, n. 28), "From OS *hāde* 'this (f.)', but in [the] N[erwa] T[exts], is used for both m. and f." In Babylonian Jewish Aramaic there occurs a rare masculine demonstrative *ʔādi* or *ʔade*, of unknown origin. This could point to a possible source of *ʔādi* in the Nerwa texts. Again, could there not have been a phonetic merger of the two forms *ʔādi*/*ʔade*, one masculine and one feminine?

3.3 *kīman*: In Neo-Aramaic, we find the conjunction *kīman*, meaning 'when.' Sabar writes (p. 27, n. 348), "Var. *ku ʔīman* I < OS *kul ʔemmāt* (> *ʔīmā* > *ʔīman*, 'nunation') 'when-ever'. It is rarely attested in [the] N[erwa] T[exts] and seems to be the forerunner of the common form *kīman*." Were it not for this rare variant, one would certainly compare *kīman* with Babylonian Jewish Aramaic (and other dialects) *kīwan*/*kēwan*, which has precisely the same semantic content and syntactic functions as Neo-Aramaic *kīman* (see 3.1 above). Were this indeed a correct comparison, one would be inclined to search for an Akkadian source for this word as doublets with *m* ~ *w* in Akkadian loan words are owing to inner-Akkadian dialectal

variation. Cf., e.g., *kimah* > *gumḥa* ~ *gwh* [**giwah*] in different Aramaic dialects.¹⁶

4. Summary

4.1 The reviewer hopes to have made amply clear how important he believes Professor Sabar's book is to Aramaic and Jewish studies. For the "classical" Aramaist and especially the one who works in "Jewish Aramaic," there is no better, accessible or more attractive introduction to the Neo-Aramaic language and literature. There is something here for everyone—for the linguist, the text and commentary; for the Midrashist, the translation and commentary; and for the student of literary history, a fine introduction to the "Oral and Written Literature of the Kurdish Jews" (pp. 161-178). Sabar has carried out a complex task admirably, certainly in the body of the work. Since he promises us future editions of the remaining Nerwa texts, he may pardon us a hope that a full scale grammatical treatment may be forthcoming, as this dialect with its archaic features is a crucial one for the history of Aramaic. As a teacher, one would hope that a students' chrestomathy of this type of literature and other Jewish Neo-Aramaic might also be in the offing. But these hopes for the future, while meant as a compliment to Sabar, are ungrateful by their nature. So let us thank him for what he has given us, and hope that his work will help bring Neo-Aramaic studies to their rightful place in the world of Northwest Semitic and Jewish studies.

October, 1979.

16. E. Y. Kutscher, "Kuk and its Congeners" (Hebrew), in idem, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (N 6): [תלז]-[תלז]. Cf. also S. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Assyriological Studies 19; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1974): 143-144. An Akkadian source for *kēwan* was first proposed to me by my teacher, Professor F. Rosenthal.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE 4QENOCHE FRAGMENTS AND 11QTGJOB

ROBERT I. VASHOLZ

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

With the publication of the *editio princeps* of the Aramaic fragments of the Book of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4 by J. T. Milik, we now have those orthographical and grammatical features for a comparison with those of 11QtgJob.¹ In a recent study that appeared in *MAARAV*, M. Sokoloff concluded that morphologically 4QEn^a is somewhat later than 11QtgJob but that orthographically it seems to be earlier.

In sum, the morphological features of 4QEn^a indicate that it should be placed somewhat after 11QtgJob. Because of the paleographical dating of 4QEn^a (1st half of the 2nd century B.C.E.) this would then place 11QtgJob earlier than hitherto assumed. On the other hand, the archaic orthographical features which this manuscript shares with the Hermopolis Papyri would seem to suggest an earlier date.²

While in agreement with some of his conclusions, I believe some of his claims require correction.

(1) He notes that in 4QEn^a "original *sin* is always spelled with

1. J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976): 161.1

2. M. Sokoloff, "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *MAARAV* 1:2 (Spring, 1979): 202-203.

samek." This, he states, is in agreement with 11QtgJob.³ But a glance at Sokoloff's own work on the targum shows that this is not the case.⁴ The *šin* in 11QtgJob is not always spelled with a *samek*. The two texts, then, are not in agreement on this point.

(2) The elision of the *ʔalep* in *I-ʔ* verbs is characteristic of 4QEn^a. While this is usually not the case in 11QtgJob, elided forms do occur.⁵ Sokoloff concludes that this evidence indicates an earlier date for 11QtgJob than for 4QEn^a. However, with only four examples from 4QEn^a and the evidence in the Targum being mixed, one wonders if this should be counted as support for dating at all.

(3) Sokoloff notes one example as evidence for the dissimilation of the *nun* of the *I-n* verb.⁶ (On a very small fragment the possibility of another instance of *nun* dissimilation, *lnš[lh]*, may be attested. This, however, is uncertain.⁷) 11QtgJob, though, contains examples of both the assimilated and the dissimilated *nun* and with the same verb that is used in 4QEn^a.⁸ With no examples of assimilated *nun*, in 4QEn^a, and with only *one* clear example of dissimilated *nun*, how can one say that 4QEn^a and 11QtgJob are in agreement on this point? 11QtgJob is mixed, 4QEn^a is not (as far as we know).

(4) Original short *u*-vowels are not represented in the orthography of 4QEn^a and Sokoloff cites this as a point in which this text agrees with 11QtgJob.⁹ However, short *u* is sometimes indicated by *waw* in this Qumran targum as Sokoloff himself has noted in his commentary.¹⁰ Here again, 4QEn^a cannot be said to be in agreement with 11QtgJob.

3. Ibid., p. 202.

4. M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI*. (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974): 14. Sokoloff has contributed a quality volume to the Qumran corpus for the English reader. In my constant reference to his work, I have discovered few omissions; 2 m. p., pf. (11:2=27:12) MT *hzytwn* omitted from Glossary, p. 206. 3m. s. Imp. *hybʔ* (32:8=39:9) MT and (16:1, 2=30:13, 14) MT *ytwn* omitted from "Morphology of the Aramaic of TGI" p. 182.

5. Ibid., 32:8; 16:1,2 (as in Biblical Aramaic).

6. Sokoloff, "Notes" (N 2): 219.

7. Milik, 4QEn^a (N 1): plate 5, frag. 1.

8. Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 31:5; 33:3; 36:5.

9. Sokoloff, "Notes" (N 2): 202.

10. Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 13.

(5) According to the author, indication of final [*ā*] is nearly always *h* in the determinate state (11 vs. 3) in 4QEn^a.¹¹ I believe that, in order to use this kind of evidence for comparison of texts, only exactly corresponding forms should be employed. Exact correspondence must include the use of identical words as well as the use of identical phonemes. Generally speaking, unless numerous examples are available, I would argue that to compare the orthography of a given phoneme in the words of one text with a like phoneme in different words in another text is to use negative evidence. The comparison of exactly corresponding forms is particularly necessary for texts that have a mixed orthography.¹²

The exact correspondence of the determinate forms which appear in both 4QEn^a and 11QtgJob are *ʔrʕ*, *ʕnn* and *ʔnš*. In 4QEn^a, *ʔrʕ* in the determinate state attests to both *-ʔ* and *h*.¹³ In 11QtgJob it is always *-ʔ*.¹⁴ The noun *ʕnn* has *-ʔ* in 11QtgJob, while *ʕnn* attests to *h* in 4QEn^a, and *ʔnš* is always used with *-ʔ* in both.¹⁵ Regarding final /*ā*/ when not a determinate ending, there are no exact correspondences of the feminine absolute endings or the infinitives in the derived conjugations. The first singular independent pronouns (*ʔnh*) are identical in both works, while the first plural pronominal suffix of *klnh* in 4QEn^a has no correspondence in 11QtgJob.¹⁶ A comparison of *kl* and *hd* shows 4QEn^a with two examples of *-h*, while 11QtgJob has *-ʔ* twice and *-h* twice.¹⁷ Third feminine plural pronoun does not occur in our targum. Summarily, regarding exact correspondence, there is a negligible difference. 4QEn^a uses *-ʔ* five times, *-h* nine times, while 11QtgJob uses *-ʔ* eight times and *-h* seven times.

11. Sokoloff, "Notes" (N 1): 202.

12. See my article, "A Further Note on the Problem of Nasalisation in Biblical Aramaic, 11QtgJob and IQ Genesis Apocryphon" *RevQ* 37:10 (September, 1979): 95-96.

13. Milik, 4QEn^a (N 1) 142:7; 145:1, 146:3; 150:17; 157:5; cf. 157:7; 158:19.

14. Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 13:5; 24:7; 30:2.

15. Milik, 4QEn^a (N 1): 146:4; 150:18, 19; Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 3:8; 28:2; 34:1; 34:2 (?).

16. For *ʔnh* cf. Milik, 4QEn^a 142:4; 162:5; Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 14:6; 21:1; 22:3; 25:9; 37:6. Cf. 26:5; 13:3; 26:6, 7. For *klnh* cf. Milik op. cit., 150:2.

17. Milik, 4QEn^a (N 1): 142:3; 150:3; Sokoloff, 11QtgJob (N 4): 37:3; 5:6; 30:5 (twice).

In my opinion, Sokoloff's claim that (1) and (4) above demonstrate an agreement between the texts is not correct.¹⁸ He makes too much of (3) as evidence. After all, both *nun* assimilation and dissimilation is found in BA, 11QtgJob and 1QapGen. I am dubious about using only one example for support. The employment of (2) as support for an earlier 11QtgJob is also questionable. There are just too few examples available, especially in light of the fact that 11QtgJob has elided forms too. And while data from (5) is not used by Sokoloff for a specific comparison of 4QEn^a and 11QtgJob, exact correspondences noted above yield more orthographic examples for comparison than does the evidence for the other arguments. If such scant data means anything, both 4QEn^a and 11QtgJob witness to a mixed orthography that demonstrate a close agreement. In fine, while morphological features do suggest an earlier date for 11QtgJob than 4QEn^a, I doubt whether any judgment can be made regarding orthographical features.

BOOKS RECEIVED

MAARAV lists here all books received which are within our publishing purview or which the editors deem may be of interest to our readership. The appearance of a book in this section neither assures nor precludes its review in a subsequent issue.

- BLAKELY, JEFFREY A. and LAWRENCE E. TOOMBS; ed. by Kevin G. O'Connell, S.J., *The Tell El-Hesi Field Manual: The Joint Archaeological Expedition to Tell El-Hesi*; Vol. 1, Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980. Pp. xix+133.
- CALLAWAY, JOSEPH A. with the assistance of Kermit Schooner and William W. Ellinger III, *The Early Bronze Age Citadel and Lower City at Ai (Et-Tell); A Report of the Joint Archaeological Expedition to Ai (Et-Tell)*, No. 2, Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980. Pp. xiv+295.
- CERESKO, ANTHONY R., *Job 29-31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic*, *Biblica et Orientalia* 36, Rome: PBI, 1980. Pp. xiii+272, \$19.00.
- KLEIN, MICHAEL L., *The Fragment-Tragums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources*, Vol. 1, *Texts, Indices and Introductory Essays*; Vol. 2, *Translation*, Rome: PBI, 1980; Vol. 1, pp. 260; Vol. 2, pp. ix+199, 8 plates.
- KUGEL, JAMES L., *The Idea of Biblical Poetry, Parallelism and Its History*, New Haven and London: Yale Univ., 1981. Pp. xi+339, \$27.50.
- LEVIN, SAUL, *The Father of Joshua/Jesus*, Binghamton: SUNY, 1978. Pp. 195, \$4.00.
- MARCUS, DAVID, *A Manual of Babylonian Jewish Aramaic*, Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981. Pp. viii+132, \$7.75.
- ROFÉ, ALEXANDER, *The Book of Balaam*, Jerusalem: Simor, 1979. Pp. 77 (Hebrew with detailed contents in English).
- TARRAGON, JEAN-MICHEL DE, O.P., *Le culte à Ugarit*, Paris: Gabalda, 1980. Pp. 208.
- WENHAM, G. J., *The Book of Leviticus*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979. Pp. xiii+362, \$9.95.

18. Sokoloff, "Notes" (N 2): 202. (1) in this article corresponds to his heading 2; (2) to 5; (3) to 6; (4) to 11, and (5) to 1.

WOUDSTRA, M. H., *The Book of Joshua*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981. Pp. xix+396, \$16.95.

Love & Death in the Ancient Near East

*Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope
on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*



Edited by

JOHN H. MARKS and ROBERT M. GOOD

To order *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East* please send check or money order for \$27.50 (casebound) or \$20.00 (paperbound) to:

FOUR QUARTERS PUBLISHING COMPANY
28 HIGH STREET, GUILFORD, CONNECTICUT 06437

Love & Death in the Ancient Near East

CONTENTS

Mesopotamia and Anatolia

Benjamin Foster, *Gilgamesh: Sex, Love and the Ascent of Knowledge*

William W. Hallo, *The Birth of Kings*

Harry Hoffner, *Hittite Terms for the Lifespan*

Thorkild Jacobsen, *Two bal-bal-e Dialogues*

Marcel Sigrist, *On the Bite of a Dog*

Syro-Palestine:

Alan Cooper, *MLK 'LM: "Eternal King" or "King of Eternity"?*

Mitchell Dahood, *Love and Death at Ebla and Their Biblical Reflections*

William G. Dever, *Funerary Practices in EB IV (MB I) Palestine: A Study in Cultural Discontinuity*

Dennis Pardee, *"As Strong as Death"*

Simon B. Parker, *Death and Devotion: The Composition and Theme of Aqht*

Biblical Studies and Judaica:

Brevard Childs, *Death and Dying in Old Testament Theology*

David Noel Freedman, *On the Death of Abiner*

Tikvah Frymer-Kensky, *The Planting of Man: A Study in Biblical Imagery*

Judah Goldin, *The Death of Moses: An Exercise in Midrashic Transposition*

Robert Good, *Exodus 32:18*

M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Abraham—Lover or Beloved of God*

Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 16: A Panorama of Passions*

Jonas Greenfield, *Smitten by Famine, Battered by Plague (Deuteronomy 32:24)*

Paul Hanson, *In Defiance of Death: Zachariah's Symbolic Universe*

Lansing Hicks, *The Door of Love*

Delbert Hillers, *Dust: Some Aspects of Old Testament Imagery*

Stephen A. Kaufman, *The Second Table of the Decalogue and the Implicit Categories Of Ancient Near Eastern Law*

Charles A. Kennedy, *The Cult of the Dead in Corinth*

Thomas W. Mann, *Holiness and Death in the Redaction of Numbers 16:1–20:13*

Roland E. Murphy, *Dance and Death in the Song of Songs*

H. Neil Richardson, *Psalms 106: Yahweh's Succoring Love Saves from the Death of a Broken Covenant*

Jack Sasson, *Love's Roots: On the Redaction of Genesis 30: 14–24*

Stanislav Segert, *"Live Coals Heaped on the Head"*

Daniel Snell, *Notes on Love and Death in Proverbs*

Jeffrey H. Tigay, *"What is Man that You Have Been Mindful of Him?" (On Psalm 8:4–5)*

John Van Seters, *Love and Death in the Court History of David*

Robert R. Wilson, *The Death of the King of Tyre: The Editorial History of Ezekiel 28*

Islam, Egypt:

Fred Donner, *The Death of Abu-Talib*

Cyrus H. Gordon, *The Marriage and Death of Sinuhe*

Dimitri Gutas, *Our Better Halves*

Franz Rosenthal, *Reflections on Love in Paradise*

To order *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East* please send check or money order for \$27.50 (casebound) or \$20.00 (paper-bound) to:

FOUR QUARTERS PUBLISHING COMPANY
28 HIGH STREET, GUILDFORD, CONNECTICUT 06437