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ISRAEL'S BENEFICENT DEAD: THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF ISRAELITE ANCESTOR CULTS AND NECROMANCY

This investigation aims to ascertain whether or not the Israelites believed in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead. First, a lexicon of selected mortuary practices and beliefs is outlined. In the Israelite context, those rites most likely to reflect this belief are necromancy and those which fall within the purview of the ancestor cult intended to express veneration or worship of the ancestors (ch. 1).

Secondly, an evaluation of the relevant texts from Syria-Palestine of the third to first millennia B.C.E. demonstrates that a longstanding West Semitic or Canaanite origin for Israel's belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead cannot be established on the basis of these data (chs. 2 and 3). Thirdly, an examination of the Hebrew Bible demonstrates that while a concern to care for or commemorate the dead might be inferred, neither an ancestor cult nor ancestor veneration or worship in particular can be established on the basis of the available literary (or material) evidence.

Moreover, while necromancy is occasionally attested, the relevant passages which polemicize against Israel's embrace of this practice originate either in the last days of the Judahite monarchy or, more likely, during the exile itself. The historical reality which gave rise to this polemical tradition was the threat which Mesopotamian religion and magic beginning with the Neo-Assyrian period posed to later (dtr?) Yahwism (ch. 4).

Comparative ethnographic data suggests that the longstanding absence of the belief in the beneficent dead in Israel and Syria-Palestine might be partially explained as a reaction to the pervasive fear of the dead. Nevertheless, once this belief was embraced by late Israelite society, owing to contemporary developments in politics (Mesopotamian hegemony), economics (depletion of resources), and religion (popularity of divination), necromancy, not ancestor veneration or worship, presented itself as the preferred ritual expression of this belief (conclusion).
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ISRAEL’S BENEFICENT DEAD: THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF ISRAELITE ANCESTOR CULTS AND NECROMANCY

This investigation sets out to ascertain whether or not the Israelites believed in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead and, if they did, to reconstruct what can be known about the origins of such belief.

A review of past works in the field exposes a marked imprecision in the application of anthropological terminology relevant to the study of mortuary practices. Moreover, a significant number assume the validity of antiquated theories of the origin of primitive religions. The resultant reconstructed model is one which not only depicts a Canaanite-Israelite ancestor cult spanning some two millennia, but within the purview of this cult are included a wide range of otherwise unrelated mortuary practices. In recent discussions, the third-to-second millennium texts from Ebla, Mari, Ugarit, Nuzi, and Emar as well as the first millennium Aramaic, Phoenician, and Hebrew inscriptive materials have been cited in support of this model (ch. 1, pt. 1).

The present investigation first offers a lexicon of selected mortuary practices and beliefs as defined in the light of modern anthropological studies. The following terms are treated: rites of passage, funerary rites, mourning rites, ancestor cults, death cults, the feeding of the dead, the care for the dead, the commemoration of the dead (or geneonymy), the veneration of the dead, the worship of the dead, and necromancy. Within the Israelite context, those rites most likely to reflect the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead -should they be found to exist- include necromantic rites and those ancestor cult practices intended to express veneration or worship of the dead. Owing to the lack of relevant speculative discourse in these sources, references to such ritual complexes provide the only available literary contexts from which to extract expressions of such a belief (ch. 1, pt. 2).

In pre-first millennium Syria-Palestine, isolated data might point to the care for or commemoration of the dead, but neither the veneration nor worship of the dead nor the consultation of the dead for the purpose of retrieving information concerning the future are documented. A second
millennium West Semitic or Canaanite origin for Israel's belief in the beneficent dead cannot be established on the basis of these data. The texts from Ebla, Mari, Ugarit, Emar, and Nuβi do not provide evidence for such a belief as embraced by the indigenous populations of third-to-first millennia B.C.E. Syria-Palestine.

The so-called Eblaite king list TM 75.G.2628, attests to offerings to "the god of So-and-so" dingir + PN (= personal name). The dingir sign is repeated several times and in each instance it is followed by the name of a different individual. These offerings were intended for the personal god of either former members of the royal dynasty or, in view of the enigmatic term en at Ebla, of related influential bureaucrats.

Sumerian texts from Pre-Sargonic Lagash record the fact that individual kings of the Ur-Nanshe dynasty took as their personal god a particular deity named Shulutula. This god received sacrifices in the cult and was identified by the same construction found in the Eblaite king list, dingir + PN. In other words, the Eblaite text is not a list of offerings to the divinized royal ancestors. Rather, the text reinforces the legitimacy of the current dynasty/bureaucracy by reviewing within a cultic setting the unbroken succession of former dynasts/bureaucrats as established by their having inherited, each in their turn, the dynastic personal god.

The Mari kispum ritual documents the existence of regular offerings to the dead kings (Ša Šarrānī) in second millennium Syria-Palestine. However, this ritual does not reflect the veneration or worship of those kings. The same applies to the offerings ana maliki "for the (now deceased) vassal rulers" formerly under Mari hegemony. Neither term is divinized as we would expect them to be if veneration or worship were intended. In the Pre-Sargonic ancestor cult at Lagash, the dead kings who received regular offerings were likewise not deified. Such offerings express only a concern to care for or commemorate the former kings and to legitimize the current political structures.

In the light of comparative ethnographic data, the fact that at Mari the recipients of kispu are perceived as a corporate group supports the notion that they were not considered empowered with supernatural benevolence, but were viewed as those dead of the distant past who were deserving of continuous care. The exact relation of the deceased kings (Šarrānu) to the current Amorite dynasty is unknown, so to assume that the veneration or worship of royal ancestors is in view lacks cogency. Moreover, the supposedly related pagrū‘um offering simply refers to the carcass of the animal sacrificed, not to offerings made to a human corpse.

The Ugaritic evidence likewise fails to offer compelling evidence for the existence of the belief in the
supernatural beneficent power of the dead. The so-called Ugaritic king list KTU 1.113 attests to offerings to ‘il + PN which, like its precursor at Ebla and Lagash (dingir + PN), designates the personal god of the Ugaritic dynasty, not the deceased divinized royal ancestors. Besides, the term ‘il at Ugarit nowhere represents a (divinized) spirit of the dead. In the Shapash hymn (KTU 1.6:VI), ‘ilm is most likely parallel to ‘ilnym. The term ‘il ‘ib is the Ugaritic equivalent to "the gods of the fathers" ilānu/ilū ab(b)ī or dingir. The term found in cuneiform texts and as such functions as a heading in pantheon lists at Ugarit. The term does not represent the "divinized father".

KTU 1.161 records a coronation ritual for the new king along with funerary rites on behalf of the recently deceased king. The dead heroes, the rp‘im qdmym, are summoned along with the mlkm to rendezvous with the throne of the recently deceased king upon its arrival in the netherworld in order to deliver it to the king’s netherly abode. This group of the dead is nowhere portrayed as possessing supernatural beneficent powers. The Ugaritic rp‘um are mythic warriors and the rp‘i ‘ars and the qbš dt/dn comprise groups of living mercenary warriors and not dead royalty. The mythic figure Dtn in 1.124 is not consulted in a necromantic type ritual, but is instructed by a major deity as to the fate of a sick child. Like its cognate at Mari, the term pgr in 1.13 and 1.14 designates the carcass of an animal offering, not a human corpse to which the offering was made.

While the Emar texts attest to the metū or dead alongside the ilānu and the Nuzi texts document the etemmū or the spirits of the dead alongside the ilānu, neither of these traditions depict the dead as having been divinized. Rather, in the case of the metū or etemmū, dead ancestors in need of continual care are in view and these are paired with the personal gods or household gods perhaps from the rank and file of the local pantheon. Their occurrence together can be explained simply by means of the fact that the gods and the dead placed similar demands upon the heir as he/she was expected to "honor" (kunnū), "call upon" (nabû), and "serve" (palāḫu) both. To honor, call upon, and serve signify typical acts of filial piety; obeisance to the gods and care for or commemoration of the dead (chs. 2-4.1).

An evaluation of both the first millennium Syro-Palestinian evidence and the biblical materials demonstrates that, contrary to the consensus opinion, a first millennium Canaanite-Israelite ancestor cult, let alone ancestor veneration or worship, cannot be established on the basis of the literary (or archeological) evidence. Moreover, literary critical considerations favor the view that the Isaiah texts 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4 while concerned with necromancy, are redactional passages of or related to the deuteronomistic traditions. Likewise, Deuteronomy 14:1, 18:11, and 26:14 are also redactional in character. These passages have to do with
practices related to mourning (in the first and last instances) and necromancy (in the second). In any case, Deut. 18:11 is a deuteronomistic or post-deuteronomistic insertion.

The same applies in the case of the pertinent texts in the Deuteronomistic History. 1 Samuel 28:3-25, 2 Kings 21:6 and 23:24 concern themselves with necromancy and the first is a post-deuteronomistic addition. Moreover, the 'ēlōhîm of 1 Sam. 28 represent not the deified dead, but the gods from below summoned to assist in the retrieval of the ghost as suggested by the invocation of the gods in contemporary Mesopotamian necromancy texts. In any case, an ancestor cult is not documented in these texts, only necromancy.

These passages originate either in the last days of the Judahite monarchy or, more likely, during the exile. If not solely of deuteronomistic orientation, all of the passages share the same concern to polemicize against Israel’s embrace of this practice. The polemicizing traditions projected necromancy into passages about earlier times and portrayed it as a longstanding illicit "Canaanite" practice. As such, it was outlawed by Moses, the founder of the nation, polemicized against by the great prophet Isaiah, and expunged from the cult by the righteous king Josiah. And so, within the Deuteronomistic History, necromancy functions as the Achilles Heel of both the first monarchy led by Saul and the second epitomized by Manasseh.

The historical reality which gave rise to this polemical tradition was the deuteronomistic tradition's acquaintance with Assyrian and perhaps Babylonian religion and magic. Several arguments support a Mesopotamian influence vis-à-vis Israelite belief in the beneficent dead as expressed in necromancy. The rise in divination's popularity during the reigns of late Assyrian kings, the marked increase in the number of necromancy texts in Mesopotamia beginning in the Neo-Assyrian period, and the absence of necromancy in other ancient Near Eastern traditions support the likelihood of a Mesopotamian backdrop for the deuteronomistic polemic.

The deuteronomistic tradition depicted this Mesopotamian backdrop as an historical syncretistic threat. The inclusion of illicit Mesopotamian religious elements in the Josianic reform substantiate the tradition's concern in this regard. Minimally, these include selected practices having to do with astral religion such as those directed to the "constellations" or mazzālōt (2 Kgs. 23:5) and the "rooftop altars" or hammizbā hōt 'āšer 'al-haggāq (2 Kgs. 23:12). The possibility remains that other practices in this account also point to Mesopotamian influence such as the horses and chariots dedicated to the sun.

Moreover, deities such as Baal, Asherah, and the Host of Heaven as employed in this account might reflect a "Canaanite interpretation" of Mesopotamian gods. In any case,
other contemporary biblical traditions reflect Mesopotamian influence in regard to mortuary practices such as the funerary custom of burning a fire for the dead royalty (śārap šērēgāh). In the final analysis, either willful adoption or imperial imposition would offer an adequate explanation as to how this threat was perceived to be realized in late Judahite religion by the deuteronomistic tradition.

The late condemnation of the belief in the supernatural benevolent power of the dead in the form of necromancy stands as evidence not of the compatibility of this belief with earlier Yahwism, but of its belated introduction into Israel. Had this belief been expressed in ancestor worship or veneration (or, for that matter, necromancy) in earlier times, surely the related cultic rites would have been explicitly condemned in the Hebrew Bible, but ancestor cults and necromancy are lacking therein and the textual and material records of late third-to-early first millennium B.C.E. Syria-Palestine.

While the exilic to post-exilic biblical evidence reflects the possible presence of heretofore unattested Israelite mortuary practices, the continuity with the earlier traditions stands out. Like the marzēah attested at Ugarit and the pre-Hellenistic marzēah more generally, that mentioned in Amos 6:7 and Jeremiah 16:5 has as its major concern commercial interests. It reflects no intimate connection with the cult of the dead or the ancestor cult. Jeremiah 16:5 records the exceptional practice of holding funerary rites on behalf of a former member.

The biblical Rephaim likewise evince no ancestor cult associations. The Rephaim of the poetic texts are the weak common dead, a generalization of the Ugaritic rp'īm qdmym. Those of the narrative texts parallel the rp'um or mythic warriors of Ugarit. The biblical Rephaim traditions evince no belief in their supernatural beneficent powers. On the other hand, Isa. 65:4 documents the continued observance of necromancy in Israel, but now in a form similar to what came to be known in later antiquity as a rite of incubation.

The peger of Ezek. 43:7,9 merely refers to a king's corpse buried near the temple and therefore potentially defiling. Psalm 106:28 is an exilic or post-exilic re-interpretation of Num. 25:2, a priestly polemic against contact with the dead through the eating of sacrifices offered to them. Such sacrifices might suggest the adoption in late Israel of ancestor or death cult rites, but the exact significance of such sacrifices remains to be ascertained.

Comparative ethnographic data suggests that the longstanding absence of the Israelite belief in the supernatural power of the dead might be explained in part as a reaction to the pervasive fear of the dead. While textual
references to the fear of the dead are few and problematic, both jewelry and figurines recovered from Iron Age burials in Palestine suggest a concern to ward off malevolent apparitions including perhaps the ghosts of the dead.

Israel's adoption of the belief in the supernatural beneficent dead, as in the case of the Greeks' adoption of this same belief as expressed in the form of the hero cult, was perhaps influenced by major socio-political changes. In the Israelite context, the adoption of necromancy took place during the upheavals of the late pre-exilic to exilic period. The Greek hero cult coincided with the collapse of existing social structures and the rise of the polis. As such, both offered new broad based group identities replacing or supplementing existing religious traditions. The former replaced the ancestor cults of the Greek aristocracy with their concern to care for or to commemorate the pitiful dead while the latter was introduced alongside existing Israelite religious forms providing new avenues of access to the world above.

Once the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead was adopted by late Israelite society, it was expressed in the form of necromancy, not in royal ancestor worship or veneration. The heavy tribute, taxes, and/or levies paid to Assyria would have severely weakened the needed economic base to sustain a Judahite royal (or, for that matter, domestic) ancestor cult. Moreover, the characteristic legitimating function of the royal ancestor cult had no place within the diminished power structure of a subject nation. Besides, it would have conflicted with the interest of the contemporary empires of Mesopotamia to legitimate their presence in the region. Lastly, with the rise in popularity of the divining arts both in Mesopotamia and Judah, necromancy presented itself as the preferred religio-magical expression of the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead.
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INTRODUCTION

Treatises on ancient Israelite religion more often than not advocate the view that at least some segments of early Israelite society believed in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead to affect the world of the living. Moreover, it has become axiomatic that this Israelite belief as expressed in the corresponding ritual forms of necromancy and the ancestor cult finds its origin in Canaanite culture of the second millennium.

Both the early modern research interest in Israelite ancestor cults and necromancy as well as the recent resurgence owe their impetus, at least in part, to the claims of early modern social historians. Ardently applying evolutionary and typological models to the history of religions, these turn-of-the-century intellectuals identified the ancestor cult (in which necromancy was often included) as the incipient expression of man's search for ultimate reality and human destiny.

That is to say, his belief in the supernatural and in man's survival after death were first symbolized in this cult. According to these theorists, the belief in the superhuman power of the dead eventuated into the abstraction "god", while the post mortem persistence of a ghost with a benevolent inclination, provided the rudimentary stimulus for the conceptualization known as beatific afterlife.

In what follows, we shall attempt to reconstruct what can be safely said concerning the existence, origins, and character of Israelite ancestor cults and necromancy. Methodologically, this demands that we first define the terms we intend to use. We
must therefore compile what is in essence, a descriptive glossary of selected mortuary practices so as to enhance the rigor and exactitude of the ensuing investigation.

We will next examine the Syro-Palestinian textual data and, to a lesser degree, the archeological finds spanning some three millennia. In so doing, we seek to evaluate the widely diffused assumption that ancestor cults and necromancy comprised early Canaanite practices reflective of an indigenous belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead, practices and belief which by virtue of their antiquity and proximity, informed early Israel's reverence for the benevolent dead.

Then we will evaluate the oft-cited biblical evidence supposedly reflective of Israelite ancestor cults and necromancy. As we scrutinize the texts of the Hebrew Bible, we will give particular attention to their respective compositional histories as this offers a reliable means of reconstructing the purported origin and development of these practices in Israel.¹

Having established their interpretation and compositional history, we will then appraise each of the relevant biblical passages in the light of its contemporary Near Eastern context. This provides the kind of hermeneutical control needed to identify potential socio-religious forces at play in Israel's recognition of the benefic power of the dead as manifested in her observance of ancestor cults and necromantic practices. Needless to say, such an approach stands as valid whether those influences are found to be Syro-Palestinian in origin or otherwise.

¹At least more so than the non-historical approach exemplified in Spronk 1986 and Lewis 1989.
CHAPTER I

MORTUARY PRACTICES: A DESCRIPTIVE GLOSSARY

Current interest in the Israelite version of the cult of the ancestors and necromancy has been stimulated in large part by the recent publication of epigraphic and material remains from Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra), Mari (Tell Hariri), and Ebla (Tell Mardikh). Owing to the geographic proximity of these finds as well as the presumed temporal and cultural affinities which the societies reflected in these discoveries share with each other and with early Israel, investigators hoped that these data would shed new light on Israelite mortuary practices.

In fact, a survey of the secondary literature reveals a growing consensus that, like her Syro-Palestinian neighbors and relatives of the third and second millennia, early Israel observed similar death and ancestor cult practices. Moreover, these recent explorations have vindicated the reconstructions of those late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century researchers who drew similar conclusions but lacked sufficient evidence to support their claims. Such shared results should not be construed as mere coincidence. As a reconstruction of the modern history of interpretation like that of Spronk reveals, much recent research derives its impetus from these earlier works.¹

¹Spronk 1986:43-54. The 1864 work of the French social historian, Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, La Cité antique (= The Ancient City, 1873) stands as the starting point for many of the biblical researches both old and new. For his influence, cf. Momigliano 1977:325-43 and Humphreys 1987:459-61. See also the two part foreword to the 1980 edition of The Ancient City by Momigliano and Humphreys.
While Israelite ancestor cults and necromancy have been the object of ongoing, intensive investigation, the history of interpretation has suffered both from terminological inaccuracy and imprecision. All too often, vocabulary reflective of a wide range of mortuary practices has been confused with or subsumed under the headings of ancestor cult and necromancy. Therefore, as a fitting introduction we shall compile what is in essence, a glossary of terms with the hope that such an approach will enhance the following investigation's level of accuracy and evaluation. To this we now turn.

Durkheim identified the following constituent elements of the cult of the dead: repeated standardized practices oriented toward the dead at ritual locations associated with the dead. He also speculated that death cult practices served, "to fulfill the need which the believer feels of strengthening and reaffirming, at regular intervals of time, the bond which unites him to the sacred beings upon which he depends".  

In societies where such cults exist, the belief in the persistence of some aspect of the human personality after death is universally attested. This belief, while perhaps not to be understood as the underlying motivation explaining the existence of such cults, is an important aspect of many cultures. The persistence of the human personality after death is a concept that has been explored in various ways throughout history and across different cultures.

---

2 Spronk 1986 and Lewis 1989 use the terms "funerary practices", "necromancy", "cult of the dead", and "ancestor cult" interchangeably.


of all death cults, remains a common denominator. Therefore, we shall consider it as another element worthy of consideration.

The same elements can be found in what we shall designate the *cult of the ancestors* with some important qualifications attached *vis-à-vis* the belief in man's persistence after death. But before we can take up those, we must mention the most distinctive feature of the ancestor cult over against the death cult, namely the kinship ties which bond the living and the dead. The ancestor cult comprises customary beliefs and practices directed towards dead predecessors. The cult of the dead is directed toward the dead in general while the ancestor cult is a lineage cult.5

Returning to the question of *post mortem* existence, Fortes has pointed out that the African ancestor cult can exist alongside the sketchiest lore about the mode of existence of the dead, that mortuary practices are not necessarily directed towards consigning the ancestors to a spiritual realm of existence in a supernatural realm, but towards discorporating them from the social structure. Moreover, in the African context, the metaphysical implications of the Christian notion of the soul do not apply (= indestructible essences that animate bodies and succeed them in the timeless realm of God, pending resurrection in a corporeal form). For example, among the Ashanti an ancestral 'spirit' is not thought of as a kind of nebulous being or

5Ahern 1973:121 summarized the typical credentials for ancestorhood. She listed "an adult man who is a direct descendant of the lineage-ancestors and who is married, sired male children and handed down property to his sons". There are exceptions of course as in Japan where the responsibilities fell to the female household heads who succeeded deceased mothers-in-law.
personified mystical presence but primarily a name attached to a relic such as a stool. The constituent of personality is not imagined to survive in a supernatural realm after death, but is believed to remain behind to look after descendants. Moreover, an ancestor's afterlife is specifically tied to the continued authority he/she can exercise. They can behave both benevolently and malevolently. When the latter is the case, it may be due to the lack of close ties with any one living group. In other words, their behavior will not terminate their status as recipients of ritual.

A second distinctive feature is the moral influence which the ancestors exercise over their descendants. Ancestors exert positive moral forces upon their descendants and can cause or prevent misfortune, whereas the spirits of the dead in general may exercise powers which achieve amoral or even anti-social ends. That is to say, misfortune at the hands of the ancestors is interpreted as retribution for failure in matters of filial piety, whereas at the hands of the dead spirits, it may be explained as an act of a malicious, arbitrary, or capricious

---


8 So Newell 1976:21-29. This eliminates the simplistic notion that the ancestral spirits were solely benevolent, while the spirits of the dead more generally were malevolent (or vice versa). Thus, with regard to Mesopotamia, the opposing views of both Bayliss 1973:115-26 and Skaist 1980:123-28 require qualification.
apparition or one without descendants and therefore not an ancestor. 9

The traditional view that the cult of the ancestors is merely a religious phenomenon fails to take into account the ethnographic data which suggest that it is also an aspect of the living social relations in a given society and closely linked to a society's regulation of inheritance and succession. This equally applies to the cult of the royal ancestors. In Africa, the king participates in the cult of his ancestors and may appeal to them on behalf of the nation as any head might do in the limited descent group context. Thus, the royal version follows the pattern of lineage cult of the ancestors. However, the national significance of the royal ancestor cult derives from the political rank of those ancestors being worshipped and not from their ancestral status. 10

The cult of the ancestors might manifest itself in the cult of the common ancestors, those deceased who have real kinship ties with the living. It has been suggested that it may also be made manifest in the cult of the mythic ancestors. 11 It should be pointed out however that the so-called mythic ancestors were never perceived as human procreators begetting and bearing

9 Cf. Gluckman 1937:117-36 and Fortes 1976:9-10 on this distinction between the cult of the dead and the ancestor cult within the African context.


offspring, but were conceived as creators of humanity.\(^1\) Therefore, a more appropriate identity for this group might be the mythic heroes and as such they would be more appropriately located in the complex of rites related to the hero cult.

Taking the well documented version of the hero cult from ancient Greece as our example, it is fair to say that figures who might be included are those who displayed some extraordinary quality, though not necessarily a virtuous life. As a member of this class, a given hero might be placed at any one of several points along a continuum as the heroes included a wide array of figures; faded deities, vegetation spirits, epic heroes, the ancestors, the eponymous figures, and heroes who lived in historical times.\(^2\) More simply, there were those who descended from the world of the gods like the mythic heroes, and those who became heroes after their death, the legendary or epic heroes.\(^3\)

The proximity of the mythic heroes to the gods appears to be much closer than that of the legendary heroes. Nevertheless, the world of the gods and the world of heroes, and of mortals for that matter, were kept quite distinct. Only such figures as Dionysus and Heracles who were considered herōs theos stood as exceptions to this rule. In any case, the Greek hero cult was

\(^1\) Fortes 1976:3-4.


\(^3\) In the Greek traditions, both can be found in the epic poetry. This probably reflects the mixture of ancient and late traditions, so Burkert 1985:205. Moreover, all such heroes, whether mythic or legendary, fall victim to death, so Kerényi 1959:1-22.
otherwise not one in which the hero was worshipped or apotheosized, but at most venerated. Moreover, kinship ties were lacking and an extended period of time lapsed before regular rites intended for the hero arose. It was believed that the heroes, in contrast to the ordinary Greek dead, could assist the living by protecting them against enemies and diseases and opening the wombs of barren women and were on rare occasion labelled healers or iatroi.

Returning to the topic of death cults, in its most rudimentary form, the belief in man's persistence after death issues in the death cult practice which we shall identify as the care for the dead. In this case, the dead have not escaped all human frailty and so are perceived as in need of assistance, even sustenance. This often carries with it the implicit notion that the dead are weak. They have no power to affect the living in a beneficial way.

In the case of the ancestor cult, the care for the ancestors is motivated by the obligation to continue one's filial duties for immediate lineal predecessors after their death. This keeps the ancestors alive and their presence continually accessible to the living descendants as they partake together of

Cf. Kerényi 1959:1-6. Characteristically, the sacrifices to the heroes were not the same as those offered to the major gods and the altars were distinct in form and lower in height.


Cf. Farnell 1921:369 for the healing heroes among whom were Asclepius, Amphiarais, and Achilles. The significance of the term iatroi as applied to the biblical Rephaim will be taken up in 4.7. On the state of the common dead in Greece as deserving of pity rather than fear or reverence, cf. Garland 1985.
the food offered to the ancestors. Nevertheless, the ancestors are not viewed as superior beings. They are without power.

Other death cult practices that are widely attested include the veneration of the dead and the worship of the dead. The veneration of the dead assumes the persistence of man after death. Moreover, it presupposes the belief that the dead can influence the high god(s) to act on behalf of the living. The dead obtained this power through their heroic acts or qualities exhibited while living, or thought to be living in the case of the mythic heroes.

Not only do the living offer the dead their expressions of gratitude, but the dead receive various forms of inducements from the living. The dead do not appear to have the same degree or quality of divinity as the high god(s), nor can they act independently of the god(s). Therefore, they are not worthy of, and unlike the gods, they do not receive, worship. The same set of criteria applies in the case of the veneration of the ancestors.

As a parallel, we offer the Roman Catholic cult or veneration of the saints in which the deceased intercede on behalf of the living. This the dead can accomplish owing to their acquired access to divine virtus or power. The dead gain such an

---

18 Fortes 1976:10-11,14.
19 Hultkrantz 1978:102-03 goes so far as to remove care for the dead which he equates with gifts to the dead from under the general rubric of the cult of the dead arguing that such care does not necessitate the belief that the dead may bestow some benefit upon their devotees.
exalted position through the testimony of a virtuous life
accompanied by miracles with the latter often considered the
divine reward for the former. In this practice, the dead receive
veneration or douleia but not worship or latreia which is
reserved only for God.\textsuperscript{21}

Goody concluded that the worship of the dead implies not
only the idea of survival after death (and we would add, repeated
standardized practices oriented toward the dead at locations
associated with the dead), but also the belief that the dead, as
superior powers to the living, actively participate in the
mundane affairs of the living.\textsuperscript{22} Goody's definition requires
further qualification since, as it stands, it also encompasses
the veneration of the dead.

The worship of the dead requires that the living serve the
dead in a greater capacity. Mere gratitude and care will not
suffice. The same goes for inducements. The dead require the
highest form of reverence for they can act independently of the
high god(s) to affect the world of the living. They are, in
effect, equal in power with the god(s). The living must
propitiate the dead through the offer of goods, services, words,
and other gestures in order to secure their favor.

\textsuperscript{21}The Second Vatican Council made the following
pronouncement with regard to the cult of the saints: "Let the
faithful be taught, therefore, that the authentic cult of the
saints consists not so much in the multiplying of external acts,
but rather in the intensity of our active love. By such love, for
our greater good and that of the Church, we seek from the saints
example in the way of life, fellowship in their communion, and
aid in their intercession", cf. Abbot 1966:84 and note Hawley
1987 for a recent assessment of the cult of the saints.

\textsuperscript{22}Goody 1962:18,20-25,379.
Similarly, *ancestor worship* will be restricted to those acts which reflect the belief that the power possessed by the ancestor is equivalent to that of a deity. In this case however, the dead are restricted *vis-à-vis* their extent of influence. While they can directly influence the living like the gods, they can do so only within the boundaries of lineal descendancy.

As in the case of the terms discussed thus far, death and ancestor cults are not to be equated with *the commemoration of the dead*. By the commemoration of the dead or *geneonymy* we do not intend an equation with the Roman Catholic practice by the same name in which the living attempt to produce benefits on behalf of the dead through worship of the deity as a response to the doctrine of purgatory. The commemoration with which we are concerned is that which perpetuates the memory of the deceased. It does not by necessity assume the persistence of man after death beyond the recall of the dead in the mind of the living.

The familiar practice of laying flowers at the grave of the deceased or the formal rites enacted at the tomb of the unknown soldier illustrate the secular version of the commemoration of the dead. The recognition of the saints observed in the Church of England in which the dead are remembered for their exemplary lives expresses the same but from within a religious context.

In both cases, the non-religious and religious, the living are edified through a process of legitimation that takes place in which certain ethical norms exemplified in the lives of those now dead are revered. But, such rites, while perhaps appearing periodically, do not necessitate, as the non-religious examples
demonstrate, a belief that the dead obtain an afterlife beyond the recollection of their years prior to death.\textsuperscript{23}

Furthermore, the cult of the dead should not be confused with \textit{the rites de passage} commonly known as funerary rites and mourning rites.\textsuperscript{24} The rites of passage mark the passage of a person through the cycle of life, from one stage to another over time, from one social role, status, or position to another. In the rites of passage, a fundamental tripartite process can be discerned: separation (from a former status), transition (or liminality), and incorporation (or aggregation, into a new status).\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{The funerary rites} are performed during the period in which the dead person passes from this life (separation), through death (transition), to the next life (incorporation). \textit{Mourning rites}, with varying degrees of intensity, take place during the transitional or liminal stage of death which itself may last for an extended period of time (in some cases, for several years). Mourning rites can therefore be subsumed under the more general rubric of funerary rites.

The period of mourning characteristically ends with the arrival of the dead in the afterworld. In the case of burials, 


\textsuperscript{24}The observation of Singleton 1977:3 is \textit{a propos}, "Though all peoples solemnize the burying of their dead, far from all subsequently devote a great deal of their ritual time and energy to remaining on good terms with the departed."

arrival may coincide with interment or an additional time period might be required for the journey to, and arrival in, the afterworld. In the latter case or in cases where burial is not observed, arrival often is signalled by the consumption of the body, whether it be induced naturally (i.e., through decay) or artificially (e.g., cremation or cannibalism).

But what differentiates funerary rites from the cult of the dead? Durkheim's distinction between rites and a cult is only of limited help on this point. Rites might comprise practices which appear only in certain and, we would add, temporary circumstances, while a cult comprises a system of practices repeated periodically.26

More importantly, funerary rites occur between death and the arrival in the afterworld, whereas death cult practices begin with the arrival in the afterworld and continue on a regular basis perhaps indefinitely. Moreover, certain funerary rites do not necessarily assume the persistence of man after death.27 For example, some mourning rites may be intended purely for the benefit of the living.

Another related practice arose on frequent occasion in cultures where the dead, or segments of the dead, were perceived as possessing benevolent powers of significant magnitude. This divinatory practice commonly referred to as necromancy involves

the communication with the dead for the purpose of retrieving information usually about the future.\textsuperscript{28}

However, not only is the rite observed on a sporadic basis but the ghost imparts no blessing upon its suitor beyond the mere discharge of knowledge. While it will receive extensive treatment in the following chapters owing to its repeated mention in the Hebrew Bible and its potential for illuminating Israelite beliefs and practices reflective of the supernatural benefic power of the dead, this should not be construed as an attempt to subsume necromancy under the rubric of death and ancestor cults as has been done so often in the past.\textsuperscript{29}

By way of concluding our glossary, we should point out that we intend to use the phrase mortuary practice to designate any one practice, or group of practices, which falls within the purview of rites and cults recognized as arising out of, and as expressing the human response to, death. In other words, it may refer to any one of the terms defined above or any combination thereof.

\textsuperscript{28}Cf. Bourguigon 1987:345-47 who defined necromancy as "the art or practice of magically conjuring up the souls of the dead . . . to obtain information from them, generally regarding the revelation of unknown causes or the future course of events" (p.345). Tropper 1989:13-23 unfortunately employed a more general definition of necromancy and so was able to incorporate additional ancient Near East practices under this heading which do not exemplify the supernatural benefic power of the dead.

\textsuperscript{29}Cf. Spronk 1986 and Lewis 1989 for recent examples. The related medical and magical apotropaic rites aimed at warding off malevolent ghosts and/or their affects are not included in this treatment as they are not representative of the cult of the dead as we have defined it. Their exclusive negative import based on the fear of the dead precludes their inclusion in what follows as does the apparent lack of permanence and regularity in the accompanying rituals, cf. Scurlock 1988:1-102, 125-317, 363-66 on the magical expulsion of ghosts in Mesopotamia.
CHAPTER II

THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL SYRO-PALESTINIAN TEXTUAL EVIDENCE:
THE LATE THIRD TO EARLY SECOND MILLENNIA B.C.E.

Methodologically, it is self-evident that the reconstruction of Israel's religion, or any given aspect thereof, must take into account both the material and non-material remains which record for posterity the religious beliefs and associated practices of her Syro-Palestinian neighbors. These beliefs and practices comprise the conceptual milieu for much of the religious thought embedded in the Hebrew Bible.

In this and the following chapter, we will examine the relevant Eblaite, West Peripheral Akkadian (Mari, Nuzi, and Emar), and Ugaritic epigraphic remains in order to ascertain what death and ancestor cult and necromantic practices, if any, were embraced by the inhabitants of Syria-Palestine both prior to and contemporary with Israel of the Tanakh.¹

It should be noted at the outset that while a thorough systematic examination of the relevant material remains lies beyond the scope of the present investigation, an attempt will be made to evaluate briefly some of this evidence as it pertains to the interpretation of a given textual datum.²

¹In 4.2., we will also briefly survey the slight first millennium Aramaic, Phoenician, and Palestinian epigraphic remains for indications of West Semitic death and ancestor cult practices.

²Cf. e.g., our discussion of Ugaritic 'urbt "aperture" and Hebrew יָמֵת in Deut. 26:14 in 4.4.3. Treatments of Bronze to Iron age Syro-Palestinian burial customs can be found in the dissertations of Cooley 1968; Stiebing 1970; Angi 1971; Ribar
2.1 THE EVIDENCE FROM EBLA

A scholarly consensus has yet to emerge on matters concerning various problematic aspects of the language and culture of the city-state of Ebla. Nevertheless, its cultural and economic ties seem closest with Syrian city-states west and north of the Mesopotamian heartland such as Kish, Abu Ṣalabikh, Mari, and Ugarit.

However, it now appears that its regional power was significantly less than initially surmised. Moreover, the Ebla archive probably dates from the late third millennium and not earlier and spans the reign of but one ruler, Ibbi-Zikir/Sipis', not five. Finally, it has yet to be definitively demonstrated that the archive represents the royal library.

2.1.1 THE EBLAITE KING LIST

The recently published TM 75.G.2628 = ARET 7.150 comprises an offerings list. According to Archi, the editor, the colophon or section 3 (see below) identifies the text in its entirety as a list of sheep offerings for the deities whose statues are located

1973; Gonen 1979; Abercrombie 1979, and Bloch-Smith 1990. One dissertation is currently in progress, that of Wenning (Münster).


5Geller 1987:141-45 concluded that Ebla was under the hegemony of Mari rather than vice versa.

in the cult center Darib (r.III.2-r.V.1?). In addition to the several pairs of gods with accompanying dingir sign in section 2 (III.7-r.III.1?), ten personal names are listed in retrograde order in section 1. Archi identified the latter as the former kings of Ebla (I.1-III.5):*

(1) (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I [10 udu]</th>
<th>dingir</th>
<th>2 udu</th>
<th>r. I wa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[dingir]</td>
<td>En-àr-Da-mu</td>
<td>d Ni-da-KUL</td>
<td>d Gu-la-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ir-k]ab-[D]a-mu</td>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>IV wa</td>
<td>1 udu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>Ba-Da-mu</td>
<td></td>
<td>[d x-r]a-ru₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]g-ri-[i]&lt;Ha-&gt;LAM</td>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>2 udu</td>
<td>[Da]-rí-[i]b¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>III I-bi-Da-mu</td>
<td>d Ra-sa-ap</td>
<td>[1 ud]u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-dub-Da-mu</td>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>wa</td>
<td>²GÁxSIG₇-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II dingir</td>
<td>A-gur-Li-im</td>
<td>d A-dam-ma</td>
<td>II lú da-da(-)EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kum-Da-mu</td>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>2 udu</td>
<td>[á]š-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>A-bur-Li-im</td>
<td>d A-gú</td>
<td>1 x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-sar-Ma-lik</td>
<td>en-en</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lacuna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3)

| r. III (?) dingir- | dingir-dingir |
| uru-uru             |               |
| al₄-tu₃             |               |
| IV in Da-rí-ib¹     |               |
| (?)                 |               |
| V (?)               |               |

"[(An offering of sheep) for] the deities [of] the cities, [who(se images?)] reside in Darib . . . . . "

²According to Archi 1988A:106, Darib was apparently the seat of this dynastic cult. It might be Ta-ra-b of the geographic list of Thutmosis III, and perhaps modern Atareb, thirty kilometers north of Ebla.

Archi concluded that the royal status of the ten names is assured by the inclusive designation en-en, which he translated as "kings" (cf. III.6 at the end of the list). Owing to the fact that each of these ten names is also preceded by the dingir sign, Archi identified them as the dead divinized former kings of Ebla.⁹

That sheep (udu) are designated for the known gods of the pantheon in section 2, III.7-r.II.3, suggested to Archi that the text also recorded offerings to the dead divinized kings as reflected in his reconstruction at the beginning of section 3 "[( aç offering of sheep) for] the deities [of] the cities . . .".¹⁰

But even if we were to accept Archi's proposal that sacrifices for the dead deified kings of Ebla are in view, we can find no evidence from the text or at Ebla more generally that supports the assumption that this was a regularly repeated ritual. Whereas at Mari we have regularly repeated kispum offerings to the dead, but non-deified(!) kings included as part of the cultic calendar (cf. 2.2.1.), at Ebla no analogous phenomenon has yet been documented.


¹⁰Cf. Archi 1986:213 "[Schafopfer für] die Gottheiten der Städte . . .". Based in large part on Archi's view of the function of the dingir sign, Fronzaroli 1988:1-33 argued that a reconstructed text comprised of TM 75.G. 3205+3218 (= ARET 3.178) along with an edited fragment TM 75.G.3132 (= ARET 3.112) and previously unedited fragments TM 75.G.4828+4843+4883+4889 comprises a sort of funerary liturgy in which benedictions and lamentations are offered by the new king on behalf of the royal ancestors whose tombs were located in temple mausolea in several local cities under the hegemony of Ebla.
Moreover, a comparison with the somewhat related rituals lying behind the Ugaritic text *KTU* 1.161 and the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty (cf. our analysis in 3.1.9.) would favor the conclusion that what occasioned the Eblaite ritual was the recently deceased king's funeral. It should be recalled that in the previous chapter, we argued for the fact that funerary rites and the ancestor cult are not to be confused.

Furthermore, it is not at all a given that the term en at Ebla necessarily designates the "king" of the entire city-state with all that the term implies with regard to independence and sovereignty. In fact, the various contexts in which en occurs has led Michalowski to offer a more general designation for en, e.g. "the one in charge". This finds confirmation in the probable non-royal status of Irkab-Damu and Igrish-Ḫalam, two of the names listed in Archi's text.¹¹

If, on the one hand, Michalowski is correct in his assessment of Eblaite en and the non-royal status of at least some of the individuals listed in Archi's text and on the other, the ancestor cult association of this text is upheld, then one is left with the unavoidable conclusion that the en-en in our text are deified dead non-royalty and patrons of a death or ancestor

¹¹ So Michalowski 1985:294-95,297 and 1988:267-77 who argued that the en might have been only a bureaucrat heading one of the many major organizations in the city. This assumes that the archive might not represent the central royal library. He also documented numerous occurrences in which officials other than kings were designated by en both at Ebla and in neighboring city-states, cf. also Edzard 1981:123.
cult. But this notion must be rejected as non-royal individuals neither attained divine status before or after death in the Mesopotamian heartland or its periphery nor were death or ancestor cults established on their behalf concomitant to any supposed post mortem deification.

Our critique of Archi's proposal thus far has presumed a mortuary context for the ritual reflected in *TM* 75.G.2628, but there are good reasons to disassociate entirely this text and its ritual from a mortuary context. First, Archi appears to evince some inconsistency with his earlier writings in his assumption that the text lists the names of dead deified kings. Where the dingir sign similarly stands in its own case and precedes what he has identified as a royal name elsewhere in the Ebla texts, Archi rendered dingir + RN (= royal name) as a reference to the personal god of a king "the god of RN", and not as the divine determinative.

---


13 The posthumous deification of the dead accompanied by repeated offerings and other cultic rituals directed to them or, more precisely, their statues was the exclusive prerogative of the king in the Mesopotamian heartland. According to Hallo 1980:190 and 1988:54-66, this so-called cult of the divine king is explicitly attested beginning with the Sargonic Dynasty of Akkad through the Ur III Dynasty and lasting through the end of the Old Babylonian period, but cf. 2.1.6.
He offered the following rendition of *TM* 75.G.570 v.II.18-IV.5, "ša-ma-gan, dingir en é-siki, En-ki, dingir En-ár-Da-mu, dingir I-sar-Ma-lik, "Šamagan. . . .the god [of] the en [of] the 'wool house'. . . .Enki. . . .the god [of] Enár-Damu. . . .the god [of] Isar-Malik". He surmised that the last two forms cited above referred to the personal deities of Enár-Damu and Isar-Malik. But in their occurrences in *TM* 75.G.2628, he concluded that these same forms represented (the statues of) their deified departed spirits.

Second, Archi claimed to have found support for his proposed genre of *TM* 75.G.2628 in the Syro-Palestinian literary tradition. The Ugaritic text *KTU* 1.113 supposedly confirmed that *TM* 75.G.2628 recorded a royal ancestor cult ritual for, not only is it similarly organized in retrograde order but, it too comprises a list of deified royal ancestors to whom cultic rites were directed. Here the ancestors are identified by the alphabetic equivalent to dingir + RN, 'il + RN.

The citation of this text as support raises some major difficulties. First is the lack of chronological proximity as the Ugaritic text was composed over a millennium later. Second is the


22
identification of the exact nature of the ritual involved. As with TM 75.G.2628, if we were to assume that dead deified ancestors are in view in KTU 1.113, and this is by no means certain, then in the absence of unequivocal evidence for regularly repeated ancestor rites at Ugarit over against the well documented enactment of funerary rites for one of its kings (cf. 3.1.9. for our treatment of KTU 1.161), it would be going well beyond the available evidence to posit that the underlying ritual in either text involves something more than a funerary rite.

In the final analysis, both the view that 1.113 contains an ancestor cult ritual and our critique of that position are obviated by the fact that Archi's prior notion that dead deified kings are listed here finds no support in the contemporary Syro-Palestinian or Mesopotamian textual traditions. To cite in support the supposed equation of the dead in general and the ilu [= dingir] element in the Neo-Assyrian version of the Legend of Etana and in a handful of texts from Nuzi and Emar hardly justifies such an argument as these are equally controvertible (cf. 4.5.1.). In sum, Archi's view of KTU 1.113 presents the same difficulties as TM 75.G.2628.

Besides, Liverani viewed KTU 1.113 as a ritual list of the personal god(s) of the former Ugaritic kings. He acknowledged that the names mentioned in KTU 1.113 represent the deceased kings of Ugarit and that each is preceded by the lexeme 'il, but it was the deity who functioned as the object of a legitimating ritual and not the dead kings. For Liverani, the 'il + RN element
was to be rendered "the god of RN". The similarities shared by KTU 1.113 and TM 75.G.2628 support the notion that both texts might reflect this same significance. Only in the case of the Eblaite list, the names would represent politically important personages other than kings based on what we know of Eblaite en.

We can best decide in favor of Archi's or Liverani's view of the function of KTU 1.113 and, more importantly for the present treatise, that of TM 75.G.2628 by examining the contemporary texts from Mesopotamia, as these texts provide a relatively high degree of chronological, geographical, cultural, and, therefore, conceptual proximity.

We can reconstruct what comprised some of the concurrent practices and beliefs attendant to the royal ancestor cult from the economic archives at Pre-Sargonic Lagash. One feature that particularly stands out at Lagash is that the royal ancestors are neither deified nor, as Archi conjectured for Ebla, are they equated with the gods.

The account lists known as the en-en-n£-ne texts record offerings to the ancestors who include not only former rulers, but also their mothers, wives, and daughters. However, the names

---

17 Cf. Liverani 1974:340-41 and 3.1.6. for this view of 1.113. Pardee 1988:173 n.25 argued that this makes little sense owing to the lack of mention of specific god names. But he did not recognize the fact that the personal gods often occur without their specific names, cf. e.g., the sixteen epithets listed in Vorländ 1975:8-25.


of those deceased persons of royalty who received offerings are not preceded by the dingir sign in the Lagash cult. That is to say, they were not explicitly deified. Moreover, there are no references to the statues of the ancestors in the en-en-né-ne texts and so we can hardly assume that such statues were used in the ancestor cult.²⁰

In any case, the former were not included in the níg-giš-tag-ga texts along with the major deities, temples, and other implements which receive offerings.²¹ We would have expected the ancestors to be included in the níg-giš-tag-ga texts had they been deified, whereupon they would have received offerings of a similar capacity as those for the major gods.²²

Therefore, we cannot simply assume as Archi does that at Ebla statues of the ancestors were used as the place of deposit for the offerings. In any case, if we grant for the sake of argument that in TM 75.G.2628 the names listed did represent the dead deified ancestors, then on the basis of the Lagash evidence we would have expected them to receive sacrifices of a similar


²¹Kobayashi 1984:56-57 concluded that the rulers and their wives mentioned in the níg-giš-tag-ga texts were the offerers and not the recipients of sacrifices and that the statues mentioned in these texts were votive or "prayer-statues" which received small quantities of offerings contra Talon 1974:167-68 who argued that these statues represented the dead as participants in funerary feasts.

capacity as those offered to the gods in section 2, but the ancestors are allocated less.\textsuperscript{23}

Lastly, if we again assume with Archi that the names in the Eblaite king list do represent the royal ancestors who receive offerings, then based on known contemporary practices we should not expect the names to be preceded by the dingir sign designating deification, for at Lagash dead royal ancestors were not so deified. This strongly suggests that the dingir sign preceding the ten names was employed for another purpose.

The cumulative weight of the above arguments severely diminishes the likelihood of Archi's royal ancestor cult interpretation of \textit{TM} 75.G.2628. Given these problems, we offer an alternative interpretation of the text. Our analysis begins with the observation made earlier, namely that the dingir sign, or its alphabetic equivalent 'il, preceding the name of a king or prominent person might designate a personal god "the god of RN".\textsuperscript{24} This use of dingir/'il + RN is attested in the contemporary Sumerian royal inscriptions from Pre-Sargonic Lagash. The personal god of the Ur-Nanshe dynasty, Shulutula, is

\textsuperscript{23}On the status of the dead in relation to the high gods, cf. also Pardee 1988:173 n.25; Klein 1982:32 n.45; Lambert 1971:543-45 and see further on this point, 2.1.5.

\textsuperscript{24}Archi also recognized this possibility in his rendering of the following examples: dingir \textit{Ib-la\textsuperscript{1}} "the god of Ebla" in \textit{TM} 75.G.1871 rev. III:1-2; dingir dingir dingir uru uru "the gods [of] the cities" in the same text, \textit{TM} 75.G.2628:r.III.1; dingir dingir en "the gods [of] the en" in \textit{TM} 75.G.1885:X.5-6, and dingir dingir \textit{maliktum-maliktum} "the gods [of] the (dead?) queens" in \textit{TM} 75.G.10167:1.26-II.2. Cf. also dingir en en "the god [of] the ens" in \textit{TM} 75.G.10088:XVII.15-16 and, of course the frequent dingir en "god [of] the en", cf. 2.1.5.
identified by means of this same construction: 𒀀Šulutula dingir En-te-me-na "Shulutula, the god of Entemena".\(^\text{29}\)

The royal inscriptions from Pre-Sargonic Lagash contain the earliest references to the personal gods. These gods received sacrifices in the cult and functioned as intermediaries between men and the supreme gods.\(^\text{26}\) It has been suggested that the personal god embodied the personification of a man's luck.\(^\text{27}\) Nevertheless, the exact nature of the personal god's involvement in the life of his protégé remains obscure.\(^\text{28}\)

Of particular interest is the fact that the personal god was often referred to without recourse to a specific god name, e.g. "my god", "god of my fathers", "my creator", "my shepherd", "my father", etc.\(^\text{29}\) This is so in spite of the fact that in royal circles, the personal god could be identified as a well known

\(^{25}\)Cf. Vorländer 1975:9 and Kobayashi 1989:22-44 esp. p.22 and n.4. The latter points out that the common designation was dingir-an-ni "his god" and that in the following Lagash dynasties, the personal god of Enentarzi was Mesandu and of Uruinimgina, Minshubur.


\(^{27}\)Cf. Jacobsen 1976:155-56 and Klein 1982:295. In CAD 7(1960): 101-02, #5, the phrase "to acquire a god" lù.dingir.tuk = Ša ilam išû is used to describe luck and "to not acquire a god" lù.dingir.nu.tuk =Ša ilam la išû describes having no luck.

\(^{28}\)Just how personal, exclusive and permanent the personal god was remains a point of debate, cf. Sasson 1977:286-87; Mayer 1978:493-94; and Klein 1982:303 n.2. Various theories have arisen as to the nature of the personal god's involvement in the actions of his human protégé. Either the personal god was responsible for his human protégé's actions, so Jacobsen 1976:157, or he punished his protégé for wrongdoing, so Klein 1982:295-96, or abandoned him to the mercy of the demons, so Vorländer 1975:165-67.

\(^{29}\)Cf. Vorländer 1975:8-25 for an inventory of epithets.
member of the pantheon (e.g. Shamash, Sin, Adad, Nergal) and one who represented the human protégé in the divine assembly.\textsuperscript{30}

The relationship of the individual and his personal god was often conceived metaphorically as that between a parent and his son.\textsuperscript{31} Among royalty, it was customary for the personal god of a dynastic king to be inherited by his successor son.\textsuperscript{32} This explains the references to the personal god as the "god of the fathers".\textsuperscript{33}

It was also a known practice among royalty to erect statues of their personal gods and place them in temples or chapels. Gudea of Lagash placed a statue of his own god Ningishzida in a chapel attached to the temple which he had built for the city goddess, Baba. His reasons for doing so were to strengthen the power of his throne, to enable him to judge rightly, and to

\textsuperscript{30}So Vorländ 1975:8-117,149-64; Jacobsen 1976:157; Klein 1982:296; and van der Toorn 1985:44. On other occasions, certain of the high gods such as Shamash could be approached by an individual to intercede on his/her behalf before the personal god, cf. the edition of LKA 139:24-27 in van der Toorn 1985:Appendix #3.g.

\textsuperscript{31}Cf. Vorländ 1975:16-17,27-29 and Klein 1982:296-97 and note the latter's qualifications of Jacobsen 1976:157-60 regarding the notion that the gods were incarnate in the human parents of their protégés.


\textsuperscript{33}Cf. Vorländ 1975:12-14,155-58 and Jacobsen 1976:159 and the qualifications of Klein 1982:296-97. In the light of the fact that the personal gods comprised members of the pantheon, the pluralized form of this epithet "gods of the fathers" would function as an appropriate heading for a god list or a text recording offerings for the gods as in the Ugaritic text KTU 1.118:1, on which cf. 3.1.3.
lengthen the days of his life. In other words, he sought to be successful as a king. 34

Two general spheres of duties clustered around the personal gods. In private they were to be honored materially and verbally. This would involve sacrifices in the first instance and prayers in the second. In public, they were to be honored in much the same manner. 35 As the case of Gudea demonstrates, official and personal religion might be joined together resulting in cultic rites which no doubt included sacrifice. These rites were directed toward the king's personal god in order to ensure his success.

The above survey offers much in the way of elucidating the ritual reflected in TM 75.G.2628. The widespread belief in personal gods, the use of the dingir sign to designate the personal god, the practice of referring to the personal gods without using specific god names, and the ritual sacrifice to personal gods in the form of their statues favor a re-evaluation of the nature of this ritual. When these elements are considered in the light of our present inability to delineate the exact nuance of the term en at Ebla, they point to the possibility that TM 75.G.2628 records a ritual in which the statues of ten personal gods receive sacrifices from their human protégés who were non-royal administrative officials.

On the other hand, if we allow for the possibility that en in our text signified "king", then the royal custom in which the

throne's successor inherited the personal god of his father might suggest an alternative form of ritual for TM 75.G.2628, one which incorporated the royal rites expressive of the belief in a personal god for the purpose of legitimating the current dynasty.

In other words, our text might associate each ruler in succession with the dynasty's personal god in order to signify the deity's sanction of the throne, thereby ensuring the dynasty's success. Such a ritual might have comprised part of the funerary ceremonies of the recently deceased king and/or the coronation ceremonies in honor of his successor. The same applies in the case of the Ugaritic text KTU 1.113 (cf. 3.1.6.).

2.1.2. OFFERING LISTS AND LAMENTATIONS FOR THE DEAD KINGS

In a treatise outlining fundamental elements of the official cult at Ebla, Pettinato listed several offering texts which supposedly testified to the existence of a royal ancestor cult. According to him, two texts in particular mention "(slaughtered) sheep" offerings (udu [.fb-tag]) made in the eleventh month for "the lamentations [of] the kings" si-du-si-du en-en. Moreover, the associated rites were performed in the royal palace garden or 3\#kiri, which supposedly contained a

royal hypogeum or ki-sur, where the deceased kings were
interred. 37

Pettinato based his interpretation of si-dù-si-dù as
"lamentations", on the equation of Sumerian si-dù and Eblaite di-
u-mu-mu attested in bilingual lexical lists from Ebla. 38 For di-
u-mu-mu, he offered the Akkadian cognate dimmatu a "lament", from
damāmu "to mourn (for the dead)". 39 In support of Pettinato's
proposal, Del Olmo Lete made the observation that the offerings
associated with the lamentations for the kings are immediately
preceded by offerings to "the (dead) fathers", a-mu-a-mu and to
the chthonic god Rasap (= Resheph), and are followed by offerings
to Rasap. 40

With Pettinato's proposal, not only are we confronted again

37 Pettinato 1979B:31-32 = 1979C:115-16. The garden is
mentioned in TM.75.G.1764:III.10 and the so-called hypogeum in
TM.75.G.2238:XII.22 and TM.75.G.1274:IV.7 and cf. Pettinato
1980:68. His view of the texts cited in n.17 has been accepted by
Xella 1983:288, 1985:75; Healey 1984:251; Spronk 1986:140-41; and

relevant lines cited in Pettinato 1979B:31 and n.159 = 1979C:115
and n.159 are v.XII.4-5 and Pettinato 1982:320. Pettinato
1979A:94 and 1982:33,320 mentions another bilingual lexical list
TM.75.G.1678:v.XII.14-15 [Catalogue no. 1116] which equates si-
dù-si-dù and di-mu-mu.

d-m-m in Hebrew, Ugaritic (KTU 1.16:I.26), and Arabic (damā).
Pettinato is followed by Archi 1988A:106 n.10 and Fronzaroli

40 Del Olmo Lete 1986A:69 n.38. TM.75.G.2238:IV.21-25 and
XII.21-26. The term a-mu-a-mu occurs in XI.30 and Rasap in IV.8-
9,15-16, XII.7-8,13-14,19-20, and v.I.2'-3'. On a-mu-a-mu, cf.
Pettinato 1979B:17,20 = 1979C:101,104 and Xella 1983:288,
1985:75.
with the problem of the meaning of en at Ebla, but in the absence of decisive contextual evidence, we must also come to terms with the ambiguity inherent in the syntactic value of the genitival en-en. If we assume for the sake of argument that si-dū does signify lamentation, and this is by no means certain (see below), then the question arises, does the "of" in "lamentations of the en-en" signify lamentations on behalf of the deceased en-en "lamentations for the (dead) en-en" as Pettinato claims, or were the en-en those who performed the lamentations "lamentations by the (living) en-en"?

We know that mourning over the death of a dignitary by foreign officials comprised one component in the international diplomatic protocol of Mesopotamia. Two typical occasions for international mourning can be identified. A foreign ruler of equal status might be mourned or a king might be mourned by the dignitaries of vassal territories and/or his family and subjects.

The elements repeatedly attested in international mourning contexts are the arrival of the news of death via a messenger, the immediate reaction of grief by the recipient which included, among other gestures, the shedding of tears, fasting, and lamentation, and the dispatch of an envoy laden with funerary gifts and grave goods to be presented at the funeral.

Therefore, it is possible that the en-en of Pettinato's texts are officials, domestic and foreign, who, on a particular

---


occasion in the eleventh month of an unknown year in the reign of Ibbi-Zikir, performed the expected mourning rituals on behalf of some politically distinguished, but presently unidentifiable, departed soul (or the recently deceased kin thereof).

These rituals would have included among other observances, the offering of mutton (udu), perhaps for the purpose of insuring the arrival of the deceased in the netherworld. But given our reconstruction and the repeated entry "lamentations of the en-en" in the offering lists, what most characterized these rites was the cultic lamentation performed by the en-en. 43

Even if one assumed that ritual mourning is in view, it can be understood apart from any immediate association with funerary rites on behalf of a recently deceased dignitary or his/her kin. Ritual lamentation is also associated with invigoration or fertility rites and the rituals related to the hidden god in Mesopotamia and perhaps Syria-Palestine. 44 Given this scenario, the en-en might be Eblaite or foreign officials who perform sacrifices and cultic lamentations to the god(s).

Nevertheless, as we previously intimated, the basis for our proposal as well as that of Pettinato, namely that Sumerian si-du and its lexical equivalent Eblaite di-mu-mu refer to lamentations, is debatable. The root d-m-m in West Semitic can also signify "to be silent". In this case, our text might

---

43 Be that as it may, there is no evidence in the texts that this ritual lamentation was a regular observance. Those that are dated come from the same month, the eleventh, of the same year. This simply points to the time in which the funeral took place, for the dates, cf. Pettinato 1979C:116.

44 Cf. now the detailed treatment by Padella 1989.
describe the en-en as waiting in silence for a divine revelation.\(^5\) Again, the en-en would constitute living Eblaite administrators or foreign dignitaries with priestly functions.

By way of conclusion, we offer a response to those arguments offered in support of Pettinato's view of these texts. While gardens in Syria-Palestine and Mesopotamia might have occasionally served as burial places from the late third millennium onwards (cf. e.g., 2.2.1.2.), gardens had many other cultic functions as well.\(^6\) In light of this and the previously stated objections, Pettinato's view of ki-sur as "hypogeum", is severely weakened since, as he admits, this is entirely dependent upon his view of si-du-si-du en-en.\(^7\)

Lastly, the contextual support cited by Del Olmo Lete is problematic. The defunct status of a-mu-a-mu is debatable (cf. 2.1.4.) and it is more likely that Rasap is depicted in one of his other attested roles such as the god of plague or pestilence rather than as patron god of a royal ancestor cult (cf. 2.1.5.).

We now turn to consider additional texts which have been cited as indicative of offerings for the dead kings of Ebla. Archi entertained the possibility that another text, TM.75.G.411 r.I.1-III.10, records such offerings: 2 ninda ga-ziz en-en "two breads and one bread gazi [for] the kings" (I.3). In the final

\(^5\) On this significance of d-m-m, cf. Baumann 1978:260-65 and note his bibliography.


analysis however, he rejected this notion.⁴⁸ His conclusion on
the matter was in part a reaction to the theory of Pettinato that
the en-en in this text (and elsewhere) were former kings still
alive who formed a senate, retained their titles, and continued
to exercise power as rulers emeriti alongside the active king
elected every seven years.⁴⁹

Archi, like Michalowski and Geller, rejected Pettinato's
theory. In our estimation, he rightly concluded that the en-en in
this text were living and not dead on the basis of the likelihood
that the other recipients of the offerings were living members of
the Eblaite royal class, e.g. "the son(s) of the kings", dumu-
nita-nita en-en.⁵⁰ Moreover, in other texts, the en-en are
mentioned alongside princes and foreign "messengers" kas₄ kas₄,
i.e. those who distributed measurements of oil as payment in
exchange for services rendered.⁵¹

In conclusion, Archi opted for the view that the en-en
were, in addition to the king of Ebla, invited guests and rulers
of foreign cities under Ebla's hegemony. But again, the
qualifications of Michalowski apply. Eblaite en does not
necessarily refer to the "king" of Ebla with all that the term

⁴⁸Archi 1982:205-07 and cf. p.202. The text was originally


⁵⁰On the significance of the dumu-nita en, cf. Michalowski
1988:267-77 who suggested that this term might represent members
of powerful elite families at Ebla.

include TM.75.G.233:1-I-11.4; TM.75.G.406:IV.2-5; and
TM.75.G.541: I.1-II.6 and are otherwise unpublished, pace Beld, Hallo, and Michalowski 1984.
implies vis-à-vis sovereignty and independence. In any case, the contextual factors favor the mention of living en-en in this text whatever their identity. This in turn makes highly unlikely a royal ancestor cult setting for the sacrifices listed.

2.1.3. THE EBLAITE VERSION OF THE MARZÉAH

Ebla now perhaps offers the earliest attestation of the West Semitic institution known as the marzéah. In one administrative text, three women receive variegated dresses on "the day of the marzéah in the month of Ishi", ud mar-za-wa itu i-ši.52

In another more recently published, three garments are allocated for "Dudasa, superintendent of the marzéah", Du-da-sa ugula mar-za-wa.53 According to some scholars, membership in this confraternity in first millennium Syria-Palestine may have required the observance of death cult practices at commemorative feasts held on behalf of former members (more on this to follow).54

Based on the proposal that Hebrew bêt marzéah is supposedly synonymous with the "house of drinking", bêt mišteh in Jer. 16:5-


54 For bibliography and summary of views regarding the marzéah institution, cf. 3.1.5.
Dahood has suggested that a parallel semantic relation occurs at Ebla involving *mar-za-u* when one compares the above text with another at Ebla in which two garments are offered to the god Rasap "on the day of the drinking feast of his son", ud *maš-da-ù dumu-nita-šu*, for Dahood, the parallel becomes apparent. Assuming that the Eblaite terms *mar-za-u* and *maš-da-ù* can be equated with their Hebrew counterparts *marzēāḥ* and *miṣteh* respectively, Dahood's proposal demands careful evaluation.

In the light of the fact that the available evidence indicates that the death cult relations of the *marzēāḥ* were rare or non-existent prior to the first millennium at Ugarit (cf. 3.1.5.), that our two texts make no mention of such relations, and that *bēt marzēāḥ* and *bēt miṣteh* in Jer. 16:5-8 are not synonymous institutions (cf. 4.6.1.), we are, for the present, compelled to reject any possible connections of Eblaite *mar-za-u* and, for that matter, *maš-da-ù*, and the cult of the dead or the ancestor cult.

### 2.1.4. EBLAITE ANCESTRAL GODS AND THE CULT OF THE DEAD

The names of three deities which show up in the offering lists as recipients of sheep sacrifices have been cited as testimony to a cult of royal ancestors and sundry other persons of prominence. According to Xella, the deities *a-mu-a-mu, a-mu, a-mu,  


and 'en are "the fathers", "the divine father", and "the divine king(s)", respectively.

Xella concluded that the a-mu-a-mu referred not to royal personages per se, but to other individuals who had obtained a rank of such importance so as to warrant their receiving offerings in the official cult subsequent to death. The a-mu was the divinized ancestor of the king and the 'en were the defunct former kings (viewed collectively). Furthermore, a-mu was the forerunner of Ugaritic 'Il'ib, the so-called "divinized ancestor" (but. cf. 3.1.3.), while 'en anticipated the Ugaritic mlkm and rp'um (cf. 3.1.7. and 3.1.8.).

As was found to be the case with the interpretations of Archi and Pettinato addressed above, several obstacles impede our acceptance of Xella's proposals. First, it should be underscored that a-mu-a-mu occurs in only one published text, TM 75.G.2238, the context of which offers no support for the dead and deified status of the a-mu-a-mu. More important however is the fact that the dingir sign does not precede the a-mu-a-mu. According to the Eblaite ancestor cult advocates' own reckoning, this is the criterion by which one could ascertain the dead and deified status of an associated individual. In our view, its absence all but eliminates Xella's interpretation of a-mu-a-mu.

---


Therefore, owing to the lack of any compelling evidence to suggest otherwise, the a-mu-a-mu more likely represent living personages. They probably function as the beneficiaries of the sacrifices, not the recipients, on behalf of whom Minai made delivery. The role of recipient is taken up instead by the deity AMA-ra mentioned two lines later (XI.29-XII.4): 2 udu a-mu-a-mu GABA "two sheep [of (= from)] the fathers [for] receipt [by] AMA-ra, Minai has delivered".

Pettinato, followed by Archi, viewed "AMA-ra in XII.2 as a month name, but if this were in fact the case we would expect it to be preceded by itu as recognized even by Pettinato elsewhere. We follow Sollberger in his suggestion that "AMA-ra at Ebla is a god name, that is when the itu element is lacking. This deity is also attested in the Abu Salabikh god lists.

In which case they may be deceased, but clearly neither deified nor recipients of ancestor cult rites. Our approach also applies in the case of TM 75.G.2403:I.16-II.5 cited in Archi 1988A:107 where a-mu again lacks the preceding dingir sign: 2 udu "Ra-as-ap in sa.zakî Šr-ak-Da-mu nidba in u4 gi-ba-ulu nidba a-mu-su" 2 sheep [for] Rasap in the palace, Irak-Damu has offered at the time of the g. [of] the offering [of (= from)] his father. Elsewhere Irak-Damu is designated "the son of an en" dumu-nita en. Archi 1988A:108 and n.13 identified the en as Ibrium.

For a-mu-a-mu, see TM.75.G.2238:XII.30. GABA in XII.1, has no equivalent in the bilingual lists. Pettinato suggested "middle (of the month of d'AMA-ra)", but Archi 1985:282 offered "receipt", cf. also CAD 7(1960)183, Akkadian irtu "chest, back".


We turn now to Xella's two remaining forms d'a-mu and d'en. Just as Archi had demonstrated in the case of dingir + RN in the Eblaite king list, so he has convincingly argued that the dingir sign preceding a-mu and en in the offering lists functions not as the divine determinative, but as the noun denoting deity "the god of". Thus, d'a-mu should be read as dingir a-mu "the god [of] the father", and d'en as dingir en "the god [of] the en".

We contend that the gods intended in these references are the personal gods. They show up repeatedly but never are explicitly identified with a known deity, which, as we noted above, was a characteristic way of referring to one's personal god. The possibility that the archives date from the time of Ibbi-Zikir suggests that "the god [of] the father" refers to the personal god of Ibbi-Zikir's father, the deceased Ibrium, and "the god [of] the en", to that of Ibbi-Zikir. Furthermore, the attested practice whereby a king passes on his personal god to

---


his son suggests that the dingir a-mu and dingir en probably refer to the same god. 66

In closing, we should mention for the sake of completeness that Archi also included "the god [of] the queen's father" dingir a-mu ma-lik-tum and "the spirits [of] the dead queens" dingir dingir ma-lik-tum-ma-lik-tum in his version of the Eblaite royal ancestor cult. 67 Similar practices on behalf of royal family members have been gleaned from the archives of other Syro-Mesopotamian sites. 68

The roughly contemporary economic archives at Pre-Sargonic Lagash mentioned earlier, the en-en-né-ne texts, record offerings to the ancestors which include not only former rulers, but their mothers, wives, and daughters as well. But it should be recalled 66 Employing the same questionable logic which led him to view dingir + RN "the god [of] RN" as a dead deified king who received offerings in the royal ancestor cult, Archi 1988A: 107-12 unfortunately concluded that these two phrases likewise pointed to such a cult. "The god [of] the father" was, for Archi, the dead deified Ibrium, former king of Ebla, and "the god [of] the en" was "the god [of the person of] the king", by which we understand him to mean, the dead deified king, for he offered little else by way of elucidation.


68 Charpin and Durand 1986:168-69 and n.131 have reiterated the opinio communis that the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty makes reference to offerings for dead royalty. Even if this interpretation be granted, the text would not reflect a royal ancestor cult ritual but a one enacted on the lone occasion of a king's accession to the throne, i.e. a funerary ritual. For the more likely presence of geneonymy in this text (commemoration of the name), cf. 2.2.6. and 3.1.9. Against the view that a lone reference to kispū offerings for a dead deified female official is attested at Mari, cf. 2.2.1.
that neither the names of those deceased persons of royalty who received offerings were preceded by the dingir sign, that is to say, they were not deified, nor were their names included among the offering lists for major deities, temples, and other implements in the nīg-giš-tag-ga texts. 69

This reinforces our contention that the dingir sign in the Eblaite offering texts cited above was not intended to signify a deified dead person of prominence. Rather the Eblaite scribes had another meaning in mind in these instances, namely the personal god of the queen's father and the personal gods of the queens.

2.1.5. Eblaite Rasap and the Cult of the Dead

The director of the Italian expedition to Tell Mardikh, Paolo Matthiae, theorized that the later monumental remains from the Middle Bronze western palace area of the Amorite period preserve evidence of an Eblaite royal ancestor cult. In successive articles, he argued that the close proximity of a royal necropolis and the Rasap temple at Ebla pointed to the existence of this cult. 70

Matthiae's identification of the temple as dedicated to Rasap was, in part, influenced not only by the proximity of the royal graves, but also by the equation of Rasap and Nergal, the Sumerian god of the netherworld, in a bilingual syncretistic god


list from Ebla.\textsuperscript{71} But even if one grants the possibility that Eblaite Rasap was a chthonic deity, his role in Matthiae's royal ancestor cult cannot be supported by the archaeological and epigraphic evidence.

First, burials \textit{prima facie} do not prove the existence of an ancestor cult. Moreover, the supposed royal character of the relevant tombs is not at all certain.\textsuperscript{72} In the end, even Matthiae recognized the stratigraphic limitations at Ebla unlike the data from Avaris which he cited as support.\textsuperscript{73} Lastly, the inherent difficulties in identifying royal elements in burial remains and deposits has been thoroughly outlined by Moorey in his evaluation of Woolley's excavations at Ur.\textsuperscript{74}

Turning to the written records, it should pointed out that with the exception of his equation with Nergal in the bilingual god list, Rasap's supposed underworld role remains otherwise unattested at Ebla.\textsuperscript{75} Prior to the publication of the Ebla texts the underworld role of Rasap or Resheph was documented only as early as the late second millennium at Ugarit. But there he fills

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} Matthiae 1984:30. For Avaris, cf. Bietak 1979:249-61.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Moorey 1977:24-40.
\item \textsuperscript{75} On the literary evidence concerning Eblaite Rasap, see Dahood and Pettinato 1977:230-32; Pettinato 1979B:25-26 = 1979C:109-10; Müller 1980:7; Dahood 1987:97 (published posthumously); and Sollberger 1986:9,11.
\end{itemize}
perhaps only the minor role of gatekeeper. In any case, Rasap and Nergal may have been equated at Ebla and Ugarit based not on some shared role as underworld patron, but on their similar roles as gods of plague and pestilence. But even if Rasap obtained the role of a chthonic god at Ebla, it is another matter altogether to attribute to him the position of patron deity over a royal ancestor cult in the absence of any evidence for such a role and, more importantly, in view of our own findings vis-à-vis the lack of textual witness to an Eblaite royal ancestor cult.

We should point out that Matthiae cited the discovery of a sculpted ritual basin in the temple complex as evidence for the relation between the temple and Rasap. On the basin are depicted a banquet scene and two series of soldiers which Matthiae deemed appropriate to Rasap's supposed role as god of war. If the depiction on the basin is to be connected to Rasap, and this is by no means certain, it only underscores the curious silence concerning Rasap's role at Ebla as patron of the royal

76 Contra Cooper 1987:1-7 and Fulco 1987:343, Resheph is not netherworld king at Ugarit. At best, he is depicted as its gatekeeper, cf. KTU 1.78: 3-4: špšt ṯrh ršp "Shapash, her gatekeeper is Resheph". As no explicit mention of the netherworld is made, this reference to his association with Shapash might refer to those gates offering passage only to and from heaven's interior on the analogy of the Babylonian model proposed by Heimpel 1986:127-51 and cf. 3.1.7.3.


ancestor cult, for one would have expected that role or at least his more general chthonic role to be associated with such material evidence found in the area identified by Matthiae as having been set aside exclusively for royal ancestor cult rites.

2.1.6. SUMMARY

We thus conclude our evaluation of the Eblaite evidence. Having examined what has been offered to date, we come away thoroughly unconvinced that a royal ancestor cult is as yet attested in the available epigraphic or, for that matter, the archaeological data at Ebla.

Even if we were to grant for the sake of argument that Eblaite en designated the king, unequivocal evidence is presently lacking for the regular care for, let alone the veneration of or worship of the royal ancestors. Moreover, we have no indication that dead Eblaite kings were the objects of commemorative rites. At present, the available Eblaite archives and archeological record simply do not substantiate the existence of such practices.

*TM 75.G.2628* more likely preserves in part a ritual in which the dynastic personal god whose name, owing to common knowledge, goes unmentioned and who received sacrifices for the purpose of political legitimation. This legitimizing function is made explicit in the repeated association of this god with the names of ten only partially identifiable, but nevertheless politically important, protégés.
Although we have much yet to learn about the political structure of the Eblaite state reflected in the archives, it is safe to say that -whatever specific function the term en signified at Ebla- at the least these ten individuals were prominent members of certain elite families of Ebla.\textsuperscript{79}

In any case, based on known concurrent practices documented at Pre-Sargonic Lagash, we should not expect the worship of the dead kings at Ebla. At Lagash, the kings are neither deified nor are they grouped with the major gods in the offering lists. On the rare occasion where their statues receive offerings in the cult, they do so not as objects of worship but as venerated votive statues.\textsuperscript{80}

In keeping with our line of argument, we should point out that Ebla likewise testifies to neither a general death cult nor to a domestic ancestor cult. The same applies with the practice of necromancy.\textsuperscript{81} In other words, if any sector of Eblaite society adhered to the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead, we must await future studies to clearly document that fact.\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{79}It has been recently suggested that these families might have made up a "corporate dynasty" of sorts, cf. Michalowski 1988:267-77.


\textsuperscript{81}We do have some types of incantation texts from Ebla, cf. Krebernik 1984.

\textsuperscript{82}One must avoid the \textit{a priori} assumption that the Eblaites would have observed such a cult owing to their proximity to Anatolia and Mesopotamia. Hultkrantz 1978:97-126, esp. pp.100-101, notes that among North American Indians, while the Navajo peoples borrowed much in the way of ceremonialism from the Pueblo who did observe an ancestor cult, the Navajo, owing to their morbid fear of the dead, never adopted such a cult.
Nevertheless, even if future investigations bring to bear new evidence indicative of such a cult, one will be hard pressed to claim that it reflects an indigenous West Semitic origin. Moreover, if this cult should record the care for, the commemoration of or the veneration of the royal ancestors, then the obvious analogy obtains in the contemporary royal ancestor cult at Pre-Sargonic Lagash.

In any case, the investigator will need to demonstrate that what transpired at Ebla was the worship of the ancestors and not simply their post mortem care, commemoration, or veneration as at Lagash. Only then can any claim of a relatively unique practice at Ebla be seriously considered. Any claims of indigenous West Semitic origins will require clear documentation. Unfortunately, as already intimated in Archi's works\(^3\), future claims will no doubt resort to invoking parallels with the roughly contemporary cult of the deified king in the Mesopotamian heartland.

It is assumed that this cult with Sargon of Akkad as its oldest dedicatee was established by Semites who had ascended to power and united Mesopotamia by 2350 B.C.E.\(^4\) Note should be made however that, while the deification of living kings was no doubt instituted in the days of Sargon's grandson Naram-Sin, the earliest texts which record offerings made to Sargon wherein his posthumous deification can be assumed come from the later Neo-


\(^{84}\) Cf. Hallo 1988:54-66.
Sumerian period. This full blown royal ancestor worship complete with rituals to the divinized deceased kings might have been instituted for the purpose of political expediency not by the kings of Akkad but by the kings of the Ur III dynasty in honor of their Akkadian predecessors. In other words, such ideology might not be uniquely Akkadian or Amorite in origin.

What the Ebla archives do suggest is that whatever entity the term en designated at Ebla, whether an important bureaucratic official or a king, great emphasis was placed on the honor due the personal god of such an individual (dingir + PN, dingir + en) and those of their forefathers (dingir + a-mu) for they, alongside the other major gods of the pantheon, received sacrifices in the cult.

Moreover, other texts suggest the possibility that on the occasion of the funeral of a politically important person and in conjunction with the norms of international protocol, Ebla received foreign "ens" or dignitaries who made offerings and lamentations on account of the deceased. Again we must emphasize the fact that funerary rites are not to be equated with death and ancestor cults. Moreover, such rites as preserved at Ebla do not reflect a belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead.

---

2.2. THE EVIDENCE FROM MARI

The transition from Ebla to Mari is both chronologically and geographically warranted. As we move from the Pre-Sargonic to the Post-Ur III period, we encounter sizeable documentation reflective of the linguistic and religious features shared by these two city-states in contact. As we enter the Old Babylonian period, the Amorite ethno-linguistic element attested at Mari provides evidence for continued links with Ebla.

The texts from Mari provide extensive documentation for regular offerings to dead royalty and other persons of prominence in early second millennium Syria. The primary datum is the ritual associated with the kispum offering. Owing to its


88 The Mari texts are published in the series Archives royales de Mari abbreviated ARM(T) [ARM = volumes of cuneiform hand copies; ARMT = volumes of corresponding transliterations and translations]. The texts will be cited by volume, text, and line number and the accompanying discussions by author, volume, year, and page number.
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connection with the supposed underworld god Dagan and the *kispum* ritual, the *pagrā'um* ritual has also been cited. To these and other data reflective of the royal ancestor cult at Mari, we now turn.

### 2.2.1. THE KISPUM RITUAL

In a letter which Kibri-Dagan, governor of Terqa, sent to his king, Zimri-Lim at Mari, the wishes of the god Dagan at Terqa are communicated to Zimri-Lim through the medium of a *muhḫūm* priest, "God sent me! Hurry and write to the king so that he might consecrate the *kispū* to the *etemmum* (spirit) of Yahdun-Lim!"98

Leaving aside both the questions of this Yahdun-Lim's identity, that is, whether he is a former king of Mari or the prematurely deceased son of Zimri-Lim91, and the exact nature of the *kispū* offerings mentioned in this text, that is, whether they

---


98 *ARMT* 3:40:13-18: ilum'nu išpuranni humuṭ ana šarrim šupurma kispī ana eṛemmim ša Yahdun-Lim likrubu. Wilcke 1986:11-16 has recently published a text in which one Dagan-naḥmis, a female prophetess(?), receives a dream prompting the offering of *kispum*.

91 This Yahdun-Lim might be Zimri-Lim's prematurely deceased son, cf. Dossin 1938:111 and 1939:106 on *ana kimāḥim ša Yahdun-Lim mār šarrim*. On additional references to a tomb of one Yahdun-Lim, cf. *ARMT* 16/1(1979):216; Dalley 1984:137 n.16; Durand 1985B:404; and now Charpin and Durand 1989:18-19 who, in light of *ARMT* 3:40, located the tomb at Terqa. It appears that the references to a former king named Yahdun-Lim do not point to Zimri-Lim's father as Khatni-Addu filled this role and Yahdun-Lim and Khatni-Addu were two different people, so Charpin and Durand 1985:337, but cf. Sasson 1984A:116 n.1.
are funerary offerings or royal ancestor cult offerings, this datum corroborates the mortuary nature of the "kispum for the kings", kispum ša šarrāni.

Be that as it may, the recently published ritual text, Mari 12803, removes all doubt as to the mortuary nature of such offerings as the kispum ša šarrāni. Not only do the statues of the dead kings, Sargon and Naram-Sin, receive kispum offerings in the course of what perhaps comprises a regularly observed ritual calendar, but other dead persons of prominence do as well. Still another text lists kispum possibly offered for the

---

92 Cf. Tsukimoto 1980:129-38 for examples of the kispum offering as a funerary gift outside of Mari.


94 We follow the reading of Charpin and Durand 1986:165 n.115:"The kispum (offered) to Sargon, Naram-Sin, to the Khanean yaradi, and to those of Numkha, and to various others, this kispum has been offered" kispum, ana lugal-kiš, [x]* Naram-30, īšā'anna iaradi, ū ana Šut Numḫe, ū did<1>ih[ia] kispum annūm īkkasap (11.16-21). Cf. also Birot 1980:141-47 and Tsukimoto 1985:73-78. On a another group of deceased personages of political importance who receive offerings, the maliku, cf. 2.2.1.1. The Khanean yaradu have been taken to refer to settled Khaneans, so Tsukimoto 1985:76-77 (< (w)arādu "to settle down"); or to deceased Khaneans, so Malamat 1989:100-01 (< yārōḏ "to descend"). Cf. also Birot 1980:144. It might simply refer to Khanean "descendants".
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deceased in general *ana kispim ša abbê*, but this is not certain.95

A more recently published dispensary list has been cited as evidence for *kispum* offered to the deceased queen mother of Zimri-Lim, Addu-duri *ana kispim ša 'Addu-duri*.96 However, that the name is preceded by the dingir sign actually complicates matters. Owing to the fact that neither the *kispum ša Šarrāni*, nor the *kispum* for (the statues of) Sargon and Naram-Sin in *Mari 12803*97, nor any other references to the *kispum* at Mari designate the deceased human recipients as deified— and we would certainly expect this to be the case with the deceased kings if others of importance such as a queen mother were so divinized— it is unlikely that this was the intended significance of the dingir sign preceding Addu-duri.

Rather, the dingir sign in this case more likely designates the personal god of Addu-duri, dingir *Addu-duri "kispum for the (personal) god of Addu-duri"*. This unnamed god no doubt had chthonic associations for we know that the *kispum* was

---


96 For the text, cf. Materne 1983:197 n.12 (11.9-10). If Addu-duri was the widow of Khatni-Addu, so Batto 1974:64-72, and if Khatni-Addu was Zimri-Lim's father, so Charpin and Durand 1985:33, then she might have been Zimri-Lim's mother. The syntactic parallel *ana kispum ša Šarrāni* in the same text (11.13-14) favors "Addu-duri as the recipient, not the offerer.

occasionally offered at burial as sustenance for the dead as well as a gift to the denizens of the netherworld, both spirits and gods (*Totenbeigabe*). Moreover, as a special offering made during the course of magic rites, the *kispum* was made to the underworld gods known as the Anunnaki.⁹⁸

In any case, the identification of the *kispum* as a "funerary offering" is grossly inaccurate. By a wide margin, the majority of texts depict it as a *regular* food offering presented to the dead. We know of only three instances, all of which come from outside Mari, where the *kispum* was placed in the grave at burial. The common practice at Mari entailed *kispum* offerings at regular intervals, once, sometimes twice monthly, long after the funerary rites had ceased.⁹⁹ To be sure, the practice of placing gifts at the grave is attested at Mari, e.g., offerings *ana kišmahim ūa PN*, but *kispum* is never described as such.¹⁰⁰

At Mari, the king's presence was required at the regular *kispum* ritual at which food, such as honey, KUM bread, sour

---


bread, or cake, and drink, such as šipkum or alappānum beer, fine meal, sesame, as well as oil were typically offered to the defunct predecessors. Nevertheless, special occasions or circumstances might warrant the unscheduled enactment or postponement of the regular kispum ritual.

It is often asserted in the secondary literature that the kispum entailed a meal for both the living and the dead. However, the relative small quantity of food suggests that it merely satisfied the requirements of the dead or the cultic functionaries.

As to the nature and significance of the ancestor cult at Mari, we are left with very few clues. It is tempting to apply what is known about the ancestor cult in Mesopotamia to the Mari context, but the fact that we are dealing with the royal ancestor cult for the most part at Mari severely qualifies the contribution which the evidence from the heartland can make.

---

101 Cf. ARMT 9:226 for a list of some of these foodstuffs and now Lafont 1984:252 [Text 248] where meat consignments are atypically listed among the kispum. Cf. also Wilcke 1986:11-16 for other kinds of bread and beer. On the presence of the king at Mari during the kispum rituals, see Talon 1978:64; Sasson 1979:125 and 1985b:447. ARMT 10:50:14 may allude to Zimri-Lim's neglect of his duties on behalf of the dead, so Sasson 1983:289.


103 Ribar 1973:91-92 pointed out that the fifty qa kispum corresponds to the low end of the scale for the royal table, the naptan šarrim (cf. ARMT 9:212, 98,71,193) and that three qa represent the daily ration for an individual. Thus, at best we might have a small number of living attendants at the kispum ritual (perhaps the royal family), otherwise we have no clear evidence for a mortuary banquet in which the living partake of the kispum.
On this point, we gain limited assistance from the written remains at Mari. The recently published text, Mari 12803, apparently functioned as a means for Shamshi-Addu to link up his dynasty with the dynasty of Akkad from which he derived his claim to power.\textsuperscript{104} In this case, the ritual served to legitimate existing dynastic political structures by reaffirming their link with the past.\textsuperscript{105}

The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty is frequently cited as exemplary of this same motivation.\textsuperscript{106} However, this must be qualified, for the term kispum is nowhere to be found in the text. Moreover, nothing in the text itself points to its regular use in the royal ancestor cult. In fact, the closing lines strongly suggest its intended use on a lone historical occasion, the coronation of Ammiṣaduqa. In any case, it may record a commemoration ritual not an ancestor cult rite (cf. further 3.1.7.1.).

On the other hand, Mari 12803 reveals that the kispum ritual dedicated to Sargon and Naram-Sin comprised part of a larger liturgical calendar or menology. Thus, this kispum ritual was probably repeated on a regular basis. Nevertheless, it cannot be simply assumed that Mari 12803 is reflective of the ritual


\textsuperscript{105}Cf. now Tsukimoto 1985:229-32.

involving the monthly kispum offerings recorded in the lists. 107 Be that as it may, do the Mari references point to the care for, the veneration of, the worship of, or simply the commemoration of the former kings and persons of prominence? We shall defer our answer to the summary at the end of this section, 2.2.6.

2.2.1.1. THE ROYAL KISPUM AND THE OFFERINGS FOR THE MALIKŪ

Two aspects of the royal kispum ritual call for further discussion, the occurrence of kispum ša šarrāni alongside offerings "for the malikū" ana malikī (/im) 108 , and the kispum rites enacted "in the garden" ina rapiqātim. The malikū at Mari have been understood to represent demons 109 , infernal spirits 110 , counsellors 111 , non-royal departed men of distinction 112 , princes 113 or other non-reigning members of the royal line. 114

107 Contra Malamat 1989:98. In Mari 12803, the kispum was offered on "the first day of the month of Addar" (col. I.1), while other rites took place on other days of the same month (col. I.9, 27-28) as well as on "the day of biblum" (col. II.1-3) and "the day of gimkum" (col. II.7). Cf. Birot 1980:139-50, esp. p. 145 and n.2 and Charpin and Durand 1986:165.

108 Tsukimoto 1985:65 and n.254 mentioned twenty-two texts and lists three instances where offerings ana malikī occur alone, ARMT 7:8; 12:282 and 342. The regular lack of mimation points to a plural form, see further n.118.


113 Cf. e.g., Burke ARMT 11 (1963):139.

114 So Charpin and Durand 1986:165,168-69. Durand 1985A:159 n.55 also proposed the designation "chiefs of the tribe".
While the malkū, which Aro equated with the malikū at Mari, may denote either demons or infernal spirits in Old Babylonian oil omens and Standard Babylonian literary texts from the Mesopotamian heartland¹¹⁵, nowhere at Mari do the malikū appear as such.¹¹⁶

Besides, it is highly unlikely that the name of a class of wholly evil chthonic beings would have gained the level of popularity needed to become an element in Mari personal names.¹¹⁷ More satisfactory are the interpretations of malikū which depict them as defunct counsellors or princes, but definitely not former kings owing to the fact that the malikū, whatever their identity, receive smaller offerings and on a less frequent basis than the

¹¹⁵ For the omen texts, see Pettinato 1966 [Texts 1,2]. The malkū occur alongside the spirits eṭemmū and the demons kūbū, cf. Aro 1961:604, and at the end of a series of bad apodoses, so Heider 1985:153-55. They appear in the Shamash Hymn along with the gods ilāni₃ (1.7) and the demons ₑkūbū, and the Anunnaki ᶣanunnakū (1.31), see Lambert 1960:126-27 (but read ᶤkūbū, not ᶣkūsū, in 1.31 with Römer 1973:313). In Ebeling 1931:56-58, the malkū accompany the Anunnaki and the gods "who inhabit the earth" ilāni₃ ašibūt ěršetim."¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Sasson 1979:126-27 and 1985B:448 has suggested that the offerings for the "oath on (the life of) a god" niš ilim and to the malikū are closely related to the kispum. The relation of the deity Malik (in personal names only) and the malikū at Mari remains problematic, see Müller 1984:965; Heider 1985:102-13; and Olyan and Smith 1987:273.

¹¹⁷ For lists of Mari (Amorite) personal and divine names with the maliku(u) element, see Gelb 1980:321-23; Heider 1985:416-17; and Beyer 1985:101.
Nevertheless, these proposals present their own set of problems. Although there may be some question as to whether or not one or more distinct roots of *malāku* exist, philologists generally acknowledge a multiplicity of roots. That a West Semitic root *malāku* "to have authority" from which derives *mālikum* "king, ruler", should be kept distinct from the East Semitic *malāku* "to counsel" from which derives *mālikum* "counsellor", has been recently defended. In the Ugaritic Akkadian text, *RS 137:16*, the following phrase appears "the mayor and the overseer of the fields will have no authority over him" ū *iḥazanu URU*kū̀ *UGULA A.ŠÁ*ē *iā imallik UGU-šu*. The form *imallik* derives from a root *malāku* which reflects a semantic meaning "to have authority" and should be considered distinct from *malāku* "to counsel". The form *namlakātum = mamlakātum* "kingdom" found at Mari likewise favors the presence of a root

---

118 So Talon 1978:65-66; Sasson 1979:126; and Tsukimoto 1985:65 and 255-60. Only twice in twenty-two instances alongside the *kispum ša šarrāni* does *maliku(m)* appear with mimation in *ARMT 9:121:V:43* and *12:85:10*. The singular could stand as a collective, so Tsukimoto 1985:67, or an individual, e.g., the god Malik, so Heider 1985:111. The collective is more likely, for the plural is the regular form [note that Heider 1985:108 n.200 must restore -im in *ARMT 9:123:12*].


malāku "to have authority" at Mari.\textsuperscript{121} In any case, counsellors at Mari are otherwise designated wēdūtum.\textsuperscript{122}

We turn now to the prince interpretation of malikū. The attested epithet "son of the king" mār šarrim at Mari renders less likely the specific office of prince for malikū. Nevertheless, it does not altogether eliminate the regal associations of the malikū as their frequent mention alongside the deceased šarrānu as recipients of offerings in the royal cult strongly favors their royal status.\textsuperscript{123}

It is our contention that the malikū at Mari represent rulers of vassal kingdoms under Mari's hegemony. Although the nominal form of the West Semitic root m-l-k "to have authority" is usually translated by the English "king" its non-absoluteness has been recently reiterated.\textsuperscript{124} In Syria-Palestine, the kings, or rulers, of local city-states, the m-l-k-m, were frequently

\textsuperscript{121} Cf. \textit{AHw} 2(1972):728.

\textsuperscript{122} Cf. Charpin and Durand 1986:168 n.130 and \textit{ARMT} 1:14:7, 73:8,104:9; \textit{ARMT} 4:80:5; \textit{ARMT} 5:73: 8,13; and \textit{ARMT} 7:190:9 and 227:8',12'.

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{ARMT} 8:46:5' and Dossin 1939:106 and cf. Wiseman 1965:21 and now Charpin and Durand 1986:168 n.130. The Hittite royal lists, cf. Laroche 1971:116-17; the Old Babylonian Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty; and the Ugaritic ritual text \textit{KTU} 1.161 demonstrate that in addition to deceased kings, others of political prominence might be the objects of ritual observance. However, none of these texts can be considered in and of themselves reflective of a royal ancestor cult, for they reflect funerary concerns (or perhaps commemorative rites as part of a larger series of coronation rites in the second and third instances, cf. 3.1.7.1. and 3.1.9.).

\textsuperscript{124} Cf. Handy 1988:57-59 who argued that English "ruler" is more in keeping with the relativity exemplified in the use of the term.
subjects of the East Semitic imperial kings of Mesopotamia, the šarrānu.

In the light of the fact that in the Mari lists the dead šarrānu receive both larger and more frequent offerings than the malikū we can safely assume that a similar political hierarchy obtained there. Such a hierarchical relationship between living šarrānu and malikū is likewise reflected in the El-Amarna archives.¹²⁵

At Mari, these rulers of local city-states are depicted as the deceased recipients of offerings alongside the former kings of Mari, the šarrānu. The proposed lower political status of the malikū at Mari best explains why in the royal cult, the malikū received smaller offerings and on a less frequent basis than the šarrānu.

We tentatively suggest that the offerings ana malikī are to be viewed as an extension of those mortuary rites practiced within the sphere of international diplomacy such as the official mourning over the death of a king or, as in the present case, a vassal ruler.¹²⁶ The post mortem inclusion of the malikū in ceremonies alongside the former Mari kings would then reflect an attempt on the part of the Mari throne to strengthen existing

¹²⁵ See Weber in Knudtzon 1915:1225-26 on "malik šarri "vassal ruler of the king" in EA 131:23 (p. 557). In Moran 1987:349, the editors prefer the East Semitic "conseillers", but if two separate roots exist for m-l-k, the West Semitic "to have authority" and the East Semitic "to counsel", we would expect the West Semitic at Amarna. Note also that in EA 131:21, malikšarri is a gloss to rabisi, the highest Egyptian official in Syria-Palestine, so Rainey 1970:76. What is clear is that the malikū at Amarna held a subordinate political position to the šarrānu.

political relations with its vassal kingdoms by honoring its defunct district rulers.

Given this reconstruction, we should make mention of a recently published letter written to Zimri-Lim, king of Mari, by one Ishme-Dagan (king of Assyria and son of Shamshi-Addu?). Finet interpreted the text as follows. A lone malikum appears as the object of an unidentifiable ritual. Ishme-Dagan explains that although he had initiated the prescribed ritual on behalf of the malikum, he was unable to complete the ceremony in the absence of an expert in the rite of the malikum.\(^{127}\) In response to his apparent dilemma, he wrote to Zimri-Lim to request that their emissaries negotiate the immediate dispatch of one so skilled.

On the other hand, Durand has argued that malikum in this text signifies a divinatory sign of judgment much like the erištum mark as found in omens.\(^{128}\) In the case at hand, the judgment or counsel manifests itself by the appearance of an apparition, the malikum. He cited two newly published texts in support. The one makes mention of the arrival of the apparition as the malikum ša 'IM "the 'Judgment' of Addu".\(^{129}\) The other

---

\(^{127}\) Finet 1985:89 [Text A.674]: "I am paying homage to the malikum and the malikum is there, but the expert in the malikum rite is not here" malikam karbāku ū malikum ittabši ū mudi parsim ša malikim annikām ul ibašši (11. 5-10). Durand 1988A:490 and n.40 rendered malikam karbāku "I am obtaining a malikum sign for that which I requested in my prayers", see below.


\(^{129}\) Text A.490 in Durand 1988A:501-03.
mentions a woman by the name of Yataraya who "gives a (good) counsel" 'Yataraya inūma malikam iddinu. 130

At present, it is impossible to decide whether a deceased district ruler has been summoned or that simply a judgment sign similar to an erištum mark was being conjured.

2.2.1.2. THE KISPUM OFFERED IN THE ROYAL GARDEN

The garden at Mari appears as a place where several types of offering associated with the royal court were made. One text records the apportioning of "the king's meal" naptan šarrim "in the (tilled?) garden" ina rapiqātim. 131 A second text notes that the king's meal is apportioned as "a sacrifice to Ishtar in the king's garden" nīqi Ištar ina kirē šarrim. 132 These texts establish the cultic function of gardens at Mari as places for sacrifice. Another records the enactment of a second type of offering apportioned from the king's meal, the kispum offered "in the (tilled?) garden" ina rapiqātim. 133

Based on Landsberger's proposal that rapāqu means "to turn the earth (with a spade)", Burke offered for the derivative

132 ARMT 12:267:5 and for treatments on the cultic function of gardens in the ancient Near East, see 2.1.2.
"rapiqātum "flower bed of a tilled garden" and concluded that this was a royal burial place where kispum rites took place. Margueron has cited court 106, the court of the Palms, in the royal palace complex as the most likely location for the garden giš kiriš lugal where the king's meal naptan Šarrim was served. It appears that this same area may have been the location for the related kispum ceremonies as Birot has reconstructed a reference to the Court of the Palms in Mari 12803.

Two Sumerian texts, one dating from the end of the third millennium, clearly testify to the burial of prominent persons in gardens. Moreover, a royal burial plot may have been uncovered within the Old Babylonian palace complex at Mari. Thus, the royal kispum ritual could have taken place in the palace gardens where the kings and other royalty were buried.

---

134 Cf. Landsberger 1937:185-87; Burke ARMT 11(1963):136 n.15 and p.139 n.17 and cf. Aramaic r-p-q "to dig up" e.g., Jastrow 1903:1491-92. Kennedy 1987:231-34 described the garden in later Roman death cults as a place of burial and where food and flowers were grown for the funerary banquet and support of the endowment.


136 The earliest is a royal inscription of Urukagina, last of the Pre-Sargonic rulers of Lagash "when a dead person is taken to the garden of Enki" gi. 4Enki ka.ka adda₇₇ u. tūm₇₇, cf. Lambert 1956:172-73 and Talon 1978:63. The second is a Neo-Sumerian court document concerned with a plot of family real estate "he discovered that the tomb of the Grand Chorister of the city was in the garden" kiriš₄ a ki.mah gala.mah uru.ka i.me.a bi.in.[e]š.a., cf. Falkenstein 1956-57:165 [Text 101:13-14] and Talon 1978:63.


138 Al-Khalesi 1977:68-72; 1978:4 argued that adjacent to court 131 of Zimri-Lim's palace, the Gallery of Paintings, was a funerary complex bit kispî [Unit 5] which included royal burials.
However, it is more likely that gardens connected with kispum rites functioned to memorialize the kings, their bodies lying in rest elsewhere. Terqa, the home of the dynasty, has been proposed. It is from this city that a letter is sent to Mari requesting that Zimri-Lim respond by letter to Kibri-Dagan of Terqa so that the latter can consecrate the kispū to the eḫemmum (spirit) of Yahdun-Lim, the assumption being that Yahdun-Lim's spirit inhabited his tomb located in Terqa.\textsuperscript{139}

2.2.2. THE BĪT KISPĪ AND THE BĪT DAGAN

According to a text found at Terqa, Shamshi-Addu built in that town "the é ki.si.ga, his house of silence, the house of Dagan" é ki.si.ga bīt qūltišu bīt qultigu bit *Dagan.\textsuperscript{140} The é ki.si.ga has been equated with bīt kispī "house of offerings to the dead" which in turn has been identified with the house of Dagan.\textsuperscript{141} If


\textsuperscript{141} So Grayson 1972:24-25; Menzel 1981(I):52; and Dalley 1984: 122-23. Menzel conjectured that the bīt Dagan at Neo-Assyrian Assur is to be equated with a bīt kimāḥḥi documented there. While the latter is in all likelihood to be associated with rites in the Aṣṣur temple and é.ki.sl.ga can designate a grave kimāḥḥu(m) (cf. Tsukimoto 1985:235), Menzel's equation of the bīt Dagan and the bīt kimāḥḥi at Assur depends upon the equation of the bīt Dagan in Terqa (Shamshi-Addu I) with the
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correct, then we have evidence which not only identifies the location (of the gardens?) where the *kispum* ritual was performed, but also connects the god Dagan with royal ancestor cult practices at Mari.\footnote{So e.g., Healey 1977:50.}

But the expected spelling of the Sumerian equivalent to *bît kispī* is é ki.sl.ga, not é ki.si.ga. Elsewhere, the latter has the meaning "place of silence" and therefore may stand in apposition to é qūltišu. Such a grammatical construction — Sumerian temple name + Akkadian gloss + house of DN- is attested in another inscription of Shamshi-Addu.\footnote{Cf. Tsukimoto 1980:137 n.29, 1985:70-73 and Charpin 1985:86, 1986:217 and n.2. The other Shamshi-Addu text is AOB 1(1926):8:6-8, pp.22-23: é am.kur.kur.ra *bît rīm mātātim bît dEnlil*. The Enlil temple or é amkurkurra = "the house of the wild bulls of the lands".}

Even if we suppose for the sake of argument that *bît kispī* is the correct reading, its relation to the house of silence and the house of Dagan remains enigmatic.\footnote{We note the conjecture of Lambert 1987:403-04 that Sumerian *ki.si.ga* (not *ki.si.ga*) might have originally meant "silent place" where offerings were made to the dead ancestors and later developed a meaning to cover the offerings made at this quiet place. These offerings were designated *kispum* in Akkadian.} Apart from Tsukimoto's proposal and in the absence of decisive contextual evidence, the apposition could signify a number of possible relationships. Therefore, in the final analysis, this text cannot establish the location of the *kispum* ritual or the patronage of Dagan in the royal ancestor cult.
2.2.3, DAGAN, LORD OF PAGRŪ

We come now to a second major datum which has been cited as evidence for royal ancestor cult practices at Mari. Such an assumption rests on an inference derived from Dagan's epithet "lord of pagrū" bēl pagrē. It is assumed that this epithet is indicative of not only Dagan's connection with the royal ancestor cult, but that of the pagrūm offering as well.143

The epithet bēl pagrē has been rendered: lord of corpse offerings, lord of corpses (a netherworld god), lord of funerary offerings, and lord of human sacrifices.146 Akkadian pagrum and the related ritual attested at Mari, the pagra'ūm, have been attributed the following meanings: bloody sacrifice, corpse or cadaver, sacrifice of (for) the dead, sacrifice of the stele, and slaughtered animal.147

While pagrum without further qualification can denote the corpse of a fallen soldier or a slain animal, the debate arises over its use in sacrificial contexts.148 Is it the sacrifice itself that is in view (a human sacrifice) or its intended object (a sacrifice for the dead)? Does pagrum and its derivative


148 Cf. the examples cited in AHw 2(1972):809 pagru (2) "Leiche, Kadaver".
pagra'um found at Mari involve a mortuary offering of some sort or simply a slain animal unrelated to such concerns?¹⁴⁹

Not a single instance can be cited from its handful of occurrences at Mari that could establish pagra'um as a sacrifice associated with mortuary matters, let alone human sacrifice.¹⁵⁰ Neither the connection with Dagan via the epithet bēl pagrē nor the mention of the pagrum given to Dagan pagram ana 'Dagan inaddin¹³¹, are sufficient in themselves to substantiate the mortuary nature of pagra'um. In fact, as we have indicated above (2.2.2.) and shall further demonstrate below (cf. 2.2.4.), the royal ancestor cult or death cult associations of both Dagan and pagrum/pagra'um are entirely lacking at Mari.

Nowhere in the Mari archives is Dagan's supposed role as patron deity of the royal ancestor cult otherwise mentioned.¹³² Moreover, recently published Mari texts make the proposal that pagra'um denotes human sacrifice obsolete. These offering lists demonstrate that animal sacrifices were meant, specifically


¹³² Cf. 2.2.2. and 2.2.4. and the recent survey by Lambert 1985B:525-39, esp. 532,538, but cf. p.533 where he rendered the epithet bēl pagrē as "lord of funerary offerings".
carcasses of dead animals. On more than one occasion of the pegrā'um offering, the sacrificial bullock was distributed among those present. On another occasion, Dagan, who had become angered over the issue of pagrum, was appeased with an offering of slaughtered mutton.

Lastly, none of the texts mentioning the pagrum/pagrā'um offering point to any association with mortuary rites. The same goes for its assumed connections with the royal cult and the royal ancestor cult in particular. In those cases where we gain some assistance from the contexts, the evidence indicates that the pagrum/pagrā'um was offered by non-royal personages.

2.2.4. THE PARALLEL KISPUM AND PAGRĀ'UM RITUALS

One datum remains which has been cited in support of the connection between the pegrā'um offering and the royal ancestor cult and again Dagan's assumed role in that cult forms the basis of the proposal. In 2.2.1., we quoted from a letter, ARMT 3:40, sent by Kibri-Dagan, governor of Terqa, to the king of Mari in which Dagan at Terqa, through the medium of a muhūm priest, exhorted Zimri-Lim to offer kispū to the spirit of his departed

---


135 Cf. ARMT 18:38:5 and Durand ARMT 21(1983):71-72,160 n.20. Villard ARMT 23(1984):533 n.e discussed the most recently published text, 561:16, in which the pegrā'um ritual is either accompanied by offerings of silver or is purchased with silver.

(father or son?) Yahdun-Lim.\textsuperscript{157} The assumption is that Dagan takes on a direct role in matters \textit{kispum}.

In another severely damaged text, \textit{ARMT} 2:90, it appears that Dagan again instructs the king to perform certain rites, and again he does so through the medium of a \textit{muhhum} priest, that is, if we are justified in restoring the form in a lacuna in the text.\textsuperscript{158} In this case, the king orders the \textit{nīqī pagrāʾī} to be offered. Owing to the fact that it is Dagan who instructs the king through the medium of a \textit{muhhum} priest in both texts and that \textit{ARMT} 3:40 is related to matters mortuary, it has been assumed that the latter should be similarly interpreted.\textsuperscript{159}

But the logic here is controvertible. In the absence of confirming data, one cannot assume that whenever the god Dagan, a \textit{muhhum} priest, and a sacrifice are related as they are in the above two letters, that one has unequivocal evidence for a mortuary cult at Mari. As a point in fact, in the remaining Mari archives, the \textit{pagrāʾum} offering is never explicitly related to such concerns. Moreover, in its eighty plus instances at Mari, the \textit{kispum} offering is never attested in direct relation to the \textit{pagrāʾum} offering. Furthermore, it should be recalled that the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{157} \textit{ARMT} 3:40:7b-18. For 11. 13-18, see 2.2.1. and n.90.
\item \textsuperscript{158} \textit{ARMT} 2:90. According to Malamat 1966:220, \textit{muhhum} can be reconstructed in 1. 16. The extended lacunae in 11. 13-17a has been restored on the basis of \textit{ARMT} 3:40:7b-9: "On the same day I sent this letter to my lord, the \textit{muhhum} priest of Dagan...." [\textit{um tuppi an}nēôm [\textit{ana šer}] bēliya [\textit{ušābilam} 3\textsuperscript{11} \textit{muhhum 8}]a đ Dagan.
\item \textsuperscript{159} The phrase \textit{nīqī pagrāʾī} occurs in \textit{ARMT} 2:90:18(?),22. Jean \textit{ARMT} 2(1950):65; Finet \textit{ARMT} 15(1954):238 and Ebach 1971:365-68 understood this phrase to designate "sacrifices for the dead". Talon 1978:69-70 tentatively equated the \textit{nīqī pagrāʾī} with the offerings \textit{ana maliki}, but assumed the shared identity of Malik and Dagan at Mari in the absence of supporting data.
\end{itemize}
pagra'um offering remains otherwise unconnected with the royal cult, that is, with perhaps the exception of ARMT 2:90, although it must be recognized that the extensive lacunae makes any interpretation of this text tentative at best.

Likewise, the logic that would make Dagan out as the patron deity of the royal ancestor cult based on ARMT 3:40 leaves much to be desired. While Dagan's demands recorded in this text are related to the royal ancestor cult, this does not necessitate the conclusion that he is the cult's patron deity. As a major god of the Mari pantheon, his influence and authority no doubt spanned a wide range of religious concerns. In fact, his general non-involvement with the royal ancestor cult at Mari is confirmed by the fact that only once in eighty plus references to kispum is Dagan mentioned. Therefore, a more likely candidate for patron deity of the royal ancestor cult at Mari might be at hand.

2.2.5. THE CULT OF THE DEAD DEIFIED ITŪR-MER

The deity Itūr-Mer occupied one of the two most important positions among the gods of Mari. As the god of the region of which Mari was the biggest and most important town, he was most

\[\text{ARMT 3:40:14-15.}\]

\[\text{As Dalley 1979:290 has pointed out, we have no unequivocal evidence for a Dagan shrine at Mari. Despite Dagan's epithet bēl Terqa in ARMT 10:62, his exclusive patronage of Terqa, the home of the Mari dynasty, remains in doubt as Dagan shows up separately from bēl Terqa in a god list at Mari, cf. Lambert 1970:247-50.}\]

\[\text{The other was Dagan. For helpful treatments on Itūr-Mer, see Nakata 1974:323-33; Dalley 1979:289-90; Sasson 1979:133; and Lambert 1985B:533-35,538-39.}\]
likely considered patron deity of the Mari kingdom. Two recently published texts of Shamshi-Addu in which Itūr-Mer gives him "the land of Mari and the bank of the Euphrates (and its domains)" māt Mariš; ú aḫ 14 Purantīm (ú namlakātišu) verify the regional extent of his influence. 163 They also help to elucidate an epithet of Itūr-Mer found elsewhere at Mari, "the ruler of Mari" Šar Mariš. This title can now be properly rendered "the ruler of the kingdom of Mari". 164

All of the above support the proposal that the otherwise unidentified deity given the title "ruler of the land" Šar mātim in god lists at Mari is none other than Itūr-Mer and not Dagan as previously conjectured. 165 In fact, Dagan is actually listed separately from Šar mātim in a list of gods at Mari. 166 In any case, we know of temples, a city gate or precinct kā Itūr-Mer, Šangum priests, muḫḫum prophets, a qīlāšātum feast, and a feast of musicians devoted to this deity. 167


164 ARMT 10:63:16 and cf. 10:66:18 and 10:72:11-12. Note that the phrase is not Šar Šar Mariš "ruler of the city of Mari", but "ruler of Mari". His dominion over the entire Mari kingdom would explain why his more restricted relationship to the town is rarely attested, so Lambert 1985:539.


As to the origins of Itūr-Mer, it has been proposed that this god was originally a mortal hero or former king of Mari who was deified after his death.\textsuperscript{168} That Itūr-Mer might have been originally a human figure is supported by the fact that the name form *IprVs-DN is a well attested personal name in Akkadian onomastics. Furthermore, the Itūr element in personal names is quite common at Mari and should not be taken as an epithet of the god Mer.\textsuperscript{169}

Nakata has proposed that Itūr-Mer became the patron deity of an important ancestor cult at Mari. To date, the only such cult attested at Mari is the royal ancestor cult. Sasson cited a recently published text in which Itūr-Mer presides as patron deity over what stands as the best candidate for the Mari version of the marzeaḥ.\textsuperscript{170} Nevertheless, our findings \textit{vis-à-vis} the non-mortuary relations of the marzeaḥ prior to the first millennium should caution against the assumption that this datum supports Itūr-Mer's patronage over an ancestor cult at Mari (cf. 3.1.5.). In any case, Itūr-Mer is entitled "lord of pādum" bēl pādim (1.2)

\textsuperscript{168}Cf. Nakata 1975:15-24 and Dalley 1979:289-90. Owing to his continued rule over the "land of" Mari long after his death, the epithet Šar mātim should not be restricted in its reference to his actual reign while a living ruler, \textit{contra} Dalley 1979:290.

\textsuperscript{169}Nakata 1975:15-24. He cited ARMT 3:40:13-18 as his Mari evidence. He also cited the deification of the \textit{etemmum} of departed persons of prominence in Mesopotamia as support, but this phenomenon is not attested at Mari. While Nakata 1975:18-19 attempted to refute earlier advocates of the storm god interpretation of Itūr-Mer, Lambert 1985B:533-35 has recently embraced this position. For Lambert, Itūr-Mer originally represented an old storm god of northern Mesopotamia and Syria.

\textsuperscript{170}Sasson 1985B:447.
and the fourteen "sons of pûdum" assemble to pay homage to him. (11.31-33).

The editor of this text identified the individuals comprising the accompanying list of names (11.3-30) as priests or possibly merchants. Elsewhere, the same "sons of pûdum" are depicted as attendants of a feast held in the Gallery of Paintings or court 131, the court adjacent to Al-Khalessi's conjectured funerary complex or bit kispî (cf. 2.2.2.). In any case, prior to their attendance at that feast, they banqueted in the temple of the netherworld god Nergal.

Another Mari text possibly relates Itûr-Mer and the royal death cult. It makes mention of Zimri-Lim's repeated trips to the bit kimti. As suggested by its use in a tomb inscription of Sennacherib, Moran tentatively identified the bit kimti as a "mortuary chapel". In the end, it was a Šangum priest of Itûr-Mer who, having dreamt of Zimri-Lim's pilgrimages, deemed them misspent owing to the permanence of his kingship.


173 Moran 1969:42-43, but cf. p.56. He appointed Dagan as patron deity of this cult, but as we have argued above, and as the mention of the priest of Itûr-Mer suggests, Itûr-Mer stands as a better candidate. The relevant line in the Sennacherib text can be found in OIP 2:151:13: "Palace of rest, eternal residence, irremovable family dwelling of Sennacherib" ekal tapšuhtî Šubat dârât bit kimti Šuršudu Ša 4 Sinahḫēriba (ll. 1-4a) and cf. CAD 8(1971):377 and AHw 1(1965)479.

174 ARMT 10:51:8-15: "In my dream Belet-biri stepped up to me and spoke as follows. Thus she (spoke): ... is his kingship, and the rule is his permanent possession. Why does he keep going up again and again to the 'family house?' ina šûttiya 4 nin-biri
If future studies can establish Itūr-Mer’s status as patron of the royal ancestor cult at Mari, and admittedly this is by no means certain, then we might gain a more accurate understanding of the enigmatic qilāsātum feast and the festival of musicians connected with this deity.\textsuperscript{175} Perhaps, these festive occasions also testify to this role of Itūr-Mer. In the final analysis, the suggested mortuary associations of Itūr-Mer remain circumstantial at best.

### 2.2.6. Summary

This completes our survey of the Mari evidence. At Mari, regular kispum offerings were made to the dead kings. As suggested by the repeated occurrence of malikū, the deceased vassal rulers, and the groups mentioned in the ritual reflected in Mari 12803, it appears that other prominent dead also received kispum on occasion. The numerous dispensary lists, the royal letters, the commemorative royal inscription from Terqa, and the related ritual text, Mari 12803, when considered together, substantiate the existence of a royal ancestor cult on Syro-Palestinian soil during the early second millennium.\textsuperscript{176}

On the other hand, our findings pertaining to the pagrā’um offering contradict the consensus opinion attributing to it and to the god Dagan central roles in the royal ancestor cult at

\begin{quote}

izzerma kiam iqebm umma šima dirutum namlakašu u palûm dûršu ana e kimtim ana mînim ītenelli.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{175}On the latter, see ARMT 9:176:5 and cf. 7:267:5’.

\textsuperscript{176}Cf. now Malamat 1989:96-107 for a recent summary of the Mari evidence.
Mari. Finally, Itūr-Mer's role in the royal ancestor cult at Mari remains in our estimation plausible regardless of his purported euhemeristic origins. However, this proposal must await future verification, for the present evidence is inferential at best.

Owing to the fact that the various Amorite elements dominated the geo-political map during this period, and this applies to the Mesopotamian heartland as well as to such peripheral sites as Mari, that texts first make mention of the kispum offering beginning with the Old Babylonian period\textsuperscript{177}, and that the Amorite ethos supposedly emphasized genealogical, tribal, and ancestral relationships while the Sumero-Babylonian element did not\textsuperscript{178}, one might conclude that the kispum ritual was essentially an Amorite innovation indigenous to north Syria.

Furthermore, one might assume that it was then introduced into the Mesopotamian heartland from north Syria coincident with the ascendancy of the Amorite dynasties there and that it was subsequently adopted by the various peoples inhabiting Syria-Palestine of the first millennium such as the Arameans.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{177}The same can be generally said of the Sumerian equivalent, ki.si.ga. For the relevant texts, cf. Tsukimoto 1985:26-38.

\textsuperscript{178}So Hallo 1983:7-18, esp. pp.9-12.

\textsuperscript{179}Cf. e.g., Xella 1988:219-25. Greenfield 1973:46-52 and 1987:70-71 argued that the kispum ritual evolved during the period of Amorite domination in order to allow for conforming to West Semitic usages and was eventually adopted by the Israelites via the Arameans. Dietrich and Lorentz 1980:381-82 assumed that pagrum/pgr was the West Semitic synonym for kispum and that the Ugaritic text \textit{KTU} 1.161 was a later (Amorite) reflex of \textit{Mari} 12803. Pope 1981:176 concluded that the marzēah was the West Semitic equivalent to the kispum.
In response it should be pointed out that the royal ancestor cult is well attested in "Pre-Amorite", and for that matter "Pre-Akkadian", Mesopotamia. As we noted in 2.1.1., it was regularly observed in the earlier Sumerian culture at such urban centers as Pre-Sargonic Lagash. While it is true that Sumerian ki.si.ga does not show up at Lagash during this period, a variety of analogous offerings such as food, drink, and animals as well as clothing were made to the ancestors of the royal family at Lagash on a monthly basis. These rites often took place at the ki-a-nag or funerary shrine, at least this was the case for the deceased ensis or lugals and their wives.\(^{180}\) In fact, it can be argued that owing to the elements which the Lagash and later Mari rites share, the Mari royal ancestor cult reflects a significant degree of continuity with its Sumerian predecessor whereas it has little in common with the cult for the worship of the dead deified kings of the dynasty of Akkad.\(^{181}\)

First, neither in the Lagash nor Mari royal ancestor cults are the deceased royalty deified. That is to say, nowhere in the literary evidence are the cult recipients preceded by the dingir/ilu sign.\(^{182}\) On the other hand, the royal ancestor cult established for the worship of the deceased Sargonic kings


\(^{181}\) On which, cf. Hirsch 1963:5,13,16,24,30 and Hallo 1988:54-66. Owing to the fact that the earliest documentation for this cult comes from the Neo-Sumerian period and not Sargonic times, the cult in honor of the dynastic kings of Akkad might have been instituted by the kings of the Ur III dynasty for legitimation purposes.

\(^{182}\) On the lone possible exception at Mari, i.e. ana kispim Ya'a Addu-duri, cf. 2.2.1.
coincides with their posthumous deification.\textsuperscript{183} Second, at Lagash and Mari, the dead royalty are referred to collectively in the lists, at Mari as šarrānu and malikū and at Lagash as en-en-nē-ne. We mention one final point of similarity in anticipation of our discussion to follow. In the light of the above observations, neither cult concern itself with the worship of dead divine monarchs (more on this below).

In sum, the Mari cult exhibits no new elements which might be considered uniquely Amorite in origin. It simply approximates the earlier Sumerian cult. Thus, it is our contention that the kispum offering was more a Semitic adaptation of an existing Sumerian practice than an actual Amorite or, for that matter, Akkadian innovation. Furthermore, one might argue that its diffusion moved from East to West, from the heartland to the periphery, and that it enjoyed popularity among the privileged classes of the peripheral regions only sporadically. Indications of both aspects of this process may be reflected in the textual record at Mari.

Presently, we lack any reference to the kispum offering or to the ancestor cult more generally from the reigns of the Amorite rulers who preceded Zimri-Lim, Yagid-Lim and Yaḥdun-Lim.\textsuperscript{184} However, beginning with the reign of Zimri-Lim's foreign

\textsuperscript{183} So Hallo 1988:54-66. The same has been proposed for the kings of the Ur III dynasty, cf. Klein 1981B:35.

\textsuperscript{184} Durand 1985A:159 n.55 has offered a reconstruction of an isolated reference to kispum in a Šakkanakku period text, \textit{ARMT} 19:253:4. However, the original editor, Limet, read only [x x]pum. Durand also suggested that 19:214, also a Šakkanakku text, records offerings to the prominent dead although kispum per se is not mentioned. Two other kispum texts, RA 64(1970):35 [Text 28] and Wilcke 1986:11-17 have been dated to the reign of Sumu-Yamam
predecessor, Shamshi-Addu I of Assyria, kispum is first attested at Mari.\textsuperscript{185} In fact, several kispum texts date to the so-called Assyrian period.\textsuperscript{186} With the beginning of the reign of Zimri-Lim, the number of occurrences significantly increases.\textsuperscript{187}

On the other hand, we have a number of references to both the royal ancestor cult in the texts of the earlier Sumerian and Akkadian dynasties of the Mesopotamian heartland and to the kispum ritual in the texts of the Amorite dynasties of the Old Babylonian period that eventually dominated the heartland. In other words, the royal ancestor cult was already a well-established Sumerian, but adapted, Semitic institution prior to the Amorite institution of kispum offerings at Mari.

Therefore, the royal ancestor cult at Mari cannot be understood as a distinctly north Syrian Amorite practice, but as a rite observed by the earlier Sumerian royalty in the Mesopotamian heartland and subsequently adapted by the varied Semitic peoples—Akkadians, Assyrians, Amorites—who settled there. The easterly Semites later exported their adapted version of the Sumerian royal ancestor cult to the peripheral regions of their ever expanding nation-states of Assyria and Babylonia.

---

by Wilcke, p.12 n.2. He based his dating on the name of a palace official, Hammil, who shows up in both texts. But a Hammil is attested in the reigns of Yahdun-Lim, Sumu-Yamam, and in the Assyrian period. Therefore, it is not possible to assign these two texts to any one of these periods based on this datum alone.

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. \textit{ARMT} 7:9; 12:3, 85, 96; and \textit{Mari} 12803.

\textsuperscript{186} In addition to the texts cited in n.185, cf. the seven texts in Charpin 1984:88-89,103-06 [Texts 30-36] and the three texts in Charpin 1985C:260 [Texts 10146, A.1403, 11125].

\textsuperscript{187} The remaining kispum texts date from Zimri-Lim's time, so Talon 1978:60; Sasson 1979:125-28; and 1985B:447, cf. n.89.
That the royal ancestor cult at Mari is not uniquely Amorite or West Semitic is further substantiated by our findings vis-à-vis the Syro-Palestinian textual evidence from the mid second millennium onwards. In spite of an abundant textual witness for the periods following the Amorite domination of Mari, we have no indication that a royal ancestor cult continued uninterrupted as West Semitic tradition. No such cult is evidenced at Ugarit (cf. 3.1.).

If we can assume that the dead Šarrānu were former Mari kings and that they were perceived as genealogically related to the current dynasty —neither point is uncontroversial—, then we can offer some speculation regarding the intended functions of the kispum. Mari 12803 leads one to conclude that political legitimation and regional diplomacy might have been one function. But can we ascertain from the available data whether or not the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the ancestors was embraced at Mari?

As argued previously, it is unlikely that these rites presupposed worship of the royal ancestors as both the internal and comparative evidence points in the opposite direction. The Amorite dynasty at Mari not only instituted a version of the royal ancestor cult that had been informed by the Sumerian

188 The same probably applies in the case of Emar. Durand 1989:85-88 has speculated that a non-royal ancestor cult is attested, but cf. 3.2.2. How long the kispum ritual continued at Mari is impossible to ascertain, for we have no textual evidence for the following periods. Owing to the fact that it was the Babylonian Amorite Hammurapi who conquered Mari after Zimri-Lim came to power and that we have kispum at Babylon dated to his reign (cf. Tsukimoto 1985:39-56) we would expect its continuance after Zimri-Lim perhaps in modified form owing to Hammurapi's concern to legitimate his rule there.
ancestor cult, but it may have adopted a policy similar to that evident in Babylonia under Hammurapi in which the deification of living and dead kings instituted during the preceding Sargonic and Ur III periods had been abolished.¹⁸⁹ This non-deification of Mari kings likewise applies in the case of the kispum and sheep sacrifices offered to (the statues of?) Sargon and Naram-Sin in Mari 12803. As the editor of this text pointed out, neither of these names is preceded by the dingir/ilu sign.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, that the kispum was presented first to Shamash and only then offered to Sargon and Naram-Sin in Mari 12803 further reflects the inferior status of the dead kings when compared to the high gods.

Pertinent in this regard is the fact which we pointed out earlier, namely that in the dispensary lists we find the dead kings and bureaucrats at Mari referred to only collectively.¹⁹¹ Recent research on Chinese and Japanese ancestor cults offers a plausible explanation for the collective grouping of the dead Mari kings and bureaucrats. Like their Far Eastern counterparts, the unidentified Mari royal ancestors might have merged into an impersonal collectivity by virtue of genealogical distance or they might have been perceived from the outset as only remotely influential with regard to the continuity of the current Mari

¹⁸⁹ Contra Hallo 1988:62-63 who, for the continued deification of dead kings, cited on p.62 n.51 the Bronze age archeological evidence from Ebla which we rejected in 2.1.5. and the literary data from Ugarit which we also reject, cf. ch. 3.


¹⁹¹ This argues against the practice of geneonymy or the commemoration of the dead by name at Mari whereas at Lagash, the collective term en-en-né-ne is followed by the listing of individual deceased kings and relatives along with their offerings and so suggestive of geneonymy.
dynasty. In either case the result is the same, the dead Mari kings were attributed little if any power to influence the lives of the living. Thus, in addition to its legitimating function, it would appear that the Mari cult functioned simply to provide care for the dead kings and bureaucrats.

In the absence of any textual witness from Mari for an articulated cosmography of the spirit world, we cannot be certain that these cultic rites presupposed an extended lore regarding the mode of existence of the dead. The lone mention of the term etemmum, that being of the Yahdun-Lim of ARMT 3:40, even if viewed as related to the royal ancestor cult—a point we shall grant for the sake of argument—does not obviate this fact.

From this we would infer that as a class, the Šarrānu were not perceived of as the immediate ancestors of the existing Amorite dynasty. Perhaps, they comprised the former non-Amorite dynasties at Mari and/or dynasties of the Mesopotamian heartland e.g., the ancient dynasty of Akkad as suggested by the mention of Sargon and Naram-Sin in Mari 12803. If this in fact were the case, then the mention of these two names would be exceptional and indicative of their commemoration.

Cf. Fortes 1976:8-11; Newell 1976:20-23; and Hardacree 1987:264. In the Japanese ancestor cults, the dead individual goes through a second symbolic death and after some time has lapsed requiring daily ritual attention is placed among the remote communal ancestors who no longer require regular care but nevertheless are commemorated in periodic community rites.

If we could be certain that the Yahdun-Lim of ARMT 3:40 was Zimri-Lim's father then we would have possible testimony to an individual ancestor of immediate continuity and therefore one with authority. Even so, in the light of our previous arguments, veneration would be the highest form of religious observance one could expect in this instance.

As we pointed out previously, these kispū may designate those intended to be placed at the grave at the time of burial "for the spirit of Yahdun-Lim" kispū ana etemmim ša Iaḥdun-Lim. On the funerary kispū offerings, cf. Tsukimoto 1980:123-38. In other words, this text might reflect only the concern to care for the weak spirit of Yahdun-Lim (father or son of Zimri-Lim?) as it completes the necessary rites de passage.
As we mentioned in ch. 1, we know of comparative examples where the dead are personified in the ancestor cult but where the intent is not to consign them or equip them for spiritual existence in a supernatural realm as might be the case with other types of mortuary practices. Rather the intent is to discorporate them from the social structure.\(^{196}\)

In conclusion, while it appears that in addition to deceased royalty other groups of politically prominent dead could receive *kispum* offerings, the evidence does not support the notion that at Mari the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the ancestors was embraced by the royal court. Moreover, evidence that might suggest that the same or other sectors of Mari society held to such a belief is entirely lacking. Neither a domestic ancestor cult, a death cult, nor, for that matter, necromancy is as yet attested at Mari.\(^{197}\)

---

\(^{196}\) Fortes 1965:125-29 and cf. Singleton 1977:18-25 who emphasizes the anthropocentric semi-personal spirituality, the atheistic religiousness, and evanescent eschatology of the African ancestor cult as opposed to the theism, afterlife, and substantial spirituality intrinsic to the epistemological framework which so often informs the analysis of ancestor cults in other societies by Westerners.

\(^{197}\) Notwithstanding the conjecture of Wilcke 1986:13 that the *kispum* Ša sarrānį mentioned in conjunction with the dream of one Dagan-naḫmiš in an extremely abbreviated text points to a necromantic rite. The *kispum* more likely indicated the required quality of payment or the intended destination of the payment for service rendered, namely the dream. In any case, we can recover nothing concerning the purpose and nature of the dream. For recent evidence for a private ancestor cult in the Old Babylonian heartland, see now the text *CBS* 473 in Wilcke 1983:49-54 and Kraus 1987:96-97. This text comprises a prayer to the moon god Sin on behalf of a commoner's deceased relatives of four generations to whom are offered bread and water. As it stands, it records no more than the care for the weakened dead. It dates to the thirty-third year of Ammiditana. For additional texts from the heartland, cf. Malamat 1989:97.
We shall now examine the oft cited evidence from Ugarit, the Nuzi data which have re-surfaced in current discussions, and the newly published enigmatic texts from Emar. In keeping with our goal of achieving a reasonable degree of comprehensiveness, we shall also briefly survey the textual material from Alalakh and El Amarna.

3.1. THE EVIDENCE FROM UGARIT

Like the transition from Ebla to Mari, the transition from Mari to Ugarit is not without reason. Besides their geographical and chronological proximity, we know that these two city-states had extensive cultural contact. Moreover, their religious traditions held several elements in common as illustrated by the many Syro-Palestinian deities which they shared.

---

1 Sasson 1984A:110-20 and 1984B:246-51 treats the frequent mention of Ugarit at Mari and their repeated diplomatic exchanges. Mari appears in an Ugaritic religious text as well, cf. KTU 1.100:78 (we note for the sake of completeness that Ugarit is also mentioned in the third millennium Eblaite geographical atlas).

Since their discovery, the Ugaritic texts have been examined repeatedly for second millennium Syro-Palestinian evidence supporting the Canaanite origin of Israelite death and ancestor cult practices.\(^3\) As we have pointed out previously, the resurgence of this approach owes much of its impetus to the recent publication of *KTU* 1.161 and the re-evaluation of previously published texts.\(^4\)

3.1.1. THE DAGAN STELAE

Two inscribed stelae were discovered in the rubble from a stone wall of a building identified as a temple in the eastern acropolis of Ugarit.\(^5\) The fact that the accompanying inscriptions, *KTU* 6.13 and 6.14, mention the god Dagan suggested to the Ras Shamra expedition that Dagan was patron deity of the adjacent temple.\(^6\)

\(^3\)This aligns with the interpretation of the material data by Schaeffer 1939:49-56; Sukenik 1940:59-65; and Angi 1971:1-93, but such an application of the material evidence is problematic, cf. 4.4.3.

\(^4\)Where possible, the Ugaritic texts will be cited according to their edition numbers in Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*, 1976, abbreviated *KTU*. In the case of the para-mythological texts, texts will be cited according to their respective chapter numbers in the new edition of Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques*, 1988, abbreviated *LTP*.

\(^5\)Concerning their discovery, see Schaeffer 1935:155-57 and pl. xxxvi.

Albright surmised that the two stelae were used in the cult of the dead at Ugarit and Roberts concluded that the inscriptions designated Dagan as the recipient of sacrifices for the dead. In support of the mortuary associations of the stelae and their inscriptions, Roberts argued for the underworld role of Dagan at Ugarit based on his mention in cuneiform texts from various sites, particularly those from Mari. Below, we offer our translation of the Ugaritic texts:

```
skn.d ṣ'lyt

tryl.l dgn.pgr

[ anál l 'akl

----------

pgr. d ṣ'ly

çon.l dgn.b'lh

[ anál b mḥrm/t

Roberts' assumption that Dagan is cited in these texts owing to his underworld role and that therefore these stelae function in the death cult is unwarranted. The various lines of

---


8 Roberts 1972:19.

9 The enigmatic bmhrm/t has been rendered "inviolable offering" Albright 1969:106 n.30 "in that order" so Ebach 1971:366; "sanctuary" with Ribar 1973:37 n.23 (following Mendenhall's suggestion based on Old South Arabic); "total destruction" so Healey 1977b:46, "total dedication" Healey 1986:30; "for total dedication" or "in the sacred precinct" with Healey 1988:106-07; "at the burnt offering altar" so Dietrich and Loretz 1983:297-98; "in the morning" so Spronk 1986:150; and "for the designated offering" with Lewis 1989:75 and n.23.
evidence adduced by Roberts in favor of Dagan's underworld role have each been addressed in the preceding chapter and none were found to be convincing.\textsuperscript{10} In other words, if these stelae and their inscriptions played a death or ancestor cult role, such a role must be established on other grounds.

Albright initially interpreted \textit{pgr} as "mortuary offering", but later as "funerary stele".\textsuperscript{11} Other proposals include "altar", "stele", "sacrifice", "corpse" or "(human) cadaver".\textsuperscript{12} The supposed parallelism between \textit{skn.d šc lyt} in 6.13 and \textit{pgr.d šc ly} in 6.14 has been cited as support for viewing \textit{pgr}, like \textit{skn}, as "altar" or "stele".\textsuperscript{13}

But the reverse argument has been employed by others in order to interpret \textit{skn} as "alimentary offering" in light of \textit{pgr} "sacrifice".\textsuperscript{14} The fact that in \textit{KTU 1.17:1:26}, \textit{skn} is "set up" or "erected" \textit{nšb} renders these latter proposals obsolete. In any case, contrary to general opinion, the two inscriptions evince dissimilar structures: 6.14 is elliptical in nature, for \textit{skn} in 6.13 has no genuine parallel.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} Cf. 2.2.2., 2.2.3., and 2.2.4. contra Roberts 1972:19 followed now by Lewis 1989:72-79.
\item \textsuperscript{11} Albright 1969:106 n.30 (originally published in 1942) and 1957:246 and cf. Ebach 1971:368.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Neiman 1948:57.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Dussaud 1935:178.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Cf. Ebach 1971:367; de Tarragon 1980:68; and Segert 1982:241. The last views the stelae as "quasi-parallel".
\end{itemize}
The function of the term *skn* might best be understood in the light of the Syrian cult of bêtyles now documented at Mari and Emar.16 In this cult, the *sik(k)anu(m)*, or sacred stone, was considered the abode of the deity, and at times, even the deity itself. If *skn* is to be identified with *sik(k)anu(m)*, then *skn* in our texts might likewise represent a sacred stone in which, so it was believed, the deity dwelt.17 Obviously in 6.13 and 6.14, the deity in question would be Dagan.

This new documentation also clarifies the meaning of *skn* in the mythological texts. In *KTU* 1.17:I:26, 44 and II:16, the phrase *skn* 'il'ib occurs. If, as we shall demonstrate below, 'il'ib refers, not to some deified ancestral spirit, but to the "gods of the fathers", that is, those worshipped by Danil's forefathers and identified in the god and offering lists as the members of the pantheon (cf. 3.1.3.), then *skn* 'il'ib probably refers to the "bêtyles of the gods of the fathers".18 Of particular interest to us is the frequent mention of Dagan in connection with the cult of bêtyles at both Mari and Emar.

A "bêtyle of Dagan" *sikkanum ša d Dagan* has been recently documented at Old Babylonian Mari.19 At Late Bronze Emar, the bêtyles were used in cultic ceremonies dedicated to Dagan. His

---


17 Following Durand 1985C:82 n.10.


19 Durand 1985C:81-83 [Text A 652:(3'-4'),11'].
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temple is also mentioned in the context.\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore, in the Emarite cult of bêtyles, a ritual is attested in which an animal was slaughtered and the bêtyles rubbed with its fat and blood. The remaining portions were then eaten by those in attendance. Again, the deity involved is Dagan. He shows up in some mysterious role during a related night vigil which in turn might suggest that his bêtyle was included among those used.\textsuperscript{21}

In the light of the data from Mari and Emar, we view (\textit{l})dgn in 6.13 and 6.14 as references to the two bêtyles (sknm) of Dagan upon which our two texts are inscribed. Thus, as at Emar, the ritual inferred from 6.13 and 6.14 might have entailed the rubbing of fat and blood of a sacrificial animal designated \textit{pgr} on a bêtyle of Dagan at Ugarit. This was followed by a communal meal (cf. 6.13:3 \textit{l'akl}).\textsuperscript{22}

We turn now to the meaning of \textit{pgr} in 6.13 and 6.14. Various lines of evidence converge to establish the general range of meaning of Ugaritic \textit{pgr} in offering contexts.\textsuperscript{23} The fact that \textit{pgr}

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{20} Arnaud 1986:338-46, 350-66, 369-70 [Texts 370:41, 43; 373; 375].
  \item\textsuperscript{21} So Arnaud 1980A:117 and 1981:34. Cf. now 1986:352, 359 [Text 373:57b-58a]: \textit{sikanati išš šuš ṭaš}ašu "The bêtyles are rubbed with fat and blood" and 11.196-97: "In the night vigil, Dagan passes among the bêtyles" \textit{ina pâni nubatti} 4Kur \textit{ina berât naš sikanāti etiq}. Perhaps, \textit{bmḥrt} in 6.14:3 should be rendered "by the morning light", that is, before daybreak in view of \textit{ina pâni nubatti}.
  \item\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Healey 1988:107 for an alternative interpretation of the function of these stelae as records of sacrifices originally set up in a sanctuary.
  \item\textsuperscript{23} In a severely damaged Ugaritic divinatory text recently published by Arnaud 1982B:217 [Text RS 1979-26], perhaps resembling the \textit{Summa izbu}, the editor read \textit{[pa]}\textit{grim} (1.6 '), a human corpse which receives mourning rites \textit{bakū} (cf. 1.12').
\end{itemize}
occurs with the causative of the verb  in 6.13 and 6.14 suggests its offertory function. This view of pgr finds additional support from the cognate pagrum / pagrāʿum found in offertory contexts at Mari. Another line of argument comes from the parallel structure of two other texts, KTU 4.182 and 4.316.

It is a well known fact that pgr designates the name of a month in the Ugaritic calendar yrḥ pgrm. In 4.182:35-40, the following sequence of months occurs: nql, mgmr, and pgrm, while in 4.316:1-5 (and cf. UT 1160:1-5), the sequence is nql, mgmr, and dbḥm. The former sequence is a partial representation of the consecutive order of months in the Ugaritic calendar. 24

Thus, the month officially designated pgrm was also depicted as a month characterized by the making of sacrifices dbḥm. Its use as the title of the month and, as we shall see forthwith, as an epithet of a major deity like Shapash, substantiates the relative importance of pgr in the Ugaritic cult.

The form  pgr occurs in 1.39:12,17 and 1.102:12. In 1.102, which comprises a list of divinities, pgr functions as a divine epithet somewhat analogous to Mari bēl pagrē, "(Dagan) lord of the slain animal sacrifice". 25 This is supported by the immediate context of 1.12 where each of the deities listed is

24 So de Tarragon 1980:26-28. For additional references to this month name, cf. 4.172:2; 4.193:2,7; 4.266:2; and 4.366:2.

accompanied by an epithet (ll.11ff.): "nt ḫbly špš pgr 'itln ḫnqtm. . . .

The offertory nature of pgr, its designation as an official calendar month, and its employment as a divine epithet indicate that the term not only signifies a class of cultic offerings, but that these offerings were of particular importance. Nevertheless, the identification of pgr as human sacrifice is unwarranted. To begin with, one can no longer resort to Mari pagrum / pagrāʾum and Dagan to buttress this position as we have demonstrated above.26

Moreover, in 1.39:12,17 špš pgr is followed by terms designating offerings, one grain w t rmnm, and one animal gdlt.27 The term gdlt may specify one kind of offering from the class pgr, while the conjunction w and t rmnm point to an independent class of offerings, probably meal offerings.28 These contexts neither suggest pgr "human sacrifice", nor do they offer any clue that mortuary matters are in view. This conforms with our findings with regard to Mari pagrum / pagrāʾum which has been identified as a slain animal intended for sacrifice (cf. 2.2.3. and 2.2.4.).

26 Cf. 2.2.2.-2.2.4. Dagan’s death cult role is not reflected in his equation with Enlil, contra Montalbano 1951:395 and most recently Wyatt 1980:377. For the texts CT 24:6:22 = 22.120, see Lambert 1967:131 and recall Enlil’s many roles unrelated to the netherworld. Dagan is associated with the underworld in a ritual commentary, cf. Lambert 1968B:109-10, but it is late, syncretistic, and Babylonian.


28 Cf. t rm alongside lḥm in 1.16:VI:11-12 and 1.18:IV:19, 29-30.
Therefore, the assumption that pgr is associated with mortuary matters owing to its being offered to two gods with supposed underworld connections, Dagan and Shapash, is unwarranted. Besides, Shapash, like Dagan, may have received a pgr offering for reasons other than her chthonic associations. In any case, not only Ugaritic pgr, but also Dagan, lack any death or ancestor cult associations.29

By way of conclusion, we must consider the archeological context of these two stelae.30 Both stelae were found outside the building in question, supposedly a MB temple. This edifice was identified as Dagan's temple solely on the basis of the texts inscribed on the two stelae, but there is little evidence otherwise for a Dagan temple at Ugarit (cf. 1.104:13). In fact, Tuttul is identified as Dagan's cult center at Ugarit (1.100:15). Besides, the building in question has been attributed to El.

Furthermore, the stele housed in Paris has a projection designed to fit a socketed base, but no such base is recorded in the report findings.31 This re-opens the relation of the MB building to the stelae. The persons named in 6.13 and 6.14 are identifiable members of the LB royal house (tryl 2.34:2 and c zn 4:93.II:8) and the use of the alphabetic script points to an LB period dating for the stelae.

Thus, it is very likely that the stelae had been completely removed from their original context and transported to the area


adjacent to the wall of the MB building. Not only does this favor the view that the stelae had no connection with the earlier temple, but it also points to the possibility that the stelae were intentionally buried at this location for the burial of such monuments is a well known practice. 32

3.1.2. A KISPUM-LIKE OFFERTORY TEXT

Another text which has been cited as evidence for an Ugaritic cult of the dead is 1.142:

\[ dbht. byy.bn \quad \text{Sacrifices of Byy, son} \]
\[ try^3. l \ c\tt[ ] \quad \text{of Try, for } c\tt[ ] \]
\[ d. b qbr \quad \text{who is in the grave.} \]

Commentators view the plural construct \textit{dbht} as food offerings to the deceased \textit{c\tt} and equate them with the \textit{kispum} offerings. According to this view, the mentioned offerings were brought to the grave subsequent to burial on a regular basis and

---

32 On the ritual burial of foreign gods, cf. Nielsen 1954:103-22. Besides entertaining the popular notion that Ugaritic \textit{yr\`h pgrm} and its Alalakh correspondent \textit{arah pagri} denoted a month in which funerary sacrifices were made (but see above and cf. 3.2.2.), Sasson 1966:136 n.57 suggested that during this month the gods, that is their statues, were buried either for cultic or practical reasons as they may have been in a deteriorated state.

33 Cf. Pardee 1989:42-43 who read \textit{try} against \textit{\$ry} of \textit{KTU}.
therefore indicative of death cult practices.\textsuperscript{34} However, such an interpretation is problematic.

1.142 is inscribed on a clay liver model. Like those found at Old Babylonian Mari, the twenty plus known liver models from Ugarit were collected in order to facilitate recognition, diagnosis, and prescription in the art of divination. Our model graphically records the description of the observed feature based on the analysis of a specific liver (= protasis), while the inscription records the concomitant instruction (apodosis). Thus, like the liver models from Mari, 1.142 reflects a particular historical occasion of a haruspicinal rite.\textsuperscript{35}

This leads to the conclusion that the sacrifices \textit{dbht} in 1.142 are not \textit{kispum}-like offerings made on a regular basis. The instruction to offer sacrifice may have coincided with the burial of \textit{c\_ttr[ ]}, in which case \textit{dbht} would show some affinity to the thrice attested \textit{kispum} offerings included with the burial (cf. 2.2.1.). Such offerings do not qualify as death cult practices, but reflect instead an occasionally attested funerary rite.

\textbf{3.1.3. THE DEITY 'Il'ib}

Another datum frequently cited as indicative of the existence of death or ancestor cult practices at Ugarit is the


term 'il'ib, often rendered "the divine ancestor/father". 36 According to this view, in 1.17:I:26 and II:16, a sacred stone is erected in honor of the divine ancestor: nṣb ṣkn 'il'ib, while in 1.109:19, libations and offerings are purportedly made on his behalf through the aperture leading to his tomb: b'urbt 'il'ib. 37

'Il'ib shows up frequently in cultic texts and is attested in the pantheon lists as well. 38 Moreover, the term occurs in two or three mythological passages in the Aqhat texts 1.17:I:26, 44(?) as 'il'ibh, and 1.17:II:16 as a 'il'iby. Morphologically speaking, interpreters have viewed these occurrences of 'il'ib in one of two ways. Either it comprises one word or is to be divided into two elements, 'il and 'ib. As one word, 'il'ib has been derived from the Arabic lexeme la'aba and translated "divinized sacred stone". 39

Others have related it to major deities attested elsewhere such as Akkadian Ilaba, Eblaite a-mu, or Hittite Zawalli, all of which supposedly represented deified ancestors at one stage or

---

37 Gray 1978:102; Xella 1981A:53-54; and Spronk 1986:145, 148-49 connect 'urbt with the tomb opening through which regular offerings were made to the dead. But in 1.4:V:23, 'urbt parallels ḫln, a palace lattice or window, cf. 1.4:VII:18. Besides, such tomb openings may have served as a means of ventilation or fumigation, cf. 4.4.3. The new datum RIH 78/20:3 ḫqṭ ṣurbtm "like incense from an aperture" supports this latter function for 'urbt.
38 Cf. 1.41:35; 1.56:3, 5; 1.87:38; 1.91:5; 1.109:12, 15, 19, 35; 1.138:2; 1.139:1; 1.148:10, 23 and RIH 77/28:3, 6 (= RIH 77/26:3, 6?). The alphabetic pantheon lists include 1.47:2; 1.118:1 and probably 1.74:1.
another. Be that as it may, a major deity is unlikely in the mythological contexts. The accompanying possessive suffixes -h and -y favor a personal god, a deified ancestor, or some other sacred object of worship. This fact has resulted in independent proposals for the mythic 'il'ib and cultic 'il'ib.

In the case of 'il'ib comprising two elements, a connection with the concept of deity is unanimously recognized for 'il. The term is attributed either an adjectival force, i.e., "divine" or a nominal one. With the exception of its mythological references, a nominal form 'il might render either the deity El or the more general "god(s)". While some have viewed 'il as the divine determinative based on this supposed function of 'il in the so-called Ugaritic king list 1.113 (on which, cf. 3.1.6.), this use is unlikely in the case of 'il'ib since none of the other gods listed in the cultic texts are so designated.

The second element, 'ib, has proven to be more problematic. It has been equated with 'ab, "father", with the added possibility of an adjectival force, i.e., "paternal". The vocalic change 'i > 'a has been explained variously.


So Lambert 1981:301.

Following Lambert 1981:301. This approach is assumed by de Moor 1980B:184-87 esp. n.66.

proposed "ghost, shade which returns to the earth".\textsuperscript{44} Hoffner offered, "sacrificial pit". Thus, 'il'ib "god of the pit" would be a member of the 'ilm 'argas, "the earth gods" (i.e., of the netherworld).\textsuperscript{45} According to this view, 'il'ib would be also a deity related to necromancy and the cult of the dead.

But behind Hoffner's proposal stands a complicated etymological and phonological argument.\textsuperscript{46} Furthermore, it is severely weakened by the fact that Ugarit offers no supporting evidence for the use of pits or a god of the pit in necromancy. Lastly, both of the above proposals ignore the approximate equations of the pantheon lists: Ugaritic 'il'ib (1.118:1) = Akkadian dingir abi (RS 20.24:1) = Hurrian enšt atn[ţ]m (1.116:12). The Ugaritic Hurrian represents a plural form "gods of the fathers", the significance of which we will detail below.

It would appear that the best solution to this dilemma is the recognition of two homonymous forms, 'il'ib. We would then have a major deity in the pantheon and offering lists and a divinized ancestor in the mythological texts.

In the case of the former, the most likely candidate appears to be Ilaba although another proposal has been offered "El, the father", the personification of El's fatherhood over all

\textsuperscript{44} Albright 1968:141-43, cf. Arabic 'āba "to return" and see further 4.3.2. for the possible connection of this Arabic root and Heb. 'ôb "One-Who-Returns".


\textsuperscript{46} Cf. the criticisms of Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín 1974:450-51 and Müller 1975:68-70 and for additional comments, cf. 4.3.2.
living things. This rendering has been suggested on the basis of reading 'il'ib 'ars wšmm in 1.148:23-25, but this is unlikely.47 While the ancestral spirits supposedly provide the least problematic approach for the mythological references to 'il'ib, it is at this juncture that interpreters part company.

For example, Lambert tends to interpret the 'il'ib of the mythological texts in the light of his proposed deity Ilaba of the pantheon and offering lists. The Old Akkadian god Ilaba, in a later form 'Il'ib, served everyone as a private family god.48 On the other hand, Healey concludes that the ancestral spirit of the mythic contexts also fits the lists. According to Healey, the Akkadian pantheon list from which Lambert based his proposal has a false etymology of a confused and obscure term.49

In what follows, we shall offer an alternative solution to this veritable impasse. As generally recognized, 'il'ib normally stands at the head of the various lists of gods. A notable exception is 1.47. Here, 'il'ib occurs in 1.2 and is preceded by 'il 珺n in 1.1, which has been interpreted either as the deified

47 The other proposals seem less likely. See 2.1.4. against d-a-mu. An Akkadian origin is prima facie more likely than a Hittite one. De Moor 1980B:184-86, in proposing "El, the father" overlooked the § offering separating 'il'ib and 'ars wšmm in 1.148:23-25 and reconstructed the highly conjectural reading dingir.ad ㎢ Ki [ú AN] in RS 26.142:13'-14', a fragmentary Ugaritic Akkadian pantheon list, cf. Nougayrol 1968:321.


49 Healey 1985:119 and cf. 1979:355 where he noted that its occurrence at the head of the pantheon might be explained by seeing here the divine ancestor par excellence.
mountain Zaphon or the god of Zaphon. The problem with both of these proposals is that mount Zaphon \( spn \) and Baal, the god of Zaphon, \( b\text{'l spn} \) are mentioned later in the list (1.47:5,15; and cf. 1.118:4,14; and RS 20.24:4,14). A better solution is to view 'il \( spn \) as a title or heading of the entire list or minimally of the first ten lines, "the gods of Zaphon".

We see a similar summarizing function for 'il'ib, both in the lists and in the Aqhat texts. In this case, both 'il and 'ib would comprise plural forms "the gods of the(/his/my) fathers", with the 'ib of the Aqhat texts standing for the fathers collectively. The data from the comparable god lists found at Ugarit are in agreement with this interpretation. To begin with, it is compatible with Akkadian dingir \( abi \). The latter, \( abi \), might be defective for the plural \( abbi \). Moreover, the absence of the plural indicator, whether it be the determinative \( ^m^m^l^l^l^l \) or

---

\(^{30}\)Mullen 1980:268-69 viewed 'il \( spn \) as "divine Zaphon", Baal's mountain, with the 'il element functioning as a divine determinative. De Tarragon 1980:156 conjectured an anonymous deity of Zaphon similar to 'il'ib, while Baal is favored by others.

\(^{31}\)Against the view of de Tarragon 1980:156, Healey 1985:117 noted that, unlike 'il'ib, 'il \( spn \) is never the recipient of worship either here or in its three remaining occurrences 1.3:III:29; IV:19; and 1.101:2. Moreover, its restoration in a lacuna in the offering list to gods, 1.148:1, is unjustified.

\(^{32}\)Following Healey 1985:117-18.

\(^{33}\)Lambert 1981:299 and de Moor 1980B:184 n.66 recognized the possibility of plural forms for both 'il and 'ib when followed by the suffixed pronouns -\( h \) and -\( y \) of the mythic texts.

\(^{34}\)So Lambert 1981:299.
reduplication of dingir, is not uncommon for forms intended to be read as such.55

The Hurrian evidence is particularly instructive for our purposes. The plural Hurrian en atnbn = enna attannibina "the gods of the father" is quite common.56 A similar Hurrian form probably occurs at Ugarit in a section comprising 11.10-29 of the offering text 1.116. As recognized by the original editor, the form in question, like its predecessor, functions as a title or heading for what follows. Both introduce the major gods who receive offerings in the cult. Like the Ugaritic alphabetic lists, this list begins with El:57

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wbbt.} & \text{ašžlm} \\
\text{enšt.} & \text{šlnnšt}m \\
\text{enšt.} & \text{atn[ ]}m \\
\text{eld.} & \text{tšbd} . . .
\end{align*}
\]

In the temple, sacrifice:
both to the šalanna gods, and to the gods of the fathers;
to El, to Teshub, etc. . . .

Laroche reconstructed the dative plural št = šta in atn[št]m = attanna[šta]ma making the form apposite to enšt = ennašta "the gods-fathers".58 He assumed that this was the plural

55With Healey 1985:119, the alternative remains that the Akkadian has a false etymology of a confused and obscure term.


58Xella 1981A:317 followed the reading of KTU intt atnt *t*[ ]m. Nevertheless, as the editors recognized, the two characters in question remain highly problematic.
of en atnd = en(n)i attannida. Nevertheless, Laroche recognized
the fact that the form en atnb = enna atannibina "the gods of
the father" is far more common. In the light of this fact, we
would read atn[ţ]m with the plural genitive and translate enšt
atnzm = ennašta attannaše-ma "to the gods of the fathers". This
form then is not the plural syntactic equivalent of en atnd.60

Finally, we mention an Akkadian cultic pantheon list from
Ugarit which exhibits several affinities to 1.118.61 We want to
highlight another it shares with 1.47 and 1.116. Like the lists
1.47 and 1.116, it begins with an introductory section containing
multiple headings. Each heading refers to a distinct group of
gods. RS 26.142 begins as follows (11.2'-4'):

[. . . . . . . .]  
[il]ānu [m* Y ]  sikkuru The gods of the bolts,  
ilānum* dadmema The gods of Dadmema?  
ilānum* labana The gods of Labana?  
d.dusbur.zi.níg.din Vase bur.zi.níg.din.  
d.is zannaru Lyre.


60 Laroche 1968:523. For the morphological justification of
our proposal, see Laroche 1968:530-32. He also noted the
ambiguity inherent in the determinative suffix or article -n in
Ugaritic Hurrian which can represent either the singular or
plural, and the intermingling of the genitive and dative plural
endings on nouns Y = še or šā.

61 For RS 26.142 and a discussion of the various elements
Another example of a god list from Ugarit which contains a
summarizing heading is PRU 6 132 (= RS 19.85) which begins with
ilānum* Ugarit "the gods of Ugarit" followed by the names of
individual gods, e.g., d IM, d Padrai, etc.
As in the other lists, a lengthy inventory of the major gods follows. Each is listed individually as the recipient of cultic offerings (11.7'-24'; 11.5'-6' list sacred implements).

Turning now to the cultic texts, we find that 'il'ib receives the greatest quantity of offerings. In 1.148:9b-10, 'il'ib is lavished with numerous offerings: 'alpm, ḫrm, gdlt, wšlmm, but each of the following individual gods including even El, is allocated only a single offering, either a š, or an 'alp. In 1.23, the term 'il'ib immediately follows 'il ḫyr which Xella understood as, "the gods of the month of Khyr", and like the 'il ḫyr, 'il'ib receives no offerings. However, each of the following individual deities receives a š offering. This supports our proposal that 'il'ib is used alongside 'il ḫyr, as an abridgment of the individual gods "the gods of the month of Khyr" and "the gods of the fathers".

In 1.91:2-5, 1.109, and RIH 77/2B, 'il'ib heads a list of deities who receive offerings from the king. In 109:12,15,19, the offerings made to 'il'ib again far outnumber those designated for the individual gods. In RIH 77/2B:3, 'il'ib is offered gold and silver, then a series of other offerings (1.6) before El is ever mentioned (1.7). The significant difference in the kind and amount of offerings made to 'il'ib as opposed to the remaining gods, including El the high god, is best understood when 'il'ib

---

62 Cf. Xella 1981A:93 who wrongly attributed to 'il'ib, the following š offering which instead goes with arš w šmm of the next line. In 1.109:19, the phrase w b 'uurbt 'il'ib has a similar introductory function and the same sequence, sacrifice + recipient, follows; š b l, etc.
is viewed as "the gods of the fathers", the gods viewed collectively.

This interpretation works in the mythological references as well. Thus, "one who sets up the bêtyles of the gods of his/my fathers" $nsb$ $skn$ 'il'ibh/y, would no longer comprise a reference to the divinized ancestors, but to those well-known gods of the pantheon worshipped by the royal predecessors. Furthermore, our proposal for 'il'ib gains support from the īlāni abbî or dingir.$^{63}$. The cuneiform sources "the gods [of] the fathers". These were not the divinized ancestors, but well known members of the pantheon and, in particular, the personal gods of the royal dynasties.$^{63}$

3.1.4. THE DUTIES OF THE FAITHFUL SON

Several scholars have seen evidence for an ancestor cult in the Aqhat text, 1.17:1:26-33. According to this line of argument, the ideal son is one who "sets up the stele of his divine ancestors" $nsb$ $skn$ 'il'ibh as an act of filial piety (1.26).$^{64}$


Our interpretation of this line and its immediate context are reflected in the following translation and defended below:

\[\text{n}sb.\text{skn.}\ 'il'ibh.\  \text{One who sets up the stelae of his fathers' gods,}\]
\[\text{bgdš\ ztr.}'\text{cmh.}\  \text{in the sanctuary, the marjoram of his clan(?);}\]
\[\text{l'ars.\mšs}'u.\qtrh\ \text{from the earth, one who sends up his smoke,}\]
\[\text{l}c\text{pr.}\text{,amr.}'\text{atrh.}\  \text{from the dust, one who protects his chapel;}\]
\[\text{ṭbq.\lht\ n'ish}\  \text{one who puts the lid on his revilers' abuse,}\]
\[\text{grš.d.}"y.\lnh\  \text{one who expels those who act against him;}\]
\[\text{ahd.ydh.\bškrn.}\  \text{one who holds his hand when he is drunk,}\]
\[\text{mc\ msh}\ [k]\Šb\c\ yn.\  \text{one who carries him when he is sated with wine;}\]
\[\text{sp'u.\ksmh.bt.\bśl}\  \text{one who serves his wheat/corn in Baal's temple,}\]
\[\text{[mt]nth.bt.}'\text{il.}\  \text{his grain offering in El's temple;}\]
\[\text{ṭh.\ggh.bym\ [ṭ'i]t}\  \text{one who plasters his roof on a miry day,}\]
\[\text{ṛḥs.npš.bym.ṛt}\  \text{one who washes his clothes on a filthy day.}\]

The crucial terms for the ancestor cult interpretation are 'il'ibh, ztr, 'cmh, and qtrh. The second, ztr, is a hapax legomenon and has had numerous explanations. Recent defenders of the ancestor cult interpretation offer "thyme" or "marjoram", the latter being supposedly attested elsewhere in mortuary rites.\textsuperscript{65}

While the third term is generally viewed as the preposition 'cm with the suffixed pronoun, the minority dissenters offer "his clan", that is, those members long gone, which for them poses a

\textsuperscript{65}For "thyme", cf. Pope 1977B:164 and 1981:160 n.4 and for "marjoram", cf. de Moor 1986:407-09, both derived from Akkadian zatēru, Arabic zā' tar. This is preferable to adopting a Hittite loanword from sittar "votive (sun) disk" for which see now Avishur 1986:51.
fitting parallel to 'il'ibh "his divine ancestors". Most interpreters agree on the meaning of qtrh. It has to do with smoke or incense like its Semitic cognates, although the less likely alternatives "vapor" or "spirit" have been suggested.

The first term 'il'ib was treated above and the supposed ancestor cult connections were rejected. Nevertheless, should the context of 1.17:1:26 point to such connections, then our interpretation of 'il'ib must be reconsidered. While de Moor's reading of "marjoram" for ztr is possible, this argument stands or falls with his reading of zc tr in 1.43:3 and the supposed death cult context of that text. However, both the reading zc tr and the death cult interpretation of 1.43 are questionable. His reading of zc tr is based on the photograph in Herdner against the more recent KTU edition which reads an erasure (cf. 1.3 below):

---


De Moor translates these lines as follows:
"When Athtartu of Hurri enters the pit, // the house of the
king serves a banquet in the house of the star // gods.
Marjoram of death, // a garment and a chemise, neck-piece of
gold . . . . ."

The term gb in 1.43:1 may denote any convex shaped object, e.g.,
a room, a grotto, a mound, a (human) back, an eyebrow, a cistern,
but for Ugaritic, "pit" is tenuous at best.69 Furthermore, the
syntax of 11.2-3 is difficult owing to the problematic word
division and traces of the erased letter. De Moor's "star gods",
'ilm kbkbm, if indeed these two terms are to be syntactically
related, designate heavenly beings, not netherworld deities.70
Lastly, gtrm of 11.9-17, which has been viewed as one of the dual
divinized ancestors Gathar-waYaqar, does not secure the ancestral
cult interpretation of 11.1ff. The term probably has to do with
strength, Akkadian gašru, thus "the strong ones".71

---

69 Cf. de Tarragon 1980:100-01 for a summary of other interpretations of gb.
70 As recognized even by his student Spronk 1986:157.
71 Contra Spronk 1986:158 and cf. pp.181-82. The form gtr in
1.108:2, which is crucial to his argument, is very problematic
owing to the damaged context: [--]gtr.w yqr. In any case, the two
forms may represent epithets, not names of deceased ancestors,
the further listing of epithets in 1.108:6ff.
The term $cmh$ has been understood as qualifying $ztr$ in the following manner, "the $ztr$ of (offered to) his clan" that is, those members long gone i.e., his divine ancestors as elaborated by the parallel 'il'ibh. But apart from this alleged instance, $cm$ in Ugaritic never has this meaning. In more than 150 occurrences it represents the preposition "with".\textsuperscript{72} Even if clan is meant, a death cult interpretation remains uncertain. At best, we can only identify an unknown temple ceremony involving perhaps marjoram.

We know that incense was used in Mesopotamian mortuary rites during Neo-Assyrian times.\textsuperscript{73} In the text at hand, $qtr$ may simply reflect a funerary rite in which incense was placed at the tomb for aromatic purposes. Others have taken $qtr$ as (also) alluding to the spirit of the departed, but this has little to commend it as parallels are lacking in the treatments advocating this position.\textsuperscript{74}

In any case, we are not obliged to see a death cult ceremony in 1.17:1:27, for if it is the departure of the spirit to the otherworld that is in view, its arrival there may have merely concluded the funerary and mourning rites.\textsuperscript{75} Funerary and mourning rites are among those comprising the heir's duties at

\textsuperscript{72}Pope 1977:163-64 followed by Pardee 1980:288.

\textsuperscript{73}Cf. e.g., the text cited in Bayliss 1973:123-24.

\textsuperscript{74}So Caquot and Sznycer 1974:422 n.q; De Moor 1986:409; and Spronk 1986:149. Healey 1979:356 concluded that while man's life departs like smoke $km.qtr$ (cf. 1.18:IV:25-26,37 and add $kqtr$ 'urbtm in RIH 78/20:3), there is no evidence of $qtr$ meaning "ghost", but this subjective approach is necessitated only by adhering to a strict synonymous parallelism for 11. 28-29.

\textsuperscript{75}Thomas 1987:450-59. esp. pp.451-52 has cited cases where the spirit's arrival in the afterworld concludes the funerary rites.
Nuzi. In any case, qṭr might refer to the smoke rising from the household fires in light of the succeeding clause.

Protecting the "place", 'aṭr, from dust hardly refers to a cultic location where death cult practices were enacted as the rendering of 'aṭr as "mortuary chapel" is dubious. The Akkadian asirtu cited in support simply denotes a cultic room in a private house. The term ksm in 1.31 is not to be equated with Akkadian kispum. Rather, in view of its use in the sacrificial contexts of 1.41:19, 1.87:20, 1.39:9, 4.269:4,20,30 and 4.345:2,4,9 and the parallel [mt]nth "grain offering" in 1.32, ksm designates a grain served sp'u, not eaten, by the offerer at the temple.

In sum, we would propose that like the other duties of the faithful son mentioned, those in 11.26-28,31 were observed while the father was alive, yet inebriated or perhaps afflicted as in the case with the duties of roof mending and garment washing (11.29-30,32-34). The rites involving marjoram ztr and incense qṭr refer to those expected of the ideal son, like those of the ideal king, in service to the gods rather than to the dead.

---

76 So Greenfield 1982:311.

77 Following Gaster 1950:275-76 and n.2.

78 Contra Albright 1944:35 n.38 and Ginsberg 1969:150.


80 Cf. the deeds of Idrimi in Oller 1977:16 (11.88-91) for the tasks expected of the ideal king in service to the gods.
3.1.5. THE UGARITIC VERSION OF THE \textit{MARZÉAH}

Opinion is divided over the supposed death and ancestor
cult associations of the Ugaritic version of the \textit{marzéah}. Some
recognize the \textit{marzéah} solely as a death cult institution while
others fail to see any connection between the two. Also there are
those who maintain that the death cult depicts only one aspect of
1968:179-86 viewed the death and ancestor cult connections of the
Ugaritic \textit{marzéah} as its most important feature. Eissfeldt
1969:187-95; L'Heureux 1979:206-12, 218-21 and Fabry 1984:
cols.11-16 argued that it has nothing to do with mortuary
matters. Others such as Greenfield 1973:48-49, 1974:451-55; de
1988B:34-37 considered the death and ancestor cult relations as
only one of its aspects.}

The number of proposed cognate etymologies serves to
underscore this disparity of opinion: \textit{rzh} "to cry out", \textit{rzh} "to
unite oneself", \textit{rzh} "to make a noise, to be loud", \textit{rzh} "to fall
down from weakness and remain prostrate without power to rise".
Nevertheless, not only are these generally unconvincing, they are
all but nullified by the equally plausible explanation of the
origin of the term as a non-Semitic loanword of unknown
meaning.\footnote{Eissfeldt 1966:165-76 held that \textit{rzh} "to cry out" reflected
the Israelite \textit{marzéah}, while \textit{rzh} "to unite oneself" represented
the practices of the \textit{marzéah} of the Syrian religious world. Pope
1972:193-94 suggested the third etymology, while Greenfield
1974:452 and Greenfield and Avigad 1982:125 n.32 concluded that
an unknown foreign loanword is in view. Meyer 1979:603-04 offered
what appears to be a variation on \textit{rzh} "to cry out" with his "to
make a noise, to be loud".}

As we pointed out earlier, Ebla perhaps records the
earliest attestation of the term \textit{mar-za-\textit{w}}, but for the present

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{rzh} "to cry out"
\item \textit{rzh} "to unite oneself"
\item \textit{rzh} "to make a noise, to be loud"
\item \textit{rzh} "to fall down from weakness and remain prostrate without power to rise"
\end{itemize}
the Eblaite evidence offers no help *vis-à-vis* the mortuary connections of the West Semitic *marzēah* (cf. 2.1.3.). The same can be said for the proposal that the *marzēah* institution was known at Mari and Amarna. At Ugarit, the term occurs in numerous economic and legal texts and in one mythological context, 1.114:15. Based on the presumed equation of Ugaritic *mrzh* and *mrzc*, it has been restored elsewhere and thereby associated with the *rp'um*, the supposed dead ancestors (cf. *m*(?)rzcy in 1.21:11, a Rephaim text).

Matters *marzēah* have changed little since the cogent summary outlined by Greenfield over a decade and a half ago. The Ugaritic *marzēah* had both institutional and cultic functions. As a matter of practice, it comprised an assembly which celebrated a festival dedicated to a specific deity, e.g., Anat, (4.642:1-7) or Shatrana (RS 15:70:4,7,11,16; without determinative).

---


87 For *RS* 15.70, see Nougayrol 1955:130 and pl.17.
Nevertheless, the conclusion that the Ugaritic version of this festival, like the much later Greek thiasos, was characterized by wanton drinking is tenuous at best. The evidence for this generalization is based on a single passage—one which is found in a mythological context—and therefore cannot be pressed too far: 'il yšt bmržh yšt [.y]n. ʾd šbr "El continues to sit at his marzēḥ, he drinks wine to satiety" 1.114:15-16.

Eissfeldt, for example, assumed a rigid correspondence between the divine and earthly versions of the marzēḥ at Ugarit. But as Sasson has noted, in the absence of confirming evidence from the administrative texts, reconstruction of historical elements from myth is problematic. Besides, a lone reference cannot prove that wanton drinking was characteristic of a practice otherwise well attested at Ugarit.

As an institution, the marzēḥ had its own special meeting place, ʾé lūʾ mar-zē/za-i "the house of the men of the marzēḥ" (RS 15.70:4, 7 and 15.88:4). Another text depicts the actual establishment of a marzēḥ institution, mrzh d qny šmnm b.bt w "the marzēḥ which Shamuman established in his house" (3.9:1-4). Shamuman functioned as the head or rb of the marzēḥ (3.9:12). Its members comprised the higher economic strata of society. This is confirmed by the mention of a large sum of money in a broken

---

90 For RS 15.88, see Nougayrol 1955:88 and pl.20.
These funds were either the high penalties imposed on its members for breach of contract (3.9:11) or the dues required for membership (3.9:17).

In addition to a house, the marzēāḥ owned such valuable property as fields and vineyards, šd kr[m] (4.642:3) and eqel karāni (RS 18.01:5). It also had state sanction since the reigning king transferred and confirmed ownership of marzēāḥ property, "Ammishtamru, son of Niqmepa, king of Ugarit" (RS 15.70: 2-3, 19-20) and "Niqmepa, son of Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit" (RS 15.88:2-3). A member of the marzēāḥ was designated "a man of the marzēāḥ" alphabetic mt mrzh (3.9:13), syllabic lúẹ́ẹ́ marziḥi (RS 14:16:3, etc.) or "a son of the marzēāḥ" bn mrzh (4.399:8). As we noted above, the head of the organization was given the title rb.

But what evidence exists that would suggest any mortuary associations of the Ugaritic marzēāḥ? The Ugaritic evidence cited in past discussions consists of two texts, 1.114 and 1.21. Otherwise, the mortuary connections of the West Semitic marzēāḥ date from later periods and originate in other locations.
While most interpreters view 1.114 simply as a divine drinking bout, Pope has attempted to reconstruct a death cult ritual in this text, but we remain unconvinced of his argument.\(^{97}\) First, his citation of a late isolated rabbinic use of Aramaic \(\text{šūdnītā}\)' a cognate of \(\text{šd}\) in 1.1, in a funerary context must be evaluated over against the widely recognized use of Ugaritic \(\text{šd}\) as the verb "to give a banquet" without any connection with mortuary rites.\(^{98}\) This is a foundational datum for Pope's interpretation.

Second, his interpretation of \(\text{yrḥ gbh}\) "mixed his tripe" in 11.4-5 as a reference to the drinking of juices from a deceased relative's body must be evaluated in light of the regular use of \(\text{yrḥ}\) as a reference to the moon god Yarikh (or simply "month"). In no other instance in the Ugaritic corpus does this form obtain a meaning connected with moisture or liquids as Pope presupposes.\(^{99}\)

Pope cited \(\text{klb}\) in 11.5,12 as further evidence for a death cult context. The widely attested role of dogs in death cult rituals of divergent cultures prompted this hypothesis.\(^{100}\) But, ______________


\(^{98}\) With Loewenstamm 1980:372,410-22 against Pope 1977B:175. Others view the form as derived from a verb "to give chase, roam" attested in Ugaritic, Arabic, and Akkadian, cf. e.g., Cathcart and Watson 1980:41,44.

\(^{99}\) Pope 1977B:179.

\(^{100}\) Pope 1977B:183-89. Pope's additional arguments are still less convincing. The forms \(\text{yrṭqṭ}\) 1.5 and \(\text{ylnn}\) 1.8 may denote noises made to drive away the ghosts, so Pope 1977B:181, but this hinges on his prior arguments as does his view of El's drunken stupor as an experience of death intended to join the worlds of
not only did Pope fail to identify the dog's exact function in our text, others have seen klb in 11.5,12(?) as references to the canine-like behavior of the inebriated moon god.\textsuperscript{101} In any case, Virolleaud failed to restore klb in 1.5 in the editio princeps, but rather left the space blank. Moreover, his reading of rib in 1.12 was confirmed by the editors of KTU and Pardee, while the editors of KTU and Pardee tentatively read $k^*l^*b^*$ in 1.5.\textsuperscript{102}

We turn now to the references in the Rephaim texts, and in particular 1.21:II:1 (cf. also 11.5,9). The actual form attested in these texts is mrzc which, beginning with Eissfeldt, has been viewed as a variant of Ugaritic mrzh. This conclusion is based on what is perceived to be orthographic variants in the Ugaritic Akkadian texts: mar-zi-i (RS 18.01:7,10) and mar-zi-\hi (RS 14.16:3).\textsuperscript{103}

However, it is not at all certain that the phoneme \hi which lies behind mar-zi-\hi (RS 14.16:3) ultimately lies behind mar-zi-i and mar-za-i (RS 15.88:4,6), both of which presume the presence of the phoneme \c. The equation is based \textit{a priori} on the equation of the similar alphabetic forms. This not only betrays a

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. Loewenstamm 1969:72,74; L'Heureux 1979:160,166; Margalit 1979-80:69,81-82; and Cathcart and Watson 1980:37 and note KTU's reading km klb in 1.5. Spronk 1986:198-99 took an approach which both eliminates Pope's view and avoids the function of klb as a simile.


\textsuperscript{103} So Eissfeldt 1969:195. Similarly, L'Heureux 1979:142 n.43 added that the \c is the voiced equivalent to the unvoiced \hi evincing a supposed partial assimilation to the voiced z.
circularity of reasoning, but creates other obstacles as well. First, the intervocalic voicing of *h* to *c* would be exceptional for Ugaritic Akkadian.\textsuperscript{104}

Furthermore, the resultant vocalization based on *mar-za-i* would be *marzaḥi*, a *maqtil* form, but this is not what we would expect based on the remaining Ugaritic forms and Hebrew *marzēah*. We would expect *marzihi*, a *maqtal* form.\textsuperscript{105} In other words, with regard to the occurrences of the Ugaritic form of *marzēah*, the syllabic writing system at Ugarit is as ambiguous as the alphabetic.\textsuperscript{106}

Even if the underlying assumption that the *rpʿum* represented chthonic beings were the correct one, and this is by no means certain (cf. 3.1.7.), their relation to the *marzēah*, actually *mrz*\textsuperscript{c} in 1.21:II:1.5,9, remains ambiguous owing to the damaged state of the passages in question and the absence of the requisite data proving such a presumed correlation.\textsuperscript{107}

Furthermore, even if we were to assume that *marzēah* is mentioned in these passages, we have the added issue of the host who invited the *rpʿum* to the *marzēah*. If it is El, as suggested by 11.8-9 *wy*c n *ʿil* [ *mrz*\textsuperscript{c}]y. "And El replied . . . my *marzēah*", \textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. Huehnergard 1987:278.

\textsuperscript{105} Huehnergard 1987:271-2.


\textsuperscript{107} L'Heureux 1979:206-12 and Fabry 1984:col.13 dismissed the death cult associations of the *marzēah* at Ugarit and rejected the underworld connections of the *rpʿum*.
then we have a divine banquet of which the mythic heroes or rp'um are a part.\textsuperscript{108}

Finally, even if one concluded, based on this lone datum, that the marzêah played a part in the Ugaritic death and ancestor cults, one clearly cannot extrapolate from this that such a role was an important one, for the numerous legal and administrative texts indicate otherwise. They lack any death cult associations, but rather focus on the economic-social interests of its members.

These concerns rather than the hypothetical funerary connections of the marzêah or, for that matter, the drinking habits of its members, lie behind each of its references. \textsuperscript{114} El's banquet, is no exception, for, while drinking is a major part of the plot, only the underlying social setting remotely resembles what can be confidently reconstructed from the administrative and legal texts, namely a festive occasion celebrated by the highest echelons of the social structure. In conclusion, we reject any association of the Ugaritic marzêah with mortuary matters.\textsuperscript{109}

\textbf{3.1.6. THE UGARITIC KING LIST}

Frequently, \textit{KTU} 1.113 has been cited as evidence for the existence of a royal ancestor cult at Ugarit. Two particulars of the text have occasioned this interpretation: the repeated

\textsuperscript{108}Cf. similarly L'Heureux 1979:142. Pope 1972:192 preferred Danil whom he viewed as mourning the death of his son Aqhat and inviting the shades of the dead, the rp'um, to his marzêah.

\textsuperscript{109}Lewis 1989:80-88 likewise recently held out against the mortuary nature of the Ugaritic marzêah.
element 'il which precedes what have been identified as the names of former Ugaritic rulers on the reverse of the text and what appears to be some sort of cultic ceremony recorded on the obverse, the exact nature of which has eluded interpreters: 110

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBVERSE</th>
<th>REVERSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 [ ]x w rm tph</td>
<td>12 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]l'umm l ncm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]w rm tblm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]pr l ncm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [ ]x mt w rm tph</td>
<td>16 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]hbr l ncm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]ymgy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]r*m tblm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]cm</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The so-called Ugaritic king list, particularly its obverse, has been described as having some affinities with the genres of ritual, incantation, prayer, and hymn. However, Pardee has pointed out that 1.113 lacks the terminology of the Ugaritic rituals. Moreover, the genre of prayer is inadequate, for 1.113 has far less repetition than the Ugaritic prayer 1.119. Likewise, if by hymn certain Biblical psalms are meant, we lack Ugaritic parallels. While the repetition of formulae might be reflected in a psalm such as 136, this is too late to provide a working model for 1.113.

Although 1.113 reveals a curious absence of ritual terminology, it is wrought with mythological vocabulary e.g., tp, tlb mgy, and rm. This fact along with the poetic form of 1.113 and its presumed mortuary correlations led Ribichini and Xella to the conclusion that 1.113 and 1.161 shared the same cultic function. But, if, as we shall argue in 3.1.9., 1.161 represents a coronation text with accompanying funerary liturgy (and not the Ugaritic version of the regularly observed kispum ritual), then such similarities miss the point. Besides, we shall argue below that 1.113 has an altogether different function.

111 Kitchen 1977:140.
113 For 1.119, see Watson 1984:360-62 and the bibliography cited there.
114 The term tp "tambourine" occurs in the mythological context of 1.16:1:41 and with tlb "flute" in 1.108:4. mgy and rm show up in poetic and mythological contexts. The hapax legomenon l'umm might be the poetic form of "peoples", so Pardee 1988:170.
115 Ribichini and Xella 1979:150 n.29.
Pardee has classified 1.113 as a "para-mythological" text, that is, one which employs mythological elements for practical ends. He further identified its setting as a festival in which the dead divinized Ugaritic kings were invoked by the accompaniment of music. It has a supposed parallel in the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty wherein the dead kings are also apparently invoked. Furthermore, the obverse shows similarities to 1.100 in its tendency for word repetition and etched horizontal lines separating the poetic stanzas.\textsuperscript{116}

The incantation text 1.100 exhibits a repeated summons addressed to twelve different deities. While 1.113 contains no explicit mention of known deities, the address in 1.100 might provide a working model for understanding the enigmatic \textit{n} \textit{c} \textit{m} in ll.2,4,6, and 10 of the obverse. This term has been identified as the title of a living king summoned to the ceremony.\textsuperscript{117} It is used as a title for the legendary heroes Keret and Aqhat of the mythological texts, both of which were possibly kings.

But it is a gross inaccuracy to state that the term is not applied to deities.\textsuperscript{118} It is so used in 1.23:1,23,60, and 67 in reference to Shahar and Shalim, the \textit{'i} \textit{l} \textit{m} \textit{n} \textit{c} \textit{mm}, and in 1.24:25 in reference to the moon god Yarikh, \textit{n} \textit{c} \textit{mn} \textit{'i} \textit{l} \textit{m}.\textsuperscript{119} This fact coupled with the invocation of gods depicted in the literary parallel

\textsuperscript{116}Pardee 1988:170,172,175-78.


\textsuperscript{119}Cf. Del Olmo Lete 1981:429 and p.453 respectively.
1.100 argue in favor of identifying ncm in 1.113 as a title of a god. This is given added support by the use of the tambourine, tp, and flute, tlb, in a benediction to the god Rp'u 1.108:4.\textsuperscript{120}

Interpreters who assume that an ancestor cult context stands behind the ceremony reflected in 1.113 have proposed several deities for ncm: Baal, Rp'u, Malik, or Mot.\textsuperscript{121} However, in the absence of decisive evidence from the context, the identity of the god titled ncm remains for the present enigmatic.

In spite of the widely accepted position that 1.113 records rites directed to the dead divinized kings of Ugarit there is, in actuality, slim textual basis for this view, that is apart from a predisposition to interpret 'il + RN as a reference to a deified king. As we noted in 2.1.1., Liverani offered a better interpretation of the text. He concluded that the repeated element 'il + RN referred not to rituals aimed at deified defunct Ugaritic kings, but to those dedicated to the personal god(s) of former kings.\textsuperscript{122}

His proposal gains support from 1.100 and 1.108. The address to the numerous deities in 1.100 and the use of the same musical instruments in 1.108 in the benediction to the god Rp'u, point to 1.113 as a text associated with a ritual directed toward the deity. Like 1.100, 1.113 more likely reflects a ceremony in which a god or gods are invoked, not deceased royalty. As in the

\textsuperscript{120} The mention of these instruments in two different texts is not sufficient evidence alone to identify Rp'u as the god of 1.113.

\textsuperscript{121} Cf. Pardee 1988:170-71 for a survey of proposals.

\textsuperscript{122} Liverani 1974:340-41.
case of the Eblaite king list, 1.113 comprises a list of dead kings each successively associate with the dynastic personal god known by all and so designated by the generic term 'il. The text was recited in the cult so as to legitimate the current dynasty.

Recall that our interpretation of 'il + RN finds a precedent in the Sumerian royal inscriptions where the personal god of the king was identified by means of dingir + RN, 'il + RN's corresponding cuneiform formula also attested in the Eblaite king list. As we pointed out, the personal god of king Entemena of Lagash is identified as dšulutula dingir En-te-me-[na] "Shulutula, god of Entemena".123

While the exact identity of the god(s) in 1.113 remains obscure to the modern reader, undoubtedly common knowledge sufficed to identify the name of the deity of the royal dynasty designated 'il + RN.124 Common knowledge might also explain the significance of another rubric as well. The dynastic personal god along with other gods worshipped by the royal family might be referred to collectively in the Ugaritic term 'Il'ib "the gods of the fathers" discussed earlier. In fact, the identity of some of these gods is probably to be found in the names of those deities listed under the rubric 'Il'ib in the cultic texts (cf. 3.1.3).

123 Cf. Vorländer 1975:9 and cf. pp.151-52 for possible examples from Syria-Palestine of the second through first millennia B.C.E.

124 Pardee 1988:173 n.25 rejected Liverani’s view and cited the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty in favor of the ancestor cult connections of 1.113, but the chronological proximity of the Genealogy is not close, it was used on the lone occasion of Ammisaduqa’s coronation, none of the listed individuals are divinized, and so its assumed ancestor cult affiliations are highly conjectural, cf. our treatment in 3.1.7.1.
In the light of the text's mention of musical instruments, ncm, in our view, would refer to an anonymous singer who performs for the gods as ncm does in 1.3:1:19. Alternatively, ncm might depict an individual granted an affirmative omen having enticed the gods for a verdict with music. Thus, we conclude that, like the Eblaite king list, 1.113 comprises a list of the former kings with each associated with the dynastic personal god. In the light of the text's obvious concern with dynastic continuity, this god in all likelihood was to receive cultic ritual for the purpose of political legitimation.

It goes without saying that we reject the related proposals that 1.113 exhibits similarities with either 1 Samuel 28, an account of necromancy, the marzēāḥ, or the kispum. First, there is no indication that the invocation had as its goal a divine revelation as in 1 Samuel 28. Second, the Ugaritic marzēāḥ knows no practice involving music or singing, not to mention that its mortuary connections are in doubt. Finally, music has yet to appear in the kispum ritual and 1.113 makes no mention of kispum-like offerings. Even if we could establish its mortuary

---

125 So Levenson 1985:66.

126 What we have proposed remains possible in spite of the fact that the exact nature of the ritual reflected in the text remains uncertain in every detail. We should also note that Schaeffer 1963:215 suggested that two distinct scripts revealing two independent hands are present on the obverse and reverse and so the texts of the two sides might not be related. Of course, if this is indeed the case, it eliminates a major datum for the ancestor cult adherents.

associations, 1.113, like 1.161, might reflect a ceremony intended for a single occasion.

As a final note, we should make mention of Del Olmo Lete's thesis that Ugaritic theophoric names such as ydb'il, y'arš'îl, c'mtr, etc., of 1.106 and 1.102 represent the dead, deified dynastic ancestors who, along with the major deities mentioned, receive cultic offerings, e.g. gdlt (cf. 1.106:3-5). These three names also occur alongside the name yrgbbîl in 1.102:16-20. According to Del Olmo Lete, yrgbît is a title of king Niqmaddu based on 1.6:VI:57-58, nqmd mlk 'ugrt 'adn yrgb bîl t_rmn, "Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit, Lord, Baal terrified, Trmn".128 Nevertheless, Del Olmo Lete's proposal is heavily dependent upon those works in which the diffusion of ancestor and death cults at Ugarit is a given.129 Therefore, we question his view of such texts as 1.113 and 1.161 (cf. 3.1.9.) and such entities as the rp'um (cf. 3.1.7.) which are frequently cited in support. In any case, the types of theophoric names which he treated were usually attributed to living persons. In fact, it has been argued that these names are those of living officials of high ranking who brought offerings to the cult.

Stamm pointed out that the recipients of offerings in 1.106:1-2, which are known deities for the most part, are preceded by the l preposition, e.g. l ršp hgb cšrm and l 'inš

128 Del Olmo Lete 1986A:55-71 and 1986B:83-95. Del Olmo Lete 1986B:84 classified the above three names as 'inš 'ilm "divine persons" (cf. 1.106:2) and located them in 1.39:20-21, a sacrificial agenda supposedly related to the royal funerary liturgy where the phrase 'inš 'ilm occurs again.

129 In particular, he drew upon the works of de Tarragon 1980:167 and Xella 1981A:83-84.
'ilm Šrp, whereas the offerers, including the above three names, as in 11.3-5, precede the mention of their gift, e.g. PN + gdlt.\textsuperscript{130} In any case, \textit{yrgbbc} l in 1.6:VI:58 has been identified as a place name found in Tuthmosis III's toponymic list.\textsuperscript{131}


\textsuperscript{131} On \textit{yrgbbc} l as a possible place name in 1.6:VI:58, see Herdner 1978:4-5.
3.1.7. THE UGARITIC RP’UM

In the six decades since the discovery of the Ras Shamra texts, the rp’um have been categorized as gods, shades of the dead, and/or living persons.\(^{132}\) The first two categories, while widely accepted, create serious difficulties and the third tells us little else beyond the fact that such entities existed in the mythological traditions, but not necessarily in the historical traditions. Be that as it may, the growing consensus is that the rp’um are synonymous with or include the dead deified kings and that they participated in the royal ancestor cult as founders of the dynasty.\(^{133}\)

According to the editors of KTU, the root r-p-’ occurs in thirty-six instances where the reading is undisputed.\(^{134}\) It is reconstructed in sixteen additional contexts often based on the repetition of similar lines either without change or with predictable variation.\(^{135}\) Nonetheless, some readings formerly


\(^{133}\) Cf. now the numerous treatments of KTU 1.161 listed in 3.1.9. and the remarks by Healey 1986:27-32.


endorsed must now be discarded. Finally, we note that the form appears in personal names often as a theophoric element.

3.1.7.1. THE RELATED DITĀNU NAME

Owing to the controversial nature of the Syro-Mesopotamian evidence for the *rp'um* both prior to and contemporary with Ugarit (more on this below), we shall begin our investigation with a comparative analysis of the name *dtn*, the widely attested *Ditānu* (or one of its variants) of the cuneiform sources. As all commentators recognize, this name parallels the *rp'i 'ars* on three occasions (1.15:III:3-4,14-15, 1.161:2-3,9-10) and so it can theoretically provide a model by which to reconstruct the tradition history of the *rp'um* concept. Because the *Ditānu* name is repeatedly associated with the name *mar.du*, we must first say something about the Amorites.

---

136 In the Keret legend, 1.14:I:7, *rp'at* is now read as *(?)rwt*. In 1.82:28, *[. . .*]p'im is now read as *[. . .]*hm. The form *yrp* comes at the very end of 1.21:II:5, but the beginning of 1.6 is missing (i.e., no aleph sign exists).

137 Grøndahl 1967:180 and cf. p.84: *rap-a-na* (from *rap'anu*), *a-birx-pi-i*, *abdi-rap-i*, *am-mu-ra-pi*, *bitta-ra-ap-i*, *abrp'u*, *ilrp'u*, *bdrp'u*, *c mpr'i/cmpr*, *rp'an*, *rp'iy*, *rp'iyn*, *yrp'u*, *yrp'i*.

138 Cf. e.g., Tidinu, Titinu, Tidnim, Tidānum, Didānum, Datnim, and Datnam. Lipiński 1978:91-110 has collected much of the pertinent data on the name. We reject his conclusion that it was simply a tribal name derived ultimately from the animal name for antelope and never a personal name. Cf. its use as a personal name in the obelisk of Man-ishtusu in Gelb 1957:294 and at Ebla.

139 This will become self-evident in the following discussion, cf. provisionally the lexical series *Sb* in Landsberger 1955:114, 1.209 *ti-di-nu* = *a-mur-ru-u*.
The theory of gradual infiltration as an adequate explanation for the Amorites' rise to power throughout Syro-Mesopotamia in the aftermath of Ur III has been called into question.\textsuperscript{140} Roberts has recently concluded that a re-evaluation of the evidence favors a more militaristic role on the part of the Amorites.\textsuperscript{141} Weeks has outlined a model in which the Amorites obtained political domination through their military superiority in spite of their small numbers.\textsuperscript{142}

These military bands had the capability to move quickly and decisively against far larger foes owing to their strategic efficiency. In some instances, having been hired as mercenaries by the local authorities, they were assisted in their usurpation by conniving officials within the existing political structure.\textsuperscript{143}


\textsuperscript{141} Roberts 1985:82-83. Prosograpy indicates a heavy new influx in the Ur III and Isin-Larsa period some of which suggests invasion rather than infiltration. The references to the Amorite invasions in Edzard 1957:33-34, and the military titles in the Old Babylonian period that are composed of the element mar.du in Edzard 1957:37 further support this.

\textsuperscript{142} Weeks 1985:50. Their small size is suggested by the lack of evidence for their settlement and significant linguistic or cultural impact. On p.57, Weeks cited Redford's similar explanation for the rise of the Hyksos, but this must be reassessed in light of the evidence for Asiatic settlements at Tell el-Muskhuta and Tell el-Dab\textsuperscript{a}. A better analogy might be that of Ward 1972:52-60 for the Soshou and note Rowton 1974:1-30 whose enclosed nomadism theory involved extensive raiding by the Amorites.

\textsuperscript{143} Weeks 1985:50. He qualified his approach as follows: "This does not mean that every person the texts call an Amorite was a soldier... some Amorites banded together in military attachments. The result was that the term Amorite came to have something of a military flavour".

126
This model of Amorite ascendancy confirms Pettinato's understanding of the Ditānu name at Ebla. Tidinu, or Titinu, is the name of a high official in the royal court who married one of king Ibrium's daughters. Pettinato viewed this as a shrewd political move on the part of the king, for Tidinu was the "chief of the mercenaries" lugal- (erēn-) BAR.AN BAR.AN. In the light of Ebla's possible dependency upon foreign armies, such a marriage served as a means to solidify allegiances between Ebla and the Amorite mercenaries under Tidinu's leadership. The use of Ditānu as a name of the chief of Amorite mercenaries at Ebla aligns with Matthias's proposal that Amorites composed an important segment of Eblaite society, that the eventual collapse of Eblaite culture and the actual destruction of the city were due to Amorite upheavals, both internal and external.

Outside of Ebla, the name maintains these militaristic associations. The Tidanum or "Tidanites" of the mid-third

---


millennium are described as the enemies of Umma or Lagash. Statue B of Gudea, prince of Lagash, from the late third millennium locates the Tidānum at the "Mardu mountain". Michalowski located this mountain and the Ur III defenses built to contain the mar.du (see below) in the northeast. Weeks explained the unusual presence of the Amorites (Amurru = "West land") in this area known for so long as a theatre of war as motivated by their search for employment as mercenaries.

In the reign of Shulgi, king of the Ur III dynasty, the Tidānum are depicted as enemies alongside the land of Anshan. The Tidānum posed such a significant threat to Shulgi that he constructed the massive wall alluded to above in order to prohibit their further penetration. It was completed in the reign of Shu-Sin and was designated "Mardu wall" (Sumerian bad mar-du) or "Fender of Tidanum" (Akkadian murṭq tidānim). The ultimate victory of the Tidānum over Sumer and Akkad is described in the Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur and in the Lamentation over the Destruction of Nippur.


149 Michalowski 1976:104.

150 Weeks 1985:54.

151 Van Dijk 1960:13. The Tidānum occur without the kīlā determinative found on an-ša't-ānki. The lack of consistency in this regard implies that the name did not necessarily represent a specific place name in those instances where it occurs with kīlā.

The former depicts the Tidanum as having "daily fastened the mace to the girdle" ti-id-nu-um\textsuperscript{153} e u\textsuperscript{4}Š-u\textsuperscript{15} meddú-a úr-ra ba-ni-in-gar.\textsuperscript{153} In the latter, the Tidanum are mentioned in reference to the temple of Umma "from which the Tidanum had made the misfortune arise" ugu-bi-ta ti-da-nu-um nu-gar-ra ū-b-ta-an-zi-ge\textsuperscript{4}-ēš-a.\textsuperscript{154}

It appears that at some point the Tidanum switched sides and became allies of the last king of Ur, Ibbi-Sin, for he writes in a letter "Now, Tidanum -O Enlil!- has arisen for me from its mountain as my helper, it will rout Elam and catch Ishbi-Erpa" (who had become the first king of Isin and Ibbi-Sin's rival) ū-ne-Šē ti-da-nu-um-e ʾen-līl kur-bi-ta ā-dah-mu im-ma-zi elam\textsuperscript{151} za mu-un-tag-ge ū ʾišbi-erra mu-un-dabš-bē.\textsuperscript{155}

By Old Babylonian times, Amorite dynasties had established themselves throughout Syria and Mesopotamia. From Ur the following compound form is attested Me-ʾdi-ta-an. The divine determinative suggests that the name had become associated with sacred powers, but the exact significance remains obscure, "the sacred powers of Ditānu" or "of the (personal god) of Ditānu".\textsuperscript{156}

In the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty, Ditānu occurs in 1.6 as a name attributed heroic dimensions. This name along with


\textsuperscript{155}Cf. Falkenstein 1950:59–79, esp.72, 11.35–36. We incorporate the variant reading of an unpublished copy in Wilcke 1969–70:23 which reads ti-da-nu-um in place of mar-du!

\textsuperscript{156}Cf. Figulla 1953:no.497:11 and 581:11. It is impossible to decide whether "the sacred powers" refer to those "of Ditānu" or to those "of the (personal) god of Ditānu".
the others in 11.1-28 was no doubt recited in the cult, the significance of which we shall address shortly. *Ditānu*, written *Dīdānu* in the AKL-A (= Assyrian King List-A):i:4 (10), is also portrayed as one of the "seventeen kings who lived in tents".\(^\text{157}\)

The fact that *Dīdānu* is depicted in AKL-A as a nomad of heroic stature from the distant past fits the view that the eponymous bearer of that name was believed to be a glorious leader of marauding Amorites. He was also perceived by the writer of the King List as having obtained control over those regions which his legions had conquered, thus his title king (lugal).\(^\text{158}\)

The remaining data from this period consist of several Amorite personal names which incorporate the *Ditānu* element.\(^\text{159}\)

These provide additional testimony for the notoriety of the *Ditānu* name. The two forms discussed above, Me-\(^\text{4}\)Di-ta-an and *Ditānu*, point to the use of the name as a theophoric element in the compound genitive names from this period, e.g. Su-mu-di-ta-na.\(^\text{160}\)


\(^\text{158}\) An Old Babylonian votive text from Nippur describes a foreigner who came to Babylonia to make offerings at its sanctuaries "Ammishtamar, the ruler of the Didanum, leader of the Amorites" [amm]išṭamar [x]didānim [rabi]ān MAR.TU, cf. Fossey 1911:248-49; Stol 1976:87; and Heltzer 1981:5 and n.33. The only known name for this period is Ammishtamru I of Ugarit, cf. Kitchen 1977:139 and Heltzer 1981:5-6. If correct, this text explicitly connects the Ugaritic dynasty, the *Ditānu* name, the Amorites, and, as we shall argue below, the *rp’u(m)* = rabûm "leader, chief".


In conclusion, the theory of Amorite military supremacy, the repeated association of *Ditānu* and the Amorites in military contexts, both as the name of an individual and the eponym of marauding warriors bands, and the subsequent notoriety attached to the name all point to the following reconstruction.

Early on, *Ditānu* represented a renowned Amorite warrior contingent which had adopted the name of their legendary founding leader (not to be equated with the one mentioned at Ebla). The legends attached to the name grew to enormous heroic dimensions owing to the international fame of those Amorite warriors, sometime mercenaries, who bore the *Ditānu* name. All this accords well with the relation of the name to *qarrādu* "strong, heroic, warrior"\(^{161}\), and with the connection to the animal *ditānu* = *alim*, an aurochs, or possibly a kind of antelope.\(^{162}\) Alternatively, either of these could impute to *Ditānu* the status of a title or battle name.

By Old Babylonian times, the name *Ditānu* had obtained significant notoriety and incorporated into the official cultus. All this points to new religio-political dimensions having attached themselves to the name. The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty is informative in this regard (11.29-42):


Interpreters follow Finkelstein’s original proposal and assume that the groups listed, both those individuals in 11.1-28 including Dītānu (1.6) and those groups mentioned in 11.29-38, are the deceased who are the recipients of offerings and rites (cf. 1.38: pāqidum ū sāḥīrum) and are invited to a communal meal (11.39-40) in the hope that they would supernaturally bestow their blessings upon the new king Ammiṣaduqa (11.41-43). In other
words, this supposedly comprises a *kispum* ritual.\(^{163}\) Accordingly, 1.33 expresses the king's concern to invite to commune any soldier who fell (= died) in military disasters.\(^{164}\)

While generally accepted, this interpretation is rather strained in view of the absence of any explicit indicator that a mortuary ritual is in view. Such characteristic terms like *kispum* and *etemmum* are missing.\(^{165}\) Moreover, the term *pāqidum* must be attributed a specialized meaning and the significance of the term *sāhirum* has yet to be convincingly determined. Even if we were to assume for the sake of argument that a mortuary rite was in view, the notion that a communal meal involving the living and the dead stands behind the *kispum* ritual is merely conjecture.\(^{166}\)

What the text records is a royal genealogy made up of eponymous ancestors (11.1-19) and kings of the first dynasty of Babylon (11.20-28) followed by an invitation to still a third group to participate in a communal meal and to offer blessings


\(^{164}\) The translation of Charpin and Durand 1986:166-69 which we generally follow assumes that the soldiers mentioned are those who had died in battle, but were not buried, and who had descendants present at the feast. In any case, they were not necessarily "nameless" as Finkelstein 1966:113 would have it.

\(^{165}\) Eating and drinking clearly signify a festive occasion, but the nature of that feast must be established on independent grounds in the absence of any known technical terminology related to the Mesopotamian ancestor cult.

\(^{166}\) Cf. Tsukimoto 1985:61.
upon the new king Ammišaduqa. In the absence of compelling
evidence otherwise, we propose that the names in 11.1-28 are
simply recited (and not invited as shades to a kispum meal) for
the purpose of commemoration. Those groups mentioned in 11.29-43
are living "descendants" who attended the feast each in their
turn to memorialize the dynastic dead on the special occasion of
the recently elevated successor's coronation.

We should point out that such geneonymy (the commemoration
of ancestors by name) is not to be equated with ancestor
veneration or worship although each presuppose the mnemonic use
and perpetuation of pedigrees and genealogies. Furthermore,
recognition of demonstrable ancestry does not predicate ancestor
worship. In any case, both the legitimating function of the
ritual and the political importance of the Ditānu name remain in-
tact.

167 Recall the Old Babylonian votive text from Nippur which
documents the possible existence of a contemporary living Ditānu
contingent, cf. n.158. This would entail rendering im-qu-tu in
1.33 (< maqātu) not as "fell" in the fatal sense, but as
"suffered injury/defeat" or perhaps simply "fought", cf. CAD
10(1977):240-51 [##lb,1d1',4].

168 Röllig 1969:273 viewed the Amorites, Khaneans, and
Gutians as contemporary contiguous political groups. Charpin and
Durand 1986:169 postulated a surviving warrior contingent related
to those deceased apparitions supposedly invited to the feast. On
pp.166-67, they proposed bal = palā "turn" in 11.29-32 as
indicative of the successive groups who come, each at their turn,
to receive a portion of the offerings. We differ only in that we
take these groups to be entirely living.


170 Nevertheless, owing to the likelihood that what
transpired did so on the occasion of Ammišaduqa's coronation, the
observances cannot be viewed as regularly occurring -another
argument against its royal ancestor cult associations.
In the light of the central role of the military in this ritual and the theory of Amorite military superiority outlined above, we render erín = šābum in 11.29-30 as "soldiers", rather than the more general "people". Accordingly, the writer of this text demonstrates a realization that Amorite rule stemmed not from a particular city or ethnic group, but from soldiers of a particular ethnic background.171

The important place given to such great warriors of days gone by as Ditānu reveals a heretofore unnoticed criterion in the selection of names included in the list.172 It appears that Ammiṣaduqa sought to align himself not only with former kings, but also with those eponymous warrior heroes of former ages whom the traditions identified as having established and, in view of the likely persistence of remnants of the Ditānu warriors, who continued to sustain his current rule.

His attentiveness to the interests of the military served to solidify allegiances with those surviving elements in his enlistment including those identifying themselves with the name Ditānu. The recognition of this complimentary perspective reflected in the Genealogy, namely the legitimation of the dynasty to both the military and the royalty, is crucial to


172 The Genealogy does not identify the individuals listed before Sumu-abim, the first king of Babylon, as kings, cf. 11.1-19. In the Assyrian King list-A, they become the "kings who lived in tents". Although Shamshi-Addu sought to trace his descent from nomadic kings, this apparently was not the sole concern of Ammiṣaduqa, contra Lambert 1974:430.
understanding properly the rationale behind the inclusion of the \textit{rp'i 'arş} and the \textit{qbs ddn} alongside the \textit{mlk(m)} in 1.161.

We can now examine the occurrences of \textit{dtn} or \textit{ddn} at Ugarit. The name \textit{dtn} is found in the compound \textit{bn dtn} in 4.69:II:9, VI:29 and 4.422:52, in the para-mythological text 1.124:11,14, as \textit{bpñr qbs dtn // btk rp'i 'arş} in 1.15:III:2-3,14-15, as \textit{ddn} in a damaged offering text \textit{RIH 78/11:1-2}, and in 1.161.\textsuperscript{173}

In the thirteenth century administrative list 4.69, the \textit{bn dtn} represent one social class among many who receive the highest level of state payment for services rendered in the capacity of "warriors" \textit{mrynm} (cf. I:1 and II:9) and "priests" \textit{khnm} (cf. VI:22 and 29).\textsuperscript{174} Furthermore, that the \textit{bn dtn} are depicted as owners of great herds in 4.422, confirms their important social status.

In 1.124, a personage named \textit{Dtn} and another entitled \textit{'adn 'ilm rbm} (11.1-2) engage in dialogue over the fate of a sick child.\textsuperscript{175} The latter is generally identified as \textit{El} "Lord of the Great Gods"\textsuperscript{176}, but this creates the potential problem of


\textsuperscript{174} On the \textit{mrynm} = maryannu, cf. Rainey 1965:19-20 and Reviv 1972:219-22 who conclude that the chariot was not the crucial factor making the maryannu an'elite soldier class. Nevertheless, groups like the \textit{bn dtn} who fulfilled the roles of \textit{mrynm} and \textit{khnm} no doubt comprised influential political forces at Ugarit.


\textsuperscript{176} However, Dietrich and Loretz 1980:395-96, followed by Spronk 1986:193-94, proposed Baal. Pope 1977B:179 was also reluctant to identify \textit{'adn} as \textit{El}. 136
El or Baal consulting a lesser class of being. Scholars have reversed the roles of Dtn and the 'adn in 11.1-4, but it has been claimed that this supposedly violates the clear syntax.\(^{177}\)

Pardee, who published a recent collation of the text, identified 'adn not as El or Baal, but as Yqr, the king mentioned in 1.113:26', the deceased founder of the Ugaritic dynasty. Thus 'ilm rbm would not refer to the major gods of the pantheon, but to the divinized deceased kings or "the many gods".\(^{178}\) Tropper rendered 'adn 'ilm rbm as "the (chief) incantation priest of the royal ancestors" and compared the ba'alat 'ôb of 1 Sam. 28 and understood 1.124 to reflect a royal necromantic ritual.\(^{179}\)

Both proposals are based on the assumption that a royal ancestor cult can be documented at Ugarit and that 'il in 1.113 reflects the divinization of Ugaritic kings. As we have argued, the 'il element in 1.113 designates the tutelary god of each king (cf. 3.1.6.) and a royal ancestor cult at Ugarit remains to date unattested. Therefore, the identities of 'adn and 'ilm rbm and the role of the 'adn and Dtn must be reconsidered.

Notwithstanding their somewhat distinct roles, the probability of the earlier identification of the 'ilm rbm as the ilānu rabûtu, the determiners of fates in Enuma Elish, is greatly enhanced with the unlikelihood of their representing divinized

\(^{177}\) So Pardee 1983:133 and 1988:184-86, but see below.


\(^{179}\) Tropper 1989:151-56.
ancestors. This in turn favors the view that 'adn is El or Baal. As neither of these gods would consult the Dtn whom we have come to know through our survey in which prophylactic powers are lacking, we see Dtn consulting 'adn in 11.1-3, not vice versa.

We can safely ascertain from 1.124 only that Dtn was an important mythic figure and that he plays a subservient role to El or Baal in finding a remedy for a sick child (cf. mtp in 11.3,12). This conforms to the fact that nowhere in the cult or in myth is the name depicted as a beneficent ghost.

We turn now to dtn in the legend of king Keret, the phrase bphr qbs dtn is found parallel to btk rp'i 'ars in 1.15:III:3-4,14-15. Keret has been promised the blessing of future progeny after having lost both his wife and children. He is then praised with the following words:


Astour 1975:281; Lipiński 1978:94; Caquot 1981:355. Pardee 1983:131, 1988:183 read 1.4 as follows "Ditan answered him (= the Lord of the great/many gods)" w y ny nn dtn and understood the line as expressive of Dtn's supernatural role in giving instructions to heal the sick child. Notwithstanding his remarks in 1983:128 and 1988:180 ["the reading ['dtn'] is probable"], a glance at the photograph and handcopy in Pardee 1988:180-81 will demonstrate that the supposed dtn reading is all but obliterated. In any case, the reading w y ny nn dtn in 1.4 and in 11.13-14a might be translated with the 'adn instructing Dtn (in the vocative case) "then he ('adn) answered him, 'O' Ditanu, You shall reply. . . ".

m'id rm krt                   Be greatly exalted, Keret,
btk rp'i 'arş                   among the rp'i 'arş,
bphr qbs dtn                   in the assembly of
                             the Gathered Ones of Ditanu

These lines reveal a striking similarity to 11.2-3,9-10 of 1.161
and their significance likewise has been variously understood.
They have been understood as recognition of Keret's success in
obtaining numerous offspring by a solemn meeting of the (living)
chiefs of the tribe of Ditanu, or to his blessed afterlife
with an esteemed place among long-departed ancestors, or to
Keret's power to overcome childlessness which is the same power
that the spirits of the dead were believed to possess in
overcoming death. Thus, he can be said to have become one of
them.

In the light of our survey, we offer another alternative
which takes into consideration the context of the legend. The
previous lines record that Keret was able to procure a son by
leading a military campaign against the realm of Udm (cf.
1.14.III-1.15.I). Under threat of siege, its king, Pabil, offered
Keret a new wife who then gave birth to numerous offspring. The
concern for progeny was crucial to a great warrior-king for


183 The term qbs we take to be the plural construct passive
participle qabisu. Contra Lipiński 1978:97, the term is used in
Biblical Hebrew to denote the living more often than the dead.

184 De Moor 1976:324.


several reasons. Two in particular stand out in the light of the Genealogy and 1.161.

In both the Genealogy and 1.161, the new king is the son of the recently deceased and in both, the former king, his dynastic predecessors, and the heroic warriors of antiquity including the legendary Ditānu, are all commemorated (for 1.161, cf. 3.1.9.). In 1.161:13-16 the new king performs the additional rites of mourning in honor of his father.

Together these elements reflect the king’s hope that upon his death, not only would his son inherit the throne through dynastic succession but that at his son’s coronation, he would memorialize his father’s name by establishing for posterity his membership among the great Amorite warrior heroes of hoary antiquity. This aspiration of the Ugaritic dynasty is anticipated in the Keret legend and realized in 1.161, a funerary liturgy observed on the occasion of Ammurapi’s coronation.

The reigning king’s anxiety over the prospects of his inevitable death and the new king’s concern for political legitimation explain the coalescence of coronation and funerary rites as anticipated in 1.15:III and reflected in 1.161. That Keret’s concern for a son and the resultant praise anticipate his future commemoration is confirmed by Ammurapi’s assembly of the living qbs dtn in 1.161 to hear the recitation of his father’s name. Our proposal gains support in the thesis that we would

\[187\] The ritual complex reflected in the Genealogy might presuppose Ammiṣaduqa’s enactment of funerary rites for his father Ammiditana (1.28), but in recognizing this possibility we must caution against the potential confusion of funerary rites and ancestor cult rites.
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expect to find the aspirations of the kings of Ugarit expressed in the life of a paradigmatic hero like Keret. 188

This completes our survey of Ditānu. Outside Ugarit, Ditānu initially represented a personal or battle name turned eponym. As an eponym it designated the legendary patron of a renowned band of Amorite warriors. Eventually, socio-religious importance was imputed to the name as we have an isolated instance wherein a compound name it is closely associated with sacred powers. The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty testifies to its incorporation into the royal cult as the name of an ancient warrior worthy of commemoration. 189

Ugarit evinces a remarkable degree of continuity. As Dtn maintained its prominence as a mythic hero tradition, this led to its eventual place of importance in the cult (1.124 and cf. RIH 78/11?). This was partially a result of its continued identity as patron name of a politically influential warrior nobility, the bn Dtn and qbs dtn. However, the name was never deified or given the status of a ghost with supernatural beneficent powers worthy of veneration or worship. The name was perhaps commemorated (cf. our view of 1.161 in 3.1.9.). In sum, the Ditānu name was not employed at Ugarit in a distinct Amorite royal version of the ancestor cult.


189 The name is not preceded by the divine determinative in the Genealogy. This favors reading the contemporary OB name Me-
4 Di-ta-an as "the sacred powers of the (personal) god of Ditānu".
3.1.7.2. THE RP'UM AS GODS

Virolleaud took the rp'um to be minor deities in the service of Baal. There were only seven or eight rp'um and rp'u bc 1 "Baal the healer", or "Baal has healed", in 1.22:1:8 was their leader. This understanding of rp'u bc 1 is not at all certain and a more fitting interpretation of this phrase is given below. Moreover, Virolleaud wrongly concluded that the rp'um anointed Baal on the occasion of his enthronement. He based this on a mistaken translation of 1.22:II:14-18. Needless to say, he has few, if any, followers today.

The rp'um have been classified as gods on the basis of the parallel 'inlym in the Shapash hymn 1.6:VI:46-47 (cf. also the damaged 1.21:II:3-4). But the latter form itself has presented serious difficulties, although the similar form 'lnm occurs in Punic and Phoenician where the affixed n designates the numeric plural "gods".

Nonetheless, this evidence is much too late to be considered decisive. Besides, it never occurs with the

---

190 Virolleaud 1940:77-83.
192 The additional references cited by Mullen 1980:261-62 occur in lacunae.
193 Cf. Segert 1976:112 for the Punic and Phoenician forms. In KAI 117, a first century C.E. Latin-Punic bilingual inscription from El Amruni (Libya) 1.1 of the Neo-Punic reads $\text{IcI[n]}$ 'r'p'm' . . . "for the gods of the Rephaim . . ." not $\text{IcIn}$ 'r'p'm "for the deified Rephaim . . ." according to Vattioni 1980-81:293-99 followed by Garbini 1986:13-14 and cf. 4.2. ("$\text{In}$, if that is in fact the correct reading, is generally recognized as a variant of '$\text{In}$'). The Latin reads $D[is]$ $M[anibus]$ SAC[rum]. In any case, this text is too late to impact our treatment.
corresponding y infix. The term 'ilnym is probably comprised of the divine name 'il with a doubly hypocoristic expansion: -ānu plus -iy-, a nisbeh formation "the godly ones(?)". The most that can be safely asserted is that while 'ilnym is probably related somehow to the concept of deity (< 'il), its exact nuance cannot be recovered.

The precariousness of equating the rp'um with the 'ilnym is further illustrated by a recent proposal in which a chiastic structure has been posited for 1.6:VI:45-49 with 'ilnym and 'ilm parallel on the one hand, and rp'lm and mtm on the other, rather than rp'lm and 'ilnym followed by 'ilm and mtm, the order given in the text. If the mtm were understood to be "mankind" or "the warriors" as suggested by the context of the Baal myth (cf. 3.1.7.3.), then the rp'um would not be related to the gods, but with mortals and in particular, heroic warriors.

Others have cited the personal names from Ugarit in which r-p-' supposedly functions as a theophoric element designating the name of a deity, e.g., abdi-rapi "the servant of Rapi'u"; but, in fact, the significance of the root in these cases is not certain. It may function as an appellative (G participle) e.g.,

---

194 L'Heureux 1974:268 n.14. Virolleaud 1940:83 took the term to be an adjective from 'Iwn "oak tree" or a gentilic connected with Eylon mentioned in Josh. 19:43.

195 Previously, help was thought to be at hand in the couplet 'ilnym and 'ilm in 1.3:IV:34-35, but the reading 'ilm is doubtful, contra Horwitz 1979:38. KTU reads *lm not 'ilm in 1.3:IV:34 (= CTA 3.IV:78).

196 Cf. Spronk 1986:162-63. Assuming that the mtm designated "the dead", he concluded, and we believe, wrongly, that the rp'um were to be related to both the gods and the dead.

197 Jirku 1965:82-83.
"abdi-rapi "the Servant heals".\textsuperscript{198} In any case, forms like 'ilrp'u "El heals" at Ugarit and 'IM-ra-pi "Addu heals" at Mari categorically eliminate the second element, i.e., r-p-', as theophorous.\textsuperscript{199}

Finally, it should be pointed out that neither the rp'um nor, for that matter, the singular Rp'u (assuming that the latter is a personal name or epithet of a deity) show up in the god lists or sacrificial lists at Ugarit. We would expect, at least on occasion, such major or minor deities to be unequivocally represented in these and related lists as is the case with the corresponding mlkm and Mlk (cf. 3.1.8.).

3.1.7.3. THE DEAD RP'UM AND THE GODDESS SHAPASH

In spite of its current popularity, the view that the rp'um comprise the shades of the dead also has its difficulties. Prior to the publication of 1.161, this view was based on the Hebrew and Phoenician data, the connection of the rp'um and the mortuary related marzēah\textsuperscript{200}, and the equation of the rp'um with the mtm "the dead ones" in the Shapash hymn 1.6:VI:45b-49a. The last datum presupposed that the sun goddess functioned in these lines as psychopomp, transporter of the dead to and from their netherly abode.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{198}Cf. L'Heureux 1979:215-16. This is particularly the case if the root has the alternative meaning "to be strong", rather than the assumed "to heal, make whole", so Brown 1985:170-73.

\textsuperscript{199}Huffmon 1965:264.

\textsuperscript{200}Cf. esp. Pope 1972:170-203.

\textsuperscript{201}So Caquot 1959:90-101.
Nevertheless, the Hebrew and Phoenician evidence is much later and should not take precedent over the internal evidence from Ugarit in interpreting a much earlier, and perhaps distinct, tradition as we have at Ugarit (see below). Moreover, we rejected above the inherent mortuary relations of the Ugaritic marzēah as well as the supposed connection of the rp’um and the marzēah (cf. 3.1.5.).

Finally, Shapash’s netherworld connections, and thereby those of the rp’um, cannot be substantiated by an appeal to the Shapash hymn or, for that matter, the Baal-Mot texts 1.6:I-VI more generally. In 1.6:I:7-8, Shapash is depicted as having “descended to the ’ars” yrd b’ars where she met the goddess Anat. It was here that Anat recovered what remained of Baal after Mot ruthlessly smote him. According to 1.5:VI:24b-31, this region was located at the "outback" dbr or "steppe by the shore/stream of the realm of death" Šd Šhl mmt. In 1.6:I:16-18, Shapash is depicted lifting Baal’s corpse on to Anat’s shoulder whereupon Anat carried him to Mount Zaphon for burial.

We know that this region was not the netherworld, for had Baal been killed by Mot in the netherworld, Anat’s retrieval and burial of Baal would have been superfluous. Rather, this

---


203 So Gibson 1978:74 n.4; L’Heureux 1979:195-96; and Smith 1986:311-14. Margalit 1980:155-57 recognized this incongruity in the scene, but upheld Shapash’s role as psychopomp and rearranged the order of the texts. This region is located at "the edge of earth" qsm ’ars / ġṣr ’ars and the edge of the underworld, the "edge of the water regions" ksm mh/’iyt (1.4:VIII:4; 1.5:VI:4-5;
region was located at "the edge of (inhabitable) earth" qšm 'ārs and underworld, "the edge of the water regions" kšm mh/iḥy according to 1.4:VIII:4; 1.5:VI:4-5; 1.16:III:3-4. To be sure, in 1.6:1:17-18, Baal did descend to the netherworld from atop mount Zaphon through "the hole of the chthonic gods" hrt 'ilm 'ārs, but only subsequent to receiving the proper funerary rites as administered by Anat.

Thus, Shapash is not portrayed in these lines as having descended to the netherworld. Our conclusion finds external confirmation in a thesis similarly concerned with the Babylonian sun god Shamash. Heimpel has argued that Shamash remained at all times in the heaven and never passed into the netherworld. In contexts where it was previously assumed that Shamash was located in the infernal world, it is more in keeping with the data as a whole to view Shamash as located in heaven's interior whence he

1.16:III:3-4).

We equate El's mountain hr 'il (1.4:II:36 and cf. ḫr ḫl = pēn 'il via phrähl in 1.2:1:20,30) and the mountain at whose base was located the netherworld entrance ḫr ṭrğzz // ḫr ṭrmg // tlm (1.4:VIII:2-4). Thus, the stream/shore by the realm of death makes up part of the "two rivers" nhrm and "two seas" thmtm where El's mount was located (1.4:IV:21-22; 1.6:1: 33-34; 1.17:VI:47-48). These waters separate earth and netherworld and represent the West Semitic approximation of the apsu, cf. Lambert 1985A:451 and 1985B:537.


In 1.19:III:6,20-21,41, "the hole of the chthonic gods" hrt 'ilm 'ārs is that place wherein Danil would place Aqhat once he found his remains and performed the customary mourning rites.
concerns himself with the matters of the dead and whence his radiance penetrates the netherworld.\textsuperscript{207}

This reconstruction provides the fitting background for understanding the recently published description of Shamash in a Neo-Babylonian necromantic ritual "O Shamash, the judge, you bring those up from above down below, those from below up to above" \textsuperscript{d}utu di.ku, ŝa elâti ana šaplāti ŝa šaplāti ana elâti tubbal. The verb \textit{abalu} can be rendered "to bring" when it takes the ventive.\textsuperscript{208} In another related text, Shamash brings up a ghost from the netherworld \textit{etemmi etūti lišelanni}.\textsuperscript{209} Neither text necessarily assumes Shamash's presence in the netherworld, only the exercise of his power and influence there.

Returning to the Ugaritic goddess Shapash, she is mentioned thrice more in 1.6, but in none of these instances is she located in the netherworld: 1.6:II:24-25; III:24-IV:25; and VI:22-29.\textsuperscript{210} In the last, she delivers El's verdict from mount Zaphon in favor of Baal over Mot. It is this passage in particular that provides the linchpin for interpreting the Shapash hymn within the context of 1.6:I-VI.

By delivering her verdict in the final struggle between Baal and Mot, Shapash displays her role as judge of the gods. When this is viewed in the light of 1.6 more generally, her role


\textsuperscript{208}Cf. \textit{CAD} 1(1964):14 \textit{contra} Finkel 1983-84:11 [Text K 2779:13b-14a] "to carry".

\textsuperscript{209}Finkel 1983-84:9 [Text \textit{BM} 36703:ii:3].

\textsuperscript{210}Contra Caquot 1959:90-101, esp. 93-98.
as judge of mankind also comes to the fore. Repeatedly in 1.6, Mot threatens to devour mankind (II:17b-19a and V:24-25), but by her judgment against Mot, Shapash ultimately thwarts his evil scheme and thereby saves all of humanity along with Baal.

These two aspects of the sun deity's role as judge conform with what we know of Shamash's function in Mesopotamia.211 We mention Shapash's epithet "Illuminator of the gods" nrt 'ilm found repeatedly in 1.6 (I:8-9,13; II:24 IV:8-9,17, and cf. the epithet of Shamash nūr ilānī) which is generally taken as a reference to her wise judgment.212

Assuming that the hymn should possess a significant degree of continuity with the myth, we should point out that the preceding contexts nowhere present mankind as dead, rather humanity is only threatened with an annihilation that is never actualized.213 Moreover, having found no indication in the myth or elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts that Shapash journeyed to the netherworld, there is no reason to view mtm as "the dead (ones)" as is so often the case.214

211See e.g., Frymer-Kensky 1987:162-63.
212Cf. e.g., Healey 1980:239.
213Cf. Healey 1977A:94,184,196, but in line with his view of the rp'um as shades of the royal dead, Healey considered the hymn to be a later addition to the myth and concluded that these lines portray a democratization of the dead rp'um at Ugarit.
214The view of Smith 1984:377-80 and Dijkstra 1986:147-52 that Kothar-wa-Khasis in 1.6:VI is spell-caster and knower (of ghosts) wrongly assumes a netherly background for the hymn. In 11.49-50, Kothar-wa-Khasis functions as Shapash's weapons' maker. In 1.2:IV:7-16, he fashions clubs for Baal in the course of his battle with Yamm. Philo of Byblos records the tradition that Chousor was one of two brothers who discovered iron, how to work it, and thereby invented the hook, lure, line, and raft, cf. Eusebius Preparatio Evangelica 1.10.11 and the translation of
As we pointed out previously, in the myth Shapash fixes the fate of those dwelling in the divine realm and those in the earthly realm by limiting the power of Mot. Her judgments are universal, effectual for both gods and men. This fact offers the most likely context for understanding the elements of the concluding hymn. We take the term mtm to refer to "mankind" or perhaps, "warriors", hence the corresponding merism, "gods" 'ilm and "men" mtm.\textsuperscript{215} This in turn supports the view that these lines in the Shapash hymn comprise a chiastic structure in which the rp'um are to be associated with the mtm "men" or "warriors" and the 'ilnym with the 'ilm "gods".

This brings us to the matter of t\textit{k}k in 11.45b-47.\textsuperscript{216} Some interpreters view the form as the preposition t\textit{h}t with the suffix and understand the passage to convey the notion that Shapash is located in the netherworld along with the rp'um and 'ilnym, "Shapash the rp'um are under you // Shapash the 'ilnym are under you".\textsuperscript{217} Others have suggested a prefixed verbal form of h\textit{k}k, Attridge and Oden 1981:45.

\textsuperscript{215} The form mtm occurs in parallel to ĝzrm in 1.22:I:6. It has been frequently rendered "the dead" as in 1.6:VI:48, but in light of the parallel terms in both contexts, it more likely represents "men, heroes, warriors", cf. Del Olmo Lete 1981:585 and 1.3:I:13 mt Šmm "men of the heavens". The Akkadian cognate mutu signifies a warrior, cf. \textit{CAD} 10(1977):316.

\textsuperscript{216} For a convenient survey of opinions, cf, Lewis 1989:36 n.155.

\textsuperscript{217} It can no longer be assumed that the term rp'\textit{i}m represents a noun in the oblique case as the aleph may be syllable closing, i.e., rapi'\textit{ú}ma, cf. the works of Verreet 1983:223-58, 1984:307-21, and 1986:324-30.
"Shapash, you rule the rp'um // Shapash, you rule the 'ilnym".\textsuperscript{218}

While the latter rendition can be made to conform with our understanding of the passage, it too is generally taken to refer to Shapash as judge of the dead rp'um and 'ilnym. Based on our previous arguments, either proposal would suffice but with the qualification that a figurative meaning is meant, namely that Shapash has authority over these groups—her location in the netherworld not being in view.

In 1.22:I:8-9, "the warriors of Baal" mhr b°l and "the warriors of Anat' mhr cnt are depicted alongside "the rp'u of Baal" rp'u b°l.\textsuperscript{219} Moreover, they are associated with the "heroes" ḡzrm of 1.7. Finally, in 1.20:II:3-4, the rp'um are depicted as harnessing their horses and mounting chariots. These passages strongly suggest that not only did major deities gather about them others of lesser, but power-laden, status such as warriors, but that included among these warriors were the rp'um. The rp'um along with others probably assisted Baal in his two engagements with Mot's company outside the netherworld, both at


\textsuperscript{219}De Moor 1976:323-45 assumed that in 1.20-1.22, the rp'um were shades of the dead. The texts are sufficiently damaged so as to render such a conclusion tentative at best. His student Spronk 1986:165-77 maintained this view on the basis of 1.6:VI:45-49! For a view of 1.20-1.22 different from that of de Moor or Spronk, cf. Del Olmo Lete 1981:404-24 and the bibliography cited there. De Moor 1976:325-29 and Healey 1977A:177-80 viewed rp'u b°l as an epithet of Baal "Baal Rapi'u", but the immediate context, in particular, the parallel mhr b°l and mhr cnt, militates against this.
the steppe separating earth and netherworld and on mount Zaphon, the location of the battle royale.

Likewise, Shapash's retinue might have accompanied her to the steppe and to mount Zaphon where she confronted, or, in the case of the former, might have confronted, Mot and his cohorts. Clearly, this could adequately explain the mention of the rp'um in the closing lines of the Baal-Mot myth without having to assume the rp'um, or for that matter, the mtm, are netherworld shades.

The couplet crb špŠ // sb'i'a špŠ in 1.15:V:18-19 (cf. 1.19:IV:47-49) is often cited in support of the netherworld journey of Shapash, and by implication, the defunct nature of those who comprise her entourage. To be sure, when seen in the light of 1.16:I:36-37 and II:24-26, the couplet unfolds as an announcement of the death of Keret "the setting of Shapash, Keret will meet, the host of Shapash, our lord" crb špŠ lymğ krt // sb'i'a špŠ b'lny. But this in no way necessitates Shapash's netherworld descent. Following Heimpel's Babylonian model, the destination of such a journey is the western door of heaven. From there the sun goddess and her host enter heaven's interior while the newly departed journey along those pathways leading to the netherworld.220

In summary, the rp'um of the mythological texts are nowhere portrayed as the shades of the dead.221 This is crucial to


221 The form rp'i yqr in RIH 77/8a+13+21B:14' (= RIH 77/21:14), does not support the chthonic nature of the rp'um, cf. Levine and de Tarragon 1984:656 against Bordreuil and Caquot
understanding the mention of the *rp’um* in 1.161 (cf. 3.1.9.).

While the exact significance of *‘ilnym* remains elusive, the identification of the *rp’um* as heroic warriors is secure. With this background in mind, the relevant lines of the Shapash hymn take on the following significance:\(^{222}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{špš } rp’im \ tḥtk & \quad \text{A} \quad \text{Shapash, the *rp’um* are under you,} \\
\text{špš } tḥtk \ ‘ilnym & \quad \text{B} \quad \text{Shapash, the *‘ilnym* are under you;} \\
\text{c dk } ‘ilm & \quad \text{B’} \quad \text{Your witnesses are the gods,} \\
hn \ mṭm \ cdk & \quad \text{A’} \quad \text{Behold, men/warriors are your witnesses} \\
\end{align*}
\]

3.1.7.4. THE LIVING *RP’UM*

Several writers have argued for living *rp’um* at Ugarit. Gray concluded that the *rp’um* in 1.20-1.22 were human agents or cult functionaries who accompanied the king on his visits to the threshing floors or *grnt* and plantations or *mtc t* in order to promote fertility (cf. 1.20:II:3-4).\(^{223}\) According to Ryan, the *rp’um* composed living chariot warriors similar to the *maryannu /

1979:301-03; Bordreuil 1981:46; and de Moor 1981-82:119 and n.55. In view of the text's fragmentary nature, *yqr* may simply be an epithet like the parallel *nɔ’m* in 1.15', rather than the name of the deceased founder of the Ugaritic dynasty, and the parallel *šd qdš* of 1.13' may be "the field of the temple", not "the holy šēdu spirit".

\(^{222}\)The above reconstruction allows for the possibility that Resheph was Shapash's underworld gatekeeper, cf. "Shapash, her gatekeeper is Resheph" *špš tḥrh ršp* and 2.1.5. n.76, in spite of Shapash's absence there. Of course, Resheph might be keeper of those gates to heaven's interior leading to the netherworld.

Aistleitner viewed those in 1.15:III as human princes.\textsuperscript{224}

For Healey, the rp'um originally constituted an early Amorite tribe related to Ditānu, remnants of which may have persisted at Ugarit (where they also came to designate the dead in general).\textsuperscript{226} Along similar lines, Heltzer understood the rp'um of 1.15:III to comprise a Sutean sub-tribe known as the Rabba'um attested at Mari (and recognized their status as shades in other texts).\textsuperscript{227}

The basic weakness inherent in each of these proposals is the underlying assumption that the data from the mythological texts provide a reliable source for reconstructing historical elements, for none of them cite references to the rp'um in the non-literary texts from Ugarit.\textsuperscript{228}

The only proposal known to this writer which employs data from the non-literary texts is that of S. H. Margulies(?) as noted by Sperling. He suggests that the bn Rp'iyn (sic Rp'iym) in


\textsuperscript{226}Healey 1977A:195.


\textsuperscript{228}Cf. the apposite remarks by Sasson 1981B:81-98 regarding the limitations of this general approach. He underscored the need for confirming data from the non-literary texts. Rainey 1974:188; Pardee 1981-82:266-67; and Pope 1983:67-69 set forth similar arguments against the living rp'um.
4.232:8 were a guild under the patronage of the divine \textit{rp'um}. As provocative as this datum is, unfortunately Sperling neither cites his Margulies source nor offers a summation of his view of the identity or social function of the \textit{bn Rp'iyn}. Beyond the fact that they received payment from the royal treasury and that their name derives from a root \textit{r-p-'}, Sperling offers little else.

The data from 4.232 when considered alongside Heltzer's thesis might provide the kind of historical confirmation needed to identify a living element among the Ugaritic \textit{rp'um}. Heltzer concluded that the \textit{rp'um}, or more precisely, the \textit{rp'i 'ars̱}, were the Rabbeans, a West Semitic tribe attested at Mari. This points to the plausible identity of the \textit{bn Rp'iyn} as the Rabbean tribe, rather than a guild. Unfortunately, as promising as Heltzer's thesis is, it presents serious problems at several points.

First, we lack independent confirmation, whether from the non-literary texts or otherwise, that the later people of Ugarit knew of a Rabbean tribe. Furthermore, his etymological argument falters in that a more suitable etymology for Rabbean is to be found in \textit{r-b-y} or \textit{r-b-b}, and not in \textit{-rb-}' (= \textit{r-p-}') as the spelling \textit{Rabbayu} in \textit{ARMT} 1:6:9 demonstrates.

Furthermore, Heltzer assumes an early date for the mythological texts (and/or their traditions) in order to locate

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[229] Cf. Sperling 1971:col.79. The affixed \textit{-iy-} and \textit{-n} on \textit{Rp}' could conceivably comprise a doubly hypocoristic expansion, the former being the common \textit{nisbeh} formation, thus, "the ones of \textit{Rp}u" (= \textit{rp'um}). For examples of similarly constructed names in Ugaritic, cf. Gordon 1965:63 and Segert 1984:43.
\item[230] Cf. e.g., Albright 1968:94 n.140 and Lipiński 1978:96 n.30.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the Rabbeans at Ugarit in the first centuries of the second millennium, but the dating of these texts remains a controversial point among Ugaritologists.\textsuperscript{231} He also presumes that the Suteans, of which the Rabbeans supposedly comprise a sub-group, are mentioned in the Ugaritic texts, so that one would expect them to show up there as well. However, the supposed Sutean references in the Ugaritic texts involving the term \textit{št} are minuscule and consequently, interpretations of \textit{št} abound.\textsuperscript{232}

3.1.7.5. THE RP'UM: MYTHIC AND EARTHLY WARRIORS

We offer an alternative paradigm for the possible identity of the Ugaritic \textit{rp'um}. We submit that the development of the \textit{Ditānu} traditions outlined in 3.1.7.1. can in fact provide a working model with which to reconstruct the tradition history of the \textit{rp'um}. The fact that these two independent traditions meet in 1.15:III and later again in 1.161 and that they both comprise warrior traditions strengthens the viability of our reconstruction as do the additional elements they hold in common.

For example, we know that the \textit{bn Dtn} were employed by Ugarit as elite warriors or \textit{mrynm} (4.69:1,II:9). Likewise, Ugarit employed the \textit{bn Rp'iyn} along with the \textit{mrynm} (4.232:8,33). In light of this and the warrior role of their mythic counterparts the \textit{rp'um}, we tentatively propose that the \textit{bn Rp'iyn}

\textsuperscript{231} Cf. e.g., Sasson 1981B:86-87 and n.12, n.13.

comprised a contingent of living warriors in the service of the city-state of Ugarit.²³³

On the analogy of the Ditānu traditions as surveyed in 3.1.7.1., we would tentatively suggest that Rp'u originally designated a legendary hero, whether real or perceived, who became the eponym of a renowned band of living warriors active during the reigns of Ugarit's last kings. In any case, it is only in the final days of Ugarit that a dead element within the rp'um, namely the rp'im qdmym, is attested in 1.161.²³⁴

This latter element has its analogue in the tradition history of the Ditānu name, for in the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty, Ditānu came to represent the legendary hero now considered deceased but likewise not endowed with supernatural benefic powers as Ditānu in the Genealogy was merely commemorated not venerated, worshipped, or petitioned for supernatural blessing. Moreover, at Ugarit the name was not employed in 1.161 or in 1.15:III to designate the dead as we understood the qbs d/dtn to refer to a living band of warrior-nobility. The significance of the name in 1.124 remains to be ascertained.

But what extenuating factors gave rise to the idea of a dead element among the rp'um in the last days of Ugarit? We believe that specific socio-historical factors contributed to the transformation of what were in essence received mythological traditions and 1.161 reflects this transformation in its

²³³ Unlike the case with the term dtn, a god related to rp', namely Rp'u, might be attested in the para-mythological texts at Ugarit. For the existence of the deity Rp'u, cf. 1.108:1 and 3.1.9., and de Moor 1976:328-29.

²³⁴ Cf. also L'Heureux 1979:189,204.
conceptualization of the *rp'im qdym* as dead warrior heroes.

Prior to the accession of Ugarit's last king, Ammurapi, to the throne, Hittite hegemony in the region had all but eclipsed, so Ugarit found itself in need of expanding its military forces.

This need was only heightened as news of the invading Sea Peoples began to circulate throughout the region. These factors explain the establishment of the *bn Dtn* and *bn Rp'iyn*, soldiers or mercenaries alongside the *mryn*, who received payment from the royal treasury for services rendered. These military contingents along with their patron heroes, *Dtn* and *Rp'*, were established and, as a result of military engagements, dead from among these contingents inevitably multiplied.

Having organized themselves in response to Ugarit's call for defense, many warriors comprising the *bn Rp'iyn* (and *bn Dtn*) undoubtedly fell in battle and now dwelt among the dead. So what was originally a mythological concept, then an earthly organization, with increased military casualties, became associated with the world below. While their specific role in the Ugaritic royal cult will be addressed in our treatment of 1.161 (cf. 3.1.9.), suffice to say that the dead were not attributed supernatural benefic powers.

1.15:III points to additional motivations for the specific inclusion of the *rp'i 'ars* and *qbs ddn* in 1.161. The son's loyalty to his father compelled the new king to perform the expected mourning rites. If the aspirations of the Ugaritic kings were indeed expressed in the life of a paradigmatic hero like Keret, then we can safely conclude that at death the kings of Ugarit fancied being memorialized among the great warrior-
nobility, the rp'i 'arṣ and qbs dtn.235 The context makes clear that for this to be realized, a king must have a son.

Owing to the fact that 1.161 originates in the royal cult and demonstrates a clear dependency upon the 1.15:III episode of the earlier Keret legend, we must consider the possibility that it might provide some helpful information in this regard. As stated above, this text records mourning rites in honor of Niqmaddu III, the former king. The rp'i 'arṣ and the qbs ddn play central roles in these rites, for not only is Niqmaddu's death ritually mourned by his son Ammurapi, but as the example of Keret's royal aspirations expressed in 1.15:III and the context of 1.161 suggest, Ammurapi eulogized his father's name within their ranks. In sum, for the realization of the royal hope that one would be memorialized at death by the living rp'i 'arṣ and the qbs dtn a king of Ugarit depended upon his successor son.

In the light of the repeated occurrence of rp'um in military and heroic contexts and the inadequacy of alternative hypotheses, the significance of Ugaritic r-p-' might best be understood in the light of Akkadian rabā'um "to be large, great", and its derivative rabium (< rabûm) "leader, chief".236 Thus, the

235 Concerning this type of educational and political role which such literary traditions as the Keret legend fulfilled in Ugaritic society, cf. Sasson 1981B:96-98.

rp'um would be "the Great Ones" or "the Mighty Ones".\textsuperscript{237} As noted by several writers, nowhere are the rp'um described as "healers" or "healed ones", "gathered ones" or "fertilizers"\textsuperscript{238}, nor is the deity Rp'u to be identified as El or Baal, both of whom have been considered healer deities (or Mot, Molek, or Resheph).\textsuperscript{239}

Aistleitner had proposed Akkadian rubûm, ruba'um "prince" as cognate to Ugaritic r-p'-.\textsuperscript{240} However, this would impute an inherent regality to the rp'um. Our survey indicated that the rp'um were portrayed as a military contingent lacking royal associations. The non-royal nature of the rp'um stands in spite of the depiction of the ruler(?) Danil as a mt rp'i as he was renowned for his heroic accomplishments as a warrior hero ĝzr.

\textsuperscript{237} Cf. also Loewenstamm 1976:col.406. This would result in two Northwest Semitic roots, r-p-' I "to heal" found, for example, in Hebrew, and r-p-' II "to be great, numerous". This has been independently endorsed by Brown 1985:115-48,160-73.

\textsuperscript{238} Cf. Burns 1970:172; Loewenstamm 1976:col.406 "there is not in any text a clear reference to an act of healing [rēpûʔ], be it healing the sick, reviving the dead, or restoring fertility to man or earth", 1980:320 n.1 "the Ugaritic root rp' is nowhere attested in the unequivocal sense of 'to heal'"; and cf. esp. Brown 1985: 115-30,146-47 against these alternatives.


\textsuperscript{240} Aistleitner 1959:83, 1967:295 followed by Sauer 1966:col. 1590-91 and Mendenhall 1973:160 who posited "an archaic north Syrian root rp' meaning 'lord'". The same might be assumed for rp' "to be large, great" and would explain the consistent presence of the p in later West Semitic languages.
Besides, his supposed royal status has been called into question.\footnote{241}

Our proposal applies as well in the case of king Keret. This mythic proto-type of regality yearned to beget a son who would in turn perform those funeral rites fit for a great warrior. At his death, he fancied being memorialized within the ranks of the warrior heroes, the $rp'i$ $'ar\$ and $qb\$ $dtn$. Keret could expect this honor, for we know that on at least one occasion he led his great army in battle (against Pabil of Udm).

That an Ugaritic king might obtain an intimate association with the $Dit\$nu and $rp'um$ names is further suggested by the mention of two titles given to one Ammishtamar in an Old Babylonian votive text from Nippur. This individual has been identified as Ammishtamru I of Ugarit and is proclaimed "the ruler of the Didanum, leader $rabi[']\$\$\$num of the Amorites".\footnote{242} The connection between the Ugaritic king, the $Dit\$nu warriors, and the $rp'um$ is here explicit, that is, if "leader" $rabi[']\$\$\$num from $rab\$\$\$m is cognate with Ugaritic $r-p-'$. If so, this datum directly joins the $rp'um$ traditions and the Amorites, thereby

\footnote{241}Cf. Dressler 1976:152-53 for a critique of Danil's status as king. The meaning of $mt$ $hrnmy$ which, like $\$zr$, frequently parallels $mt$ $rp'\$i$, has eluded scholars. The suffixed $-y$ has been viewed as a gentilic ending resulting in numerous proposals: Hermel (Egyptian $hrnm$ near Kadesh on the Orontes), Albright 1953:26-27; Hinnom (as entrance to the netherworld), Pope 1977B:166; a location on the eastern shore of the Kinnereth Sea, Barton 1941:213-25; or between the Kinnereth and Hermon, Margalit 1981:149-50. Cf. Astour 1975:283-84 for a summary of these and other views.

\footnote{242}Cf. n.158.
suggesting an additional element shared by them and the *Ditānu* traditions.\(^\text{243}\)

### 3.1.8. THE UGARITIC *MLK(M)*

The Ugaritic *mlkm*, along with the Amorite *malikū* and later Canaanite/Israelite *mlākīm* have been taken to represent dead kings venerated/worshipped in the royal ancestor cult.\(^\text{244}\) One must now also consider the Emarite *imlikū*, the divine warriors and guardians of the entrances to Nergal's infernal city.\(^\text{245}\)

The *mlkm* (without divine determinative) show up in two alphabetic pantheon lists 1.47:11 and 1.118:32, while a parallel Akkadian list *RS* 20.24:32 records the corresponding term *d ma.līk* **4**. The plural form *mlkm* is also attested in the recently published omen text *RIH* 78/14:4' and in a so-called Rephaim text 1.100:41, the form *mlk bc ttrt* in 1.107:17, and *rp'u mlk c1m ... ['il] ytb bc ttrt 'il tpt bhd re'y* in 1.108:1-3a, while the Akkadian *d ma-lik* shows up in *RS* 20.121:81 (additional citations will be noted in the discussion).

Both 1.100:41 and 1.107:17 have been cited as proof for the

\(^{243}\) The text is rather damaged, therefore any conclusion drawn on the basis of these titles is tentative at best.

\(^{244}\) See most recently Heider 1985:102-147, 383-408.

\(^{245}\) So Arnaud 1985B:235.
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existence of an Ugaritic deity Mlk. While this is probably the case, the posited netherly character of this deity at Ugarit remains problematic. For some interpreters, the basis for this supposition lies in the supposed identification of Mlk with one or more of the better known Ugaritic gods allied to the netherworld, e.g., Baal, Resheph, or Mot (and even Rp’u), and for others in the chthonic affiliations advanced on behalf of ğtrt in 1.100:41 and 1.107:17 as well as its parallel ḫ ḳy in 1.108:2-3a.

The correlation with Baal is based on the prior assumptions that Rp’u is the chthonic aspect of Baal and Rp’u is to be equated with Mlk. According to this line of argument, the identification of Baal and Rp’u is disclosed in the phrase rp’u b°l in 1.22:1:8, but, as we have already noted, the parallel mhr b°l and mhr ġnt strongly suggest that the initial element in rp’u b°l comprises a group of warriors "the Mighty Ones of Baal".

246 The evidence for this deity at Ebla, Abu Salabikh, and Mari remains controversial. In all three cases, the evidence derives solely from personal names, cf. Nakata 1974:377-87; Heider 1985:96-98,102-13; Lambert 1985B:533; and Beyer 1985:101 who added the additional personal names from the indices of ARMT 21 and 22. Olyan and Smith 1987:273, in their review of Heider, suggested that the malik element may be an epithet even when divinized (e.g., ḏam from ham-, "father-in-law"). One Milku ḏMilku, deity or epithet, is now known from Emar as the recipient of drink offerings, cf. Arnaud 1986:460,63,66-67 [Texts 472:62', 473:15'].


248 For a survey of some of these positions, cf. the independent assessment of Day 1989:31-46.


250 Normally, we would expect the conjunction joining such a compound divine name as Rp’u B°l, cf. e.g., ḫ ḳys. The Phoenician god B°l mrp’ is not immediately relevant to the
Furthermore, Rp'u is not to be equated with Mlk. We know that other gods were also considered "kings" at Ugarit. For example, El (who likewise is not to be identified with Rp'u) is given the epithet mlk (cf. 1.6:I: 35-36). Having detached Baal from Rp'u, we can safely note that Baal is likewise attributed an eternal kingship mlk c1mk (1.2:IV:10).

Even if mlk in 1.100:41 and 1.107:17 was to be viewed as an epithet, and this is highly improbable, it cannot be simply equated with Rp'u's epithet in 1.108:1 mlk c1m, for the two are probably not the same.\textsuperscript{231} In any case, mlk (b)c ttrt(h) in 1.100 and 1.107 is most likely the deity, for in 1.100, the remaining personal names are those of gods, each followed by their address.\textsuperscript{232}

The equation with Resheph relies on the prior identification of Resheph in the supposed epithet rp'u mlk c1m.\textsuperscript{233} In Egyptian texts, Resheph is given the titles kh\textsuperscript{3} d.t and nb nh\textsuperscript{h} "lord of eternity", indicating that he was perceived to be "eternal king of the netherworld".\textsuperscript{234} As these titles comprise rough equations of Ugaritic mlk c1m, it has been argued that rp'u must be an epithet for Resheph.

\textsuperscript{231}Olyan and Smith 1987:272-74 view mlk in 1.100 and 1.107 as an epithet.

\textsuperscript{232}For a defense of the place name interpretation of c ttrt in 1.100 and 1.107, see below.


But as we have pointed out previously, Resheph at Ugarit is nowhere described as the *ruler* of the netherworld. On the contrary, he is portrayed only in the role of the sun goddess's gatekeeper which, as we intimated previously, might locate him in heaven's interior rather than in the netherworld. 255

Be that as it may, *rp'u* should not be considered part of an epithet. 256 The phrase *mlk c1m* is used at Ugarit in reference to the king of Egypt. 257 It finds its identical parallel in Hebrew where it also functions as a divine epithet *melek c dālām* (Jer. 10:10 used of Yahweh). In view of this, and Akkadian *šarru dārū* "king of eternity", as well as the Egyptian epithets cited above, only *mlk c1m* constitutes an epithet, while *rp'u* specifies a name of an independent deity.

The correlation of *Mlk* and Mot is based on the idea that Mot was esteemed in some sense king of the netherworld. 258 Mot's netherworld throne *ks'a*, kingship *mlk*, royal seat *tbt*, and scepter of rule *ḥt mtpṭ* are mentioned in 1.6:VI:28-29, while in 1.4:VIII: 12-14 and 1.5:II:15-16, we hear again of his throne *ks'u tbt* as well as his royal inheritance *ṃḥlt*.

Nevertheless, Mot is nowhere given the title "king" at Ugarit. Furthermore, as we shall demonstrate below, *Mlk*'s

255 Cf. 2.1.5. n.76 and 3.1.7.3. Therefore, we would categorize his equation with Nergal, the Mesopotamian king of the underworld, as an attempt on the part of the scribe to approximate the two gods. See Healey 1985:122-23 for additional examples.


258 Lehmann 1953:361-71; Mulder 1965:57-64,70; and Cooper 1981:446 citing a suggestion by Pope.
chthonic affiliations at Ugarit are otherwise entirely lacking, so while kingship may be common to both, this in no way inextricably seats the latter on the netherworld throne. This stands in spite of the possible identity of Mlk with the "ma-lik of RS 20.121:81.

A "Ma-lik of the Old Babylonian double columned Weidner list is equated with Nergal who has been identified as the Mesopotamian king of the netherworld ("u.gur). But what obtained in Mesopotamia in one period is by no means indicative of what transpired in Syria at another. Besides, at Ugarit, although one would have expected perhaps Mot, it is Resheph and not Mlk, who is in some meaningful sense equated with Nergal (cf. 1.118:26 = RS 20.24:26).

We turn now to the form "ttrt in 1.100:41 and 1.107:17. This form has been interpreted as a divine name, but a toponymic interpretation appears more likely as the incantation 1.100 comprises a list of several deities along with their habitats. We follow those who identify "ttrt with the Ashtaroth situated in the Transjordanian Bashan region of the Hebrew Bible, but we reject any notion of a netherworld location for Bashan.

---

259 Afk 2:17:20. The same equation is made in a Late Assyrian god list from Assur. For both texts, cf. Lambert 1971:474 and 1985B:533 n.16.


Day has made a reasonable case for Bashan in Ps. 68:16, 23 (ET 15, 22) as the mountain of the gods (possibly Hermon) and that while it obtains mythological coloring, nowhere is it attributed a netherly locale (although the netherworld entrance was probably located at its base, but this is quite different). Moreover, the link with Ugaritic bṭn "serpent", cited as exemplary of Bashan's chthonic symbolism, is unconvincing, for Hebrew has the cognate peten "snake".263

We shall now consider additional texts where the god Mlk has been proposed. De Moor advanced the suggestion that Mlk shows up in 1.108:12 as well as in 1.41:48 and 1.87:52 in the phrase ḫl mlk "the host of Mlk".264 The damaged context of 1.108:10ff. precludes any certainty in this regard. In any case, the term ḫl has been generally taken to be derivative of ḥll "to desacralize, profane".265 The same uncertainty attends zbl mlk cllmy in 1.22:I:10 which Pope rendered "Prince Mlk the Wise"266, and rp'u

Note that interpreters often discuss this datum in support of the chthonic nature of the Ugaritic rp'um and the Rephaim of the non-poetic Hebrew texts, cf. the reference to "King Og of Bashan -one of the last of the Rephaim- who resided in Ashtaroth and Edrei" (Josh. 12:4).


265 Cf. Xella 1981A:63,74. The readings in 1.41:48 [ḥl] mlk and 1.87:52 [ḥl mlk] are doubtful. The term mlk shows up in 1.91:2,7, 11, but Xella 1981A:335-45 argued that 1.91 is an economic text and not a liturgical or religious one. It deals with consignments of wine used in royal sacrificial ceremonies. There is the remote possibility the Mlk might appear as the subject of the verbs in 1.161:11-2,25-26.

266 Pope 1977B:167. Spronk 1986:171,174-75 offers "the highness, the king, the unrelated" and follows de Moor 1976:342 in viewing cllmy as a compound, but at this point, their argument becomes unnecessarily complex. For a more likely explanation
mlk newInstance in 1.108:1 which Heider interpreted as "Rapiu, Mlk the Wise", Rapiu being a title of the god Mlk.267

The epithet "wise" is based on Arabic kalima, but this etymology for the Ugaritic newInstance is not at all certain.268 In view of zbl mlk newInstance in 1.13:26-27, mlk in zbl mlk newInstance in 1.22:1:10 may be no more than a noun or adjective forming part of a title.269 Whether one takes mlk in 1.108:1 to be a deity or an epithet depends largely upon one's interpretation of rp'u in 1.108:1, whether it is a title of a well known deity or an independent deity in its own right. We deduced above that rp'u is an independent deity and that mlk newInstance is a title.

In any case, while a deity Mlk is attested at Ugarit, any preconceived notions about its chthonic qualities must await future confirmation. Therefore, arguments derived from the character of Ugaritic Mlk in favor of a chthonic element in the mlkm, which have been assumed to be the pluralization of Mlk, must be rejected. To the mlkm we now turn.

The mlkm have been interpreted as dead kings and/or minor chthonic deities and, at times, even equated with the dead rp'um.270 The mlk in 1.161:11-12,25-26 are two deceased Ugaritic

---

267 Heider 1985:127. We translate "Rp'u, the king of yore". Heider elsewhere used this proposal as evidence for the explicit role of the deity Mlk among the rp'um.


kings, probably Ammishtamru II and Niqmaddu III.\(^{271}\) That they are deceased is confirmed by the mourning rites observed on Niqmaddu's behalf and by the fact that these mlkm are located in the netherworld.

Another text has been cited as support for the chthonic nature of the mlkm. In 1.22:1:16-17 the phrase \(bqr m\) mlkm has been translated "the hall of kings" or the "heights" where "the kings" sit.\(^{272}\) Healey concluded that these were deceased kings.\(^{273}\) This would apparently fit the context of a gathering of the \(mtm, \acute{g}zrm, rp'u b\longleftarrow l, hyl hh\) in 11.6-10, and the \(c\brm\) in 1.15, but as we have shown previously (cf. 3.1.7.3.), the first three entities are not be identified as chthonic beings.

The same applies to the latter two, for their underworld affiliations are dependent upon those postulated for the former.\(^{274}\) Nevertheless, the \(c\brm\) (and the Hebrew equivalent \(\acute{c}\\bar{b}'\rfm, \text{Ezek. 39:11}\)) have been interpreted as "the ancestors passed away", or "those who came over" the river of death.\(^{275}\)

\(^{271}\)De Moor 1976:343 identified the mlkm as Ammishtamru I and Niqmaddu II, but funerary and mourning rites observed on a single historical occasion as in the case of 1.161 suggest more immediate deceased royal ancestors. In the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty, Ammisaduqa succeeds his father Ammiditana.

\(^{272}\)For "hall", see de Moor 1972(II):12-13. For "heights", see Caquot and Szynier 1974:177 n.b and cf. \(gb\longleftarrow l//q\longleftarrow l\) in 1.3:VI:7-8. See also Ribichini and Xella 1979:153 and n.42.


\(^{274}\)Spronk 1986:171, following de Moor 1969:174 n.54, renders \(hyl hh\) as "host of filth". Del Olmo Lete 1981:423 favors the reading \(hyl\)h\(h\) following CTA against KTU and on p.551 lists alternative meanings for Ugaritic hh.

However, owing to the ambiguity of the context, others have offered "traveller(s)". In any case, the significance of q\textsuperscript{1} is uncertain. The form mlkm has been taken as an adjectival genitive and q\textsuperscript{1} as "fig cake", thus, "royal fig cake". Moreover, the phrase has also been rendered "blossoms fit for kings".

The mlkm which show up in the two alphabetic pantheon lists, 1.47:11 and 1.118:32, have been viewed as singular forms with enclitic -m and therefore added confirmation that a deity MLk was known at Ugarit. But others have argued that d ma.lik\textsuperscript{2} in RS 20.24:32, the parallel Akkadian pantheon list to 1.118:32, unequivocally secures mlkm's plural status. This, however, must be qualified.

Huehnergard has recently pointed out that "the determinative \textsuperscript{2} often appears on singular forms in peripheral Akkadian and may not, per se, be taken as an unambiguous marker

---

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{77} Pope 1977B:168,176.
\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{78} E.g., L'Heureux 1979:153,157.
\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{80} Nougayrol 1968:60,339 followed by Healey 1975:235, 1985:120; and Heider 1985:117. Astour 1966:280-81 viewed mlkm as divinized mlk sacrifices as suggested by the inclusion of cult objects, such as the "censor" 'uht and "lyre" knr, and sacrifices, such as the $1m "peace offering". But $1m might be the deity $1m who appears at the end of offering lists, cf. 1.39:8 and 1.41:17, so de Tarragon 1980:159, or better yet, "completed", so Xella 1981A:327 or perhaps "divinized health", so Caquot 1979:1404.
of the plural".\(^{281}\) Thus, \(\text{d}'\text{ma lik}^\star\) in \(RS\) 20.24:32 might represent a singular form (cf. \(\text{d}'\text{ma lik}^\star\) in \(RS\) 20.121:81) and the \(-m\) on \(mlkm\) in 1.118:32 might be enclitic, but when viewed together and in conjunction with the \(malikû\) from Mari, a plural form without mimation, we prefer the plural.

Now others have deduced that the list which stands behind 1.118 and 1.47 derived from the cult.\(^{282}\) Healey stated that it replicates the "canonical" list of Ugaritic gods and was apparently influenced by the ritual of 1.148, a text which contains a similar list of gods. 1.148 begins with the heading "sacrifice of Zaphon" \(dbh\ \"spn\), and 1.47, "the gods of Zaphon" \('il\ \"spn\). Furthermore, 1.118 lists several divinized cultic objects.\(^{283}\)

In our view, this is very slight evidence indeed upon which to assign 1.118 and 1.47 a cultic function. We know that god lists had non-cultic functions e.g., as scholarly endeavors for the purpose of collecting information or propagating a particular theological doctrine.\(^{284}\) In cases where a god list had a cultic function, such is easily detectable. For example, in the Mari pantheon list published by Dossin, the numbers of sheep assigned to the deities are clearly recorded.\(^{285}\) But no such inventory

\(^{281}\) Huehnergard 1987:720.


\(^{283}\) Healey 1985:122-23.


taking is evident in 1.118 or the Ugaritic lists with the
exception of 1.148.286

In fact, 1.148 actually supports our argument. Where god
lists were used in the cult, the practice of registering the
deities along with their respective offerings was observed in the
scribal tradition at Ugarit. Even if we were to concede that
1.118 was intended for the cult, in the absence of any dating
formulae, we would have no way of knowing if it was used on a
repeated basis.

The mlkm now appear in RIH 78/14:4*: "in the month of
Kislev, you/they shall watch the mlkm" or "the mlkm shall be
observed". According to the editors, this is the first such omen
text attested at Ugarit. It apparently originates in the royal
court (cf. mlkn "our king" in 1.7').287 Healey initially
suggested that the mlkm appear here as the demonic aspect of the
mlkm, but subsequently recognized the more likely possibility
that they function as foreign hostile rulers, for other apodoses
are couched in the natural, not the supernatural, sphere.288

286Healey 1985:116-17 and 1988:104-05 discussed repeated
markings on 1.118 and RS 20.24 and concluded that these were some
type of check mark. On the analogy of the Mari pantheon list
published by Talon 1980:12-17, and cf. Lambert 1985B:528-32,
these marks are best viewed as an aid to copying, rather than
indications of the number of offerings received by each entry in
the Ugaritic lists.


288Healey 1985:124 n.25 and 1988:108. The brevity of the
omen precludes any decision on the matter, but recall that in the
Mari text recently published by Finet 1985:89, and cf. Durand
1988:489-91,501-03, a malikum possibly plays a role in divination
and the royal cult, but cf. 2.2.1.1.
In conclusion, 1.161 provides the only data from which we can extrapolate an unequivocal netherly connection for the Ugaritic mlk(m). In this text, mlk represents a deceased king, or, more generally, a ruler. As to the mlk(m)'s character or function, 1.161 intimates only that such a one resided in the netherworld to be summoned to receive and escort the royal throne on its journey toward the recently deceased king's abode (cf. 3.1.9.). As such, a dead mlk exhibited no supernatural powers.

If the mlk(m) of 1.161 are to be equated with mlkm in 1.118:32, then one might conclude that the latter's parallel in RS 20.24:32, 4ma.lik[m], points to the deification of the Ugaritic mlk(m). But this is unlikely, for nowhere in the Ugaritic texts otherwise are dead kings deified (cf. 3.1.6. and 3.1.9.), 1.161 gives no indication that the mlk(m) possessed supernatural beneficent powers, and the Akkadian listing only approximates the Ugaritic. Be that as it may, the link between the Ugaritic mlkm and the malikū or "vassal rulers" in the kispum texts from Mari —regardless of their function and nature— finds confirmation in the equation of 4ma.lik[m] and mlkm at Ugarit.

What we have said leaves open the possibility of child sacrifice at Ugarit. We know from Egyptian reliefs of the New Kingdom that in Syro-Palestinian cities under attack, children were ritually sacrificed. Nevertheless, despite the efforts of such scholars as Herdner, the Ugaritic textual evidence for

---


such practices remains enigmatic.\textsuperscript{291} The same applies to the material evidence.\textsuperscript{292}


\textsuperscript{292} Cf. Schaeffer 1962:77-83 but see Bińkowski 1982:80-89, esp. p.81 who concluded that no evidence of ritual cremation evincing violent death or a sacrificial context, or for that matter, cremation in general, is attested at Ugarit.
3.1.9. THE UGARITIC VERSION OF THE ROYAL KISPUM

With the discovery and publication of KTU 1.161 = RS 34.126, it appeared that previous studies were all but vindicated in the assumption that ancestor cult practices were common place among Ugarit's royalty. In spite of this growing consensus, we are convinced that the internal evidence and literary generic affinities of 1.161 point in another direction.

3.1.9.1. THE LITERARY GENRE

On the whole, previous studies tended to confuse rather than clarify the literary genre of KTU 1.161. Admittedly, this was due in part to the attendant difficulties vis-à-vis the readings as published in the initial editions of the text. This was particularly the case with the heading in 1.1.

Lipiński read spr dbḥ qlm in 1.1 as "booklet of the sacrifice of a child" and understood it as a ritual text related to child sacrifice and the cult of the dead. In his most


294 Lipiński 1978:98. He understood mlk in 11.12,26 as "molash" sacrifice", a sevenfold sacrifice (cf. ṭcy in 11.27-30). The reading of qlm, upon which his general interpretation depended, must be rejected in favor of ẓlm (see below).
detailed treatment on the Rephaim, Caquot read spr dbh 'ilm and concluded that this text comprised a poem intended to accompany a sacrifice to the gods.\footnote{Caquot 1981:354. He included within the category of gods the rp'um whom he viewed as the deceased royal ancestors based on his view of 1.113.}

In their latest discussion of 1.161, Dietrich and Loretz thought our text reflected a marzeah feast and assumed that the latter was part of the cult of the dead.\footnote{Dietrich and Loretz 1983:23. L'Heureux 1979:192 and Margalit 1980:199 and n.1 also mentioned this possibility but rejected it. Against the death cult relations of the Ugaritic marzeah, cf. 3.1.5. We should mention that 1.161 offers no indication that it was a feast per se.}

More frequently, 1.161 has been compared with the royal Mesopotamian kispum ritual and the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty in particular.\footnote{De Moor 1976:333 n.72 was the first to suggest a comparison of 1.161 and the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty. His proposal has been followed by most subsequent writers. Michalowski 1983:245 labelled 1.161 a royal ancestor list "encountered within the context of ritual offerings to deceased ancestors".}

\footnote{Pitard 1978:67,69,72. 1.161:2-12 comprise the invocation, 11.13-17, the food offerings, (11.18-19) 20-26, the libations, and 11.27-30, seven extispicies to determine the decision of the dead (11.31-34 indicate that the rite was efficacious). On p.72, he concluded "in some, if not all, cases, haruspicies were carried out in Mesopotamian kispum rituals . . . " and in n.30 cited Nougayrol 1967:222-23 in support, but the latter cited only one text BM 78564. Tropper 1989:129,144-50 has proposed a similar understanding of the text in which 1.161 comprises a necromantic incantation for the purpose of obtaining the active involvement of the ancestors in the present.}

Pitard, having outlined what he believed to be the essential components of the kispum ritual—an incantation and invocation of the dead, food offerings, and libations as well as the optional element of haruspicies—proceeded to interpret 1.161 along very similar lines.\footnote{Pitard 1978:67,69,72. 1.161:2-12 comprise the invocation, 11.13-17, the food offerings, (11.18-19) 20-26, the libations, and 11.27-30, seven extispicies to determine the decision of the dead (11.31-34 indicate that the rite was efficacious). On p.72, he concluded "in some, if not all, cases, haruspicies were carried out in Mesopotamian kispum rituals . . . " and in n.30 cited Nougayrol 1967:222-23 in support, but the latter cited only one text BM 78564. Tropper 1989:129,144-50 has proposed a similar understanding of the text in which 1.161 comprises a necromantic incantation for the purpose of obtaining the active involvement of the ancestors in the present.}
To be sure, others have discovered additional elements in common with the kispum ritual. With the recent publication of Mari 12803, Dietrich and Loretz had initially identified several elements it shared with 1.161. According to these authors, both texts record offerings to the images (cf. lamassatu 12803:i:5 and qlm 1.161:1) of the divinized kings made at the foot of their thrones. Moreover, the sun deity plays a central role in both. Based on these shared elements, the authors equated dbḥ of 1.161:1 with kispum of Mari 12803:I:2 "offering(s) to the ancestors".

Nevertheless, nowhere in the text of 1.161 can evidence be cited in favor of its use on a regular basis. In fact, the benediction (11.31-34) makes clear that the text was composed for a specific historical occasion, the coronation of Ammurapi III with its attendant mourning rites in honor of his recently deceased father Niqmaddu III (11.13-16).

In this respect, 1.161 does find its closest parallel in the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty. But this must be

---

299 Pope 1977B:178 read qlm in 1.161:1 and connected it with the bit qultišu and bit kispi of the Shamshi-Addu inscription discussed in 2.2.2.

300 Dietrich and Loretz 1980:381-82. In 1983:21, they continued to uphold the close parallels shared by 1.161 and Mari 12803.


302 Levine and de Tarragon 1984:654,659 speculated that 1.161 was a canonical liturgy used whenever succession took place and assumed that the ritual, while funerary in nature, initiated the cult of the dead, cf. also L'Heureux 1979:192. However, not all cultures having funerary rites observe death and/or ancestor cults, cf. also Newell 1976:18-19; Singleton 1977:3; Hultkrantz 1978:102; and Hardacre 1987:264.
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qualified. Not only does the Genealogy lack any indication of its regular use, it too is tied to a specific occasion, the coronation of the Babylonian king Ammisaduqa with perhaps accompanying funerary rites for his father Ammiditana. Therefore, like 1.161 it should not be classified as a regularly occurring *kispum* ritual.

To be sure, both evince closer affinities with coronation ceremonies than with the repeated *kispum* rituals like the *kispum Ya Šarrāni* and Mari 12803. We contend that the Genealogy and 1.161 reflect rites characteristic of the royal coronation, with the funerary rites for the former king in 1.161 comprising an expansion on this ritual complex.

The Mesopotamian version of the coronation ceremony comprised as many as eleven distinct, but variable, elements; divine election, assembly of the nobles and dignitaries, preparatory purification, the king's presentation before the deity, investiture with insignia, giving of a throne name, acclamation of the king (blessing of the gods and people),

---

303 Pitard 1978:69 proposed that separate texts circulated which recorded the full list of ancestors invoked in 1.161 and the Genealogy, since normally all the ancestors were invoked during the *kispum* ritual. However, he can cite no example in support of these claims. Besides, Mari 12803 lists only Sargon and Naram-Sin by name, cf. also ARMT 3:40 in 2.2.1 where only one Yahdun-Lim is mentioned. In any case, *kispum Ya Šarrāni* at Mari may refer to select individual kings of days gone by.

304 Cf. 3.1.7.1. It should be recalled that neither *kispum* nor any other term regularly associated with such rites can be found in the text and this has resulted in a variety of interpretations, cf. the surveys in Wilson 1977:107-14 and Charpin and Durand 1986:163-70.

305 Cf. Artzi 1980:161-70 for the observation that coronation and funerary rites in honor of dignitaries are components of international diplomacy.
enthronement, paying of homage (and swearing of loyalty oaths),
affirmation by the king, and celebration.\textsuperscript{306} We know that
sacrifice was occasionally offered as well.\textsuperscript{307} Several of these
find analogues in 1.161.

Such elements as the assembly of nobles and dignitaries,
the presentation before the national or local deity of the king-to-be in the temple or shrine, the acclamation of the king, and
sacrifices to the god(s) all find parallels in 1.161.\textsuperscript{308} The
assembly of nobles and dignitaries finds its analogue in 11.2-5,9-10 as we take the entities mentioned there to be living persons. The acclamation of the king can be seen in the closing lines, 11.31-34, the presentation before the deity might be reflected in 1.18, and seven sacrifices to the deity are recorded in 11.27-30 and anticipated in 1.1 \textit{spr dbḥ ṣlm} (cf. 3.1.9.2.).

The assembly of nobles and dignitaries is ubiquitous in
coronational procedures throughout the ancient Near East from
Neo-Sumerian times onwards.\textsuperscript{309} In a Middle Assyrian coronation
ceremony, nobles or \textit{rabānu} and princes or \textit{ṣa reš šarrāni} gather

\textsuperscript{306}Cf. Wilkinson 1986:242-71 who also adds as a possible element anointing with oil which while not explicit in Mesopotamia was observed in the adjacent regions. His work significantly expands that of Ben-Barak 1980:56-67 who outlined only three stages in the Mesopotamian coronation ceremony; the convocation, the installation, and the acclamation.


\textsuperscript{308}Both Bordreuil and Pardee 1982:128 and Levine and de Tarragon 1984:654 recognized the connections of 1.161 with coronational ceremony based on the presence of the acclamation of the king, but both failed to adequately apply the implications of their findings to the interpretation of the text in its entirety.

\textsuperscript{309}Cf. e.g., de Vaux 1961:102-07 and Wilkinson 1986:242-71 and esp. p.266 where the assembly is documented for texts dating from the Neo-Sumerian period through to the Neo-Babylonian period.
to kiss the feet of the new king, offer him gifts, and give their blessing before the people. This text also lists the sun deity in the form of the winged disk or Šalmu as intimately involved in the coronation rites. As such it has its comparable element in 1.161:1 in Žlm.\textsuperscript{310} In a recently published epic which contains a coronational ceremony for Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, the "nobles of the land" IŞrubũšši ša māti and "the dignitaries of Akkad" IŞrubûtušši kur Akkadištī assemble and kneel before the king, greet and pray for him, and publicly bless him in the sight of the people.\textsuperscript{311} We should mention in this regard another recently published Old Babylonian text from Tell Asmar in which "the ambassadors of the whole land" Šipru mātim and "all the Amorites" Ammurum kaluššu gather for the funeral of Abda-El, an Amorite chieftain, in order to pay their respects and to participate in his successor's coronation.\textsuperscript{312}

The repeated occurrence of this last coronational element strongly suggests that we could expect its presence in 1.161. It is our contention that the summons of the rp'i 'arš and the qbsp ddn to assemble reflects this characteristic coronational element. Just as in the funeral of Abda-El, the Amorites are assembled to pay their respects to the dead and to offer their blessing upon the new king, so it is in the case of 1.161 wherein


the Amorite related Ditānu and the rp'um warriors are assembled among whose ranks we could expect many nobles and princes.\footnote{If we adopted the etymological proposal of Aistleitner wherein Ugaritic $r-p-$ is equated with Akkadian rubûm, ruba'um "prince", then we would have a virtual semantic equivalent between rp'i 'ars of 1.161 and the $\text{'}\text{rubûum}$ $\text{'}\text{ša māti of the Nabopolassar coronation ceremony, but cf. 3.1.7.5.}}$

This supports our previous findings vis-à-vis the rp'um, namely that a living element from among this group is presupposed in the Ugaritic texts. Thus, the presumed similarities which 1.161, and for that matter the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty, share with the regularly observed kispum rituals are only apparent not real.

On the other hand, Mari 12803 lacks any mention of the living king and nobility, appears as part of the liturgical calendar, and explicitly records kispum offerings beginning with the first day of Addar (1.1) and repeated perhaps thereafter at the appointed times mušter[tam] kispam ikassap (cf. 11.28-30).\footnote{Cf. Birot 1980:145; Tsukimoto 1985:73-78. Had this text been tied to a particular occasion, a royal funeral and/or a coronation, and not to the royal ancestor cult, on the analogy of 1.161 and the Genealogy, one would have expected the mention of the deceased father and his son, the living king, in this case Ilakabkabu and Shamshi-Addu respectively.}

It is not a direct parallel with our text, for it was used on a repeated basis and is unconnected to coronation rites per se.

That an assembly of living persons of prominence is gathered on the occasion of the ritual reflected in 1.161 gains additional support from the text. In the ritual descent of Niqmaddu's throne to the netherworld (11.20-26), nowhere are the rp'i 'ars or the qbs ddn explicitly located in the 'land below'.

Taking this into account as well as our arguments in 3.1.7.,
L'Heureux's observation concerning the need for the Ugaritians to qualify the term rp'um is apposite "It would hardly be necessary to specify that these rp'im are qdmym if the word rp'm originally and of itself referred to the dead" (cf. 11.8,24). 315

However, L'Heureux wrongly included in the rp'im qdmym all of the names in 11.4-8. We would add to this group only the individuals listed in 11.6-7, Sdn-w-Rdn and Tr c11mn, for in 11.22b-24a only these two -as identifiable members of the rp'im qdmym- are located in the netherworld. Moreover, the fact that the two names which are attributed the epithet rp'u, Ulkn and Trmn of 11.4-5, are not so located, strengthens our suggestion that living elements among the rp'um are to be identified in the texts from Ugarit and that in 1.161 they comprise the assembled warriors from among whom nobles and dignitaries rose to office.

We now turn to consider in what capacity the dead in 11.6-8, 11-12 and again in 11.22b-25 are summoned. Tropper, like most interpreters before him, identified all those entities in 11.2-12, 22b-25 as apparitions who were invoked in order to bestow their blessings upon the new king.316 But if 1.161's affinities with coronation procedures to which we have several Mesopotamian textual witnesses (as opposed to no unequivocal examples of 'necrophantic' liturgies) are an accurate reflection of the religio-political concerns of the ritual, then it is far more likely that the blessings of 11.31-34 are those of the deity and the people, in this case, Shapash -the only deity explicitly

315L'Heureux 1979:204 and cf. p.189. However, we reject his identification of these as dead kings.

mentioned in the text- and the living warriors, nobles, dignitaries and the population of Ugarit.

That the dead were not summoned from the netherworld to return to the world above (in the form of their statues?) is supported by the fact that in 11.20-25, where the throne is portrayed as descending to the netherworld (cf. 3.1.9.2. on 11.20-26), it is received down below by Sdn-w-Rdn, Tr cilmn the rp'im qdmym, and Amittamru. In other words, the writer of 1.161 not only presupposes the location of these entities in the netherworld in his initial summons in 11.6-8,11-12, he never lets them leave that region as 11.20-26 demonstrate. The summons served to alert the dead to prepare to receive Niqmaddu's soon-to-descent throne. We offer as a structural outline of 1.161:

317 The other entities generally understood to return to the world above from below, namely, the rp'i 'arş, the qbs ddn, Ulkn, and Trmn (11.2-5.9-10) we identified as living groups or individuals. They are never explicitly depicted as located in the netherworld which may also explain their different titles and epithets from those located below.

318 Note that Niqmaddu is not one of those to whom the throne descends, cf. 1.26. Perhaps too they were to transport it to its proper place in anticipation of Niqmaddu's eventual arrival following the liminal stage of death (cf. 1.2.). For the benefit of the living in attendance, this summons also served a legitimating function fulfilled through the recitation of these names within the constraints of an artificial genealogical framework (i.e., geneonymy).

319 For further discussion on the literary genre of 1.161 cf. 3.1.9.2., 1.1 zlm.
I. Heading: A [Coronation] Ceremony with Sacrifices [and oath swearing] before Șalmu [the divine emblem of the solar deity] (1.1)

II. First Call for the Assembly of the Living Warrior-Nobility (11.2-5)

*III. Summons of the Deceased Warrior Heroes of Old [to prepare to receive the soon-to-descend throne of Niqmaddu] (11.6-8)

IV. Second Call for the Assembly of the Living Warrior-Nobility (11.9-10)

*V. Summons of the the Recently Deceased Kings [to prepare to receive the soon-to-descend throne of Niqmaddu] (11.11-12)

*VI. The New King's Mourning for his Predecessor-Father [with the shedding of tears to invigorate Niqmaddu during his journey to the netherworld] (11.13-17)

VII. The New King's Presentation before the Solar Deity, Shapash (11.18-19)

*VIII. Ritual Netherly Descent of the Deceased Predecessor's Throne (11.20-26)

IX. Sacrifices to the Solar Deity, Shapash (11.27-30)

X. Acclamation of the New King with Blessing (11.31-34)

* = funerary and mourning elements

---

A TYPICAL ANCESTOR CULT INTERPRETATION OF KTU 1.161

I. Heading: A Celebration in Honor of the "Shades" (1.1)

II. Summons of the Illustrious Dead to Ascend in order to Supernaturally Bless the Living (11.2-12)

III. The New King's Mourning for his Deceased Father (11.13-17)

IV. The Solar Deity's Descent and Retrieval of the Illustrious Dead (11.18-26)

V. Sacrifices in Honor of the Illustrious Dead (11.27-30)

VI. The Blessing of the New King, the Queen, and the City of Ugarit by the Illustrious Dead (11.31-34)
1. spr. dbh. zlm  The account of the sacred celebration before Šalmu:

2. qr'itm. rp'i. 'a[rs]  "Have you called the Mighty Ones of the Earth?"

3. qb'itm. qbs. d[dn]  Have you summoned the Gathered Ones of Didanu?

4. qr'a. 'ulkn. rp['a  He called Ulkn, the Mighty One,

5. qr'a. trmn. rp['a  He called Trmn, the Mighty One;

6. qr'a. sdn. w. rd[n]  He called Sdn-w-Rdn,

7. qr'a. tr. cllmn[  He called Tr cllmn,

8. qr'u. rp'im. qdmym.  They called the Mighty Ones from Old;

9. qr'itm. rp'i. 'ars  Have you called the Mighty Ones of the Earth?

10. qb'itm. qbs. dd[nn]  Have you summoned the Gathered Ones of Didanu?

11. qr'a. c mtmr. m[l]k  He called Amittamru, the (defunct) king,

12. qr'a. 'u. nqm[d] mlk  He called, yea, Niqmaddu the (defunct) king;

13. ks'i. nqmd [.] tbky  At the throne of Niqmaddu, you must weep,

14. wydm[. hdm. p' nh  as he who sheds tears at his footstool;

15. lpnh. ybk. tlhn.  Before him, he must weep at the table,

    mlk]- (16)- w. ybl[. 'udm[ th  so that the (defunct) king might swallow his tears;

16. cdmt. w. c dm[. c dm[  Gnashing of teeth and gnashing of teeth, gnashing of teeth.

17. išḥn. šps[  I bow down, O Shapash.

    w. išḥn (19) nyr. rbt.  I bow down, O Great Light,

    c lin. šps[ tšš  Lift me up O Shapash, please shine!

18. 'agr [.b]l k. l. ksh.  After your Lord, O throne,

    'agr (21) bclk. 'ars. rd.  After your Lord to earth descend,

    'ars. (22) rd. w. špl. c pr.  To earth descend and be low in the dust;
Go down to Sdn-w-Rdn;

Go down to Tr c llmn;

Go down to the Mighty Ones of Old;

Go down to Amittamru, the king,

May you remain warm, yea, Niqmaddu, the king;

One and an offering.

Two and an offering.

Three and an offering.

Four and an offering.

Five and an offering.

Six and an offering.

Seven and an offering.

The sacred assembly is convened!

Peace! Peace to Ammurapi!

and peace to his sons!

Peace to Taryelli!

and peace to her house!

Peace to Ugarit!

and peace to its gates!"
3.1.9.2. AN ANALYSIS OF KTU 1.161

1.161 was unearthed in 1973 and a published transcription of the text based on a plaster cast of the tablet soon followed in 1975.\textsuperscript{320} One year later the editors of KTU offered a collation of the tablet without the aid of photographs, KTU 1.161. A list of corrections to KTU gleaned from photographs in Ugaritica VII was subsequently published in 1981.\textsuperscript{321}

Two new independent collations of the text have recently appeared, both based on a detailed investigation of the original tablet housed in the Aleppo Museum.\textsuperscript{322} They disagree essentially on three readings, \textquoteleft ibky / tbky (1.13), tqdš/m / tqdm/d (1.30), and b'ah / bnh (1.32). Be that as it may, none pose insurmountable difficulties for our interpretation.

Line 1: The form spr has been interpreted as "the written record", "account", or "instruction" of the sacrifice of zlm. The underlying assumption is that 1.161 records a ritual. The mention of dbh and the language of 11.13-17 and/or 11.27-30 have served as its textual support. In our view, 1.161 should be viewed as a descriptive, not a prescriptive, ritual. Although the words of the king are quoted in the lament and petition sections, explicit ritual instructions are otherwise lacking.

\textsuperscript{320} Caquot 1975-76:427-29.
\textsuperscript{321} Dijkstra, de Moor and Spronk 1981:374-78.
\textsuperscript{322} Cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 1982:121-28 with additional remarks in Pardee 1987:211-17 and Pitard 1987:75-86 (photographs and drawings, pp.110-55). On p.76 n.6, Pitard noted that most of his research had been completed by the time Bordreuil and Pardee appeared.
Line 1: dbh is in the genitive case and depicts the occasion on which this recitation text is read i.e., "the account of the sacred celebration for zlm". While the term is commonly translated "sacrifice", it can denote a celebration involving a processional. In 1.148:1, dbh appears as the title of such a sacred celebration "for Zaphon" dbh spn, that is, for the gods of the pantheon. It occurs elsewhere at Ugarit in a mortuary context where offerings are placed at the grave on one particular occasion subsequent to burial (cf. dbht in 1.142:1 and see 3.1.2.).

Line 1: zlm. In view of the generic affinities 1.161 shares with coronation procedures and its lack of commonalities with royal ancestor cult rites (or, for that matter, funerary rites involving grave offerings), we offer a different interpretation of zlm than those offered previously. Dalley has argued that in Mesopotamia from the mid-second millennium onwards the cognate term salmu designated the god Šalmu, another name for the sun god Shamash.

Moreover, iconographically the term presupposed the presence of the divine emblem, the winged disk, upon which loyalty oaths were sworn to the royal dynasty. In addition to Šalmu's occurrence in such contexts as treaty ceremonies, the

---

223 Cf. Virolleaud 1968:582 and de Tarragon 1980:56, 98-99, 103, 109-10. These authors assumed a meaning "banquet", but there is no hint of a funerary meal in the text. The latter appears to have realized this in Levine and de Tarragon 1984:651 "sacred celebration". In any case, this is not a marzšaḥ feast associated with the cult of the dead contra Dietrich and Löretz 1983:23.
author concludes that it appears elsewhere in oath swearing contexts, the Assyrian coronation ritual mentioned previously being a case in point.\textsuperscript{324}

We would suggest that $zlm$ in 1.161:1 should be read as $\text{Şal}mu$, the iconographic emblem of the sun goddess Shapash. That two distinct terms for the sun goddess are present in 1.161, $\text{Şal}mu$ (1.1) and Shapash (11.18-19) can be explained as follows. The name $\text{Şal}mu$ is used in the heading to represent the presence of the specific design of the winged disk, the sun goddess's divine emblem. As such it functioned as the focal point of the coronation ritual and as the emblem upon which oaths of loyalty to the ruling dynasty were sworn.\textsuperscript{325} The same obtains elsewhere as $\text{Şal}mu$, $\text{Şal}mu$-sarri, and Shamash occur together in a single text and as such were represented by two or more slightly different symbols in the presence of which oaths were sworn.\textsuperscript{326}  

\textsuperscript{324} Cf. n.310 and Dalley 1986:85-101, esp. pp.93,97-98. On p.97, Dalley concluded that $\text{Şal}mu$ also showed up at royal burial rites as the $\text{ dém}$ at Alalakh as AT 366:12,20 suggested, but this is controvertible. In the statue of Idrimi found in a different stratum at Alalakh, $\text{ dém}$ represents the royal statue.\textsuperscript{325} Dalley 1986:94-96. In the light of the eleven or so possible elements that could be represented in a coronation text, the relative brevity of 1.161 can be explained along the lines offered by Ben-Barak 1980:67 for the abridged version of Nabopolassar's coronation. As is likely in the case of our text, war was being waged or imminent so the concern for the confirmation and blessing of the gods resulted in an abbreviated account although this may not necessarily reflect what transpired in general practice.\textsuperscript{326} Dalley 1986:90-91.
Verreet's findings regarding the significance of the aleph sign and his analysis of the verbal system has severely weakened the case for an internal passive verb in Ugaritic. Dietrich and Loretz thoroughly applied Verreet's findings to 1.161 in an attempt to remove the difficulties with regard to the person, number, and voice of the verbs and the case of the related nouns. They rendered the verbs of 11.2-3, 9-10 as jussives and the forms in 11.4-8, 11-12 as imperatives: qr'u in 1.8 2mpl and qr'a in 11.4-7, 11-12 2fpl. Thus, both men and women take active parts in the ceremonies as is possibly the case in 1.40. The authors also suggested new grammatical analyses for ks'i and 'ibky in 1.13 and rp'im in 1.24 in view of Verreet's theory concerning the vowelless aleph. The form ks'i was rendered kussi'a, the accusative singular, 'ibky as 'abkiyu 1cs (but read now tbky in 1.13), and rp'im as rapi'ūma, the nominative plural.


328 Cf. Verreet 1983:234-36 and 1986:324-30 against Good 1980:41 and Bordreuil and Pardee 1982:126 who follow Singer 1948:1-10 on the vocative significance of the oblique case. Forms like y'uhd previously read as passives of one kind or another, Verreet read as ya'ḥudu, an active imperfect, just like y'ihd = ya'ḥudu. In both cases, whether 'u or 'i, the aleph is vowelless and closes a syllable.


Xella translated the forms in ll.2-12 as perfects. The change from plural to singular coincides with the change from general reference to specific rp'um and with the change of subject. This avoids the necessity of postulating designated male and female roles, the supporting evidence for which is dubious (cf. 1.40). Del Olmo Lete prefers the "rhetoric/imperative alternance frequent in the hymnic form" (cf. 1.4:III:30-36). Our view is a combination of Xella and Del Olmo Lete and affords us the advantage of circumventing the instructional imperative.

Lines 2-3, 9-10: rp'i 'arṣ // qbṣ ddn. In our diachronic study of the Ugaritic data (cf. 3.1.7.), we proposed that the rp'i 'arṣ // qbṣ dt/dn originally represented mythic warrior heroes lacking any link with the netherworld as suggested by a detailed examination of their mention in the mythological texts (cf. e.g., 1.15:III). On the other hand, our findings identified a living element within the rp'um in the dispensary lists which date from the latter days of Ugarit. This living element was called the bn Rp'iyn. In the coronation of Ammurapi, also from the latter days of Ugarit, such living warriors are identified as the rp'i 'arṣ. Their status as living warriors is given added support by the generic affinities of 1.161 with coronation ceremonies. In such ceremonies, nobles and dignitaries are called to assemble on the occasion of the coronation of a king (cf. 3.1.9.1.). In the case of our text, their assembly functioned to give the new king both civil and sacral legitimation.

Line 13: *ks'i*. In previous treatments, interpreters assumed that the *aleph* represented the case of the noun and were thereby forced to argue that the throne was personified in this instance and given a vocative plural force (but cf. *ksh* in 1.20).\(^{334}\)

However, the plural of *ks'i* would be *ks'at*. Moreover, we cite the findings of Verreet, namely that irrespective of the accompanying vowel, the Ugaritic *aleph* sign with third *aleph* nouns in syllable closing position is vowelless.\(^{335}\) Thus, *kussi'a* is best rendered in the accusative case as the object of the verb *tbky*.

Line 13: *tbky*. This reading is preferred by Pitard although it remains in doubt.\(^{336}\) The verbal form is the G 2ms imperfect *tabkiyu* "you shall weep" and refers to Ammurapi. If the alternative 'ibky were preferred, it would not be necessary to analyze it as the rarely attested imperative with prosthetic *aleph* as so often is the case. Verreet has shown that the *aleph* sign when prefixed to verbal forms can signify the vowelless *aleph* prefix, thus 'abkiyu "I will weep".\(^{337}\)

Line 15: *tlhn mlk*. The latter was formerly read as ml'α and cited as evidence for the mention of food offerings. The preferred reading is *mlk*. This form is not in genitival relationship with *tlhn*. Based on the stichometry of 11.15-16, *mlk* is best understood as a case of enjambment and should be included


\(^{335}\) Verreet 1983:256-57.


in 1.16 with the following w. The w should be viewed as either a mater lectionis for the vowel of the nominative case i.e., mlkw = malku or it might represent the emphatic conjunction.

Line 16: 'udm=th. The mention of tears has not attracted the attention of scholars other than to suggest a common mourning rite. But the magical power of tears has played a central role in funerary rituals in other societies. For example, in the funerary feasts of the Torajas, the Galelarese and the Javanese of Indonesia, tears were thought to possess the power to revive the dead as well as express grief and mourning. In Scandinavian mythology, Baldr, the beautiful son of Odin, having been killed could leave the netherworld of Hel and return to live among the gods only if all things in creation shed tears for him. In our text, tears, in addition to their expression of sorrow, might have possessed the power to invigorate the spirit of Ammurapi's father during the debilitating journey to the dry, dusty netherworld.

Line 17: cdmt. Pope has offered the Arabic cognate c adama "to seize with the teeth, bite, chew violently" as an expression of violent grief. This is particularly appropriate to the context.

338 Cf. Gaster 1950:15-16 and Moon 1987:360-61. Hvidberg 1962:55-56 offered a similar interpretation of Anat's weeping for the dead Baal in 1.6:I:9-10 and cf. 1.19:II:61-74, but this went hand-in-hand with his interpretation of the Baal-Mot myth as a seasonal fertility cult drama, so the tears were viewed as reviving the vegetation.

339 Gaster 1976:101-02 offers the explanation that the tears simply served to quench the thirst of Niqmaddu.

Line 18: ’šhn. This form has been most frequently analyzed as an imperative with prosthetic aleph. In light of Verreet's findings, we prefer a prefixed verbal form of šwh/šhh "to bow down, sink down" with suffixed n.341 The subject then would be the living king who laments the death of his father.

Line 19: cln. This form is generally rendered as a preposition or adverb cly with the pronominal suffix n. We read the form as calini, the internal causative imperative of cly with lcs suffix "lift me up!".342 As such, it would serve as the complement to the king's sinking down, for now the king petitions Shapash to restore and exalt him. How Shapash accomplishes the king's restoration is described at the end of 1.19.

Line 19: tšš. With the understanding of this portion of 1.19 as an introductory formula preceding a speech of Shapash in 11.20ff. the form tšš has been derived from a root šw/yh "to shout, cry out". But words of incantation or the like are not normally put in the mouth of a god.343 Besides, a portrayal of the sun goddess as calling out (tšš) seems out of place.

Caquot offered šhh "to gleam, be dazzling".344 A similar alternative might be nšš "to shine" as found in Syriac. In other words, Ammurapi petitions the sun goddess for her invigorating power to one stricken with grief. But 1.19b might also comprise

---

341 For this etymology, cf. Pitard 1978:71. Others proposed šhn "to be hot" with the sun goddess as subject following Caquot 1974-75:427.


343 So Pitard 1978:71.

344 Caquot 1974-75:428.
the king's presentation before the deity, with the appearance of the sun goddess's light sought by the king signalling her sanction of his royal claim. That a shrine of Shapash might provide the backdrop for this coronation ceremony with its attendant mourning rites is supported by not only the sun goddess's great popularity in the Ugaritic cult (cf. e.g., 1.41. etc.), but also the fact that she had a cultic place built in her honor, a bt špš (cf. 6.24:2). Whether this comprised a sanctuary within the royal complex or an independent structure is difficult to determine. In Mari 12803, the sun god's sanctuary is mentioned and it has been suggested that that kispum ritual might have been enacted in an area within the royal palace dedicated to Shamash.\footnote{Durand 1987A:108 n.209 and 11.I:12-15. Birot 1980:143,146 concluded that a temple of Shamash was in view.}

**Lines 20-26: 'attr . . . 'arš rd.** A number of commentators have taken these lines to refer to Shapash's descent to the netherworld, but both our negative findings with regard to the presumed netherworld descent of the sun deity at Ugarit and the specific criticisms against this interpretation of 1.161 suggest otherwise (cf. 3.1.7.2.).\footnote{Taylor 1988:151-77 has summarized the criticisms against this position; (1) Shapash would have to speak to herself but the second person suffix on bæk in 1.21 proves otherwise and (2) no one in the context could be considered "the Lord" of Shapash who would have the authority to order her to descend.}

We prefer the interpretation which has the throne descending to the netherworld "after its Lord", Niqmaddu. This position has been recently defended and sufficient comparative
evidence has been cited which depicts the importance and presence of the royal throne in the netherworld. 347

Nevertheless, the question remains as to how this descent was thought to be accomplished. It is most likely that during the ritual the throne was placed in the royal tomb alongside the king. In a recently published Neo-Assyrian text describing a royal funeral, the regalia of the dead king was first presented before the sun god Shamash and then placed in the royal tomb. 348

That the throne is depicted as descending not to Niqmaddu, but to others already resident in the netherworld (11.22b-25) can be supported as follows. With the dead heroes and kings summoned (11.6-8,11-12), the appropriate funerary rites of mourning (and gift giving) completed (11.13-17), and the sun-goddess's sanction of the new king announced (11.18-19), Niqmaddu's throne was placed with his body in the tomb which was then shut and sealed. The throne was then commanded to descend to the netherworld where the dead heroes and kings waited to transport it to Niqmaddu's netherly abode.

It was probably held that the throne preceded Niqmaddu to the netherworld in anticipation of his arrival there which would subsequently take place following the extended process of decay. This entails that we take seriously the scribe's intention in

347 Cf. Taylor 1988:151-77. The critique of Lewis 1989:40-44 not only sets aside this view prematurely, but cannot stand in light of our findings regarding the lack of reference in the Ugaritic texts to the sun goddess's location in the netherworld.

recording $\text{thm} \ 'u. \ nqmd \ . \ mlk$ "May you stay warm, O Niqmaddu the king" in 1.26 (see below) as a reference to the sun goddess's care for the dead king during his transition, or rite of passage, from the world of the living to the world of the dead.

Line 20: $ksh$. We follow those commentators who read here a scribal error for $ks'i$ "throne". 349

Lines 22-25: $\text{tht}$. Most view this as the preposition "beneath, under". Alternative nouns have also been proposed. 350 Margalit offered a verb based on Akkadian $ta\ddot{u}$ meaning "juxtapose". 351 Del Olmo Lete proposed the root $nht$ "to descend" and we analyze the form as a G volitive parallel to the preceding imperatives $ti\ddot{h}hata$ "go down" (cf. Hebrew $n\ddot{a}\dot{h}\dot{e}\ddot{t}$). 352

Line 26: $\text{thm}$. Interpreters emend this form to $\text{tht}$ owing to the latter's four previous occurrences. However, the root $\text{hm}m$ "to be warm, heated" and the likelihood that Niqmaddu had yet to arrive in the netherworld as he was only recently or about to be buried recommends the alternative of positing a request that Shapash give warmth to Niqmaddu during his journey toward that chilly destination. 353


353 This was anticipated alongside the invigoration/sustenance offered through the swallowing of tears. Gaster 1976:102 and n.54 noted the Tyrolean custom of kindling a fire for the purpose of warming the spirits of the dead, but he
Line 27: tcy. This form is commonly translated "to make sacrifice" and finds immediate support in the mention of dbh in 1.1. The term is well attested at Ugarit.384

Line 30: tqdm cšr. The latter has been unanimously rendered "bird" by commentators. But the assumed mention of birds would in fact oppose this interpretation, for we know that in Mesopotamia the sacrifice of birds to chthonic beings was prohibited.385 Hebrew offers an interesting alternative in ẖāšar "to retain", cf. ẖāšārah "sacred assembly".386 The form here is the G passive participle ẖāšīru used collectively (lit. "those retained"). In view of the cultic context and the Hebrew analogue, we translate cšr as "the sacred assembly", a reference to the completed gathering and the close of the ceremonies.387 The verb tqdm we read as the D passive preterite "the sacred assembly is convened".388

In conclusion, we reject the royal ancestor cult interpretation of 1.161. The mention of Ammurapi, the recipient posited this for 'išhn (11.18-19) of our text.


385 For the text, see Thureau-Dangin 1921:65,79,85 [AO 6451:42] and cf. Oppenheim 1977:191 and CAD 7(1960):213. The prohibitions against bird and ox sacrifices to Belet-šeri and Eresh-kigal are unqualified (1.42), while those against sheep offerings to Shakkan (in the temple of Shamash) and against offerings of beef to Kharru (in the temple of Sin) are restricted to a specific sacred locale (11.40-41).


387 For this phenomenon at Ugarit, see Segert 1984:49 (par.52.2).

of the blessings endowed, along with several elements characteristic of a coronation suggest its use on that sole occasion. We view 1.161 as a ritual incorporating funerary or, more specifically, mourning rites on behalf of Niqmaddu, Ammurapi's father and former king of Ugarit, within the larger complex of coronation rites intended to secure the (oath of) loyalty from the military and royal establishments. The dead are summoned simply to transport Niqmaddu's throne to its netherly abode once placed in the grave while the living are summoned to publicly acknowledge the legitimacy of the new king.

3.1.10. SUMMARY

We discovered that the assumed identification of the \textit{rp'um} as defunct kings, the widely accepted interpretation of \textit{'il'ib} as the divinized ancestor(s), as well as the repeated identification of the Ugaritic \textit{marzēah} as an institution related to the royal ancestor cult (or to a death cult more generally) are all dubious and that more adequate interpretations commend themselves. Likewise, necromancy \textit{per se} remains unattested at Ugarit.

The mention of dead kings in 1.113 and 1.161 who, it should be pointed out, are not deified, can be cited neither in support of the regular participation of the defunct \textit{mlkm} in the royal cult nor to the exercise of their supernatural beneficent power amongst the living. In fact, 1.161 might point to the weak status of the spirits of dead royalty as they must receive invigoration and sustenance in order to complete their netherly journey. Such frailty also characterizes the Mesopotamian dead.
The epigraphic evidence does attest to the royal aspiration of commemoration in death as one perpetually worthy of the status endowed by the *rp’i ‘ars* and *qbs dtn*, to such funerary rites as mourning rites enacted on behalf of recently deceased kings and to the ritual transfer of the deceased king’s throne to its proper netherly locale by the spirits of former heroes and kings.

3.2. THE EVIDENCE FROM NUZI AND EMAR

In addition to the extensive textual traditions from Ebla, Mari, and Ugarit, we must peruse the intriguing written remains from the neighboring locales of Nuzi and Emar.

3.2.1. THE EVIDENCE FROM NUZI

Mourning and burial rites are well attested at Nuzi. That death and ancestor cult rites were observed at Nuzi has also been suggested. The Nuzi terms *kipsu*, *kispātu*, and *kipsātu* have each been offered as derivatives of *kispum* with metathesis cited as the explanation for the first and last forms. Moreover,

---


commentators have identified the ilānu at Nuzi as "dead ancestors", for they show up alongside the eṭemmū on three occasions and appear as the recipients of kipsātu, the supposed Nuzi equivalent to kispum, in AO 15546.\textsuperscript{361}

Tsukimoto rejected the connection of kipsu and kispātu with kispum and opted for kipsātu as the Nuzi rendition of kispum. He identified kipsu in HSS 13:383:4,7 (actually ki-IB-su) with the form kib-su from Nimrud, a reference to the customary payment to the temple treasury at Calah.\textsuperscript{362} Furthermore, he cast doubt on the view of kispātu in AASOR 16:66:31 as the name of "the month of the funeral offerings of iškīški" ina arḫi kispātum ša iškiški. Grammatically, one would expect araḫ kispāti or araḫ ša kispāti.\textsuperscript{363} Moreover, the name kispātum ša iškiški is nowhere attested and the form iškiški is a hapax legomenon. In any case, according to Tsukimoto, a better candidate for kispum at Nuzi is to be found in the metathesized kipsātu.

Although Tsukimoto opted for the equation kipsātu and kispum, Cassin had earlier rendered dingir\textsuperscript{364} kipsātu in AO 15546:5 as a feminine personal name on the basis of its


\textsuperscript{363} Tsukimoto 1985:106 acknowledged the fact that the phrase probably referred to the name of the month, but rejected its connection with funerary offerings. As grammatical analogues, he cited araḫ pagri(m) and araḫ ša balāṭi isinni akīti, cf. CAD 1/II(1968):261.
attestation at Alalakh thus, "the gods of Kispāti".\textsuperscript{364} Owing to the presence of the preceding divine determinative dingir\textsuperscript{6} in AO 15546:4, Cassin also rejected the notion that arhi kispāti ša iškiški in AASOR 16:66:31 referred to funerary offerings at Nuzi as Pfeiffer and Speiser had suggested.\textsuperscript{365}

Tsukimoto rejected Cassin's interpretation of kispāti in AO 15546:5. First, the form lacks the expected determinative mi. Second, one would scarcely expect the mention of numerous tutelary gods belonging to a woman in this text. In the few cases where a woman is attributed divine protection, not only is it usually limited to one god, but the woman in question is a priestess, not a commoner.\textsuperscript{366} Third, in view of the missing divine determinative and the repeated mention of offerings, Cassin's interpretation of kipsāti makes no sense in the context of HSS 14:152. Tsukimoto rendered kipsāti in AO 15546:5 in the accusative "as kipsātu", a classification of the offerings made to the gods dingir\textsuperscript{4} of 1.4. He then proposed the equation kipsātu with kispum.\textsuperscript{367}

The decisive datum for Tsukimoto was the mention of kipsātu as offerings to the dingir\textsuperscript{4} or ilānu in AO 15546. The Nuzi connection of the ilānu, which he viewed as the ancient

\textsuperscript{364}Cassin 1962:60. This personal name also occurs at Mari. cf. Huffmon 1965:49 as noted by Tsukimoto 1985:97 and n.369.

\textsuperscript{365}Cassin 1962:60. Pfeiffer and Speiser 1936:115 interpreted this phrase as "the time of the funerary offerings".

\textsuperscript{366}Cf. Tsukimoto 1985:98 and n.370 where the author rejects two of the four references to women who possess personal gods cited in Vorländers 1975:46-47.

\textsuperscript{367}Tsukimoto 1985:95-98.
ancestors, and the *etemmū*, which he viewed as the recent ancestors, confirmed his hypothesis that *kipsātu* was the Nuzi rendition of *kispum*.

Thus, one could expect the mention of *kispum* in this context.

That *kispum*-like offerings were made to the "gods" and "spirits" has been given added support by YBC 5142:30-31 where, upon the death of the testator, the heir was expected to continue to "serve" the "gods" and "spirits" as formerly done by the now defunct father *ilāni u etemmīya ipallāḫšu*. Some scholars have assumed that this text also points to both the "gods" and the "spirits" as figurines, for they appear to be objects passed on to the respective heir(ess). Moreover, like the *etem kimti* "the family spirit", the *ilanu* dwell in family houses *ilānīya*

---

268 Tsukimoto 1985:104-05 and cf. n. 386 where he suggests that the *etemmū* became *ilanu* once they lost their identifiable character. There are in fact three terms for the Nuzi family sacra: *ilanu, etemmū*, and *an.zalag* (for which cf. HSS 14:8:2,10). The latter has been rendered *d*utu by CAD 8(1971):403 (for *JEN* 478:4); *an.zab* by Draffkorn 1957:221-22; *dingir.zab* by Cassin 1981:41-42; and *an.zalag* or *annamru* or *dnamru* - cultic lamps used in conjunction with the divine images - by Deller 1981:62-71.


270 Two other texts which mention both the "gods" and the "spirits" record the denial of rights to the disinherited son: *JEN* 478:6-8 *ina ilāni u ana etemmī* (Erasure) *eqīlī u bītī lā ilaqqa* which Rouillard and Tropper 1987A:355 translate "He shall not receive the gods or the spirits or the fields or the houses", and *HSS* 19:27:11 *ul il[ānī]ya u[l] etemmīya "not my gods or my spirits" (the remaining context is damaged). On the possibility that figurines are involved, cf. also Draffkorn 1957:221-22 and the Hurrian phrase enna sarrena "ilanu figurines". Against this view, see below and n. 404 for Paradise's translation of *JEN* 478.
According to Tsukimoto, this confirms their function as ancestral spirits in the form of figurines who protect the living against malevolent demons.

While this reconstruction is provocative, it remains highly conjectural. The fact that kipsātu occurs only in two offering texts, both of which lack any corroborative evidence for a mortuary context, hardly inspires confidence that what is involved is the kispum offering. Furthermore, the lone depiction of the ilānu and the eṭemmū as recipients of service or palāḫu insures neither the status of the ilānu as dead unidentifiable ancestors nor the veneration/worship of the ilānu or the eṭemmū.

The term ilānu at Nuzi characteristically represented either the gods of the pantheon and/or the personal gods. Moreover, we noted earlier that service to the gods was a duty expected of both the ideal son and king. So, what may be outlined here are the duties to both the personal gods and to the spirits, not to the remote and immediate ancestors (cf. further 4.5.1.). This would offer an alternative explanation for the nature of the ilānu which inhabit family dwellings. They are not ancestral spirits, but personal gods who dwell in sacred buildings.

---


Furthermore, the portrayal of ilânu together with ētemmû as figurines is questionable—at least in the case of the latter. Owing to their laconic character, the relevant texts may simply record the heir's loss of rights concerning the "gods" and "spirits". This might mean that the disinherited heir could no longer pray to the personal gods for protection at their shrines on family property or access the family property where he could continue to "serve" the dead at their graves.\textsuperscript{373} It is therefore conjectural at best to assert that like the ilânu depicted elsewhere at Nuzi—which we take to be personal gods and not deified dead ancestors—, the ētemmû too were figurines or images.

Lastly, and most importantly for our purposes, the mentioned service to the ētemmû might entail simply the commemoration or feeding and care of the dead ancestors. In other words, owing to the fact that the exact nature of the service is for the present irrecoverable, one cannot assume that it was motivated by a belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead.

Be that as it may, we would conjecture that the underlying premise central to the inclusion of the ētemmû in the above mentioned texts is that their graves where service was rendered were located on sacred portions of the family property.\textsuperscript{374}

\textsuperscript{373} Against the rendition of Rouillard and Tropper 1987A:355. Paradise 1972:311 n.218 rendered JEN 478:6-8 as follows "He shall not have rights to the gods and (ancestral) spirits. Fields and houses he shall not receive" and added lā iqerreb in the erasure, see also CAD 4(1958):397.

\textsuperscript{374} In other words, the inclusion of the "gods" and "spirits" serves to underscore the point that the disinherited heir would not receive any family land and buildings. This suggests that JEN 478:6-8 contains an ABB'A' pattern—personal gods—ancestor
3.2.2. THE EVIDENCE FROM EMAR

The excavations at modern Meskéné, ancient Emar, furnish substantial textual witness for the religious beliefs of its Syrian inhabitants. Moreover, the several hundred cuneiform texts published in Recherches au pays d'Astata Emar constitute a wide range of literary genres. They date to the Late Bronze Age and verify Emar's importance within the contemporary Hittite empire.

Various funerary rites were apparently observed at Emar. A kissu feast of Ninkur possibly refers to a funerary lament performed by the nugagtu, the "lamentation priestess". Furthermore, an Emar version of the LU I series lists a "priest performing funerary rites" [u]-ru-uh ŠITA. INANNA = [ú]-ru-uh-hu among the Emarite cultic personnel. Finally, several versions of a ballad in honor of the defunct heroes appear at Emar, but we

spirits-fields-houses. The personal gods would then represent the sacred buildings on family property, the spirits the sacred portions of the family land, while the terms fields and houses include the remaining profane land and buildings.


Cf. Arnaud 1975:87-92 for a discussion of Late Bronze Age chronology and the Emar texts. Margueron 1975:84-85 has concluded that the inability to recover Old Babylonian levels at Emar is due to their being inundated by the Euphrates.

Arnaud 1980:118, 1985B:233, and 1986:387 [Text 388, no MSK number is given]. In 11.6.57 a deity šuwala is mentioned as the object of ritual sacrifice and singing for whom the editor gives the translation "Cheol"! Stephanie Dalley (personal communication) notes that this may simply comprise the personal name Shu-ila šuwila.

can say little else until a hand copy with accompanying transliteration is published.\footnote{380}{A composite translation of the versions is given by Arnaud in Beyer 1982:51 (no MSK numbers are cited).}

It is the genre of testament that provides the greatest potential evidence for the observance of death and ancestor cult practices at Emar. In one case, the testator expresses the wish to either call upon (\textit{nabû A}) or perhaps lament (\textit{nabû B}) his "gods" \textit{iłānu} and possibly his "dead (= deceased ancestors)" \textit{mētū}.\footnote{381}{Arnaud 1986:197-98 [Text 185:2-3 = MSK 74300:2-3] but cf. Durand 1989:88 "I may call upon/lament my gods and my dead" \textit{dingir-\textit{mēj analysti}} \textit{mētēya lunābbi}. The verb is the intensive precative ics of \textit{nabû A} "to name, call" or \textit{nabû B} "to lament", cf. \textit{CAD 11}(1980):32-39 and \textit{AHw 2}(1971):699-700.}

Similar phraseology appears in three texts purported to originate from the vicinity of Emar.\footnote{382}{Sigrist 1982:242 and Huehnergard 1983:11-12 argued that these three texts come from the region of Emar, for, like the texts discovered there, they are written in Middle Assyrian, their tablet shapes are typically Syrian as are the locations of the seal impressions on the upper and/or lateral left edges. Moreover, the Huehnergard texts both mention the name of an Emarite king (cf. 1:37 and 2:43) as well as the name of a scribe known from Emar (cf. 1:42 and 2:50), cf. also Arnaud 1987:237-39 and Durand 1989:85-88. Cf. Arnaud 1975A:87-92 and 1975B:87-93 for a treatment of these names.}

In the first published in 1982, two sons inherit their dead father's estate. The sons are bequeathed several duties, one being to "honor" (\textit{kunnû}) the "gods" \textit{iłānu} and the "dead" \textit{mētū} of their father.\footnote{383}{Sigrist 1982:243-45 [Text 1:25-27] "Itur-da and Iphur-Dagan shall honor the gods and dead of Abika, their father" \textit{Itür-DA u Iphūr-Dagan dingir-\textit{mēj analysti}} \textit{mitī ša Abīka abīšunu ukannû}. The verb is the intensive future 3mpl of \textit{kunnû} "to honor (a deity or dead person)", cf. \textit{CAD 8}(1971):540-42.} The two remaining texts were published the following year. In both, the testator describes his daughter as

---

380 A composite translation of the versions is given by Arnaud in Beyer 1982:51 (no MSK numbers are cited).


382 Sigrist 1982:242 and Huehnergard 1983:11-12 argued that these three texts come from the region of Emar, for, like the texts discovered there, they are written in Middle Assyrian, their tablet shapes are typically Syrian as are the locations of the seal impressions on the upper and/or lateral left edges. Moreover, the Huehnergard texts both mention the name of an Emarite king (cf. 1:37 and 2:43) as well as the name of a scribe known from Emar (cf. 1:42 and 2:50), cf. also Arnaud 1987:237-39 and Durand 1989:85-88. Cf. Arnaud 1975A:87-92 and 1975B:87-93 for a treatment of these names.

both male and female, the significance of which enabled the father to pass on the right of inheritance to her in the absence of sons. As was the case with the two sons in the text discussed above, the daughter is endowed with certain tasks previously minded by her father. Of particular interest is the assumed duty of calling upon (nabû A), or perhaps lamenting (nabû B), the "gods" ilanu and "dead" mētû.

Arnaud rendered the verb kunnu in such contexts as "invoke". Durand, on the other hand understood both this term which, as it stands, is too vague and nabû "to call" in a technical sense "to pronounce the name" and presupposed an ancestor cult context. This he did on the basis of the Mari and Ugaritic materials.

The repeated mention of the "gods" ilanu alongside the "dead" mētû in inheritance texts recalls the similar occurrence of the "gods" ilanu in parallel to the "spirits" etemmû at Nuzi in related contexts. While at Nuzi both entities are either served by the heir(ess) or the heir is denied ownership of them, at Emar both are called upon (or lamented) and honored.

If at Emar it could be demonstrated that mourning rites were involved, i.e., that nabû B "lament" was intended- but this


385 Huehnergard 1983:11-19 [Text 1:8], 26-29 [Text 2:11] "She may call upon my gods and my dead" dingir*iya u mētēya lū tunab(b)i. The verb is the 3fs intensive precative of nabû A "to name, call" or nabû B "to lament".


is for the present impossible to decide - then the case for the chthonic nature of the ilānu would be strengthened. Be that as it may, the general use of ilānu elsewhere as representative of the gods in general or the personal gods in particular, suggests that at Emar the same obtains in the use of the term even when found coupled with forms of mētū (cf. further 4.5.1.).

On the other hand, if lamenting of "gods" and the "dead" was in view in these texts, then we would have additional data for the observation of funerary, or more specifically, mourning rites at Emar, at least in the case of the mētū (the "gods" might be chthonic gods requiring ritual lamentation). In any case, honoring and calling upon the dead might simply entail pronouncing their name in a commemorative rite or geneonymy. If offerings were involved, these might be nothing more than expressive of the concern to care for the dead.

Whether these acts took place on a regular basis or during the period of funerary rites is impossible to decide. In the final analysis, we cannot ascertain whether or not these rites presupposed a belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the

---

As would their potential involvement in death and ancestor cult rites, that is, if they were understood to represent deified ancestors. Shell 1983-84:159-70 assumed that the phrase dingir*-ni ša abiya ana šebüte altakān "I have put the gods of my father as witnesses" in a new text from El-Qitar (11.23-24) refers to the ilānu (= ancestors) of the Nuzi and Emar texts. Despite the text's similar concern to regulate inheritance, it is the gods of the pantheon who function as witnesses to legal agreements rather than the tutelary gods or the dead spirits. Moreover, the gods here are not described as one of the objects of inheritance.
dead. Moreover, if we assume that they did, we cannot know what level of power the dead were believed to have obtained. In addition to the references in which the ilānu are mentioned alongside the mētū, Durand has cited data for the presumed domestic ancestor cult at Emar and has offered alternative interpretations of several texts treated by Arnaud. Durand concluded that kuburu in several texts is to be translated "tombe" (< quburu). This creates a mortuary context for the recorded offerings in these texts which were in Durand's view occasioned by the ritual abandonment of a family tomb resulting from the recent sale of family property. Arnaud had previously rejected this meaning for kuburu and translated it as "sicle lourd" or "préciput". In any case, assuming that Durand's proposal should stand, these references cannot tell us whether or not such rites were observed on a regular basis let alone whether or not beliefs in the supernatural power of the dead kin stand behind them. They may simply constitute funerary rites involving expressions of commemoration or, if regularly observed, care for the dead.

Moreover, the problematic form mētū presents a major obstacle for the ancestor cult interpretation as we would expect mītūtū. Huehnergard 1983:28 tentatively took the form mētēya to be the irregular plural of mītūtīya, cf. also his qualified translations on pp.15,19. Durand 1989:87 did make a distinction between the mītū "the clan dead" (cf., e.g. Sigrist 1982:243-45 and Arnaud 1987:237-39 1.26 dingir** i mi-ti Ša Abīka abīšunu ukannū) while the mītūtū (cf., e.g. the texts in Huehnergard 1983:11-19,26-29) designated "the dead in general". Arnaud 1983:206-07, 1986:197 understood the form to represent "lower divinities".

In closing, we mention the Emarite deity (?) "Milku found in offering contexts, and the imlikū, perhaps the divine warriors and guardians of the entrances to Nergal's infernal city. Whether or not the latter represent dead "rulers" like the Amorite malikū and Ugaritic mlkm remains to be verified.

Based on the equation of "Malik and Nergal in an Old Babylonian god list, the Weidner list OECT 1:9:2:8, one might be tempted to equate "Milku with Nergal at Emar. This would help to explain the apparent depiction of the imlikū as protégés of Nergal—they are simply the pluralization of "Milku. Against this stands the fact that "Milku is listed separately from Nergal in a ritual text from Emar.

3.2.3. SUMMARY

In summary, the available evidence from Nuzi and Emar remains inconclusive vis-à-vis the existence of death and ancestor cults, royal or otherwise. The Nuzi and Emar data allow for alternative interpretations, that is to say, they may comprise funerary rites involving commemoration of or care for the domestic rather than royal ancestors.

If future studies unequivocally document the presence of a royal ancestor cult at Emar like the recently conjectured domestic version—which itself is not at all certain—, its presence in this peripheral site would reflect the kind of
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influence emanating from the Mesopotamian heartland which we proposed for Mari. In the case of Emar, such influence might be construed as simply continuing through later periods perhaps by way of Mari.

In any case, as we underscored in our summary of the Ugaritic material in 3.1.10., it will be the task of future studies to delineate clearly the character of these cults—whether care for, commemoration of, veneration of, or worship of the dead is involved, whether they reflect royal or domestic versions—, what beliefs are reflected in them, and what are their possible origins. The presently available information cannot provide adequate answers.

In anticipation of what might give occasion to future exaggerated claims vis-à-vis the Emar texts, it is safe to say that these materials will not establish the hypothetical West Semitic origins of those presumed death and ancestor cults purportedly practiced by the first millennium inhabitants of Syria-Palestine—Israel's immediate relatives and/or neighbors. In any case, we simply cannot identify unequivocal evidence that an indigenous belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead characterized the West Semites of the third and second millennia.

The results derived from our investigation of the Ugaritic materials confirm this as we would surely expect indications of such practices there, that is, given the prior assumptions that death and ancestor cults were West Semitic in origin and that they were observed at a more easterly contemporary site like Emar which was inhabited, at least in part, by West Semites.
In fact, when viewed collectively the evidence thus far indicates that death and ancestor cults were not indigenous to Syria-Palestine of the second millennium. This in turn raises the likelihood that they were imported on occasion from outside the region—at least in the case of the royal version—no doubt for reasons related to political expediency, for as we mentioned above, temporary Mesopotamian influence best accounts for the presence of the royal ancestor cult at Mari. This explanation of the cult at Mari and the absence of such cults at other second millennium sites provides a working model, if you will, for our examination of the first millennium texts from Syria-Palestine.
CHAPTER IV

THE EVIDENCE FROM THE HEBREW BIBLE

Apropos of the existence of death and ancestral cults in ancient Israel, marked swings in the pendulum pro or con have tended to characterize the history of interpretation and the pendulum appears to be decidedly on the move again in the direction of apex pro. That is to say, the number of scholars who have accepted the notion that such practices were indeed embraced by at least certain sectors of Israelite society is currently on the rise.¹

Having set forth in previous chapters what can be confidently affirmed vis-à-vis death and ancestral cults and necromancy in Syria-Palestine of the third to second millennia B.C.E., we shall next turn to examine the evidence posited in the Hebrew Bible. But before doing so both the biblical traditions' "Canaanite" origin for Israelite ancestor cults and necromancy as well as the early to mid first millennium B.C.E. extra-biblical Syro-Palestinian textual evidence must be evaluated. The impetus for this approach arises out of the frequent reference to both sets of data, the biblical and the inscriptional, in support of the theory that such practices were indigenous to the local culture and that Israel had early on adopted the practices of her neighbors.

4.1. THE SUPPOSED 'CANAANITE' ORIGINS OF ANCESTOR CULTS AND NECROMANCY IN ISRAEL

While the biblical traditions characterize necromancy and various other mortuary rites as "Canaanite" in origin, we contend that in such instances these traditions reflect an archaizing tendency intended to create the appearance of antiquity and, thereby, to lend greater authority to their content. As our treatment in 3.1. demonstrates, the Ugaritic materials—apart from the question of whether or not they accurately reflect geographically and chronologically distant Canaanite practices—do not substantiate the existence of ancestor cults and necromancy among the Canaanites of the late second millennium.

Secondly, like the terms Hittite and Amorite, the term Canaanite as employed by the biblical writers does not correspond to any political or ethnic entity known from the historical documents of the second millennium. For the late biblical writers the term functioned instead as an ideological or rhetorical term for the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Palestine who came to epitomize the foreign occupation which persistently threatened Israel's claim to the land and its blessings.²

That the biblical traditions would resort to such rhetorical license is illustrated by the fact that the deuteronomistic (hereafter dtr) traditions attributed practices such as the cult of Asherah to syncretistic origins and radically


altered the traditions concerning the Judahite kings Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah in conformity with dtr Yahwism. Asherah's foreign affiliation has been shown to be an artificial reconstruction created by the dtr tradition serving as a diversion for what once constituted the forefathers' worship of a goddess. Asherah was originally the consort of El, but as Yahwism appropriated the El traditions, so the inclusion of Yahweh to El resulted in Asherah becoming Yahweh's consort.

Along similar lines, we would argue that a late dtr-related rhetorical polemic lies behind the references to necromancy in Deut. 18:11, 1 Sam. 28:3-25; 2 Kgs. 21:6, 23:24, and Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4. This polemic projected necromancy further back into Israel's historical traditions, attributed to it Canaanite origins, and attached its condemnation to heroic figures like Moses, Isaiah, and Josiah, thereby gaining for itself new levels and dimensions of authority. While we will treat each of the

---

4 For other examples of dtr rhetorical distortion e.g., the reform cult of Jeroboam (1 Kgs. 12:25-33) and an alleged deity Molek (1 Kgs. 11:7; 2 Kgs. 23:10; Jer. 32:35), cf. Olyan 1988:11-13. For the artificial dtr portrayal of Hezekiah and Josiah as reforming traditionalists and Manasseh as apostate innovator, cf. Ahlström 1982:68-80.


6 Smith 1990:7-12 lists the following points in favor of the "Israelite inclusion of Yahweh into the older figure of El": (1) the divine element in the name Israel is an El name not a Yahwistic one, (2) Deut. 32:8-9 depicts Yahweh as one of the sons of El who received Israel as his nation, (3) there are no biblical polemics against El, (4) the El name developed into a generic designation for god as a result of Yahweh's inclusion into El, (5) Exod. 6:2-3 reflects a tradition in which only the name of El Shadday not Yahweh was made known to the patriarchs, (6) the inscriptive onomastica identifies Yahweh and El, (7) the characteristics and epithets of El become those of Yahweh in Israel, and (8) Yahweh and El exhibit a similar compassionate disposition toward humanity.
above passages in detail, we offer by way of illustration, a
sample analysis of the first Isaiah passages.

An exilic or post-exilic redaction of first Isaiah is
widely recognized regardless of how one might characterize the
nature of that redaction. Moreover, significant portions of this
redaction have been identified as dtr in orientation. In favor of
the exilic-post-exilic redaction of chs. 1-35 are the following:
the role of Babylon in 13:1-14:23, the overthrow of Babylonia by
the Medes in 13:17,21:2, the lack of condemnation of Persia and
Media in the oracles against the nations (chs. 13-23), the
destruction of Jerusalem, the Babylonian exile, the restoration,
the use of Torah as wise instruction, and retribution.

In addition to the fact that ch. 1 and chs. 65-66 have
numerous thematic and linguistic elements in common suggesting
the same post-exilic redactional hand, they both reflect dtr
influence. Furthermore, 1:29-31 and possibly 1:19-20, preserve
a characteristic dtr polemic against cultic apostasy and 3:10-11
reflects the dtr distinction between the righteous and the wicked


9The themes shared by ch. 1 and 65-66 include: gan "garden" 1:29 and 65:3,66:17; bāhar "choose" 1:29 and
65:12,66:3-4; lō' hāgaš "no delight" 1:11 and 65:12,66:3-4; bōš "shame" 1:29 and 65:13,66:5; 'ālfîm "trees" 1:30 and 65:22;
burning" 1:31 and 66:15-16,17; and "unquenched fire" 1:31 and

10Sweeney 1988:196 and n.12.
and their reward and punishment. Furthermore, Isa. 2:8 and 17:8 reflect the dtr expression "the work of one's hands" $\text{ma}^c \text{ašēh}$ $\text{yādāyw}$ and 17:8 mentions "the asherahs and the incense altars" $\text{w}^\circ \text{hā'āšērîm} \text{w}^\circ \text{hāhammānîm}$ which is also indicative of dtr redaction. As noted above, the dtr tradition has portrayed Asherah religion in 17:8 as Canaanite in origin and has inserted this polemic into the earlier traditions of first Isaiah.

These examples establish the precedent for the hypothesis that an exilic or post-exilic redaction and one with a dtr orientation stands behind those Isaiah traditions having to do with necromancy and at least potentially death and ancestor cults. An examination of the evidence pertaining to necromancy reveals that the terms '6b and yidd$^c$ēnī (or their variant forms) appear only in Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4 and in the dtr tradition at Deut. 18:11; 1 Sam. 28:3-25; 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24 (necromancy is unattested in Hosea, Amos, and the Elijah-Elisha traditions). A comparison of the Isaiah passages with the necromancy texts original to the Deuteronomistic History (hereafter DtrH), 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24, demonstrates that the former assumes that necromancy was practiced in Israel in king Ahaz's day, while the latter depicts its subsequent introduction not before the days of Manasseh. Had traditions concerning necromancy's introduction

---


13 For the dtr redactional level of Deut. 18:11 and the post-dtr redactional nature of 1 Sam. 28:3-25, cf. 4.4.2. and 4.5.1.
during Ahaz's reign or earlier existed, the writer of the DtrH would have integrated these into his evaluation of Manasseh's predecessors as such traditions would have set the precedent for attributing the 'sin' of necromancy to earlier kings. Had they existed, we would have expected the DtrH to have mentioned Ahaz's embrace of necromancy and Hezekiah's proscription of it.

That Manasseh's reign provides the terminus ad quo for Israel's appropriation of necromancy gains further impetus in the likelihood that necromancy was a foreign practice appropriated by the Israelites from their Mesopotamian overlords not before Manasseh's reign. The following points support this proposal. With the exception of the biblical passages, necromancy is attested only in Mesopotamia in the pre-Hellenistic ancient Near East, the number of Mesopotamian necromancy texts significantly increases during the Neo-Assyrian to Late-Babylonian times, divination in general increased in popularity during the reigns of the late Assyrian kings who controlled Palestine during Manasseh's reign, vassalship was first imposed on Judah in Manasseh's reign and, beginning with his vassalship, Mesopotamian political, religious, and economic influence on Israelite (Judahite) culture significantly intensified.

The evidence for the late redaction of first Isaiah, the arguments for the DtrH account of Israel's appropriation of Mesopotamian necromancy not before Manasseh's reign, and the

14 The question of whether Israel's acquaintance with Mesopotamian necromancy found expression in the biblical traditions as a vestige of a historically verifiable syncretistic Israelite religious practice of pre-exilic times or merely as a literary topos employed by a later ideological tradition (or both!) will be addressed in 4.5.3.
(post-dtr) redactional character of 1 Sam. 28, point to the redactional character of Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4 (cf. also 4.3.-5.). Given these considerations and the dtr nature of at least some redactional processes evident in Isaiah 1-35 and the phraseology common to both Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4 and Deut. 18:11 and 1 Sam. 28:3-25, we would suggest that the redaction of the Isaiah passages is, like that in 1 Sam. 28, (post-)dtr in nature and derivative of Deut. 18:11. The consultation of the dead (דָּרַ֔שׁ 'e-l-hammētīm) occurs only in Deut. 18:11 and in Isa. 8:19 and 19:3 (cf. דָּרַ֔שׁ 'e-l-hā'iṭṭīm "consult the ghosts") and the consultation of the netherworld gods (יִלָּהָ֖ם יֵלָ֥הֶים 'e-l-[hā] 'e-lōhîm), appears only in 1 Sam. 28:13 and in Isa. 8:19 and 19:3 (cf. דָּרַ֔שׁ ה֥א-יִלָּהָ֖ם "consult the false gods"). This redaction expanded necromancy's pervasiveness so as to explicitly indict the general population. It also enhanced the dtr tradition's authority by identifying it with the prophet Isaiah.

4.2. THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL SYRO-PALESTINIAN TEXTUAL EVIDENCE: THE EARLY FIRST MILLENNIUM B.C.E.

Before taking up the biblical traditions in detail, we must complete our examination of the Syro-Palestinian evidence, the Aramaic, Phoenician, and Hebrew inscriptions of the first millennium. First to be briefly considered is the relevant Aramaic evidence. The primary datum cited as indicative of an Aramaic royal ancestor cult is the Hadad inscription, KAI 214, the religious significance of which is, to the say least, problematic. Teixidor concluded with regard to the beliefs embedded in KAI 214, "The Cilician region of which Panamu was
king was never a land of Semites and consequently the Aramaic inscription may express convictions which are not Semitic".13

The phrase in 1.21 "and (he) invokes the name of Panamuwa" wyzkr 'šm pnmw has been viewed as reflective of the practice of calling upon the ancestors and, in the case at hand, the ancestor is the presumed deceased eighth century king of Sam'al, Panamuwa I. However, owing to the numerous lacunae, the immediate context remains obscure and so it is impossible to determine whether or not a death or ancestor cult rite is in view. In fact, the reading and interpretation of 1.21 is debatable. Not only is the reading wyzkr questionable, but the meaning of 'šm has been variously understood. The following reading is given in the edition of Donner and Röllig: [ . . . ]r 'šm pnmw from which wyzkr is reconstructed on the basis of 1.16 wyzkr 'šm hdd.16 In any case, the contexts are not parallel. The object of one is a known deity and the other a royal personage.

Therefore, in order to justify reconstructing 1.21 on the basis of 1.16, one must first establish on independent grounds, not merely that the invocation of the name of a king, but that the invocation of a dead king by name, was an Aramean practice at

13 Teixidor 1987:371. The mention of akalšu "his bread" and mēšu "his water" as offerings made to the gods Adad and Shala in the curse formulae in 11. 16-18 (Aramaic = Assyrian 11.26-30) of the ninth-century bilingual Tell Fakhariyah inscription has been cited by Greenfield and Schaffer 1985:51-53 as evidence for an Aramaic version of the royal kispum rite. But these gods may be given such offerings for reasons unconnected to mortuary concerns. This curse might reflect the belief that food offered first to a god was capable of conferring divine blessing to the one who consumed it thereafter, cf. Oppenheim 1977:189. In any case, we lack data for the patronage of Adad and Shala in mortuary matters.

this time, for while the invocation of the name is an essential service observed in the Mesopotamian ancestor cult, it is not its sole Sitz im Leben. This has yet to be demonstrated. Finally, it must be convincingly argued that this specific reference in 1.21 is the dead king Panamuwa as others have argued that this reference is to the living Panamuwa (see below).

Be that as it may, earlier commentators of the text took 'šm to refer to "sin offering" or "guilt" in both 11.16 and 21: "remember the guilt before/sin offering of Hadad" (1.16) and (note the lacuna!) "[ . . . ] a sin offering of/for Panamu(wa)". In other words, this passage might be irrelevant to the subject of Aramean mortuary practices and beliefs.

We turn now to a second datum cited in KAI 214 as indicative of royal ancestor cult practices. The repeated phrase "May the nbš of Panamuwa eat with you/Hadad and may the nbš of Panamuwa drink with you/Hadad" t'kl nbš pnmw c mk/ hdd wšty nbš pnmw c mk/ hdd in the same text (11.17,21b-22a) has been taken to refer to food and libation offerings for the dead spirit of Panamuwa. But, not only is the reading t'kl in its two occurrences conjectural (cf. 1.17: [t']kl; 1.21: t[']kl), the

17 Cf. e.g., Müller 1893:52-53, 1894:572-73; and Conder 1896:64.

18 Cf. e.g., Gaster 1950:275; de Moor 1973(II):31; Greenfield 1973:47, 1987:68,70-71; Donner and Röllig 1973:220-21. Others have seen in these lines rudimentary indications of beatific afterlife, cf. e.g., Halévy 1894:35-37; Astour 1980:228; Healey 1984:351; and Spronk 1986:208; and Smith and Bloch-Smith 1988:283. But Caquot 1976:303 and n.3 rendered the form c' m "with" in the above phrases temporally rather than locally "May the spirit of Panamuwa eat/drink at the same time as you (= Hadad)". This eliminates a supposed belief that the king's departed spirit was feasting with his god.
attendant translation of the larger phrase is not at all certain. 19

In fact, if KAI 214 records the last will and testament of Qrl, the father of Panamuwa 20, then it is more likely the case that we have a reference to the living Panamuwa and to the royal banquet following his coronation in which he feasts with his god Hadad who was present in the form of his statue. 21 Assuming for the sake of argument that t'kl and wtšty are the correct readings and that they refer to "eating" and "drinking" we might render the passage as follows: "may the nbš of Panamuwa eat with/at the same time as you/Hadad and may the nbš of Panamuwa drink with/at the same time as you/Hadad". 22

The remaining Aramaic evidence attests to both mourning rites and the setting up of memorials in honor of the deceased.

19 Müller 1893:53,62, following the editio princeps of von Luschan and Sachau 1893:49, completely omitted t'kl in both instances and interpreted wtšty nbš pnmw c mk/ hdd as "and may you bind up the spirit of Panamuwa with you/Hadad", a petition for Hadad's protection of Qrl's living heir. He took šty to mean "to intertwine", cf. Hebrew sty II.

20 Following Müller 1893:54,62 and 1894:573.

21 Cf. Wilkinson 1986:262-63. Among others, the hymn to Ur-Nammu B describes a banquet held by the king for the gods immediately after his election. The use of nbs in KAI 214 would be similar to the use of Hebrew nps in connection with one's inclination toward his god (Ps. 63:9) or the emotional states of joy and bliss, cf. Ps. 86:4.

22 Greenfield in private communication emphasized the coronation background of the text, cf. the phrase "When my son (bny = Panamuwa) grasps the scepter and sits upon my seat . . . ." (11.15,20). We take bny as the singular noun with 1cs suffix, final mater ľ.
It also lays stress on the inviolability of the tomb. An Aramaic version of the marzēāh is as yet lacking for the pre-mid first millennium and the later evidence remains for the most part, if not entirely, silent on the matter of its death and ancestor cult connections.

The Phoenician evidence likewise lacks any indication of death and ancestor cult practices. Nevertheless, Puech has recently offered a new collation of KAI 30 which results in the mention of regular offerings for a deceased man or hero "and the man who puts a stop to the peace offerings at this tomb for this man or hero. . ." "wh☆'ś 'š [d] [h]š[1] mm lqbr z' k[c] l hgbr z'"

23 Cf. e.g., KAI 215 (the Panamuwa inscription-eighth century B.C.E.), 225 (the Sinzeribni inscription-seventh century B.C.E.), and 226 (the Si'gabbār inscription-seventh century B.C.E.). It is impossible to determine whether or not the memorial set up in honor of the deceased in these cases involved regular rites beyond the funeral. In any case, veneration and worship are not mentioned or depicted, these are silent on the matter of the benefic power of the dead.


25 Cooper 1987:316 concluded "there is insufficient evidence to permit the reconstruction of a Phoenician cult of the dead . . ."; but he qualified his statement by identifying the Phoenician marzēāh as the ritual banquet of the cult of the dead.
Be that as it may, the author recognized the highly conjectural nature of his reconstruction and offered the viable alternative  .'</code>

"desecrate" for hdl in 1.2b and  hdbbr for  hgbr in 1.3.27 This would remove any mention of repeated offerings to the dead. In any case, if such were in view, they might have been offered only during the funeral period as gifts.

The Phoenician version of the marzēah is sparsely attested.28 The mention of Shamash as patron of the marzēah in a dedicatory inscription on a fourth century bronze phialē may simply reflect the sun deity's function as judge in commercial legal matters.29 Mortuary associations are otherwise lacking.30

---

29 Against the view that in this text libations are offered by the marzēah of Shamash to the dead (reading 'nsk with prosthetic aleph from nsk "to pour") so Catastini 1986:11-18, cf. Amadasi 1987:121-22 who returned to the reading of the editors, Greenfield and Avigad 1982:126-28, 'nḥn. Peckham 1987:83 assumed the death/ancestor cult background of all three texts and cited the biblical evidence in support, but cf. 4.3.1. and 4.6.1.
30 Assurbanipal's palace relief has been cited as indicative of the marzēah's spread to Mesopotamia from Phoenicia, so Barnett 1985:1*-6*. That the Rp'm are depicted in this relief has been argued by Gubel 1989:47-50. In view of the lack of mortuary connections of the pre-Hellenistic marzēah, cf. 4.3.1. and 4.6.1., such elements are better explained otherwise. Besides, this would be the first explicit association of the marzēah with a victory celebration and with the involvement of the enemy dead (the severed head of the Elamite king is illustrated in the reliefs). We would expect the involvement of dead benefic ancestors.
The Phoenician *rp'm* are mentioned in three texts. The relevant contexts are of little help beyond the establishment of the chthonic nature of the *rp'm*. The question remains whether they were considered simply as the shades of the dead in general, dead kings, or, in line with our proposal *vis-à-vis* the Ugaritic *rp'um*, mythic warriors with whom the distinguished members of society sought to be associated *post mortem*.

The last viewpoint might find confirmation in the Phoenician evidence. In 1.2 of KAI 30, the text newly collated by Puech, if the reading *hgbr* is correct, it could refer to the special status of a deceased individual, a "hero". At Ugarit, we found that the cognate *dzr* repeatedly showed up parallel to *mt rp'i* where both forms functioned as titles of the legendary hero Danil. In view of our findings concerning the Ugaritic *rp'um* (cf. 3.1.7.), we would venture the proposal that as death drew nigh, members of the higher echelons of Phoenician society sought the esteemed status of hero in an attempt to perpetuate their memory among the living.

---

31 KAI 13 and 14, the Tabnit and Eshmunazar inscriptions. Both date from the sixth century B.C.E. and were found at Sidon. Cf. also KAI 117, the Latin-Punic bilingual inscription of the first century C.E. from El-Amruni, Libya.

32 Cf. KAI 13:7b-8 "may you have no seed under the sun nor a place of rest with the *rp'm" 'l y[k]n l[k] zr cz bhym tḥt šmš wmsk *t rp'm and KAI 14:8b-9a "may they have no place of rest with the *rp'm* and may they not be buried in a grave and may they have no son or seed to succeed them" 'l ykn lm mškb 't rp'm w'l yqbr bqbr w'l ykn lm bn wzr cz tḥtnm.

33 In any case, the divine status of the Phoenician *rp'm* cannot be established on the basis of the first century C.E. Neo-Punic text KAI 117:1 l[nm] *r'p'm* "for the deified *rp'm* . . ." with most commentators who assume the equation of *lnm* and *'lnm*, cf. e.g., Sperling 1971:col.79. Vattioni 1980-81:297-98 has revived the alternate reading l[nm] *r'p'm* "for the gods of the
The Phoenician royalty sought longevity. The kings of Byblos spanning the tenth to fifth centuries B.C.E. prayed to the gods for lengthy reigns and long life. Moreover, the royalty did seek to perpetuate their names among the living. The repeated use of funerary stelae to commemorate the dead illustrates this.

When we come to the available early to mid first millennium Palestinian inscriptive evidence, we find no mention of death and ancestor cult practices. Our surveys of the comparative material underscore the point we made earlier that the Syro-

---

34 KAI 4-7,10 and cf. 25:5-7 and 26A:III:2-6 and C:III:19-20.

35 Cf. KAI 10:11b-15, the curse of Yehawmilk, a Byblian king, against anyone who would remove the written form of his name after his demise.

36 Cf. the use of msbt in Phoenician texts at Umm el-C Amud in Magnanini 1973:85-86 [Text 6], 88 [Text 12]; at Kition in Amadasi and Karageorghis 1977:48-53 [Texts B1-4], 56-58 [Texts B5-6], 88-100 [Texts 40-45]; in the west Mediterranean in KAI 53 (Athens), 60 (Piraeus), 78 (Carthage), 100 (Dougga), 149 (Maktar), 163 (?), 165 (near Guelma) 202 (Afis) and cf. Tomback 1978:194 [Texts 2a,2c,4a].

37 Spronk 1986:307-1, following Mittmann 1981:143-44, argued that the eighth century B.C.E. Uriyahu graffito incised in Tomb II at Khirbet el-Qom referred to the deity's protection of both the living and the dead, that is to say, it presupposes some kind of continuance of one's relationship to Yahweh after death. Spronk's proposal is severely weakened by his dependence upon unlikely textual readings, his penchant for radical emendation justified solely on the basis of three supposed scribal errors, and his omission of 11.5-6. For a more reliable rendering of the text, cf. Hadley 1987:51 where no hints of afterlife beliefs are evident.
Palestinian or, to use the term employed by the biblical writers, "Canaanite" origins of Israelite death and ancestor cult practices and necromancy is an artificial reconstruction and that another point of origin should be sought. In our examination of the biblical texts cited by scholars, we will evaluate the possible Mesopotamian background for the introduction of practices reflective of the supernatural benefic dead.

4.3. THE PRE-EXILIC PROPHETIC LITERATURE

In this section, we shall examine several prophetic passages, the contexts of which many commentators have dated to the pre-exilic era. Nevertheless, the secondary nature of these texts remains a matter of continued debate. Therefore, we must carefully evaluate the arguments for the compositional histories of these texts in our attempt to reconstruct hypothetically the history of Israelite religion vis-à-vis death and ancestral cults.

As mentioned previously, we shall also examine the biblical texts concerned with necromancy. We do so for two reasons. First, many interpreters have assumed a close association between Israelite necromancy and death and ancestor cults. Secondly, owing to the nature of both the comparative and biblical data associated with the texts concerned with necromancy, that tradition, once reconstructed, can offer a workable model for the

\[38\] Cf. e.g., most recently Rouillard and Tropper 1987B:235-54 and Lewis 1989.
possible reconstruction of the history of death and ancestor cult practices in Israel.

4.3.1. AMOS 6:7

Clearly, the earliest text cited in past discussions on Israelite death and ancestor cult practices is Amos 6:7. Greenfield labelled the marzēah mentioned in v.7 a funerary cult, for in 6:9-10 the death of Samaria's wealthy class and their burial by close relatives is anticipated. Pope, who ventured little distinction between the rites associated with the funerary feast and those connected with what he labelled the cult of the dead, explicitly stated that the marzēah in Amos 6:7 exhibits features characteristic of the latter and has upheld this position to the present.

Nevertheless, Vermeylen 1978:563-64 viewed 6:7 as a later dtr redaction. He argued that vv.6b-7 appear to interrupt an otherwise complete oracle beginning in v.3 and ending with v.11. Furthermore, the vocabulary does not favor the authenticity of the verse: mirzah (!) occurs only one other time and then in a later passage (Jer.16:5); s’rūhim contains a mater lectionis whereas in v.4 it is written defectively; and the verb gālāh is found principally in reference to the deportation of the people at the dtr level of the book (5:5; 7:11,17). On the dtr redaction of Amos, cf. Schmidt 1965:168-92 and now Coote 1981.


Pope 1977B:216 "The mention of ivory beds, feasting, music and song, wine bibbing, and perfume oil in Amos 6:4-7 . . . are all features of the funeral feast in the marzēah(-house), or drinking house". In 1987:459, Pope cited the inebriation reflected in marzēah s’rūhīm "srawler's banquet" within the context of the following observation "From ancient times to the present celebrations of death have been commonly accompanied by drinking of alcoholic beverages to excess". Cf. also Coote 1981:35-39 and Loretz 1982:87-93.
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Before we address these proposals, we will offer our translation of 6:4-7. Within the doom oracle spanning 6:1-7, 6:1-2 comprises a woe cry, 6:3-6 encompasses an accusation section, and 6:7 contains a concluding pronouncement of judgment:42

(4) haššōk'him c al-mittōq šēn
ūse rūhīm c al-c aršōtām
wē 'ōk'ēlim kārim mīṣṣō'n
wāc āgālim mīttōk marbēq

"Those who lie on beds of ivory, who loll on their couches, who feast on lambs from the flock And on calves from the stall.

(5) hāpporētim c al-pī hannābel
kē dawīd ḥāš'bû lāhem kē lē šīr

Those who hum snatches of song to the tune of the lyre43-

Like David, invent for themselves instruments of music.

(6) haššōtīm bē mīzrēqē yayin
wē rē'sīt bē mānimim yīmṣāḥū
wē lō' neḥlō c al-šēber yōsēp

Those who drink from the wine bowls And anoint themselves with the choicest oils-

But they are not concerned about the ruin of Joseph.

(7) lākēn c attāh yīglū bē rō'ē
gōlīm
wē sār mirzāh sē rūhīm

Assuredly, right soon they shall head the column of exiles; and the marzēāh of lolling44 shall come to an end".

42 Cf. the new JPS translation. The meaning of v.3 is uncertain.


44 Others translate sē rūhīm as "revelry". Either rendering eliminates the assumption that mirzāh should be translated "revelry" as the following adjective would be redundant.
In the light of Amos's repeated accusations of social injustice, commentators have viewed this oracle as motivated by the social elite's exploitation of the peasant population in their quest for wealth and populance. Clear as well, is his condemnation of their lack of vigilance.\(^{43}\)

Nevertheless, Barstad has argued that polemic against foreign deities was the foremost concern of 6:1-7 and not the opulent feasting of the upper classes and that Amos is therefore to be viewed as a monotheist like Hosea. For external support, he cited the comparative evidence associating the marzēāḥ with patron gods. For Barstad, the sacral nature of the marzēāḥ provides an implicit backdrop to Amos's polemic in 6:7. For internal support, he listed several passages as examples of Amos's polemic against the nation's worship of foreign gods, two of which demand our attention, 5:26 and 8:14.\(^{46}\)

Against this line of argument is the fact that commentators since the time of Wellhausen have viewed Amos 5:26 as a later addition.\(^{47}\) Some have argued for the dtr redactional nature of v.26 on the basis of the idealization of the wilderness wandering evident in 5:25-27.\(^{48}\) Others have done so on the basis of the

---

\(^{43}\) Cf. e.g., most recently King 1988A:137-62 and 1988B:34-44.

\(^{44}\) Barstad 1984 also treated 2:6-8; 4:1 and 6:13. On the latter two, cf. Polley 1989:89-94. The phrase 'Elōhēhem in 2:8 is translated "their god" by most commentators, not "their gods", and so Amos is attacking what he viewed as an unacceptable Yahwistic practice.


mention of two late attested Mesopotamian astral deities Kewan and Sakkuth (and cf. the phrase kôkab 'êlôhêkem "of your astral deity/ies" in v.26b).49

Amos 8:14 is extremely problematic. The phrase be 'ašmat šômârôn, is often emended to read "Ashimah of Samaria", but according to 2 Kgs. 17:30, this Syrian (?) goddess was not introduced into the northern kingdom until after the Assyrian conquest of Samaria. Others have rendered this phrase "the guilt of Samaria" as the term 'ašmat could be construed as derivative of 'ašmāh. But, this term occurs only in late texts and has likewise resulted in the attribution of 8:14 to a later hand.50

In any case, we should point out that the mention of patron foreign deities is nowhere to be found in 6:1-7. This is merely an inference made by Barstad on the basis of the occasional association of local marzēahs with patron deities in the comparative material.

Returning to the question of the mortuary associations of mirzâh, the construct form of marzēah, nothing in 6:1-7 points to such a connection. While the allusion to the burial of relatives in vv.9-10 could be taken as suggestive of the marzēah's mortuary associations, in the context of a pronouncement of judgment it

49 Against McKay 1973:68 and 123 n.4 who argued that the presence of Assyrian deities does not necessarily date the passage after 722/1, see Lemche 1985:310 n.15. In any case, Borger 1988:70-81 has shown that while plausible, the Assyrian deities interpretation must for the present remain conjectural.

50 Cf. the opinio communis outlined in Soggin 1987:96-101, 140-41 and the discussion in Polley 1989:91-94, where the interpretation of the guilt of Samaria and the god of Dan in 8:14 is reiterated resulting in both phrases referring to unacceptable Yahwistic practices.
most likely refers to their death as the expected outcome of divine judgment and therefore stands as an independent element with no direct relation to the marzēah.

As most interpreters acknowledge, the mortuary associations of marzēah in Amos 6:7 must be established on the basis of what we can know of the marzēah from the comparative data. We found that in the Eblaite, Ugaritic, Aramaic, and Phoenician texts, mortuary elements were absent. The only exception to the comparative material is a lone possible reference in the later Nabatean inscriptions. In other words, such associations were by no means intrinsic to the pre-Hellenistic West Semitic marzēah.

Thus, chronologically, geographically, and culturally, the comparative evidence favors the non-mortuary nature of the marzēah and confirms our conclusion that the marzēah in Amos 6:1-7 lacks any reference to the dead or to foreign gods. Rather, this text condemns the preoccupation of the wealthy class with a luxurious lifestyle to the neglect of the needy. The issue as Amos saw it was Israel's unethical behavior, not her illegitimate religious practices.

Nevertheless, we do not intend to reject the possibility that in an isolated instance the marzēah could be associated with

---

51 Whatever view one takes on the matter, it is clear that death and ancestor cult relations are entirely lacking in what has been interpreted as the West Semitic marzēah depicted in the banquet scene from the roughly contemporary palace relief of Ashurbanipal, cf. Barnett 1985:1*-6*, followed by Gubel 1989:47-55.

52 Whatever conclusions one reaches regarding the mortuary associations of the marzēah at Palmyra, Hellenistic influence may be present as it most likely developed under the influence of the Greek thiasos.
matters mortuary in pre-Hellenistic times, but such could be explained as simply due to the notion that social fraternities in antiquity might acknowledge the death of one of their illustrious members by a solemn funeral. But this by no means establishes a intrinsic connection between this institution and mortuary rites or more specifically death and ancestor practices. We will take up this point in greater detail in our treatment of Jer. 16:5, the later and lone remaining biblical reference to the marzēah (cf. 4.6.1).

4.3.2. ISAIAH 8:19-22

Isa. 8:19-22 comprises the closing lines of a lengthy section beginning in 6:1. This section is generally recognized as pre-exilic in date, so 8:19-22 potentially provides us with the earliest biblical reference to necromantic practices in Israel. While the association of this passage with necromancy is generally recognized, the terms 'ōḇōt and yiddēcōnīm in v.19 continue to exercise interpreters as to their intended referents: do they represent the spirits of the dead or the practitioners who inquire of those spirits? Before we offer our interpretation, we must attempt to establish both the mortuary associations of these terms as well as the compositional history of Isa. 8:19-22.

On the basis of 1 Sam. 28:3,7,8, and 9, we can safely conclude that the term 'ōb, the singular form of 'ōḇōt, denotes a spirit of the dead as it refers there to Samuel's shade, and by way of its repeated association with yiddēcōnī(m), we can tentatively propose the same general field of meaning for the
latter (for 1 Sam. 28, cf. 4.5.1.). That the spirits of the dead are in view is further verified by their occurrence alongside mēṯīm in v.19. Deut. 18:11 confirms this, as "the inquirer of the 'ōb and the yiddēcōnī" šōʾēl 'ōb wēyiddēcōnī is followed by the summary term "the necromancer" dōrēš 'el-hammēṯīm. Lastly, both terms are paralleled by the term "shades" ʾittīm in Isa. 19:3 which is most likely to be equated with Akkadian ētemmūm "spirit of the dead" (cf. 4.3.3.).

We now turn to the compositional history of these verses. The unit 8:16-18 is generally recognized as forming the conclusion to an original memoir or Denkschrift beginning at 6:1. While this memoir records the prophet Isaiah's activities on the occasion of the Syro-Ephraimite crisis, commentators have concluded that the unit 8:19-22 comprises a later, perhaps two-layered, expansion on that memorial and dates from the time of the exile. As such it applies Isaiah's prophecies to the Babylonian capture of Jerusalem and ascribes that disaster to the people's illicit practices.

---

This in turn supports the summarizing function of mēṯīm in Isa. 8:19.

Contra Burns 1978:8 who understood the term as "sorcerers".


According to several commentators, 8:19-22 comprises a two-fold addition to that memorial, vv.19-20 followed by vv.21-22. Although Vermeylen 1977:24,228-32; 1978:694 accepted the exilic date, he argued for the unity of vv.19,21-22 and viewed vv.20,23a as a later expansion from the same period. This is supported by the intimate connection of the motifs of consulting the dead and the gods on the one hand and distress and darkness on the other, for which cf. 1 Sam. 28:3-25, Prov. 1:24-28, and Micah 3:4-8.
As we set forth in 4.1., several lines of argumentation not only point to the likelihood of exilic or post-exilic redactional processes preserved in first Isaiah and the dtr or post-dtr character of at least some of those redactional processes, but also to the redactional nature of Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4, and the dtr-related orientation of that redaction.\(^{37}\) Recall that the terms ‘ḥb and yidd\(\text{כ} \)ōnf or their plural forms are not attested in any other pre-exilic or, for that matter, exilic prophetic tradition. However, both terms are found otherwise only in dtr narrative and legal texts (Deut. 18:11; 2 Kgs. 21:6, 23:24) or narrative and legal texts dependent upon the dtr tradition (1 Sam. 28:3-25; 1 Chr. 10:13; 2 Chr. 33:6; cf. also Lev. 19:31; and 20:6,27 and cf. 4.5.1.-3).\(^{58}\)

Moreover, when seen in the light of Syria-Palestine’s geopolitical contacts with Mesopotamia during the mid first millennium and following and the numerous clues in the biblical traditions to Mesopotamian influence on Israelite religion of this period (cf. 4.5.2.), the enhanced status of Mesopotamian necromancy-like divination more generally- among late Assyrian


\(^{58}\)The non-Isaianic origin of ‘ḥb and yidd\(\text{כ} \)ōnf is further highlighted by the fact that in the post-exilic text Isa. 65:4 (cf. 4.6.4.) a form of Israelite necromancy associated with a rite of incubation enacted in gardens is polemized against, but neither of these two terms are mentioned. If the hand responsible for chs.65-66 is the same as that responsible for the post-exilic redaction of chs.2-66 and the composition of ch.1, cf. Sweeney 1988:21-24 and 4.1., and if these two terms were original to first Isaiah, then we would have expected a redactional hand acquainted with the first Isaiah traditions and responsible for 65:4 to have made mention of the ‘ḥb and yidd\(\text{כ} \)ōnf.
kings controlling Syria-Palestine and the intensification of Mesopotamian political, economic, and religious influence beginning with the reign of Manasseh, favors a relatively late Mesopotamian background for the Israelite appropriation of necromancy. This is given additional support by the lack of attestation of the practice of necromancy in Egypt, Anatolia, and Syria-Palestine in pre-Hellenistic times. The arguments in support of each of these points are detailed in 4.5.1.-3.

Finally, when the background of crisis and despair and the resort to unconventional modes of revelation are seen in the light of the dtr redacted text Deut. 18:11 (cf. 4.4.2. and the parallel Lev. 19:31 and 20:6,27) and dtr Isa. 19:3 (cf. 4.3.3.) and Isa. 47:10b-12 where the same or similar magical practices are condemned, an exilic date becomes all the more compelling:

(19) וְכִי יֹֽוָֽםֹּרֵךְ 'ָֽאָלֶֽקֶם  'לָל הָֽאֶבֲּעֵבֹּט

"And when they say to you, Consult Those-Who-Return"


And cf. Finkel 1983-84:15,17. Moore 1990:53-55 generalizes the term so as to include the marzēah and the expulsion of ghosts, but the latter is an attempt to rid one of a ghost not communicate with it. As noted earlier, Tropper 1989 also employs an imprecise definition of necromancy which, in view of several of his texts, includes the mere contact with ghosts. The retrieval of information concerning the future is lacking. In other words, he fails to document the associated belief in the dead's supernatural benefic power. Moreover, not only does he questionable find this practice in Egyptian and Hittite texts (pp.27-46, 110-22), but his inclusion of Ugaritic texts (pp.123-60) is hardly convincing in the light of our findings in 3.1.

and the Knowers who chirp and mutter! Does not a people consult their (chthonic) gods, the dead on behalf of the living?

'el-hayyidm onim ham'šapš'pim

we hammahgilm hālō'-'am

'el-'elōhāyw yidrōk b'c'ad

haḥayyim 'el-hammētām

(20) le ṭōrāh wehitc ūdāh

'îm-lō' yō'mēr kaddābār

hazzeh

'āšer 'ēn-lō śāhar

(21) wec ābar bāh niqšeh we rāc ēb

we ūnayāh kt-yirc ah we hitqāssap

wē qillēl bē malkō ūbē'lōhāyw

Ūpānāh le mācē lāh

(22) we 'el- 'eres yabīt

62 For our rendering of v.20, see Hayes and Irvine 1987:166-67. However, we take the phrase 'ēn-lō, to denote (the lack of) possession, cf. BDB p.513 para.5b. We connect šāhar with its cognate form in the exilic context of Isa. 47:10b-12 (cf. v.11 and the related sōhārayik in v.15 and Akk. sāhiru "charm, sorcerer"). This text is likewise concerned with the condemnation of such practices.


64 Heider 1985:330-31 read "they will curse by Molek and by their gods", and explained the -w in mlkw as the result of dittography with the initial w in ūbē'lōhāyw).

65 Wildberger 1972:355-58 and Kaiser 1983:202 concluded that this is not metaphorick as it refers to the conjuring up of the dead.
Surely distress and darkness with no daybreak; Straitness and gloom with no dawn."

The verbal form *yō·mērū* in v.19 lacks an appropriate antecedent in vv.16-18. This confirms the redactional nature of vv.19-20a as does *lē tōrāh wēlītē lōdāh* in v.20, a (secondary) allusion to v.16 *sōr tōdāh hāqōm tōrāh*. The inverted word order evident in v.20 shows that *tōrāh* in v.20a reflects the post-exilic understanding of the term to designate a specific body of teaching or the written divine law as in several late additions to Deuteronomy (cf. e.g., 1:5, 28:61, 31:9,26) and not the more general "wise instruction" of first Isaiah as recorded in v.16.

The post-exilic redactor was able to employ the written law in his polemic against alternative modes of revelation and so contrasted the prophetic word with that revelation sought through necromancy. The threat of enacting the death penalty for practicing necromancy as preserved in the dtr related references in the Holiness Code (hereafter HC) suggests that this "unorthodox" magical means of interpreting the future must have posed a serious challenge to deuteronomistic "orthodoxy" after the exile when conventional forms of religion had all but failed (cf. Lev. 20:6,27).

---

66 Heider 1985:328-32 made reference to an unpublished paper by J. Glen Taylor who pointed out the netherworld imagery of no dawn (v.20), inhabitants famished and cursing (v.21), palpable darkness (v.22) and suggested that the antecedent of *bāḥ* in v.21 is Sheol.


The negative interrogative particle ḫālô' opening v.19b clearly governs both objects of the verb yidrōš "its (= a people's) gods" 'ēlōhāyw and "the dead" hammētîm. As it is unlikely that Isaiah would have urged a people to consult their dead on behalf of the living, the enticement to necromancy must be continued (in the form of two questions) to the end of v.19.\(^6^9\)

The close proximity of 'ēlōhāyw and hammētîm within the context of an enticement to necromancy has elicited the close attention of commentators.\(^7^0\) Recent treatments have opted for the notion that the gods here and in 1 Sam. 28:13 are the dead, the emphasis being on their preternatural or divinized state.\(^7^1\)

However, we demonstrate in our treatment of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 (4.5.1.) that the oft-cited term ilû -contrary to the opinio communis- is not co-terminous with words such as eṯemmû or mētû used to designate the dead in Mesopotamia. In fact, various gods are petitioned in necromantic rites of the Neo-Assyrian times and later to assist in retrieving a ghost. This suggests that 'ēlōhāyw "his gods" is a reference to those gods and netherworld deities known to be summoned in necromantic ritual.

Given the presence of necromantic practices in this exilic redactional text, it remains for us to ascertain the meaning of

\(^6^9\) Some commentators have concluded that the enticement to necromancy ended with v.19a and v.19b was viewed as the beginning of the prophetic response with two questions "should not a people consult its God (or should they consult) the dead on behalf of the living?", cf. the RSV and most recently Watts 1985:125-28 and Oswalt 1986:230,237.

\(^7^0\) The LXX read the accusative singular of theos and 1QIs* read the singular 'lwhw.

\(^7^1\) Cf. e.g., Lewis 1989:131.
the terms 'ōbōt and yiddēcōnīm. Not only are their referents debated, but the etymology of 'ōbōt remains disputed. On the other hand, while the etymology of yiddēcōnīm presents no difficulty, the significance of y-d-c "knowing" remains problematic and is likewise bound up with the question of its intended referents: are these "knowers", i.e., the dead who have special knowledge about the future, or the "familiar spirits", i.e., the ancestral dead, or are these the practitioners who have the special knowledge enabling them to communicate with the dead? We will defer our examination of this issue to our treatment of the 'ōbōt.

For 'ōbōt, several interpretations have been put forward e.g., "revenants", "(the spirits which issue from) the pit", and "fathers, ancestors". While the first and last find adherents, the second has received substantial criticism and is generally rejected. In Hebrew, the plural form of 'ōb, 'ōbōt, is

---


more frequent, but plural "pits" do not seem to be indicated in the presumed non-biblical parallels. Second, there remains some question as to the problematic phonemic relation of the \( p \) and \( b \) in the Sumerian, Hittite, Akkadian terms and Hebrew 'ôt. Third, there is no explicit connection with "holes" in Israelite necromancy.\(^7\)

We give preference to the connection with Arabic 'āba. To date, no damaging criticisms of this proposal have been offered.\(^7\) On the other hand, the association with Hebrew 'ôt "father" presents several difficulties. Assuming this etymology, the woman of Endor in 1 Sam. 28:7 who rouses the spirit of Samuel would have to be labelled a "the controller of a father" 'ēšet ba'alat-'ôt, but unless one could demonstrate familial relations to exist between the woman of Endor and Samuel, or for that matter Saul and Samuel, it is unlikely that Hebrew 'ôt had such underlying associations.\(^8\)


\(^7\) Lust 1974:135 rejected this position. The French "revenant", or, as Lust further defines the term "ghosts of the deceased who can be called up through a spiritist", would not have been an acceptable concept in the first millennium B.C.E., but 1 Sam. 28 provides as close a parallel as one could hope to find! Nevertheless, we recognize the fact that the Arabic is unattested in earlier phases of Semitic, so Hoffner 1974:131.

\(^8\) Cf. the similar criticism of Ebach and Rütterswördelen 1980:207. Spronk 1986:254 attempted to circumvent this objection by arguing that in 1 Sam. 28, 'ôt had become a general designation for all spirits of the dead, but he neither offered support nor did he explain how the ancestors were distinguished from the dead in general. In any case, his view that an ancestral spirit of the woman of Endor might have acted as an intermediary between her and other spirits, contradicts Saul's request in v.8. Saul specifically asks her to divine (Qal of qāsam) and bring up
Furthermore, this proposal requires a protracted and unconvincing argument involving the Canaanite shift ą to ę as well as a highly speculative theological motivation for the vowel change, i.e., to dissociate the highly regarded fathers from the condemned practice of necromancy. 79

We return now to the identity of the referents indicated by 'ōbôt and yidd*e'ônîm. At least four possibilities have been proposed: the pit (in the case of 'ōbôt), the spirit of the dead, the image of the dead, as well as the one who conjures up the dead. The first can be eliminated owing to its dependence upon the etymological argument derived from Sumerian ab, Akkadian apu, and Hittite api which we rejected earlier.

That an image might on occasion be in view has been reiterated recently. 80 The key to this interpretation lies in the syntactic relation of 'ōbôt and yidd*e'ônîm to such verbs as "make" (Qal of 'sāšāh: 2 Kgs. 21:6, 2 Chr. 33:6), "burn" (Piel of bā'ar: 2 Kgs. 23:24), "destroy" (Hiphil of kāraţ: 1 Sam. 28:9), and "drive out" (Hiphil of sūr: 1 Sam. 28:3). In these instances, our two terms function as what appear to be material objects, and therefore eliminate spirits of the dead as suitable referents. Accordingly, images would fit the contexts more readily.

(Hiphil of cālāh) the 'ōb which Saul should name. This was not one of her ancestors. Spronk's comparison with Ugaritic 'il'ib and Aramaic 'b' as read by his mentor de Moor in KAI 214:16, must also be rejected, cf. 3.1.3.


While Lust, one of the advocates of this position, recognized the fact that the above verbs can be applied to persons, he rejected this possibility, for "when considered together however they rather refer to a material object". Nevertheless, Lust did note the use of כָּשֹׁה in Gen 12:5, where slaves are said to have been "acquired". Such a notion could also apply to the hiring of a professional class.\(^1\)

Furthermore, Lust failed to mention that כָּשֹׁה is used in conjunction with another professional class, the "priests" קֹהָנִים and designates their having been "appointed" (cf. e.g., 1 Kgs. 12:31, 13:33; 2 Kgs. 17:32; 2 Chr. 2:17). Lastly, persons who associate themselves with such illegitimate divinatory rites could be punished by burning, destruction, or expulsion. As Lev. 20:27 makes clear, persons who have in them the 'ובֵית and the יִדְּנֶה are to be "put to death" (מֵתוֹ yômāțō) by stoning.

Nevertheless, these verbs could equally apply to the spirits of the dead. It is conceivable that spirits of the dead were officially appointed or instituted (כָּשֹׁה), exterminated or purged (Piel of בַּכַּר, cf. the formula בִּכַּרְתָּ הָרָא miqqirbekā "you shall purge the evil from your midst", e.g. Deut. 21:21), removed, i.e., forbidden (Hiphil of קָרַע, cf. 1 Sam. 20:15), and rejected or put aside (Hiphil of sūr, cf. e.g. Josh. 11:15; Ps. 66:20). Where it was previously assumed that necromancers were in view, the evidence equally allows for the possibility that the referents are deceased spirits.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Lust 1974:137 and n.6.

\(^2\) This is also the opinion of the translators of the JPS.
Isa. 8:19-22 provides a test case for our proposal. The raised spirits are described as "chirping" (ḥamšapšapîm) and "twittering" (ḥammahgîm). In the past, commentators have taken these notions as indicative of the methods employed by mediums and wizards to deceive their clients, but this interpretation lacks contextual support. In Isa. 29:4 the ōb is similarly depicted as "chirping" (tĕşapšēp), but in this case, it is clearly located in the netherworld (cāpār "dust"). The comparison of the dead with birds is sufficiently documented for the ancient Near East and, as in the case of the passage at hand, may signal their ability to take flight from the netherworld. 83

Moreover, elsewhere the ōbôt and yiddēcōnîm function as the objects of such verbal actions as "inquire" (dāraš + 'el: Isa. 8:19, 19:3; 1 Chr. 10:13), "ask" (šā'al: Deut. 18:11; + bē - 1 Chr. 10:13), "divine" (qāsam + bē - : 1 Sam. 28:8), "turn to" (pānāh + 'el: Lev. 19:31, 20:6), and "seek unto" (Piel of bāqāš + 'el: Lev. 19:31). Only in two instances is a professional explicitly mentioned. In Deut. 18:11, the necromancer is described as "one who asks" (Qal ptc. of šā'al) of an ōb or a yiddēcōnîm", while in 1 Sam. 28:7, the lady of Endor is named "the controller of a spirit" 'ēšet ba'ēlāt ōb.

By way of summary, nowhere do the unqualified terms ōbôt and yiddēcōnîm require the practitioner interpretation. In fact, several contexts make the spirit interpretation preferable, while others would readily avail themselves of the same. This would

83 Cf. Spronk 1986:100 and the bibliography in n.2. This may help to explicate Isa. 29:4 where the voice of the living is compared with that of the ōb from the (lower) earth (mē'ereṣ).
eliminate the notion that the *yiddɔnīm* designates one who has the special knowledge needed to communicate with the dead. Moreover, in none of the uses of *yiddɔnīm* are familial ties apparent. In fact, 1 Sam. 28 speaks directly against this (see above). So "familiar spirit" is less likely a meaning than simply "knowers", i.e., spirits who have superior knowledge of the affairs of the living.

At this point, a note of clarification must be underscored at the risk of being redundant. What obtains in Isa. 8:19-22 is an example of necromancy, that is to say, the calling up of the deceased for purposes of ascertaining the unknown or predicting the future. Unlike prescriptions for expelling a ghost owing to some malevolent influence it might exert, in necromancy the active presence of the ghost is desired. Although it is often assumed that necromancy shares such a *modus operandi* with death and ancestor cults, no examples of the latter can be cited from the ancient Near East to substantiate such an assumption. In any case, the numerous arguments which we outlined in ch.1 demonstrate that necromancy is not to be equated or confused with the death or ancestor cult.

As to the origins of the Israelite version of necromancy, we suggested above that Assyrian and Babylonian practice provided the stimulus for its introduction into Israel. The impetus for such a proposal consists of several points. First, Isa. 29:4,

84 Cf. the definition for necromancy offered in Bourguignon 1987:345-47.

85 For examples of ghost expulsion rites, cf. the thorough treatment of several texts from Mesopotamia by Scurlock 1988:73-102.
while from a later dtr hand, polemicizes against an Israelite form of necromancy which the biblical writer sets within the context of an impending Assyrian invasion. The additional arguments set forth below suggests that this is more than mere coincidence.

We know that while necromancy remains unattested in Egypt, Anatolia, and Syria-Palestine, it was widely observed in Mesopotamia from the Neo-Assyrian period onwards in both Assyria and Babylonia. Moreover, by the end of the eighth century B.C.E., Assyria, followed by Babylonia, had gained political control over Syria-Palestine and it was while exercising sovereignty over this region that the late Assyrian kings became preoccupied with various forms of divination, thereby offering an avenue for religious influence upon the local cults.

When these factors are viewed in the light of the late pre-exilic to exilic composition of each of the relevant biblical texts, as can be established on the basis of independent literary critical arguments, then the force of our proposal gains added momentum. In other words, Israel was first presented with the opportunity to adopt voluntarily such mantic practices as necromancy from her East Semitic overlords of the mid-to-late

---

86 Cf. Scurlock 1988:5-7,103-12,318-42 for the Assyrian and Babylonian examples from Assur (BAM 215), Babylon (AfO 29/30:2-3), Uruk (SpTU 2 no.20), and Nineveh (AfO 29/30:4). The dates of these texts fall between the Neo-Assyrian period and the third century B.C.E.

first millennium. For the compositional histories of the remaining texts pertaining to necromancy (Deut. 18:11; 1 Sam. 28:3-25 [= 1 Chr. 10:13]; 2 Kgs. 21:6 [= 2 Chr. 33:6], 23:24), we refer the reader to the following sections.

4.3.3. ISAIAH 19:3

Isaiah 19:3, like 8:19, makes mention of the 'ābōt and the yiddēnīm, but in this instance, they are viewed by the author as reflective of necromantic practices indigenous to Egypt. Commentators have taken this to be indicative of the author's ignorance of Egyptian beliefs or characteristic of his Yahwistic bias as evidenced by his dependence upon expressions found elsewhere in the book, 8:19 being a prime example. As was the case with 8:19, we must first reconstruct the compositional history of both vv.1-4 and vv.1-15 in order to ascertain the contribution of v.3 to our investigation.

The oracle against Egypt, 19:1-15, falls into three parts: vv.1-4 portray the collapse of the religious and civil order, vv.5-10 depict the failure of the Nile floods, Egypt's economic

---

No. Nevertheless, contra Spieckermann 1982:137-38, the East Semitic origins of the terms 'ābōt and yiddēnīm cannot be assumed. Subsequent to the adoption of necromancy, these functional names were attached to the ghosts by the local Canaanite-Israelite populations. While McKay 1973 and Cogan 1974 concluded that Assyria did not force its religion upon its vassal states, Spieckermann 1982:307-72 has shown that the primary sources indicate that this was probably the case. For our position that first millennium Syro-Palestinian culture and Israel in particular experienced religious influence from contemporary Mesopotamia, whether one has in mind imposition and/or assimilation, cf. 4.5.2.

Cf. e.g., Kaiser 1980:101.
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base, and vv.11-15 describe the helplessness of her political leaders in the face of disaster. The general consensus is that vv.1-15 derive not from Isaiah, but from a hand heavily dependent upon other passages in the book, particularly the foreign nation oracles. The repudiation of Egypt and its political strength differs considerably from that found in undoubtedly Isaianic passages such as 20:1-6, 30:1-5, and 31:1-3. Furthermore, the author's style, replete as it is with wooden repetitiveness, is inferior to the elegance and conciseness of the Isaianic hand.

When these arguments in support of a post-Isaianic composition are seen in the light of the depiction of Egypt's instability (v.2) as well as her political independence and subsequent domination by a foreign ruler (v.4, cf. Ezek. 30:12), we must look for a period, or periods, in which the themes of conquest and instability come to the fore. Accordingly, the exilic to post-exilic time span best suits the compositional setting of vv.1-15.

90 Vermeylen 1977:320-21 listed as additional elements the struggling fratricide (v.2, cf. 3:5), the spirit of Egypt (v.3, cf. 30:1,31:3), the recourse to necromancy and enchanters (v.3, cf. 3:2-3,8:19), the incapacity of the planners (v.4, cf. 3:4), the princes of Zoan (vv.11,13, cf. 30:4), the folly of the sages (v.11, cf. 29:14), the plan of Yahweh (v.12, cf. 14:24-27), the staggering drunkard (vv.13-14, cf. 28:7-8,29:9), the vomit (v.14, cf. 28:8), the spirit poured out by Yahweh (v.14, cf.29:10,31:3), the head and the tail, the palm branch and the reed (v.15, cf. 9:13).


92 "Egypt" is repeated seven times in four verses.

93 Van der Toorn 1988:209 completely ignored the arguments against an eighth century date. With Kaiser 1980:99, the late date eliminates the Egyptian campaigns of Esarhaddon and Asshurbanipal. He proposed 404-343 B.C.E., the period between the revolt of Amyrtaios and the final reconquest by Artaxerxes III.
As mentioned above, the 'ôbôt and yiddéc ônim in 19:3 have been viewed as indicative of the author's ignorance of Egyptian beliefs or characteristic of his Yahwistic bias. While mortuary practices were observed in Egypt from the early second to the late first millennia, necromancy per se remains unattested. In view of the dtr propensity for rhetorical license, it is difficult to know whether or not the dtr hand was concerned with the accuracy of his association of Egypt and necromancy. Given our arguments in 4.1. and 4.3.2. for dtr influence on first Isaiah and the dtr character of 'ôbôt and yiddéc ônim, 19:3 reflects the explicit dtr characterization of non-dtr Yahwistic magico-religious practices as non-Israelite in origin as a threat to pure Yahwism and the implicit warning against the nation:

\[\text{win}^\text{e} \text{baqqāh ru}\text{a}^\text{*} h-\text{miṣrayim be qirbō} \quad \text{"Egypt will be drained of spirit, and I will confound its plans;"}\]
\[\text{wa}^\text{c} \text{āsātō '}\text{b} \text{allēx }^\text{ê}\text{c} \quad \text{So they will consult the idols}\]
\[\text{wē }\text{dārē šū }'\text{el-hā'ēlim }^\text{ê} \quad \text{and the shades,}\]
\[\text{wē }'\text{el-hā'ittīm} \quad \text{wē 'el-hayyiddéc ônim Those-Who-Return and the Knowers."}\]

Ochos. Vermeylen 1977:321 proposed the Egyptian campaign of Nebuchadrezzar (605 B.C.E.) based on the fact that the author was unaware of the post-exilic additions to the book.


96 The late redactional character of 19:1-15 and the distinctively Mesopotamian origins of the necromancy topos, can account for the presence of Hebrew ('ôbôt and yiddéc ônim) and Akkadian technical terminology ('ittīm) in an oracle against Egypt inserted into a pre-exilic Isaianic context.
Like ḥāʾēḇāt and hayyiddēʾōnîm, the terms ḥāʾēlîlîm and ḥāʾiṭṭîm function as the objects of the verbal form wādārēṣû "they will consult...". As pointed out above, the last form, a hapax legomenon, has been equated with Akkadian eṭemmum "spirit of the dead".97 Others have compared Arabic ḏaṭṭa "emit or utter a sound or noise"98 or Ugaritic ṭum, but the meaning of the latter remains to be established owing to its lone occurrence in Ugaritic.99 We prefer the Akkadian based on the parallelism īlānu "gods"/ētemmū "spirits of the dead" which closely resembles the Hebrew parallelism, albeit with its polemical thrust, ēlîlîm "false gods"/iṭṭîm "spirits of the dead(?)".100

While the analysis of ēlîlîm remains problematic, it is likely that it "was created as a disparaging pun on, and as a diminutive of, ēl" (cf. kēsil "fool" where the lamedh may function as a diminutive ending).101 The similar use of this term

97 Cf. Jirku 1912:11-12; Kaufman 1974:50,143 n.23; and Cohen 1978:42. The doubling of ū has been explained as a marker of the plural.

98 Cf. e.g., Gray 1912:324; Perles 1914:109; and Lane I:66.


100 For our view that the gods when found parallel to the dead in such instances refer to the netherworld gods summoned in necromantic rites and not to the deified status of the dead, cf. 4.5.1. and Finkel 1983-84:1-17 for references. Note that for ēlîlîm, the LXX reads tous theous "the gods", although in 19:1 the LXX reads ta cheiropoieta "made by human hands" for MT ʾēlfîlē migrayim. Contra Lewis 1989:133-34, this does warrant the conjecture that the LXX had as its Vorlage Hebrew ʾēlōhîm in 19:3, for gods and their images could be viewed simply as aspects of the same referents, cf. e.g., Isa. 42:17 and Ex. 20:23.

101 Preuss 1977:285. According to the author, its relation to the adjective ēlīl "weak, worthless" must be recognized as well.
in late and dtr passages such as 2:8, 18, 20; 10:10, 11 (cf. also 1 Kgs. 18:33-35 and Isa. 36:18-20); and 31:7 supports the post-Isaianic redaction of 19:3.\footnote{102}

Isa. 19:3 offers little in the way of enhancing our knowledge of Israelite necromantic practices beyond the information gleaned from 8:19. Several of the above mentioned elements do suggest that the ridicule of such practices, whether depicted as embraced by Israelites or supposedly observed by neighboring foreigners, was the dtr tradition’s reaction to Mesopotamian religious influence of the late pre-exilic to exilic periods. Such influence is no doubt exemplified in the use ‘ittîm = Akkadian ētemmû.

4.3.4. ISAIAH 28:7-22

Early in this century, commentators suggested that the antagonists of 28:7-22 practiced necromancy and that in 28:10, 13, Isaiah was mimicking the phrases spoken during their séances.\footnote{103} Recently van der Toorn has attempted to advance Daiches’ proposal by explicating the sense of continuity it gives to the whole of


\footnote{103} Cf. e.g., Wade 1911:180; Skinner 1915:225; Daiches 1921:6 and König 1926:254.
28:7-22. This line of interpretation offers a very attractive solution to the crux of v.10 (and v.13).

According to van der Toorn, 28:7-8 contain Isaiah's description of the rites performed by certain cultic prophets while in attendance at a marzēaḥ feast. At this feast, the participants sought inebriation in order to enter into a visionary trance. While in the trance the living functioned as the medium or mouthpiece for the dead. 28:10 records Isaiah's mimicry of the bird-like twitterings and groans produced by the necromancers turned ventriloquists (cf. LXX engastrimuthous in Isa. 19:3). These sounds were viewed as the dead's oracular message uttered by the living while in a drunken stupor (šē måcāh v.9 and cf. the similar use of Akkadian egirrū and Greek klēdon).

Thus, the "strange lips" b€lācāgē šāpāh and "foreign tongue" b€lāšon 'aherent of v.11 as well as the 'anšē lāšon "self-confident chatterboxes" or "men of nonsensical talk" of v.14 are to be understood as references to the necromancers and their esoteric language. The author further hypothesized that the prophets were required to interpret these unintelligible sounds in order to decipher the message communicated by the dead.

Van der Toorn 1988:199-217. He argued for the essential unity of vv.7-22. Vv.7-13 is traditionally viewed as earlier than vv.14-22 based on the view that the religious office of priest (kōhen) and prophet (nāḇī') of v.7 is not to be equated with the 'anšē lāšon of v.14 who rule (māšal) the people of Jerusalem. But the latter need not be viewed only as political leaders, for the cultic prophets influenced political life through their religious utterances, cf. pp.200-01.

Van der Toorn 1988:213 cited the Ugaritic text KTU 1.114 as illustrative of the common role inebriation obtained in the marzēaḥ banquet, but cf. 3.1.5.
For van der Toorn, the crucial datum suggestive of the divinatory or, more specifically, necromantic associations of this passage is the parallel mention of māwet "Death" and šē 'ēl "Netherworld" in v.15 (cf. v.18). These are to be understood as personified beings, deities who offer their protection to those who perform the necessary magical rites and so the relevant lines are to be taken literally (v.15):

\[\text{ki 'āmartem kāraṭnū bērīt 'et-māwet} \]
\[\text{wēc im-šē 'ēl cāśīnū ḥōzeh} \]
\[\text{šīt šōṭēp kī-ya'ābōr lō' yē bō'ēnū} \]
\[\text{ki šamnū kāzāb maḥsēnū ūḥaḥšēqer} \]
\[\text{nīstārēnū} \]

"We have concluded a covenant with Death, and with the Netherworld we have made a pact; would the overpowering scourge come along, it shall not reach us, for we made Lie our refuge, and in Deceit we take shelter".

Halpern has independently proposed a similar interpretation of Isa.28. The priests and prophets are viewed as participants in the ancestral cult and believe that they can manipulate the deity while in a state of alcohol-induced ecstasy. According to this line of interpretation, v.10 contains Isaiah's mockery of the priests' and prophets' verbal 'babyisms' for the vomit and ordure they produced while hallucinating under the influence. As support, the author suggested that saur and qaw in v.10 comprise a wordplay on the terms qi' "vomit" and šō'āh "excrement" of v.8

106 Van der Toorn 1988:202-04. He also speculated that kāzāb "Lie" and šēqer "Deceit" refer to the gods Chemosh and Milcom/Moloch.

107 For the reading šōt with qere and 1QIs9, cf. now Day 1989:59 n.101. The following verb ya'ābōr is the qere reading, cf. v.18, the kethibh being cābār.
thereby enhancing the accusation that the priests and prophets had indulged in coprophilia.\textsuperscript{108}

Like van der Toorn, Halpern viewed Death and Sheol in vv.15 and 18 as underworld deities worshipped by the priests and prophets. In light of this netherly context of v.18, Halpern concluded that \textit{hammass\={a}} of v.20a is best viewed as a technical term for a "funerary bench" with its accompanying "shroud" (= \textit{hammass\={e}k\={a}h} v.20b).\textsuperscript{109} But for Halpern, it was not vv.15 and 18 that supplied the crucial data in support of a divinatory backdrop for this passage. Rather, v.7 functioned for the author in this capacity. Here the priests and prophets are depicted as seeking oracles or visions, cf. \textit{b\={a}r\={o}\'{e}h} "in seeing".\textsuperscript{110}

However, rites related to ancestral cults or necromancy are not explicitly mentioned in Isa. 28:7-22. While divination may be in view in v.7 and ecstatic utterances of an inebriated priest perhaps in v.10 -both of these interpretations are currently disputed-, neither necessitates the presence of rites involving the dead. Besides, others have interpreted v.7 without any reference to professional prophetic practices such as visions and divination.

For example, Driver argued that the \textit{RSV} translation "they err in vision, they stumble in judgement" offers a poor parallelism with the "strong drink" \textit{\=se\={k}\={a}r} and "wine" \textit{yayin} of

\textsuperscript{108}Halpern 1986:113-14.
\textsuperscript{110}Halpern 1986:114. Like van der Torn, Halpern 1986:118 cited the Ugaritic text \textit{KTU} 1.114 as illustrative of the association of drunkenness, excretion, and death in the \textit{marz\={e}\={a}h} feast, but cf. 3.1.5.
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v.7. He read rō'eh as rōweh "intoxication" following Theodotion's methē and the Peshitta's rwāyūtā "intoxication" and translated šāgū bārō'eh (= bārōweh) "given up to tippling" and added that rāʾāh = rāwāh occurs in a number of other passages as well.\textsuperscript{111}

The mention of Death and Sheol in vv.15 and 18 cannot be employed as decisive proof or supporting evidence in favor of this view. Against the reliance of van der Toorn, and for that matter, Halpern, on 28:15,18 as indicative of necromantic practices, it should be pointed out that most interpreters construe these lines as figurative for taking the necessary precautions to avert impending disaster. Many have seen in these lines allusions to political agreements either with Assyria (to spare the tipplers when Assyria invades) or with Egypt (against the Assyrians).\textsuperscript{112} Even the position that chthonic deities are in view does not necessitate that one embrace the necromantic interpretation.

Day has recently argued that Death and Sheol refer to the Molek cult and child sacrifice.\textsuperscript{113} In other words, a necromantic or death cult orientation of a literal rendering appears probable


\textsuperscript{112} See the recent surveys in van der Toorn 1988:202 and Day 1989:60-62. Day's criticism of the covenant with Egypt is most convincing. Nevertheless, the covenant with death is best taken to refer to the fatal outcome of Israel's political jockeying having not put her faith in Yahweh, cf. Nicholson 1986:115. Death and Sheol are personifications of the party with whom the agreement was made, so Burns 1976:338, but cf. his less convincing treatment in 1989:29-30.

\textsuperscript{113} Day 1989:58-64.
only if one concludes that the prior arguments for necromantic or
dead and ancestor cult practices in Isa. 28 are convincing.\textsuperscript{114}

Nevertheless, if we were to assume for the sake of argument
that necromancy or rites related to the ancestral cult constitute
the illicit practices for which this prophetic oracle was
intended, then Halpern's suggestion that the priests and prophets
functioned as imitators of the dead might hint at a Mesopotamian
backdrop for the causal clause ending v.8 "for (κf) all the
tables are full of vomit, no place is without filthiness".\textsuperscript{115}

That is to say, just as it is with the dead in Assyria who,
having been abandoned by the living, must eat their dung\textsuperscript{116}, so
it shall be for the priests and prophets who drink to excess in
hopes of imitating the dead or receiving a message from Yahweh,
for when they die, they will find their netherly diet to consist
of vomit and excrement. The author's allusion to this their
ultimate fate underscores his exhortation to reject their methods
and message.

This brings us to the compositional history of this
passage. If, as we argued in 4.1. behind the phrase "the covenant
with death" \textit{'et-mawet} in 28:15,18, there stands an implied
contrast with Yahweh's covenant which brings life, and if the dtr

\textsuperscript{114}Cf. Day 1989:61-62 for additional criticisms of the
necromantic interpretation: (1) Isa. 28:15,18 do not speak of the
dead in the plural which is what would be expected if necromancy
was in view and (2) consultation is not the same as a covenant.
Cf. also the critique of Tropper 1989:326-30.

\textsuperscript{115}We would understand the perfect form \textit{mālš 'Q} as
descriptive of a future event as if it were already past (i.e.,
the so-called prophetic perfect).

\textsuperscript{116}Cf. Xella 1980:151-60 who applied the significance of
this Mesopotamian topos for 2 Kgs. 18:27 and Isa. 36:12.
traditions were responsible for at least the proliferation of covenant ideology expressing Yahweh's relationship with Israel, then we have evidence for the dtr redaction of this chapter and Isa. 1-35 more generally.\(^{117}\)

Again, supposing those commentators are correct who advocate the presence of necromancy in Isa. 28, based on our findings *vis-à-vis* the exclusive dtr association of those texts which make mention of this divinatory art, we would have additional support for the dtr redactional nature of this passage and Mesopotamian influence would best explain its presence here.

This in turn would support the view that the covenant with Death/the pact with the Netherworld was made with Assyria in order to avert disaster. We would understand it as an allusion to Israel's desperate embrace of not only Mesopotamian political hegemony but also religion in response to the impending invasion perhaps in the last minute hope of placating the enemy. According to the author, it was too late, for Assyria will break covenant and destroy Israel (v.18).

4.3.5. ISAIAH 29:4

Isa. 29:1-8 comprises a description of Jerusalem's salvation.\(^{118}\) The date and authorship of this passage remain

\(^{117}\) The covenant lawsuit or *rib* in Isa. 1 has been cited as indication of the presence in Isa. 1-35 of the covenant idea as expressive of Yahweh's relationship with Israel, cf. e.g., Kaiser 1983:12, and the "father-son" metaphor common in ancient treaty parlance supports this view, cf. Fensham 1971:121-35.

\(^{118}\) So Kaiser 1980:264. It begins with a woe oracle, vv.1-3(4), and ends with a description of salvation beginning with v.5b(-8) (*tippāqāḏ* in v.6a, following the editor of *BHS*, is to
disputed. Clements, for example, concluded that 29:1-4 were
Isaianic and therefore composed just prior to 701 B.C.E. when the
possibility of an Assyrian siege of Jerusalem grew imminent,
while 29:5-8 were added later by a Josianic redactor.

His division is based on the observation that 29:5-8
reflect a dramatic change in perspective, for the foes are no
longer the agents of Yahweh, but have become his enemies. These
verses attempt to interpret Sennacherib's failure to take
Jerusalem in 701 as a victory for Yahweh and to establish the
inviolability of Zion (v.7).119

Kaiser, on the other hand, rejected an Isaianic nucleus to
29:1-8. To begin with, the warning lacks a typically Isaianic
reproach with reasons derived from the present rather than the
future. Secondly, the allusion to David in v.1a is ambiguous.
Moreover, according to this line of interpretation, it contains a
non-historical conception of deliverance. With regard to v.4
specifically, Kaiser argued that the phrase "and it shall be" in
v.4b (Hebrew hāyāh) is indicative of a redactional hand and the
same shows up in vv.2b (2x), 5a, 5b, 7a, and 8a.120

Lastly, Kaiser concluded that in 29:1-4, the prophet
predicts Jerusalem's destruction. This reflects the hand of an
exilic writer. These observations support our contention that
where the term 'ōḇ (cf. v.4) and/or the term yiddēḇōnī appear in
the Isaiah traditions, we have likely evidence for the presence

be taken in a positive sense).

of dtr ideology. In other words, 29:4, like 8:19 and 19:3, is redactional in nature and, we would argue, based on the additional arguments set forth previously, dtr in orientation (cf. 4.3.2.) The writer argues that such distress and calamity will befall the city that her voice will be reduced to the sound of a ghost chirping in the netherworld:

"Brought low\textsuperscript{121}, you shall speak from (lower) earth, from the dust your speech shall issue\textsuperscript{122}. your voice shall be like One-Who-Returns from (lower) earth, from the dust your speech shall chirp".

The JPS translation views the simile in v.4c with \textit{kē 'ōb} as referring to the voice of the ghost "your speech shall be like a ghost's from the ground", whereas the RSV interprets the comparison as one in which the voice of Jerusalem comes up from the netherworld just as a ghost was known to do (not merely its voice, cf. our translation).

To be sure, either rendition provides a fitting analogy for the deadly fate of the city. The former assumes that voices of the dead could be heard arising from the ground and the latter suggests that the ghost itself could return to the land of the living. Both notions are attested in the Hebrew Bible. The former

\textsuperscript{121}For similar phraseology, cf. Akkadian \textit{šapliš ina ēserTim} "below in the netherworld".

\textsuperscript{122}Various proposals accompany \textit{tiššah}: \textless šh\textquoteright h "to be low", so Irwin 1977:51, \textless Arabic saḥha "poured out", thus "issue", so Driver 1968B:51, and \textless syh "to utter", so Dahood as noted by Irwin 1977:51 and cf. Job 7:11.
is implied in the final clause of our passage (29:4d) where the 'ôb is heard "chirping" (tê šapêp, cf 8:19) from the "dust" or netherworld (cāpâr). The latter is assumed in 1 Sam. 28:8 where Saul requests that the woman of Endor bring up (câlâh) the 'ôb which he should name.

This passage is of particular interest owing to the Assyrian backdrop of vv.1-8. Given our arguments for the late Mesopotamian origin of Israelite necromancy (cf. 4.1 and 4.5.2.), we understand the use of the first person in the woe oracle of vv.1-5a (or at the least vv.2-5a) to be the Assyrian king's proclamation. As such, it displays a convincing degree of familiarity with Mesopotamian divination and has a precedent in the contemporaneous proclamation of the Assyrian king spoken by the Rabshakeh in 2 Kgs. 18:28-35. Moreover, both doom accounts make mention of Assyrian afterlife beliefs, that is if the eating of dung and drinking of urine in 2 Kgs. 18:27 refers to one's anticipated existence in the netherworld.¹²³

This text is also of interest owing to the presumed efficacy regarding necromancy and as such stands in stark contrast to the polemical posture of 8:19 where such efficacy is categorically denied. In any case, the metaphoric use of necromancy for the abject weakness and mortal fate of Jerusalem's inhabitants in Isa. 29 hardly stands if such notions concerning the realities of the world of the dead were entirely dismissed by the author. Furthermore, this text supports the view that in 1 Sam. 28, the efficacy of necromancy is also assumed.

Thus, the dtr denunciation of necromancy is best understood as a response to the widely held Mesopotamian belief embraced from the time of king Manasseh's reign onward that communication with the dead truly enabled one to obtain knowledge about the future. The dtr redactor of 29:4 sought to demonstrate that the true source of revelation is Yahwistic prophecy and in view of 29:10, it appears that the cessation of prophecy is connected with the adoption of necromancy as in 1 Sam. 28:6. To be sure, the dtr hand responsible for 8:19 took another approach altogether by denying the efficacy of necromancy in his attempt to establish Yahweh's as the only true form of revelation.

4.3.6. SUMMARY

Our examination reveals that while necromancy was absent in Israel prior to its introduction by the Judahite king Manasseh, it was polemicized against by a post-dtr hand and projected into Isaianic traditions reflective of the reign of king Ahaz and attributed to the people as a whole. In reaction to the pervasive Mesopotamian religious influence of his own day and/or the days of Manasseh, the post-dtr hand consciously distorted necromancy's point of origin -from Mesopotamia to Canaan-, projected his concerns further into the past, and identified his agenda with that of the prophet Isaiah in order to give his

\[12^4\text{Cf. 4.3.2. and 4.5.2. for our defense of Manasseh's reign as the earliest possible date for the introduction of necromancy into Israel and that Mesopotamia provided the most likely point of origin for these practices.}\]
ideological stance the air of greater antiquity and unprecedented authority.

Our investigation also revealed that like necromancy, death and ancestor cults were of no apparent concern to the early prophets. Not only did this become evident in our assessment of Amos 6:7 and the character of the Israelite marzēh, but also in the non-mention of these cults in first Isaiah and other early prophetic traditions. As to the implications to be drawn from this, we would suggest that the evidence supports the view that this deafening silence reflects the real absence of such cults in Israel prior to the last days of the Judahite monarchy or perhaps the redactor's own day.

The Syro-Palestinian evidence which we examined in chapters two and three makes highly unlikely the notion that such silence can be explained away by resorting to the argument that they did exist among the local "Canaanites" and therefore Israelites, but presented no ideological threat to the then extant forms of Yahwism. First, the extra-biblical data suggest that such cults were altogether non-existent or apparently did not constitute a major element in the religious traditions of Syria-Palestine and so we cannot assume that they constituted pervasive practices indigenous to the region.

Secondly, based on our findings vis-à-vis necromancy, the last days of the southern kingdom through to the exile provide a more likely context than any time previous for the potential introduction of death and ancestor cults into Syria-Palestine. Be that as it may, it is curious that the dtr tradition did not polemicize against death and ancestor cults as it did necromancy.
These practices known to be popular in contemporary Mesopotamia were not attributed local or "Canaanite" origins and projected into the Isaianic traditions or any other tradition concerned with earlier times.

The fact that the dtr tradition condemned the related practice of necromancy flies in the face of the assumption that the same tradition would have overlooked death and ancestor cults as potential objects of its religious polemic -assuming that they existed- as they too presuppose the belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead. The most likely explanation is that, unlike necromancy, those cults reflective of such a belief were observed in Israel neither among the royalty nor the society more generally.¹²⁵

Nevertheless, critics have identified a number of passages in the legal and narrative traditions of the Hebrew Bible that purportedly document Israel's embrace of Canaanite death and ancestor cults during the days of the early monarchy with the attendant assumption being that the belief in the supernatural power of the benefic dead was part of the nation's early heritage. To these texts we now turn.

¹²⁵ This leaves open the possibility that the care for and/or commemoration of the dead was observed but we lack unequivocal evidence for these practices and their accompanying beliefs. Cf. our conclusion for an explanation of the absence of death and ancestor cults in the biblical traditions.
4.4. DEUTERONOMIC LEGAL MATERIAL

In this section, we shall examine the laws of Deuteronomy for evidence of death and ancestor cult practices and necromancy. The relevant texts fall within the confines of the legal corpus spanning chapters 12-26. Each of these texts has been scrutinized in past treatments of the Israelite death cult: 14:1, a command outlawing selected mourning rites on behalf of the dead, 18:11, a prohibition against necromancy, and 26:14, a requisite confession that the tithe lacked any association with the dead.

4.4.1. DEUTERONOMY 14:1

Deut. 14:1 forbids the observation of two mourning rites, self laceration and tonsure:

bānīm 'ātem lō' yahweh 'ēlōhēkem lō' tīgōḏ gū
wē lō'-tā́ṣīmū qorḥāh bēn c ēnēkem lāmēt

"You are the sons of Yahweh your God; you shall not cut yourselves or make any baldness on your foreheads on account of the dead".

A wide range of mourning rites are attested in the Hebrew Bible. Several have been cited as evidence for an Israelite

126 See the surveys with bibliographies in Ehrlich 1959:166-19; Kutsch 1965:25-42; Gruber 1971:col.485-87; De Ward 1972:1-27, 145-66; Gruber 1980(II):401-79; Spronk 1986:244-47; and now Padella 1989. Deut. 21:12 mentions an act performed by the foreign woman taken captive "she shaved her head" gīlī'shāh 'ēt-rō'šāh. Although the following context is one of mourning (cf. bākāh in v.13b), this prior act is indicative of a purification rite (cf. Num. 6:9,18 and Lev. 14:8,9) and so is not relevant to our investigation.
cult of the dead. In the case of Deut. 14:1, Smith concluded that 14:2, the reason for Israel’s abstention from self laceration and tonsure, "for you are a people consecrated to Yahweh your God", pointed to the divinity of the dead mentioned in v.1. Moreover, according to Smith, the phrase "sons of Yahweh your God" in 14:1 and the broader context of laws against foreign gods (13:2-19) implied a worship of the ancestral dead.

A second, and often related, tendency of commentators is to construe the prohibition against the mourning rites of self-laceration and tonsure as a reaction to similar Canaanite practices. According to this view, a passage like 1 Kgs. 18:28 where the prophets of Baal cut themselves suggests that these customs were characteristic of mourning and fertility rites observed in the Baal cult. In more recent treatments, texts from Ugarit have been cited in support of the 1 Kgs. 18:28 background to Deut. 14:1.

An Akkadian text preserved at Ugarit which the original editor entitled "The Just Sufferer" describes the mourning rites on behalf of a man near death. One of those mourning rites involved is the laceration of the body: "My brothers washed with

127 Cf. e.g., Wensinck 1917:96-97 and Morgenstern 1966:105-06.

128 Smith 1918:185. These mourning rites would then be employed as acts of supplication, on which see below.

129 Zech. 13:6 has been cited as well, cf. e.g., Roberts 1970:76-77. But the wounds on the prophet in this instance are likely those inflicted by his parents and friends who have accused him of false prophecy and not those resulting from ritualistic self laceration, cf. vv.3,6b.

130 Cf. e.g., Craigie 1976:230; Mayes 1979:238-39; Spronk 1986:244-47; and Lewis 1989:100-01.
their blood like (an) ecstatic(s)" ahhu'a kīma mahē damīšunu ramkū.¹³¹

In the Ugaritic mythological texts, KTU 1.5:VI:11-22, 31-1.6:I:5, El and Anat mourn the death of Baal. Among the mourning rites performed by the gods are self-laceration and tonsure.¹³²

These acts have been taken to reflect mourning rites performed in the Ugaritic cult on behalf of Baal like those mentioned in 1 Kgs. 18:28. It is this Canaanite connection that supposedly provides the rationale for their being forbidden in Deut. 14:1.¹³³ Before we offer our evaluation of these views, we will survey the biblical perspectives vis-à-vis the practices of self-laceration and tonsure as they provide us with important clues as to when, how, and why the sanction against these rites arose.

Contrary to the proscription in Deut. 14:1 and, for that matter, Lev. 19:27-28 and 21:5, the above rites were considered acceptable expressions of grief in the pre-exilic to exilic prophetic tradition. In Amos 8:10, Yahweh sanctions Israel's mourning, lamentation, her donning of sackcloth, and, contrary to Deut. 14:1, the tonsure of the head or "baldness" qorḥāh. Micah 1:16 likewise lists tonsure as one of the mourning observances which Yahweh prescribes for Samaria and Jerusalem. The forms


¹³³ Cf. e.g., Gray 1965:65 and de Moor 1971:200-01.
employed are the Qal fs imperative of qārah "to make bald" and the parallel Qal fs imperative of gāzaz "to shear".

Similarly, Isa. 3:24 assumes the legitimacy of qorḥāh "baldness" as a form of grieving among the Jerusalemites, while in Isa. 22:12, Yahweh explicitly commands qorḥāh along with weeping, mourning, and girding with sackcloth. On the other hand, Isa. 15:2 lists qorḥāh as a mourning practice known among the Moabites alongside weeping, wailing, beard shaving, and sackcloth. Thus, the pre-exilic prophetic testimony condones tonsure in spite of its observance among the local West Semitic populations. The same scenario obtains in the exilic prophetic traditions.

Jer. 7:29 depicts Yahweh as entreating the nation to mourn its impending doom by "shearing their locks" and, as in Micah 1:16, the Qal fs imperative of gāzaz is present.\textsuperscript{134} As was the case in the pre-exilic period, tonsure continued as a legitimate practice in Israel (cf. Jer. 16:6, 41:5; and Ezek. 7:18) in spite of the fact that it was a rite common among the local populations (cf. Jer. 47:5 Philistia, 48:37 Moab; and Ezek. 27:31 Tyre and the surrounding regions).

Similarly, Job 1:20, part of the post-exilic framework of the book, portrays Job's "shearing of the head" as a rightful act of mourning.\textsuperscript{135} Lastly, mention should be made of the late text Ezra 9:3 where Ezra tears hair from his head and beard in a

\textsuperscript{134}The phraseology employed is gozzī nizrek "shear your locks".

\textsuperscript{135}The phraseology employed is wayyāgoz 'et-rō'šō "and he sheared his head".
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moment of grief. Although not for purposes directly related to
the dead, this rite probably had its origin in such mourning
rites.

Along with the practice of tonsure, the gashing of the
flesh (hitgōdēd) is viewed as an acceptable expression of
mourning in the book of Jeremiah (cf. 16:6, 41:5). In another
late text, Job 2:8, a form of the rare hitgārēd "to scratch
oneself" might point to an act of mourning alongside the
covering of oneself with ashes.

A rather unique instance of the mention of self-laceration
obtains in Hosea 7:14, a pre-exilic passage. The issue taken up
by Hosea is Israel's insincerity, not the rites themselves. This
is supported by the verse's ABBA pattern, "but they do not cry to
me from their hearts as they wail upon their beds; although for

---

136 The phraseology employed is wā'emr tāh miśe'ar rō'sš f
ūz(*) qānī "I tore hair out of my head and beard".

137 Cf. Lev. 19:27 and 21:5 where shaving of the head and the
shaving of the beard as well as gashing are all mentioned
together in what constitute mortuary contexts. On the use of
nepeš in these passages to designate the dead, cf. 1*nepeš in
21:1 and lānepeš in 19:28 See Lev. 21:1, 22:4 and Seligson 1951
on napṣōt mēt in 21:11. Moreover, in Lev. 21:5, the preceding
context has to do with the defilement of a dead corpse (cf. vv.1-4),
while a prohibition against necromancy in 19:31 follows 19:27.

138 Jer 5:7 in the MT reads a form of hitgōdēd, but many
Hebrew manuscripts read a form of hitgōrēr "to lodge with" and
the LXX reads katēluov "to lodge with".

139 On the other hand, a resh may have been confused for a
dalet and l*hitgārēd "to scratch oneself" should be read as
l*hitgōdēd "to cut oneself".
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In spite of commonly held opinion, this text does not explicitly attach the mentioned mourning rites to the worship of Baal. Rather, the rites listed are viewed as two mourning rites employed as acts of supplication to Yahweh. In other words, neither wailing nor gashing are proscribed; Israel's faithless attitude is the object of Hosea's dirge.

In sum, the cumulative testimony of the Hebrew Bible down to the time of Ezekiel reveals that self-laceration and tonsure were common Israelite forms of mourning and supplication (cf. also Ezra 9:3). The frequent attestation of these rites has been explained as the result of the prohibition in Deut. 14:1 not being known or enforced, but this hardly offers an adequate solution to Yahweh's repeated adjuration to observe tonsure as an expression of mourning.

146 Several Hebrew mss read yitgōdādû for MT yitgōrārû and the LXX reads katetēmnonto. In 1 Kgs. 18:28 kai katetēmnonto = Hebrew wayyitgōdû. This favors the mention of laceration in Hosea 7:14. On v.14a, see Andersen and Freedman 1980:474-75.

141 So e.g., Mays 1969:111-12 and Andersen and Freedman 1980:473-75. These advocates cite in support 7:16a where they emend MT lō' čāl "not upwards" to labbačāl "to (the) Baal", and cf. BHS. LXX reads apestraphesan eis oudên "turn aside to nothing" in support of MT. Although Hos. 2:10 (ET 8) attributes Israel's grain and new wine as given over to Baal, the author claims that these were originally Yahwistic as in 7:14 with the implication that Israel knowingly rejected this origin. Beyond this point, the two texts develop differently. 7:14 underscores Israel's ritual hypocrisy, while 2:10 (ET 8) depicts her apostasy. In other words, a Baalistic backdrop is lacking in 7:14. Moreover, nothing is said in 2:10 (ET 8) of the ritual gashing as in 7:14.

142 Cf. e.g., Wright 1953:2.42.
In the light of the pre-exilic to exilic prophetic testimony, Bertholet, and, more recently, Horst have dated 14:1 later than Jeremiah. The two passages from the Holiness Code, Lev. 19:27-28, 21:5, should likewise be viewed as later than Jeremiah. As a case in point, Jer. 41:5 mentions laceration and the shaving of the head as acts of supplication as eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria approach the house of God to make offerings with "their beards shaved" məqulləḥē zāqān, their garments torn, and "their bodies gashed" ǔmitgōḏ dīm. Like Ezra 9:3, these rites probably originate in the rites of mourning for the dead, the shaving of the head and beard and gashing (cf. Lev. 19:27 and 21:5).

In view of Jer. 41:5, Smith concluded with regard to Deut. 14:1 "Unknown to Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and to those Shechem Jews who, in obedience to the central law of D, brought their offerings to the temple, this law cannot have formed part of the original code of D; but it is an exilic or post-exilic addition". In other words, after the capture of Jerusalem, Israelites from the former northern kingdom who remained loyal to the Josianic reform as evidenced in their pilgrimage there, would hardly have observed mourning rites outlawed in the very law code which they were attempting to obey. In fact, the prohibition against laceration and tonsure is not found among the laws

144 Smith 1918:184-85.
forming the basis for the Josianic reform which are generally viewed as reflective of a so-called Urdeuteronomium.\textsuperscript{146}

To be sure, additional evidence in support of the redactional nature of 14:1 is at hand. Smith noted that the phrase using the plural number "You (pl.) are the sons of Yahweh. . . " in 14:1 reflects a late process of individualization of the Israelites. It is otherwise unattested in the early strata of Deuteronomy.\textsuperscript{147} Following earlier critics, Mayes cited the change to plural address as an argument in favor of the editorial nature of the prohibition. Although itself insufficient as a criterion for source division, when it is coupled with the emphasis on the purity of worship, a theme at home in dtr circles, it increases the likelihood of dtr expansion.\textsuperscript{148}

Assuming that Deut. 14:1 is a dtr addition, it probably reflects an expansion on a law against self laceration and tonsure preserved in the later HC. An earlier form of the law was directed at the priests (Lev. 21:1,5) which in turn was expanded to incorporate the people (Lev. 19:27-28). In both, these rites are enacted "on account of the dead" (l- + nepeš, cf. 4.4.2).

In all likelihood, the priestly law preceded the law for the people, for to suppose the reverse, that the law for the


\textsuperscript{147}Smith 1918:184-85.

\textsuperscript{148}Mayes 1979:46-47, 237-39 following e.g., Horst 1961:61-2; and Minette de Tillesse 1962:29-87, esp. 40-41. Mayes attributed 14:1 to a second exilic editor concerned with the pure worship of Yahweh. For the change in number (or Numeruswechsel) as a criterion for distinguishing between passages original to Deuteronomy and later dtr additions, see Nicholson 1967:25-36 and now Preuss 1982:34-35,93-95.
people preceded the priestly regulation, would be redundant.\textsuperscript{149} Like Lev. 19:27-28, Deut. 14:1 records a later expansion on this law. In any case, commentators opine that the law arose at least in part as a reaction to foreign practices and this has prompted the assumption that a distinctly Canaanite practice is in view as suggested by a text like 1 Kgs. 18:28.\textsuperscript{150}

It is often assumed that 1 Kgs. 18:28 comprises a polemic against ritualistic gashing by the association of this act with the Baal cult, but this requires re-evaluation. The context nowhere condemns the self-laceration committed by the Baal prophets per se. If this rite were indeed a magical mourning rite for Baal, one would have expected an author who throughout the episode polemicizes against the Baal cult to do the same in the case of self-laceration (cf. vv.21,27,29).\textsuperscript{151}

Furthermore, when this lack of condemnation is seen in the light of Hosea 7:14 as well as Jer. 16:6, 41:5; and Ezek. 7:18, it suggests that for the author of 1 Kgs. 18:28, self-laceration was an acceptable act of supplication in both the Yahweh and Baal cults. This would explain why it was allowed to stand uncondemned. Thus, the phrase "according to their custom"


\textsuperscript{150}Carmichael 1974:78-80 viewed Deut. 14:1 as part of the laws against idolatry in 13:2-19. 14:1 forbids mourning for those put to the death for idolatry, cf. Jer. 16:1-8 where mourning for dead idolaters is prohibited. But this does not adequately explain the law for the priest in Lev. 21:5.

\textsuperscript{151}The verb wayyitnabb ʿô in v.29 "they (= the prophets of Baal) raved on" (cf. RSV and JPS) is used with a pejorative force in 1 Sam. 18:10; 2 Kgs. 9:11; and Jer. 29:26.
k*mišpātām in v.28a simply denotes the distinct manner in which the prophets of Baal performed this rite over against how an Israelite might have observed the same.\(^{152}\)

If laceration were an act of supplication in the respective cults of Yahweh and Baal of the first millennium and the biblical authors assumed its general validity, then the arguments for Deut. 14:1 as a prohibition against laceration on the basis of some supposed Canaanite associations miss the point. Moreover, a magical fertility rite involving self-laceration and tonsure among the Canaanites remains unattested. But most telling of all is the fact that the act in 1 Kgs. 18:28 is one of supplication to a deity, while that in Deut. 14:1 is one of mourning on behalf of a dead human.\(^{153}\)

Contrary to general opinion, the texts from Ugarit do not substantiate a Canaanite background for Deut. 14:1. "The Just Sufferer" text explicitly portrays laceration as an expression of mourning on behalf of a human about to die. There is no indication in the text that a magical fertility rite for Baal is involved. Baal never shows up in the text. It is the Mesopotamian god Marduk who is repeatedly mentioned!

More importantly, the provenance of the text is not Ugarit, but rather some easterly location, probably between

\(^{152}\) Cf. also Jones 1984(II):320.

\(^{153}\) Moreover, 1 Kgs 18:28 does not mention tonsure. However unlikely, none of the advocates for a Canaanite background suggest that lāmēt might refer "to the Dead One", i.e., Baal, as has been suggested for I*mēt in 26:14, cf. 4.2.3. This would point to acts of supplication in 14:1 but, as in 26:14, this lacks contextual support.
Aleppo and Mari. Therefore, to label this text, or the practices mentioned therein, as representative of a first millennium Canaanite practice hardly evokes confidence. Likewise, the reference to the ecstatic prophet via a simile ("like (an) ecstatic(s)") cannot substantiate the Baalistic associations of such mourning rites. The ecstatic alluded to no doubt performed laceration as an act of supplication to Marduk. Besides, we know that mourning rites fulfilled this function in Mesopotamian religion.

The mourning of El and Anat is more difficult to assess. As mentioned above, it has been assumed that El and Anat perform acts of mourning as seasonal rites of fertility. In this instance, these rites represented a type of imitative magic to revitalize Baal. It is then assumed by interpreters that these rites were also observed in the Ugaritic cult. This reconstruction in turn supposedly explains the gesti performed by the Baal prophets in 1 Kgs. 18:28.

Besides the fact that the context is severely laconic, the myth offers no explicit support for the efficacy of the mourning rites in the revitalization of Baal. Moreover, the seasonal-fertility interpretation of the Baal-Mot myth remains problematic. Furthermore, we presently lack any clear references

\[ ^{154} \text{Following Nougayrol 1968:265-67 and Roberts 1970:77.} \]

\[ ^{155} \text{For instances of mourning rites used as acts of supplication in the ancient Near East, see the lengthy note in Gruber 1980(II):471 n.3 and cf. Dan. 9:3.} \]

\[ ^{156} \text{Cf. e.g., Gray 1965:252.} \]
to mourning rites or their magical power in the Ugaritic cult. 157

In the final analysis, the mourning of El and Anat was most likely intended to resemble the common mourning rites performed on behalf of the recently deceased. 158 That is to say, neither magical rites of revitalization nor acts of supplication are in view.

Not only is the citation of 1 Kgs. 18:28 as an explication of Deut 14:1 dubious, but the prior assumption that a magical fertility rite for Baal lies behind 1 Kgs. 18:28 is unwarranted. The relevant Ugaritic texts simply do not substantiate this interpretation. Therefore, a more adequate explanation for the prohibition in Deut. 14:1 is a desideratum, one which can also account for the pre-exilic and exilic prophetic acceptance of such rites.

Laceration and tonsure are attested as mourning rites among several ancient Near Eastern peoples. 159 The texts found at Ugarit suggest that this was the case for second-millennium

157 Recall "The Just Sufferer" text is not original to Ugarit, so the ecstatic(s) mentioned there cannot be associated with the Ugaritic cult. The late first millennium evidence cited by de Moor 1971:200-01 as well as his reliance on precise calendrical dating is unconvincing.

158 De Moor 1969:226 acknowledged this possibility.

Syria, although we have as yet no evidence for their observance as mourning rites among first millennium Canaanites.\textsuperscript{160}

On the other hand, the DtrH preserves a tradition in which Mesopotamian religious customs were introduced into Israel in the days of Sargon II (722-705), but such traditions are difficult to assess.\textsuperscript{161} In any case, we know that Assyrian funerary customs were known to the late Israelite writers. The funerary custom of "making a fire" śārap šēpāh for a dead king (2 Chr. 16:14, 21:19; and Jer. 34:5) is an appropriation of a royal Assyrian practice.\textsuperscript{162} In our estimation, such familiarity with Mesopotamian funerary practices influenced dtr perspectives regarding self laceration and tonsure as acts of mourning.

The annals of Sargon II record Merodach-baladan II's reaction to the news that the Elamites would not deliver him from the hands of Sargon: "he threw himself to the ground, he rent his [garmen]t, he took up the razor, and he uttered a lament"

\textsuperscript{160}Recall that 1 Kgs. 18:28 depicted laceration as an act of supplication, not mourning. To assume that the former presupposes the latter as extant in the Canaanite context is unwarranted in the absence of confirming data. Podella 1986:263-69 examined iconographic representations of mourning on first millennium terra cotta figurines from Philistia. Laceration or tonsure as mourning or supplication rites are lacking, although a first millennium figurine from Rhodes depicts a self laceration rite.

\textsuperscript{161}Miller and Hayes 1986:339,345-46,370-72 following Spieckermann 1982 view this as an historical process on the basis of a text like 2 Kgs. 17:24-41. This could be merely reflective of the dtr writer's knowledge of Mesopotmaian practices of his own day expressed in traditions about earlier times.

\textsuperscript{162}Akkadian šuruptu šarpat, cf. Parpola 1983:7-8 [Letter #4], 190-92 [Letter # 195], 270-72 [Letter #280]. Zwickel 1989:267-77 has recently argued that the funerary fires of Israelite kings like Asa and Zedekiah (but not Jehoram) were borrowed, but modified, apotropaic rituals of the Assyrian royalty probably from the time of Esarhaddon (during Manasseh's reign).
Another depiction of tonsure as an expression of mourning is reflected in the inscription dedicated to the mother of Nabonidus, Adad-guppi. In the closing section of the inscription, a third person account narrates Nabonidus's instruction to his armies on the occasion of her funeral "the troops/people of the entire land cut their hair..." șabû mâti kalama pir[(?)tušunu] ugallibuma.¹⁶⁴

The Greek historian Xenophon (fifth century B.C.E.) observed during an engagement of Assyrian and Persian forces led by Cyrus, that as the Persian forces breached the fortress walls "the Assyrian women... tore their cheeks" hai gunaikes tôn 'Assurion... druptomenai (pareian) for fear of their impending death and that of their children.¹⁶⁵

When the references in these texts are coupled with the literary arguments in favor of a late compositional date for 14:1, then the era of Mesopotamian hegemony of Palestine provides an appropriate setting for the eventual ban on what were formerly legitimate rites of mourning, self laceration and tonsure. Allusions to these practices are explicitly connected with Assyria in Isa. 7:20 "In that day, my Lord will cut away

¹⁶⁵Cyropaedia iii.3.67. In iii.1.13, Xenophon recorded the same act by Armenian women who were sure their king was about to die after he had answered Cyrus wrongly.
(yəgallah) with the razor that is hired beyond the Euphrates - with the king of Assyria- the hair of the head and the hair of the legs, and it shall clip off the beard as well". This is all the more highlighted by the fact that during the pre-exilic and early exilic periods, the observance of these same practices by both the Israelites and the local populations went uncondemned in the prophetic traditions.

A somewhat similar development obtained in the case of the cult of Asherah. This cult, like the above mourning rites, was viewed in non-dtr circles as originally compatible with the cult of Yahweh. Nevertheless, the later dtr ideology condemned this cult as syncretistic in origin, but its foreign attachments, however misconstrued, were made explicit. 166

Although various anthropological models have been cited in order to explain the eventual proscription of these two rites 167, it is more likely that either confusion with similar Mesopotamian customs and/or, perhaps owing to an underlying fear of the dead as some critics have suggested (cf. our conclusion), the threat which the longstanding Israelite version of these two rites posed for the later dtr Yahwism led to their being banned, both

166 The practice was condemned by artificially associating it with the Baal cult, so Olyan 1988:1-22, 70-74. The assumption here is that the goddess Asherah was in fact originally the consort of El who was then taken over by Yahweh, cf. Olyan 1988:39-61.

167 Differing from his earlier view (1974:78-80), Carmichael 1976:1-7 concluded that these mourning customs constituted an entanglement of life and death. Wenham 1979:272, following the view of Mary Douglas, saw the underlying rationale as the standard of wholeness which rejected defect or disfigurement, cf. Lev. 21:18-21 (the priest) and the laws on skin diseases in Lev. 13-14 (the people).
for the priest (Lev. 25:1) and for the people (Lev. 19:27-28; Deut. 14:1).\textsuperscript{168}

In conclusion, neither a death nor an ancestral cult is apparent for Deut. 14:1. What is of concern is the observance of two mourning customs. There is no mention of, or allusion to, those mortuary rites which extend beyond the burial of the dead, or for that matter, the dead's arrival in the netherworld.

\textbf{4.4.2. DEUTERONOMY 18:11}

With Deut. 18:11, we return to the topic of necromancy. The practitioner \textit{šōʾēl ʾōḇ wēyiddēcōnī} "he who inquires of the One-Who-Returns and the Knower" is one among a nine item list of forbidden mantic offices spanning vv.10-11.\textsuperscript{169} This passage along with its immediate context, 18:9-14, comprises a portion of the so-called \textit{Amtergesetze}, or laws of the officials, spanning 16:18-18:22. Since at least the time of Wellhausen, critics have argued for the redactional nature of the \textit{Amtergesetze}.\textsuperscript{170}

Nevertheless, Lohfink has attempted to establish the whole of 16:18-18:22 as a dtr sketch of a constitution for the

\textsuperscript{168}Dan. 9:3 records the use of fasting, sackcloth and ashes, as acts of supplication for the Israelite in Mesopotamia of the Persian period. Laceration and tonsure are not mentioned.

\textsuperscript{169}"He who inquires of the One-Who-Returns and the Knower" \textit{šōʾēl ʾōḇ wēyiddēcōnī} may be in apposition to "the necromancer" \textit{dōrēš ′el-hammētim}, cf. Isa. 8:19 where dirēš šā ′el-hāʾōbōt wē ′el-hayyiddēcōnim is semantically paralleled by yidrōš . . . ′el-hammētim. The LXX omits the copula throughout vv.10-11 and recall that asyndeton is rare while apposition is common, so Emerton 1962:129-38, cf. n. 49.

The restoration of the nation composed during the exilic period.\textsuperscript{171}
The basis for his proposal is the strong affinity between the 
Amtergesetze and characteristic dtr language. For, example, the 
forms \textit{yrš} (16:20; 17:14; 18:12,14), \textit{tw-bh} (17:4; 18:9,12 [2x]),
and \textit{hc byr b'S} (18:10) are dtr phraseology.\textsuperscript{172}
Furthermore, "Torah" (tôrâh; 17:9,11,18,19) is found otherwise only in later
dtr redactional layers of Deut.\textsuperscript{173}

Lohfink also pointed out that the law in 18:1-8 allows
every rural Levite to offer sacrifice at the central sanctuary
(presumably Jerusalem), although 2 Kgs. 23:9, part of the
Josianic reform, did not grant this right.\textsuperscript{174} Thus, according to
Lohfink, Deut. 18:6-8 must be later as it could not be part of

\textsuperscript{171}Lohfink 1971:143-55 and cf. 1981:87-100; 1982:953-85; and
1985:200-21 narrowed the boundaries of Lohfink's exilic
constitution to 17:14-18:22.

\textsuperscript{172}Lohfink 1981:92 and 1982:953-85. For \textit{yrš}, cf. the DtrH
texts 1 Kgs. 14:24; 21:26; 2 Kgs. 16:3; 17:8; 21:2. It shows up
only in the parenetic framework, introduction and conclusion
(never in the pre-dtr laws): 6:1,18; 7:1, 17-24; 8:1,7,20; 9:1-6;
10:11; 11:5, 8-12,22-25,29,31; 12:1,2,10,29 (2x); 15:4; 19:1,14;
21:1; 23:21; 25:19; 26:1; 27:2,3, 4,12; 28:21,63; 29:1-7;
30:16,18. These are viewed as dtr additions. For \textit{tw-bh}, cf. the
DtrH texts 1 Kgs. 14:24; 2 Kgs. 16:3; 21:2 and the dtr text Deut.
12:31. For \textit{hc byr b'S}, cf. the DtrH texts 2 Kgs. 16:3; 17:17; 21:6
and the dtr text Deut. 12:31 (\textit{srp b'S}).

\textsuperscript{173}1:5; 4:8,44; 27:3,8,26(2x); 29:20,30,40; 31:9,11,24,26;
dealing with inquiry directed to God that was applied to Torah.
This reapplication in turn has resulted in internal tensions
within the pericope.

\textsuperscript{174}The generally accepted position that 2 Kgs. 23:4-20
deliberately presents Josiah as in conformity with the demands of
the law of Moses is presupposed here, cf. also Mayes 1983:131.
While any comparison of these two passages runs into the
difficulty of explaining the relationship between the priests and
Levites, Emerton 1962:129-38 has argued with regard to the phrase
"the priests, the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi" in Deut. 18:1
that asyndeton is rare while apposition is very common.
the law book which instigated, at least in part, the Josianic reform. Owing to the fact that the priests are mentioned again in 17:18 as caring for the Torah—a further reaching claim of the once rural, but now unified Levites—this text too is to be considered post-Josianic and therefore dtr. 176

As with the Amtergesetze in general, the law of the prophet which comprises vv.9-14 (the negative section) and vv.15-22 (the positive section), has likewise been assigned a complex redactional history. 177 Of special interest is the fact that critics have assigned 18:11, where ʿāb and yiddēnōnī occur, to the earliest compositional stratum.

The early compositional date for 18:11 is founded upon the often unstated premise that the verse preserves an old law reflected in 1 Sam. 28:3,7-9 and Isa. 8:19, 19:3, 29:4. 178 García López reconstructed four stages in the compositional history of Deut. 18:9-22: (1) a primitive text—vv.10a, 10b, 11, 12a; (2) a proto-deuteronomic redaction—vv.9a, 14, 15a, 21, 22aB; (3) a redaction completed by the dtr Historian—vv.9b, 10aB, 12b; and

175 Hoffmann 1980:208-226 is more skeptical about the existence of a law book per se forming the basis of Josiah's reform. Accordingly, the account of the law book's discovery is fictitious. 2 Kgs. 23:4-20 depends upon some vague historical traditions about a reform in Josiah's time and is a collection in one place of all references to the reform.


178 Cf. e.g., Smith 1918:231. Donner 1983:238 concluded that 1 Sam. 28:3-25 is pre-Deuteronomic, but cf. McKenzie 1991 for arguments against a pre-Deuteronomic level in DtrH.
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(4) a redaction related to DtrH and the concerns of Jeremiah–vv.15b-20, 22aa, 22b.¹⁷⁹

The weakness inherent in such a reconstruction is not the recognition that a dtr hand is present in 18:9-14 and vv.15-22. Rather, it is the presumption that vv.10-12a are old. Moreover, when coupled with the evidence for dtr redaction, this in turn forces the critic to postulate multiple—at least two, but usually more—layers of redaction for vv.9-14.

However, the argument for the early attestation of 'Ĕbōt and yiddēcōnīm stands on shaky ground. In addition to their occurrence in the dtr redactional passages Isa. 8:19, 19:3, and 29:4¹⁸⁰, the 'Ĕbōt and yiddēcōnīm occur otherwise in the dtr texts 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24, in three texts from the HC, Lev. 19:31; 21:6,27, and in still later texts of the Chronicler, 1 Chr. 10:13 and 2 Chr. 33:6 (= 2 Kgs. 21:6).

Furthermore, they are entirely absent in the remaining prophetic traditions both pre-exilic and exilic. Neither Amos nor Hosea, nor the Elijah-Elisha traditions for that matter speak out against the 'Ĕbōt and yiddēcōnīm. Lastly, 1 Sam. 28:3-25, evinces extensive evidence for its dtr or post-dtr character (cf.

¹⁷⁹García López 1984:290-308. The author left the status of v.13 undecided. Seitz 1971:235-43 assumed the antiquity of v.11 in his reconstruction: (1) a pre-deuteronomic text–vv.10-12a; (2) a deuteronomic collection–vv.9, 12b, 14-15; (3) a deuteronomic elaboration–vv.16-18; and (4) a dtr elaboration–vv.19-22. He viewed v.13 as simply late. Cf. also Mayes 1979:279-80: (1) the oldest stage–vv.10-12a; (2) a deuteronomic legislation–vv.9, 12b; (3) a post-dtr addition to the law–vv.15-18 (v.14 is a connecting link); and (4) a still later addition–vv.19-22. V.13 is an isolated later addition.

¹⁸⁰Cf. 4.3.2.–5. and Barth 1977:152-56,184-90,285-90.
4.5.1) while the existence of a supposed pre-Deuteronomic level for the DtrH has been recently challenged.¹⁸¹

The language of Deut. 18:9-14 further supports the notion that a dtr hand is at work, for these verses have clear links with dtr and other late texts. This is the case for v.9b: hgwym hhm²⁻, for v.9ba: (t)̲lmd 1̲cśwt¹¹³, and for 9bB: ktw̲bt hgwym.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, v.9b cannot be separated from v.9a as the latter, beginning as it does with a kî clause, demands an apodosis for the protasis and it can no longer be presumed that vv.10-12a formed the original apodosis of a hypothetically older v.9a, for as we shall argue shortly, the antiquity of these verses is in doubt.

Furthermore, the stereotypical opening to the law in 18:9a, ky + bw' + ḫrs, is also found in 7:1, 8:7, 17:14, and 23:21, all of which have been identified as forming part of the parenesis of the book.¹⁸⁵ Based on the fact that the form yr̲š shows up in each of these texts and that this form never shows up in the pre-dtr laws of Deut., Lohfink assigned all of these parenetic verses to


¹⁸³Cf. Deut. 4:1,5,14; 6:1; 20:18. 17:19 also uses lmd.

¹⁸⁴Deut. 20:18; 1 Kgs. 14:24; 2 Kgs. 16:3, 21:2; Ezek. 16:4; Ezra 9:1; 2 Chr. 28:3, 33:2.

¹⁸⁵Cf. also the related 12:29, 19:1, and 21:1.
a dtr hand.\textsuperscript{186} He also argued for the dtr origins of the terms 
\textit{ntn} and '\textit{rgs} in 18:9a.\textsuperscript{187} 

The dtr character of 18:9-12 gains additional support from 
the detailed analysis of García López in spite of his propensity 
to divide the pericope into half and even quarter verses based on 
the assumed antiquity of vv.10-12a. He astutely noted the 
linguistic affinities between 18:9-12 and the dtr text 2 Kgs. 
16:3:\textsuperscript{188}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kgs. 16:3</th>
<th>Deut. 18:10-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v.3ba \textit{wgm} '\textit{t-bnw hc byr b'š}</td>
<td>v.10a \textit{l'-yms'} \textit{bk m'byr bnw wbtw b'š}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.3bB \textit{ktc bwt hgwym}</td>
<td>v.9b \textit{l'-tlmd l'swt ktc bt hgwym hhm}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.3bc \textit{šr hwryš yhwh 'tm}</td>
<td>v.12b \textit{ky . . . yhwh 'lhyk mwryš 'wtm}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{mpny bny yśr'1}</td>
<td>\textit{mpnyk}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He also pointed out that the formula \textit{hc byr bn(--) (wbt[--]) b'š} in v.10a shows up only in late texts.\textsuperscript{189} In fact, the entire list of forbidden practices in Deut. 18:10b-12a are, with the lone exception of \textit{hbr hbr} (owing to its rare occurrence), most frequently attested in dtr passages of the DtrH: 1 Sam. 28:3,7,9; 1 Kgs. 14:24; 20:23; 2 Kgs. 9:22; 16:3; 17:17; 21:2,6 and 23:24.

\textsuperscript{187}Lohfink 1981:92-96.  
\textsuperscript{188}García López 1984:296-97.  
Lohfink also listed the extensive parallels between Deut. 18:10b-11 and dtr 2 Kgs. 21:6:¹⁹⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Kgs. 21:6</th>
<th>Deut. 18:10b-12a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w ישב ir- 'et b' nô bâ'êš</td>
<td>maכ־אבîr b' nô-ûbîttô bâ'êš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wכ ônên</td>
<td>maכ ônên</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wכ nihêš</td>
<td>âm(כ) naheš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wכ ašâh 'ôb wכ yiddכ ônî(m)</td>
<td>wכ 받 'ôb wכ yiddכ ônî</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once v.11 is assigned to a dtr hand, the same must be attributed to v.12a, for at the least this first half of v.12 presupposes v.11. Moreover, the suffix on 'wtm in v.12b presupposes hgwym hhm in v.9b and is therefore dependent upon at least that half verse. In addition, the forms yrṣ as well as mpy, both of which have been labelled as dtr by Lohfink, show up in v.12b (recall our comparison of v.12b with the dtr text 2 Kgs. 16:3).¹⁹¹

V.14 likewise contains a reference to yrṣ, while the phrase mqrרב- (m) 'hî- in vv.15 and 18 has close affinities with 17:15, a passage in the law of the king, 17:14-20. The whole of the law of the king is generally recognized as dtr owing to its language and the analogies it shares with 1 Sam. 8:5-20, 10:17-25, and 1 Sam.

¹⁹⁰Lohfink 1988:col.428. He also included 1 Sam. 28:7-9 which we take to be part of a dtr or post-dtr addition to the DtrH spanning 28:3-25, cf. 4.5.1.

¹⁹¹Lohfink 1982:661,674-75.
Finally, as regards to vv.16-22, the majority of commentators acknowledge the dtr origin of these closing verses. By way of summary, the extensive dtr language present throughout Deut. 18:9-22 and the inclusion of what is otherwise late concern to condemn necromancy in v.11, points to the work of a dtr hand. Our proposal gains additional support from a detailed examination of the other mantic practices mentioned in Deut. 18:10-11.

The rite of human sacrifice reflected in the phrase "the one who makes his son or his daughter pass through the fire" maš 'āḇīr bê nô-ḇēbītō bā'ēś, was originally part of the Yahwistic cult in pre-exilic and exilic times, but the dtr circle or those later traditions susceptible to dtr influence attached this practice to the Baal cult and/or a cult considered by the Israelite writers to be devoted to a deity named Molek and then proceeded to condemn it.

The same can be said for the second mantic office listed, "the augur" qōšēm qēsāmīm. Both Isa. 3:2 and Micah 3:6-7,11 establish the legitimacy of this practice in pre-exilic Yahwistic religion, but it too is later condemned in dtr circles (1 Sam. 192 Cf. e.g., yrš and ky + bw' + 'rš in 17:14 and Lohfink 1971: 149-51, 1988:cols.427-28 and Preuss 1982:137. Mayes 1979:271, although he acknowledged the presence of dtr additions to 17:14-20 (vv.16,18-19,20b), viewed the dtr texts in 1 Sam. as dependent upon Deut 17.


A possible reference to augury in the late text Isa. 2:6 not only supports the belated concern to condemn such a practice, but it also offers a possible clue to its perceived origin.

That Isa. 2:5-9 is a dtr addition is supported by the dtr expression "the work of x's hands" which shows up in v.8 ma'āšēh yāḏāyw. Likewise, the verb hištāḥawāh in v.8 might evince dtr influence. These and other data confirm the view that vv.5-9 comprise a later dtr addition to 2:6-21(22). For example, critics insert "augurs" qōsē mīm before miqqédem in v.6 following the Targum and appeal to haplography in the MT, "Surely you have rejected your people, O house of Jacob, because they are full of augurs from the East, and of soothsayers like the Philistines and they strike hands with foreigners." If on the mark, the formerly legitimate augur is in this late text described as a foreign import from Mesopotamia and condemned (or, less likely in view of the passages to follow, the author intends only to condemn a foreign version of augury).

---


198 Cf. Wildberger 1972:95-96; Barth 1977:222-23; and Kaiser 1983:6, 56-66 and esp. his survey of opinion on pp.63-66 and n.33. Sweeney 1988:176 viewed vv.6b-9a as original to the oracle, but was forced to exclude v.9b from consideration in order to claim that this pericope of accusation would lack a judgment statement and therefore could not have stood independently on its own.

199 Although v.6c is problematic, it clearly refers to Israel's illicit relations with the nations.
The condemnation of the augur is taken up again in the story of Balaam in Num. 22-24 which is, in all likelihood, a late composition.200 In 22:7, the elders of Moab and Midian carry qe samim b' yāgām, that is, "fees for augury in their hand" for Balaam's hire.201 Most commentators take 22:5 as indicative of Balaam's Syrian origins where he is identified as the son of Beo at Pethor, by the River in the land of Amaw.202 What is most curious is the fact that foreign augury is not condemned by the narrator.203 Only in the story of Balaam's ass, 22:22-35, a secondary addition, is Balaam and, indirectly, his augury polemicized against.204

In Josh. 13:22, a late P addition, the prophet Balaam is labelled the augur haqqōsēm.205 Not only does this text confirm the later foreign associations of augury, it alludes to the

---

200 So Rouillard 1985 (not engaged by Moore 1990). Note that the episode of Agag is mentioned in 24:7, a story attributed to Saul's day in what is recognized as a late text, 1 Sam. 15. Moreover, vv.17-18 speak of the wars of David against Edom and Moab. Rouillard proposed four redactional stages; (N1) 22:2-21, 36-23:26 [650-40 B.C.E.], (N2) 22:22-35 [after Josiah's reform], (N3) 23:27-24:6 [exilic], and (N4) 24:7-24 [soon after the exile]. Having compared the Balaam story and Second Isaiah, Van Seters 1986:245-47 dated Rouillard's N1, N3, and N4 to the exilic period, while N2 constituted a secondary addition.

201 Following the RSV.

202 Cf. 23:7 which places Balaam in Aram. Budd 1984:254 (n. 5b) noted both the Syrian and northern Mesopotamian locations of Amaw proposed by scholars. On p.272, he identified Balaam as a "Mesopotamian seer".

203 This verse is found in Rouillard's N1 stratum and is according to the author Josianic in date.

204 Rouillard's N2.
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raison d'être for its eventual condemnation. In other words, in spite of its earlier legitimacy, augury was connected to foreign influence and eventually condemned.\textsuperscript{206}

Both the "soothsayer" מִצְוֹנֶן and the "sorcerer" מֶקֶשׁפֶּה of v.10 require a detailed treatment. At first glance, Micah 5:1 and Isa. 2:6 appear to substantiate the ban on these two practices during pre-exilic times (recall that Isa. 2:6 also mentions the augur). However, the dtr status of Micah 5:9-13 has been repeatedly defended.\textsuperscript{207} The presence of the Hiphil of the verb קְרִיט of v.9,10,11, 12.\textsuperscript{208} Moreover, the phrase "the work of x's hands", here in v.12b מַאֲשֵׁה יָדֶקָה, is a characteristic dtr expression\textsuperscript{209} as is the verbal form הִשְׁתַּחֵּֽו "bow down" in the same half verse.\textsuperscript{210} Furthermore, the root נָתַשׁ in v.13 is typical of dtr-Jer.\textsuperscript{211}

As outlined above, Isa. 2:6 likewise exhibits evidence of a dtr hand. Otherwise, the soothsayer shows up in dtr passages of

\textsuperscript{206}In the notice that Balaam was killed by the Israelites, the priestly perspective aligned itself with the dtr tradition.


\textsuperscript{208}Cf. Lohfink 1981:97.


\textsuperscript{210}Cf. Weinfeld 1972:321.

\textsuperscript{211}Jer. 12:14 and cf. Deut. 29:27; 1 Kgs. 14:15; Amos 9:15, all with reference to the exile and see Wolff 1980-82:132-33.
DtrH (2 Kgs. 21:6), in late prophetic passages (Jer. 27:9; Isa. 57:3), in HC (Lev. 19:26), and in the Chronicler (2 Chr. 33:6 = 2 Kgs. 21:6).

Now, the sorcerer is attested in a dtr text of the DtrH (2 Kgs. 9:22), in late prophetic texts (Jer. 27:9; Isa. 47:9,12; Nahum 3:4; Mal. 3:5; and Dan. 2:2) and in the Chronicler (2 Chr. 33:6 = 2 Kgs. 21:6). Moreover, in exilic and post-exilic prophetic traditions, this office is connected with Mesopotamian influences, particularly Babylonian (Isa. 47:9,12) and Assyrian (Nahum 3:4). In summary, the soothsayer and the sorcerer are depicted as late comers in Yahwistic religion, as foreign, namely Mesopotamian, imports and are therefore condemned.

The next office, the "diviner" (?) is never mentioned in pre-exilic or exilic prophetic texts. It occurs in dtr texts of DtrH (1 Kgs. 20:33; 2 Kgs. 17:17, 21:6), in HC (Lev. 19:26), and in the Chronicler (2 Chr. 33:6 = 2 Kgs. 21:6).

Like the practice of augury, it is also found in the late story of Balaam, Num. 22-24. Balaam is described as one well versed in the foreign arts of divining (23:23, cf. also 24:1) and augury (23:23, cf. also 22:7). Again, what is surprising is that the narrator depicts Balaam as diviner and augur in 23:23, part of the earliest section of the story, but offers no condemning

212 For the references in the Yahwist, Exod. 7:11 and 22:18, cf. n.222.

213 Cf. also Mal. 3:5 and Dan. 2:2.

214 Its references in the Yahwist, Gen. 30:27, 44:5,15, will be examined in the concluding section of 5.2.2.

evaluation.\textsuperscript{216} Again, only in the story of Balaam's ass, 22:22-35, a secondary addition, is Balaam, and indirectly his art of divining, polemicized against.\textsuperscript{217}

Finally, the "charmer" הָבֶר הָבוֹר is likewise never mentioned in pre-exilic prophetic texts but, like the sorcerer, the charmer is later depicted in Isa. 47:9,12 as having Babylonian connections (cf. vv.1,5 and Dan. 2:2). Having concluded that Hebrew הָבֶר was cognate with Akkadian ubburu "bind magically", Held has recently suggested that Isa. 47:9,12 comprises a satire on Neo-Babylonian magic.\textsuperscript{218}

In summary, none of the first six mantic practices listed in Deut. 18:10-11 were condemned in pre-exilic prophetic traditions. Neither Hosea nor Amos nor, for that matter, the Elijah-Elisha school stood in opposition to them. Two of the practices, human sacrifice and augury, were compatible with earlier Yahwistic religion and only later condemned in dtr circles. The remaining four, soothsaying, sorcery, divining, and charming, were not attested in pre-exilic texts. This might indicate that they were unknown. In any case, when they do show up in later dtr texts or texts influenced by dtr ideology, they are depicted as illicit foreign practices.

\textsuperscript{216} Rouillard's N1.

\textsuperscript{217} Rouillard's N2.

The prophetic traditions connect the illicit status of these practices to their foreign attachments. In three, sorcery, divining, and charming, Mesopotamian associations are explicit. Nevertheless, "foreign origins" as a basis for proscription is contrived in the case of augury as we found it to be compatible with pre-exilic Yahwistic religion. Such purposeful distortion is characteristic of the dtr ideology. As we pointed out previously, the same rhetorical technique is evident in the dtr polemics against Manasseh, the alleged bull cult of Jeroboam, the cult of Asherah, and perhaps the cult of human sacrifice.

In the case of sorcery, divining, and charming, all possible late comers in Israel's traditions, the stated Assyrian and Babylonian influences might reflect genuine instances of foreign syncretism. Whether these attachments are real or contrived, the foreign origins weighed heavily in the dtr polemic against these practices.  

One final observation calls for consideration. Of the various lists of illicit practices which include "5h(δή) and yiddē̂c Ṣnī(m), Deut. 18:10-11 is clearly the most expansive with its list of nine mantic practices. A comparison of the related lists in 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 2 Chr. 33:6 indicates that the inventory tended to expand over time. The addition in 2 Chr. 33:6 to the

219 We should also point out that the biblical traditions nowhere explicitly identify Balaam as a necromancer. This strengthens our proposal that this form of divination was peculiar to Mesopotamia and was understood as such by the biblical writers.

220 Cf. the following passages for lists of three of more: Lev. 20:2-6; 1 Sam. 28:3,7-9; 2 Kgs. 17:17, 21:6; Isa. 8:19; Jer. 27:9; and 2 Chr. 33:6.
five item list in 2 Kgs. 21:6 involves an office attested only in late prophetic texts, namely the sorcerer (cf. dtr Micah 5:11; Jer. 27:9; and Isa. 47:9,12).

In Deut. 18:10-11, the sorcerer and three additional offices, the augur, charmer, and consulter of the dead, were added to what probably comprised an earlier inventory of outlawed mantic practices. These items are otherwise condemned only in late texts (Isa. 47:9,12 and dtr 2:6 and 8:19). Thus, Deut. 18:10-11 may reflect the later expansion of an inventory of illicit mantic offices.

Before concluding, we should point out that some of these practices are in isolated instances attributed non-Mesopotamian but nevertheless, foreign, associations. In 1 Kgs. 20:33, the Syrians practice divining, while in 2 Kgs. 9:22 sorcery appears in Phoenician dress. Moreover, the augur and the soothsayer are found among the Philistines in 1 Sam. 6:2 and Isa. 2:6.221 Finally, the diviner and sorcerer are depicted in Egyptian dress in Gen. 30:27, 44:5,15 and Exod. 7:11 (cf. also Exod. 22:18 for the latter).

Nevertheless, the preponderance of references assume Mesopotamian influence and so these comprised the most formidable threats to dtr Yahwism. The passages depicting non-Mesopotamian, but nevertheless foreign, connections possibly reflect a subsequent expansion on the dtr perspective. In other words, the polemical perspective has been widened so as to include other

221 Recall that the augur was compatible with pre-exilic Yahwistic religion.
foreign peoples. In any case, none of these practices can be considered exclusively characteristic of early "Canaanite" populations. In conclusion, Deut. 18:10-11 reflects a late expansion on a dtr tradition proscribing various mantic practices. This tradition reflects the dtr and related traditions' acquaintance with Mesopotamian magic which was subsequently expanded so as to include numerous peoples symbolic of pre-exilic antagonisms in the land. The condemnation of these practices in Deut. 18:11 establishes the antiquity and authority of the dtr polemic as it attaches itself to Moses.

4.4.3. DEUTERONOMY 26:14

Deut. 26:12-15 continues the law on the tithe where 14:22-29 left off. In recent treatments, this passage has become a crux interpretum in the debate over whether or not Israel embraced a death and/or ancestor cult. Those pro have cited it as their clearest example, while those con have listed it as the only text worthy of mention although they dismiss it in the final

\footnote{The fact that 1 Kgs. 20:33 and 2 Kgs. 9:22 probably constitute later additions to DtrH, so Jones 1984(II):337-39,450-54, that Isa. 2:6 is a dtr addition, that 1 Sam. 1-7 might be the product of an exilic dtr hand, so Van Seters 1983:346-53, and that the Yahwist's work is dependent upon that of the Deuteronomist, supports such a proposal (cf. Exod. 7:11,22:18 and n.212). For an example of the Yahwist's dependence upon a late Mesopotamian, specifically Babylonian, topos, cf. Van Seters 1989:333-42.}

\footnote{Brichto 1973:29 saw Deut. 26:14 as reflective of an Israelite ancestor cult for which provision was normally made except in the case of the tithe. Ribar 1973:75-76, followed by Lewis 1989:103-04, sought to leave open, but clearly preferred, the periodic nature of the offering as part of a death cult. Spronk 1986:39,49,241,248 viewed this verse as evidence for the ongoing care of the dead, but not their veneration.}
analysis. But before we can adequately evaluate the arguments on either side, we must attempt to reconstruct the compositional history of the text:

\[
\text{lo'-'ākaltī b* 'ōnī mimmennū} \quad \text{"I have not eaten any of it (the tithe) in my mourning,}
\]

\[
\text{w* lo'-bi' artī mimmennū b* tāmē' \quad \text{nor have I removed any of it in a state of uncleanness,}\]

\[
\text{w* lo'-nātattī mimmennū lē mēt} \quad \text{nor have I given any of it on account of/to a dead person.}"
\]

First, critics have repeatedly underscored the (exilic) dtr character of the preceding section, vv.1-11, particularly the credo in vv.5-10, as well as the succeeding section, vv.16-19. While the same has been posited for vv.12-15, others have recognized the presence of older material which has been adapted by a dtr redactor to a new context.

Mayes for example, proposed that old material has been reworked by a later hand in both vv.12 and 14a. That later material is present is indicated by the phrase "before the Lord your God" in v.13. This presupposes centralization and depends

\[\text{224 Cf. e.g., Heidel 1963:204-06.}\]

\[\text{225 Perles 1914:109-10 equated b* tāmē' of v.14b with Akkadian etemmum and translated "I have not made burnings for a spirit of the dead".}\]


\[\text{227 Mayes 1979:46,244-45,332-37 and 1983:36 and n.30, 39.}\]
upon the law in 14:22-29 and points to a post-deuteronomic hand. Furthermore, the phrase "obeyed the voice of" in v.14 is dtr\textsuperscript{228} as are the notions of God's dwelling in heaven and looking down on earth in v.15.\textsuperscript{229}

On the other hand, the internal tensions evident in vv.12-15 point to the possibility that not all was the product of the dtr circle. V.12 states that the tithe was to be given to the Levite, sojourner, fatherless, and widow, but v.14 assumes three ways in which this might not have been fulfilled. The stress on ritual purity in v.14 suggests that the tithe was given to Yahweh rather than to the poor as recorded in v.12. Thus, according to Mayes, the tithe in v.12 comprised older material reapplied in a new context.\textsuperscript{230} Such tensions in the text led Mayes to postulate that in v.14a, a dtr redactor has incorporated an ancient confession of cultic purity.\textsuperscript{231}

Nevertheless, we contend that the tensions observed by Mayes are not as apparent as he proposed. While v.14 records three ways in which an Israelite might not fulfil his obligation to the Levite, sojourner, fatherless, or the widow, the difficulty need not be viewed at the level of a supposed redactional seam. Rather, it may well be that a deliberate contrast is made by the narrator.

\textsuperscript{228} Cf. 27:10; 28:1,2,15,45,62; 30:3,8,10.

\textsuperscript{229} Cf. 1 Kgs. 8:30 and 2 Chr. 30:27, Jer. 25:30; and Zech. 2:13, all late passages. See also Weinfeld 1972:326 and Preuss 1982:144.

\textsuperscript{230} On the tithe, cf. Gen. 14:20, 28:22; Lev. 27:30-31; 1 Sam. 8:15,17; and Amos 4:4.

\textsuperscript{231} Mayes 1979:335-36.
What the narrator underscores by means of the required pledge in v.14 is that no depletion of the tithe was excusable, even for what might be considered otherwise worthy religious causes which, in the case at hand, would include those associated with the solemn act of mourning. This is in keeping with the thrust of v.12 where the stress lies on the giving of the tithe in full measure "when you have completed (tškalleh) tithing all the tithe of your yield . . ." and v.13 "I have completely removed the holy portion . . .". The same concern can be seen in vv.13b and 14b where complete obedience to the ṭišwōt is emphasized.

Assuming that mourning is the theme common to all three of the negative pledges in v.14, even while one was in mourning (v.14a), no portion of the tithe was to be eaten in place of one's regular food supply should it be made unclean by contact with the dead. Unclean food could be eaten only after a seven day period of purification. It was first to be washed and sprinkled on the seventh day (cf. Num. 31:23). Thus, v.14a might anticipate a common tendency to substitute the tithe set aside for the needy in place of one's regular staple in difficult times.

On the other hand, in obedience to the purification laws, one was not to dispose of the tithe should a person touch it in a state of uncleanness, owing to their previous contact with a corpse. More specifically, v.14b might anticipate a situation in

---

232 For bš 'ōnf as "mourning" and our defense of the theme of mourning as the common denominator for all of v.14, see below.

which the tithe had been stored in open earthenware which, having been contaminated by the unclean person who touched a corpse, was to be broken (Num. 19:15) and its contents thrown out.

Finally, v.14c states that the one could not give any portion of the tithe to others in mourning—this is the force of lō'-nāṭatti. . . lēmēt—however solemn such an act might have been, for of more importance are the needs of the poor. In sum, if vv.12-15 do not evince the redactional tensions proposed by Mayes, then the entire pericope, like the remainder of the chapter, might derive from a dtr hand.

Nielsen has in fact argued for the dtr character of the whole of chapter 26. Since 27:4-8 was an original element of Deuteronomy rooted in northern traditions now reshaped, then this would imply that ch. 26 is dtr as it intrudes upon what originally incorporated chs. 12-25 and 27:4-8. As Nielsen pointed out, even those critics who had assigned ch. 26 to the Urdeuteronomium nevertheless recognized its supplementary character.234

In the final analysis, the likely presence of a dtr hand throughout ch. 26 will necessitate that we weigh heavily those concerns characteristic of dtr ideology as well as its stimulus in our treatment of the mortuary practices evident in 26:14.

We turn now to the significance of Deut. 26:14 for the subject of Israelite death and ancestor cults. The form lēmēt in v.14c has given rise to three interpretations of the clause wē lō'-nāṭatti mimminnō lēmēt "nor have I given any of it on

account of/to a dead person”. It refers either to (1) food given by friends to their grieving neighbors as an act of consolation "on account of a dead person", or to (2) food offered "to the dead", whether temporarily or periodically in order (a) to sustain them and/or (b) to gain their favor, or to (3) food given "to the Dead One", that is, a chthonic deity, either Baal or Mot. 233

Options 2 and 3 are variants on the death cult interpretation (with the exception of the temporary offering up of food to the dead). Owing to the lack of support from the context of ch. 26, we reject the third as highly conjectural. 236 However, the situation is quite different in the case of the second. Its advocates have resorted to the material remains from Syria-Palestine to buttress the death cult interpretation of the passage.

Ribar, a recent advocate of the death cult hypothesis, leaned heavily upon the MB/LB material remains from Megiddo and Ugarit. With regard to the Ugaritic finds, he followed the lead of Schaeffer, the original director of the French expedition to Ras Shamra, who concluded that the archaeological evidence from the site pointed to a death cult. 237


236 The common use of (l')mēt to refer to the dead speaks against this option.

Ribar in turn applied Schaeffer's reconstruction of the Ugaritic finds to the remains at Megiddo in order to bolster a similar death cult interpretation of the remains there as originally advocated by Schumacher, Megiddo's excavation director. For Ribar, the holes in the ceilings of tombs as well as the presence of associated clay pipes, storage jars, and pits pointed to repeated offerings to the dead. It is this type of observance which is reflected textually in Deut. 26:14.

Now, Schaeffer had argued for a death cult via the ceiling holes according to the following logic: (1) the dead were in need of sustenance, (2) therefore, libations were regularly administered in response to this belief (3) as a similar practice with matching devices for pouring libations is clearly attested among the Mycenaeans, and (4) Mycenaeans were among the inhabitants of Ugarit.

Schaeffer's material evidence consisted of various devices for pouring libations: (1) a pit located beside a tomb with an accompanying (2) gutter leading to the tomb, (3) windows in funerary vaults assuring the dead's access to the libations, (4) large jars built into the walls of tombs equipped with cups for pouring, (5) cup-marks sunk in stone at the entrance to a tomb and a gutter leading to a pit laying beneath the floor at the

---

238 Cf. Schumacher and Steuernagel 1908:19-22.

tomb's center, (6) stone slabs covering the various pits with holes bored through the center to allow the dead's ready access to the libations, and (7) large jars with the bottom removed located near some of the tombs used in the performance of libating.240

Nevertheless, other reconstructions of these remains have been proposed. Cooley for example, viewed these devices, not as evidence of a death cult at Ugarit, but as indicative of funerary rites on behalf of the dead. The libations were administered during the period lasting from burial to the complete decay of the body at which time the deceased was believed to have arrived in the netherworld. Libating ceased once the dead entered the netherworld for they could no longer influence the living.

According to Cooley, this approach adequately accounts for the possibility of ritual libations as well as multiple burials in which the skeletal remains of earlier deceased were callously handled in order to make room for new burials. The death cult hypothesis does not sufficiently explain the mistreatment of bones after decay.241

Margueron offered another interpretation of the evidence based on his examination of the Grand Bâtement at Ugarit. He suggested that the libation devices found there were used on

240 Schaeffer 1939:46-56.

241 Cooley 1968:77,177,189-203, esp.198-201, 1989:47-58. In his attempt to substantiate a death cult at Dothan by reference to the tomb window which was used for libations, Lewis 1989:180 quoted Cooley 1983:50-51. But Cooley viewed this datum as evidence for funerary rites. Moreover, Cooley 1968:177 noted that the dead may have retrieved their own water supply from the jugs placed outside the tomb via the access provided by the window.
the occasion of each new inhumation. The fact that several of the
tombs with which such devices are related evince multiple burials
supports this proposal.\textsuperscript{242}

Margueron understood these libations to have "served to
conciliate the forces of the infernal world" and the pit at the
center of the tomb to establish a close relation between the
vault and the underworld. In other words, libations were not
offered as a means to quench the thirst of the recently deceased.
Rather, they were offered in an attempt to appease the
netherworld gods.\textsuperscript{243} Although not cited by Margueron, this
practice is well documented in the Mesopotamian literary
tradition.\textsuperscript{244}

It appears then that the so-called libation devices can
accommodate several interpretations. However, serious
shortcomings surface upon closer examination of the first two
proposals. The problematic nature of Schaeffer's first two
assumptions has been exposed by Binford in his critique of the
"rationalist-idealistic" tradition beginning with the late
nineteenth and early twentieth century anthropologists E. B.
Tylor and J. G. Frazer.

\textsuperscript{242}Margueron 1983:8-9 also noted that two alabaster vases
were found in the pit of the tomb. Their diameter was larger than
the holes in the walls of the tomb by 1.4 cm. Thus, they
comprised votive offerings made before the completion of the
room. Moreover, the bones found in the tomb were brought there
and deposited through the holes in the walls which he designated
"sky lights".

\textsuperscript{243}Margueron 1983:19.

\textsuperscript{244}The Third Dynasty of Ur, the Old Babylonian period, and
the Neo-Assyrian period are represented in the texts found in
In this tradition, mortuary practices were studied within the context of primitive religion and ideas and beliefs were invoked as reasons for particular practices, but as Binford pointed out, "by a referral of observed differences within one class of phenomena (behavior) to postulated differences within another (ideas), we are forced to seek the explanations for differences in ideas and in the conditions favoring their change." The circularity in reasoning is self-evident.

Schaeffer's remaining two premises are debatable as well. The presence of Mycenaean artifacts may simply reflect the importation of foreign goods and not the presence of Mycenaean inhabitants or their beliefs. The use of such foreign luxury goods as funerary gifts is known from late Bronze age Byblos. Moreover, the vaulted tombs at Ugarit which Schaeffer considered of Aegean influence have parallels in Syria and Mesopotamia, but are only occasionally attested in the Aegean of that period.

Cooley's reconstruction is also unconvincing. This writer is unaware of examples from the ancient Near East wherein the notion that the spirits of the dead, once having arrived in the netherworld, could never return to haunt or, for that matter, serve the living. In fact, the frequent mention of spirits of the

---

dead causing distress to the living in Mesopotamian texts and the various ritualistic attempts to appease them reveal that they did leave the netherworld.\footnote{230}{230 Cf. Bottéro 1982:43 and 1983:203.} 

To be sure, there are descriptions of the netherworld as a place of no return (Cf. Akkadian \textit{erṣet la tārī})\footnote{231}{231 Cf. \textit{The Gilgamesh Epic} VII:iv:34–35.}, but in light of the fact that the dead visited the living, this probably reflects their inability to return to their former state of life. It does not exclude the possibility that the dead might make contact with the living in the land of the living.

Margueron's assessment of the various devices found in the \textit{Grand Bâtiment} presents some interesting possibilities vis-à-vis their application to the funerary data at Ugarit more generally, but as the author recognized, much remains to be completed. In the final analysis, we are left with the unavoidable conclusion that such devices say nothing about Ugaritic or, for that matter, Canaanite beliefs beyond perhaps the mere fact that there was an afterlife.

But what would the so-called libation devices tell us about a supposed death cult if they had a purely functional purpose? Ribar admitted that the ceiling holes, clay pipes, storage jars, etc., may testify to various techniques of ventilation or fumigation, alternate means of access, or even evidence of quarrying operations.\footnote{232}{232 Ribar 1973:45.} If such apertures were made to minimize offensive odors resulting from bodily decay, what could we
surmise about an Ugaritic cult of the dead? The ceiling holes may have provided escape for the smoke of burning incense placed in the tomb for fumigation, or perhaps they served to ventilate the chamber, or along with the other related libation apparatuses like the gutters and jars, they functioned to supply additional aromatic oils after burial.

A textual datum often cited in support of the death cult interpretation actually confirms the first of the functional explanations offered above. The death cult adherents have identified the Ugaritic term 'urbt "aperture" with the holes used for regular food offerings found in the ceilings of tomb chambers at Ugarit.

The recent publication of Ras Ibn Hani 78/20 indicates that such an aperture functioned as a passageway for incense (RIH 78/20: 3): kqṭr 'urbtm "like incense from an airhole". If mortuary concerns are present in the list of duties of the faithful son in KTU 1.17:1:27, and this is by no means certain

233 Tufnell 1953(III):64 interpreted the ceiling holes in tombs at Lachish as air shafts.

234 We know that the use of spices for the preparation of the corpse for burial was a common practice, cf. e.g., 2 Chr. 16:14, Byblos 13 (cf. 4.2.3.) which refers to the body (of a dead king?) prepared in myrrh and bdellium, and H: A:III:15' in Gadd 1958:35-92 and Longman 1983:267-79,282, esp. p.276 = H: A:III:31' in ANET 1969:312] where the corpse of Nabonidus's mother, Adad-guppi, is said to have been covered in scented oil.

235 KTU 1.4:V:23 and 1.109:19 and cf. 3.3.3. Adherents include Gray 1966:173 n.2 and 1978:102; Ribar 1973:64 n.8; and Spronk 1986:145.

(cf. 3.3.4.), then the reference to "incense" qṭr there might allude to its use in funerary rites. Put simply, in honor of his father, the faithful son would provide incense at his father's tomb until the decay of the body was complete.\textsuperscript{257}

Another datum cited as evidence for a cult of the dead at Ugarit is the burial beneath houses.\textsuperscript{258} But as Barrelet has demonstrated vis-à-vis the evidence at Ur, this understanding of the burial beneath houses is by no means certain. The burials in abandoned sections of villages in pre-Achaemenid Turkmenia should caution against too hasty conclusions, for without additional information we cannot know whether the dead were buried beneath the dwellings of surviving family members or in abandoned houses.\textsuperscript{259} Granted the possibility that on occasion they were buried beneath an family dwelling, we cannot be sure that the family remained in the house or that they felt compelled to leave it. Perhaps, such burials were an attempt to conceal a grave in the event that a conquering army might seek to desecrate or rob it. As it stands, the data do not substantiate a domestic death or ancestor cult let alone elucidate its significance.\textsuperscript{260}


\textsuperscript{258}Most recently Spronk 1986:142-45 viewed this practice as evidence for "the care of the dead".

\textsuperscript{259}Barrelet 1980:20 and n.31.

\textsuperscript{260}Barrelet 1980:2-27, esp. pp.13-14. Thus, the findings of Callot 1983:44-45,65-66 namely, that at Ugarit a house and its grave were built together and that the grave was accessible from the house, is mute with regard to a domestic cult.
Furthermore, the practice of burying royalty beneath the palace does not establish a royal ancestor cult at Ugarit. When seen in conjunction with the lack of references in the Ugaritic texts regarding royal burials or an attendant cult, such a choice of location for royal tombs may be better explained as an attempt to hide the graves to avoid their desecration. We know that Assurbanipal desecrated the bones of the ancestors of his enemies. This in turn might explain Nabonidus' concern to bury his mother in "a hidden location" ina niṣirti.

In concluding our evaluation of the material remains, we summarize the relevant findings of Ucko. He pointed out that the presence of grave goods does not necessarily indicate a correlative set of afterlife beliefs. He noted that some items found in graves might have been deemed so personal that for that reason alone they were regarded as best buried with the dead. Others, like weapons, were likely deposited in simple recognition of the military prowess of the deceased.

He astutely identified the problem inherent in the recovery of afterlife beliefs from material remains via the following

\[\text{261} \text{ Cf. the royal tomb in Courtois 1979:col.1236.}\]
\[\text{262} \text{ E.g., the bones of the Elamite kings, cf. Luckenbill 1927(II):210 and Brinkman 1984:102 and n.510.}\]
\[\text{263} \text{ Cf. H}^2 \text{ A:III:16'in ANET 1969:561 and cf. p.312; CAD 11}^2 (1981):276; and Longman 1983:276. McGinnis 1987:1-12 has recently published a Neo-Assyrian text mentioning a king's "secret tomb" bit niṣirti. For a discussion of the relation of niṣīrtu and Hebrew nāṣūr in Isa. 65:4, cf. 4.6.4. The burial of Mesopotamian kings in swamps may evince the same concern to hide their location, contra Beaulieu 1988:36-37. Moorey 1984:14 suggested that the paucity of literary references to the death and burial places of Mesopotamian kings was due to their taboo status.}\]
question: "what will future archeologists deduce about twentieth century beliefs in the afterlife from the discovery of a teddy bear, coats and blankets, collars, favourite toys and foods in the shape of rubber bones and actual chocolate which have been deposited with the dearly departed at Woodlands Private Animal Cemetary at Burwash in Sussex?". 264

Returning to the interpretation of le met. in 26:14, the remaining option "on account of the dead" offers a more adequate rendering of the phrase. First, other biblical passages refer to the use of food or more specifically "bread” lehem within the context of mourning: Hos. 9:4; Jer. 16:7-8; and Ezek. 24:17,22. 265 In these passages, the mourners eat the bread.

It is our contention that Deut. 26:14 points to the similar use of food in a mourning context. Commentators agree that the theme of death met. is central to the verse. This supports the interpretation of b* 'ônî in v.14a as a cognate form of 'áwen, "in mourning" rather than as "in my strength". 266 Furthermore, the LXX en odynēi mou assumed that mourning was in view.


265The MT of Jer. 16:7 reads lāhem "to them" probably under the influence of the same form in vv.5,6, but the LXX assumes lehem "bread", and cf. RSV and JPS. The MT of Ezek. 24:17,22 reads "bread of men" lehem 'ânâšîm, but the Targum and Latin Vulgate read "bread of mourning", Hebrew lehem 'ônîm after Hos. 9:4. In any case, the context of Ezek. 24:15-24 makes mention of the consumption of bread during mourning. Cf. also 2 Sam. 3:35 where David's refusal to eat bread may be due to the premature timing of the gesture.

Second, the form 1έmēτ of 26:14 shows up in the mourning context of Deut. 14:1 as the form lāmēτ and in this instance it clearly refers to acts observed "on account of the dead", and not practices directed "to the dead". This rendering of the lamed preposition when its object refers to a dead person finds a semantic equivalent in the form 1- + nēpeš "on account of the dead" in Lev. 19:28 (lānēpeš) and 21:1 (1έnēpeš)266. In other words, what stands behind Deut. 26:14c is the custom of giving food as an act of consolation and nourishment to those in bereavement on account of the dead, "nor have I given any of it (to those bereaving) on account of the dead".

It is now possible to be more specific as to what aspect of death dominates v.14, namely the theme of mourning. This includes firstly lέmēτ in v.14c, then ב* 'ōnf "in my mourning" in v.14a, and finally ב* tāmē' "in a state of uncleanness" in v.14b.

According to Deut. 21:22-23; Num. 19:11-20; and Lev. 21:1-4, 22:4, contact with a corpse, or even proximity to it in the same dwelling, constitutes uncleanness. Likewise, Deut. 26:14 assumes that the corpse defiles the mourner and for that matter food with which it or the mourner might come into close proximity. Furthermore, Hos 9:4 specifically states that "the bread of mourning" leḥem 'ōnîm (⊂ 'āwen) defiles.

Nevertheless, it is not the ritually defiling power of the corpse that stands at the forefront of the narrator's concern in v.14. Rather, as proposed previously, the narrator addresses what

266 On this use of nēpeš, cf. Lev. 21:1, 22:4 and see Seligson 1951 on nāpšōt mēt in Lev. 21:11. In Jer. 16:6 the form lāhem evinces the same force of the preposition "on account of" as it likewise refers to the dead.
might be popularly viewed as legitimate excuses for offering less than the required amount of food set aside for the needy. But for the narrator, none of the mentioned excuses in v.14 related to the solemn act of mourning suffice as a justification for skimping on one's tithe.

While the author assumed the efficacy of the corpse's contaminating power, for those who sought to observe mourning protocol, they must remember to hold fast to their commitment to the underprivileged and use none of the tithe while in grief over the loss of a family member or in the hope to console another who had recently lost a loved one.

This text then in no way suggests that the Israelite dead were worshipped, venerated, or even cared for on a regular basis. The form *lēmet* in 26:14c, as in 14:1, refers to a rite, not of the death cult, but of mourning.268

Even if one were to assume for the sake of argument that *lēmet* suggested the practice of making offerings "to the dead", and that this in turn reflected an Israelite funerary and/or death cult, the introduction into Palestine of contemporary Mesopotamian funerary practices269 and death cult rites such as

268 As Heidel 1963:205 correctly pointed out, the oft-cited references to placing food in the grave with the dead in Tobit 4:17 and Sirach 30:18 [Greek text] owe their origin to Greek influence.

the *kispum* ritual\(^{270}\) would explain the promulgation of a sanction against selected mortuary rites like those found in Deut. 26:14.

\(^{270}\) Cf. Tsukimoto 1986:107-24 for the *kispum* ritual of Neo-Assyrian to Late Babylonian times. While the textual evidence from this period reflects the royal versions of these rites and practices, private *kispum* rites might be attested for earlier periods, so Wilcke 1983:49-54, but cf. Kraus 1987:96-97.
4.4.4. SUMMARY

We have scrutinized the relevant deuteronomistic legal texts for evidence of death and ancestor cult and necromantic practices in Israel. Our findings suggested that the texts were mute concerning the existence of any Israelite version of death or ancestor cults.

Deut. 14:1 was found to be a later dtr prohibition aimed at selected mourning rites, not death or ancestor cult rites. The dtr writer outlawed what were originally legitimate rites of tonsure and gashing in reaction to Israel’s exposure to similar Mesopotamian mourning gesti during the late pre-exilic and exilic periods.

Likewise, the dtr text Deut. 26:14 forbade certain abuses associated with rites of mourning, not death or ancestral cult rites. The pledge regarding the tithe stipulated that no portion of the tithe be used for purposes other than to feed the needy. Included in this proscription was the use of the tithe in the solemn act of mourning. Should the regular supply of food become unclean through contact with the dead, the tithe was not to be eaten in its stead (v.14a). Furthermore, it was not to be discarded owing to its having become unclean through such contact (v.14b). Finally, one was not to give it (mélō-nāṭatti mimmennū) to others who were mourning on behalf of the dead (lēmēt; v.14c) as an act of consolation.

On the other hand, the dtr passage Deut. 18:10-11, like the dtr redactional texts embedded in the book of Isaiah, attested to the existence of an Israelite version of necromancy, but only
polemically as necromancy was condemned by Dtr circles in response to the introduction of this mantic art from Mesopotamia.

4.5. THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY

In the present section, we will examine those passages in the DtrH relevant to the Israelite belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead. Said texts singularly pertain to the divinatory art of necromancy: 1 Sam. 28:3-25; 2 Kgs. 21:6; and 2 Kgs. 23:24.

4.5.1. 1 SAMUEL 28:3-25

Saul's encounter with the prophet Samuel post mortem in 1 Sam. 28:3-25 has engendered a wide range of responses from Jewish and Christian scholars alike. Among others, Josephus, Justin Martyr, Origen, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Tertullian, Jerome, and later, Kimhi, Martin Luther, and John Calvin have tried their hand at interpreting the inauspicious scene at the Endorian witch's abode.

Commentators have been at odds over whether what appeared was truly the ghost of Samuel or a pythoric spirit which was permitted to assume Samuel's form. Even among those who have advocated the view that it was Samuel, there is disagreement over the source of power behind his conjuration. Some view Israel's god, Yahweh, as the source while others make allowance for the
possibility that the woman possessed the (demonic?) powers to bring Samuel up from the grave. 271

To be sure, these opposing opinions do not exhaust the range of responses documented in the secondary literature. 272 For example, some have argued that the witch, while in a state of ecstasy, might have deceived herself into imagining she saw Samuel and heard him speak or perhaps, she deliberately deceived Saul by pretending to see Samuel. 273

In any case, most modern critics understand the episode to reflect a genuine belief in the efficacy of the art of necromancy and Isa. 29:4 supports this view. Assuming this to be the case, the critic faces the remaining task of identifying the appropriate Sitz im Leben out of which such a belief and its proscription would have arisen. Are these the actual goings-on of an Israelite king from the late second millennium B.C.E. who, having previously outlawed necromancy, turns tail to embrace it as a last resort or does this story reflect a later writer's ideological concerns read back into earlier history?

In order to answer this question, we must first attempt to establish the compositional history of 1 Sam. 28:3-25. This pericope is widely recognized as forming a sequel to 1 Sam. 15. The remark in 15:35, "Samuel did not see Saul again until the day

271 For the prominent role of women as necromancers, cf. the bibliography in Spronk 1986:254 n.3.

272 Kirkpatrick 1888:244-45 offered a survey of late nineteenth century opinion while Smelik 1977:160-78 has detailed the Rabbinic and Christian exegesis prior to 800 C.E.

273 Perhaps relevant here is the LXX rendering of 'δέβ as engastrimythos "ventriloquist"."
of his death" anticipates the episode in 1 Sam. 28:3-25 (cf. esp. v.3).²⁷⁴ Particular attention has been given to 28:17-18 which clearly presupposes ch. 15, where Samuel announces Yahweh's rejection of Saul in response to his failure to destroy completely the Amalekites.²⁷⁵ If this connection holds, then it is safe to conclude that whatever date one assigns to ch. 15, the same or later can be proffered for 28:3-25.

Others however, have viewed vv.17-18 as a secondary addition to 28:3-25.²⁷⁶ If this is in fact the case, then the remainder of 28:3-25 need not be taken as dependent upon ch. 15. But the isolated redactional character of 28:17-18 is doubtful. Together with vv.16 and 19, vv.17-18 form a unified prophetic speech: an accusation (in the form of a question, v.16), a rehearsal of past obedience (vv.17-18a), and an announcement of


²⁷⁵ Cf. Wellhausen 1973:259-61 and Schunck 1963:94-96. 1 Sam. 15:28b reads qāra' Yhwh 'et-mamlā'kūr yišrā'āl me'ālēkā "Yahweh has torn the kingship over Israel away from you" and 1 Sam. 28:17b reads wayyiqra' Yhwh 'et-hammamlā'kāh miyyādekā "Yahweh has torn the kingship out of your hands". For the dtr character of this language, cf. 1 Kgs. 11:11,13,31 and 2 Kgs. 17:21 and Weinfeld 1972:23 n.2, 355.

judgment (מַכְּנָה, v.18b) followed by a judgment speech (v.19). 277

Furthermore, Saul's answer to Samuel's question in v.15 anticipates Samuel's further response in v.16. Therefore, v.16 cannot be relegated to the level of an isolated redactional element. The same can be said for at least the second half of v.19 which is presupposed by v.20. On the basis of the unity of vv.16-19 and the links which vv.16,19 have with the immediate context, it is unlikely that any part of the speech is secondary to the immediate context. 278

Therefore, given the probability that the whole of 28:3-25 comprises a sequel to ch. 15, it remains for us to detail the compositional history of the latter. Several considerations cast doubt on the credibility of the account of the Amalekite engagement in ch. 15. 279 First of all, the Story of David's Rise (1 Sam. 16:14-2 Sam. 5:12) does not recognize control of Judah by Saul as the story would have the reader believe.


278 Veijola 1975:58, followed by Beuken 1978:5-6, concluded that vv.17-18 comprised a later gloss by DtrP which maintained the two-part prophetic oracle of vv.16,19 -annunciation and motivation. Not only is this an imprecise genre analysis of vv.16-19, but this view eliminates the scant evidence for the redactional nature of vv.17-18!

Moreover, the annihilation of the Amalekites does not account for David's later campaign against this group in 1 Sam. 30. Finally, the early stories about Saul (1 Sam. 9:1-10:16; 11:1-15; 13:2-14:46) reveal that Samuel had no role in Saul's monarchy. This was the creation of a later redactional hand.\(^{280}\)

A related issue is the question of literary genre. Some have suggested that ch. 15 comprises an example of the "judgment speech to the individual", a literary form which has been dated to the pre-classical prophetic period.\(^{281}\) On this basis, Birch dated 1 Sam. 15 to the late eighth century B.C.E.\(^{282}\)

It should be pointed out that in spite of the fact that the judgment speech to the individual is a narrative form which refers to earlier periods of Israel's history, it forms part of the DtrH or a dtr redaction of the prophetic books where the lateness of the genre can be clearly established.\(^{283}\) This tells against the location of this literary form only in early periods.

Besides, an alternate literary genre has been proposed for ch. 15. This passage more appropriately exemplifies the prophetic didactic legenda. In this literary form, religious teachings are conveyed through the speeches of stereotypical characters in

\(^{280}\) With perhaps the exception of the first story of Saul's youth, 9:1-10:16, but even in this case Samuel has a lesser role in the original version. Van Seters 1983:254-58 viewed the original lines of 9:1-10:16 as 9:1-8,10-14,18-19, 22-27aab; 10:2-6,9-13 (9:9, 15-17,20-21, 27ac,b; 10:1,7-8,14-16 are later additions).


\(^{283}\) Cf. 1 Kgs. 13:1-3 and v.2 where the mention of Josiah establishes the lateness of this exemplar, so Rofé 1974:158-60.
which the exaltation of Israel's god comes to the fore. In ch. 15, the lesson to be taught is "obedience is better than sacrifice", a theme also found at home in classical prophecy.284

Furthermore, in this genre the prophet is depicted as the medium of the divine word, a portrayal characteristic of the DtrH in Kings and of the post-classical period more generally. Other examples of this genre include the stories of Naaman the leper (2 Kgs. 5), Elijah and the widow of Zarephath (1 Kgs. 17:8-24), and the healing of Hezekiah (2 Kgs. 20:1-11).285

As a further point in favor of the dtr or post-dtr character of 1 Sam. 15, the language and style have clear affinities with the dtr tradition. The phrase "hearken to the voice of Yahweh" שׁמא לְקוֹל (dibrē) Yhwh is dtr (vv.1b,19,20,22)286 as is "thus says Yahweh of hosts . . ." כֹּה ᄒָמר יְהוָה. The same applies in the case of the following phraseology: "show lovingkindness" כָּשָׁה הֵסֶד

284 As distinct from other prophetic legendae, neither the miraculous nor the figure of the prophet are of major concern. In fact, the way in which miracles are presented might constitute the object for critique, so Rofé 1974:145-53 followed by Van Seters 1983:259,304.


287 Cf. 2 Sam. 7:8, the prose sections of Jeremiah, e.g., 6:6,9; 9:6,16; 11:22; 19:11, and late texts dependent upon dtr, e.g., Mal. 1:4 and 1 Chr. 17:7.
(v.6) "the word of Yahweh came to . . . " wayyhi debar Yhwh 'el-
(v.10) "he did not confirm my word" we 'et-debaray lô' hēqim (v.11) "do that which is evil in the eyes of Yahweh" cāšāh hārâc becēnê Yhwh (v.19) "devoted to God" hērem (v.21a), and "violate Yahweh's command" cēbar 'et-pî-Yhwh (v.24)

The reciprocal judgment statement in which the king/people reject Yahweh and Yahweh rejects him/them is characteristically dtr (vv.23,26). The description of the Amalekite opposition (v.2) shares similar language with Deut. 25:18 and the tearing of the cloak as a symbol of Yahweh's tearing of the kingdom away from a disobedient king (vv.27-28) finds a parallel in 1 Kgs.

288 Cf. 1 Sam. 20:8,14; 2 Sam. 2:6; 3:8; 9:1,3,7; 10:2 22:51; 1 Kgs. 2:7; 3:6 and Foresti 1984:89 (DtrN).

289 Cf. 2 Sam. 7:4, and as Van Seters 1983:260 n.49 has pointed out, the phrase shows up frequently in Jeremiah (e.g., 1:4,11; 2:1; 13:8; 16:1), Ezekiel (e.g., 3:16; 6:1; 7:1; 11:14), and the dtr stories of prophets in Kings (e.g., 1 Kgs. 13:20; 16:1,7; 17:2,8; 21:17,28).


293 Foresti 1984:89 labelled this as DtrN.

11:29-31. These several points when considered together point to the late dtr or post-dtr character of 1 Sam. 15. If we are correct in our assessment of 1 Sam. 15 and its linkage with 1 Sam. 28:17-18, then we can safely conclude that 1 Sam. 28 is likewise dtr or even post-dtr. To be sure, there are independent arguments for the post-dtr character of 28:3-25.

Firstly, 28:3a "Now Samuel was dead" āš(e)mūʿēl mēt is dependent upon the dtr text 25:1 because it presupposes the death of Samuel as something already known; 25:1 records "Now Samuel died" wayyāmot ʾēmūʿēl. Moreover, the latter part of 28:3a "and all Israel had mourned for him and buried him in his own town of Ramah" is a revision of 25:1a "and all Israel assembled and mourned for him, and they buried him at his home in Ramah". The fact that v.3 repeats 25:1 raises the unlikelihood that the same author would cite the same facts twice.

Critics have repeatedly pointed out that the presence of 28:3-25 creates a distinct disturbance in the geographical and chronological progression of the battle against the

---


296 Cf. Schunck 1963:82-85 and Foresti 1984:passim. The latter assigned ch.15 to DtrP.


Philistines. The Philistines are at Shunem north of the Jezreel while the Israelites are stationed on Mt. Gilboa, whereas in 29:1 the Philistines are at Aphek some distance away and Israel is encamped in the plain. The Philistines arrive at Jezreel only in 29:11. Thus, 28:3-25 comprises a secondary addition to the earlier story at the DtrH stratum in 28:1-2, 29:1-11.

The post-dtr character of 28:3-25 is given added confirmation in v.3b where the reform by Saul is mentioned. If this pericope was dtr, it would be exceptional for Saul not to have been commended for his reform.

Finally, the association of the root q-s-m with the terms '6b and yidd*7 in v.8 points to a post-dtr author. While all three terms refer to necromancy in our passage, the DtrH lists of

300 Wellhausen 1899:251-52.

301 Van Seters 1983: n.57 outlined three possible locations for Aphek: in the Sharon south of Jezreel, in the plain of Acco, and in the region east of the Sea of Galilee.

302 Driver 1912:213 noticed its dislocation and preferred to place it after chs. 29 and 30. McCarter 1980:422-23 and Klein 1983:269 proposed that the narrator merely switched to a non-sequential perspective from David (to 28:2) to Saul (28:3-25) and back to David (29:1 and following). Van Seters 1983:262 concluded that 28:3-25 should not be placed after ch. 29 or 30 owing to the fact that 28:4 would follow 29:1 and so depict a retreat up the mountain before the battle had begun. Cf. also Dietrich 1987:25-36.

303 Van Seters 1983:262 concluded that, although secondary, 28:3-25 was not an independent tradition. Rather, it was dependent upon the previous compilation of the Aufstiegsgeschichte or the Story of David's Rise (1 Sam. 16:14-2 Sam. 5:12). Schunck 1963:95 and Foresti 1984:133-34 have listed the linkage 28:3-25 has with accounts in 1 Sam. 7-14 and the Aufstiegsgeschichte which could only presuppose the synthesis offered by DtrH.

304 So Van Seters 1983:262.
prohibited practices where q-s-m and our two terms appear together (e.g., Deut. 18:10-11; 2 Kgs. 21:6; and cf. 2 Chr. 33:6), make a clear distinction between augury and necromancy. Only in the stratum of later narrative texts does the root q-s-m take on a more generalized sense (cf. 1 Sam. 6:2; 15:23 and Josh. 13:22; Num. 22:7, 23:23). Thus, only in texts post-dtr, did the root q-s-m become so generalized.

The above arguments indicate that 1 Sam 28:3-25 is a late composition, probably post-dtr. As we pointed out in 4.1., the language and style point to its dependency upon such dtr passages as Deut. 18:10-11, 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24, and to those elements it shares with the post-dtr Isa. 8:19, 91:3, and 29:4. Furthermore, the deafening silence from some two millennia of Syria-Palestine with regard to the practice of necromancy together with its widespread observance in Mesopotamia from Neo-Assyrian times onwards supports a late *Sitz im Leben* for the composition of 1 Sam. 28:3-25.

The Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal employed various forms of divination to ascertain the intentions or activities of political and military enemies. Ashurbanipal was particularly concerned with the outcome of his struggle with his rebellious brother, Shamash-shumu-ukin, king of Babylon. Several extispicies dated to Ashurbanipal's reign inquire about the success of planned military strategies and the eventual outcome

305 In Jer. 27:9, q-s-m shows up with other prohibited practices; false prophets, dreamers, soothsayers and sorcerers.

306 Cf. similarly Foresti 1984:133 n.142.
of war. In 1 Sam. 28., this is the function necromancy was to fulfil (vv.4-7,15b), but once conjured up, Samuel's spirit not only conveys an unfavorable decision concerning the outcome of the battle (v.19), it proceeds to determine the future of his inquirer's royal aspirations (v.17).

This role of necromancy is attested in a diviner's letter to king Esarhaddon dated 672 B.C.E. The question for which a decision was sought was whether or not Ashurbanipal should have been appointed to the position of crown prince. The question is answered in the affirmative by means of consulting the spirit or ghost (etemmum) of Esarhaddon's recently deceased wife Esharra-Ḥamât. While royal legitimacy was not Saul's concern in his having Samuel's ghost called up, the "omen" spoken by Samuel's spirit addresses this issue and answers in the negative.

The late composition of the story finds additional collaboration in the preponderance of similar necromantic tales characteristic of late antiquity. Although Trencsényi-Waldapfel collected numerous Greek and Latin texts dealing specifically

---

307 On the queries placed before the sun god Shamash and extispicy reports from the reigns of these kings, cf. Starr 1990:XIII-LXVII, esp.pp. XXX-XXXV and see pp.262-70 for the use of divination to determine military strategy and to ascertain the outcome of a war.

308 LAS 132 in Parpola 1970:107 and 1983:120: The following translation is that of Parpola: (Beginning lost) [The crown prince] explained [it as follows]: "The gods Aššur (and) Shamash ordained me to be the crown prince of Assyria because of her (= the dead queen's) truthfulness." (And) her ghost blesses him in the same degree as he has revered the ghost: "May his descendants rule over Assyria! (As it is said), fear of the gods creates kindness, fear of the infernal gods returns life. Let the [king, my] lord give order" (remainder lost). Cf. also CAD 4(1958):397, 8(1971):396; Bayliss 1973:124; Finkel 1983-84:1,3; Tsukimoto 1985:159; and Tropper 1989:76-83.
with the art of necromancy which offer impressive parallels to the major motifs found in 1 Sam 28:30-9 and others have similarly noted such parallels\(^ {9}_{10} \), their full significance has not been appreciated by critics as they have been predisposed to seek out second millennium antecedents.

Some of these critics have sought to anchor the early origins of the witch of Endor account in supposed parallels from Hittite and Mesopotamian sources, but not only do they inadequately address the issue of the compositional history of the passage, they often wrongly understand Hebrew 'ôb as related to "pit". Moreover, the early comparative examples frequently cited are not concerned with necromancy *per se*.*\(^ {11}_{11} \)

Having established what we believe to be the probable compositional history of this pericope, we conclude that 1 Sam. 28:3-25 reflects the religious concerns of a post-exilic writer faced with Israel's acceptance of the foreign practice of necromancy. Nevertheless, the post-dtr author's characterization of this mantic art as an ancient practice observed by the local

\(^{9}_{10}\)Trencsényi-Waldapfel 1961:201-22.

\(^{11}_{11}\)Cf. e.g., Vattioni 1963:468 and n.43,477 and n.73; Ebach and Rüterswördten 1980:212-13 and Brown 1981:395.

\(^{11}_{11}\)Humphreys 1980:80-85 cites only Greek parallels to 1 Sam. 28 and 31, but otherwise draws upon the texts in Vieyra 1961:47-55 and Hoffner 1967:385-401. Only one of the texts cited in Vieyra and Hoffner dealt with necromancy and it was Greek *(Odyssey XI:23-29,34-43)*. Besides, the Hittite version of the Greek *chthonioi* (= infernal deities and the dead, on which see Guthrie 1955:221-22), the *kattereś Šiuneš*, never appear in any of the examples. Lastly, none of the second millennium texts in Ebach and Rüterswördten 1980:205-20 concern necromancy. The same criticism applies to the works of Tropper 1989 and Moore 1990 as both authors assume or make use of vague definitions and questionable examples.
Canaanites appears to contradict the comparative documentation for the late and exclusively Mesopotamian interest in necromancy. Josh. 17:1-12 lists the city of En-Dor (v.11) and its dependencies among those Canaanite enclaves Israel failed to dispossess. According to this tradition, Israel was only able to force the inhabitants of En-Dor to pay tribute (v.13). The author of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 probably built upon this tradition by attributing Israel's observance of necromancy to her contacts with these Canaanites of the settlement period. But is the post-dtr writer's reconstruction a reliable tradition?

The whole of Joshua chapters 14-17 may very well comprise the work of the exilic Priestly Writer. The entire block of material reflects P's characteristic penchant for delineating the inheritance of individual tribes and families by lot. The ideological concern reflected in such a scheme comes from the exilic period and attempts to justify the unfulfilled promise of land inheritance; Israel's failure to dispossess fully the Canaanites led to her apostasy.

Furthermore, for the later biblical writers, the term Canaanite, like the terms Amorite and Hittite, functioned primarily as an ideological or rhetorical term for the pre-

---

312 En-Dor is mentioned again only in Ps. 83:11 (ET 10) in an allusion to Deborah's deliverance of Israel from the hands of Jabin, king of Canaan/Hazor, and his military commander Sisera, but the city is not explicitly mentioned in the narrative account given in Jud. 4.


314 For this distinctly priestly approach to the allotment of land over against the tendency in Dtr to portray the inheritance of the land from the perspective of the nation as a whole, cf. Von Rad 1966:79-93.
Israelite inhabitants of Palestine who come to epitomize the foreign occupation including those of later times which persistently threatened Israel's claim to the land and its blessings. 315

So, the question remains, why would the post-dtr narrator of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 seek to project this concern back into the history of an earlier period? Like the Deuteronomist, the Yahwist, and the Priestly Writer, our author sought to give his polemic an historical basis. Moreover, like these historians, he sought to attach his historical argument to Israel's perpetual enemies the Canaanites, in order to bring to the fore the central concern of the nation after the exile—the land and its blessings.

A comparison of our passage with the list of Manasseh's sins in 2 Kgs. 21:6, the cultic reform of Josiah in 2 Kgs. 23:24 and the dtr addition to the Mosaic law, Deut. 18:10-11, indicates that our author drew from the dtr language expressive of the concern to rid Israel of necromancy. But with the insertion of the episode of the Witch of En-Dor in 1 Sam. 28:3-25, necromancy was no longer merely the preoccupation of a relative late comer like the dtr ideology, rather it was depicted as an age old problem.

To be sure, the dtr circle condemned outbreaks of this form of divination as reflected in the account of Manasseh's apostasy, but the post-dtr writer established a much earlier precedent. According to our author, Israel's first king had violated the dtr

law earlier inserted in Deut. 18:11—now the authoritative law of Moses—and his complicity had left its lasting influence on Israelite religion even after the exile. In the end, our author's polemic can hardly be labelled innovative for it finds justification in the formative stage of the nation's origins.

The dtr ideology advocated the premise that both the land and its blessings were dependent upon complete separation from foreigners and their religious practices. In this light, the legend of Saul underscores the point that in tolerating the presence of foreigners, like Israel of old in matters Canaanite, and by embracing their religious beliefs, like Saul in his rendezvous with the witch of En-Dor, the nation once again places itself in jeopardy with regard to her rights to the land and its blessings.

We move on now to other interpretative details in Saul's consultation with the Endorian hexter. Contrary to widely held opinion, the 'āḇōt and the yiddēcōnīm of vv. 3,7–9 refer neither to a class of professional mantics nor to ancestral images, but to the spirits of the dead, "the Ones-Who-Return" and "the Knowers".

In v.7, the witch is entitled "a woman, controller of One-Who-Returns" 'ēṣēt bašālāt 'ēb.\textsuperscript{316} In v.8, the woman is asked to divine for Saul "by means of(?) One-Who-Returns". The form bā'ēb here could designate either the indirect or direct object of the

\textsuperscript{316}Based on the LXX gynaika engastrimyton/os, McCarter 1980:418 conjectured that a conflation of 'ēṣēt 'ēb and bašālāt 'ēb has taken place, but cf. Driver 1912:215 ('ēṣēt may be in the construct state in suspenso, cf. GKC #130e) or Stoebe 1973:485 ('ēṣēt may be in the absolute state, cf. GKC #96).
verbal form of q-s-m.\textsuperscript{317} In any case, there is nothing in the general context that would suggest the involvement of a second necromancer or an image. The crucial passage in this regard is Lev. 20:27 where it is reported that a man or woman might have in them the 'ôb or the yiddêcônî.\textsuperscript{318} This surely eliminates the necromancer and the image as interpretive options.

Furthermore, while it is true that the related verbs often take inanimate things as their grammatical objects (in the case at hand, recall that both 'ôb and yiddêcônî have been viewed as images), they can equally accommodate abstract or animate objects (or, as in the present context, their post mortem remains). The verb hĕsfr in v.3 can be translated "put aside" (matters; Josh. 11:15) or "reject" (prayer; Ps. 66:20) in addition to "drive out".\textsuperscript{319} Similarly, hikrît in v.9 can be rendered "forbid" (kindness; 1 Sam. 20:15) or "abolish" (one's name; Josh. 7:9) in addition to the more general "cut off".\textsuperscript{320}

The \textit{crux interpretum} of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 is the term 'êlôhîm in v.13 which is generally taken to refer to the dead Samuel.

\textsuperscript{317}Commentators usually interpret the bet preposition as signifying an indirect object "divine for me by One-Who-Returns". But the parallel line "bring up for me the one I shall name to you" in v.8d and the phraseology of 1 Chr. 10:13 where it is stated that Saul "consulted an 'ôb" liš'êl bā'ôb lends support to "augur for me One-Who-Returns", with the bet preposition governing the direct object.

\textsuperscript{318}Following Driver 1912:214.

\textsuperscript{319}The JPS translation rendered 1 Sam. 28:3b "And Saul had forbidden [recourse to] ghosts and familiar spirits in the land".

\textsuperscript{320}Cf. 4.1.2., contra Hertzberg 1964:218. The JPS translation rendered 1 Sam. 28:9b "You know what Saul has done, how he has banned [the use of] ghosts and familiar spirits in the land".
This is so in spite of the syntactic difficulties present. The witch's response to Saul's query in v.13, namely that she saw "gods ascending" ʾēlōhîm . . . cōlîm, comprises a plural noun coupled with a plural participle. But Saul's immediate response in v.14 utilizes a singular pronominal suffix, "What is his appearance?".\(^{321}\)

Assuming that the ʾēlōhîm of v.13 identified Samuel, Driver outlined two alternatives for the above discrepancy: (1) while the witch saw more than one figure, Saul in his anxiety inquired only about the one whom he was interested or (2) ʾēlōhîm is an honorific plural (\textit{GKC} \#124\(^{-1}\)) and denotes "a god" (\textit{GKC} \#132\(^b\) note), the plural cōlîm being merely a grammatical plural like ḥayyîm in ʾēlōhîm ḥayyîm for Yahweh in 1 Sam. 17:26.\(^{322}\) In the final analysis, the available independent data must be brought to bear to decide the issue.

The notion that the dead in Israel might be attributed divine status and depicted as "gods" has been recently reiterated. Evidence from Mesopotamia, Anatolia, and Syria has been cited as indicative of such a concept.\(^{323}\)

Often mentioned are the Akkadian \textit{Ersatznamen}, the association of the īlānu with the ētemmû in Akkadian texts from Assyria and Nuzi, the recently published parallels between īlānu and mētû in the Emar texts, the Ugaritic king list \textit{KTU} 1.113

\(^{321}\)The LXX does not evince this discrepancy, for Saul's query of v.14 is phrase differently "What did you perceive?" tī egnōs, on which, see below.

\(^{322}\)Driver 1912:215.

wherein the form 'il is followed by a personal royal name (i.e., "Divine So-and-So"), the Shapash fragment in the Baal-Mot Epic KTU 1.6.VI:45-49 wherein 'ilm parallels mtm, the Hittite Totenrituale wherein at the king's death he becomes a god, and the Phoenician inscription from Pyrgi wherein a buried god qbr 'ilm has been (wrongly) identified as a spirit of the dead.

While it has been repeatedly affirmed that the dead in Mesopotamia are designated by the lexeme ilu/ilānu, the cited data are sparse and highly controvertible. First, the ilu element in the so-called Ersatznamen may refer to "good fortune", "luck", or a "personal god", and not the spirit of the dead.324

Second, while the spirits of the dead are associated on occasion with the "gods" ilānu, their supposed equation is another matter altogether. Often cited is the bilingual incantation text from Assyria, CT 17,37 "Y", 1-10: "the captive gods come forth from the grave, the zaqīqu come forth from the grave, for the offering of the kispū, for the water libation, they come forth from the grave".325

But the fact that the captive gods are located in the netherworld only confirms what we already knew, namely that the Mesopotamian underworld was inhabited by sundry forms of numina. Furthermore, we know that the kispum frequently comprised a gift


325 The Akkadian phraseology employed is ilānu kamūti ištu qabri ittasūni zaqīqu limnūti ištu qabri ittasūni ana kasāp kispū u nāq mē ištu qabri, cf. most recently, Tsukimoto 1985:148. Zaqīqu has several possible renderings, e.g., "phantom", "wind", cf. CAD 21(1961):58-59 and AHw 3(1981):1530a. In any case, usage reveals that the term cannot be equated with etemmum "spirit of the dead".
offered to the gods of the underworld (*Totenbeigabe*) or a form of enticement to the infernal deities, particularly the Anunnaki, for protection from tormenting ghosts.\(^{326}\)

But most telling are the Neo-Assyrian necromancy texts where it is recorded that offerings are to be made to various deities such as the Anunnaki, Pabilsag, Shamash and the primordial deities of the netherworld, Enmesarra, Ninmesarra, Endasurimma, Nindasurimma, Enkum, and Ninkum, for their aid in raising a spirit of the dead.\(^{327}\)

That the captive gods come up from their graves in the netherworld might be expressive of the Mesopotamian belief reflected in *Enuma Elish* that these gods, having been slain for their rebellion against the established pantheon and perhaps imprisoned in their sepulchers, could be released from the netherworld by the appropriate means whether it be the decree of Marduk at creation as in *Enuma Elish*\(^{328}\) or the requisite incantational procedure.

It appears that there were many groups of such gods who comprised the defeated and slain divine enemies, not all of which had apparently rebelled, been captured, and released at the creation of man. For example, many Asakku demons and Tammuzes show up after the death of the Asakku demon in *Lugale* and the


\(^{328}\) Cf. *Enuma Elish* IV:93-120 (esp. l.120), VI:11-34, VII:26-32 (on VII:26-27, see below).
death of Tammuz. These slain divine enemies are given various titles; "the conquered Enlils"  de.n.lil=kišitti, "the dead gods" d ugs.ga=kišitti or "the battered" abtūtu /šulputūtu. In a Seleucid period bilingual incantation, Shamash is said to be in charge of "the dead gods" d ugs.ga.âm.

It goes without saying, one cannot appeal to Enuma Elish VII:26-27 to buttress a simplistic equation of the captive gods and the spirits of the dead. The relevant lines read as follows: "Lord of the holy incantation who raises the dead to life, who has compassion on the captive gods".

While the captive gods are described as dead, the significance is not that the captive gods are to be equated with the spirits of deceased mortals, for man had yet to be created. Rather, the following 11.28-29 make clear that, not only are the dead of 1.26 the captive gods of 1.27, but that both refer to those gods who were slain for their rebellion against the great gods. These lines also point out that it is by the creation of

---


331 UVB 15.36:9-10 in Falkenstein 1959:36-40. The phraseology employed is rabis ugs.ga.âm. ina qirib arallî rēs etēmmu murtappidu ša dūtu la paqdu "(Shamash) who watches over the dead gods in the netherworld, who helps the roving spirit of the dead who has no virility", but parallelism alone cannot secure the equivalence of the dead gods and the deceased, on which see below.

332 Cf. e.g., Tsukimoto 1985:148 and n.490. Heidel 1963:153 and n.49 wrongly assumed that the captive gods in the incantation texts were the deceased and not the gods defeated at creation for "these were released after the creation of man".

333 The phraseology employed is bēl ūpiṭu kù-ti muballit mīṭi ša an dingir.dingir kamûti irtû târu.
man whose lot it is to relieve the captive gods of their service, that these dead gods can be restored to their former place in the pantheon.

Turning now to the other few remaining texts, in the Neo-Assyrian version of the Legend of Etana "the gods" ilānu and "the spirits of the dead" etemmū show up as parallel members of a poetic bicolon. Contrary to widely held opinion, the parallelism alone cannot insure the equation of the ilānu with "the spirits of the dead". A complementary force of the poetic parallelism might equally apply here. The text reads, "I honored the gods, served the spirits of the dead". Now the term "god(s)" ilu/ilānu most frequently designates the gods of the pantheon and quite often the personal protective gods.

Thus, in the Legend of Etana, one would expect that ilānu refers to the personal gods, that is, if familial obligations are in view, if not, then to the gods of the pantheon. In other words, the text simply seeks to convey the widely held notion that the gods as well as the spirits of the dead, two distinct groups of supra-natural beings, demand their service. The burden of proof is surely on those who would argue otherwise.

That the ilānu delineate the same group as that signified by the dead may be actually contradicted, not confirmed, by the


335 Cf. our discussion of the use of the dingir sign in the so-called Eblaite king list in 2.1.1. and recall that the personal gods are at times identified as the gods of the pantheon, cf. van der Toorn 1985:44 where he cites TCL 18, n.85:25-26.
handful of instances where the *ilānu* are mentioned alongside the *eṭemmū* at Nuzi and the *mētū* at Emar. In view of the general usage of *ilānu* outlined above and the non-poetic contexts in which these parallel pairs occur at Nuzi and Emar, it is likely that a distinction was intended. We are otherwise forced to make the unwarranted assumption that the ancient writers in these instances were guilty of blatant redundancy. Some distinction is recognized even by those who seek to identify "the gods" with "the spirits of the dead".336

In the genre of testament at Nuzi, both "the gods" *ilānu* and "the spirits of the dead" *eṭemmū* are depicted as deserving of service (*palāhu*). As in the case of the Legend of Etana, "the gods" *ilānu* might just as conceivably refer to the family personal gods which is what we would expect in the context of inheritance.

The same can be said for the references to "the gods" *ilānu* alongside "the dead" *mētū* in the Emar texts. In the genre of testament at Emar, the gods and the dead are "honored" (*kunnū*) and "called upon" (*nabū A*).337 Again, the explicit mention of the gods together with the dead in a non-poetic context lends

336 Tsukimoto 1985:104-05 and Rouillard and Tropper 1987A:354-56 recognized the redundancy of merely equating these terms at Nuzi. Nevertheless, their commitment to relating the two resulted in the delineation between the *eṭemmū* as the recent identifiable ancestors and the *ilānu* as the remote unidentifiable ancestors.

337 Or perhaps, "lamented" (*nabū B*). Even so, this alternative alone could not secure the status of *ilānu* as spirits of the dead.
credence to the view that the former designate a group of supernatural beings distinct from the dead. Within the context of inheritance, we would expect the ilānu to represent personal gods. 338

Turning now to the evidence from Ugarit, in 3.1.6., we argued that the phrase 'il + personal royal name in the Ugaritic king list KTU 1.113 (and cf. 2.1.1. for the Eblaite king list) refers to a deceased king's personal god to whom ritual is directed. 339 Moreover, we argued in 3.1.7. that the terms "the gods" 'ilm over against "the dead" m'tm or, better yet "men", in KTU 1.6:VI:45ff. serve as antithetical rather than as synonymous elements.

The above survey undermines the view that the dead in general or the deceased royalty in Syria-Palestine attained the status of "gods". Even the oft-cited evidence from Mesopotamia vis-à-vis the couplet ilānu//ētemmū/mētū is controvertible on this point. 340

This brings us full circle to the question of the meaning of 'ēlōhìm in 1 Sam. 28:13. In an attempt to maintain some distinction between the high gods, and other "gods" such as the dead, it has been recently suggested that the term when applied

338 Cf. our treatment of the Emar materials in 3.2.2.

339 Our conclusions regarding the non-divine status of dead kings at Ugarit conforms with the sacral nature of the Ugaritic royal ideology more generally.

340 We recognize the fact that the Mesopotamian royal dead of the period ca. 2300-1800 were deified, first posthumously, then while living, cf. e.g. Klein 1981B:29-36 and now Hallo 1988:54-66. But this is clearly the exception to the rule in regard to Mesopotamian royal ideology.
to the deceased simply pointed to some type of transcendent character obtained at death. This character had in some way a lesser significance than that of the high gods, for the dead were not worshipped in the same way as the high gods. Accordingly, the term 'ālōhîm when referring to the dead should be rendered as "preternatural being(s)".341

However, our analysis throws into question the assumption that the dead in Syria-Palestine obtained the status of "god" in any sense of the term. Of course, this nullifies any attempt to interpret 'ālōhîm in 1 Sam. 28:13 as the spirit of the deceased Samuel. Besides, if by "god" a spirit of the dead was intended, why were the terms 'āḇ and yiddēćōnî not used? They are the only "technical" terms for necromancy used in the account and in the dtr traditions more generally. That the woman sees a spirit of the dead as expressed by 'ālōhîm would be for her and Saul superfluous.

It is our contention that the phrase 'ālōhîm . . . cōlîm reflects a familiarity with the rite documented in the Mesopotamian necromancy texts in which the necromancer appeals to the netherworld gods in order to insure the appearance of the spirit of the dead.342 As we pointed out above, in these Neo-

341 Lewis 1989:50,106,115-16. For "preternatural" as a translation of 'ālōhîm in 28:13, cf. also NAB. The English derives from the Latin praeter naturam "beyond nature".

342 On this role of the gods, cf. esp. Scurlock 1988:106-10. Hutter 1983:32-36 similarly concluded that "gods coming out of the earth" did not refer to Samuel's supernatural character, but simply affirmed the success of the necromantic process. However, he wrongly arrived at this via the Hittite incantations in which the underworld gods were summoned up from the "pit" and through the conjecture that necromancy was associated with such alien gods at En-Dor, cf. Josh. 17:11-13, and that En-Dor had an
Assyrian and later texts, various deities such as the Anunnaki, Pabilsag, Shamash, and the primordial deities of the netherworld are called upon for assistance.  

In view of the cuneiform evidence which indicated that the dead were not deified and cuneiform data which testified to the intervention of netherworld gods in necromantic rituals of the mid to late first millennium, we contend that vis-à-vis the function of 'ēlōhîm in 1 Sam. 28:13, the MT is either confused or reflects a later belief in the divinity of the dead as found in the Greek world.

We conclude that the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX perhaps preserves a tradition independent of MT, one which reflects an Israelite writer's familiarity with the Mesopotamian sequence of necromantic rites. On the other hand, the MT might reflect necromantic practices other than those characteristically Mesopotamian. For example, on occasion heroes were eventually equated in some meaningful sense with the gods in Greek hero cults and Samuel would qualify in later traditions as a hero. The LXX 1 Sam. 28:13 records the outcome of the necromancer's successful appeal to the netherworld gods. Upon seeing the spirit of Samuel, the witch is able to identify Saul (vv.11-12), but originally Hurrian name enna durenna.

343 The Mesopotamian necromancy texts also contradict recent opinion that Saul's night visitation (v.8) was the appropriate time for consulting the dead, cf. Spronk 1986:168; Lewis 1989:114; and Hoffner 1967:393 and the nocturnal rituals for the Greek chthonioi. These texts demand that needed mixed ointments stand overnight. Only in the morning is the dead consulted by applying the salve to a figurine of the dead or to a skull, cf. Finkel 1983-84:9 and Scurlock 1988:104 n.483, 318-19. Thus, Saul's nocturnal rendezvous was no more than an attempt to conceal his illicit visit.

337
Saul, not having access to the witch's vision\textsuperscript{344}, requests that she detail her experience (vv.13-14a):

"(v.13) And the king said to her, 'Fear not, tell (me) what you have seen?' And the woman said to him, 'I saw gods ascending out of the earth'. (v.14) And he said to her 'what have you perceived?'\textsuperscript{345} And she said to him, 'An upright(?)\textsuperscript{346} man ascending out of the earth and he is clothed with a mantle'."

The woman first perceived the gods whom she had invoked for assistance ascending from the netherworld (v.13b), then, having succeeded in gaining their help in conjuration, she saw Samuel's spirit ascending, wearing his identifiable cloak (v.14a).\textsuperscript{347}

A second, but, in our estimation, less likely, interpretation views 'šlōhîm as signifying a man given divine authority as in Exod. 4:16, 7:1. In other words, in her language the witch expressed well on whose authority and with whose

\textsuperscript{344}Cf. the Mesopotamian necromancy texts that describe how magic ointments must be smeared on the necromancer's face in order to make the spirit of the dead visible, "You rub (it) on your face and then you can look at the ghost and he will speak with you", Finkel 1983-84:10 This type of ritual gave access solely to the necromancer.

\textsuperscript{345}The LXX reads ti egnōs. The Greek translator's Vorlage possibly read mh t'tr "what can you make out?", from Hebrew t-'-r meaning "to regard intently" (Qal) or "to form (a shape)" (Piel). The MT misread the form as a noun from r-'-h and replaced the final -t with -w. McCarter 1980:419 proposed mh yḏcí t as the Hebrew Vorlage while Lewis 1989:109 proposed mh tr'y (< r'-h).

\textsuperscript{346}Whether Samuel appeared in v.14 as "an old man" (MT), "an erect man" (LXX), or perhaps "a startling man" (following Lewis 1989:116) is impossible to decide.

\textsuperscript{347}There remains the possibility that the MT's "What is his appearance" refers not to "the god(s)" in v.13, but to Samuel in v.12. Saul, expecting the woman's mention of the gods in v.13, was more interested in Samuel's appearance and so sought further information regarding the apparition which led her to identify him in v.12.
message Samuel came.\textsuperscript{348} Thus, what begins as an account of an efficacious conjuration to the end of v.12, beginning with v.13, transforms into an account of Yahweh's intervention.\textsuperscript{349} In any case, this interpretation would help to explain the witch's identification of Saul in v.12b.\textsuperscript{350} She expected an '\(\delta h\)' or a \(yidd\)\(\textsuperscript{on\textit{f}}\), but as expressed in her own words, she sees more than that, she sees an '\(\&\&\text{o}_h\text{i}_m\)', a man possessing the authority of God, none other than the prophet Samuel.\textsuperscript{351}

4.5.2. 2 KINGS 21:6 AND 23:24

THE CASE FOR THE LATE MESOPOTAMIAN ORIGIN OF ISRAEL'S BELIEF IN THE BENEFICENT DEAD

With this section we come to the two lone references to necromancy in the DtrH, 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24.\textsuperscript{352} Not only is the consultation of the '\(\delta h(\delta t)\)' and \(yidd\)\(\textsuperscript{on\textit{f}}\) listed among the


\textsuperscript{350} Part of the LXX tradition reads Saul for Samuel in v.12. This does not explain her ignorance of Saul's identity throughout vv.8-11. Although a complex redactional history has been proposed for the immediate context with vv.11-12a being identified as an addition, cf. e.g., McCarter 1980:421, it is just as likely that Samuel's appearance as an '\(\&\&\text{o}_h\text{i}_m\)' and his association with Saul offered a clue to the identity of her visiter, cf. similarly Klein 1983:269.

\textsuperscript{351} Both of the above proposals can accommodate the perspective reflected in Ecclesiasticus 46:20 that Samuel prophesied after his death.

\textsuperscript{352} Recall that 1 Sam. 28:3-25 is a post-dtr insertion. Its parallel, 1 Chr. 10:13, might be a later addition to Chronicles, so Ackroyd 1977:8 and Braun 1986:151; but cf. Williamson 1982:95 and De Vries 1989:121,397.
"detestable practices" attributed to king Manasseh (2 Kgs. 21:6), it is also enumerated among those obliterated in the subsequent Josianic "reform" (2 Kgs. 23:24). While both are set in the last days of the Judahite monarchy, only 2 Kgs. 21:6 has a parallel in the Chronistic History (hereafter ChrH) at 2 Chr. 33:6.

If, as we have argued, Deut. 18:11 and 1 Sam. 28:3-25 are dtr and post-dtr additions and if Israelite necromancy owes its origins to first millennium Assyria, its lack of mention in the apostasy and reform accounts of Manasseh's predecessors creates the impression that, from the perspective of the historians of the DtrH and ChrH, prior to Manasseh's reign, Israel had not yet embraced Assyrian necromancy. This would explain why, from the dtr perspective, it apparently posed no threat to Yahwism in earlier times.

Nevertheless, this conflicts with the impression created by the hand responsible for the insertions of Isa. 8:19 and 29:4 in their canonical contexts. In the case of Isa. 8:19, necromancy is polemicized against in a context set some forty years earlier in Ahaz's reign on the eve of the Syro-Ephraimite war (735 B.C.E.). But in the DtrH and ChrH, necromancy goes unmentioned in

As Ahlström 1982:68-80 has convincingly argued, Manasseh's "syncretism" was probably the creation of the dtr ideology. He was likely the traditionalist and the so-called reformers, Hezekiah and Josiah, were the innovators.

the apostasies of Ahaz (2 Kgs. 16:1-4, 10-18//2 Chr. 28:1-4, 21-25) and Hoshea (2 Kgs. 17:7-23) as well as in the list of practices introduced by the foreigners recently settled in Samaria (2 Kgs. 17:24-41). 385

A similar discrepancy arises with Isa. 29:4. In an oracle proclaimed on the eve of the Assyrian siege of Hezekiah's Jerusalem (701 B.C.E.), a polemical allusion is no doubt made to Israel's supposed adoption of Mesopotamian necromancy but in the DtrH and the ChrH, Hezekiah's reform lacks any mention of it (2 Kgs. 18:3-6//2 Chr. 29:3-31:21). 386 In other words, its omission in the DtrH and ChrH accounts of earlier Judean kings is a blatant inaccuracy if, as assumed by Isa. 8:19 and 29:4 in their contexts, it had become a widespread phenomenon in Judah prior to Manasseh. The working assumption is that, had necromancy circulated in Judah prior to Manasseh's reign, it would have been incorporated into the official cults of his predecessors which in turn would be reflected in the DtrH and ChrH.

Throughout our treatment we have made reference to the fact that the art of divination experienced increased popularity in


the days of the late Assyrian kings and that it was often employed to ascertain successful military strategies and to determine the outcome of an impending war\textsuperscript{357}, that, in line with this, the distribution of texts concerned with necromancy attest to the high esteem given this practice in the Neo-Assyrian period and following\textsuperscript{358}, and that the Assyrian royalty held the belief that through necromancy \textit{per se} a ghost of the prominent dead could determine the political destiny of one of its members (cf. 4.5.1.).\textsuperscript{359}

Having considered these points in the light of the compositional histories of the biblical texts treated thus far, we proposed a late Mesopotamian origin for Israelite necromancy. We now turn to consider the evidence for potential Mesopotamian stimulus in other contemporary religious practices with a view to evaluating the likelihood of our proposal. In other words, would we expect an Assyrian and Babylonian impetus for Israel's adherence not only to necromancy, but also to death and ancestor cults -assuming they existed-, in the last days of the monarchy and/or the exile?

To be sure, evidence for wide ranging Mesopotamian religious influence has been extracted from the depictions of the


\textsuperscript{358}Cf. Finkel 1983-84:1-17; von Weiher 1983:100-03; and Scurlock 1988:5-8,103-12,318-42; Parpola 1970:107, 1983:120; and Tropper 1989:76-103 who includes a number of additional texts from Neo-Assyrian times in line with his broader definition of necromancy on pp.103-07.

\textsuperscript{359}E.g., \textit{LAS} 132 in Parpola 1970:107 and 1983:120 and cf. n.308 for the translation.
cult of king Ahaz, Manasseh's grandfather. To cite the most controversial example, Ahaz' altar in 2 Kgs. 16:10-16 which he ordered built in the Jerusalem temple and modelled after one he saw while visiting Damascus to seek audience with the Assyrian king has been interpreted as an adaptation of an Assyrian prototype and therefore evidence for the introduction of Assyrian religion into Judah. Some critics have gone so far as to conclude that, in accordance with the presumed Assyrian policy of imposing upon vassals their official cult, Ahaz was forced to adopt this Assyrian altar and the religion more generally.

Two monographs by McKay and Cogan have challenged the notion that Assyria imposed its cult upon its subject nations. According to both of these writers, the Assyrians never made it a regular policy to do so, at least not in the case of vassal states. Besides, the religion of the Judahite kings evinces closer parallels with Syro-Palestinian religions. The altar of Ahaz and the religious practices introduced by Manasseh but

---

360 For a listing of the elements in the cult of Ahaz that have been identified as Assyrian, cf. the surveys of McKay 1973:1-19 and Cogan 1974:1-7,65-115 and see now Spieckermann 1982:318-22,362-69 for a recent defence.


363 Cogan 1974:65, while allowing for the occasional imposition of the Assyrian cult on provincial states, labelled Judah a vassal state throughout the late Neo-Assyrian domination of Syria-Palestine (740-640 B.C.E.).
rejected by Josiah, were Aramean and Canaanite in character, rather than Assyrian.\footnote{364 McKay 1973:15,18-19,69 recognized the probability that Assyrian religion was practiced in Judah at the time but rejected its official status. Moreover, He assumed the normative nature of Yahwism and accepted the judgment of apostasy against Manasseh made by the dtr tradition (pp.25-27).}

In response to McKay and Cogan, Spieckermann has offered a new defense of the Assyrian imposition theory.\footnote{365 Spieckermann 1982. His work has been largely ignored in the English speaking world, cf. e.g., the recent commentaries on 2 Kgs. by Jones 1984; Hobbs 1985; and Cogan and Tadmor 1988 and on 2 Chr. by Dillard 1987. All of these follow McKay and Cogan. The first, second, and fourth engage Spieckermann only superficially while the third shows no knowledge of his work. Of the recent German commentaries on 2 Kgs., Würthwein 1984:380-82,391,456-59 endorsed Spieckermann's general thesis, while Hentschel 1985 made no mention of him. Donner 1986:329-38 and Lohfink 1987:467-68 have more recently embraced the major outlines of Spieckermann's work.}

Unlike his predecessors and opponents, he offered an extensive treatment of late Assyrian religion as a basis for identifying Assyrian religious elements in foreign contexts. According to the author, the late Assyrian kings became increasingly susceptible to the influence of divination with the loss of political strength.

Various oracular techniques with the exclusive consultation of Shamash, the use of a horse in an oracular rite, astronomical observations and omnia (extispicy), hemerologies and menologies, apotropaic prayers, namburbi rituals, the substitute king ritual, and ecstatic prophecy all grew in prominence in the court of the Sargonid kings.\footnote{366 Spieckermann 1982:246-301. In support of the proposal that Assyrian religion impacted first millennium Syria-Palestine, we should mention the discoveries at Hamath. Bâtiment III of Stratum E (= the period 900-720 B.C.E.) is probably a temple. Its cardinal orientation (main entrance facing West) and the discovery in or nearby the structure of basalt orthostat}

\footnote{344}
Spieckermann has convincingly defended the position that the Assyrian kings imposed their royal cult upon not only their provincial states but also their vassals as well as others whom they subjected. In summary fashion, the author outlined the Assyrian practices of establishing garrisons in conquered regions, mass deportation, installation of qēpu-officials or "advisors" loyal to the Assyrians in foreign courts, and various forms of economic sanctions (annual tribute ma(d)dattu/mandattu, display gifts namurtu/tamartu, lucrative trade control, military levy and corvée). He concluded that often little distinction was made in the application of these military and administrative policies between provinces and vassaldoms.\(^{367}\)

He then surveyed primary sources indicative of the Assyrian intervention in the local cults of both provinces and vassal states. The poorly preserved annals of Tiglath-pileser III describe how he penetrated deep into Palestine in 734 and conquered (among others) the Philistine city-state of Gaza. The gods of Hanunu of Gaza were taken as booty and images of the fragments with Neo-Luwian characters, a cuneiform archive, a royal Neo-Luwian inscription dedicated to the god Tarhunzas, and several dedicatory Aramaic graffiti suggest this. Of the twenty or so cuneiform texts found in the building which include medical rituals, a hymn, an omen from the series Šumma izbu, magical texts, an exorcism text against sorcery, and epistolary texts, the lone namburbi against the evil of a snake is of special interest. Owing to a reference to the city Anah of Suhi in one of the letters and the similarity in script and grammar it shares with the namburbi, scholars have dated both to 840-38 B.C.E. While Bâtiment III was probably dedicated to some Semitic deity or pantheon as the chief goddess of Hamath during the ninth century was Pahalatis, Semitic ba'ālat, the cuneiform texts indicate that under Assyrian stimulus, Mesopotamian divination was practiced alongside the local religion, so Holloway 1991:248-52.

Assyrian gods and the royal statue were placed in the palace(?) at Gaza. The southernmost province established by Tiglath-pileser II was Du'ru. Gaza was never made a provincial state. 368

On the other hand, the region of the Sealands was a provincial state and Sargon exacted regular annual tribute from the Hindaru tribe for the support of the cults of the Babylonian Bel and Nabû. 369 In a depiction of a banquet prepared by Sargon during his eighth campaign in honor of his Mannaean vassal Ullusunu, the images(?) of Aššur and the Mannaean gods are present. 370

In Esarhaddon's vassal treaties, the vassal is required to "fear Aššur, your god (ilkunu)" and to guard the image (šalam) of Aššur, the king, the crown prince as well as their seals accompanying the treaty tablets. 371 In his second Egyptian campaign, Esarhaddon appointed officials over his new territories and established regular offerings for Aššur. 372

For their rebellion, Assurbanipal punished the Arameans of the Sealands by appointing officials over them, demanding of them

368 Spieckermann 1982:325-28. He cited the transcription in M. Weippert's 1971 Eberhard-Karls-Universität zu Tübingen dissertation, p. 490, 11.9'-11'. That the location was the palace is not certain as this is a partial restoration . . . i]na qereb ē.[gal ša uru. hazziti . . .] "... i]n the midst of the pa[lace of Gaza . . ]."


regular offerings to Aššur, Mulissu (a non-Babylonian god), and the great gods of Assyria, and by exacting tax and tribute.³⁷³

Spieckermann continued his survey with two data crucial to his thesis, Esarhaddon's Nahr el-Kelb and Zinjirli inscriptions. The first documents the seizure of the deities of Taharka as booty during the 671 campaign against Memphis while the second which recounts the events of the same expedition states that regular offerings for the god Aššur were imposed on the Egyptians.

In other words, the Assyrians not only deported local national gods, but also introduced the worship of Aššur. On the basis of this example and the laconic nature of Assyrian historiography typical of the royal annals, the author concluded that such acts were indicative of Assyrian routine policy.³⁷⁴ Moreover, he noted that several of the above practices have points of contact with religious observances in Judah prior to the reign of Manasseh. The author concluded that Assyria began to impose its official religion on Judah prior to Manasseh's reign and that Judah held the status of vassal as early as Ahaz's day.³⁷⁵


³⁷⁴ Spieckermann 1982:351-52. Nevertheless, Tiglath-pileser III only imposed his gods on Gaza, mention of his taking the local gods as booty is never made. In view of the archeological record which suggests that Iron Age religion in Palestine, whether one has in view Israel, Judah or some other national entity, comprised a cult of many gods until after the exile, cf. Weippert 1988:620-31, it is better to view these practices not as strict policy.

In another instance, after having an inscription describing the might of Aššur and his own name etched on Arabian divine statues captured some twelve years earlier by Sennacherib, Esarhaddon released them to the penitent Arabian king Hazail. No doubt, the statues would serve thereafter to focus attention in the local cult on the Assyrian god. The author pointed out that the territory of the Arabs never obtained the status of province, rather it remained a vassaldom.\textsuperscript{376}

For Spieckermann, the evidence establishes the lack of distinction between provinces and vassals in the matter of Assyrian cultic interference. In addition to their political and economic obligations, reverence for the gods of Assyria was demanded of both.\textsuperscript{377}

While Spieckermann has ably defended the view that the Assyrians did in fact impose their religion upon vassal states, on two important points we must take issue with his thesis. First, his reliance upon the redaction-critical methods of Veijola and Dietrich allows him to dismiss elements in the reform

\textsuperscript{376}Spieckermann 1982:355-57. Cogan 1974:35-37 minimized the importance of the Assyrian inscriptions on these statues. However, it is clear that this practice stands as an example of Assyrian cultic intervention in the case of a vassal. Therefore not only does it severely undermine Cogan's explanation that Assyrian kings returned statues simply as a gesture of good will and that from the vassal's perspective the statue retained only historical and sentimental value (pp.30-34), but it contradicts his general thesis as well.

\textsuperscript{377}Spieckermann 1982:369-71.
accounts that do not easily lend themselves to Mesopotamian attachments.\textsuperscript{378}

Secondly, Spieckermann’s evidence for the imposition of Assyrian religion in periods earlier than the reign of Manasseh is, at best, circumstantial. The fact that Ahaz’s altar in 2 Kgs. 16:10-16 has perennially posed an enigma for would-be interpreters is indicative of the great degree of ambiguity accompanying this datum, so much so, that many commentators have been able to offer equally compelling arguments in support of the non-Assyrian nature of Ahaz’s altar (see below).\textsuperscript{379}

Even if we were to grant an Assyrian origin, the context could make equal allowance for Ahaz’s voluntary acceptance of selected Assyrian forms, and not the imposition of the official Assyrian cult. In fact, it is our contention that Ahaz became the ruler of an Assyrian satellite state by willful submission. As such, he was able to avoid the heavy-handed Assyrian administrative policy of forcing its official religion upon vassals who resisted her sovereignty.\textsuperscript{380}

\textsuperscript{378}For example, by attributing Manasseh’s association with child sacrifice to a later dtr layer, Spieckermann 1982:165 avoids having to decide whether the mlk-sacrifice is Canaanite or Arameo-Assyrian in origin and whether or not Manasseh observed this rite as an act of loyalty to Assyria.


\textsuperscript{380}We follow Miller and Hayes 1986:346.
Based on what we know of Assyrian administrative policy, conquered kings and their principalities could be placed on one of three rungs of the geo-political ladder: a satellite, a vassal, or a province. Having voluntarily submitted to Assyrian rule, satellite states experienced little Assyrian intervention in the social, religious, and administrative life so long as political and economic obligations such as providing labor, tribute, military personnel, were fulfilled.

Vassal states comprised lands conquered for refusing to submit or showing disloyalty and involved greater Assyrian control of political and economic life including appointed Assyrian officials alongside local dynasts and sworn allegiance as expressed in vassal treaties.

Provinces consisted of rebellious states crushed by Assyria and placed under the rule of a military governor. Various elements of the population were deported and settled elsewhere and new settlers were brought into the province. This system was neither rigidly followed nor consistently applied. 381

Several factors point first to Ahaz's original independent status, secondly to his subsequent voluntary submission to Assyrian sovereignty, and thirdly, to his position as ruler over a satellite state, not a vassal state. 382 It should be noted that

381 So Miller and Hayes 1986:320-22 and cf. Donner 1977:418-21,427,432. As an example of how this system functioned, Israel (i.e., the northern kingdom) made the transition from satellite (738 B.C.E.) to vassal (732 B.C.E.) to province (722 B.C.E.) in just a few short years. Perčírková 1987:162-75 offered a helpful outline of the generally recognized two tiered system of vassal and province.

382 Following Miller and Hayes 1986:341-46.
prior to the sequence of events depicted in 2 Kgs. 16:7-9, Ahaz had never previously submitted to Assyrian sovereignty.

Secondly, the fact that Ahaz was bordered by both members of the opposing coalition makes it highly unlikely that he could have succeeded in sending messengers ladened with a gift to Tiglath-pileser III while his enemies, with which Judah had been at war since the days of Ahaz's father Jotham (cf. 15:37), remained at large.

In other words, Ahaz probably sent his gift after Tiglath-pileser had conquered Damascus in 732 B.C.E. and not before, and his payment was a response to the Assyrian king's presence in the region, not its motivation. The Assyrian eponym lists report that Tiglath-pileser III campaigned in Philistia in 734 B.C.E. and in Damascus in 733/2 B.C.E. The dtr writer connects Ahaz's gift with the latter (16:9, cf. 2 Chr. 28:20-21), while the former goes unmentioned in the Hebrew Bible.

Undoubtedly, Ahaz could not expect Assyrian protection from the Israelite-Syrian coalition of Pekah and Rezin prior to his becoming an Assyrian satellite. But this hardly justifies the dtr attempt to make the Assyrian king out as an opportunistic mercenary roaming the region in search of a "bribe" šōḥad, cf. 16:8. Moreover, both 2 Chr. 28:21 and an Assyrian royal

---

383 Luckenbill 1927:436.

384 McKay 1973:6 viewed Ahaz's vassalship as initiated by the request of Tiglath-pileser III as he preferred 2 Chr. 28:20-21 over 2 Kgs. 16:7, but the Chronicler's account is unreliable, see below.

385 On the term "bribe" šōḥad in 2 Kgs. 16:8, cf. Cogan and Tadmor 1988:188. The related phrase "your servant and son" in 16:7 is likewise the creation of the dtr writer, so Cogan and
inscription of Tiglath-pileser III describe the gift of Ahaz as a tribute, not a bribe. 386

It appears that the dtr writer has telescoped the events and altered them in order to make Ahaz out as a villain. 387 By way of summary then, our reconstruction is as follows: Ahaz ruled an independent kingdom prior to the Assyrian campaign against Damascus in 732 B.C.E. At that time, he voluntarily submitted to Assyrian sovereignty, paid his expected tribute, and called upon his new overlord to provide protection from the coalition.

As mentioned above, other scholars have offered non-Assyrian origins for the altar, notably Syrian or, less preferably, Phoenician. 388 The Syrian interpretation is based on the argument that Assyrians did not offer burnt offerings and 2 Chr. 28:23 which states that Ahaz worshipped Syrian gods. However, the "brazier" kanûnu was commonly used in Neo-Assyrian temple worship and ritual and served to immolate animal sacrifices by fire. 389 Sheep were burned on a brazier before the god Aššur. 390 Other gods probably had their own braziers. 391


386 ANET 282.

387 Thus, the events of 2 Kgs 16:5-6 cannot be read as immediately preceding those of 2 Kgs 16:7-9. On this Tendenz of the dtr writer here, see Jones 1984:532,536.


389 Cf. kinûnu in CAD 8(1971):393-95, Neo-Assyrian kanûnu.

390 So Menzel 1981:T 33 6'-10' and cf. T 35 VII 44'-48' which attest to other uses of a kanûnu with cooked meat in the Aššur temple.
Adad-nirari III commands the people of Guzana (Tell Halaf) to make a burnt offering (ma-ag-lu-a-te qu-lu-a) to the god Adad. This suggests that an Assyrian king might not only make concession for local custom but he might actually endorse it on occasion. If we assume for the moment that Ahaz had constructed an Assyrian style altar, burnt offerings could have been condoned if not encouraged by Tiglath-pileser III.

In 28:23b, the Chronicler cites as the motivation for Ahaz's worship of Syrian gods "because they helped them (the Syrians), I will sacrifice to them (the Syrian gods) so they will help me". But this can hardly be a logical deduction from 2 Kgs. 16:9, for the Syrian gods had been defeated previously by those of the Assyrians and Ahaz first saw the altar in Damascus only after the Assyrians had conquered the capital of his Syrian enemies.

Moreover, as stated previously, 2 Kgs. 15:37 depicts Judah at war with the Syrians since at least the days of Ahaz's father, Jotham. It is worthy of note that this passage gives no indication that the Syrian gods gained the victory in their battle against the god(s) of Judah. So then, what could possibly have motivated Ahaz to worship the gods of his perpetual foes as assumed by the Chronicler? Simply put, according to the

---

393 2 Chr. 27:1-9 omits the war with Rezin and Pekah entirely and adds the account of Jotham's victory over the Ammonites. The unavoidable inferences is that according to the Chronicler, Jotham's god(s) brought him success.
DtrH, there was no occasion for Ahaz to esteem the Syrian gods as worthy of his devotion.

There are additional indicators that suggest that the ChrH account is independent of the DtrH tradition. Ahaz's worship of Syrian gods in 2 Chr. 28:23 stands in direct conflict with 2 Kgs. 16:13,15 where it is assumed that Ahaz offers sacrifices wholly compatible with the Yahwistic cult. The conclusion usually drawn is that the Chronicler has intensified Ahaz's apostasy in an attempt to align the apostasy of Judah with that of Israel at the time of the schism (cf. 2 Chr. 13:8-9). So it is doubtful that he records reliable historical information.

Of course, one could argue that, owing to the fact that the DtrH and the ChrH both view Ahaz as a rampant "syncretist", together they presuppose what was originally a favorable tradition in which Ahaz was a king who simply embraced a wider range of religious forms than that of the later dtr ideology.

394 This latter point has been frequently inferred from the type of sacrifices described in 16:13,15.


396 Cf. Spieckermann 1982:362-69. The new altar was reserved for the gods of Assyria, while the small bronze altar was moved aside and reserved for continued Yahweh worship (cf. 1 Kgs. 8:64). Ezek. 9:2 might offer historical confirmation of Ahaz' altar reform and the silence in 1 Kgs. 7 might reflect the historiographer's disdain for the use to which this altar was put in the divided monarchy. Ahaz pleased both his Assyrian overlord as well as the faithful Yahweh worshippers like Uriah the priest (2 Kgs. 16:10; Isa. 8:2). This also explains why the altar went
In other words, what the dtr writer condemned as Ahaz's propensity for syncretism, was more likely his embrace of traditional Yahwism, albeit an eclectic form. Be that as it may, Ahaz was not forced into vassalship, so he would not have been required to establish a local version of the official Assyrian cult to the eradication of his existing cult. At most, he might have incorporated into his cult certain aspects of Assyrian religion.

That at least some Assyrian religious forms found their way into the temple in Judah at this time finds added support in 16:17-18. These verses outline several alterations to the temple made by Ahaz. The emendation of hēsēb "to turn about" in v.18 to hēsir "to remove" with reference to "the cast-metal seat(?)" mūsak haṣḥabbā'1 and "the king's outer entrance" mēbō' hammelek ḥaḥiṣōnāh is motivated by the desire to see in these verses a collection of metal for the payment of tribute to the Assyrian king rather than an Assyrian religious innovation introduced by Ahaz. 398

However, the verb hēsēb makes good sense left unchanged and depicts only the repositioning of the cast-metal seat and may point to Ahaz's willingness to incorporate new elements from the Assyrian cult alongside those of his current cult. In any case, there is no hint here that the items were given to the Assyrian uncondemned in the dtr ideology. If the deities identified with these altars were reversed, then lēbaqqēr "to consult" in 16:15b might signify (Assyrian) divinatory rites.

398 Cf. e.g. Jones 1984:541-42.
king as tribute and 2 Chr. 28:21 cannot be cited in support of
the use of the items in 2 Kgs. 16:17-18 as tribute payment, for
it parallels 2 Kgs. 16:7-10a and a more fitting parallel to 2
Kgs. 16:17-18 can be found in 2 Chr. 28:24a.399

The tribute interpretation has given rise to the additional
unwarranted speculation that the Sea of 16:17 (hayyam; JPS
"tank") was moved so that Ahaz could use the material from the
bronze oxen under it as tribute (cf. 1 Kgs. 7:25).400 But the
relocation of the Sea might have been motivated by the need to
reposition it in order to make room for Assyrian additions to the
cult.

Our reconstruction results in the following rendition of
the final clause of v.18 mipp' nē melek 'aššûr as "in deference to
the king of Assyria". It does not infer that the bronze oxen were
removed because of the pressure to find tribute money, for it
comes at the wrong point in the narrative. Rather, as it stands
it conveys Ahaz's willful submission to the Assyrian king on
matters of religious concern. Therefore, there is no need for the
radical proposal of placing this clause immediately following
v.17.401

399 Cf. the use of qāṣaq "cut off, take away" in both
accounts. 2 Chr. 28:24a comprises a summary of 2 Kgs. 16:17-18
as the phrase "furnishings of the house of God" k' lē bēt-
hā'ēlōhîm covers the various items listed in the 2 Kgs. 16:17-18
account.

400 Cf. e.g., Jones 1984:541 and Cogan and Tadmor 1988:193.

Sanda 1912:203-05. Olmstead 1931:452 went so far as to render the
final phrase in v.31 as "from before the face of the king of
Assyria" and took it to be a reference to a statue of the
Assyrian king erected in the temple.
Having reviewed what we believe to be convincing arguments for the DtrH's portrayal of Assyrian religious influence for the periods immediately prior to the time of Manasseh⁴⁰², we nevertheless conclude that the evidence remains ambiguous with regard to Assyrian cultic imposition on Ahaz. Whether one speaks of voluntary adoption or imperial imposition, either scenario could potentially confirm the traditions reflected in Isa. 8:19 and 29:4, namely that like Assyrian religion more generally, necromancy had taken hold in Judah prior to Manasseh's reign.

Given this possibility and the references in Isa. 8:19 and 29:4, one might argue that the DtrH account intended to depict Manasseh as the first Judahite king to embrace necromancy. In other words, it circulated in Judah in Ahaz's day only on the "popular" level. But it is difficult to accept the notion that, had necromancy flourished in the reign of Ahaz, he would not have incorporated it into his official cult, for even on the dtr ideology's own count, Ahaz evinced rampant "syncretistic" tendencies.

Furthermore, had it been embraced both on the popular and official levels in Ahaz's day, it is most unlikely that the dtr polemic against Ahaz would have left necromancy unscathed.

⁴⁰²Xella 1980:151-60 has pointed to further evidence for Judean familiarity with Assyrian religion prior to Manasseh. In the dtr account of the encounter between Hezekiah's defenders of Jerusalem and the Assyrian official, the Rabshakeh, the Judeans are warned that they will be forced "to eat their own dung and drink their own urine" 2 Kgs. 18:27//Isa. 36:12, an allusion to the tragic destiny which awaited them in the netherworld where they would be forced to consume their own bodily wastes according to Mesopotamian belief. Others take this to refer to the Judeans as having to consume their own bodily wastes in the desperate hope of holding out against the Assyrian siege.
Lastly, had necromancy been introduced as an element in Ahaz's cult and had it continued into Hezekiah's reign, one would have expected its mention in Hezekiah's reform notwithstanding its theologically programmatic nature.403

Lastly, if necromancy had been present on Israelite soil during the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah as suggested by the contexts of Isa. 8:19 and 29:4, the likelihood of its incorporation in the apostasy of Ahaz and/or the reform of Hezekiah is further underscored by the dtr insertion banning necromancy in the law of Moses at Deut. 18:10-11. This redactional piece would have established the needed literary-ideological precedent for the integration of necromancy into the apostasy and reform accounts of Manasseh's immediate predecessors.

The potential which such a redactional addition might offer as a literary-ideological device was astutely observed by the post-dtr hand which added 1 Sam. 28:3-25 to the DtrH (and cf. 1 Chr. 10:13). His addition not only bolstered the dtr polemic by giving it greater antiquity, but more specifically, it established necromancy as the litmus test for the fidelity of Israel's kings to (what was in fact the later dtr brand of) Yahwism. In Saul's case, the failure to avoid it resulted in the 'death' of the nation's first royal house.

Therefore, we can safely conclude that, had the dtr tradition been aware of necromancy's presence in Israel before

403 In isolation, this is not as strong an argument, for child sacrifice was practiced by Ahaz in the DtrH (16:3), but it escaped mention in Hezekiah's reform, on which see Heider 1985:288.
Manasseh's reign, this tradition would surely have been integrated into the DtrH’s evaluation of his predecessors. Furthermore, that the dtr ideology would have been cognizant of such a tradition had it actually existed is supported by its first hand acquaintance with traditions preserved in first Isaiah. In other words, if the tradition of pre-Manasseh Israelite necromancy reflected in Isa. 8:19 and 29:4, was authentically Isaianic, the dtr ideology would have accessed it for its potential polemical impact. 404

Several additional lines of evidence favor the tradition reflected in the DtrH and ChrH over against that posited in Isa. 8:19 and 29:4. That is to say, Manasseh’s reign, rather than the administration of Ahaz, provided the probable context for Israel’s adoption of Assyrian necromancy. It is our contention that in Ahaz’s reign, Judah voluntarily submitted to Assyrian rule, became a satellite, and paid the expected tribute (2 Kgs. 16:7–10a; 2 Chr. 28:21). 405

Following Hezekiah’s revolt however, Judah lost its status as a satellite and was reduced to the level of a vassal state (701 B.C.E.). Based on what details we know concerning Assyrian policy toward vassals, this would have entailed greater Assyrian control of Judah’s political, economic, and religious life. In

404 As exemplified in the dtr redaction of first Isaiah, cf. 4.1. and 4.3.2.–6.

405 Cf. ANET 282, a clay tablet inscription of Tiglath-pileser III where Ahaz is listed as having paid tribute to Assyria, an act expected, in one form or another, of satellites, vassals, and provinces alike, so Miller and Hayes 1986:320–22.
other words, more pervasive Assyrian religious influence is what we could expect of Judahite religion after Hezekiah's revolt but not earlier.

The Assyrian royal inscriptions verify Manasseh's status as a vassal (cf. also 2 Chr. 33:10-13).406 In one instance, he and twenty-one other vassal kings of the West were required to transport timber and stone colossi from Lebanon to Nineveh for Esarhaddon's royal storehouse.407 On another occasion, these same kings were required to help build Port Esarhaddon on the site of the destroyed city of Sidon.408 Ten years later, Manasseh and others was required to provide troops for Ashurbanipal's campaign against Egypt.409

Whereas Ahaz had voluntarily submitted to Assyrian control and became a satellite, Manasseh came to the throne following a major rebellion. In the days of Ahaz, Assyrian power was relatively unthreatened by developments in the region whereas in Manasseh's day, anti-Assyrian sentiment was widespread.

Moreover, Manasseh seems to have been hand picked by the Assyrians. His age at accession suggests that older siblings had been passed over and that the Assyrians were running the government initially. During this time, there appears to have been an extensive Assyrian presence in the region (cf. Isa.

406 In the royal inscriptions, we find the mention of, "Manasseh, king of the land of Judah" Menasi/Minsi šar māt Iaudi, cf. now Cogan and Tadmor 1988:265,339.

407 Cf. ANET®, 291, Prism B of Esarhaddon.

408 Cf. ANET®, 290b, Prism A of Esarhaddon.

409 Cf. ANET®, 294, the Rassam Prism and Prism C of Ashurbanipal.
28:11-13; 33:19). We know that Assyrian troops were stationed in the region (at Tell Jemmeh/Gemme) to protect the southern borders from invasion by the Ethiopian leadership in Egypt. Lastly, it was the policy of Sennacherib's successor, Esarhaddon, to require his subjects to swear an oath of allegiance to the Assyrian god Aššur in hopes of minimizing political infidelity.\footnote{\textit{Cf. ANET} 534-41, esp. 538, the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon.}

With this historical background as a starting point, critics have interpreted various elements in Manasseh's official cult as Assyrian in origin. The deities Baal and Asherah of 21:3,7 have been viewed as West Semitic versions of Mesopotamian deities, Aššur and Ishtar respectively. Based on 23:5,12, the Host of Heaven mentioned in 21:3,5 has been taken to refer to the Mesopotamian astral cult, the Sun = haššemeš = 𒊣Šamaš, the Moon = hayyārešaḫ = 𒊣Sīn, and the Constellation = mazzālōt < manzalātu /mazzalātu. Lastly, the child sacrifice of 21:6 has been interpreted as an adaptation of a Mesopotamian cult (cf. also 16:3 and 17:31).

Moreover, numerous practices attributed to Manasseh but mentioned only in Josiah's subsequent reform have been identified as Assyrian in origin. In 23:5, "the idolatrous priests", hakkēmarīm have been equated with the kumru priests of cuneiform documents. "The (male?) prostitutes" haqqēdēšīm of 23:7 have been cited as evidence for the introduction of an Assyrian version of hierodule (cf. Akk. ḫarīmtu).

In 23:8b, "the high places by the gates" bāmōt haššēqārim have been emended to "the high places of the goat demons" bāmōt...
haṣṣēcīrīm and seen as evidence for the presence of Assyrian rituals intended to propitiate malevolent ghosts (cf. Lev. 17:7; 2 Chr. 11:15; Isa. 13:21, 34:14). The "horses . . . and chariots dedicated to the sun" haṣṣūṣīm . . . markēk ḫōt laššemēš in 23:11 have been interpreted as Assyrian introductions.411 Lastly, the "rooftop altars" hammizbē ḫōt 'āšer 'al-haggāq of 23:12 have extensive parallels in contemporary Assyrian religion.412

While it is difficult to establish with certainty the interpretationes canaanicae of the Assyrian deities proposed for the apostasy and reform accounts, the reference to the goddess Asherah illustrates the feasibility of this approach.413 The argument that the asherah in inscriptive sources and in the book of Judges do not represent the Canaanite goddess Asherah of

411 Taylor 1987:16-18 and 1988:561-64 has recently identified the four-legged animal immediately below the solar-disk on the top register of the cult stand from Taanach as a horse and connected it with the horses of the sun in 23:11. Others have identified the animal as a bull, cf., e.g. Smith 1990:116. The date of the cult stand and the identity of its makers and the inhabitants of Taanach remain problematic, cf. Smith 1990:19-20. In any case, Smith 1990:115-21, while acknowledging the absence of an indigenous sun cult, is in error in his facile dismissal of possible Assyrian influence in the solar cult reflected in 2 Kgs. 23:11 solely on the grounds that "the notion that Neo-Assyrian rulers imposed their religious practices on their Levantine subjects has been discredited" (p.117 and n.17 citing McKay 1973 and Cogan 1974).


413 In this regard, the reconstruction of Delcor 1981:91-123 might be a more realistic reconstruction. Although one might challenge specific points of his proposal such as his tendency to view Assyrian influence as mediated through Aramean religion, he argued for more than one foreign provenance for the elements listed in Josiah's reform: Mesopotamian, Moabite, Ammonite, and Phoenician elements. Where Assyrian religion was imposed, it existed alongside the local religions (pp.95-104).
the first millennium but instead refer to her symbol and, by secondary association, to other goddesses such as Ashtarte has recently been defended.  

While we would agree in principle that the dtr tradition had a marked tendency for rhetorical polemic in its use of the term asherah, we do not accept the suggestion that asherah in 2 Kgs. 21:7 and 23:4,6,7, is not a goddess. That a deity is most likely referred to is supported by the mention of the *pesel* "image/idol" of Asherah in 21:7 and the clustering of "the Baals, the Asherah, and the Host of Heaven" in 23:4. The first and third are clearly deities (with perhaps implied Assyrian analogies) and so we would expect the second to signify the same. That the asherah received "clothes(?)" *bāṭtīm* (23:7) and was removed (23:6) comports with the likelihood that the image of the goddess is involved. Her image was erected in the temple in 21:7 and removed in 23:6.

What we would argue is that these references to asherah in which a deity is involved are not to be understood as historically reliable references to the goddess known by that name, but as a "Canaanite interpretation" of a foreign deity. In 1 Kgs. 18:19 where the term asherah occurs, an historically reliable reference to the goddess Asherah is unlikely. She is never attested in any Tyrian text or anywhere in coastal Phoenicia during the Iron Age. It is possible that the dtr tradition has Phoenician Ashtarte in mind as a threat to northern Israel in the ninth century or to Yahwistic religion of the late

---

monarchy or exile. In our view, the term asherah, in addition to its identity as a cultic symbol, was on occasion employed as a theologically programmatic term for (the cults of) foreign goddesses. We would follow Spieckermann and others and argue that Asherah refers to Ishtar in 2 Kgs. 21:7 and 23:4,6,7 as we can eliminate Ashtarte for she is mentioned independently in 23:13.

In any case, while all of the above indications of Assyrian influence are not equally convincing, the cumulative effect is one which presents a compelling argument for the presence of Mesopotamian religion in Israel appropriated not before the reign of Manasseh and as late as the dtr writer's own day. Another Assyrian mortuary custom introduced into Judah not before the time of Manasseh and as late as the time of the Chronicler is the funerary custom of "making a fire" šárap šērēpāh in honor of a recently deceased king mentioned in 2 Chr. 16:14 (Asa), 21:19 (Jehoram), and Jer. 34:5 (Zedekiah) reflects an adaptation of a royal Assyrian practice first attested in the royal correspondence from the reigns of Esarhaddon and his son Ashurbanipal, the contemporaries of Manasseh. Its non-mention in the DtrH is curious but readily explainable. Either the exilic writer of the DtrH knew nothing of it or, more likely, had he known of its Assyrian origins, he avoided mention of it. Any non-critical reference in the DtrH to a mortuary practice of Assyrian origin which might have had widespread acceptance in former days among Israelites could undermine his polemic in spite of the

---


possibility that it posed no direct obstacle to the later dtr interpretation of true Yahwism.

The royal funerary fire had apparently lost any traces of its foreign attachments by the post-exilic period, for the Chronicler projected it back into the accounts of Judah's earlier kings as a positive criterion for evaluating their reigns, from the time of Asa onwards. 2 Chr. 16:14 makes no mention of the observance of this practice before Asa while 2 Chr. 21:19 assumes that it was observed in honor of Jehoram's predecessors, that is "his fathers". The author of Jeremiah likewise viewed the royal funerary fire as a royal Judahite tradition rather than a foreign practice. This is clear from the reference in the Zedekiah account to making the fire for "your (Zedekiah's) fathers, the former kings who preceded you".

The Mesopotamian record and the biblical account together point not only to Israel's adoption of an Assyrian death related rite in the time of Manasseh, they also confirm the Tendenz of Israelite writers and in particular the dtr tradition to add to the accounts of earlier kings practices attested or known to be popular only in later periods.417

417 The burial of Judahite kings in gardens such as Manasseh (2 Kgs. 21:18), Amon (21:26), and Josiah (2 Chr. 35:24?) might reflect an acquaintance with the elaborate royal gardens erected by Neo-Assyrian kings (kirû, kirmāḫu, and ambassu and cf. Wiseman 1983:137-44) on the part of the royal court and/or the dtr tradition. A similar familiarity might be reflected in the dtr tradition's account of Absalom's pillar (massebet) erected in his lifetime as a memorial. Such stelae established in memory of Neo-Assyrian kings are well attested. It should be stressed however, that only the invocation of the name is mentioned in 2 Sam. 18:18 baṣ̄ûr hazkîr šēmî. In other words, geneonymy is in view, not ancestor worship or veneration, contra Lewis 1989:118-20.

365
4.5.3. SUMMARY

The preceding arguments provide a compelling interpretative context for enhancing the likelihood of Assyrian influence vis-à-vis necromancy in Judah either during or after Manasseh's reign. As stated previously, the rise in popularity of divination among late Assyrian kings, the preponderance of references to Mesopotamian necromancy from the Neo-Assyrian period onwards, the political domination of Judah by the Mesopotamian imperial states of Assyria and Babylonia in the mid first millennium, and the likelihood of Assyrian influence on the religious life of Judah whether by means of willful adoption or imperial imposition support our thesis that necromancy and the belief in the beneficent dead were introduced into Israelite religion from Mesopotamia during the mid to late first millennium. This finds further support from the argument e silentio that with the exception of the biblical references, necromancy remains otherwise unattested in Syro-Palestinian texts or, more precisely, in Canaanite-Israelite religion and magic.

Having said all this, it must be conceded that, while Manasseh's reign provides the most probable pre-exilic context for the introduction of Assyrian religion, there remains the possibility that necromancy's portrayed arrival on Israelite soil during this period comprises an idealization of the concerns of the dtr tradition's own day. That is to say, in the matter of the belief in the beneficent dead, these traditions represent, not so much reliable historical recollections, as artificial literary
compositions in which current ideological issues have been projected into the reconstructed past.

In fact, an artificial literary nature for the whole of the DtrH has been recently proposed by Hoffmann. He has argued that the theme of cultic reform is basic to the entire DtrH from pre-monarchic to monarchic times. The dtr religious concerns stand out and are presented most fully in Josiah's reform which in Hoffmann's assessment has very little basis in fact.

All the elements of the reform theme are brought together here and read back into the earlier reform accounts. The accounts throughout the DtrH are characteristic dtr compositions and the vocabulary is typical rather than specific and singular, the details giving only historic verisimilitude to the accounts. In each instance there is little reflection of an actual cult reform.


In summary, Hoffmann has attempted to defend Moth's theory of the single authorship of DtrH and thereby its essential

literary unity. Thus, for him the DtrH can no longer be considered the product of multiple redactions. Nevertheless, we must underscore one qualification to the above synthesis. In his composition of the DtrH, the writer was not working purely on the basis of his ideological and literary theme of cultic reform. Even the dtr polemic which resulted in the distortion of the traditional Yahwistic religion of Ahaz and Manasseh and the radical innovative tendencies of Hezekiah and Josiah presupposes at least a general knowledge of the late pre-exilic period. In all likelihood, the dtr writer exercised some degree of acquaintance with this period in order for his polemic to reflect the semblance of actuality which it does. On the other hand, his knowledge of earlier periods or, more accurately, the lack thereof, is another matter all together.

In a treatise on illegitimate and legitimate forms of revelation with its emphasis on the exclusive authority of

419 This severely qualifies the usefulness of the treatments of the relevant biblical passages offered by Spieckermann 1982, Foresti 1984, and Tropper 1989 as they presuppose multiple redactions of DtrH.

420 This is acknowledged by Hoffmann. While the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah are considered literary fiction by Hoffmann 1980:155,268-69, the "anti-reform" accounts of Ahaz and Manasseh contain genuine pre-exilic backgrounds and were motivated by Assyrian influence despite the presence of their theologically programmatic catalogues of tendentious sins (pp.144,164-66). Donner 1986:330-34 agrees as to the fictionality of Hezekiah's reform, is more skeptical about the Ahaz and Manasseh accounts but he tends toward attributing greater reliability to the Josianic reform. Würthwein 1984:389-90, 445-46, 459-60 views the Ahaz, Manasseh, and Josiah accounts as reliable attestations of cultic impact of Assyria, but views Hezekiah's reform as a late recasting of anti-Assyrian measures.

421 Cf. similarly, Mayes 1983:12. The issue here is one of degree.
Yahweh's prophets as the true source of knowledge, the dtr tradition inserted a condemnation of necromancy at Deut. 18:10-11. This added authority to the dtr polemic against Manasseh as it now had as its precedent the law of Moses. Its location here also broadened the extent of necromancy's pervasiveness. It was now depicted as having been observed by the various peoples of the land in former days (and by application those in his own day) whom he rhetorically identified as "the Canaanite".

1 Sam. 28:3-25 was added to the DtrH by a post-dtr hand and retained in the ChrH at 1 Chr. 10:13 for similar reasons as those resulting in the addition of Deut. 18:10-11. While the redactional character of 1 Chr. 10:13 has been repeatedly defended by critics, unless the post-dtr addition of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 was added to the DtrH after the final composition of the ChrH, it would be extremely difficult to accept the notion that the Chronicler would have overlooked Saul's sin of consulting a necromancer, a tradition by now present in the DtrH, for it could be argued that the sin of necromancy is what made Manasseh's apostasy more heinous than any of the kings of Judah before him and equal to that of king Saul.422

Besides broadening necromancy's pervasiveness so as to include the Canaanites, the post-dtr addition 1 Sam. 28:3-25 resulted in the placement of necromancy in the formative period of Israel's monarchy. As such, it served as the "historical" precedent for Manasseh's violation of the Mosaic law in (dtr)

Deut. 18:10-11. Thus, with the post-dtr addition 1 Sam. 28:3-25 added alongside the dtr texts of 2 Kgs. 21:6 and 23:24, the DtrH opens and closes the history of Israelite kingship with the tragic sin of necromancy. In the dtr perspective, the illicit belief in the supernatural beneficence of the dead had, in the hearts of the nation's monarchs, supplanted faith in Yahweh's word as spoken by his prophets.

According to the DtrH, Saul's observance of this practice resulted in the downfall of Israel's first monarchy. Its reoccurrence in Manasseh's reign foreshadowed the downfall of its second. With the addition of 1 Sam. 28:3-25, the deeds of Manasseh are prefigured in those of Saul. Moreover, the deeds of Josiah have their antecedents in those of David.\(^{23}\) Lastly, as the compositional analysis of both the DtrH traditions and Isaiah 8:19, 19:3, 29:4 reveals, necromancy's insertion in Isaianic oracles set in pre-Manasseh contexts is an artificial literary construct. In an attempt to characterize the days of Ahaz as ill-fated as those of Saul and Manasseh, the post-dtr tradition projected Assyrian necromancy back into Israel's earlier history and attributed its condemnation to the great prophet Isaiah. As a result it also further expanded the foreign horizons of this conspicuous abomination so as to include the likes of Egypt.

As a final note, we should say something concerning the major difference in the accounts in the DtrH and ChrH. While the Manasseh reference of 2 Kgs. 21:6 also occurs in the ChrH, 2 Chr. 370

\(^{23}\)For the writer of the ChrH, a similar thematic connection obtains, Saul's consultation of the necromancer is paradigmatic for the exile or Manasseh's reign and David's rule, for the restoration of Josiah's reign.
33:6, the reference to necromancy in Josiah's reform (2 Kgs. 23:24 + vv.25-27) has no parallel in the Chronicler's account. This suggests either that it was not original to the Chronicler's Vorlage (cf. MT 2 Chr. 35:19 + v.20 = MT 2 Kgs. 23:23 + v.28) or that he omitted it.

It is mentioned in LXX 2 Kgs. 23:24 (IV Reigns) and LXX 2 Chr. 35:19 (= Paralipomena). It may also appear in summary fashion in the paraphrase of 1 Esdr. 1:21-22. These no doubt shared the same Hebrew Vorlage of MT 2 Kgs. 21:6. As it stands, either of the above explanations for the divergences between the DtrH and ChrH is plausible.

Be that as it may, its absence in the Chronicler's account of Josiah conforms with his rendition of Manasseh in 2 Chr. 33:1-20. In vv.10-20, the Chronicler recounts an otherwise unparalleled story of Manasseh's captivity, repentance, and restoration. In v.15, reference is made to his ridding the land of the "foreign gods" which he had previously introduced. This might allude to his putting away of necromancy, for the ritual

424 That 1 Esdr. 1:21-22 does not preserve an earlier text of Chr. is suggested by its lack of mention of Manasseh, cf. Williamson 1977:16-20.

425 Williamson 1987B:112-13 has argued that the Chronicler's treatment of Manasseh in 2 Chr. 33 is his own composition replete with his own theology and style (e.g., exile and restoration, retribution theology). It conflicts with the Kgs. account and Jer. 15:4 and even 33:22a. Williamson 1982B:242-48, 1987A:9-15 has also argued that the Chronicler's account of Josiah's death, 2 Chr. 35:20-27, was probably drawn from an alternative version of the DtrH.
often involved the invocation of various deities to assist in the conjuration of the spirits of the dead.\textsuperscript{426}

\textsuperscript{426} The subsequent apostasy of Amon in the ChrH only partially contributed to the undoing of Manasseh's reform. He worshipped and sacrificed to the idols (happ'sflm) Manasseh had made (2 Chr. 33:22). He did not reinstate the "foreign gods" (ʿēlōhē hannēḵār) which Manasseh had purged (33:15a), only the image(s?) (hassemel) which he had thrown out (33:15b).
4.6. EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETIC TEXTS

With the exilic and post-exilic prophetic texts, significant developments transpire vis-à-vis Israelite death and ancestor cults. Not only do the frequency of potential references increase, but the variation in the types of associated ritual does as well. This literary corpus makes mention of the bêt marzēah (Jer. 16:5), the burial of kings perhaps with attendant rites (Ezek. 43:7,9), and possible libations and offerings to the dead (Isa. 57:6).

In the case of necromancy, developments are also telling. While this mantic art is attested only once in these texts, its observance takes on a previously unattested form, a rite that approximates what was identified in later antiquity as an incubation rite (Isa. 65:4). Such a rite entails that one sleep in a sacred place in order to obtain a revelation through a dream. In the case at hand, Israelites are depicted as sleeping in graves in the hope that the dead spirits would impart special knowledge about the future.

4.6.1. JEREMIAH 16:5

With the bêt marzēah of Jer. 16:5, we return to the topic of the Israelite version of the marzēah (cf. Amos 6:7 in 4.3.1.). This passage has been cited alongside the pertinent Ugaritic data in support of the theory that for a span of at least two millennia the West Semitic marzēah retained its death cult associations which involved among other observances, licentious behavior and intoxication.
With a perusal of 16:5-9, the question arises whether one or two social gatherings are prohibited, a "sodality devoted to feasts for the dead", as the bet marzeah of v.5 has been described\(^{427}\), and a "wedding feast" bet mišteh in v.8, or only a death cult feast, in which case bet marzeah is to be understood as co-terminus with bet mišteh.\(^{428}\) If the two are synonymous, then the festive nature of the gatherings of the bet marzeah as supposedly attested in the pre-Hellenistic comparative data finds added confirmation via the internal evidence.

In order to come to some reasoned resolution of this crux, it will be necessary to survey what can be confidently said with regard to the structure of the larger pericope, Jer. 16:1-13. Although this passage has been considered a unit, it has been pointed out that 16:1-9 share no vocabulary with 16:10-13.\(^{429}\)

In any case, most commentators view 16:1-9 as comprised of two sections, 16:1-4 and 16:5-9, which share the same vocabulary and purpose. The former contains permanent prohibitions as the negative particle loʾ occurs throughout, while the latter


\(^{428}\) Cf. Porten 1968:180-81; Pope 1977B:216; and Bright 1965:110-11 who viewed these two elements as parallel. Lewis 1989:138-39 equated the bet marzeah of v.5 with the bet mišteh of v.8 by way of an inclusio but completely omitted the crucial v.9 from his treatment.

\(^{429}\) Holladay 1986:467 cited, as a second criterion, the notion that 16:1-9 comprises Kunstprosa or rhythmic prose whereas 16:10-13 does not, but cf. Thompson 1980:401-03 and McKane 1986:363.
contains immediate prohibitions with 'al negating the major verse lines in 16:5 and 8 (and see below). 430

A number of commentators, who assume the essential unity of 16:1-9, view 16:5-9 as a depiction of Jeremiah's proclamation of the divine word given in 16:1-4 in the form of a symbolic action. 431 This gains some support from the change in negative particles, from the lō' of 16:1-4 to the 'al in 16:5-9, the presence of second person plural suffixes in 16:9 lēc ēnēkem ūbimēkem "before your eyes and in your days", and the assumed public announcement of 16:1-9 in 16:10.

Nevertheless, others who advocate extensive dtr redaction in 16:5-9 conclude that the Jeremianic nucleus preserves the historical Jeremiah's adherence to a vow of celibacy. His decision to remain in an unmarried state has been explained as owing to the demands of the prophetic office and/or to the hopelessness of the times. 432

Finally, more recent commentators have viewed 16:5-9, neither as symbolic action nor as Jeremiah's personal practice. Rather, as this exilic passage contains an account of Jeremiah's loneliness, it comprises an artful comparison of the prophet's lifestyle and the fate of the community from which Yahweh has withdrawn his Šālôm. 433


Moving on to the subdivisions of 16:1-9, 16:1-4 comprises Yahweh's exhortation to his prophet Jeremiah to abstain from marriage owing to its procreative potential (16:1-2). The reason outlined is that in the face of impending national disaster, children and parents alike will die an ignominious death. In fact, the destruction will be so devastating that no one will survive to offer the proper burial and mourning rites on their behalf (16:3-4).

An examination of the rhetorical structure of 16:1-9 reveals that two distinct occasions are in view in 16:5-9. As a unit, 16:1-9 contains a repeated twofold structure, three parallel main clauses accompanied by their respective motivational clauses each introduced with the particle ki. Two of these main clauses make up 16:5-9: 16:5a + 16:5b-7; and 16:8 + 16:9.434

A comparison of 16:5-7 and 16:8-9 demonstrates that in vv.5-7, the bet marzēah forms part of a complex of solemn funerary rites, including lamentation (s-p-d) and consolation (n-w-d), whereas in vv.8-9, the bet mištēh is mentioned within the context of a wedding as indicated by the reference to the "bridegroom" ḥārān and the "bride" kallāh. It is further characterized by the sounds of joy and gladness.

In fact, v.9, with its mention of the bridegroom and bride, forms an inclusio with the prohibition against marrying in v.2,

434 For the first instance of this repeated twofold structure, cf. 16:1-2 + 16:3-4.
not with the funerary rites of v.5.\textsuperscript{435} That the \textit{bēt mišteh} is intrinsically associated with marriage and not death can be established by the use of the term \textit{mišteh} in Jud. 10:14,19. Moreover, in Eccl. 7:2, it is contrasted, not compared, with a "house of mourning" \textit{bēt 'ēbel}.

Lest it be wrongly presumed as typical of the \textit{marzēah} assemblies, we should point out that mortuary rites do not appear as regular entries in the handful of references we have of the (bt) \textit{mrzh} of pre-Hellenistic times. The mortuary connection is late and occasional at that. In point of fact, in the isolated instances where such a connection is made, funerary rites are in view, not death cult practices. This is surely the case with Jer. 16:1-9, where we have a veritable catalogue of funerary rites, lamentation (vv.4,5,6) burial (vv.4,6), grief (v.5), gashing (v.6), tonsure (v.6), and the giving of food and drink as consolation (v.7).\textsuperscript{436}

Even the funerary character of the \textit{marzēah} for the time period reflected in Jer. 16:1-9 is controvertible. Following Thiel's general reconstruction of the compositional history of Jer. 16:1-9, Fabry has argued that the \textit{bēt marzēah} in this passage was not originally associated with mourning, but that this perspective was introduced into the text by later redactors.


\textsuperscript{436}Likewise, contrary to commonly held opinion, inebriation cannot be considered a constituent element of the \textit{marzēah} as it is attested only rarely in pre-Hellenistic times.
According to Fabry, 16:1,5,8 comprise the earliest compositional layer. 16:2,6,7 are secondary additions, and 16:3,4,9 as well as vv.10-13 are still later dtr additions.437 This would make בֶּט מַרְצָאherent in v.5a and בֶּט מִשְּׁתָה in v.8 parallel members. In light of the non-death cult attachments of the pre-Hellenistic form of the מַרְצָאherent, they should be understood as synonymous members in a chiastic structure in which v.5b-c ("Do not go to lament or to condole with them . . .") forms the antithetical element interposed in between בֶּט מַרְצָאherent and בֶּט מִשְּׁתָה.438

In the final analysis, even the funerary character of the בֶּט מַרְצָאherent for the time period reflected in Jer. 16:5 depends upon one's position regarding the likelihood or nonlikelihood of dtr redaction in Jeremiah 16:1-9. Admittedly, the theory of a systematic and extensive dtr redaction of Jeremiah as proposed by Thiel has fallen on hard times.439 Nevertheless, a general consensus remains vis-à-vis the linguistic features shared by the book of Jeremiah and the dtr corpus. The debate continues over the significance of these shared elements. In view of both these shared elements and the


438 Fabry 1984:col.15 against Loretz 1982B:87-93, esp pp.88-90. Fabry labelled this structure a doubled antithetic parallelism.

generally acknowledged redactional nature of the book, it is difficult to reject the theory of dtr influence on Jeremiah. The remaining issue to be resolved is one of degree, that is to say, what extent of dtr influence can still be discerned in the production of the book of Jeremiah.440

Our treatment of the extra-biblical materials demonstrated that the pre-Hellenistic marzēah was an association foremost concerned with economic interests, in particular real estate transactions. Its membership consisted of the upper echelons of society which held meetings in a "house" or bt. No direct evidence presents itself for the mortuary connections of the marzēah of pre-Hellenistic times. This in our view gives added support to the redactional nature of Jer. 16:1-9.

That said, we cannot categorically eliminate the possibility that in an isolated instance in earlier periods, the marzēah might have been involved with matters funerary, for social fraternities might seek to acknowledge the death of one of

their illustrious members by a solemn occasion.\textsuperscript{441} It is
nevertheless unwarranted to attach the technical term "house of
mourning" or Trauerhaus to the bêt marzēah in Jer. 16:5.\textsuperscript{442} In
the final analysis, an occasional late funerary association
cannot be the basis for positing a death/ancestor cult connection
for marzēah in much earlier periods.

\subsection*{4.6.2. EZEKIEL 43:7,9}

The phrase pigrē malkēhem in Ezek. 43:7,9 was rendered "the
funerary stelae of their kings" by Albright and understood as a
reference to an Israelite royal ancestor cult.\textsuperscript{443} More recently,
Heider has suggested that the phrase referred to "the pagrū-
offerings to/for your (sic their) malikū", that is to say, animal
sacrifices to/for the royal ancestors.\textsuperscript{444}

\textsuperscript{441}The possibility remains that an earlier occasional
incorporation of funerary rites into the social life of the bt
mrzh like those reflected in Jer. 16:5 might have provided the
stimulus for its more frequent connection with mortuary matters
later via Greek rituals.

\textsuperscript{442}Contra e.g., Schreiner 1981:104.

\textsuperscript{443}Cf. Albright 1957:242-48; 1968:203-06; and 1969:103-04,
following Neiman 1948:72-79 who understood peger as "stele", but
as an implement of idolatry not of the death cult. Neiman cited
Lev. 26:30 "the pigrē of their idols" against the corpse
interpretation. But Lev. 26:30 is simply a poetic extension of
the meaning of the term. Dr. John Day has pointed out in private
communication the similar phrase in Jer. 16:18 "the carcasses of
their detestable idols" niblat šiqqūšēhem. Galling 1959:11,
Neiman's proposal and suggested that the stelae were erected in
memory of the dead, but this is not an argument for veneration or
worship of the dead, but for their commemoration.

\textsuperscript{444}So Heider 1985:393-94 following Talon 1978:57 n.13,69-71,
who viewed the cognate Akkadian pagrā'um as an animal sacrifice.
As we have demonstrated previously, neither the use of pagrum/ pagrā'um at Mari (2.2.3.-2.2.4.) nor pgr at Ugarit (2.3.1.) support the meaning "stele", let alone "funerary stele". Based on the data from Mari and Ugarit, Ebach argued that the term in Ezek. 43 denotes an idolatrous sacrifice, that is an "offering" or (Toten-)opfer and cited the use of peger in Gen. 15:11 and Jer. 31:40 in support of this meaning.

But in the remaining twenty instances of Hebrew peger, the contexts overwhelmingly favor the meaning "corpse". Moreover, with one exception, the corpse is that of a human, the context is negative, and no indication of an offering is evident. The lone exception is Gen. 15:11. But this passage points to the use of Hebrew peger to denote an animal carcass, not an offering as no altar, no blood, and no consumption by fire are mentioned.

Furthermore, in Jer. 31:40, the term probably refers to human corpses related to child sacrifice owing to the identification of the mentioned "valley of happ'garīm and ashes" as the valley of Hinnom, the notorious cult site for this parade.

Moreover, the language is paralleled by other occurrences of peger found in construct with a personal (pro)noun, cf. "your corpses" pigrē'kem (Lev. 26:30) and "the corpses of the sons of Israel" pigrē benē yiśrā'ēl (Ezek. 6:5). These clearly do not refer to stelae.


Gen. 15:11; Lev. 26:30(2X); Num. 14:29,32,33; 1 Sam. 17:46; 2 Kgs. 19:35 = Isa. 37:36; 2 Chr. 20:24,25; Amos 8:3; Isa. 14:19, 34:3, 66:24; Jer. 31:40(39), 33:5, 41:9; Ezek. 6:5; Nah. 3:3.

Furthermore, the corpse may be in a progressive state of decay as suggested by Isa. 34:3.

Following e.g., Sarna 1966:126.
abomination (cf. Jer. 17:31, 19:5, 32:35). Lastly, it should be mentioned that nowhere in the Priestly legislation on sacrifice is the term peger used to denote an offering.

The fact that peger is qualified by the term mēt "dead" in 2 Kgs. 19:35 (= Isa. 37:36) demands that we consider the possibility that peger refers to man or animal as a material organism regardless of whether it is alive or dead. This would explain why peger on occasion necessitated further qualification as in 2 Kgs. 19:35. Nevertheless, like English "body" it could stand alone in other contexts where its mortuary character was explicit.

Having surveyed the range of opinions concerning peger, we must say something about the tendency of commentators to emend bāmōtām "their high places" to בְּמֹתָם "at their death" in v.7. This datum is often, but not always, cited in support of a death or ancestor cult interpretation. Arguments in favor of the change include the assumption that it would be rather odd for a high place to be located within the temple complex or that high places would not have been built there after Josiah's reform.


Lewis 1989:141.

In response to the second objection, it has been pointed out that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel attest to the limited success of Josiah's reform as it did not permanently eliminate all of the "apostate" practices. For example, the cult of child sacrifice at the Tophet soon reappeared (if it disappeared at all) after the reform. Thus, we would expect the bāmāh of Ezek. 43:7 to make its reappearance in Israelite religion as a "re-instituted" abomination—whatever its cultic associations.

In response to the first objection, it has been proposed that by the time of the exile the bāmāh had come to designate a small elevation for cultic use. Such an installation could be located in the temple complex.

Therefore, the bāmāh is not in an odd location as it might refer either to a small cultic place—the significance of which is unknown given the paucity of information—or, on the other hand, assuming that bāmāh designated a sizeable "high place" and that peger is connected with child sacrifice in Jer. 31:40, bāmāh in our text might designate that cultic area of the Hinnom valley where child sacrifice took place.

Having rejected Heider's equation of the malkē- element in malkēhem and the malikū, we would suggest that the phrase pigrē malkēhem would comprise an example of the subjective genitive "corpses which the (living) kings [demanded as offerings . . .]". As such the phrase emphasizes the kings' culpability. As we noted previously, the term bāmāh is intimately connected with this

454 Schunck 1977:141.
abomination in Jer. 7:31, 19:5, 32:35. Lastly, if the footstool and throne of Yahweh mentioned in 43:7 were understood to encompass not simply the confines of the ark or temple but all of the Jerusalem environs (on which, cf. 48:35), then the bāmāh of 43:7 need not be located in the temple complex.455

Assuming that the bāmōt reading is correct, if it could be established that the bāmōt designated locations where rites necessarily took place on a regular basis and that such rites observed at the bāmōt in Ezek. 43:7,9 were directed toward the dead kings (i.e., that they were not rites which the living kings supervised), then this passage would point to the relatively late arrival of death and/or ancestor cult practices in the Judahite royal cult.

Again, Assyria or Babylonia would serve as the most likely sources for the introduction of such a cult for the period in question, for the royal kispum ritual is well documented for first millennium Mesopotamia and no comparable practice is documented for contemporary Syria-Palestine.456

In conclusion, we are on safe ground in recognizing pēger in Ezek. 43:7,9 as the corpse of a king which had been placed near the temple complex in total disregard for the Priestly tradition regarding the defiling power of human corpses.457

455 Following Zimmerli 1983:415-16.


Although, the actual location of the tombs of the kings of Judah remains shrouded in mystery as the archeological data are inconclusive\textsuperscript{438}, if the prior assumption that the palace was in close proximity to the temple be granted, then 2 Kgs. 21:18 and 21:26 might preserve traditions locating the tombs of Manasseh and Amon near the temple.

Are the selection of burial sites for the Judahite kings to be explained as motivated by the belief that the dead kings were worthy of veneration or worship, care or commemoration? Given the paucity of available evidence, the likelihood of ascertaining the specific beliefs serving as the impetus for these burial customs is minimal. The \textit{modus operandi} will no doubt continue to exercise investigators.

Nevertheless, the following alternative explanation might find future confirmation. Both the general silence in regard to royal burials as well as the sparsely attested custom of burying kings in locations with only limited access like royal gardens was perhaps driven by the need to shroud the location of royal tombs in relative secrecy so that conquering foreign kings might not defile the their tombs by carrying away the bones.\textsuperscript{439} As we suggested previously, this might also explain the burial of kings in swamps.\textsuperscript{460} The Assyrian king Ashurbanipal was known to have


\textsuperscript{439}The latter view might explain the paucity of references in the cuneiform sources to the death and burial place of kings. An exception to this is the known burial Assyrian kings at Aššur, for which cf. Moorey 1984:14.

\textsuperscript{460}On which cf. Beaulieu 1988:36-37.
carried away the bones of Elamite kings whose descendants he described as "the disturbers of the kings my ancestors".461

4.6.3. ISAIAH 57:6

In the exilic passage Isa. 57:5, most commentators see a reference to child sacrifice. Traditionally, 57:6 has been similarly regarded as referring to illicit religious practices:

Among the smooth [stones] of the wady (b*hall*qē-nahal) is your portion (helqēk); they, they, are your lot; to them you have poured out a libation (nések), you have brought an offering (minhāh). Should I relent in the face of this?462

Nevertheless, Irwin offered a new rendition of v.6 based in large part on the findings from Ugarit. For Irwin, v.6 introduced a new foreign element, the cult of the dead, whereas v.5 disparaged the practice of child sacrifice. According to the author, Ugaritic ḫlg III is occasionally paralleled by mt "death" and so the phrase b*hall*qē-naḥal in v.6, traditionally rendered

461 Cf. Tsukimoto 1985:114-15, but note CAD 112 (1981):349. Did the so-called disturbers simply attempt to defile the tombs and thereby leave the ghosts uncared for or did they, by means of incantations, attempt to drive away those ghosts of dead kings from the usurped dynasty who began haunting them owing to their desecration and neglect? Perhaps the disturbers employed necromantic incantations in order to gain information from these ghosts concerning the enemy and cf. the use of r-g-z "to disturb" in 1 Sam. 28:15.

462 Commentators generally view the first occurrence of the root ḫlg as derived from "be smooth" ḫlg I and the second "divide", from ḫlg II, cf. e.g., Westermann 1969:322 and see the treatments by Schunck 1980:444-47 and Tsevat 1980:447-51. Westermann did entertain the notion that v.6 may refer to the place where the sacrificed children of v.5 were ritually buried "under the stones in the brook of the valley".
"among the smooth [stones] of the wady"⁴⁶³, he translated "with the dead of the wady" and concluded that the following libations (nések) and offerings (minḥāh) were intended for the dead. This conforms with the fact that the Kidron was a place of burial as recorded in 2 Kgs. 23:6 and Jer. 31:40 and that the Hinnom valley was the place of child sacrifice.⁴⁶⁴

Building on the proposal of Irwin, Lewis understood the Hebrew 'elīm of v.5 as "gods", rather than the "oaks" or "terebinths" of most translations. Besides, the latter is normally rendered 'ēlīm as in Isa 1:29.⁴⁶⁵ Lewis found support in the versions. For example, the LXX interpreted v.6 as follows: "That is your portion, this is your lot" referring to the "gods" 'ēlīm of v.5 which the Greek author rendered as "idols" eidolon.⁴⁶⁶ Applying his conclusion that the dead ancestors in Israel could be referred to by the word for god 'ēl/ 'ēlōhīm, he suggested "dead spirits" for 'ēlīm and posited a death cult background for not only these verses but for the entirety of 56:9-57:13.⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶³ The Hebrew is lacking a term for "stones" here ('āḇānīm). This is added in the English translations. Others rendered ḥall*qē-naḥal as "smooth serpents" rather than "the smooth stones" as such serpents were supposedly venerated in cults.


⁴⁶⁶ Similarly, the NIV adds "The idols, among the smooth stones of the ravines are you portion".

We argued against the notion that the dead in Israel were considered gods in our treatment of 1 Sam. 28:3-25 (cf. 4.5.1). Moreover, the translation of 'ēlīm of v.5 as "gods" can be challenged on the basis of the parallelism evident in v.5:468

"You who inflame yourselves among (b*-) the 'ēlīm, under (taḥat) every verdant tree;
Who slaughter children in (b*-) in the wadis, under469 (taḥat) the clefts of the rocks."

In v.5b, the objects of the prepositions b*- and taḥat consist of two terms "valleys" nāḥālīm and "clefts of the rocks" secīpē hasūrācīlm that share the same referent, i.e., that place where the illicit practices took place. Likewise, we would expect the term 'ēlīm to designate the same notion as "verdant trees" cēṣ raʾcanān, namely the location where the rites were observed.

Returning to Irwin's arguments, the assumption that v.6 introduces a new element is contradicted by the fact that most commentators see a connection between vv.5 and 6. The JPS translation retained the translation of 'ēlīm as terebinths and understood v.5 as connected with what followed as v.6 points back to the idolatrous practices mentioned there, "With such are your share and portion".470

While a rarely attested root ḥlq III might exist in Ugaritic as suggested by its parallel mt -and this is by no means


469 For this translation of taḥat in v.5b, cf. Day 1989:16 n.2.

470 The note to the verse states "the cult-trees referred to above in v.5". Along the same lines, Watts 1987:255 noted that the change of person from v.5 (2mpl) to v.6 (2fs) merely reflects the change of perspective from Israelite "evil doers" in general to the apostates of Jerusalem.
certain-, no such parallel is evident in Isa. 57:6.\textsuperscript{471} Furthermore, while the practices mentioned in v.6 are referred to only vaguely, the larger context strongly suggests that child sacrifice is in view for all of vv.5-10. Day has rendered MT melek in v.9 as "Molech" not "(living) king". This finds support in the immediate context from the mention of Sheol in vv.9-10 and the use of oil and ointments (v.9) which are closely associated with Molech in Ezek. 16:18-21.\textsuperscript{472}

4.6.4. ISAIAH 65:4

Most commentators understand Isa. 65:4 to refer to a rite resembling what came to be known as an incubation rite in later antiquity. In an incubation rite, a person sleeps in a sacred place in order to obtain a revelation through a dream. This form of dream divination is widely attested in the ancient Near East.\textsuperscript{473} The LXX interpreted Isa. 65:4 as such with the addition dia enupnia "for the sake of oracles received in dreams".\textsuperscript{474}

\textsuperscript{471}Irwin himself was doubtful about the legitimacy of his proposal owing to the admittedly scant evidence for an Israelite cult of the dead!


\textsuperscript{473}Cf. Obermann 1946; Gaster 1950:270-71; Oppenheim 1956:187-91,245-52; Otten 1980:105; Parker 1989:100-01; and Moore 1990:50-51,78-86, 99 n.11.9. Incubation was well known in the Greco-Roman world as exemplified in the cult of Asklepios. Be that as it may, the attempt of Oppenheim 1956:223 to connect the Mesopotamian ša‘ilu and ša‘īltu, necromancy, and incubation has at present no direct support, cf. Finkel 1983-84:1 n.1.

\textsuperscript{474}Other passages that have been cited as examples of incubation include Gen. 28:12-17; 1 Sam. 3:1-18, 28:15; 1 Kgs. 3:4-15, 9:2; 2 Kgs. 16:15, 19:1; 2 Chr. 1:7-12; and Pss. 3:6,4:9, 17:15. Ehrlich 1953:13-57 argued that 1 Kgs. 3 is the only genuine instance of incubation in the Hebrew Bible, but cf.
In spite of the fact that the 'šbōt and yiddēḵōnîm are nowhere to be found in this passage, the reference to those "who sit/dwell in graves" hayyōš bîm qēbārîm in 65:4a strongly suggests that this incubation rite is one which has been combined with the art of necromancy in order that one might seek the dead for knowledge of the future. The underlying belief is that the abode of the dead and the grave are indistinguishable. This form of incubation is clearly the exception to the recorded instances from the ancient Near East.

Although neither sleeping nor dreaming are mentioned per se, the parallel reference in v.4b "lodge in secret places" ūbannsōrîm yālînū signifies an all night vigil at a burial site. It should be mentioned however, that this does not

Porter 1981:202 and n.28.


Lewis 1989:158-60 viewed 45:18-19 as an example of necromancy, but the phrase ēreš ḥōšèk "land of darkness" in 45:19 is not a specialized reference to the netherworld as the perspective is more general and parallel with the first line, cf. e.g., Muilenburg 1956:532 and Westermann 1969:172-73. Furthermore, the LXX interpreted tōhū in vv.18-19, not as a reference to the underworld but as a reference to vanity (v.18 "in vain" eis kenon; v.19 "seek vanity" zētēsate), cf. e.g., Watts 1987:159-60, 162.

On Hebrew n-s-r and Akkadian nišīrtu "hidden thing" < nasaḫru "to guard, preserve", cf. Berger 1980:82-83 and note CAD 112 (1981):276 against Healey 1976:433-34 who proposed a Syriac cognate "to wail", "they sit in graves and spend the night in wailing/among the wailers", but this term is not attested in the Hebrew Bible. In the light of the Mesopotamian practice of hiding royal graves (cf. 4.4.3. n.263), the mention in v.3 of gardens (cf. 4.5.2. and n.417 and note Pope 1977B:224-26) and incense (cf. 4.4.3. and n.257), we might have an instance of necromancy taking place at what was believed to be a royal tomb.
establish the constituent nocturnal associations of the ancient Near Eastern version of necromancy. We saw in the necromancy texts from Mesopotamia that the expected time of revelation was morning. Furthermore, in view of the fact that dreams played a central role in the rite of incubation, the nocturnal aspect of the necromantic rite in Isa. 65:4 probably derives from its association with incubation.⁴⁷⁹

Can anything else be reconstructed from the context regarding the nature of the rite involved? The reference in v.4b to the eating of swine flesh and the broth of a "desecrated sacrifice"⁴⁸⁰ has been viewed as a meal shared in the context of the cult of the dead, that is a marzēḥ type meal.⁴⁸¹

In response, we must first point out that apart from the proposed funerary nature of the Israelite marzēḥ, a position which we have shown to be inadequate, we have no evidence that Israelites partook of meals in honor of the dead. Second, v.4b more likely comprises an independent thought which is included here only because it shares the common element of cultic impurity.⁴⁸² The incubation rite is polluting owing to contact with the dead, and the eating of certain meat or the drinking of

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. Oppenheim 1956:187-91 on the usual nocturnal dream. Day time dreams are attested but this appears to be the exception not the rule.

⁴⁸⁰ Wright 1987:142 rendered piggūl in v.4 as "desecrated, profaned sacrifice".

⁴⁸¹ Cf. Heider 1985:389. He noted that a reference to the drinking of the juices made from the flesh of child sacrifices has been proposed, but cf. his criticisms on pp. 190-92, 391.

juices made from such a meat was regarded as a "desecrated offering" piggūl (cf. Lev. 11:7, Deut. 14:8). 483

4.7. THE ISRAELITE REPHAIM

Scholars have repeatedly identified the biblical Rephaim or rāʾāfīm as the (semi-) divine dead ancestors and thereby exemplary of the belief in the supernatural benefic power of the dead. 484 As a matter of fact, the biblical texts testify to two distinct traditions with regard to the Rephaim. In narrative texts of the Pentateuch and DtrH are found the Rephaim who are depicted as members of the autochthonic populations of Palestine. 485 In prophetic, psalmic, and wisdom texts, those Rephaim portrayed as shades of the dead inhabiting the netherworld are mentioned. 486

Because no explicit association of the "ethnic" Rephaim and the Rephaim who are shades is ever made in the biblical traditions, various theories vis-à-vis their relationship have been proposed.

---


485 Gen. 14:5, 15:20; Deut. 2:10-11, 20-21, 3:11, 13; Josh. 12:4, 13:12, 17:15 (in the singular and plural). On the valley of Rephaim or ēmeq-rāʾāfīm, cf. Josh. 15:8, 18:16; 2 Sam. 5:18, 22, 23:13; Isa. 17:5; 1 Chr. 11:15, 14:9. For the yāḏhē hārāpāh, cf. 2 Sam. 21:15-22; 1 Chr. 20:4-8 and note 1 Sam. 17.

486 Isa. 14:9, 26:14, 19; Ps. 88:11; Prov. 2:18, 9:18, 21:16; Job 26:5 (only in the plural).
developed. The history of interpretation has generally assumed some organic connection between the pre-historic "ethnic" Rephaim of the narratives and the Rephaim who are shades. The general consensus is that the traditions concerning the "ethnic" Rephaim informed those reflective of the netherworld Rephaim. Recent scholarship also views both aspects as having their respective analogues in the Ugaritic rp'um.

The theory of de Moor comprises the most compelling and thoroughgoing proposal to date. According to this author, the Rephaim were originally the ruling aristocracy (Ugaritic rp'i 'ars) who functioned as savior-healers of the country (Hebrew rōp'ī 'īm/ Ugaritic rapi'ūma) and worshipped Baal, rp'u mlk 'lm "Savior, king of eternity", their patron deity. They then became deified royal ancestors performing the same function as savior-healers, but with the late emphasis on Yahweh as rōpē' "healer" (in direct contrast to Baal) and the general ban on ancestor worship, the Rephaim in Israel were no longer venerated as heroes. Rather, in the polemical rhetoric of the biblical traditions the rōpē'īm became weakened and relegated to the lower parts of the netherworld as the rōpā'īm < rāpāh "to be weak".

De Moor's theory can explain the "ethnic" Rephaim of the Hebrew Bible as preserving a faint memory of the heroic savior-healers turned deified ancestors also reflected at Ugarit while the weakened netherworld Rephaim would reflect the later polemic.

487 Neither the "descendants of the Raphah" ūlīdē hārāpāh (2 Sam. 21:15-22; 1 Chr. 20:4-8) nor the "remnant of the Rephaim" miyyēter hārēpā'īm (Deut. 3:11; Josh. 12:4, 13:12) help to clarify our understanding of the related philological issues.
It also explains the MT vocalization $\text{rp}'\text{ym}$ and the LXX rendering *iatroi* "healers" in Ps. 88:11 and Isa. 26:14. 488

His reconstruction also draws upon elements found in the Greek hero traditions. He cites what he perceives to be an analogous development in the Greek traditions in which "living" heroes or *herōs* died and became *herōs theos* with full divine status and who were worshipped in the cult. These heroized ancestors were often depicted as giants and called *iatroi* "healers". 489

Assuming for the sake of argument that the *opinio communis* is correct in concluding that some type of organic relationship originally obtained between the biblical "ethnic" Rephaim and the Rephaim who are shades, we would view that relationship quite differently. First, nowhere in the Ugaritic or, for that matter, the biblical texts are the *rp'um/r*pā'īm* explicitly portrayed as savior-healers. 490 Furthermore, as we noted earlier the location in the Ugaritic netherworld of a subgroup within the *rp'um*, the *rp'im qdmym*, is attested on only one occasion in *KTU* 1.161, and is exceptional in nature. In any case, in *KTU* 1.161 they are not attributed supernatural powers with which to benefit the living.

---

488 "We know for certain that even in the days of the translators of the Septuaginta the original vocalization of the word *rp'ym* was still not forgotten", de Moor 1976:340-41, i.e. *iatroi* = living aristocratic healer-saviors or *rōp'īm/rapi'ūma*. 489 De Moor 1976:323-45 and cf. the more recent version articulated by his student Spronk 1986:161-96,227-29. 490 Furthermore, as we pointed out previously, examples of the verbal form of the root *rp'* with the meaning "to heal" are not to be found at Ugarit.
They are summoned to the netherworld entrance to transport the throne of the recently deceased king to its proper place there.

Moreover, our investigation has demonstrated that the Ugaritic rp'um were not royal deified ancestors. Rather, they reflected early mythic traditions about heroic warriors for whom we have no evidence of cultic practices let alone worship or veneration. The Ugaritic texts also point to the subsequent adoption of the rp'um name by bands of local mercenaries.

Furthermore, not only is the equation of Baal with rp'u mlk c1m doubtful, but the references to the Ugaritic deity Rp'u never make any overt mention of his function as healer. Lastly, de Moor's citation of the Greek hero traditions is somewhat misleading. It was clearly the exception not the rule that a hero became herōs theos after death. The same can be said of those given the epithet iatri. Moreover, not all those who obtained this healer status were attributed gigantic size and vice versa. In other words, the Greek traditions develop in a more complex fashion.

What we can say is that in the biblical passages where the Rephaim are depicted as shades, like their Ugaritic counterparts, the rp'im qdmym, they are powerless. Moreover, nowhere in the non-narrative contexts are living human beings identified as Rephaim before their death. The term in these traditions only functioned to designate humanity's post mortem weakened existence. In Isa. 14:9, our earliest biblical record of the Rephaim as shades, it is stated that the fallen tyrant (melek bābēl, cf. v.4) simply becomes weakened like the Rephaim. That
the netherworld Rephaim once possessed supernatural beneficent powers is nowhere stated, assumed, or implied.

Assuming that the Ugaritic and biblical traditions are to be associated, what once comprised only a specific element within the *rp'um*, the netherworld Rephaim, the *rp'im qdmym*, was expanded in the non-narrative traditions of the Hebrew Bible in two directions. These biblical traditions employed the more general term Rephaim to designate shades. Whether this is to be explained as conscious compression or unwitting confusion of the earlier mythic, living, and deceased Rephaim elements found at Ugarit is anyone's guess. These traditions also incorporated the ordinary dead within the membership of the Rephaim.\(^{491}\)

In any case, we cannot accept de Moor's notion that the LXX preserves the 'original vocalization' of consonantal *rp'ym* some five hundred years after Isaiah had forgotten the underlying concept. Rather, we understand the two instances in which the LXX renders the Rephaim as *iatroi* "healers" (Ps. 88:11 and Isa. 26:14) to be reflective of a polemic on the part of these later translators against "physicians", for some streams of tradition in ancient Judaism considered this profession one of seven that had no part in the eternal life and was destined for hell.\(^{492}\)

\(^{491}\) Had *rp'ā'im* functioned as a technical term for dead kings and nobles in this passage as so often assumed, the phrase *kōl-cattūdē 'āres* in v.9 would have been unnecessary. Garland 1985:10 notes that with the passage of time the ordinary dead of no consequence received the epithet *herōs* among certain Greek populations.\(^{492}\)

\(^{492}\) Cf. Abot de Rabbi Nathan 36:5 "the best physician (*rp'fēm*) was one of the seven who had no part in the world to come", and Qid. 4:14 (R. Yehudah = Qid.82b) "the best physician (*rp'fēm*) is destined for hell", and see Brown 1985:14-15,134-35 for additional references.
sum, we have evidence neither for the (semi-)divine benefic status of the Israelite Rephaim nor for a Syro-Palestinian cult in honor of their beneficence.

Turning to the "ethnic" Rephaim, Talmon has recently outlined what he understands to be the progressive stages of the tradition history behind this term. Originally they represented a stratum of the pre-Israelite population of Canaan (Gen. 14:5, 15:20; Deut. 3:11; Josh. 13:12). Their abnormal height is an "epic aggrandizement of basic actual facts" (Deut. 2:11, 3:11) and the same applies to their association with the mythical Nephilim (Num. 13:33 and cf. Gen. 6:1-4). The connection of the y* lidē hārāgāh with the Philistines of David's day may be secondary in nature resulting from the Philistine conquest of these autochthones. 493 He summarizes by stating that "the majority of these mentions of rāpā/h - repā'īm contain no unequivocal mythical allusions". 494

Aside from Talmon's vague and questionable demarcation between historical and "mythopoeic" elements in these traditions, the tradition history can be viewed quite differently. The references to the mythological superhuman size of the Rephaim might very well be the earliest stage of the tradition. In other words, a process of historization of myth is reflected in the narrative traditions.

493 Talmon 1983:237-40. In any case, the term r* pā'īm does not serve as a gentilic name and shows up frequently alongside similar names probably denoting the character of the people although in many instances the significance is irrecoverable (e.g., Anakim, Emim, Zamzumim, Zumim, Nephilim, and Perizzim).

494 Talmon 1983:240.
In the biblical traditions about primeval peoples, two types of sources appear to be used. The first employs archaic names such as Hittites and Amorites and dates sometime after the eighth century (probably from the exile). The other construes the inhabitants as giants such as the Anakim or Rephaim which are associated elsewhere with the Nephilim (Num. 13:33) and thought to be giants. We find this portrayal of the "ethnic" Rephaim in the (post-?)dtr redaction of Deuteronomy (2:11, 3:11) and in the DtrH (2 Sam. 21:15-22; 1 Chr. 20:4-8) where they or, more properly, the yōḏḏē hārāḇāh, are also connected with the Philistines. As at Ugarit, a mercenary association probably stands behind the Rephaim who are depicted initially as giant warriors among the Philistines in 2 Sam. 21:15-22. The ideological significance of the association of the pre-Israelite inhabitants with giants is made clear in the account of David's encounter with Goliath in 1 Sam. 17 who stands as the epitome of the defiance of Yahweh.

If we assume for the sake of argument the priority of the Deuteronomistic History, then this process is developed further in the subsequent Yahwistic History. Whereas in Deut. 2:11, 3:11, the Rephaim were depicted as only generally situated in the local

495 So Van Seters 1972:64-81.
496 In an effort to strengthen the polemic they were eventually identified as Philistines as in 1 Sam 17:8. On the late compositional history of this story and David's Rise, 1 Sam. 16:14-2 Sam. 5:25, cf. Van Seters 1983:264-71. Talmon 1983:239-40 likewise noted that the descendants of Raphah are not identified as Philistines but are depicted as having fought in the Philistine army as mercenaries (2 Sam. 21:15-22; 1 Chr. 20:4-8).
geography, the Rephaim are assigned smaller yet more specific regions of habitation by the Yahwist and the Priestly Writer (cf. Gen.15:20 (Yahwist) followed by 14:5 and the P(?) texts Josh. 12:4.13:12, 17:15). At the same time, their mythic characterization as giants all but disappears (or, less likely, is assumed) in the latter stages of the tradition.

The "ethnic" Rephaim traditions possibly reflect an association with the mythic Ugaritic "Mighty Ones" (< r-š' = r-p'- II). Nevertheless, their 'greatness' has been transformed from one singularly focused on heroic military prowess to one which takes on superhuman physical dimensions and pseudo-ethnic identity. This development might reflect the kind of antiquarian concern to bring order to the numerous independent traditions about heroes and giants as found in the Greek traditions.498

The r'špā'fīm of the Hebrew Bible are neither identified as supernatural beneficent ghosts of the dead nor is such a status of the Rephaim unequivocally polemicized against anywhere in the biblical traditions. As we underscored earlier, if the r'špā'fīm who are shades are to be connected with the Ugaritic rpi'm qdmym "the Mighty Ones from Old", this in no way presupposes their superhuman benefic power as ghosts.

Like their Ugaritic predecessors, they are depicted at best as ghosts of inconsequential power and in need of care. Within

498 Cf. Van Seters 1988:1-22. If any polemic against the Rephaim traditions were intended it would be found perhaps in the purposeful omission in Isa. 14 of the royal aspiration to be memorialized at death as one having attained the stature of the rp'um warrior heroes, but this would presuppose an acquaintance with those analogous Ugaritic traditions for which, in the case of the non-narrative biblical texts, we have no indication.
the Rephaim as shades tradition, all traces of their former heroic stature had been lost although they retained elements of their earlier name. That the significance of the name was not fully comprehended in these traditions is evidenced in their representation as the ordinary dead. A similar process can be detected perhaps in the attachment of the epithet herōs to the ordinary dead of no consequence by some Greek populations.499

On the other hand, the commemoration of the exemplary lives of the mythic Ugaritic rp'um has its faint reflex in the biblical traditions concerning the "ethnic" Rephaim. In fact, a polemic might be intended here, for, according to the traditions, those lands originally owned by the Rephaim were eventually conquered and settled by the Israelites.

In concluding, we state the obvious: a lack of awareness one of the other best explains the absence of any explicit connection between the two Rephaim traditions in the Hebrew Bible. These two aspects of the ancient rp'um tradition had obtained independent status by the time the biblical Rephaim traditions were formulated. This no doubt contributed to the distinct developments evident in the growth of these traditions.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the terminological boundaries which we established in chapter one, our examination of the third to first millennia Syro-Palestinian inscriptional data has led us to the conclusion that the widely accepted notion that ancestor cults and necromancy comprised West Semitic indigenous practices spanning some two millennia and that they were embraced in both the domestic and royal societal domains is unfounded.

Furthermore, not only did we reject the notion that the ordinary and the royal dead in Syria-Palestine were deified, but we also found that the sources from the region nowhere document the veneration or worship of the dead.1 In other words, it has yet to be demonstrated that, for the period prior to the mid first millennium, the belief in the dead's supernatural beneficent power was indigenous to Syria-Palestine.

That Mari might be cited as an exception to this otherwise unavoidable conclusion is obviated by several factors. Leaving aside the fact that the Mari texts never make explicit the underlying beliefs, this cult possibly reflects temporary influence from the Mesopotamian heartland as it shares numerous elements with that at Pre-Sargonic Lagash wherein veneration or worship of the royal ancestors was of no concern. That the Mari cult likewise functioned to simply care for or to commemorate the

1 Moreover, it cannot be assumed that the exceptional posthumous deification of kings associated with the likes of Sargon and Naram-Sin during the mid second millennium in the Mesopotamian heartland led to the "democratized deification" of the ordinary dead throughout Mesopotamia, let alone Syria-Palestine, in subsequent periods.
dead finds support in the collective grouping of the Šarrānu which, on the analogy of Asian ancestor cults, suggests their impersonal remoteness and powerlessness. In any case, it has yet to demonstrated that the anonymous Šarrānu were former kings of Mari who were genealogically related to the current dynasty.

In any case, the assumption that should funerary rites be attested in Syria-Palestine, then the ancestor cult or, more specifically, their veneration or worship necessarily follows is unwarranted. While various funerary rites -particularly those observed during mourning- are occasionally attested in the evidence, it would be going too far to infer from this that regular cultic rites indicative of the dead's supernatural benevolence necessarily ensued. As the comparative ethnographic data suggest, not all peoples who solemnized the burying of their dead subsequently devoted significant rituals to remain on good terms with them.

Likewise, the argument that had West Semites achieved geographical proximity to and cultural contact with other second millennium peoples who observed death and/or ancestor cult rites (e.g. the Hittites), then they would have observed like ceremony and belief does not hold. In the native American context, the Navajo culture never adopted the death and/or ancestor cults of the Pueblo. Considering the many loans that the Navajo made from Pueblo culture in the area of ceremonialism, this contrast is particularly striking. It was apparently the Navajo's morbid fear of the dead which impeded their acceptance of such cults.²

As an initial step toward the consideration of an alternative model for the origin and nature of the Israelite belief in the beneficent dead, we examined the relevant biblical texts in order to ascertain both their compositional history and interpretation. In striking contrast to the general impression so often conveyed in the history of scholarship, we found that the biblical writers evinced a curious lack of concern for and/or interest in Israel's observance of death and ancestor cults.  
The situation is markedly different in the case of necromancy.

Scattered Psalms have been cited in support of this theory. Smith and Bloch-Smith 1988:283 saw the feeding of the dead in Ps. 22:30. But that "all the anointed of the earth" kōl-dišnē-'eres are the dead is questionable. The Ugaritic phrase cited in support mrqdm dšn "the anointed dancers" in KTU 108:5 does not refer to the dead (or to the rp'i 'aras, cf. l.v.24), but with Pardee 1988:98-9, to "ivory castanets". Against Spronk 1986:282 n.2, the MT 'ākīl "they eat", and cf. LXX ephagon, need not be emended to 'āk 1ō "surely". Anderson 1972(I):194 viewed 22:30 as the living's experience of such great distress that it was as if they were dead. 

Zolli 1950:149-50 viewed the qədōšîm "holy ones" in Ps. 16:3 as the mighty dead located "in the earth (= netherworld)" 'āšer-bā'āres. This requires emending 'addîrē "majestic" in v.3 to 'ārûrim "cursed", so as to cast a negative light and cf. Spronk 1986:334-37; Smith and Bloch-Smith 1988:283; and Lewis 1989:166. But the "holy ones" refer mostly to the living (cf. Ps. 34:10 (ET 9) and 2 Chr. 35:3) and never the dead and bā'āres is commonly attested as inhabitable earth and so the need for emendation can be eliminated. In other words, Yahweh delights in pious Israelites, cf. Kraus 1988:234,36-37.


403
Necromancy is documented in the Hebrew Bible and so testifies to the Israelite belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the dead. Nevertheless, we found this datum to be late and of foreign provenance. While its non-mention prior to the mid eighth century has been understood to mean that it was initially considered legitimate in earlier Yahwistic circles only to be condemned subsequently in dtr traditions as a threat to prophecy, our findings have shown that it was proscribed much later as part of the dtr polemic against Israel's adoption of the Mesopotamian belief in the benefic dead. This reconstruction finds additional support in the biblical traditions' treatment of selected mourning rites.

What constituted once legitimate mourning practices, self-laceration and tonsure, like necromancy, came to be outlawed in exilic biblical traditions. As the backdrop for this reversal, the contexts pointed to the polemical reaction against similar Mesopotamian practices of the mid first millennium. Like their eastern analogues, these practices either threatened dtr and related forms of later Yahwism or the potential confusion of these otherwise legitimate customs and Mesopotamian practices elicited their late proscription.

But how can we account for the late adoption of necromancy, the earlier observance of self-laceration and tonsure and the subsequent proscription of these practices? As noted earlier, the

---

4Van der Toorn 1990:203-22 has recently reiterated the speculation that the Teraphim were images of ancestors used in divination. Many of his supporting arguments have been examined in various sections of our treatise and rejected. What the Teraphim represented is anyone's guess.
Navajo's morbid fear of the dead resulted in the rejection of the Pueblos' ancestor cult. If a similar fear of the dead existed in Israel and there is only inferential evidence for this—this would explain the reticence to adopt the belief in the beneficent dead as expressed in ancestor cults and necromancy. At the same time, the fear of the dead can also account for the early observance of self-laceration and tonsure, that is if these rites were expressive of the living's attempt to hide from or drive away malevolent ghosts.

The dtr portrayal of Israel's embrace of the belief in the beneficent dead via necromancy can be best accounted for as an appropriation of Mesopotamian necromancy, whether one has in mind a religious reality in pre-exilic Judah of Manasseh's time or a literary topos employed by the dtr and related traditions of the exilic to post-exilic period (or both). Assuming for the sake of argument the first scenario, acquaintance with manifestations of benevolent ghosts could serve to temper the exclusiveness of

5 Cf. Spronk 1986:34-35, 244-45 for a survey of the proposed motivations behind these mourning customs, of which fear was one, and pp. 251-52 for the fear of the dead in Israel more generally. His statement that "the positive side in the belief in powerful and wise spirits in better attested in the Old Testament" (p. 252) is contradicted by our findings. We found it to be late, foreign, and only occasionally attested in the form of necromancy.

6 The sparse testimony regarding the malevolence of ghosts in Syria-Palestine precludes any certainty in this regard, but Judahite burial contents such as jewelry and figurines were perhaps used to ward off evil ghosts, for which cf. Bloch-Smith 1990:62-67, 74-81. For biblical traces of exorcistic praxis and the mention of malevolent demons some of whom might conceal what were once believed to be evil ghosts, cf. Jirku 1912; Tromp 1969:160-67; and Moore 1990:60-64. For malevolent demons in Canaan, cf. now de Moor 1981-82:106-19 and de Moor and Spronk 1984:237-49. Their view that certain evil demons were ghosts is conjectural. Against their reading of RIH 78/20:15 as 'ap ẓl, an evil ghost, cf. 3.1.9.2. and the alternate reading npz;l.
Israel's fear of the dead and to transform the nation's configuration of the spirit world so as to allow for the co-existence of malevolent and benevolent ghosts as in the cosmologies of Mesopotamia. A late Mesopotamian origin for Israelite necromancy also aligns with what we know concerning the history of this divinatory art in the ancient Near East as it remains unattested in Hittite, Egyptian, and Syro-Palestinian texts. In fact, only rarely is it found in Mesopotamian texts prior to Neo-Assyrian times, while in Mesopotamian (and Greek) texts of the mid first millennium onwards, it is well documented.

The dtr traditions themselves exhibit a familiarity with the late Mesopotamian version of necromancy (cf. 4.5.1. where 1 Sam. 28 preserves its role in selecting a royal successor and the participation of the gods). Initially, it was inserted into traditions about the founding of the nation, attributed to the Canaanites, and condemned in the law of Israel's greatest prophet, Moses (Deut. 18:11). In the final form of the text, this redacted tradition functioned as a precedent against what was then construed in the DtrH as necromancy's "re-introduction" by the Judean king Manasseh several hundred years later (2 Kgs. 21:6, 23:24). These dtr traditions were in turn supplemented by the story of Saul's encounter with the Endorian necromancer (1 Sam. 28:3-25). This insertion justified the rejection of the first Israelite monarchy and thereby became the historical

---

For Mesopotamia, cf. Bottéro 1983:153-203. The treatment of de Moor 1981-82:106-19 and de Moor and Spronk 1984:237-49 of benevolent demons in second millennium Canaan who were supposedly dead humans unfortunately rests on the equation of the *rp'um* and the *'ilm* with the dead at Ugarit.
precedent for the downfall of her second epitomized by Manasseh. Finally, rhetoric condemning necromancy was attributed to the prophet Isaiah (Isa. 8:19, 19:3, 29:4) with the result that the apostasy of late Judah was extended so as to include king Ahaz and to explicitly indict the entire nation.

On the other hand, what once constituted legitimate mourning practices in the traditions associated with the eighth century prophets were likewise proscribed by the later dtr tradition. Nevertheless, these practices continued their legitimacy in the traditions of the sixth century prophets (Jer. 7:29; 41:5). The tradition history suggests that at some point late in that century or thereafter, self-laceration and tonsure were prohibited (Deut. 14:1 and cf. Lev. 19:27-28, 21:5). This might be explained as a reaction to the threat which the fear of the dead posed for dtr Yahwism or, in the case that these mourning rites had by this time been re-interpreted as non-threatening expressions of sympathy for the dead, as a response to their potential confusion with similar Mesopotamian practices (or some scenario involving both?).

Regarding ancestor cults, the view they did exist in early Israel but later biblical writers consciously suppressed them as they were incompatible with late Yahwistic religion is unlikely.

---

8 Granting the early Israelite embrace of the fear of the dead, the characterization of the dead in the Hebrew Bible as weak and deserving of pity might be a late polemic against this belief, but not against the belief in their beneficence which was likewise late and foreign in origin.

9 Loretz 1978:149-204, following others, argued that traces of the cult of the dead had been eliminated by orthodox Yahwism after the exile. Prior to this such a cult was considered legitimate Yahwistic religion. See also Smith 1990:127-29.
If a mortuary practice reflective of the belief in the supernatural beneficent dead like necromancy was depicted as having thrived from the late pre-exilic period onwards then prohibited in the traditions rather than simply expunged, would we not expect the same to be the case with the ancestor cult such as ancestor veneration or worship as they express this same belief and comprised contemporary Mesopotamia practices? The non-mention of necromancy and ancestor cults in traditions about earlier times such as we find in Hosea, Amos, and the Isaianic oracles of Isaiah chs.1-35 supports their earlier non-existence.

Although necromancy and the mourning rites of tonsure and gashing as depicted in the biblical traditions were not the exclusive prerogative of the royal class, the first millennium Mesopotamian evidence depicts the ancestor cult as a royal cult, a practice primarily, if not exclusively, designed for political legitimation. So hypothetically, we would expect to find the ancestor cult among Israel's royalty, but we do not. The Mesopotamian version of the royal ancestor cult presupposes a institutional infrastructure sufficient to initiate and maintain it: ideologically expedient ritual sites such as palaces and/or temples, a professional priesthood, sufficient material wealth and livestock for regular offerings fitting for dead royalty, and finally an imperialistic monarchy established by dynastic succession. In the final analysis, we would not expect its attachment to a petty vassal kingdom like Judah.¹⁰

¹⁰ Unlike at Mari where the autonomous Amorite dynasty there competed regionally with that of the Mesopotamian heartland. This explains the introduction of the royal ancestor cult to further the political agenda of the current ruling dynasty.
As this practice was historically the prerogative of imperial monarchies, underwritten by their enormous palatial economies, managed by the professional priesthood, and incorporated into the festival calendars, it is doubtful that the requisite economic and institutional infrastructures were present to sustain a royal ancestor cult in the Canaanite-Israelite context of the mid first millennium.

While Assyrian political domination often resulted in its religious influence on subject nations, certain obstacles would have impeded the incorporation of localized versions of the royal ancestor cult whether by willful adoption or imperial imposition. Had a subject people instituted a version of the royal ancestor cult incorporating local dynastic genealogies, this would have presented a challenge to the Assyrian claim to sovereignty. Besides, the financial underwriting of such a cult would have run counter to the subject nation's obligation to pay heavy tribute or taxes to her Assyrian overlord.

The kinds of potential social influences at play in Israelite developments vis-à-vis the world of malevolent and benevolent ghosts can be illustrated by the transformations which took place in the spirit world of the Greeks. Only in the case of the special dead such as the unburied and the murdered were the dead deemed objects worthy of fear otherwise the ordinary Greek dead were considered deserving of pity. In neither instance were the dead attributed supernatural beneficent powers. In fact, such

11 Of course, an unadulterated version of the Assyrian royal ancestor cult might have been adopted, but then this would not stand as evidence for an Israelite adaptation of an Assyrian religious form.
a belief is first attested beginning perhaps as early as the eighth century but coming to prominence by the late sixth century with the rise of the Greek cults venerating the heroes.\textsuperscript{12}

Although numerous factors contributed to the rise of the Greek hero cults, there is nevertheless a strong correlation between the rise of such cults and the evolution of the Greek polis. As a new expression of broad based group solidarity these cults superceded the ancestor cult which formerly functioned in this capacity for the powerful aristocratic kinship groups.\textsuperscript{13} Whereas the heroes were venerated and occasionally worshipped, the ancestors of earlier cults were merely cared for and commemorated and if proper respect for those dead ancestors was shortcoming, reprisals would come not from the dead but from the gods.\textsuperscript{14} In sum, the origin of the Greek belief in the dead's supernatural beneficent power is associated with concurrent ideological and social transformations.

This example of the role which sociological forces might play in the development of the belief in the benefic dead invites further speculation \textit{vis-à-vis} Israelite religion. The fear of the dead, the late religious influence exerted by Mesopotamia, and the restrictive legitimating attachments and economic demands of the royal ancestor cult combine to explain why the belief in the

\textsuperscript{12} Garland 1985:1-12, 88-93.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Burkert 1985:203-08; Garland 1985:121-23; and the recent survey and critique of the archeological data by Antonaccio 1987:7-21, 358-75.

\textsuperscript{14} So Garland 1985:8,118-20.
beneficent dead was embraced in Israel only of late and why necromancy became its preferred ritual expression.

Along with these factors, the gradual demise and eventual collapse of the existing Israelite social structures as experienced during the late pre-exilic to post-exilic period led to the exploitation of the divining arts as an alternative means of access to the world of the gods and as a new expression of broad based group solidarity. A similar search for new ways to access the gods obtained with the revival of the divining arts in the days of the late Assyrian kings when royal authority was weakening and with it the stability of the empire and the relevance of traditional religion. 

In conclusion, if the traditions in the DtrH preserve substantial and reliable historical reminicence -admittedly, the verdict is still out on this-, than one might conclude that the pre-exilic Israelites or, more accurately, Judahites did embrace a belief in the supernatural beneficent power of the the dead. Nevertheless, unlike other religious beliefs that were native to early Israelite religion but polemized against in the dtr and related traditions and artificially attributed foreign origins, this belief was of Mesopotamian origin, late, and expressed in a peculiar form of divination. The most likely terminus ad quo for the appropriation of this belief and its corresponding magical rite of necromancy is the reign of the Judahite king Manasseh.
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<tr>
<td>AAAS</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Archivi Reali di Ebla: Testi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM(T)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
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<td>-------------</td>
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<tr>
<td>dtr</td>
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<tr>
<td>DtrH</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOTL</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Irish Biblical Studies</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>JANES</td>
<td>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEN</td>
<td>Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEOL</td>
<td>Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESHO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNSL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAI</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSOT</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal I,II (AOAT 5/1-2. S. Parpola, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970,1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKA</td>
<td>Literaturische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Les textes para-mythologiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARI</td>
<td>Mari Annales Recherches Interdisciplinaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBE</td>
<td>Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSK</td>
<td>Meskéné-Emar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Massoretic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVAG</td>
<td>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Agyptischen Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>New American Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABU</td>
<td>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB</td>
<td>New Century Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>New English Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Old Babylonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLP</td>
<td>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLZ</td>
<td>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrAn</td>
<td>Oriens Antiquus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Old Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS</td>
<td>Oudtestamentische Studiën</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Priestly Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIBA</td>
<td>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU</td>
<td>Le Palais royal d'Ugarit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Revue d'Assyriologique et d'Archéologie Orientale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAI</td>
<td>Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Revue des Études Sémitique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHA</td>
<td>Revue Hittite et Asianique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Revue d'Histoire des Religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIH</td>
<td>Ras Ibn Hani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Ras Shamra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF</td>
<td>Rivista di Studi Fenici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>Rivista degli Studi Orientali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEb</td>
<td>Studi Eblaiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Syro-Mesopotamian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT</td>
<td>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPS</td>
<td>Transactions of the American Philosophical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGUOS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJT</td>
<td>Toronto Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLZ</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tell Mardikh (Ebla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTC</td>
<td>Tyndale Old Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>Ugarit-Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>Vordäufiger Bericht über die... Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBC</td>
<td>Vetus Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Word Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>Die Welt des Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
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</tr>
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