



Addenda to JAOS 90 (1970), p. 184ff: The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East

Author(s): M. Weinfeld

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 92, No. 3, (Jul. - Sep., 1972), pp. 468-469

Published by: American Oriental Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/600573>

Accessed: 15/04/2008 01:51

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

24. The reading of the ur -sign is uncertain. In Otten's hand-copy its Winkelhaken is placed lower than that of the correctly written ur in rev. 10. It resembles the sign urudu but it has an additional vertical. Neither interpretation of this sign yields a satisfactory meaning.

Rev. 3. At Boghaz-Köy the signs KI.2 (read KI.MIN) are used as a ditto mark. In this text the scribe replaces the normally unvarying 2 by the number of the item in the particular list. In lines 11-16 the body parts are counted in this way up to 10, and KI.MIN is used thereafter.

6. The expected third singular active imperative of the verb *dala-* is *dalāu*, which occurs in *KUB XXXVI* 55 ii 9.

9. *aušta* could also mean "you saw."

10. The questioned "it" translates the broken *an* at the beginning of the line.

11-16. The haphazard counting and the failure of the number of body parts to total nine (as in line 10) is familiar to Hittitologists. The list of body parts in this substitution ritual is interesting because it contains several previously unattested words.¹

12. At the beginning of this line one body part is lost. The available space is small so that it was probably represented by a logogram.

13. *genzu-* may mean "lap" or "womb," cf. Hoffner, *RHA* 80 (1967), 24. The animal is a male goat (*MÁŠ.GAL*, rev. 8) so "womb" is excluded. I do not know which part of a goat is the lap.

14. There is very little space for the body part whose only legible sign is TI. UZUTI "rib" is attractive, but the traces at the break in Otten's hand copy do not favor UZU . The nominative *zašgaraiš* and the dative-locative

zašgarišši both occur only here. The inflection of the word is reminiscent of that of *aiš* "mouth," whose dative-locative singular is *išši*. I suggest that this word is a compound containing *aiš* as its second element. The first part, *zašgar-* appears to be a spelling variant of the word for "excrement," which already has two variants, *šakkar* and *zakkar*. This multiplicity of spellings must represent an initial cluster, and indicates that the distinction between initial *š-* and *z-* was neutralized before *-k-*. The compound literally means "excrement-mouth," hence "anus." The combining form of *šakkar* is that of its nominative rather than that of the oblique stem *šakn-*. (I owe the identification of *zašgar-* with *šakkar* and *zakkar* to Professor H. G. Güterbock.)

15. No previously attested body part has a dative-locative singular ending in *-danni*. *arkiyeš* occurs only in this passage. It is a plural body part whose appropriate place in the list is between the anus and the knees. One may rule out the buttocks, which are expressed by the singular *arraš*, and the thighs, which are *walleš*. Bearing in mind that the animal is male, I suggest that *arkiyeš* are the testicles. If this definition is correct, the word *arki-* (or *arkiya-*?) is the reflex of Indo-European *H₂orǵhi- "testicle" and is cognate with Greek *órkhis*, Albanian *herdhe*, and Avestan *ərəzi*, all "testicle" (the Avestan form is a dual).

17. This line resists interpretation. The reading of the first word is taken from Otten, *StBoT* 15, 4, but presents difficulties. In Otten's hand-copy the second verticals of both the *a* and the *e* are not broken and the first two verticals of the *kán* are of unequal length.

18-21. The subject of all of these verbs is probably the male goat.

21. $\text{GI}^{\text{S}}\text{zuppari lukkan } \text{hardu}$ is ambiguous and could also mean "let him keep a torch lighted."

HOWARD BERMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Cf. now V. Haas, *Orientalia NS* 40 (1971), 417f. This article reached me after I had submitted the present communication. I find no cause, however, for changing my analysis.

Addenda to JAOS 90 (1970), p. 184ff.

To p. 186: A phrase identical with *hlk lpony dy bšdqh* may be found in the Hittite: *A-NA PA-NI DINGIR.MEŠ parā ḥandandātar iḫa-* (*Ḫattušiliš* I 48, cf. A. Goetze, *MVAG* 29/3 (1924), 10 and his note pp. 52-55 there) which means: "to walk before the gods with righteousness/loyalty." *ḥandāi-* equals Akkadian *kunnū* and *ḥandandātar* is rendered by *nīg.si.sá-tar* (*nīg.si.sá* = *mīšarum*) which also supports our analogy. It seems to me that even the other instances of *parā ḥandandātar* where it is spoken of the gods showing *p.h.* in distress, war etc. might be put in proper light by Biblical *šdqh* which also connotes salvation. For the saving acts by

God by means of *šdqh* see e.g. Ps. 31:2; 71:2; 143:11 and for showing or revealing *šdqh* see Hos. 10:12, Isa. 56:1, Ps. 98:2. Even the phrase in the introduction to the Apology of *Ḫattušiliš*: *šá ḫištār parā ḥandandātar memahḫi* (line 5) may be better understood on the basis of Biblical parallels. Reciting or telling God's *šdqh* is very common in the Old Testament and is clearly attested in the ancient poem of Judg. 5 (v. 11).

As in the Assyrian documents so also in Hittite the idiom "to walk in righteousness/loyalty before RN" in the sense of serving loyally is attested in the treaties (cf. most recently: Kempinski-Kořak, "The Išmeriga Ver-

trag," *WO* 5 [1970], 192:13). The idiom seems to be rooted in the royal sphere and then was projected on the divine realm as was the case with mythical descriptions in Mesopotamia. (cf. Th. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES* 2 [1943], 167ff.). Very interesting in this respect is the letter in *ABL* 358, where Adadšumušur writes to the king saying approximately so: "just as the king made me stand before him, so let the great gods ... make the king stand before them." (r.15-20).

To pp. 190-192: H. Donner ("Adoption oder Legitimation, Erwägungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament auf dem Hintergrund der altorientalischen Rechte," *Oriens Antiquus* 8 (1969), 87-119) argues quite justifiably that unlike Babylonia, adoption had not been practiced in ancient Israel and is also quite rare in the Syro-Palestinian area. Moreover in this area it appears only as a fictitious device for alienating property. This brings him to the conclusion that the "sonship" of David is not based on adoption imagery. However, as can be seen from the examples which I supplied, it is this fictitious adoption or as he calls it: "hybrid adoption" which underlies the "sonship" of David and Israel. Donner admits that making Ephraim and Manasseh equal with Jacob's natural sons (Gen. 48:3-7) is a hybrid adoption (pp. 108-109) whose aim was to give legitimacy to their rights of inheritance within the twelve tribes. Indeed it is the right of inheritance (of land and dynasty) which motivated the use of the simile of adoption by God of David and Israel.

To note 38: Cf. also E. von Schuler, "Staatsverträge und Dokumente hethitischen Rechts," *Historia*, Einzelschriften, Heft 7 (1964), 40.—*To notes 50, 51:* Cf. most recently: E. Cassin, *RA* 63 (1969), 133f.—*To note 56:* On the variant *tknkm* of 4QPs. 89 instead of the MT *tkwn* *mw*, see E. Lipinski, *Le Poème royal du Psaume 89, 1-5, 20-38* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 6 [1967]), *ad loc.*—*To note 58:* *mwunh* as pact might also explain Neh. 11:23, 1 Chr. 9:22, 26, 31 and 2 Chr. 31:12, 15, 18.—*To note 70:* That *sp* has overtones of adoption may be learned from Ps. 27:10.—*To p. 192 and note 77:* Cf. most recently E. Cassin, *RA* 63 (1969), 134.—*To note 84:* Cf. H. Klengel, *Orientalia* N.S. 32 (1963) II pp. 35-36, 41-42, 10-18.—*To p. 194 and note 90:* Cf. also the bilingual in *KAI* 124:3: *ḫp bbn.*—*To p. 194:* For the title "son" and "firstborn" amongst the Mesopotamian Kings see M. J. Seux, *Épithètes Royales Akkadiennes et Sumériennes* (1967), 42-44. *ašarēd kal malkī* "first of all princes" which is common in the neo-Assyrian period is close in meaning to *ḫywn lmlky ḫrš* in our verse.—*To p. 190ff:* Adoption imagery similar to that of David may be found in Mari: Adad of Kalassu (Aleppo) says in an

oracle to the king of Mari: "Am I not Adad . . . whom I raised between my legs (*ša ina birīt paḫallīja urab-būšuma*) . . . I am the master of throne, land and city . . . I will give him throne upon throne, house upon house, city upon city; the land from the east to the west." Cf. A. Lods, "Une Tablette Inédite de Mari etc.," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy presented to Th. H. Robinson* (1950), 103ff., ll. 9-23. Compare A. Malamat, *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958), 67ff.—*To pp. 196ff.* (Gen. 15): The rite of passing between the pieces of the victims originated in Asia-Minor and had been propagated in the sphere of Hittite influence, cf. E. Bickerman, "Couper une alliance," *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* 5 (1950-51), 141ff. Especially interesting for our discussion is the case where a man, a goat, a puppy and a little pig were cut and the soldiers had to pass between the pieces (see O. Masson, *RHR* 137 [1950], 5-25). However, these ceremonies were mostly of apotropaic nature and were not linked to covenants.

To note 126: Goats and puppies are quite common in the Hittite rituals, cf. e.g. Sturtevant, *Hittite Chrestomathy*, 106, I:6 and see also the previous note.—*To note 131:* Cf. E. Sollberger, "The Cruciform Monument," *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 20 (1968), 57:139-148: "the meal of Šamaš had always in the land (consisted of) one three year-old calf for three meals. I decreed one three year-old calf (as) the provision of a single day." See also A. Rowe, *The Topography and History of Beth-Shan* (1930), 13 reporting the find of skeleton remains of a bull, its age fixed at three years, in the temple area. Most instructive for our case is the so called *trittys* in Greece, see my article in *Lesonenu* 36 (1972), 103.—*To note 132:* However, *ḫyīl* may be rendered "falcon" and could therefore symbolize Egypt which is to menace Abraham's children (vv. 13-14), cf. H. Cazelles, *RB* 69 (1962), 338-339.—*To note 154:* The measuring of the land by three delegates of each tribe, as described in Jos. 28:1-10, conforms with the Babylonian and Assyrian grant procedure of deputizing officials to supervise the surveying of the granted land. Cf. recently J. A. Brinkman, *Analecta Orientalia* 43 (1968), 291.—*To note 155 (on the marriage/adoption formula):* For the use of *verba solemnia* in marriage and adoption see S. Greenus, *JAOS* 89 (1969), 514ff.—

To p. 200 (the grant of Hebron): The grant of Šiqlag to David by the king of the Philistines (1 Sam. 27:6) seems also to have been motivated by David's heroic feats (comp. 1 Sam. 28:1-2). On the grant of Šiqlag see most recently J. Tigay, *JBL* 89 (1970), 183, n. 34.

M. WEINFELD