UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The "God of the Fathers" and Self-Identification in the Hebrew Bible

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

by

Michael Wingert

2017

© Copyright by

Michael Wingert

2017

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The "God of the Fathers"

and Self-Identification in the Hebrew Bible

by

Michael Wingert

Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2017

Professor William M. Schniedewind, Chair

The patriarchal narratives in the book of Genesis feature unique language addressing the deity, comprised of invoking the "God of the Fathers" and related rhetoric. Beginning with Albrecht Alt in 1929, scholars have attempted to identify the "God of the Fathers" given the canonically enigmatic ways this invocation is expressed in the patriarchal narratives. This study reframes the question by asking why such language might be used to articulate one's connection to the divine.

Biblical scholarship has primarily employed comparative data from Northwest Semitic texts and inscriptions (to include the rather large corpus of texts from Ugarit) as a means of contextualizing the world of ancient Israel presented in the Hebrew Bible. However, the bulk of this data in conversation with the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible is colored by contact with the Neo-Hittite Anatolian speaking communities dwelling in the same region. This Syro-Anatolian legacy comprises an under-researched approach to the Hebrew Bible. This study

fortifies the use of comparative Northwest Semitic data by addressing the Anatolian (i.e., Hittite and Luwian) language traditions as dialogue partners with the distinctive features found in Northwest Semitic traditions.

This investigation takes a two-pronged approach to reevaluating the topic of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible, by undertaking: 1) an examination of the biblical narrative in light of social memory, and 2) an assessment of the topic in light of cultural contact and convergence. Further approaches within the fields of biblical studies, Near Eastern archaeology, and Near Eastern religion are employed in this study to explore the topic to a greater degree today than in recent years. Additionally, the present investigation looks at the common language associated with the paternal relationship to the divine as a way of addressing the ensuing difficulties in translating such rhetoric means for dialoguing with the concept of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible. In their interpretation of such language in the ancient Near East, scholars have rendered translated various expressions concerning the "God of the Fathers" as both "Father Gods" and "Deified Fathers."

This work concludes that the rhetoric behind invoking the "God of the Fathers" forms an identity statement regarding the divine control of one's being. This rhetoric became especially important during the period of Assyrian westerward expansion in the eighth century BCE and best fits within the context of Hezekiah's reforms when divergent religious traditions populated Jerusalem. With such rhetoric, no paternal deity is immediately identifiable and when an identity for the god of one's fathers can be proposed, such a deity is not always able to be identified beyond the person in question. Furthermore, worship of a specific, mythologized El as found at Ugarit regularly proposed by earlier studies is not supported for ancient Israel as a whole. Though the possibility of such worship with specific families may very well have been the case,

not all theophoric uses of El names (or even theophory in general) refer to the specific mythologized El. Thus, the use of the rhetoric invoking the "God of the Fathers" is primarily an invocation of one's family deity, and secondarily equated with Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible in order to personalize the enforcement of the canonical Yahwism of Jerusalem.

The dissertation of Michael Wingert is approved.

Aaron A. Burke

H. Craig Melchert

William M. Schniedewind, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2017

For My Girls

Table of Contents

Abstract of Dissertation	ii-iv
Abbreviations	viii-ix
Acknowledgements	x-xi
Vita	xii-xiii
Chapter One: *Introduction to the "God of the Fathers"*	1
Chapter Two: *The History of Scholarship Surrounding the "God of the Fathers"*	19
Chapter Three: *The 'God of the Fathers' in the Broader Ancient Near East*	40
Chapter Four: *The Indo-European Cultic Traditions and the 'God of the Fathers'*	70
Chapter Five: *The Northwest Semitic Traditions and the 'God of the Fathers'*	109
Chapter Six: *The "El" Traditions and the 'God of the Fathers'*	134
Chapter Seven: *The 'God of the Fathers' and the Narratives of the Patriarchs*	162
Chapter Eight: *Synthesis and Conclusion*	197
Appendix 1	205
Bibliography	209

ABBREVIATIONS

ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*
ACLT	*Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeological Review*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BO	*Biblioteca Orientalis*
CAD	*Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CHLI	*Corpus of Heiroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*
COS	*The Context of Scripture*. 3 Volumes. Edited by William W. Hallo. Leiden, 2003.
CTH	*Catalog der Texte der Hethiter*
DDD	*Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*
DULAT	*Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in Alphabetic Texts*
HTR	*The Harvard Theological Review*
HUS	*Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JANES	*Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JCSMS	*Journal of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies*

JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
RHR	*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie*
SAA	*State Archives of Assyria*
UDB	*Ugaritic Data Bank*
UF	*Ugarit Forschungen*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Acknowledgements

The idea for this dissertation emerged as a result of several conversations I had with Professor William Schniedewind that were coinciding with my readings in Anatolian languages on the same subject. Professor Schniedewind's guidance presented me the opportunity to integrate my love of ancient Near Eastern languages and the Hebrew Bible. He has been a tremendous source of knowledge to me throughout my time at UCLA and is equally wonderful a person as he is a scholar. I would also like to express my gratitude to the members of my committee. Craig Melchert, whose depth of knowledge in the Anatolian languages led me to love Hittite and Luwian. Aaron Burke has provided me with a deeper appreciation for archaeology and the necessary dialogue archaeologists and scholars of ancient texts must share together. Yona Sabar has been a consistent presence in my studies here at UCLA, sharing my love of Semitic languages. I hope that I may help keep alive the Neo-Aramaic language of his youth, whether in academia or among the communities of Neo-Aramaic heritage.

I am tremendously thankful to have been surrounded by so many amazing people on my academic journey. The pursuit of a doctorate is challenging enough on its own, and for many of us, life "happens" at the same time. I soon came to understand what others had consistently told me: One of the greatest features of the UCLA Near Eastern Languages and Cultures community has been the quality of the people involved. We have an excellent system of leadership and mentorship proceeding forth from the department chair, to our advisers, supporting professors, and extending throughout the stages of graduate students. I hope that in my time at UCLA, I have been as fine a mentor to the younger generation of graduate students as my mentors have been to me.

Many professors, scholars, mentors, and colleagues have been a part shaping me into the scholar I am today. To Marilynn Lundberg Melzian, Christopher B. Hays, M. Rahim Shayegan, Barbara Cifola, and Carol Bakhos, thank you for our time together. Jeremy Smoak has been a friend and mentor to me in invaluable ways. He has regularly provided me with feedback on my research, been a friend, and provided me an outstanding example for me to emulate. I am also grateful to Peter Lanfer for his mentorship.

There are so many others whose fellowship made the past six years a joy. Emanuel Gergis, Philip Zhakevich, Alice Mandell, Melissa Ramos, Jody Washburn, Nadia Ben-Marzouk, Amy Karoll, Shiela Keiter, Tim Hogue, Ani Shahinian, Rosanna Lu, Andrew Danielson, Jason Price, and Martinluther Chan. Emmanuel Gergis has been a constant confidant and brother. I am very thankful for Alice and Melissa who blazed a trail before me, leading by example, and Jody Washburn who in addition to being a great friend, patiently put up with my antics for half a decade. Tim Hogue, *bar Athra*, never forget Beth Nahreen. I also extend my gratitude to Lisa McAulay of UCLA's digital library and Michael Phelps of EMEL who provided me the opportunity to read ancient Syriac manuscripts invoking the "God of the Fathers" from the world's oldest functioning library.

To my lovely wife Romina, my heart. Thank you for being the perfect companion. You inspire me every day and continually shape me into the best person I can be. Thank you for putting up with the long hours that went into this program. My parents Milton and Jane have been a constant support as have my brothers Scott and Greg. This has been quite an experience and I could not have gotten through it without all of you.

VITA

ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH APPOINTMENTS

Lecturer, Spring 2015 – Spring 2017; *Holy Transfiguration College, Springfield, VA*
Adjunct Lecturer, Fall 2016 – Winter 2017; *Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA*
Instructor, Summer 2014-16, Winter 2016, Spring 2016; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
Lead Research Assistant – Sinai Palimpsests Project, 2015-2016; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
Teaching Fellow, Spring 2015-2016; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
Teaching Associate, 2013-2015; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
Teaching Assistant, 2012-2013; *UCLA , Los Angeles, CA*
Graduate Researcher for Dr. William Schniedewind, 2011-2012; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*

EDUCATION

Ph.D. (*In Progress*), Near Eastern Languages and Cultures; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
C.Phil. (*Spring 2015*), Near Eastern Languages and Cultures; *UCLA, Los Angeles, CA*
M.A. (Dec. 2013) Near Eastern Languages and Cultures; *UCLA*
M.A..T. Ancient Near Eastern Languages and Literature; *Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA*
B.A. (May 9, 2000) School of Cinematic Arts, *University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA*

ACADEMIC HONORS AND AWARDS

2016-17	Dissertation Year Fellowship – UCLA
2016	American Oriental Society Graduate Student Award
2016	Academic Research Grant for the Humanities of Medicine in the Ancient Near East – W.M. Keck Foundation
2016	Near Eastern Languages and Cultures Departmental Nominee, UCLA Distinguished Teaching Award
2016	Ancient Mesopotamian Liver Model *Mini*-Grant, Office of Instructional Development – UCLA
2015	Collegium of University Teaching Fellows Award – UCLA
2014	Society of Biblical Literature Pacific Coast Region Graduate Student Paper Award
2013	UCLA Graduate Summer Research Mentorship – "Bodies Beyond the Flesh: Onomastic Ideology in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East."
2011	Chancellor's Prize Awardee – University of California, Los Angeles
2010	Syriac Scholarship Awardee – Emmanuel Association of Southern California
2009	Bob Watson Scholarship Awardee – Fuller Theological Seminary
1997	Dean's List - University of Southern California

PUBLICATIONS

Wingert, Michael. "Ancient Near Eastern Literary Influences on the Hebrew Bible," in *Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*. (ed. Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee; Wiley-Blackwell, Forthcoming).

_____. "Aram – Critical Issues: Origins and Identity of the Arameans," *Lexham Bible Dictionary*, John D. Barry, Ed. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.

_____. "Carchemish," *Lexham Bible Dictionary*, John D. Barry, Ed. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.

_____. "In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate: Repurposing a Trinitarian Invocation in Light of the Principle of Textual Attraction to Exodus 34:6," *Alexandria School Journal*, Vol. 2 (2015).

_____. "Receiving the Divine: Reshaping Votive Theology in the Old Testament as the Incarnational Model for Mission in the Eastern Church," in *The Proceedings from the 2015 Washington Annual Orthodox Patristic Symposium*. (ed. Emmanuel Gergis; St. Cyril Society Press, Forthcoming).

CONFERENCE PARTICIPATION AND PAPER PRESENTATIONS

Panel Chair for the session: "Transformation and Regeneration" at *2016 Conference for the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows*. UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, 2016.

"A Late Antique Paradigm for Interpretation of the Psalm Superscriptions." *Annual Meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, Book History and Biblical Literatures Session* – San Antonio, TX. Nov. 19-22, 2016.

"I Adjure You by Your Name: Onomatology, Judean Magic, and Coptic Healing Incantations as Successor to Ancient Near Eastern Medicine." *IACS 11th International Congress of Coptic Studies* – Claremont, CA, July 28, 2016.

"Literary Technology and the Development of Syriac Cursive." *AOS Annual Meeting 2016* – Boston, MA. March 19, 2016.

"The Manly Deeds of David: Before the Book of Samuel." *Society of Biblical Literature Pacific Coast Region, Hebrew Bible Session* – Claremont, CA. March 13, 2016.

"Ancient Near Eastern Cultures in the Mind and Praxis of the Early Church." *Washington DC Annual Orthodox Patristics Symposium* – Washington, DC. July 18, 2015.

"Scripture vs. the Bible: Texts in Late Antiquity in Light of Literary Technology." *Washington DC Annual Orthodox Patristics Symposium* – Washington, DC. Sept. 5, 2014.

"Funerary Stelae in the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Kuttamuwa Inscription*." Society of Biblical Literature Pacific Coast Region, Ancient Near East Session* – Fullerton, CA. March, 30, 2014.

LANGUAGES

Modern: Neo-Aramaic, **Modern Hebrew**, **German**, French (reading).

Ancient: **Biblical Hebrew**, **Aramaic dialects**, **Classical Syriac** (including Christian Palestinian Aramaic), **Ugaritic/NWS**, Akkadian, **Luwian**, Hittite, Old Persian, Ethiopic, Ancient Greek, Coptic (Bohairic).

ACADEMIC SERVICE

2016-Present	*Advisory Board* – **The Assyrian Arts Institute; Los Altos, CA.**
2015-16	*Guest Editorial Board* – **Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies**
2015	*Dead Sea Scrolls Exhibit* – **California Science Center; Los Angeles, CA.**
2013 – 2016	*Lexical Contributor* – ***Sedra Project***, **Beth Mardutho Institute**.
2013 – Present	*Volunteer Instructor, Administrator* – **Holy Transfiguration College** (**St. Cyril of Alexandria Orthodox Christian Society).**
2013 – 2015	*Content Contributor* – **West Semitic Research Project**, *USC*.

Chapter One

Introduction to the "God of the Fathers"

The God of the Fathers and Religious Lens of the Patriarchs

The transformation of the religious diversity in ancient Israel toward the canonical Yahwism of Jerusalem required making the deity Yahweh familiar to those of a different cultic devotion. The means by which this familiarity was accomplished by the Jerusalem cult required utilizing the language familiar to the inhabitants Northern Kingdom, a language prevalent in the cultic language of ancient Syria and heavily rooted in the religious life of the family. The rhetoric utilized in the cultic life of this region regularly invokes the paternal deities or gods of one's father as the centerpiece of religious devotion in one's family. It was through the invocation of the "God of the Fathers" that non-Yahwists could join in canonical unity with the religion of Jerusalem.

As a divine designation, the notion of the "God of the Fathers" is fairly ubiquitous throughout the Hebrew Bible. This titular invocation takes a relatively standard form ("the God of your fathers," and "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel") in deuteronomic and post-exilic literature, but is uniquely phrased in the patriarchal narratives. For example, Gen 31:53 notes a

plurality of deities present in the oath between Laban and Jacob: “The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, they will judge between us, the God of their father. And Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac.” Similarly, Gen 49:25 juxtaposes the paternal deity with the divine title *ʾēl šaddai*: “Even by the God of your father, who shall help thee, and by the *ʾēl šaddai*, who shall bless thee, with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that crouches below, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb.” The canonically questionable language of the patriarchal narratives suggests established traditions reaching back to a time prior to canonical development of the Hebrew Bible, beginning in Exodus 3:6a where the deity is invoked as “the God of your father: the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” Even though this accords with the Hebrew Bible’s own narrative chronology, the patriarchal setting provides a more important starting point for this investigation by virtue of the fact that narrative is set within a tribal, pre-monarchical framework. The perspective offered by the text imagines a setting apart from the official religion during the monarchical period and/or especially during the post-monarchical period when ancient Israelite religion re-forges into emerging Judaism.

The terms and expressions concerning the God of the Fathers belong to three categories: primary references, secondary references, and ancillary references. Primary references are those that suggest a less theologically developed notion of the term with regard to the Hebrew Bible progress toward a more cogent monotheism. The primary references are located in the Jacob Cycle (Gen 28:13; 31; 32:10), later the Joseph Cycle (Gen 43:23; 46:1-3; 49:24-26; 50:17) and capped off with the revelation of the divine name at Sinai (Exod 3:6, 13-16) punctuated with the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:2). In addition to predating the development of the canonical Yahwism of the monarchy or the religion of Second Temple Judaism, these instances reflect the language of the textual and inscriptional traditions of Late Bronze Age and early Iron Age Syria. This

points to the use of the "God of the Fathers" in the patriarchal narratives as the oldest of the biblical tradition and argues for an Iron Age dating of the phraseology in what would later become the book of Genesis.

Secondary references are composed of two types: those that first require primary constructions in order for their own development to take place, and those which occur in texts dating well beyond the period of pre-exilic Israel. These can be found in the following expressions: "Yahweh, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exod 4:5; 1 Kgs 18:36; 1 Chr 29:18; 2 Chr 30:6); "Yahweh, the God of your fathers" (Deut 1:11; 21; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7; 27:3; 29:25; Josh 18:3; Jdg 2:12; 2 Kgs 21:22; 1 Chr 5:25; 12:17; 2 Chr 7:22; 13:12, 18; 14:4; 15:12; 19:4; 20:6, 33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:9). 25; 33:12; 34:32, 33; 36:15); "the God of your father" (1 Chr 28:9); "the God of their fathers" (1 Chr 29:20; 2 Chr 30:19, 22).[1]

The third and final category consists of ancillary references, namely those references from the Hebrew Bible that do not directly evoke the notion of the God of the Fathers but make reference to the tradition directly and indirectly. Frequently, the ancillary references surround the context of the primary collection and initially emerge in the Abraham Cycle: *ʾēl ʿelyon* (Gen 14:18-22), *ʾēl šaddai* (Gen 17:1), *ʾēl ʿōlam* (Gen 21:3), *ʾēl bet-ʾēl* (Gen 31:13). These ancillary references to the "God of the Fathers" have been central to the investigations attempting to identify the paternal deity. Accordingly, these divine designations also serve a role in understanding the rhetorical use of the "God of the Fathers."

[1] Additional references to God identifiers (e.g., God of Israel, God of heaven, etc.) are not listed in this study.

The beliefs and practices of ancient Israelite religion have been the impetus driving biblical scholarship in the modern period. Early source critics attempted to correlate the dating of the textual sources of the Pentateuch to major themes in the religious traditions of ancient Israel according to time and place. Similarly, form critics sought to uncover the pre-literary units of biblical literature (especially prophetic oracles and psalmic literature) that reflected the life of the cult of ancient Israel as it related to Israel's neighbors. A disciple of this tradition, Albrecht Alt, sought an answer to the question identifying the "God of the Fathers" in light of canonically enigmatic texts in the patriarchal narratives. Alt observed that curious divine titles פחד יצחק *PḤD yiṣḥaq* (Gen 31:42, 53) and אביר יעקב *ʾabīr yaʿaqob* (Gen 49:24) are each set in the context of the paternal deity, the so-called "God of the Fathers," strongly suggesting a connection between these traditions. While subsequent investigations into the paternal deity of the patriarchal narratives occasionally followed in the twentieth century, these have always been secondary to broader discussions concerning ancient Israelite religion.

In the time since the investigation was broached by Alt, the biblical scholarship following this investigation has been preoccupied with discovering the identity of the "God of the Fathers." The question that ought to be asked is, why use such language to articulate one's connection to the divine? When asked in such a way, the question invites a broader understanding of the use of this divine invocation. This investigation takes a two-pronged approach to reevaluating the topic of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible, by undertaking: 1) an examination of the biblical narrative in light of social memory, and 2) an assessment of the topic in light of cultural contact and convergence. Further approaches within the fields of biblical studies, Near Eastern archaeology, and Near Eastern religion permit us to explore the topic to a greater degree today than in recent years. Additionally, the present investigation looks at the common language

associated with the paternal relationship to the divine and the ensuing difficulties that emerge from divergent scholarly interpretation of such language in the ancient Near East as a means for dialoguing with the concept of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible.[2] In order to address this problem, a *paternal paradigm* is necessary to differentiate between similar, yet divergent common language.

The paternal paradigm can be summarized thusly as mankind's attempted understanding of himself as a continuing conversation between him and his father. This framework provides the opportunity to clarify the nuances of ancient Near Eastern family religion, by examining the relationality between humans and their predecessors. The paternal paradigm consists of three related phenomena that are often confused with one another or whose nuances intersect leading researchers to be of one opinion or another. These consist of the following three phenomena: 1) the "father gods" or gods of a fatherly character who paradigmatically mirror the familial structure of the earthly (and most often royal) life; 2) the divine ancestors (i.e., "the god, the father"), who having lived their life on the earth have passed on and through apotheosis have become divinized in the divine realm; 3) and lastly, the tradition of the paternal deities (i.e., "paternal god(s)") or the gods of the fathers, to whom a person, family, or clan stands toward in their cultic devotion. These three related yet distinct phenomena provided the necessary structure for interpreting the identity or role of paternal deities among their various devotees.

[2] To date, most research has pursued a better understanding of family religion in the ancient Near East rather than conceiving of a paternal paradigm. Karel Van der Toorn observes two facets to family religion, notably that "it expresses itself in the veneration of a particular god and in the cult of the family ancestors." See Van der Toorn,, "Family Religion in Second Millennium West Asia (Mesopotamia, Emar, Nuzi)" in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity* eds. John P Bodel and Saul M. Olyan. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub. Ltd, 2008), 21. As Rainer Albertz has noted, it may be appropriate to depict the family as the key vehicle in religion (i.e., ancient Israelite religion) where the father is priest (Gen 13:18, 35:7), and the cult is the family. See Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, 30.

The investigation follows by introducing Syro-Anatolian data of both the Indo-European (i.e., Anatolian) and Northwest Semitic (i.e. "Syrian") variety into the conversation as a result of religious contact and convergence. The Syro-Anatolian tradition makes extensive use of rhetoric concerning the paternal deity or deities. This rhetoric, taken together with Northwest Semitic Traditions (and even those of the broader Near East) reveals a common discourse centered on the assertion of one's identity. The investigation concludes with a reexamination of the discourse surrounding the "God of the Fathers" in patriarchal narratives of the Hebrew Bible, where this identification rhetoric argues for a common identity for peoples of otherwise divergent religious traditions.

This study further aims to utilize research in collective memory (sometimes referred to as social memory) as the primary method for unpacking the tradition of the "God of the Fathers" in the patriarchal narratives of the book of Genesis. As it comes down to us today, the Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph Cycles form the latter-half of the book of Genesis, a text resulting from source material that has been leveled and formed into an introduction to the historical background of the identity of ancient Israel. The text retains facets of its oral sources at times that have persisted in the memory of the community through specific phrasing surrounding the paternal deity. In addition to examining the language of Genesis, this study will focus on memorial traditions maintained through ritual and stone stelae as material memorial markers.

Background to the "God of the Fathers"

The underlying motivation provoking the investigation of the identity of the paternal deity is rooted in the Hebrew Bible's own language about God, specifically its own observable progression from a less specifically defined theological position toward the familiar monotheism

known from antiquity onward.[3] The patriarchal narratives themselves do not present a literate social apparatus, and thus we must rely on these narratives as memories of the past embedded in the broader vision of the Hebrew Bible. Even after the addition of redactional layers to the Genesis narratives, it is not entirely clear whether the "God of the Fathers" is one deity or a term used for multiple deities operating within and outside of the cultic devotion of the patriarchs. The lack of theological clarity in this material points to a time for the formation of the patriarchal narratives that would have tolerated more ambiguous language in regard to the idea of divinity. While the comparative rhetoric from the region is strongest in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, the textualization is likely to have occurred in eighth century Judah during the reign of Hezekiah. The late eighth century destruction of the BCE Northern Kingdom and the absorption of refugees into Jerusalem provide a context for the integration of the northern narratives into the cultic life of Jerusalem without necessarily foreshadowing the cult reforms of Josiah nearly a century later.[4] Indeed, had patriarchal narratives been the invention of a later (e.g. post-exilic) era, we may expect the redactors to have leveled the less than monotheistic implications present in these narratives.

The notion of the "God of the Fathers" emerges in the patriarchal narratives, pre-dating the advent of Israel as a nation in terms of the biblical narrative. The "God of the Fathers" is the

[3] The term 'monotheism' is problematic on a number of levels. Here I use it only to qualify the general product from antiquity onward that is used to distinguish Abrahamic faiths from other religious systems. For a detailed discussion of the topic, see Mark S. Smith, "Monotheism and Redefinition of Divinity" in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Ancient Israel*, Susan Niditch ed. (Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 2016), 278-193.

[4] The cult reforms of Josiah targeting the bones in the sepulchers (2 Kgs 23:15-20) suggests an attempt to distance the life of the cult from the veneration of one's ancestors or any tradition associated with one's family line, including the devotion to the god of one's father.

operative *nom divin* prior to the revelation of the name Yahweh at Sinai (Exod 3:15).[5] The impact of the term appears to have been more powerful for the events surrounding the patriarchs and the nomadic period of Israel's wandering. After the revelation of the divine name, the rhetoric surrounding the family line was superseded by the rhetoric of divine royalty, following the entry of the Israelites into the land of Canaan. The remembrance of the "God of the Fathers" has as its narrative setting a time long before the monarchy, when the Israelites knew their history to have been quite different than it was during the early days of the production of the Pentateuch (or the sources that later coalesced into the Pentateuch). This memory reflects a time of divergence, when the Children of Israel could look backward and see themselves in the surrounding nations, yet still perceive themselves differently.

The emergence of ancient Israel has been the background of a number of investigations over the past century.[6] One point congruent between each position is that ancient Israel arose from a presumably illiterate or at best non-literate leadership.[7] The approach taken by this investigation addresses the problem of a society emerging out of the rubble-heap of the ancient Near East following the collapse of the major Bronze Age powers and the social framework in

[5] See Schniedewind, "Calling God Names: an Inner-Biblical Approach to the Tetragrammaton,"in *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination: Essays in Honour of Michael Fishban*e, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 74-86.

[6] With perhaps the exception of the traditional conquest model, various models for the emergence of Israel have been proposed in the twentieth century. Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth proposed a model of peaceful infiltration. George Mendenhall, working from a platform that was influenced by the then popular Marxist interpretational model, was a proponent of the peasant revolt theory. This was a position that asserted that ancient Israel emerged by overthrowing the imperial Egyptians who ruled Canaan during much of the Bronze Age. The gradual emergence theory is a recent position taken by William Dever who argues based on archeological finds that Israel was always present in the land and eventually coalesced ideologically.

[7] Schniedewind makes a distinction between literate, non-literate, and illiterate societies. The subtlety of the assertion here lies in the notion of the non-literate: "Non-literate denotes people who belong to societies where writing is either unknown or restricted, as in the ancient Near East." See Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 25.

operation during that time. The absence of a scribal apparatus for an emergent community presumes the community's conceptualization of itself to have been primarily conveyed via oral literature as the medium of social memory. Moreover, emerging amidst a mélange of peoples, languages, and cultures of the ancient Near East necessitates the investigation in terms of contact and convergence.

Traditional data sets have primarily incorporated Northwest Semitic literature (including the textual corpus from Ugarit) as the comparative framework for better understanding Israelite religion in the patriarchal narratives. This data is largely colored by interaction with non-Semitic communities from the same region: namely, those of the Syro-Anatolian tradition. The region of Syro-Anatolia is defined as the southern frontier of the Hittite Empire where contact between the Anatolian peoples of the Indo-European tradition (Hittites and Luwians) met with the Semitic populations dwelling in Syria proper.[8] More importantly, in this study Syro-Anatolia refers to the textual traditions of that same region (at the same time covering what might be regarded as the Northern Levant or Northern Mesopotamia) where the inscriptional remains attest to the cohabitation of traditions. As more Hittite and Luwian translations become available to non-specialists, these contact traditions can no longer be ignored. In other words, the pervasive extent of this cultural contact evinces a common cultic language for the region. Hebrew Bible scholarship must consider the Anatolian language literary tradition alongside the Semitic literary tradition from the region when incorporating comparative data into biblical research. This is especially significant in light of the Syro-Anatolian backdrop to the patriarchal narratives.

[8] For a brief geographical outline, see Alessandra Gilbert, *Syro-hittite Monumental Art and the Archaeology of Performance: The Stone Reliefs at Carchemish and Zincirli in the Earlier First Millennium Bce*. (New York: De Gruyter, 2011), 5.

The Syro-Anatolian Backdrop to the Patriarchal Narratives

The biblical narrative treating the origins of the patriarchs consistently refers to a Syro-Anatolian backdrop prior to entry into Canaan. The theophoric names in the book of Genesis are all names bearing the northern (to include Mesopotamian) moniniker *ʾēl* (be it the specific name El or the general term *ʾēl*), in contrast to the southern tradition lying behind the cult of Yahweh. Outside of the book of Genesis, the Hebrew Bible remembers this Syro-Anatolian heritage as journey of a wandering Aramean (Deut 26:5) who dwelt beyond the Euphrates (Josh 24:2). Ezekiel's pronouncement (Eze 16:3) of the divine reminder directed at Jerusalem of the city's Hittite and Amorite heritage too, by tradition (and scriptural context), implicates the patriarchs in this background. Apart from these inter-textual notes scattered about the Hebrew Bible, the Genesis narratives are more specific in their reference to the northeastern Levant as the backdrop to the emergence of the patriarchs.

The narratives of the patriarchs in the book of Genesis maintain a tradition remembering this Syro-Anatolian heritage, beginning with the genealogy of Abraham (Abram) from his ancestor Shem, beginning in Gen 11:10. Since the medieval era,[9] the names of Abraham's lineage have been thought to correspond with the locations of several cities around and including the Syro-Anatolian region of Harran inhabited by communities of Luwians and Arameans. In the modern era, Feyerick, Gordon, and Sarna noted this observation.[10] More recently, Hendel

[9] The Armenian edition of the Twelfth Century C.E. *Syriac Chronicle of Michael the Great* notes the connection between the person of Serug and the construction of the city in the region here defined as Syro-Anatolia: "Serug built the city of Seruch in his name." See *The Chronicle of Michael the Great, Patriarch of the Syrians*, Robert Bedrousian (trans.), (Bedrousian: Long Branch, NJ, 2013), 23.

[10] A Feyerick, C.H. Gordon, and N.M. Sarna, *Genesis: World of Myths and Patriarchs* (New York: NYU Press, 1996), 146-7.

observes that all the personal names of Abraham's ancestors correspond with toponymns from the Euphrates-Habur region, "These place-names, in various forms, are known in texts from the second and first millennia BCE"[11] Furthermore, the list of sons noted in Gen 11 prior to Terah and Abram's departure from Harran, coincides with at least two other locales from the same area.[12]

The setting for the patrilineal origins of Abraham found principally in this region of Syro-Anatolia strengthens the traditional geographic origin as being in the same region. There beyond the Euphrates, Terah and his son Abraham came out of *Ur Kaśdim* and dwelt in Haran (Gen 11:28, 31) in Upper Mesopotamia. The location of *Ur Kaśdim* has been difficult to pinpoint and is mostly likely bound to when one dates the Genesis tradition. Regardless of the dating one ascribes to the textualization of Genesis, the fact remains that biblical narrative recalls this northern Levantine tradition. One position espoused by John van Seters, argues for an exilic dating of the patriarchal narratives as attributed to an author writing in the Persian era or later, who would have redacted the citation of *(Ur) Kaśdim* in order to encourage the exilic community to make the journey from Babylon to Yehud, following the path of Abraham.[13] While the notation of the *Kaśdim* reference itself is plausibly a redaction due to the entry of the Chaldeans into Southern Iraq occurring long after the period of the patriarchs, one would expect the citation from the book of Joshua to read "on the Euphrates" instead of "beyond the Euphrates" if the Ur of Southern Mesopotamia was the correct reference.

[11] Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 52.

[12] The two names which coincide with locales in Southeast Anatolia / North Syria are Serugh (The present-day Turkish city of *Suruç*), and the Eber river region near Malatya.

[13] See Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*. Noted also in Rendsburg, "Reading David in Genesis" *Bible Review* (Biblical Archaeology Society: Feb. 2001).

The other option presented before us is that the Ur reference in Gen 11:28 and 31 refers to some place near Haran in North Syria; such a position impugns the notion of a lower-Mesopotamian location for *Ur Kaśdim*, lending credence to the long held traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, which associate *Ur Kaśdim* with south-central Anatolia.[14] Even though the location of Abraham's Ur is not the primary concern of this study, the two options for understanding the construction *Ur Kaśdim* potentially help in advancing the framework for this investigation: either 1) *Kaśdim* is original to the composition of Gen 11:28 and 31 or 2) *Kaśdim* is a redactional insertion. If *Kaśdim* is original to the Genesis text, we may consider a different etymology than the typical interpretation of Chaldees (or Chaldeans).[15] Considering the orthographic shift required for transcribing the Akkadian *kaldu* (Chaldean)[16] into the Hebrew

[14] This is the view of G.A. Rendsburg, following Cyrus H. Gordon. See Gordon and Rendsburg, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East.* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1997), 113.

[15] The shift presumably treats the problem of sibilants in Semitic languages and orthography with a hypothetical lateralized-fricative ś > l, as is sometimes speculated in phonological studies of the Semitic languages. For more on this discussion, see Alice Faber, "Akkadian Evidence for Proto-Semitic Affricates" in *JCS* 37 No. 1 (Spring 1985) 101-107; "Second Harvest: šibbōletθ Revisited (Yet Again)" in *JSS* 37 (Spring 1992): 1-10; "Semitic Sibilants in an Afro-Asiatic Context," *JSS* 29 (1984): 189-224. Additionally, Hebrew and Akkadian tend to correlate where sibilant shifting is concerned, which would make the Hebrew *kaśdim* to the Akkadian *kaldu* a unique example.

[16] In the event that the biblical rendering of *Kaśdim* does refer to the Akkadian *kaldu*, we may consider noting Akkadian letter ABL 0337 (*SAA* 10, 347) of the Neo-Assyrian period from Mar-Issar, Esarhaddon's Agent in Babylonia. The letter reports observing the eclipse of the moon and provides an interpretation. This letter is significant as it at best locates *kaldu* in the land of the Amorites to the west of Assyria and at the least implies confusion between the term Amorite and that of *Kaldu*. The relevant portion of the letter comes from recto lines 11b-15, which read in Akkadian (and following the transliteration conventions of Parpola): AN.MI ^{d}30 *an-ni-i ša iš-kun-u-ni* KUR.KUR u*l-tap-pi-it lu-um-an-šú gab-bu ina* UGU KUR—MAR.TU.KI *ik-te-mir* KUR—*a-mur-ru-u* KUR—*ḫa-at-tu-u šá-ni-iš* KUR.*kal-du*. The "at best" interpretation reads: "This lunar eclipse which took place, afflected the lands, but all its evil is piled upon the *māt Amurri* (the West). The land of the Amorites (is) the land of the Hittite or (*šaniš*) Chaldea." This interpretation would conflate the location of Chaldea with Amurru. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the "at least" interpretation is to be preferred. Though the text is part of the epistolary genre, when the term *šaniš* is used in astronomical texts, the term infers a secondary interpretation. Thus, the latter portion of r15 would be interpreted as "the land of the Amorites (is) the land of the Hittite or another interpretation (is) Chaldea." The reason for the secondary interpretation most likely results from the ambiguity of the Akkadian CvC signs MAR and KAL. These signs have the same appearance except for the final stroke. The MAR sign's final stroke is a short horizontal line on the far right, whereas the KAL sign's final stroke is a vertical line on the far right. The two terms would be even more ambiguous when written ^{KUR}MAR.TU and ^{KUR}*kal-dú*, as the characters would look nearly the same. We may subsequently infer that confusion between the two writings may

Kaśdim, a different interpretation would be to take *kaśdim* as referring to the banks or shores (Akk. *kišādu*) of a river or in reference to a rebellious population (Akk. *kašdu*). A more interesting proposal for the location of Abraham's *Ur Kaśdim* is the Hurrian city of Urkesh proposed by Arie Issar.[17] The proposal made by Issar emerges from his work on climate change and water resources in the ancient Near East, where he asserts that the movement of peoples from Urkesh in North Syria (to include Terah and Abram [Abraham]) was a period of dryness impacting the ancient Near East from 2300 BCE to approximately 1800 BCE. Issar concludes that travel from Urkesh to nearby Haran would have been a more feasible journey for Terah than far to the south in Babylonia.[18] Cyrus Gordon alludes to an Ur(a) in his discussion of Hittite merchants, though its location on the Mediterranean coast would lie too far outside the Syro-Anatolian milieu to be considered a candidate for biblical Ur.[19]

If, however, *Kaśdim* constitutes an exilic or post-exilic redactional insertion tying the community of exile to the experience of the Mesopotamian power who sent the Jerusalem community into exile (or their liberators), the issue surrounding the progenitors of Terah and Abraham nevertheless remain reflected in Syro-Anatolia. Along with Haran, locating Abraham's

---

have produced a conflated understanding of the two locations. See Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, (Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki University Press, 1993), 282.

[17] See Arie S. Issar, *Strike the Rock and There Shall Come Water: Climate Changes, Water Resources and History of the Lands of the Bible*, (New York: Springer, 2014), 67.

[18] Ibid., 67-68. Issar also notes that Urkesh was destroyed in 1530 BCE and by the time the patriarchal narratives were written down, the specific Ur(kesh) would have been forgotten though the southern Ur in Babylonia would still have been remembered. I do not concur with this assessment apart from the more general observation that Ur in Babylonia is problematic. A more solid dating for this material now dates between 2200 and 1900 BCE as recently documented by Aaron A. Burke. See Burke, "Amorites, Climate Change and the Negotiation of Identity at the End of the Third Millennium B.C." in *The Late Third Millennium in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14, and Climate Change*, ed. F. Höflmayer, Oriental Institute Seminars 11, (Oriental Institute, Chicago, 2017): 261-308.

[19] See Gordon, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura" *JNES*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Jan 1958): 28-31.

Ur in Syro-Anatolia would further highlight the region of Southern Anatolia and North Syria's importance to the development of the patriarchal narratives. Barring a more exhaustive investigation of this issue, the Syro-Anatolian location of Abraham's Ur is to be preferred to the lower Mesopotamian version.

The presentation of the patriarchs in the Hebrew Bible consistenly portrays a connection far to the north in Syro-Anatolia. The inference we may take away from this observation is that the dating of the textualization or perhaps better stated "scripturalization" of the patriarchal tradition must be read with a mind to the sensibilities found far to the Syro-Anatolian north. Seth Sanders has recently pointed out the connection between monumental writing and mortuary ritual in the Iron Age Neo-Hittite states in relation to the erection of Absalom's pillar.[20] The same connection may be extended to the patriarchal narratives of Genesis based on the connection between the common rhetoric in the region surrounding the devotion and recognition of the paternal deities. This of course is not to say that circumstances local to the land of Israel or the lower Levant, be they cultic, political, or both, play no role in the interpretation of the patriarchal literature of the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, the concept of the "God of the Fathers" creates a diachronic metonym for Yahweh the God of Israel, spanning the scope of the Hebrew Bible from Genesis to Chronicles. The question before us then concerns the incipient use of the term, the query that initiated Alt's initial research into the topic. Such reasons necessitate a reexamination of the "God of the Fathers" in light of the Syro-Anatolian contribution to the patriarchal tradition.

[20] Seth Sanders, "Naming the Dead: Funerary Writing and Historical Change in the Iron Age Levant," *MAARAV* 19:1-2 (2012): 11-36.

Regional Rhetoric

In the primeval history as transmitted through Genesis 1-11:9, the rhetorical devices employed by the writers reflect language geographically in line with Syro-Anatolian rhetorical tradition than with neighboring Mesopotamia. The case of the creation of man in the votive tradition serves as an example. Both Mesopotamia and Syro-Anatolia utilize the tradition of erecting images to function as votive monuments, noting the "(carved) image" (Sem. *ṣlm*) set up for the deity of the petitioner. In the Syro-Anatolian tradition however, the language of "image" is sometimes accompanied by an abstract noun such as "likeness." The reference can be found among both the Aramaic *HDYSʿ* inscription from Tel Fekheriye[21] and the Luwian KARKAMIŠ A15b inscription where the carved image is paired with the term for "soul."[22]

These stelae are either presented in the third person after the formula, the stela that "X set up," or they are presented in first person with a self-declarative EGO statement. The EGO statement is so named after the Luwian tradition of first person inscriptional narratives where the subject of the text begins by declaring his or her self identity with an "I am" statement; this is

[21] For a more thorough discussion of the Tel Fekheriyeh inscription, the principle contribution was published by Ali Abou-Assaf, Pierre Bordreuil, and Alan Millard, *La Statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1982). See also Jonas C. Greenfield and Aaron Shaffer, "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherya," *Iraq* 45:1 1983; Douglas M. Gropp and Theodore J. Lewis, "Notes on Some Problems in the Aramaic Text of the Hadd-Yith'i," *BASOR* 259, (1985): 45-61; Edward Lipinski, "The Bilingual Inscription from Tell Fekheriye," in *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* II, ed. E. Lipiski (Leuven: Peeters, 1994); W. Randall Garr, "'Image' and 'Likeness' in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh," *IEJ* 50: 3/4 (2000).

[22] The Luwian interpretation is less certain. Previously, KARKEMIŠ A15b §11 was regarded as "image" by John David Hawkins, *CHLI, Vol. I Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Part I*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 130-133. Hawkins does not translate the term noted by the Luwian logogram "SCALPRUM"(-)i-ara/i-za as related to 'likeness,' and suggests the possibility that the term may be connected to the material of the image such as wood or stone. He also notes the possibility that the term may have something to do with the name of the supplicant. The same interpretation is followed by Annick Payne: see Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 85. See *ACLT, i(ya)rri(ya)*, "representation." See also Theo van den Hout, "Self, Soul and Portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian," in *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Piotr Taracha (Warsaw, 2002), 185.

written *amu-mi*, usually with the EGO logogram. This tradition is far more prevalent among the Luwian inscriptions than the Semitic inscriptions from the region, where it is dominant at the Neo-Hittite city-state Yaʾudi/ Samʾal. In the biblical tradition, the self-declarative or EGO statement is most commonly associated with the identification of the deity Yahweh.

A more subtle mark of Syro-Anatolian discourse exerting ideological influence embedded in Genesis lies in the realm of mythology. Mythological themes and/or broader traditions from the Syro-Anatolian world testify to congruence or at least compatibility with dualistic themes present in Genesis. A prevalent theme of Semitic literature (to include the Hebrew Bible) is found in the unified, or *miatic*, expression of reality.[23] This perspective is to be contrasted with the dualistic understanding of reality regularly found in Indo-European culture and tradition. To illustrate, the Semitic notion of the *nfš* (Heb. נפש), regularly translated as 'soul' but also understood in the simplest sense 'life', does not distinguish a difference between life understood in a material or physical sense ('the mortal life' or 'the body') and life conceived immaterially or in a metaphysical sense ('soul'). The Greek tradition on the other hand provides a stark and ardent expression of dualism in its attestation of this Indo-European dichotomy. For the Greeks, the standard rendering of the Hebrew נפש is expressed only in the immaterial or metaphysical sense by the term *psyche* ('soul', 'mind'), a term that on its own is complimented with a secondary understanding of higher faculties in the *nous*.[24]

[23] I hesitate to use the term *monist* or *monistic* and have instead opted for *miatic* as the more appropriate term. While we can describe Semitic thought as monist, there are a number of problems with the term, in particular the theological nuances that can steer the term toward ambiguity. As an example, Smith demonstrates an awareness of the broad range the term covers, using it in various ways in his writings; for a positive use of the term see Smith, *The Rituals and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods of KTU/CAT 1.23: Royal Constructions of Opposition, Intersection, Integration, and Domination* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 160; for his qualified use of the term see Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 246.

[24] Suriano captures an often underscored point regarding the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ/*nefeš* in its broader Semitic context, understood as a term ("identity") that is both physical and abstract without being bound solely to either

This sort of dualism emerges in the mythological tradition of the Indo-European peoples in the thematic story-telling device of *brothers*, often represented by twins, who compliment and/or contradict one another, representing two poles of reality. The brothers/twin motif stretches across the Indo-European sphere of influence from Roman (Romulus and Remus) to Greek (Castor and Pollux) through Iran (Cambyses and Smerdis) and within the Indic literature (the [*Ashwin*] *Nasatya* twins). More localized in the Syro-Anatolian region of the ancient Near East, a treaty between the Hittite Šuppiluliuma and Hurrian Šattiwaza (KBo 1.1) mentions this tradition by the invocation of the twin (*Nasatya*) gods called upon as witnesses to the treaty.[25]

The authors or redactors of the Hebrew Bible make a point to quell any semblance of duality in their conception of the divine, though vestiges of the dichotomous *brothers* motif may be lying behind certain strands of the Hebrew Bible connected to this region. In the book of Genesis, the patriarchal narratives are set within the Syro-Anatolian tradition, and articulate the genealogy from Abraham to Jacob through the same literary device of brothers in juxtaposition (first through Ishmael and Isaac, and with the twin motif expressed through Esau and Jacob). Additionally, the *brothers* motif in the narrative of the patriarchs is set up through the figures of Cain and Abel, who recall the sons named *Good* and *Evil* in the Hittite story of Appu (see **Chapter Four**).

---

sense of the term. See Matthew J. Suriano, "Breaking Bread with the Dead: Katumuwa's Stele, Hosea 9:4, and the Early History of the Soul" *JAOS* 134:3 (2014): 385-405. Suriano too observes the difficulty, however indirectly, associated with the term monistic and its implications: "This is not to affirm the older monistic view of the נֶפֶשׁ, as best argued by Johannes Pedersen, where body and soul represent a single totality of being. Nor is this to embrace anew a pleonastic interpretation of body and soul in the reading of pre-Hellenistic texts. It is to suggest instead that in certain texts the abstract essence of the נֶפֶשׁ/nbš is assigned a physical presence through ritual," 388.

[25] Additionally, this mythological dichotomy is likely behind the god pairs noted in the Semitic world where contact with Indo-European tradition was prevalent (note especially god pairs at Ugarit *Šaḥru* and *Šalimu*– Dawn and Dusk – paralleling a similar function as the *Ashwin/Nasatya* twins).

The following chapters of this study reexamine the Northwest Semitic data regularly used as the groundwork for comparative cultic research with the Hebrew Bible as a phenomenon of Neo-Hittite contact and convergence. Chapter Two accounts for the historical discussion surrounding the “God of the Fathers” as well as memory studies as its own methodology and the application of such to studies of the Hebrew Bible. In Chapter Three, a broader survey of ancient Near Eastern traditions accounts for the variable language and problems associated with language invoking the tradition of paternal deities. Chapter Four introduces the Anatolian language traditions that had considerable contact with the communities of the Northwest Semitic world. Chapter Five follows by reintroducing the Northwest Semitic data in light of the common cultic language of the Anatolian texts. Following the analysis of the comparative data from the Northern Levant, Chapter Six addresses the “God of the Fathers” tradition in the patriarchal narratives of the book of Genesis.

Taken together, this work supports the conclusion that the rhetoric behind invoking the "God of the Fathers" signals an identity marker for one's invoking his or her paternal deity, whomever that deity may be. Worship of a specific, mythologized El as found at Ugarit and proposed in earlier studies is not supported for ancient Israel as a whole. Though the possibility of such worship with specific families may very well have been the case, not all theophoric uses of El names (or even theophory in general) refer to the specific mythologized El. Thus, the use of the rhetoric invoking the "God of the Fathers" is primarily an invocation of one's family deity, and secondarily equated with Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible in order to personalize the enforcement of the canonical Yahwism of Jerusalem.

Chapter Two

The History of Scholarship Surrounding the "God of the Fathers"

History of Scholarship

German scholarship in the nineteenth and early twentieth century produced a number a works concerned with uncovering the nuances of ancient Israelite religion implicit in the text of the Hebrew Bible. An ancillary discussion emerging from the larger conversation among these German scholars concerned the origins of the Israelites themselves; scholars of this era sought to explain how this nomadic people group entered the land of Canaan in light of the biblical text and the emerging archaeological record. It was within this setting that Albrecht Alt took up the question of the identity of the "God of the Fathers." This question subsequently became a revisited topic in the investigation of pre-monarchic Israelite religion for future generations.

The Beginning of the Modern Conversation

Albrecht Alt's essay "Der Gott der Väter: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der israelitischen Religion" ("The God of the Fathers: a Contribution to the pre-History of Israelite

Religion") ushered in a new conversation about the nature of pre-monarchical Israelite religion.[26] Alt proposed that a critical scrutiny of the Genesis narratives could uncover traces of the cultic sensibilities of the patriarchal period. Alt asserted that the "God of the Fathers" originally reflects different patronymic deities worshipped by distinct tribes in the nomadic period (namely the 'Fear of Isaac' פחד יצחק and 'Bull of Jacob'אביר יעקב). Since the nomadic past of the Israelites is the centerpiece of Alt's peaceful infiltration theory, Alt made comparisons with data from the later Nabatean and Palmyrene Aramaic and Greek inscriptions from Late Antiquity in order to establish a precedent for patronymic deities worshipped in a nomadic setting. Alt then took the paradigm he extrapolated from the textual record of these nomadic peoples and used his findings as a lens to interpret difficult phrases from the book of Genesis that did not fit neatly into the later canonical expression of Israelite religion during the period of the monarchy or later into post-exilic times. Alt concluded that the initial deities to whom the *Bnei Israel* subscribed entered the land nameless, but in time came to be identified with the various El gods of the Canaanite shrines.

Julius Lewy soon followed connecting the "God of the Fathers" with the divine name *ʾēl šaddai* based on his reading of Gen 49:24-26.[27] Lewy reread the direct object marker *ʾet* את as *ʾēl* אל corresponding to the *ʾēl-Abīka* אל אביך the "God of your father" in the preceding line. Herbert Gordon May directs the attention of his study toward the relationship between the deity and the

[26] When Alt developed his essay "The God of the Fathers" in 1929, he was putting together a larger discussion concerning the *Bnei Israel's* entry into the land of Canaan. Alt later proposed this theory of Israelite settlement as the process of peaceful infiltration.

[27] Julius Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *RHR* 110 (1934): 55.

genitival counterpart, arguing for the dating of the terms based on the singular or plural use of the paternal referent.[28]

Reframing the Conversation

In 1973, Frank Moore Cross published his widely influential work, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cross addresses the discussion introduced by Alt in the first chapter of this text "The Religion of Canaan and the God of Israel." The distance of the Nabateans from the time of the patriarchal period or even the textual composition of the patriarchal narratives provided Cross with the platform for redressing Alt's major assertion. An unfortunate bout of timing for Alt led to the publishing of his initial work on the topic prior to the discovery and subsequent translation of the Ras Shamra texts. Cross noted the improbability of Alt's assessment that the paternal deities of the patriarchal period were anonymous, while still acknowledging agreement with Alt that the patriarchal religion ought to be regarded as clan religion.[29] Cross builds upon the observation of Lewy, who first observed the naming of paternal deities in Old Assyrian texts from Cappadocia,[30] by introducing more instances of the specific naming of paternal deities among Old Assyrian texts and into the later corpus of Northwest Semitic inscriptions.

Cross argues that the Israelites worshipped the high god of Canaan, El, in the deity's various epithets: *ʾēl šaddai*, *ʾēl ʿelyon*, *ʾēl ʿōlam*. Much of Cross's argument is rooted in observing the rivalry between El and Baal observable from Ugaritic mythology, with the El position transposed onto Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible. By asserting that the El of what amounts

[28] Herbert Gordon May, "The God of My Father: A Study in Patriarchal Religion," *JBL*. 9:3 (1941): 155-158, 199-200.

[29] F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 12.

[30] Ibid., 9-10.

to a pan-Canaanite tradition as the identity of the "God of the Fathers," Cross largely put an end to this major segment of the investigation into ancient Israelite religion. Subsequent studies into the topic would from this point forward take Cross's position as a given, shifting the discussion about the "God of the Fathers" away from matters of identifying the deity (or deities) and to broader matters concerning ancient Israelite religion.

After the work of Cross, the identity of the "God of the Fathers" became less of a cause for explicit investigation and instead comprised a pre-monarchial feature of ancient Israelite religion that was the focus of subsequent studies. The first volume of Rainer Albertz's work *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period* addresses the "God of the Fathers" but within the context of ancient Israelite religion established by Cross. For Albertz, the question of pre-monarchial religion, and by extension the "God of the Fathers," is really a question about family and clan religion. Albertz identifies two principle foci for religion in ancient Israel: the family and the society as a whole. Both facets proposed by Albertz are useful for this study, though greater attention will be given to familial focus. As a product of the state religious apparatus, the religious sensibilities put forward by the Hebrew Bible at best allude to family religion, but comparative texts from the ancient Near East offer considerably more data. To that end, Albertz concludes that "the features shared with the Near Eastern environment are very much greater at the level of personal piety than at the level of official religion."[31]

In contrast to the work of Alt, Albertz asserts that the notion of the "God of the Fathers" does not indicate a nomadic religion, but also is attested in sedentary cultures. With regard to the land of Canaan, Albertz emphasizes that the cultural milieu of Palestine presupposed by

[31] Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, Vol. 1*, (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 20.

patriarchal narratives (Gen 12-50) does not go back beyond Iron I.[32] Instead, Albertz treats the tradition of the "God of the Fathers" as the hallmark of family religion. The father god belongs to the type of personal god who is later characteristic of the piety of Israelite families. Thus, the "God of the Fathers" appellative and all family gods had names. For Albertz, the lack of Yahweh's mention in this context is telling; all of the names from the period are El-compounds and the "God of the Fathers" is equated with *ʾēl šaddai* in Gen 49:25.

Mark S. Smith's works on ancient Israelite religion *The Early History of God* and *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism* treat the topic of the "God of the Fathers" as part of the backdrop forming the major concerns of the biblical texts, namely the emergence of Yahweh as the sole deity of Israel. Smith's expertise in the Ugaritic language and textual corpus proves invaluable for his exposition of Israel's polytheistic past.[33] Ugarit and its attestable tradition of the royal household have had a major impact on the model of the divine family. Building off the work of Schloen in his *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*, Smith draws parallels with the notion of family and the subsequent development of structures of divine mythology in ancient Canaan.

The Early History of God however focuses more on the question of Yahwish than patriarchal or pre-canonical Yahwistic religion, though in setting up his investigation Smith dedicates a valuable discussion to the early Iron Age and narrative El heritage of Yahwism.[34]

---

[32] Ibid., 28.

[33] The two volume critical edition of the Ba'al Cycle produced by Smith provides a treasure-trove of data on the cultic framework and literary exposition of the ancient Near East as told through the point of view of the Ugaritic texts. This effort has been unrivaled since its initial publication.

[34] Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 2002), 32-43.

While *The Early History of God* provides a valuable contribution to the field and the present study, Smith's follow-up text *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism* proves to be a more specific resource for this investigation. Smith's self-critique of his previous work *The Early History of God* notes the absence of a discussion concerning the fundamental nature of divinity.[35] In *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, Smith uses that very concern as the impetus for his text. Smith examines the conceptual framework by which the Ugaritic and Israelite societies construct their cultic reality.[36] This framework provides the basis from which ancient Levantine perceptions of the divine eventually become the monotheism of the Hebrew Bible. Like the work of Cross and Albertz, the broader contribution offered by Smith concerning divinity on the whole and the deity of Israel necessitates a treatment of the "God of the Fathers," a version of the deity Smith equates with the family god.[37]

Smith's value to the field has been immeasurable. Beyond the two aforementioned works, Smith has produced a collection of research at the intersection of Ugaritic studies and those of ancient Israelite religion. The major theme of Smith's research can be summarized in the following statement: "in order to understand biblical monotheism better, we must understand the polytheism of early Israel as well as the polytheism of its cultural antecedents more broadly, as reflected through the Ugaritic texts of the late Bronze Age and other sources."[38] His two volume critical edition of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle (with Wayne Pitard), similarly titled, constitutes a

[35] Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*: *Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 6.

[36] Ibid., 8.

[37] Ibid., 147.

[38] Smith, *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel*, (Minneapolis, MI: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 87.

brilliant study of comparative Near Eastern language and religion unpacking the Baal Cycle of Ugaritic literature. His more recent works *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* and *Poetic Heroes: Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior Culture in the Early Biblical World*, provide additional value for the treatment of ancient Israelite religion comprising ancillary issues tied to this present study.

More recently, Nick Wyatt provides a reassessment of Lewy and May in his introductory chapter to his text, *The Mythic Mind: Essays on Cosmology and Religion in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature*. Contra Lewy, Wyatt reads the *El* and *Shaddai* of Gen 49:35 as a divided binomial, where the *ʾanōki ʾēl-Abīka* reflected the original construction: "I am El, your father." Thus, according to Wyatt, there is no reference in the verse to the "God of your fathers."[39] Wyatt sees the development of the "God of the Fathers" tradition as an archaic phrase indicating the relationship of physical paternity (or intimacy) between the deity El and tribal eponyms that was eventually leveled by opponents of the cult of El.[40]

Problems with El

The El traditions present a number of challenges for parsing any pre-Israelite tradition from the Hebrew Bible. The proposals by both Alt and Cross connecting the "God of the Fathers" apart from and within the world of these broader El traditions is a reflex of the Syro-Anatolian cults where El literature is predominant. The majority of researchers[41] of ancient

[39] To this end, Wyatt also concludes: "The consequent identification of this deity with El Shaddai cannot be demonstrated on this evidence." Nick Wyatt, *The Mythic Mind: Essays on Cosmology and Religion in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature*, (New York : Routledge, 2014); 1-5.

[40] Ibid., 5.

[41] See also Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Vol. 1*, 30-31. Albertz states that various regional forms of the god El were worshipped as family deities; Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 143.

Israelite religion affirm the position of Cross's assertion that the deity El is the "God of the Fathers;" however, this discussion requires addressing several outstanding issues regarding El traditions as a whole in order to introduce the investigation of the paternal paradigm, and within it the "God of the Fathers" as the main subtopic for encountering the memory of patriarchal religion in the Hebrew Bible.

Alt's interpretation of the "God of the Fathers" contrasts the originally mobile Israelite (and "anonymous" in the assertion of Alt) paternal deities with the sedentary *ʾēlim* of the Canaanite world, whose shrines occupied various portions of the Levant. For Alt, the paternal deities consisted of three different deities (the God of Abraham, the Fear of Isaac, and the Mighty One of Jacob) and were clan devotions that coalesced into Yahweh. The El attributes found in the Hebrew Bible were a matter of "El religion" to which Alt did not devote an extensive discussion, opting to focus the discussion on gods associated with the names of the patriarchs. To this end, Cross considers Alt's work entirely unsatisfactory. Cross's retort to Alt is in fact an opus devoted to the place of El as the "God of the Fathers" of Israelite religion.

For Albertz, the El tradition is central to his discussion of family religion as a precursor to the religion of ancient Israel. He states that no proper names containing Yahweh appear in the patriarchal narratives and in fact, all are El compounds. These El names were various regional forms of the god El who were worshipped as family gods.[42] Albertz further takes the position that the Els of the Israelite cult are the *ilāni*, perhaps images of the deified ancestors—a practice (what he labels "ancestor religion") that was merely a religious sub-stratum at the very beginning of the history of personal piety in Israel.[43] Whether or not these El names reflected regional

[42] Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, 30-31.

[43] Ibid., 37-39.

forms of the deity El, Albertz's observation that the patriarchal narratives attest to theophoric El names instead of Yahweh names underscores the importance of the northern backdrop to the patriarchal narratives.

The bigger question for Smith is, "who was the god of ancient Israel?" and it is within this question that El traditions may be addressed.[44] In regard to the fact that אל (*ʾēl/ʾil* or El) is the term for "god" in West Semitic languages, Smith remarks that such "might be taken as evidence that as head of the West Semitic pantheon, El was regarded as the pre-eminent god (or, perhaps, divinity "incarnate")."[45] To this end, the West Semitic tradition of El presents a more specific set of mythological accounts concerning the deity by this name, and it is within this West Semitic context that the investigation for the god of ancient Israel dialogues with El traditions.

Any discussion on the El tradition would not be complete without including Marvin Pope's work, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. In this study, Pope analyzes the various ways in which El is presented in Ugaritic literature. In many ways, this chapter approaches the topic of El in a similar manner. The major difference between Pope's work and this chapter is the question of determining the place and use of these El traditions as they might apply to the paternal paradigm, and by extension what application is appropriate for better comprehending the tradition of the "God of the Fathers" in ancient Israel. To be sure, Pope's treatment of the topic is dated (published originally in 1955), but the major questions driving Pope's investigation remain the appropriate framework for sorting out the multifaceted landscape of the traditions surround El.

[44] Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 9.

[45] Ibid., 135.

Additional Studies of Note[46]

Additional studies in the realm of family structure and religion or the Pentateuch have led scholars such as Karel van der Toorn (*Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*) and John van Seters (*Abraham in History and Tradition*) to address the "God of the Fathers" in the respective research.[47] Van der Toorn's work is a treatment of family religion in the major Semitic cultures of the ancient Near East that synthesizes text and archaeology. In this work, van der Toorn dedicates a considerable amount of space to the topic of the ancestors in the religious traditions of the family as well as the devotional legacy of families.

Unlike Alt, van Seters is not concerned whether or not it is possible to reconstruct a pre-Yahwistic religion for ancient Israel; instead, van Seters is concerned with the tradition-history as a method utilized by Alt for historical and literary studies. On the Genesis narratives, van Seters' approaches oral traditions only to the very earliest stage of the written product. For van Seters, the centerpiece of his investigation on the tradition of Abraham lies in the notions of literary development and by extension, dating of the tradition. Van Seters, writing in the mid-1970s, proceeds from a framework largely established in the past century by the documentary hypothesis, portions of which he accepts and others he rejects. He concludes that a very small portion of the biblical text constitutes the tradition of Abraham and thus for van Seters, the literary analysis of the text itself is the primary question. Van Seters concludes that the Abraham

[46] Note also *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* by Johannes C. de Moor; Robert L. Cohn, "Negotiating (with) the Natives: Ancestors and Identity in Genesis," *HTR* 96:2 (2003): 147-166; E.L Abel, "The Nature of the Patriarchal God El Sadday," *Numen* 20:1 (1973): 48-59.

[47] For discussions on family religion from archaeological perspectives, see Lawrence E. Stager, "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel." *BASOR* 260 (1985): 1–35; J. David Schloen *The House of the Father As Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the ancient Near East*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001).

traditions of the Pentateuch are both exilic (the Yahwistic tradition) and post-exilic (the Priestly source)—he questions the very existence of an extensive E source. Van Seters' weakness lies in his limitations of the impact of oral tradition at large (e.g., perceiving oral tradition as a function of pre-literary society[48]) on the patriarchal narratives by binding such traditions to form and structure.

Thomas Thompson devotes a large amount of text in his book *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel* to critiquing the work of van Seters, developing the traditional complex-chain narrative in his approach to the books of Genesis and Exodus.[49] These complex-chain narratives cover the patriarchal cycles of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, which are then followed by the exodus tradition and Torah. These complex-chain narratives utilize a genealogical *Toledoth* structure as the glue binding these narratives together. Additionally, Thompson sees mention of the god of the ancestors as uniting smaller chain narratives together by common language.[50]

This present study, while relying heavily upon the preceding research, moves beyond the more general foci of investigation of Albertz and Smith by returning to a specific version of the question of the identity of the "God of the Fathers" as initially proposed by Alt and rejoined by Cross. As such, this study is opposed to the conclusions of van Seters and places a much greater value on the derivative data from which the text emerged. To put it another way, studies in oral tradition—what I will be referring to as oral literature—proceed more aptly from the question of communal or social memory than they do from literary forms and structures. Indeed, it is through the intentional act of memorializing that any of this material has reached us today.

---

[48] J. van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 312.

[49] Thomas L. Thompson, *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel: 1*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

[50] Ibid., 171.

Memory, Orality, and Textuality

Though initially behind the application of memory studies to other fields, research surrounding questions of memory, orality, and textuality in the field of biblical studies have risen to prominence in recent years. The works of Maurice Halbwachs and more recently Paul Connerton provide formative discussions on the larger topic of collective memory. Halbwachs, a student of the distinguished sociologist Émile Durkheim, was one of the founders of the *Annales* school at Strasbourg during the interbellum period of Europe in the early twentieth century. Halbwachs's works *On Collective Memory* (French: *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*) and *The Collective Memory* (French: *La mémoire collective*) provide several major contributions to the field: the social framework of memory, the dichotomy between history and memory, and the function of memory with regard to physical objects and settings. Other studies in the twentieth century have attempted to expand upon the work of Halbwachs,[51] though Connerton's brief monograph *How Societies Remember* is the most useful for biblical studies at large. A salient matter addressed by Connerton focuses on the notion of the *acts of transference* as the means by which memory is made possible in social formation.

Following these important works, studies in collective memory were eventually used as new approaches to various ancient Near Eastern disciplines. The treatment of collective memory in the context of ancient Israel began with Willy Schottroff's text *"Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* in 1967. Schottroff's study provides a comparative examination of the Hebrew root ZKR, and looks at the phenomenon as an object of memory. Daniel Fleming's

[51] Barry Schwartz, Yael Zerubavel, and Bernice Barnett, "The Recovery of Masada: A Study in Collective Memory," *Sociological Quarterly* 27:2 (1986): 147-64. For Halbwach's thought played out in sociology and interpretation of self-identity see Peter L. Berger, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1963), Ch. 3. See also Michael Schudson, "The Present in the Past versus the Past in the Present," *Communication* 11 (1989): 105-13.

article, “Mari and the Possibilities of Biblical Memory” reevaluates the evidence coming out of the Bronze Age Amorite site Mari (Tel Harriri, Syria) by addressing the fundamental aspects of the monarchies of Mari and the texts they produce from a larger social perspective. This approach looks at the wider implications for utilizing the Mari data as a comparative approach to the Hebrew Bible. Secondly, Fleming addresses the North Syrian (what is referred to in this study by the more inclusive term Syro-Anatolian) memory in the tribal traditions of Israel’s past, with specific attention paid toward the tribe of Benjamin. Marc Brettler’s article “Memory in Ancient Israel” elaborates on the observation by Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi in his work *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, that memory in ancient Israel did not (nor does it continue in Judaism) function with an interest in the history of Israel’s own past, but with an interest in keeping memories alive to live out the religious precepts set forth by the faith.

Ron Hendel’s recent works looked at the book of Exodus in light of collective memory in two articles “The Exodus in Biblical Memory” and “Exodus: A Book of Memories.” These articles were followed by his book *Remembering Abraham: Culture Memory and History in the Hebrew Bible*. In this text, Hendel takes the methodology of collective memory to once again address the Exodus narrative, but also examines the narratives of Abraham and the Patriarchs as well as David and Solomon. Hendel observes the varying antiquity embedded in the patriarchal stories: boundary conflicts between Aram in the region of Gilead (mid-to late ninth century BCE), Ur of the Chaldees as a Chaldean connection (ca. eighth to seventh centuries BCE),[52] and the names of various tribes and ethnic groups (Ishmaelites, Arameans, Philistines) as markers

[52] Here Hendel is dating Ur of the Chaldees up to two centuries earlier than van Seters.

suggesting a compositional date between the 8th-6th centuries (acknowledging documentary sources J, E, and P).[53]

Mark S. Smith's work *The Memoirs of God* examines the memory of history in light of Israel's conception of the divine. Smith uses this work as an opportunity to contextualize his previous research in Ugaritic studies and Israel's polytheistic background within the context of collective memory. The "methods of monotheism" as proposed by Smith, consist of ancient Israel's reconstitution of their polytheistic past into the devotion to and identity of one God. The monistic (i.e. monotheistic) movement in ancient Israel as a new understanding for the faith community necessitated reinterpreting the living memories of old in accord with the canonical concepts of Yahwism; for example, instead of being understood as a separate deity, ʾēl ʿelyon was reinterpreted as a title for Yahweh.[54] In short, Smith's work begins with the monotheism familiar to biblical studies and asks how this monotheistic sensibility impacts memories of the past.

Studies in periphreal fields dialogue well with memorializing the biblical rhetoric concerning the "God of the Fathers." Gerdien Jonker's text *The Topography of Remembrance* is an indispensable resource for memory studies in ancient Near Eastern research intersecting the world of the Hebrew Bible. Jonker's investigation charts the phenomenon of monumentality in the context of memory and ritual as the material instrument for communal memory. Working from the field of Egyptology, Jan Assmann's work in history's interaction with communal memory regularly intersects with the tradition of biblical literature. His emphasis on the "event"

[53] Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 47.

[54] Smith, *Memoirs of God*, 151-8.

as the primary catalyst for memory preservation forms a useful approach for the framing of the discourse concerning the paternal deity in the patriarchal narratives.[55]

Before the Relic of Scripture

Memory may be regarded as the ability living beings possess to store information detailing events of the past. Orality, that is oral communication, is the vehicle through which living beings convey those memories. The two phenomena work hand-in-hand as the integral pieces for the accumulation of social memories and after the development of writing were complimented by a technological innovation externalizing a code for storing the memories of persons or communities. This interaction lay at the heart of scribal tradition in the ancient Near East. The term 'scribe' that we have inherited in the Western European tradition (via Latin *scribere*, 'to write') is inherently related to writing; by contrast, the scribal communities of the ancient Near East operated in a culture that was predominantly oral and thus their context for writing was predominately framed by a culture of orality.[56] Furthermore, the Hebrew language reflects this sensibility, differing from our Latin-derived Western tradition (Heb. סֹפֵר 'scribe' viz. לְסַפֵּר 'to tell'). Over time however, the burgeoning of scribal culture led to more sophisticated written literature and by virtue of the elite status of scribes, offered new authority to the text itself. For the biblical tradition, this phenomenon eventually coalesced in the canonization of the scriptures.

[55] Assmann and Templer, "Guilt and Remembrance: On the Theologization of History in the Ancient near East," *History and Memory* 2:1 (1990): 5–33.See also Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[56] See also the chapter by Raymond F. Person, Jr. "Education and the Transmission of Tradition" in *Companion to Ancient Israel* (New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2016), 366-78.

The textual preservation of data comes with its own set of difficulties and limitations. Any composition that becomes textualized is in its essence a secondary or even tertiary phenomenon. Literature itself is an emergent property of the transmission of cerebral intentionality coded in the form of speech acts.[57] In today's hyperliterate world, most of us normally compose the subject matter of our intentionality at the same time that we put such intentionality into textual format. The intentionality encoded in language and its textual product thus become an extension of mind. Admittedly, it is also the case that we will pre-write, take notes, outline, and organize our thoughts, etc. when we produce larger compositions. Nevertheless, this sort of pre-compositional activity is a feature of hyperliterate societies. Hyperliterate societies possess the resources for textualization—mass production and ease of acquisition of writing materials and surfaces—in ways that early human civilization did not. To illustrate, for those who could not afford or who did not have access to papyrus and parchment, broken ostraca regularly served as a field-expedient resource for a writing surface.

For ancient Near Eastern civilizations, the textual artifacts were a byproduct of oral literature and performance. Very rarely would formation of the textual product be the primary goal of composition. Such cases would typically involve the creation of monuments or display treaties, which serving as commemorative objects often would also serve just as strong an iconographic function as they would a literary function.[58] Another set of writings intended as

[57] Here I proceed from John R. Searle's revision of John L. Austin's earlier work on speech acts. See Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and *Intentionality an Essay in the Philosophy of Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[58] Though smaller in scale, treaties were regularly displayed iconographically before divine witnesses in temple complexes (e.g., the Bronze Treaty between Tudhalia IV and Ku, the succession treaty of Esarhaddon at Tell Tayinat). See Glatz and Plourde, "Landscape Monuments and Political Competition in Late Bronze Age Anatolia: An Investigation of Costly Signaling Theory," *BASOR* 361 (February 2011): 33-66; Jacob Lauinger, "Some Preliminary Thoughts on the Tablet Collection in Building XVI from Tell Tayinat," *JCSMS* 6 (2011): 5-14.

textual products are comprised of receipts and contracts where the written product is a record or textual witness of an event. While monumental inscriptions constitute legitimate literature, and contracts became a genre of human agreement leading to the rise of treaty language, receipts provided less literary value. Even epistolary, a genre where the immediate textualization of the dictation of the letter writer would occur, would serve as mnemonic devices prompting the oral delivery of the messenger.[59]

Orality, the tradition of passing down socio-cultural information, was the primary means by which human beings conveyed their own self-identity, stories, awareness and understanding of the world. Halbwachs has noted that most memories possessed by human beings return to us when we are reminded of those memories by our parents, friends and others.[60] The proximity of friends and family for memorial interaction is the area most impacted by oral communication and proportionately less by textual communication. By extension, we may infer that memories persist strongest where settings are intimate among immediate and extended families, tribes, and clans.

Walter Ong, in his seminal work on the topic *Orality and Literacy*, rightly declares that "Writing makes 'words' appear similar to things because we think of words as the visible marks signaling words to decoders: we can see and touch such inscribed 'words' in texts and books."[61] This is certainly the case for texts in the Semitic world. In Semitic languages with early attested

---

[59] See for example the chapter by Jesús-Luis Cunchillos in *HUS* on letter writing at Ugarit. Cunchillos, Jesús-Luis, "Correspondence at Ugarit" in the *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, W.G.E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 359-74.

[60] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 38.

[61] Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, (New York: Routledge, 2002), 11. In addition to Ong's work, Niditch's work *Oral World and Written Word. Ancient Israelite Literature*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996) provides a valuable application of the broader topic of orality and literacy applied more specifically to the Hebrew Bible and Israelite tradition.

written traditions, the notion of the *word* is related to a cerebral or an oral action. This is the case for Akkadian (*awû*: 'to speak'; *awātu*: 'word') and Aramaic (*mallel*: 'to speak'; *milah*: 'word'); Hebrew conveys the sense of speaking or management of matters or affairs (*dibber*: 'to speak'; *davar*: 'word').[62] The text of the Hebrew Bible is in a sense self-aware of this problem as outlined by the scandal of textualization recorded in Jeremiah 8:8,[63] as the early years of the Israelite state functioned largely in an oral culture with limited writing.[64] The issue of authority of the living oral tradition versus a textual authority is a problem that emerges time and again over the centuries. William A. Gramm, echoing Ong, declares "The fixing of the holy word in writing always carries with it potential threats to the original spontaneity and living quality of the scriptural text, for it places it ever in danger of becoming only a 'dead letter' rather than a 'living word.'"[65] The patriarchal narratives record, in fossilized form, the memorial imprint of Syro-Anatolian culture. Extrapolating context of that discourse will provide insight into the cultic perspectives of those communities who comprised the primary audience of the patriarchal narratives.

[62] It should be noted that the Sumerian-derived Akkadian term for 'scribe' *ṭupšarru* is translated as 'the (writing) tablet master/king.' This would imply the scribe's connection to the clay and cuneiform technology. In addition, the Akkadian term for an alphabetic scribe is *sepīru* (^{LÚ}A.BAL, though the related ^{LÚ}A.BA is sometimes related to the term *ṭupšarru*) the tradition mentioned above likewise applicable to the scribes of the Hebrew language. Only later in Arabic is the concept of 'word' associated with writing: Ar. *kalimah* (كلمة) via Gr. *kalam*i (καλάμι), 'reed' the chief writing utensil for ink-based writing. The term is a foreign word imported into the language, and the root in Arabic becomes repurposed to mean 'to speak,' (the term for pen being later adopted with a /q/ *qalim* قلم).

[63] Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 115.

[64] Ibid., 63. Schniedewind notes "Writing had a limited role in Israel during this early period. The literature of Israel was primarily oral."

[65] Graham's application of the discussion provides a synthesis of the research, presenting its applicability to the question of orality and the scriptures in the Common Era. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 59-60.

Questions still persist as to what extent specific words, tropes, and stories would have been remembered and how fluid oral literature could be passed down and still considered 'original.' Studies of the recitation of oral literature generally emerge from the systematic study of folk tales. As early as 1815, the Brothers Grimm address such a process. In writing about Frau Katherina Viehmann, one of the sources behind the folklore collection assembled by the Brothers Grimm, Wilhelm Grimm notes:

> "She retains fast in mind these old sagas—which talent, as she says, is not granted to everyone; for there be many that cannot keep in their heads anything at all. She recounts her stories thoughtfully, accurately, with uncommon vividness and evident delight—first quite easily, but then, if required, over again, slowly, so that with a bit of practice it is possible to take down her dictation, word for word. Much was recorded in this way, and its fidelity is unmistakable. Anyone believing that traditional materials are easily falsified and carelessly preserved, and hence cannot survive over a long period, should hear how close she always keeps to her story and how zealous she is for its accuracy; never does she alter any part in repetition, and she corrects a mistake herself, immediately she notices it. Among people who follow the old life-ways without change, attachment to inherited patterns is stronger than we, impatient for variety, can realize."[66]

The craft of the balladeers, bards, and storytellers—those whose talents, in the words of Frau Viehmann, is not granted to everyone—conveyed their oral literature according to certain canonical standards. The performative aspect of oral literature impresses upon the transmitters of that literature, be they the performers themselves or the recipients of the performance, instances where such literature would be memorized among the involved parties. Any oral performance patterned with refrains would likely stimulate responses by the recipients (or audiences, though the term may evoke the wrong setting). As Edward Greenstein observes, "Lengthy verbal repetitions… are a clear mark of oral performance. An audience enjoying an aural experience appreciates verbatim repetition, just as a group will join in singing the chorus of a song after

[66] See Joseph Campbell, *Flight of the Wild Gander.* (South Bend, IN: Regenery/Gateway, Inc., 1979), 9.

every stanza."[67] While Greenstein's observation is sensible, we may issue some caution in some of his articulation of such events. "An audience enjoying" may or may not lie within the context of the performance of oral literature, which may be more ritualized in the cultic apparatus, and thus liturgical, than we might immediately imagine.

Like the professional class of storytellers, religious officials too would have been invested in the standardization of oral literature. Usually this standardization would be expressed in the form of liturgy. Liturgical tradition consists of repeatable structures for the ritualized expression of mythology and local philosophies—the regional *sophia*—that articulate the worldview of the local cult(s); liturgical tradition is rightly regarded as 'the work of the public.' Liturgical culture ought to be regarded as the ritualized aspect to the greater oral culture (to include informal orality). It is through the lens of liturgy that the faithful devotion to both verbatim recitation and fluidity of praxis of the oral and written literatures of the cult community harmonize.[68] What is at issue here is liturgical operation in culture at large and not a specific liturgy (such as the morning and evening prayers of thanksgiving during the sacrifices offered at the Jerusalem temple (cf. 1 Chr 23:28-32).

Liturgical culture provided the vehicle through which the oral tradition of the community's mythological past was conveyed until it was textualized in the form of the

[67] Greenstein, "Verbal Art and Literary Sensibilities in Ancient Near Eastern Context" in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Ancient Israel*, Susan Niditch ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2016), 466.

[68] The interplay between text and performance has been the subject of research within the fields of ritual studies and a relevant subset, liturgical studies. See Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969) and Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf , (New York: Basic Books, In., 1963). Note also Bradshaw, "Reckonings 7 The Reshaping of Liturgical Studies" *ATR* 72:4 (1990): 481-7. If the Syriac tradition maintains and thus reflects continuity with its ancient Near Eastern past, a similar instance is also recorded by Brock in the prayers of John of Dalyatha, where this variance is at once recorded. See Brock, *The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life*, (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1987), 328-38.

patriarchal narratives and later as scripture. To be sure, it is impossible to know how the patriarchal stories would have been conveyed in the early days of Israel. The variance found among the doublets of the patriarchal narratives provides material to suggest that these stories could have been part of the formal ritualized liturgical culture as well as the informal mythology of the community conveyed at large.[69]

Outside of those whose professional lives necessitated training in oration and the ceremonies carried out by them (i.e., the community of the local cult), the memories of the society would have carried on orally through song and storytelling. The oldest portions of the Hebrew Bible, specifically those reflecting antiquity in dialectical nuances of the Hebrew language,[70] are found in and among certain songs embedded in the text. Many of these older songs are juxtaposed with a preceding prose narrative (cf. Gen 48, 49; Exod 14, 15; Jdg 4, 5), illustrating in written form the two sensibilities through which collective memory is conveyed. It is noteworthy that two of these three examples of archaic biblical Hebrew cite traditions concerning the "God of the Fathers." In being long removed from the incipient and pre-textual process, the data present for this analysis consists of these memories textualized and eventually repackaged for the purposes of the cult as scripture.

[69] The breadth of such a study is beyond the scope and focus of the present work. The patriarchal narratives attest to both ritualized accounts of their history (the Aqedah sacrifice of Isaac by his father Abraham, the anointing of the pillar by Jacob, etc.) that may have had an accompanying liturgical function at one point. This sort of analysis emerges from Connerton's observations of ceremonial remembrance (see *How Societies Remember*). The assembly of the patriarchal stories of Genesis into an organized text has been treated with at length by Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986).

[70] See especially Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), Ch. 3; Angel Sáenz-Badillos and John Elwolde, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), Ch. 2.

Chapter Three

The "God of the Fathers" in the Broader Ancient Near East

Introduction to the Three Surveyed Regions: Mobile vs. Established Empire.

The title the "god(s) of the father(s)" evokes the broader topic of family religion. Though the locally distinct features of family religion differ across such wide geographic and cultural regions, certain themes are common among the major forces that have authored texts reflecting their perception of the divine, life, death, and the world beyond. From the two rivers stretching from the mouth of the Persian Gulf to the headwaters in Anatolia, down the eastern Mediterranean coast and up the Nile River, the great civilizations of the ancient Near East produced a wealth of textual evidence reflecting the sensibilities of both state and domestic or family religion. These common religious features of the paternal devotions and transformation establish a set of control parameters for defining the cultic norms of the broader region.

The landscape of the ancient Near East serves as the setting for biblical literature. It is only on extreme rare occasion that human literature develops in a vacuum, and even when it does, it is not easily discernable from whence stories first originate. Anything textual is in its essence a secondary or even tertiary phenomenon, and as such the product of long traditions of literary (to include oral literature) determinism passing from generation to generation. Even when literature exists as a secondary means of transmission, various peoples and cultures

encounter each other impacting the ideological development or discourse that remains. Just as a survey of Augustine would do well to be grounded in the literature of the biblical traditions as well as the writings of Aristotle, so too it is important to engage the Hebrew Bible in light of the literature or simply the textual traditions of ancient Mesopotamia, Anatolia, and Egypt.

While religion is nuanced among the various people groups of the ancient Near East, stretching over millennia, a certain degree of continuity is to be expected. This chapter proposes to investigate the following questions: What are some broad sensibilities common to all aspects of family religion? Is there a cultural *koine* that connects these ideas? The answers to these questions will assist in establishing the bounds of convergence and divergence between the Levantine traditions and other ancient Near Eastern traditions. Furthermore, the common sensibilities extant within these various traditions provide the evidence necessary to infer a greater understanding of the Hebrew Bible. Thus, this purpose of this chapter is to outline the control setting for ideas normative to the cultic traditions surrounding the discussion of the "God of the Fathers" of the broader ancient Near East.

Buffering Major Empires to the North, East, and Southwest

Greater Canaan, that is to say the geographic area represented by the Levant, was flanked on all sides by major empires during the Bronze Age. To the southwest across the Sinai was the great civilization of the Egyptians. To the north was the Hittite Empire, and to the east the great powers of Mesopotamia. What became the heartland for the ancient Israelite community is represented by the southernmost end of Greater Canaan. The ancient Israelites occupied a geographic bridge between the powers of Mesopotamia and Anatolia to the north and east, while the land's southwestern border gave way to the Sinai Peninsula and Egypt beyond.

No distance or culture is too foreign in the context of empire. Whether the tradition lay to the north and east or to the southwest, the major political powers of the region attest a legacy of long-running contact with the Levant, providing for the opportunity of intellectual interaction and exposure to neighboring worldviews. This geographic polarity buffering two continents ultimately influenced two narrative strands of Pentateuchal literature: a northern strand reflected in the Israelite tradition and a southern strand carried into the Judean tradition.[71] The northern strand, rooted in to Semitic cultures of the Near East and the Syro-Anatolian traditions formed the cultural standard comprising portions of ancient Israel's narrative and cultic past; additionally, the northern strand came to comprise the counter-point by which the Judean tradition would redress, refute, and condemn in establishing a controllable religious orthodoxy in accord with the traditions and interests of the Judean monarchy.

EGYPT

Contact between Egypt and the Levant

Contact between Egypt and the Levant dates back to the Chalcolithic era, though before 1550 BCE, interaction between Egypt and the Levant were largely commercial.[72] Matters of commerce would eventually give way to collision between peoples as a result of migrations and imperial expansion. Both the material culture and the textual record from Egypt testify to extensive Egyptian contact with the Levant throughout the Bronze and Iron Ages.[73]

---

[71] These narrative strands potentially offer more insight into the discussion of source criticism. Generally, the sources of the Pentateuch are regarded to reflect geographical traditions within an already established Israel and Judah. In terms of intellectual determinism, these strands are themselves likely inheritors of earlier traditions from the North and from the South.

[72] *ABD*, "Egyptian Relations with Canaan."

[73]Philip Zhakevich, *The Tools of an Israelite Scribe: A Semantic Study of the Terms Signifying the Tools and Materials of Writing in Biblical Hebrew*. (Austin, TX: PhD Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin. Ann Arbor: Proquest/UMI, 2015), 180-83.

The appearance of the Hyksos, a term for people(s) east of Egypt, in the Egyptian Delta signaled a period of transition from Egypt's Thirteenth Dynasty to the Second Intermediate Period. Although the term Hyksos appears to be a more generic appellation given to those populations originating in the Near East, the Hyksos appear to have had a major Semitic-speaking portion of their population, though evidence suggests that other Near Eastern peoples (perhaps Hurrians) comprised other portions of the Hyksos population.

Near Eastern rule over Egypt was not the only means through which Near Eastern ideas would have experienced contact with those of Egypt. The pendulum swung the other way when Egypt controlled and engaged with much of the Levant. Central and Southern Syria saw Bronze Age incursions by the Egyptians; the presence of the Egyptians is attested even as far as Qatna (Tel Mishrifeh), northeast of Damascus[74] and was located on the King's Highway. The material remains from ancient Qatanum[75] attest to a number of Egyptian artifacts in a region forming a buffer zone between the larger empires of the Bronze Age Near East. In addition to the material remains, anecdotes of this interaction are reflected in the literary tradition of Egypt, such as the story of Wenamun and his journey through the Levant. Whatever the factual bits of the story were, there is reason to believe the setting has its basis in the historical knowledge the Egytpians possessed of the ancient Levantine coastal regions. In short, the spread of Egyptian culture

[74] Tell Mishrifeh is located near present-day Qatna in Syria, 18km Northeast of Homs. Roccati, Alessandro. "A Stone Fragment Inscribed with Names of Sesostris I Discovered at Qatna," in *Excavating Qatna: Documents D'Archeologie Syrienne.* IV ed. Michel al-Maqdissi, Marta Luciani, et al. (Damascas: Direction Général des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie: 2002), 173-174.

[75] The Mari archives indicate the name of Qatanum (for example, see Lester Grabbe, *The Land of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age*, (Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017), 149.) however Michel al-Maqdissi states that the ancient name of the site is presently unknown. See Al-Maqdissi, et al. "Introduction" *in Excavating Qatna: Documents D'Archeologie Syrienne*. IV ed. Michel al-Maqdissi, Marta Luciani, et al. (Damascas: Direction Général des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie, 2002), 8.

penetrating deep into ancient Syria afforded the opportunity for intellectual contact between peoples.

Egyptian Cultural Influences in and with the Levant

Ancient Egypt has left us with a wealth of textual and archaeological material describing the praxis and beliefs of the ancient Egyptian religious life. The precise mechanism for ideological contact between these two regions is not entirely clear, and charting the specific course of oral contact is nearly impossible to accomplish. Nevertheless, early scribal culture was largely functioning within the realm of oral literature. Several factors connect Egyptian and Levantine scribal traditions.

The development of the alphabet appears to have arisen in an Egyptian setting. The Wadi el-Hol inscriptions from Upper Egypt place the Semitic alphabet in a specifically Egyptian context. In Egypt, writing was produced by means of writing hieroglyphs with ink on papyrus (in addition to monumental relief work). The ink-based system served as an alternative to the standard Mesopotamian cuneiform system and was eventually used to write West Semitic languages. The Mesopotamian system required clay as the primary medium into which cuneiform impressions would be made, whereas the ink-based system of Egypt required no impressions and so flexible surfaces like papyrus formed a practical alternative. In addition, writing upon the surface of existing objects like the surface of shattered clay ostraca, a well-attested Egyptian practice that was also prevalent in ancient Israel.[76] To illustrate, the Hebrew language utilizes several Egyptian loan words to articulate ink-based writing technology, demonstrating a connection between the scribal traditions of Judah and Egypt. Additionally, the use of hieratic numerals found within the corpus of Iron Age Hebrew inscriptions further

[76] Zhakevich, 187.

provides further evidence of Egyptian influence on the early Levantine scribal tradition.[77] Although there are a number of common features shared between Egyptian thought and themes in the Hebrew Bible,[78] a genre of literature produced within the scribal context are the wisdom traditions, many of which articulate religious sensibilities.[79]

Select Features of Egyptian Family Religion

Several themes present in the religious landscape of ancient Egypt confirm the extent to which certain features of religious life in the ancient Near East stretched across cultures and empires. The literature on the extent and complexity or rather sophistication of Egyptian religion is vast and beyond the scope of this present study. However, we should emphasize the overarching feature of the Egyptian worldview that perceives the entirety of being as a *unified reality*.[80] Egyptian thought, to include approaches to the religious life, projects a more fluid

[77] See Thomas O. Lambdin, "Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament," *JAOS* 73 (1953): 145-55; see also Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins Through the Rabbinic Period*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013) 58-60.

[78] Many of these instances pertaining to the narratives concerning Egypt in the Hebrew Bible have been previously observed by Donald B. Redford and Gary Rendsburg. See Redford, "The Literary Motif of the Exposed Child" in *Numen* 14 (1967); Rendsburg, "Moses as Equal to Pharoah," in *Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion*, (Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006); and Rendsburg, "Moses the Magician," in *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. Berlin: Spinger (2015).

[79] The so-called wisdom traditions of the ancient Near East have long been considered features of scribal schools. The numerous commonalities in ancient Near Eastern proverbial traditions with those of the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible has long been observed in parallel and are widely regarded as a successor to the Egyptian scribal tradition. The *Complaints of Khakheperrē-Sonb* exhibit notable parallels with the book of Ecclesiastes, presented in the form of maxims (See *COS* 114-5). A more popular comparison is often made between the book of Proverbs and the *Instructions of Amenenope*, a text assigned to the Ramesside period of Egypt and roughly contemporaneous with the emergence of Israel. According to Lichtheim, Proverbs 22:20 ("Have I not written for you thirty sayings of admonitions and knowledge?") asserts a prior knowledge of the thirty chapters of the *Instruction of Amenenope*: See Lichtheim in *COS*, 115.

[80] This follows the recent paper (among other works by the same researcher) given at the 11th International Congress of Coptic Studies during the Summer of 2016 by Emmanuel Gergis, who posits the Egyptian *sophia* (the worldview and proto-philosophical tradition of ancient Egypt) as a *unified reality* defined by several observable features in ancient Egyptian literature, namely: a god-centered perspective; a willingness to accept the accretion of

interpretation of life and death. The intercourse between life and death in Egyptian religion is mediated by relationship between the living with the predecessors and is reflected in the paternal character of divine devotion, a topic that by extension is deeply integrated with the religious landscape and mythology of the dead.

The Divine and the Cult of the Dead

The principle myth of ancient Egyptian religion concerns the death and subsequent return to life of the god Osiris. Osiris was murdered and afterwards dismembered by his brother Seth. Osiris's body was scattered and later, his wife Isis recovered the fourteen portions of his body. Isis reassembled the body of Osiris and thereby brought him back to life; this eventually led to the procreation of their child Horus. Osiris remained in the underworld where he ruled as king, while the Falcon Horus, the son begat by Osiris after his death was established as the king of those in the realm of the living.

The relationship of Osiris to Horus is that of father to son, requiring all the subsequent duties of filial piety. Horus the living cares for his dead father Osiris, as is evident from the ritual offerings made by families in the care of their own dead as realized in the ritual practice of ancient Egyptian religion. During these rites, the priest stood in the role of Horus, who presented the offering of the family as the "eye of Horus" that was restored to Osiris. To this point, Jan Assmann explains that "this restitution was the embodiment of every alleviation of lack or need, from the extreme need of the deceased lying in the tomb to the cult statue's need to be waited

paradoxical statements; a belief in the unity of heaven and earth; an emphasis on pragmatism; a focus on the need for decorum and piety; and an awareness of the imminent advent of the divine.

on."[81] The priest, through the liturgical praxis of ritual offerings maintained the connection for families between earthly and divine worlds.

> "When the priest proffers an object—a loaf of bread, a jug of beer, a piece of meat—and explains it as the "eye of Horus," he thus enters into a divine constellation that originated in the relationship between the living son (Horus) and the deceased father (Osiris). This is the constellation that spans the gulf separating this world from the next. Here, too, as in the case of the theology of cult statues, the mortuary cult shows itself to be the "preparatory school" of theology. The mortuary cult supplied the model for bridging two spheres of existence: between the living and the deceased in their tombs, between humankind and the deities in their temples. And when the god is given the eye of Horus, it invigorates his life force as well, healing him in his need."[82]

This *mythos* is a functional operation of Egyptian life, exemplified in the role of the king but extending into the culture at large. When the Pharaoh dies, he no longer is the god Horus but becomes the god Osiris. In other words, once dead the Pharaoh is transformed into the image of his deceased ancestor becoming one with his fathers. The new Pharaoh becomes the living-god Horus and fulfills the role of his father in caring for his own departed ancestry. Assmann notes the position of the deceased king is one of a son beseeching the god Re-Atum as his father to prepare his entry into the divine realm.[83] Similarly, it was through this paradigm laid down in the royal tradition that every deceased person became an Osiris from the Middle Kingdom onward. The deceased bore the name of Osiris as a reflection of the transition from the world of the living thereby uniting with the world of the divine.[84]

---

[81] Assmann, *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 50.

[82] Ibid., 51.

[83] Assmann, *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 2005), 147.

[84] Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*, (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1996), 96.

A clearer expression of unity with the god Osiris[85] is found in the Amduat where the sun god Re becomes Osiris during his daily descent into the underworld. Whereas the deceased human beings transition into union with Osiris, Re appears in the world of the dead as a corpse, incorporating Osiris into himself so that the two gods "speak with one mouth."[86] The death of Re is not unique. The Book of the Dead records that every god must go down into the West, the realm of the dead, by the order of Re—who is himself mortal (Urk. V, 14). "The Egyptians are aware that every personal being, including the gods, must die; but they state specifically that only the nonexistent is dead in the sense of being in an enduring state."[87] For the ancient Egyptians then, death was not a matter of finality but a process beings experience.

There is some evidence suggesting the notion of the divine is intimately tied to preservation of life after death.[88] In the mortuary liturgical rites performed on behalf of the deceased pharaoh or other human beings, paralleled the daily services, though the image of the deity was replaced with the image or statue of the dead person. By performing these rites, the

[85] Ibid. Hornung asserts that the deceased becoming Osiris does not "betoken a genuine identity with the ruler of the dead; rather, it means that through his own efforts the human being takes on a previously determined role that bears the name Osiris." Hornung's analysis is a bit misleading. What Hornung is describing is the process of transformation: specifically transformation into Osiris; in such a case, the human being Following Leibniz's Law, the human being becomes a predicate condition to Osiris only through the human being's death; the death of the human being then is a genuine identity with the ruler of the dead Osiris by bearing Osiris's name. Unlike deceased human beings, Re does not take Osiris's name during Re's unity with Osiris. The union of the two gods, who "speak with the same name" occurs as a result of the daily death of Re descending to the underworld; the death of Re is the predicate condition for the union between the two deities, but unlike human beings who transition into Osiris, Re rises from death in order to bring light to the world during the day.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid., 182.

[88] From an etymological standpoint, there appears to be some support for this idea. The ancient Egyptian hieroglyph for 'god' was represented by a staff with streamers. In the cryptographic form of the hieroglyphic script, this sign bears the value of /w/ on a number of scarabs; Erik Hornung notes the work of Étienne Drioton who derived this conclusion from *wt*, meaning 'to wrap, bind.' Hornung also notes that "from an early period *wt* is the title of an embalmer and the word for mummy wrappings." The implication set forth is that mummification may have had some relation to the notion of entering the divine realm.

priest partook in the ritual actions of Horus that he performed for his father Osiris. The mortuary rites included sacrifice and offering of food and drink "to satisfy the needs of the Ba and the Ka, which subsisted on the spiritual substance of the offering."[89] To this end, White surmises that worship of one's ancestors was obligatory because of the ancestors' interest in the fate of their progeny.[90] The use of the term *worship*, while correct in the historical sense of the term, is certainly antiquated and better rendered in this study as *veneration*—a traditional synonym to *worship* now predominantly carrying the connotation of respect, honor, ascribing worth without devotion to a deity. Thus, this study utilizes the phrase ancestor *veneration* unless previous authors have otherwise used the term *worship* in their publications.

Remembering the Fathers in Egypt.

The ancient Egyptian term *ꜣbwt* signifies a "family, household, image." In the coffin texts, the prayer beseeched by the soul of the dead person declares his/her desire to attain oneness through the reunification with "the *ꜣbwt*, the father, the mother, the parents ... the in-laws, the children, the spouses, the concubines, the servants ... everything that returns to a man in the necropolis."[91] The deceased lived on in the divine realm (i.e., the afterlife) and possessed supernatural powers to impact the living.[92] Participation between those living in the world and

[89] J.E. Manchip White, *Ancient Egypt: Its Culture and Its History*, (New York: Dover Publications, 1970), 42-43.

[90] Ibid, 43.

[91] The connection was first brought to my attention by Christopher B. Hays. See also his text, *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 172.

[92] Ibid. For example, Hays observes "in Coffin Texts Spell149, the deceased is given the power to become a falcon and destroy his enemy: 'I have repulsed my enemy; I have crushed his *ꜣbwt*; I have thrown down his house.' This would seem to reflect the power of the enemy's dead kin to fight on his behalf in the afterlife (as also in the Letters to the Dead; cf. §2.4.2)."

the *ꜣbwt* living in the divine realm occurred through the invocation of the ancestors. Juan Carlos Moreno Garcia has observed the participatory connection between the living and the deceased through the invocations of one's "fathers" in the necropolis. Such "emphasized the very particular position of ancestors in Egyptian society as active members of the household, and also as intermediaries with the netherworld and the foci of rituals, offerings, and celebrations (including banquets) that helped preserve kinship and social ties. Reciprocity was thus crucial in the relations between living and deceased people."[93] Invoking the name was central to the Egyptian understanding of the preservation of life beyond the physical world and is reflected in the New Kingdom saying, "one lives, if his name is mentioned."[94] In light of this, the *ꜣbwt* may be regarded as the image of the family memorialized in the divine realm.[95]

Following such a conclusion, we may seek to reevaluate the appeal sent by the non-Egyptian Laba'yu from Shechem to Pharoah among the collection of letters found at Tel el-Amarna (EA 252).[96] In this letter, Laba'yu complains about his state of affairs to Pharoah who has not provided the appropriate military assistance. Toward the end of the letter, Laba'yu expresses just how personally he takes these assaults as they are an affront against not only his

[93] Juan Carlos Moreno Garcia, "Ancestral Cults in Ancient Egypt," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

[94] Cited Assmann, *Death and Salvation*, 39; also Hays, *Death and Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, 75.

[95] See also the discussion by Christopher B. Hays in *Death in Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*, 172-173. Hays connects the notion of the *ꜣbwt* to both the deceased ancestor and the Hebrew אבות. "…it seems possible that ꜣbwt might also signify a statue of a deified ancestor. This dual sense of "ancestor/statue" would accord well with the biblical אבות: they are the dead ancestors who are represented by statues, much like the *teraphim*."

[96] The collection of Amarna letters implies that those writing to Pharoah are non-Egyptian because the language of the texts are transmitted in a local, West-Semitic, form of Akkadian. The name *Laba'yu* is less certain. If it is Semitic, it may be a local rendering equivalent to "my heart," though "heart" is universally rendered by an initial e-class vowel (cf. Heb. *leb*, Akk. *lebbum*, etc.); if Indo-European, the name may reflect the Luwian "brilliance" (cf. KUB XXXV 142+ for the term used as "to glow," though this is uncertain).

towns, but against his divinely decreed identity. Lines 30-31 read: *i-bi ú-ṣur-runa*/ LÚ.MEŠ *ša ṣa-ab-tu₄* URU ‹ù›/ *i-li šu-sú-mì a-bi-ia*/ *ù ú-ṣur-ru-šu-nu* "I will verily keep watch on my enemy, the men who seized the town ‹and› **my god**, the plunderers of **my father**!"[97] In qualifying the enemy to Pharoah, Laba'yu regards them as those who seized the town, as well as his god and his father. Both the god and the father are possessions of Laba'yu set in apposition to one another. Laba'yu defines the god and the father as one in the same, though it is not clear if Laba'yu is referring to the deity in a fatherly fashion or if the term "my god" here refers to the familial image (*ʒbwt*) of a divinized ancestor. Since the letter (EA 252) refers to a physical assault on the region ruled by Laba'yu, the interpretation of the god as father here best reflects a cult image capable of being physically taken and not an abstraction.

Conclusion: *Egypt*

The prevalent cultic markers of the paternal paradigm in ancient Egypt operate within the perception of a unified reality. The ancient Egyptian royal religious ideology testifies to a system of participation in the divine aspect of kingship through the paternal bonding between the man and his god as well as the king and his father. Even though the royal religious mythology is well outlined, similar perspectives have been observed in the domestic realm among the ancestor cult. One conclusion that may be drawn about the power of the ancestors is that they do not possess the powers of major gods or other divine forces (storm, sea), but can supernaturally influence the life of those family members with whom they share familial (paternal) continuity, fighting on their behalf or causing to prosper. The activity of the ancestors necessitates their progeny caring for them after they have entered the divine realm.

[97] The so-called letter of the "Biting Ant". See Alice Mandell, *Scribalism and Diplomacy at the Crossroads of Cuneiform Culture: The Sociolinguistics of Canaano-Akkadian,* (PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2015) 174.

MESOPOTAMIA

Mesopotamian Writing and Communication

Of all the locations of the ancient Near East, the extent of Mesopotamian thought reaches the furthest throughout the region. This contact exerted ideological influence on the literature of the neighboring regions as well as upon the Hebrew Bible.[98] The Amarna letters, a Bronze Age era cache of peripheral Akkadian texts found at Tel el-Amarna Egypt, testify to the reach and usage of the Akkadian language and cuneiform technology beyond the bounds of Mesopotamia proper. The reach of this scribal tradition extended beyond the needs of royal administration, and is reflected in the mythological texts such as the *Epic of Gilgamesh* that have been found as far away as Megiddo. The specific mechanisms for the dissemination of Akkadian literature throughout the Near East are not fully understood, though dispatching of scribes throughout the region combined with the adoption of the cuneiform scribal systems by those to the west[99] of Mesopotamia proper testify to a widespread context for the propagation of Mesopotamian literature.

Family Religion in the Ancient Near East

Like religion in Egypt, the literature covering religion in Mesopotamia is vast. The situation in Mesopotamia comprised differing local traditions operating in confluence with one another. The paternal paradigm exists at all levels in the ancient Near East, though father gods

[98] It is not simply the number of genres of literature produced in Mesopotamia—myth, legal codes, annals—but the extent these materials travelled regionally. For example, The mythological setting of Mesopotamian literature largely exerts two modes of influence on the Hebrew Bible: 1) narrative congruence, where specific elements of storylines are acceptable as part of the mythological imagery for the compilers of the Hebrew Bible, and 2) points of contrast where a specific retor to the cultic and mythological sensibilities of Mesopotamia is utilized to articulate the particular theological perspective and concerns of the compilers of the Hebrew Bible. In most cases, the Hebrew Bible presents both of these modes working in concert.

[99] Namely, the Amorites, Hurrians, Hittites (communities that exerted considerable influence over the Levant during the Bronze Age), as well as the local alphabetic cuneiform from Ugarit.

differ by region and importance. Within the paternal paradigm, the two prevailing features that stand out in the ancient Near East: the cult of the ancestors and the veneration of the local patron deity.[100] In Babylon for instance, persons belonged to a *bīt abim* (lit., 'house of the father'), a patrilinear family unit that typically consisted of a man and his wife along with their children.[101]

Akkadian orthography at times hints at religious perspectives that can be overlooked in the general discussions of the cult. The use of determinatives in writing the Akkadian language graphically specifies the nuance of the term proffered. The divine determinative represented in transcription by a superscripted "D" or "d," indicates whether or not the name mentioned is a god.[102] Occasionally however, other figures or objects are regarded with this divine determinative, complicating the way in which we understand the gods of ancient Mesopotamia.

Fathers Remembered and the Paternal Deities

As in Egypt, care for the departed ancestors is also reflected in the cultural traditions of Mesopotamia, whether the traditions are embedded in the region's mythology or the life of the cult. The myths of Bilgames and the Netherworld and Ishtar's Descent into the Netherworld each state that the dead eat clay and drink murky water,[103] suggesting that there is activity for the

[100] van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 11.

[101] Ibid., 20-21. With regard to the *bīt abim*, Van der Toorn notes that polygamy was a rare occurrence. Families were both patrilinear and patrilocal, with the wife joining the location of her husband. The father was the head of the family possessing NAM.AD.DA (*abbūtum*), or paternal authority, a feature denoting the father as the image of the family as their spokesman in legal situations, sessions of the city elders, and inheritance (to include religion). Jacobsen observes the use of the term *abbūtum* developing from its primary connotation of "fatherhood" toward the secondary meaning "intercession" due to the typical role exerted by the father. See Jacobsen, *Treasures of Darkness*, 159.

[102] There are numerous conventions used to articulate Akkadian determinatives. In addition to those noted above, determinatives are also written in Sumerian transcription with the majuscule script and separated by an em dash.

[103] Tallay Ornan, *BASOR*, No. 366 (May 2012): 13.

being beyond the physical life. Outside of the mythological traditions in places like ancient Lagash, those who could afford to have their images created had statues of varying sizes fashioned of themselves to be placed in the temple as votive objects. These statues constituted the presence of the image of the person, and were in need to food and drink offerings in order to function properly.[104] Additionally, offerings for the deceased would be conducted at a KI.A.NAĜ, a Sumerian mortuary chapel or "place of water libation" (though food offerings were presented at the KI.A.NAĜ as well).

The Epic of Gilgamesh as reflected in the Old Babylonian Yale text (YBC 2178 vi 40-43), the elders of Uruk remind Gilgamesh to perform libations to Šamaš and commemorate (*taḫassas*) Lugalbanda, the father[105] of Gilgamesh. Lugalbanda is written with the DINGIR determinative (^{d}LUGAL.BÀN.DA), indicating his association with the divine forces. Van der Toorn concludes that the libation directed toward Šamaš as an intermediary and was intended for Lugalbanda, who dwelled in the realm of the dead where Šamaš ruled during the night.[106]

The mythologizing of the ancient Sumerian kings Lugalbanda and Gilgamesh (cf. Bilgames), more easily afforded these once historical figures supernatural qualities.[107]

---

[104] Bram Jagersma, "The Calendar of the Funerary Cult in Ancient Lagash," *BO* 64 (2007): 289-307. One challenge to better understanding this tradition is that the data present for the "cult of the dead" concerns the elites or the very wealthy. "The validity of what we know is again restricted to individuals of the highest social status." See also Eva Andrea Braun-Holzinger, *Mesopotamische Weihgaben der früh-dynastischen bis altbabylonischen Zeit* (Heidelberg: Heidelberger Ori-entverlag, 1991), 227-230.

[105] Lugalbanda was a mortal king of Uruk who is indentified as the father of Gilgamesh and his guardian deity. See Andrew George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*: *The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian*. (London: Penguin, 2000), 224.

[106] We have previously seen parallel motifs from Egypt of the sun-god Re descending into the realm of the dead during the night; see van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 48.

[107] According to the Sumerian king list, Lugalbanda and Gilgamesh were near one another in succession, though a specific relationship is not defined. Lines 107-115 of the Sumerian king list provide the pertinent data for this figures: "Lugalbanda, the shepherd, ruled for 1200 years. Dumuzi, the fisherman, whose city was Kuara, ruled for 100 (ms. TL has instead: 110) years. (ms. P3+BT14 adds:) He captured En-me-barage-si single-handed. Gilgamesh, whose father was a phantom (?), the lord of Kulaba, ruled for 126 years." See J.A., Black, et al, *The*

Nevertheless, myth is effectively a culture's code for engaging the higher contemplation of their historio-cultural tradition. Moreover, the belief in the divinization of those who had passed away prevailed within the cultic tradition of ancient Mesopotamia, best documented among kings such as Naram-Sîn, with the memory of this ancient practice extended even into the medieval period.[108]

The divinization of the departed was not limited to kings but extended to humans of every age and social class (presumably). Sumerian literature attests to the belief in the divinity of the dead.[109] In the Sumerian Utu hymn, the death of one's father is remembered as the death of his god.[110] Children who had died early on, perhaps at childbirth or shortly thereafter (ostensibly prior to receiving a name), were given names recognizing their transition to divine status: e.g.,the Old Assyrian *i-su*-DINGIR "I-have-the god"; Old Babylonian *i-lu-ma* "He-is-the "God;" *šu-nu-ma*-DINGIR and *i-lu-šu-nu* for "their god," *a-na-ku*-DINGIR-*ma* "I-am-the-god," DINGIR-*lam-*

Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (http://www-etcsl.orient.ox.ac.uk/), Oxford 1998- 2017, accessed: December 01, 2016.

[108] The twelfth century (C.E.) *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, in noting the history of ancient Mesopotamia, records that "He (the King of Nineveh) also made a golden image of his father Belos and inscribed on it, 'the great god.' He made this public throughout Assyria, and many worshipped it." Michael the Great, trans. Matti Moosa, *Chronicle of Michael the Syrian*, 43.

[109] van der Toorn's citation of the Sumerian wisdom texts are not convincing. These texts juxtapose the role of each parent with a god, whereby the mother or father is placed in parallel with the role of a god. His quotation of the *Instructions of Šuruppak* (259-263) only establish relationality between parent and deity: "The words of your mother and the words of your god you must not discuss. A mother is like the sun god Utu, she gives birth to humans; a father is like a god …; a father is like a god, his word holds good." A more apt analysis would be to note this relationality as a means of framing the language utilized to describe the world of the divine. More convincing however is his citation of Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (1994: 74, IM 90648) that notes an incantation against ghosts, referring to them as the "divine dead." See van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 57-58.

[110] Mark E. Cohen, "Another Utu Hymn, *ZA* 67, (1977): 1-19. Also cited in van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 57.

ni-šu “We-have-the-god” (also at Nuzi), *i-lu-ni* “Our-god,” DINGIR-*ki-nu-um* “The-real-god,” DINGIR-*da-ri* “The-god-endures”; and DINGIR *ḫa-bil* “The-god-was-snatched-away.”[111]

Since the dead belong to the realm of the gods, a proper understanding of the importance of the family rituals for the dead is “not possible without a grasp of the divine nature of the ghosts.”[112] In his publication of “A Neo-Assyrian Text Describing a Royal Funeral,” John McGinnis provides the translation of “(deceased) spirits” for the term *ilū*, “I offered gifts to the princely Anunnaki and the spirits who dwell in the underworld.”[113] Taken together with the interpretation of certain maqlu texts, Tzvi Abusch suggests that “the ghost of the father” and “the ghost of one’s mother” accurately reflect the *il abi u ištar ummi*.[114] Similarly, to speak of “the daughter of one's god” means to speak of “one’s sister.”[115]

At the time of their death, the departed persons of one’s family were called by their gods to join them, as reflected in Old Babylonian phrases such as *ilūšu iqtērū* (“he died,” lit. “his gods took/summoned him away”) and *ilūšina iqtērūšināti* (“they died,” lit. “their gods

---

[111] The list is provided in *CAD* I, 102; most of the Old Babylonian collection cited is found in the series *Cuneiform Texts from Babylon.*

[112] Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 56.

[113] John McGinnis, “A Neo-Assyrian Text Describing a Royal Funeral,” *SAAB* 1 (Padova: Sargon Editrice e Libreria, 1987): 1-11. The Akkadian from column one reads as follows: (21') *[q]i-šá-a-ti a-na mal-ki* (22') ^{d}*a-nun-na-ki* (23') *ù* DINGIR.MEŠ *a-ši-bu-ut* Kᶦ I-timᶦ (24') [ú-q]a-a-a-iš. Since the father is the object for whom the funerary rite is being proctored, McGinnis concludes: “I would go further and suggest that what is meant is that the new king made offerings to his own ancestors.” By the time of the Neo-Assyrian period, the Annunaki would likely have been a term used for the pantheon of mythological gods leaving the remaining DINGIR.MEŠ (*ilī*) in this funerary context as the departed ancestors.

[114] I. Tzvi Abusch, *Babylonian Witchcraft Literature: Case Studies*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 58-59. Here Abusch’s suggestion follows G. Meier’s rendering of the same phrase as “jegliche ‘Hand des Togengestes,’ von seiten des väterlichen Schutzgottes und der mütterlischen Schutzgöttin, alles was es gibt.” The passage is also referenced for *ilu* in *CAD* I, 99.

[115] “The fact that divinity is ascribed to the ancestors explains the taboo on sexual intercourse with ‘the daughter of one's god.’ A cuneiform commentary to this expression specifies that ‘the daughter of one's god’ means ‘one’s sister.’” See van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 58.

took/summoned them away").[116] The presumption that the term "gods" is always in the plural has led van der Toorn to conclude that these "gods" are in fact the fathers to whom the deceased was called to join, in part due to the fact that most Babylonians held a devotion to only one god.

The dwelling-places of deities were not limited to fixed locations, and at times they could enter a human being. In the *Šurpu* series of healing incantations, a *gallû*-demon assails the subject causing a headache, in turn causing his gods to depart his body.

> Lines
> 1/2. An evil curse like a *gallû*-demon has come upon (this) man,
> 3/4. dumbness (and) daze have come upon him,
> 5/6. an unwholesome dumbness has come upon him,
> 7/8. evil curse, oath, headache.
> 9/10. An evil curse has slaughtered this man like a sheep,
> 11/12. his god left his body,
> 13/14. his goddess (Sumerian adds: his mother), usually full of concern for him, has stepped aside.[117]

Thorkild Jacobsen's position on the matter bridges the notions of the devotion to the personal deity and the divinization of the ancestors into one integrated concept.

> From a look at the various Mesopotamian dynasties known to us, we learn that father and son invariably had the same personal god and goddess. The god passed therefore from the body of the father into the body of the son as generation followed generation. This explains a passage that has given Assyriologists much trouble. An ancient commentary explains the term "daughter of his god" as meaning "his sister." Since the god who resided in a man's body had earlier been present in his father's body and had there engendered both him and his sister he is

[116] See *CAD* Q 242-243 entry for *qerû*, which as its fifth definition appears as a euphemism for death in Old Babylonian. It is worth noting that in the first instance, *ilūšu iqtērū*, the tablet is broken in the line containing the example and reads: *i-[lù]-<šu>-[.] iq-te-ru*… Since the final -u on *iq-te-ru* is subordinating, the translation of the plural "gods" stands. See Th. G. Pinches, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylon in the British Museum, Vol. 45: Old Babylonian Business Documents*, (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1964), 16 r. 5. Van der Toorn takes issue with the definition "taken away" provided by *CAD*, declaring it "unfounded." Furthermore, van der Toorn states that "the idiom has been misunderstood by the *CAD*, because it failed to see that the 'gods' are in fact the ancestors" (*Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 57). Nevertheless, Van der Toorn's rendering "called away (to join)" is not at odds with the CAD as death is an unavoidable response to the summons by the "gods" mentioned.

[117] Erica Reiner, *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*, Beiheft 11 *AfO* (Graz: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1958), 30.

> "the son of his god" and his sister is "the daughter of his god." This belief underlies also the standard Old Assyrian term for the personal god, "god of the fathers," as in Ashur, the god of your fathers," "Ilbrat, the god of our father(s)," or "Ilabrat, the god of your father(s)…[118]

During the Akkadian period, there is evidence of the cult of one Ilaba at Akkad. Ilaba was considered a warrior deity and personal deity of the kings of the Akkad dynasty.[119] The divine warrior as the paternal deity of the line of Akkadian kings invites the analysis of the meaning behind the name of this god. There is a temptation to see the name as *il-aba*, "the god of the father." Grammatically, this conclusion is problematic. While the Akkadian term for "god," *ilu*, would theoretically be in its correct bound form *il*, the construct state in Akkadian requires a genitive ending. Thus, we would expect *il-abi* if the name means the god of the father. Still, there is of course the possibility that Aba is understood as an oblique proper name inflected like an accusative, though this seems unlikely.[120]

The tradition of remembering the divinized fathers in ancient Mesopotamia is found in the *kispu* ritual. At its core, the *kispu* ritual centered on the sharing of a meal between the living and the dead. The term itself is associated with the Akkadian verb *kasāpu*, "to break into small pieces,"[121] presumably referring to the breaking of bread as a euphemism for sharing a meal, the central component of the *kispu*. Additionally, the term possesses meaning for a range of operations to include funerary offerings presented at the time of burial so as to equip the

---

[118] Thorkild Jacobsen, *Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976), 159. For a contrary position, see van der Toorn, Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel, 57: "This does not mean that the family god was incarnate in the father and passed from his body ot the bodies of his children."

[119] Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons, and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*, (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992), 107.

[120] The matter requires further investigation in light of Ilaba's association with Zababa.

[121] Cf. *CAD* K, 425; 454-456. -Karel van der Toorn, *Household and Family Religion*, 25.

deceased for the underworld where the deceased would normally eat clay and drink dirty water, as ritual offerings presented at regular intervals commemorating the dead, and finally as special offerings made during the course of magical rituals.[122] The commemorative rites associated with the *kispu* constitute the primary importance of the term as it reflects iterative process continually binding the earthly and divine realms, where the daily rite provided families the opportunity to dine with their ancestors. At the *rēš warḫim* ("beginning of the month") the more elaborate offerings were presented.[123]

Apart from the meal offerings, two additional components of the *kispu* rite assured continuity between realms; these consisted of the naming of the departed and the locus associated with the rites that were proffered. The family heir who inherited the position of the paterfamilias (typically the eldest son) held the title of *zākir šumim* ("invoker of the name"), who held the responsibility of caring for his deceased fathers by offering sacrifices and speaking their names.[124] The importance of proclaiming a name should not be underestimated. In ancient Near Eastern thought, the *name* bore the essence of the subject or being.[125] As the bearer of the essence, the name, once invoked for the first time, would have been called into being from

[122] See Akio Tsukimoto, *Untersuchungen zur Totenplege (kispum) im Alten Mesopotamien*, (Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985).

[123] Van der Toorn, *Household and Family Religion*, 26.

[124] Van der Toorn, *Household and Family Religion*, 25. See also in the same volume, Daniel E. Fleming, "The Integration of Household and Community Religion in Ancient Syria," 40.

[125] The Semitic concept of the name represents what later Greek philosophical (and by extension theological) terminology might render a *hypostatic force*. See Ch. 4 in this present work. See also Schniedewind's discussion on the hypostatization of the name in Schniedewind, "Calling God Names: an inner-biblical approach to the Tetragrammaton," in *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination*, eds. Green, Deborah A, and Laura S. Lieber, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 74-86; Karen Radner and Marten Stol, *Die Macht Des Namens. Altorientalische Strategien Zur Selbsterhaltung*, Santag 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrowitz Verlag, 2005).

nothing.[126] According to Jean Bottéro, "to receive a name and to exist… were one in the same."[127] This concept is best expressed by the Akkadian verb *apû*, "to be brilliant"; in its causative (Š) forms the term means "to proclaim, make visible" and is associated with creation narratives such as the Enuma Elish where naming and calling something into being comprise the operative acts of creation,[128] and when commemorative, in the act of *recreation*.[129] By invoking, or commemorating (as the verb *zakāru* generally implies; cf. Heb. זכר) the names of one's ancestors, the fathers continue living after the death of the physical body.

As the naming of the ancestor in the *kispu* ritual constituted the abstract or immaterial portion of the rite, the locus for the *kispu* ritual constituted the tangible or material portion of the rite. The locus of the *kispu* could take several forms, whether at a ceremonial table in the home, a large structure (É.GAL, usually "large house" though later a "temple" [cf. Heb. *hêkāl* היכל]; perhaps a "main room" portion of a structure as suggested by van der Toorn), or through the locus creation by the presence of the ritualized statues of the deceased ancestors. Inheritance texts from Nippur record the eldest son to have received the family's ceremonial table as part of

[126] Some have observed that "writing down a name could be a ritual act used to manipulate a person's fate," and the written name could in point of fact, capture the essence of the person. See Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 30.

[127] Jean Bottéro. *Bottéro/Bahrani: Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*. (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 97.

[128] Tablet I of the Enuma Elish, lines 1-2, 7-10:

1 When on high the heavens were not named (*nabû*)
2 The lands below (its) name not invoked (*šumā la zākrat*)
7 When not one of the gods was made visible (*šupû*)
8 unnamed (*šumā la zukkurū*), when no destinies had been decreed,
9 The gods were created within them:
10 *Laḫmu* and *Laḫamu* came into being (*uštapû*) and their names were invoked (*šumī izzkkarū*).

[129] Jonker states that these terms used in Syria to denote such care for the departed are either the passive *kunnū* "to be tended, honored" or *nabû* "to call, invoke", synonymous with Akkadian *zakāru*. How the introduction to the Enuma Elish may be playing off of the *kispu* tradition is a question for further study.

his paternal inheritance, where offerings for the departed would be placed along with a chair for the family ghost.[130] Sedentary communities in Mesopotamia and beyond regularly attest to in-home burials where the departed were buried under the family home. In addition to the structural locations where the *kispu* could be offered in the physical presence of the dead, an indirect way of establishing such a location would be through the presence of images, though this tradition is better attested outside central Mesopotamia to its northwestern peripheral regions.[131]

The Amorite World Rule

Though both having contributed considerable impact over the Levant, Egypt and the major cultures of Mesopotamia still maintain some cultural distance from the emergent Israelite community within which the patriarchal narratives are set. Unlike the communities of Egypt or Mesopotamia, the Bronze Age Amorites reflect a cultural situation more akin to emergent Israel as attested by the textual artifacts and material remains from Northeastern Syria.[132] Indeed, the Hebrew Bible's narrative of its own identity is rooted in the memory of the Amorites (cf. Eze 16:3). While the textual corpus from the Amorite world is exponentially smaller than the documentation from Mesopotamia, certain features of Amorite religion better attest religious traditions like the *kispu* ritual.

The chief concern of the Amorite cult is the institution of fatherhood. This is observable in regard to the predominance of the *kispu* ritual as it played out among the Amorite cities of northern Syria. At Qatna, Amorite funerary rituals reflected the notion of oneness with one's

[130] Van der Toorn, *Household and Family Religion*, 26.

[131] Ibid.

[132] This also includes those records from Mesopotamia which reflect the period of Amorite rule over the region.

ancestors by virtue of seondary burials where the bones of the ancestors were gathered together.[133] One Eblaite text lists dead kings with the divine determinative, and others record sacrificial portions for the "divinized father(s)"or "divinized king(s)."[134] Jonker observes that "With the emergence of the Amorite dynasties, the religious context within which names were recited changed. The place where they were recited shifted from the temple to the throne room and the private house."[135] The move from the temple to the private sphere suggests that the official *kispu* of localized canonical religion was better suited to the private setting of families.[136] A more likely scenario presents the Mesopotamian *kispu* as a vestige of earlier clan or tribal culture if the practice was not imported to the region by the Amorites themselves during their dominance of the Mesopotamian east. The *kispu* tradition surviving in the textual record presents a ritualized practice for the commemoration of fatherhood among clan society, not unlike the genealogical traditions commemorating the ancestors among Bedouin society.[137] According to

[133] This tradition may also be compared to the burial of Judean kings who were interred in the City of David and beneath the palace. See Burke, "The Archaeology of Ritual and Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant and the Origins of Judaism," in *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*, ed. T. Insoll, (Oxford University, Oxford, 2011): 895–907. Burke also notes the phenomenon of family tombs regularly constructed below homes, ibid., 901; See also Peter Pfälzner, "Royal Funerary Practices and Inter-regional Contacts in the Middle Bronze Age Levant: New Evidence from Qatna," in *Contextualising Grave Inventories in the Ancient Near East*, ed P. Pfälzner, H. Niehr, E. Pernicka, S. Lange, and T. Köster, Qaṭna Studien, Supplementa 3, (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2014):141–156. This tradition is also mainted by Syriac Christian communities that originated in the Middle East and settled in India, where the *qabrā* tradition of burying one's bones together with the ancestors persists against the backdrop of Hindu cremation rituals in the same region.

[134] Hays, *Death in the Iron Age II*, 95-96.

[135] Jonker, *The Topography of Remembrance*, 187.

[136] This would be an interesting possibility in light of Rainer Albertz's interpretation of ancient Israelite religion moving in the opposite direction, noting that patriarchal religion is a matter of personal piety and a substratum of Yahweh religion and the basis upon which Yahweh religion was built. See Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 29.

[137] For a relatively recent discussion, see Andrew Shryock, *Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination: Oral History and Textual Authority in Tribal Jordan*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Jonker, in orally oriented societies, a genealogy "serves as a social charter and generally speculates about origins."[138] In other words, a genealogy is an identity marker of the social group.

As with the presence of the *ȝbwt* in Egypt, the departed ancestors could be present in the form of images termed in Amorite literature (as well as Nuzi texts) as the *ilāni*, or "the household gods." These *ilī*, according to van der Toorn, were images of the dead who were the focus of the cult of the ancestors, and in a text from the vicinity of Emar referred to as "the gods of the house" (DINGIR.MEŠ *ša* É-*ti*). These *ilāni* were owned by the family, who retained the rights to the images should the family property be sold.[139] Fleming concurs with van der Toorn's assessment, stating that "there is no reason to exclude ancestral figures from such 'gods,'" with the caveat that the evidence for limiting such "gods" of household duty to the ancestors alone does not provide enough information for such a conclusion.[140]

The functionary of the Amorite communal celebration of the *kispu* was the deity Dagan, the god of farming whose name is also synonymous with wheat.[141] For the Amorites, Dagan functioned a sort of supreme ancestor, their communal deity and their father.[142] At the end of a seven-year cycle, a *zukru* festival was given on his behalf and the most important event in

[138] Jonker, *The Topography of Remembrance*, 214.

[139] Van der Toorn, "Family Religion in Second Millennium West Asia (Mesopotamia, Emar, Nuzi)" in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, 27.

[140] Fleming, "The Integration of Household and Community Religion in Ancient Syria" in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, 42.

[141] Although *dgn* becomes a euphemism for "wheat" in later texts, the origin of the name is mysterious. If farming is central to live at Emar, *dgn* may simply refer to the father of the garden (*da* + *gān*). I'm hesitant to conclude this in

[142] Fleming, *Household and Family Religion*, 45.

Emar's sacred calendar. During this time, Dagan is elevated to the highest respect and recognized as Emar's "father" as well as "Lord of the Offspring."[143] According to Fleming, the Dagan rite pertains to care for ancestors in some fashion.

> Dagan is god of the people themselves, it seems, where the people in turn identify themselves by their people, their ancestors. The living and the dead together define the community, with Dagan the divine point of reference. So far as this hypothesis succeeds, then Dagan was essential to the integration of household and public religion at Emar. Dagan bound the people as an organic whole consisting of household cells, these joined by the idea of a shared community of the living and the dead.[144]

In addition to Dagan, the Storm-god (Hadad/Baʿal) plays the next most prominent role at Emar, both in terms of the location of his temple and personal names rivaling the multitude of Dagan-names found at the site. The details of the relationship between a communal, family (i.e., tribal) god Dagan and the Storm-god. Fleming sees the presence of these deities as reflecting different socio-political forces in the area. In spite of the prominence of the Storm-god, at Emar "Dagan is the major god who most binds the religious lives of community and household, where the town is conceived as the organic sum of all its household parts."[145] It would seem then that the tribal model exercised at Emar presents Dagan merges the second two features of the paternal paradigm as both the divine ancestor and the personal (i.e. paternal) deity for the community.

[143] Ibid., 44.

[144] Ibid, 45.

[145] Fleming, *Household and Family Religion*, 49.

Onomastic Considerations

Personal names often provide clues for better understanding the fabric of societies, and in the case of the Amorites (to include Eblaite)[146] reveal salient features of their West Semitic language. As Giorgio Buccellati points out, "onomastic analysis is particularly important for the study of Amorite because practically our entire knowledge is based on an inventory of a few thousand personal names - of which only a few hundred are already attested at the end of the third millennium."[147] When these names are theophoric, they reveal ideas about the religious life of the people in question.

Several kings and queens of the Amorite world from Emar, Ebla, and Mari possessed the suffix *lim* affixed to their names (e.g., Zimri-Lim, Yaḫdun-Lim, etc.). The precise nuance of this suffix is unclear, though its use by several leaders suggests that it is titular. A number of possibilities for the meaning of *lim* have been asserted over the years. Dossin, Krebernik, and Lipinski suggest that *lim* is a divine name.[148] Perhaps one may take *lim* not as a specific divine name, but as a general name for "the divine" related to "El."[149] In such a case, *lim* may be a bi-form resulting from metathesis of the initial *ʾ* (proposed alef) with the *l* of the Akkadian *ilim*; a

[146] Here I am using the regional convention of the *māt Amurru* to group Eblaite and Amorite names together, as they ought to be regarded as closely related sociolects reflecting the rural and urban traditions of a common region. See Giorgio Buccellati, "Ebla and the Amorites," *Eblaitica* 3 (1992a).

[147] Buccellati, "Eblaite and Amorite Personal Names" *Namenforschung* 1: *An International Handbook of Onomastics* (ed. E. Eichler et al.; Berlin, 1995), 857.

[148] For more on this discussion, see Manfred Krebernik, "Lim," *RLA* 7 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1987-90): 25-27. Edward Lipinski, "Le dieu Lim," in *La civilization de Mari* (Liegè: Université de Liegè, 1967), 151-60. Georges Dossin, "A propos du dieu Lim," *Syria* 55 (1978): 327-32.

[149] Whether or not El was a specific divine name in the Amorite world is not settled. If El were such, *lim* then may be a term used to disambiguate the multifaceted use of El. For a more comprehensive discussion, see Chapter Five in the present work. For a list of proposed theophoric Amorite names containing reference to El, see Lluis Feliu and Wilfred G. E. Watson. *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*. (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

second possibility to consider would be the Levantine (i.e., Syro-Phoenician) phenomenon of apheresis for this Akkadian rendition (effectively the same term with mimation) of the divine name/term "El." Even still, this proposal does not account for the genitive rendering of the otherwise normative Akkadian reading *ilum* for "the divine," unless all *lim* names are impacted by the proleptic name in bound form. Currently, there is not enough data to proceed further with this proposal, though it should be taken into consideration in the event that further data from Bronze Age Syria emerges in the coming years. (See also **Chapter Five** in the present work.)

In contrast to a divine expression, Daniel Bodi takes the title to be in reference to a clan as opposed to a divine name, noting that

> "The Akkadian world *līmum* which stands for the figure of "1000," or "multitude" also serves to designate the 'clan.' It is a cognate of Ugaritic *lʾim* and of Hebrew *leʾōm* "clan, tribe, people. Since in Mari texts *līm* is never written with a Sumerogram and never carries a determinative (dinger) for the divine being, the older proposal to see here a reference to a supposed 'god Lim' is less probable."[150]

As a term relating to a clan or multitude, Gray proposes the term's relation to the Hebrew *lʾmym*, from the root L'Y, to be strong. This term is sometimes rendered as *archontes* in the LXX and the later Assyrian title *līmu*/*limmu* is used to designate a high official.[151] C.L. Seow however concludes that this position is highly suspect on account of the lateness of the Assyrian position vis. the Amorite usage, in addition to Gray's proposal that Lim derives from a III-Weak verb in Hebrew.[152] Such a conclusion would presume double mimation.

---

[150] See Daniel Bodi "Is There a Connection between the Amorites and the Arameans?" in *ARAM* 26:2 (2014), 400.

[151] Cited in *DDD*, 523.

[152] See C.L. Seow's entry on Lim in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, eds.* Karel van der Toorn, K, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Horst. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 522.

Nakata posits what may be a happy medium between the two positions. "The *lim ilāni* 'thousand gods' are frequently invoked as witnesses in Syro-Hittite treaties and they are mentioned in an epistolary formula attested at Ugarit."[153] This view is also supported by Benjamin Schwartz in his translation of the Hittite-Luwian Zarpiya ritual.[154] From this, Seow concludes that *lim* as a deity is thought to have been a personification of the entire assembly of the gods, and as such Lim ought to be considered a personal god; thus, according to Seow the reading of the name *Li-mi-*^{d}IŠKUR "My *lim* (personal god) is Hadad."[155] Still, a nuance of Seow's conclusion appears to be missing, leaving further questions for reading the term *lim* in various Amorite names. Assuming that Buccellati is correct in his reading for the Eblaite name *aba-Lim* as "DN is father,"[156] the Seow redaction of such would produce the translation, "the personal god is the father." If *lim* is to be understood merely as a "personal god," is it a variant of the more popular logogram, ^{d}LAMMA? Such a conclusion would necessitate a break from the connection of *lim* with the "thousand" and render it as a variation of the Sumerian LAMMA, written *LI-IM* as a Kish-type logogram indigenous to the area. This proposition does not seem likely.

In light of the *kispu* rituals practiced in Mesopotamia (by Amorites) and in Amorite Syria proper, the notion of a personal god may be extended further to the notion of the divinized clan

---

[153] Cited in *DDD,* 522. Originally in Ichiro Nakata, *Deities in the Mari Texts: Complete Inventory of All the Information on the Deities Found in the Published Old Babylonian Cuneiform Texts from Mari and Analytical and Comparative Evaluation Thereof with Regard to the Official and Popular Patheons of Mari*. Ann Arbor, Mich, 1983.

[154] See Benjamin Schwartz,"The Hittite and Luwian Ritual of Zarpiya of Kezzuwatna." *JAOS* 58:2, (1938), 338-339. Schwartz takes the Akkadogram *LI-IM* in the compound *LI-IM* DINGIR.MEŠ as "the thousand gods."

[155] Ibid.

[156] Buccellati, "Eblaite and Amorite Personal Names," in *Namenforschung,* 857.

as another way of perceiving the "thousand gods." From Tell al Rimah in Northern Mesopotamia (Assyria proper), there is one recorded instance of the DINGIR *kimtini*, "god of the clan."[157] Additionally, the clan-based social structure of the Amorites served as a local version of the divine assembly found in Mesopotamia. It is a regular occurrence at Ebla for instance for links of kinship to be deified.[158]

The divinized clan presents one way of understanding the Amorite deity Amurru (^{d}MAR.TU / ^{d}AN.MAR.TU). It is not irregular for deities and people groups to bear the same name.[159] The specific significance of this phenomenon is unclear; a surface level observation suggests the names of these deities convey their importance to the community. Though Amurru is one among several deities present in Amorite culture, Amurru functions as a tutelary deity for the Amorite community: the Amorite par excellence. In the Assyrian textual corpus from Anatolia (CCT 5 la), Amurru is mentioned as a paternal deity: *ì-li a-bi-a*, "the god of my father." A similar instance occurs in BIN 6 97: ^{d}MAR.TU *il$_5$-ká*, "Amurru, the god of your father."[160] Furthermore, Richter confirms Amurru (^{d}MAR.TU) written in the name's biform (^{d}AN.MAR.TU / AN.AN.MAR.TU) as the Amorite deity, noting the Hurrian rendering of this name (^{d}*e-ni a-mur-[ri-we]*, "the god Amurru") found in an unpublished god-list from Emar.[161]

[157] To this end, the enigmatic ^{d}*ku-ra* may reflect a similar notion for the god of the city (cf. Heb. קריה).

[158] Archi, *Ebla and Its Archives*, 649.

[159] cf. Ašur and the Assyrians.

[160] See H. Hirsch, "Gott Der Väter." Beiheft 21 *AfO* , (1966): 56–58. See also the discussion by Cross in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 10.

[161] See Thomas Richter, "Die Lesung des Götternamens AN.AN.MAR.TU," in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi* 10/2, Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 9, eds. David I. Owen and Gernot Wilhelm (Bethesda, MD.: CDL Press, 1998), 135–137.

Conclusion: Mesopotamia and the Amorite World

Like Egypt, the paternal paradigm in the Mesopotmian tradition attests to maintaining identity and continuity of the family image. While there are fatherly gods in several local Mesopotamian traditions, the overall situation is more difficult to ascertain due to the cosmopolitan make-up of Mesopotamian interaction within the major cultures that defined Mesopotamia proper. Still, continuity with the family image persists through the practices ascribed to maintaining the memory of the departed fathers. These *kispu* traditions memorialize the departed ancestor, who is term an *ilu* "god" and called to join his family gods—those gods of his fathers.

The institution of fatherhood served as the principal focus of the Amorite cult. The Amorite culture reflects a more tribal, clan based tradition than the cosmopolitan makeup of Mesopotamia proper. In the Amorite world, several of the traditions in Mesopotamia are better understood at the local Amorite level. There, images of the ancestors partake in the rites associated with preservation of their memory and even extend into communal rites. By extension the communal or tribal aspect of the Amorite cult reflects a transitionary point between family religion or Albertz's personal piety and the religion of the state.

Chapter Four

The Indo-European Cultic Traditions and the "God of the Fathers"

The Syro-Anatolian tradition undergirding the patriarchal narratives of the Hebrew Bible has not received the appropriate amount of attention when discussing the narratives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The same pertinent features of the cultic life present in the *koine* of the ancient Near East explored in the previous chapter persist within the Syro-Anatolian tradition. This tradition is best parsed into two sections: one comprising an Indo-European-Anatolian tradition and the other a Northwest Semitic tradition. Here I will divide the Indo-European-Anatolian strand of the Syro-Anatolian tradition from the traditionally investigated Northwest Semitic strand (see **Chapter Five**) in order to examine this heavily influential tradition that dominated much of the Bronze Age and carried its influence over into Iron Age.

The Hittites ruled their empire for nearly 500 years during the Bronze Age, wielding their influence throughout the Levant. The Luwian inscriptional tradition outlasted the Hittite Empire, extending into the Iron Age and testifying to the Indo-European continuity in the region and contact with the Northwest Semitic inscriptional tradition. Although the bulk of data presented in

this chapter emerges between the tenth and eighth centuries BCE, after the establishment of the Israelite monarchy and presumably before the period the memories of the patriarchal narratives and their chronological settings, the data here reflect the lasting continuity of this Indo-European-Anatolian tradition.

The Emergence and Expansion of the Hittite Empire

The Hittite homeland was located in central Anatolia with its capital Ḫattuša located near present-day Boğazkale, Turkey. The specifics of the emergence of the Hittites as a major empire of the ancient Near East have been, in the words of Amélie Kuhrt, "a problem of history."[162] A gap of some two centuries remains in primary source documents from the time of the appearance of Hittites (among other peoples) in the texts of the Assyrian colony and the first texts of the Hittite kingdom with Hattuša as the capital under Hattušili I. Thus debate continues about the establishment of the Hittite kingdom and the predecessors of Hattušili I (mid sixteenth century BCE).[163] Both Hattušili I and his successor Muršili I made conquests in Syria proper (including Ḫalab [Aleppo]), yet did not establish a permanent presence there.[164] It was not until Tudhaliya I and the beginning of the Hittite Empire that a permanent Hittite presence in the region began, where Hittite administration in Syria under Šuppiluliuma I was exercised from the city of KARKAMIŠ and remained so to the end of the Empire.[165]

---

[162] Amelie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East, C. 3000-330 BC*, (London: Routledge, 1997). 225.

[163] See Horst Klengel, Fiorella Imparati, Volkert Haas, and Theo P. J. van den Hout, *Geschichte Des Hethitischen Reiches*, (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 33-38; Richard H. Beal, "The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I," in Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr: On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003); Trevor Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); James Mellaart, "Western Anatolia, Beycesultan and the Hittites," *Melanges Mansel 1* (1974): 493-526.

[164] Klengel, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*, 44-53; 64-65.

[165] Ibid., 164-167.

The arrival of the Hittite Empire coincides with the ascent of Tudḫaliya I (c. 1430/1420 BCE). The Hittite movement south into the Levant marked major geo-political achievements of the Empire. More importantly, however, are the wealth of Hittite language texts that survive. These texts, numbering more than 30,000 found at Boğazköy alone,[166] reflect the native sensibilities of the Hittites themselves as well as contact with their neighboring communities of fellow Indo-European peoples in addition to the Semites of Mesopotamia and the Levant.

Syro-Anatolian Traditions in the Levant

During the Late Bronze Age, the Egyptian and Hittite Empires regularly fought for control over the lower Levant. Although the Egyptians had more political clout (to include administrative control) over the lower Levant as attested by both archaeological[167] and textual sources, the "Hittite" influence persisted contemporaneous with Egyptian interests. Whether through the direct agency of the Hittites or through other Indo-European populations comprising the Hittite Empire, the extent of Syro-Anatolian influence in the lower Levant is difficult to gauge. Still, there is evidence for the presence of Syro-Anatolian northerners dwelling in the lower Levant during the age of Egyptian administration. In the Late Bronze Age, the administration of the local client kings subservient to Egypt in the Levant often bore northern names and/or epithets. The king of *Ur-šalimumm* (pre-Israelite Jerusalem), *Abdi-Ḫeba*, sent several letters to the king of Egypt beseeching the pharaoh's intervention in the well-being of the

[166] As noted by Hoffner and Melchert, the town of Boğazkale was previously called Boğazköy, and the two names of the town are regularly used interchangeably in the literature. Here, I follow the convention used by Hoffner and Melchert referring to the present-day city as Boğazkale and the location of past excavations a century earlier as Boğazköy in order to maintain the true value of the description without violating the Law of the Excluded Middle (à la Russel and Frege). See Hoffner and Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 2.

[167] See for example the recent field report on the excavations from the Bronze Age port of Jaffa, Burke, et al, "Excavations of the New Kingdom Fortress in Jaffa, 2011–2014: Traces of Resistance to Egyptian Rule in Canaan," *AJA Online*, Jan. 2017 (121.1).

city. The name possesses the Semitic term for "servant," *abdi-* with the divine name *Ḫeba(t)*, the chief goddess of the Hurrian pantheon (see the discussion below). The Hebrew Bible recounts these northern peoples as dwelling among the populations of the land of Canaan.[168] The legacy of these northerners in the southern Levant is recorded in the many litanities of the peoples inhabiting the lands in both the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic literature. The Deuteronomistic literature also notes the appearance of the northerners as kings (1 Kgs 10:28), wives of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:1), and specific personalities (Ahimelek and Uriah).

Cultic and Cultural Characteristics of Indo-European Syro-Anatolia

The mystery of death and the family constitute the common thread binding together the cultic and cultural distinctive features of Indo-European Syro-Anatolia. Both Hittite and Luwian literature attest to the prevailing belief in *apotheosis*, the notion of the divinization of the human being at the time of death. Whether this was a royal phenomenon or applied to the entire populace is not entirely clear, though the KTMW inscription from Zincirl suggests that the belief extended to non-rulers (though KTMW himself was likely an elite member of his society; see below on Atri-Suḫa and Chapter Four on KTMW).[169] The Annals of Mursilis II begin by recalling the deaths of Mursilis's predecessors, using the phrase "became a god" as a euphemism

[168] The Hebrew Bible records these groups of people as Hittites and possibly the Hivites. While the Hittite presence is well attested in biblical literature, the term Hittite itself is only a reference to Indo-European peoples from the north who cohabited the region. As to the Hivites (cf. Gen 10:12; Ex 3:8, 17), there is no positive identification as to who this group is, though some have accounted them as a Luwian people from Hiyawa. For a sober assessment of "Hittites" in the Bible see Billie Jean Collins, "The Bible, the Hittites, and Construction of the "Other"," in Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2007), 153-161. In addition to this group, the question of the identity of the Horites (Hurrians? Cf. Gen 14:6; 36:21, 29, 30; also Deut 2:12, 22) remains in light of their association with the Hivites. See Bryce, *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia: From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire*, (London: Routledge, 2012), 318.

[169] On the vocalization of the name KTMW, see Younger, "Two Epigraphic Notes on the New Katumuwa Inscription from Zincirli," *MAARAV* 16.2 (2009): 159–179. Younger notes two possibilities for the pronunciation of the KT portion of the name by comparative data with other Luwian names: Katiyas and Katuwas. The two possibilities for the pronunciation of the name (Katamuwa/Katimuwa and Katumuwa) are both well supported and correct the initial publication's use of the pronunciation Kuttamuwa.

for death.[170] This central feature of Hittite and presumably Luwian religion frames the conversation surrounding family legacy in the sphere of religion. Both the recognition of Father Gods—that is, gods of a fatherly type—and paternal deities or gods of the father to whom a family is devoted, comprise two major features of the paternal paradigm. While conceptually distinct, these features possess similar imagery and work in conversation within the broader cultic tradition of *apotheosis*, and the care given to those ancestors who have died.

As observed in Chapter Three, the cultic positions found throughout the ancient Near East present the world of the divine within a familial structure. Deities are often cast in the role of a father, and as such form a stable of father gods in the ancient Near East at large to also include the Hittite, Hurrian, and Luwian traditions of Syro-Anatolia. Nevertheless, the English rendering "gods of the father" does not adequately underscore the distinction between gods of a fatherly type and those gods to whom one's father or ancestors maintain a tradition of devotion. Although the divine world is often framed in the context of a family, the phenomenon of an earthly family's devotion is a consistent feature of the region. Thus, it behooves the present study to focus on the tradition of fatherhood within the cult at large while noting the distinction in function of the father gods and those of the paternal deities.

Hittite Language Sources

The Hittites possess a rich mythological tradition that attests to a consciousness of the pervasive presence of divinity inhabiting the region. So much was this the case that the Hittites

[170] *CTH* 61 I, A (+ B) i: 3-15; See also Gary Beckman, "The Religion of the Hittites," *BA* 52 2/3, 1989, 101; and Melchert's discussion on the soul of Katimuwa: Melchert, "Remarks on the Kuttamuwa Stele," *Kubaba* 1 (2010) 4-11.

boasted of their realm as the "land of a thousand gods."[171] Gods would regularly maintain their local distinction, though their name, purpose, and function often remained the same. Thus, the storm gods, sun gods, and Ishtars abounded in the region. The Hittites appear to have incorporated the various deities of foreigners into their own tradition as a way respecting a pluralized identity of their own empire. In the words of Trevor Bryce, this resulted in "an enormously complex, unsystematic, and sometimes thoroughly confusing agglomeration of deities making up the pantheon."[172]

Appu and His Two Sons

The story of Appu and his two sons is reminiscent of the tale of Kirta from Ugarit who had no heir.[173] The story has similarly been likened to the narrative of Abraham and his difficulty in attaining an heir.[174] Appu is blessed with a great fortune, but no son to inherit his great wealth. After encountering the Sun God who changed himself to a man and appeared to Appu, the Sun God instructed Appu to get drunk, go home and impregnate his wife. Though the

[171] See for example Itamar Singer "'The Thousand Gods of Hatti': The Limits of an Expanding Pantheon," *Israel Oriental Studies* XIV (1994) = *Concepts of the Other in Ancient Near Eastern Religions*, ed. Ilai Alon, Ithamar Gruenwald and Itamar Singer (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 81. On the Hittite gods, see Emmanuel Laroche, *Recherches Sur Les Noms Des Dieux Hittites*, (Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve, 1947); H.G. Gütterbock, *Hethitische Götterdarstellungen und Götternamen*, in Belleten & (1953), 295-317.

[172] Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 136.

[173] There are numerous parallels between the story of Appu and His Sons and the Ugaritic Kirta Epic. The litany of the months in the Hittite version of the story loosely parallels the litany of the deaths of Kirta's progeny. Although pre-dating the Kirta text, the story of Appu may reflect a Semitic "original." The name Appu, rendered by the Akkadian cuneiform *ab/p-b/pu* (*abbu*) takes the form of the Aramaic the word 'father' in contrast to the Hittite *attaš*, suggesting a Semitic setting for the story (the bilabial stop /p/ is usually indicated by doubling in Hittite orthography: ^{m}*ap-pu-uš.* See Hoffner and Melchert. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language: Part 1*. [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008], 1.88, p. 36). Perhaps "original" may be beyond the scope of the evidence. Setting the story among foreigners too runs parallel with the Kirta Epic, placing the main character as a native of the land of *ʾUdam*, perhaps of Hurrian extraction (Kirta is also the name of the founder of the Mitanni dynasty). My assertion is contra Friedrich who posits a Hurrian origin of the story (Friedrich, *ZA* 49:214 [1950]), though declaring an origin to the story is itself rather presumptive. We may be better off speaking of the Semitic setting of the story, which itself takes place geographically in Mesopotamia.

[174] Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*. Ed. Gary Beckman. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 82.

tablet becomes fragmentary, this action by the Sun God presumably led to some sort of maleficence (or perhaps the intervention of the deity in some way led to an unnatural pregnancy), eventually resulting in the following comments from Appu upon the birth of his first son.

> [95] ^{m}*appuš=za* DUMU.NITA-*an duškeškiwan dāiš*
> [96] *n=an kunkiškiuwan dāiš*
> [97] *nu=šši=ššan šanezzi laman* ^{LÚ}ḪUL-*lu dāiš*
> [98] *kūwapi=⌈ši⌋ atta[š]=⌈miš⌋* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* NÍG.SI.SÁ-*an* KASKAL-*an* U[L ...]
> [99] *⌈nu=za⌋* ḪUL-*pan* KASKAL-*an ḫarker*
> [100] *nu=šši⌈=ššan* ^{LÚ}ḪUL-*l⌋u* ŠUM-*an ēšdu*
> (CTH 360.1 §15 98-99)
>
> "Appu began rejoicing in his son and playing with/dandling him; and he put a special name upon him: 'Since my paternal gods did not [take] the right path for him, but kept to the wrong path, let his name be Evil (Wrong).'"

Appu acknowledges the *idālu* (^{LÚ}ḪUL-*lu* 'evil, wrong') work of the paternal gods[175] by naming his child by the same term, *idālu*. Though there is some build up toward Appu's wife conceiving for the first time, there is no reason given for her conceiving a second time. Immediately after Appu names his first son *idālu*, the text follows with the introduction of the second pregnancy: "Again, a second time Appu's wife became pregnant." The passage follows in parallel to the preceding narrative of the naming of the first son.

> [108] *nu=šši=kan* NÍG.SI.SÁ-*an* ŠUM-*an daiš*
> [109] *pai⌈ddu=war⌋=an=šan* NÍG.SI.SÁ-*an* ŠUM-*an ḫalzeššandu*
> [110] ⌈*kuwapi*⌉*=š⌈i atta⌋š=miš*! DINGIRMEŠ NÍG.SI.SÁ-an KASKAL-*an ēpper*
> [111] [...]
> [112] *paiddu* NÍG.SI.SÁ-*an* ŠUM-*an ēšdu*
>
> "and he (Appu) put the right name upon him, 'Let them call him the right name. Since my paternal gods took the right way for him, let his name be *ḫandan* (Right).'"[176]

[175] The construction of the divine title DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* is not the expected nominative plural ending, though the determinative MEŠ is clearly marked in both instances. This has resulted in the different readings "father gods" and "paternal gods." While also translating "paternal gods" in her text, Jana Siegelová raises the possibility of "the father gods," citing the Kizzuwatna-Hurrian tradition *Appu-Märchen und Ḫedammu-Mythus* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1971), 23-24.

[176] *Ibid*., 84.

Although the specific identity of the paternal deities is not clear, the naming of the children as a reflection of the work of the paternal deities in the passage suggests that the paternal gods set the life course for one's progeny.

The Bilingual Hittite/Hurrian Wisdom Parables

The Hittite/Hurrian bilingual wisdom text presents a collection of parables and their interpretations.[177] Two of these parables provide data on the gods of one's father. The first of these parables recounts the story of a smith who cast, molded, and decorated a copper cup with ornaments. After the cup was polished and took notice of itself, it cursed the smith who cast it. The parable is explained as follows: "It is not a cup, but a human. A certain son who was hostile to his father became an adult and he moved to (a better) circle. He no longer looks after his father. The gods of his father[178] have cursed him."

A second parable records the story of a builder who erects a high and mighty tower, who in turn curses the lowliness of his builder after seeing his own loftiness. The explanation is effectively the same, noting a son who no longer looks after his father and the gods of his father likewise curse him. In each of these examples, the primary role of the gods of the father is to

[177] The Hittite and Hurrian transliterations are provided by Erich Neu in his *Das Hurritische Epos Der Freilassung*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996). An additional English translation can be found in *COS*, Vol. 1 by Gary Beckman, Pages 216-217.

[178] Here the Hurrian expression indicates "god of (his) father," while the Hittite translator consistently translates the construction as a plural *ŠA ABI=ŠU* DINGIR.MEŠ "gods of his father." See Erich Neu, *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1996), 165 and 197. Additionally, the divergent translation may be reflecting a differing cultic subtext between the Hittite-Luwian and the Hurrian traditions. The context of the passage records the curse falling on the son for mistreatment of his own father, thus the Hittite shift to the plural may reflect a Hittite-Luwian tradition whereby the paternal gods belong to an entire family rather than the personal god of the father, which is what the Hurrian seems to suggest. (Melchert, per email).

curse the son for not caring for his father. These paternal deities preserve justice by the presence of the curse upon the impious son who fails to care for his father.

The Hurrian Backdrop

The importance of the Hurrian backdrop to the literature of the Hittite cult must be reiterated at this point. The two previous examples from Hittite literature highlighting the gods of the fathers consist of the Appu text set outside of the Hittite Empire and the Hittite/Hurrian bilingual parables. Additionally, Hurrian theology–mythology and its ritual settings—appears to lie behind several Hittite rituals where the incantations are rendered in the Luwian language (see the description of the Zarpiya ritual below). Hutter states that "there might be a slight Hurrian influence in the ritual, as one might compare the 'gods the fathers' to the 'olden gods,' famous in the Hurrian cultic stratum."[179] The Hurrian distinction between father gods and paternal deities is nuanced by the cultic context of Hurrian literature. The term *en(i)=na=aš=ta attan(i)=ne=ve=NA=aš=ta* is found in the Hurrian texts ChS I/2 Nr. 22 6' (and a similar rendering in ChS I/2 Nr. 43 Rs. 19; see footnote below). Ilse Wegner renders these citations as "gods of the fathers."[180] Archi notes that this Hurrian expression is principally paternal gods and reference to father gods occurs only in those cases where the aforementioned are the very paternal gods of other deities (e.g., Enlil etc.).[181] With both nuances, the paternal paradigm is a

[179] Manfred Hutter, "Aspects of Luwian Religion," in *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert, (Boston: Brill, 2003), 252.

[180] Wegner's examples come from her grammar, citing the *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenmäler*, (Hrsg. von V. Haas, et al. 1984-2000). In her grammar she takes *en(i)=na=aš=ta attan(i)=ne=ve=NA=aš=ta* "Zu den Göttern des Vaters" (p. 71); and a second example *en(i)=na attan(i)=ne=ve=na* ^{d}*ša(v)uška=ve=na* "Die Götter des Vaters der (Göttin) Ša(v)uška" (p. 72). Both of these phrases are examples of the genitive in the grammar. See Ilse Wegner, *Einführung in Die Hurritische Sprache*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 71-72.

[181] Archi, "Associations des divinités hourrites," *UF* 11 (1979): 9-10.

feature present in Hurrian literature a tradition of mythologized patrimony still proves important for this study, evincing a paradigmatic tradition of familial divinity in the Northern Levant, presumably reaching as far as southern Canaan.

The Hurrian cultural reach extended southward to the borders of Egypt. The Amarna letters reveal that the king of Ur-Shalimum, Bronze Age Jerusalem, bore the name Abdi- Ḫeba or "servant of Ḫebat." He and several others persons from the Amarna archives bear Hurrian names.[182] Ḫebat was a popular goddess of the Hurrian pantheon. The name itself is however a hybrid name. The first portion of the name "abdi" is the Semitic term for a "servant of," followed by the divine name. This begs several questions as to the identity of the inhabitants of Ur-Shalimum (or at least the figure Abdi- Ḫeba): Are the inhabitants of Ur-Shalimum Semites (i.e., Amorites, Canaanites) living within the cultural sphere of Hurrian influence? Are the inhabitants a mix of Hurrians and Canaanites, where the Hurrian population presumably spoke and operated in the Canaanite Northwest-Semitic dialect of the time? Complicating the issue further, is the ab-di prefix affixed to the divine name Ḫeba an Akkadogram for the peripheral Akkadian scribe who would have vocalized another name upon reading the text?[183]

There has been some question over the years as to whether the Jebusites, those inhabiting Jerusalem during the Davidic conquest, were themselves Hurrians. Against this view, the generally held position concerning the Jebusites has been that they were some northern people, long regarded as Hittites. This view is largely rooted in the comment from Ezekiel (16:3): "Thus

[182] Also, for example the name *a-ki-Teššub* (a-ki-^{d}IM). Hurrian theophoric names form the Amarna Letters bear either Heba or Teššub (the Hurrian Storm-god). For more, see Richard S. Hess, *Amarna Personal Names*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 26-27; 199.

[183] This question emerges in light of Eva von Dasssow's research highlighting the use of Akkadograms in peripheral Akkadian / Canaano-Akkadian. See Eva von Dassow, "Canaanite in Cuneiform." *JAOS* 124:4, 2004, 641–674.

says the lord Yahweh to Jerusalem: your origin and your birth is from the land of the Canaanite; your father was an Amorite and your mother was a Hittite." Yigal Yadin promoted this view in his text *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*, and specifically his treatment of the Davidic conquest of the city of Jebus.[184] Yadin connected the pair of the blind and the lame mentioned in 2 Sam 5:6-8 with the Hittite soldier's oath. Yadin saw evidence for this interpretation in the curse portion of this oath that mentions blinding the soldiers should they not fulfill their duties. The contention proposed by Yadin is unlikely for a number of reasons. The Hittite document upon which the connection is based is also known as the First Soldier's Oath, a 15th Century Middle Hittite composition,[185] where a series of casuistic curses are presented before the soldier taking the oath with the oath deities as witness. [186] Among the many curses, a blind man is presented before the soldier, about whom the soldier pledges "he who makes the King of Hatti his enemy… may the oath gods make him blind too."[187] The role of the blinded man in this curse is no more prominent than the rendering of sheep fat nor is there any mention of the lame.[188] Even if the literary allusion somehow reflects a practice of the Hittites, this correlation is not enough to conclude the Hittite origin of the Jebusites.

[184] See Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in Light of Archaeological Discovery* (London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1963), 267-70.

[185] Collins, "The First Soldiers' Oath (1.66)" in *COS* 1, eds William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr., (Boston: Brill, 2003), 165.

[186] A second soldier's oath in Late Hittite is dated to a few hundred years after the tablet referenced by Yadin. In that Second Soldier's Oath, there is no evidence of any blind soldiers being mentioned.

[187] Collins, *COS* 1 (1.66), 166.

[188] The other curses comprise the melting of wax and being melted like wax, the breaking of reeds and being broken like those reeds, becoming deaf as the man without hearing is deaf, etc. There is no specific mention of becoming lame—though perhaps any number of these specific curses could I suppose qualify someone as being lame—nor is there any instruction to use the blind or lame or anyone in any sort of defensive manner, even by way of magic. First a woman is brought before the soldiers who swear that if they break their oath of allegiance against

Some extent data supplies the grounds for arguing that the Jebusites were Hurrians. The name Araunah (2 Sam 24:16), from whom David buys the land whereupon the temple will be constructed, appears to be a Hurrian title for "lord" or "king" (Hurr. *ewir*-). Gwilym Henry Jones states that this Hurrian title lying behind the name Araunah may also be the origin of the name Uriah "the Hittite."[189]

The Hittites of the Bible are more likely to be Luwians (and by extension any Indo-European of Syro-Anatolian extraction). The passage from Ezekiel citing the Hittites as forerunners of Jerusalem is unlikely to be citing the Hittites of the Bronze Age, instead referring to the so-called "Neo-Hittite" Luwian states reflecting those hailing from the *māt Ḫatti* or "land of the Hittites." Neo-Assyrian texts use the term to convey "the name for the states of Anatolia and Upper Syria that were the political and culture heirs of the imperial Hittites."[190] While the terms *māt Ḫatti* or *Amurru* (i.e., Amorites) are used by the powers of Mesopotamia to refer the greater Levant, there is some evidence to suggest that the term Hittite during later periods refers to Indo-Europeans in general as distinguished from their Semitic neighbors.[191]

---

the King of Hatti, they should be changed into a woman. If the presence of the blind and the lame truly reflected a reference to this oath, we may expect women and deaf persons to accompany the blind on top of the fortress of Zion.

[189] Gwilym Henry Jones, *The Nathan Narratives*. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 122.

[190] See Mordechai Cogan, "Locating mat Hatti in Neo-Assyrian Inscriptions," in *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume: Studies in Archaeology and Related Disciplines* (ed. Eliezer D. Oren and Shmuel Ahituv; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2002), 89.

[191] Ibid., 86-90. In one case, Cogan cites a passage from a divination text that separates the "Hittites" (^{LÚ}*ḫat-ta-a-a*) and the "Arameans" (*aḫ-lá-mu-ú*), two major population groups comprising the Neo-Hittites states. See Ivan Starr, Jussi Aro, and Simo Parpola. *Queries to the Sungod: Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria*. (Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki University Press, 1990), 152.

Cuneiform Luwian from Kizzuwatna

Luwian texts survive in two major forms: Cuneiform Luwian (CLuwian) and Hieroglyphic Luwian (HLuwian). The oldest attested presence of the Luwian language is found in names and words of the Old Assyrian texts from Kültepe-Kanesh[192] followed by Luwian loans already in Old Hittite, which increase markedly in the Hittite Empire (14th and 13th centuries BCE), many but not all marked by the "Glossenkeil" words. These have now been shown to belong to a *koine* promulgated from Hattuša, continued in the mostly post-Empire Iron-Age hieroglyphic texts.

Cuneiform Luwian texts consist mostly of passages embedded within Hittite texts from Hattuša dating to the 15th and 14th centuries BCE These texts are predominantly ritualistic in nature and comprise the spoken incantations found among the Hittite descriptions of the ritual action. These rituals are in a different dialect reflecting that of Kizzuwatna. The nuances of this dialect of Luwian suggest language contact between Luwian and Hurrian speakers in the area. [193]

The Zarpiya Ritual (KUB 9.31)

The quasi-medical text of the Zarpiya ritual is composed of a Hittite instructional text embedded with Luwian incantations.[194] The rubrics of the text (both the incipit and colophon) indicate that the text provides instruction for a *kelu* ritual to preserve one's house during times when there is death in the land. The Luwian incatation invites the the Sun God of Heaven, *ta-ti-*

[192] Hutter, "Aspects of Luwian Religion," in *The Luwians*, (Boston: Brill, 2003), 212.

[193] See on the two Luwian dialects Ilya Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (Boston: Brill, 2010), Chapter 1.

[194] Here I identify the text as quasi-medical because of Zarpiya's title ^{LÚ}A.ZU, a title normally associated with "physicians" in ancient Mesopotamia. In later Babylonian texts, this profession regularly reflects one who has mastered pharmacopoeia. The Zarpiya text is highly ritualized and reflects what appears more common to *ašīpu* approach to medicine and healing arts.

in-zi DINGIR.MEŠ-*in-zi* (“paternal deities”), and Ea into the home.[195] Whether the *ta-ti-in-zi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*in-zi* of the cuneiform Luwian Zarpiya ritual (§20 92) ought to be understood as “father gods,” “deified fathers,” or “paternal deities” (i.e., gods of the fathers, as is commonly found in the language of the HLuw inscriptions), has been a matter of debate. As early as 1938, Benjamin Schwartz took these deities by the same translation he used for the Hittite portion of the text *ad-da-aš* DINGIR.MEŠ, “deified fathers.” The Hittite portion reads, É-*aš ad-da-aš* DINGIR.MEŠ *az-zi-kán-du*, “let the *addaš* gods eat.” Echoing the conclusion of Archi regarding father gods in the context of paternal deities, Volkert Haas connects such gods with the ancestor gods Enlil and Anu, who are mentioned as ancestor gods in a Hittite-Hurrian offering list.[196] Haas bases this interpretation on Hurrian *enna attanni=we=na*, as “the fathers, the gods,” from which these Luwian rites would have emerged.[197] Though *tatinzi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*inzi* is ambiguous between “father gods” and “paternal gods,” the interpretation of Haas is impossible. Both the word order and the *=ha* on ^{d}É.A-*aš* preclude the latter being a genitive modifying *tatinzi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*inzi*. There are no “father gods of Ea.”

The portion dictated in Luwian is as follows:

> *u-ra-az-<za-aš>* ^{d}UTU-*az ta-ti-in-zi* DINGIR.MEŠ-*in-zi* ^{d}É.A-*as=ha pár-na-an-za=ta*[31] *ku-wa-at-ti an-da ḫu-u-i-na-i-ma-an la-la-an-ti pa-a u-za-as a-da-ri-ta-an* (KUB 9.31 ii 30-32)

---

[195] As part of the ritual, the text calls for the offering of a liver and heart, whereby the the Sun God of Heaven, the É-*aš ad-da-aš* DINGIR.MEŠ (“the gods of the fathers of the house”), and the thousand gods are invited to eat in the preceding Hittite portion. See below.

[196] Archi, “Associations des divinités hourrites,” *UF* 11 (1979): 9-10.

[197] Volkert Haas, *Geschichte Der Hethitischen Religion*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 111, note 31. I’d like to thank Craig Melchert for pointing this out to me in an earlier correspondence. Manfred Hutter however states that one may consider these “father gods,” that is to say, gods who are fathers, comparable to the “Olden Gods” of Hurrian literature. See Hutter, “Aspects of Luwian Religion,” 252.

"Oh great Sun-god, *tatinzi* gods, and Ea! Feed yourselves in the house where…"

Following Schwarz, others have emended the Hittite of KUB 9.31 ii 1-3 that preceded the Luwian incantation to reflect "father gods." The translation however should read:

> [(*ne-pí-sa-as* ^{d})]UTU-*us a*[(*z-z*)]*i-ki* É-*as ad-da-as* DINGIR.MEŠ *az-zi-kán-du LI-IM* DINGIR.MEŠ *az-zi-kán-du*
>
> "Oh Sun-god of Heaven eat! Let the gods of the father(s) of the house eat! Let the thousand gods eat!"

The distortion occurred by emending É-*as* (Hitt. *parnas*) to <^{d}>É-*as*. Apart from being unjustified contextually, such an emendation is also suspect in that it assumes a spelling of Ea that is not used by this text, lacking both the divine determinative as well as an -a- sign: <^{d}>É<.A>-*aš*. Thus despite previous claims, *ad-da-as* DINGIR.MEŠ refers to the gods of the father(s), matching evidence from the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus.

Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions

The second type of major evidence for the Luwian language is found in the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (in addition to a number of lead strips and seals). HLuwian operates in the logographic and syllabic traditions of Mesopotamia and in many ways is comparable to the logographic and acrophobic system of the Egyptians. Like these other scripts, HLuwian too uses determinatives to qualify many terms.

The convention used to cite HLuw inscriptions renders the name of the location of the inscription in majuscule, followed by the number that the inscription has been assigned. The inscriptions most relevant to the patriarchal paradigm have been provided and translated in full (MARAŞ 1, JISR EL HADID 4, and ÇINEKÖY). Additionally, several other HLuw texts are important to this study, though only the key portions of these texts will be provided.

MARAŞ 1 - Background

Maraş was the former capital of the Neo-Hittite state of Gurgum. The principle inscription from this Gurgum that concerns this study is that of Halparuntiyas III, dated to the late ninth century BCE based on the mention of Halparuntiya III on the Pazrcik Stele of Adad-nirari III in 805 BCE[198] The inscription decorates a stone lion that was stationed at the citadel gate of the city.[199] The inscription is likely to have followed the death of Halparuntiyas or at least been commissioned to commemorate the memory of Halparuntiyas. Hawkins suggests this based on ruler standing on a lion implying (posthumous) deification (see more below).[200]

The MARAŞ 1 inscription is the quintessential piece of material culture articulating the cultic integration of past within the life of the present (or in reference to the one commissioning the inscription). Even so, interest surrounding the MARAŞ 1 inscription generally concerns the extensive genealogy preceding the content of the inscription. This too is of interest to this study, though its importance is of a secondary nature, setting up the primary description of the paternal gods. Below I provide the text (following Hawkins) and translation of the inscription.[201]

MARAŞ 1 - Text and Translation:

1	§ 1 a	EGO-wa/i-mi-i ITONITRUS.HALPA-pa-ru-ti-i-ya-sa |("IUDEX")tara/i-wa/i-ni-sà |ku+ra/i-ku-ma-wa/i-ni-i-sà(URBS) REX-ti-i-sa
	B	Ila+ra/i+a-ma-si-i-sa |LEPUS+ra/i-ya-li-i-sa |INFANS-mu-wa/i-za-sà
2	C	ITONITRUS.HALPA-pa-ru-ti-ya-si-sà || HEROS-li-sa |(INFANS.NEPOS)ha-ma-si-sá -´
	d	mu-wa/i-ta-li-si-sà |("SCALPRUM+RA/I.LA/I/U") wa/i+ra/i-pa-li-sa

[198] Hawkins, *CHLI*, 261-262.

[199] Annick Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 78.

[200] Hawkins, *CHLI*, 261-262.

[201] Where best appropriate, I include the entirety of the inscription, though most inscriptional references will highlight only the portions germane to this investigation.

|(INFANS.NEPOS)ha-ma-su-ka-la-sá
e ITONITRUS.HALPA-pa-CERVUS2-ti-ya-si-sà
3 |(“IUDEX”)tara/i-wa/i-ni-sá || |(INFANS)na-wa/i-sa
f Imu-wa/i-zi-si HEROS-li-sà |(INFANS)na-wa/i-na-wa/i-sá
g Ila+ra/i+a-ma-si-sá LEPUS+ra/i-ya-li-sa |(INFANS)ha+ra/i-tu-sá
h DEUS-na-ti (LITUUS)á-za-mi-sà CAPUT-ta-ti ‹(LITUUS)›
4 u-ni-mi-sa |FINES-ha-ti || AUDIRE-mi-sà REX-ti-sá
i (LITUUS)á-za-mi-sa |(BONUS)u-li-ya-mi-sà |(“PANIS.SCUTELLA”)mu-sa?-nu-wa/i-ti-sá |(“PANIS”)ma-li-‹ri+i›-mi-i-sá REX-ti-sá
§ 2 |wa/i-mu |á-mi-i-zi |tá-ti-zi DEUS-ni-zi-i |(LITUUS)á-za-ta
§ 3 |wa/i-mu-ta |á-mi |tá-ti-i |(THRONUS)i-sà-tara/i-ti-i (SOLIUM)i-sà-nu-wa/i-ta
5 § 4 |a-wa/i |(“VACUUS”)ta-na-ta-´ (“SOLIUM”)i-sa-||nu-wa/i-ha
§ 5 |“SOLIUM”(-)x-ma-ma-pa-wa/i BONUS(-)u-su-tara/i-ha (DEUS)TONITRUS-hu-ta-sá-ti-i (DEUS)i-ya-sa-ti-ha LEPUS+ra/i-ya-ti
§ 6 |wa/i-mu-ta |LIS+la/i/u-si-sá (DEUS)[...]-ti-i?-sá |i-pá?-si-ha-i (DEUS)ru-ti-ya-sá-i |(“IUDEX”)tara/i-wa/i-na-za-ta-´
§ 7 |wa/i-mu! |(“IUSTITIA”)tara/i-wa/i-na+ra/i |ha-pa(-)x(-)ha-la-i-ta
§ 8 |wa/i-mu |za |*273-pa-x-x[... ||
6 § 9 [... ...]-ya-ha-´ |“PES2”(-)ti-ri+i-‹ha› |REL-ta
§ 10 |wa/i-mu x x x |x-tara/i-za-i |PRAE-i |(“CAPERE”)la-la-ta
§ 11 |i-pá?-si-pa-wa/i-mu-i (DEUS)CERVUS2-ti-ya-sá |REL-za <<-wa/i?>> |(BESTIA)HWI-tara/i |pi-pa-sa-ta
7 § 12 |wa/i-ta || |á-mi-zi |tá-ti-zi [...

1 § 1 a I am Halparuntiyas the ruler; the Gurgumean king.
B Son of Laramas the governor
2 C Halparuntiyas the Hero’s grandson
d Muwatalis the Brave’s great-grandson
e Halparuntiyas the Ruler’s great-great-grandson
3 f Muwizis the Hero’s great-great-great-grandson
g Laramas the Governor’s descendant
h Loved by the gods, known by the people,
4 renowned abroad, king.
i The loved, exalted, satisfying, honey-sweet king.
§ 2 And my paternal gods loved me
§ 3 and they seated me on my paternal throne.
5 § 4 And I settled the desolate places,
§ 5 and I benefitted the settlements by the authority of Tarhunzas and Ea
§ 6 And the gods […-]tis of the lawsuit and Runtiyas of the countryside made me ruler.
§ 7 And because of (my) justice, they …ed me.
§ 8 Where I ...
6 § 9 …ed
§ 10 They brought before me
§ 11 But whatever wild beast Runtiyas of the Countryside gave to me

7 § 12 And my fathers ...

Literary Structure:

The publication of the translated Luwian text of the Maraş 1 inscription displays seven lined sections of text, which Hawkins further subdivides into twelve sections of content.[202] Thematically, the text should be arranged into four sections, subdivided accordingly. Since the presumed component piece is unavailable, the literary structure of the inscription reflects an incomplete text.

1a	Naming of the Self
1b	Genealogy
2a	Three Qualities of the King
2b	Four Qualities of the King
3a	Introduction and Work of the Paternal Gods
3b	The Work of the King
3c	The Divine Authority for the King's Work
4	The Provisions of the [Paternal] Gods

Section 1 consists of the name of the ruler and his preceding genealogy. Hawkins groups my division of sections 1 and 2 together as one section. There is certainly an argument to be made for coupling these sections together as the text concerns an introduction to the king; however, I have chosen my organization of the text based on similar forms and topoi.

(1a) *Naming of the Self*. The inscription begins with the self-invocation of the name of the king. The first person address of the king declaring his presence is a standard feature of royal inscriptions that initiates the king's subsequent discourse. In conversation with inscriptions of comparable linguistic and thematic character, the naming of the self is the recognition of the ontological reality of the king's being present at the location.[203] Perhaps more indicative of this is

[202] I leave the sections designated by Hawkins with the § symbol, whereas I designate my divisions of the text by a pair of enclosing parentheses.

[203] The English preposition 'at' may or may not be the most appropriate rendering. Several Luwian inscriptional parallels attest to a well-developed cultic understanding of onomatology in conversation with one's

the conceit in virtually all such inscriptions that the entire text is *quoted* speech—as if the "EGO" statement, a declarative "I am" fronting the monologue of the inscription, were directly addressing the reader. One of the more interesting features of the hieroglyphic inscription is the depiction of the EGO logogram, conveying the first person pronoun (and often verb) "I am." The hieroglyph usually depicts the arm and hand of a body pointing to the face; most of the time this is limited to the arm, hand, and head though sometimes an entire human body is presented. In this inscription, the entire body is presented largely apart from the remaining inscription, in the way manuscripts often being with a giant form of the first letter beginning a text. This large (in this case, giant) EGO character stands atop the back of a lion in the same manner that deities in the ancient Near East are depicted standing upon animal footstools or thrones. The iconographic presentation implies a divine status afforded to Halparuntiyas, the subject of the inscription.[204] Additionally, the lion upon which the inscription is carved is shaped with a flat platform at the end. Hawkins suggests that this would have served as a plinth for an additional sculpture or monument, perhaps one of Halparuntiyas himself as depicted by the EGO logogram.[205] The "I am" statement is the way in which the subject of these inscriptions commemorates his own name. Often, but not consistently, a genealogy of predecessors follows this introductory formula.

(1b) The Genealogy. As noted by Payne, the genealogy has been the subject of interest because of the extensive list of ancestors it names. The list extends six (possibly seven)[206]

immaterial being. The KULULU 4 inscription attests to the 'soul' being put *a-ta* in(to) various bodies, which is not unlike the Aramaic language Katimuwa inscription that uses the Semitic preposition *b* (in, at, by) to convey the same sense with regard to the stele of the inscription.

[204] Also noted by Hawkins, *CHLI*, 262.

[205] Ibid., 261.

[206] The name Laramas is listed twice, once as the father of Halparuntiyas and again at the end of the genealogy Halparuntiyas says he is Laramas' descendent. Neither Hawkins nor Payne comment on the second Laramas, though the seven attributes of Halparuntiyas in parallel would suggest seven generations rather than six.

generations to Halparuntiyas's great-great-great-grandfather Muwizis the Hero. Such a list is unfounded in the ancient Near East apart from the *kispu* rituals of Mesopotamia and the parallel ritual of the *rapiʾūma* from Ugarit. If the memorialization of the self in stone as declared from (1a) ought to be understood in light of such ritual commemoration of the deceased, then such bears ritual implications for the investigation of name invocation in the region.

Sections (2a) and (2b) comprise two statements about the nature of king Halparuntiyas. Payne perceives the symmetry between these seven attributes and the list of seven generations that they follow.[207] The seven ancestors provide Halparuntiyas with the opportunity for an assertive statement about his own character described in these seven attributes. By employing these seven attributes for himself following the invocation of his ancestors' names, Halparuntiyas binds himself to the unified identity of his fathers with the emphatic number seven.[208]

The work of kingship is the focus of the three parts of third section (3a-3c). The introduction of the gods of the fathers is the most important for the present study: "My paternal gods loved me, and they seated me on my paternal throne." (3a) indicates the scope of action taken by the paternal deities, as the agents by whom Halparuntiyas comes to sit on his paternal

---

As Melchert has observed, "There is no question that there are two Laramas', one his father and the other his ancestor (as in Hittite genealogies, "descendant" does not imply any particular generation, so whether the older Larama is his great-great-great-great-grandfather or an even older generation is not certain, though one doubts the line went further than that. This *may* be further support for supposing that he is already deceased and with his forebears." (private correspondence).

[207] Annick Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 53.

[208] The number seven was a thematic number in Syro-Anatolian culture. E.g., the gatekeeper guarding the seven doors and seven bars to Dark Earth from the Telepinu myth; in the Hittite account of the Canaanite Elkunirša myth, Baal tells Ašertu that he killed her 77 children (this parallelism is followed resoundingly by the number 88), about whom Ašertu laments for seven years; the recurrence of the number seven in Ugaritic mythology (the Baal Cycle, Aqhat Epic, Kirta Epic); the epistolary greeting "seven and seventy times I bow at your feet" found in the letters from Amarna and Ugarit.

throne. Section (3a) ties together sections (1) and (2) introducing the king with the work of the king in sections (3b-3c) describing the work of the king. Lines (3b) and (3c) repeat the motif of being seated (*'they seated'* [SOLIUM]*i-sà-nu-wa/i-ta*) with Halparuntiyas settling (*'I settled'* ["SOLIUM"]*i-sa-||nu-wa/i-ha*) the devastated places and causing the settlements ("SOLIUM"[-]x-*ma-ma-pa-wa/i*) to prosper. Payne states that these are standard topoi used to describe kingship.[209] Indeed, the paternal character of this inscription seems like an emphatic motif that separates this inscription from others in the HLuwian corpus. While most other HLuwian inscriptions from the region follow a similar format, the length of the genealogy and the emphasis on the paternal character of the deities (many of whom would have been understood to be paternal by nature) bonds the identities of the past with Halparuntiya. Not only is the length of the genealogy unique to this text, but so is the construction *tatinzi massaninzi* "paternal gods" and the expression "seated me on my paternal throne." Payne's formulation is inaccurate, since the standard expression in all those other passages cited is "gave me my paternal succession" (*salhan=za*), and more importantly in all complete contexts this is done by named deities.[210]

Moreover, the presence of deities bookend section 3, beginning with the paternal deities in (3a) and closing the work of the king 'by the authority of Tarhunzas and Ea' in (3c).

The final portion of the extant text, section 4 reads as follows:

> The gods […-]tis of the Lawsuit and Runtiyas of the Countryside and because of (my) justice, they …ed me, […] where I …ed, they

[209] Payne observes three descriptive phrases found elsewhere in Luwian literature, though she limits comparison to the texts selected in her publication: the king loved by his gods (KULULU 4, KAKAMIX A11a, A6, TELL AHMAR 6, 1), succession to the paternal throne granted by the gods (KULULU 4, KARKAMIX A11a, A2+3, TELL AHMAR 6, 1), and resettlement of depopulated areas (KARATEPE 1). See Annick Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 54.

[210] Melchert, private correspondence.

> brought[…] before me. But what(ever) wild beast Runtiyas of the Countryside(?) gave to me, my fathers […

Even though the identity of the first deity cannot be specifically identified, the inscription twice mentions Stag-God Runtiyas of the Countryside. Runtiyas is one of the paternal deities for a number of reasons. Halparuntiyas' theophoric name testifies to devotion of this lesser-deity, as does the name of several of his ancestors. The familial identity with Runtiyas suggests a totemistic connection comprising the abstract representation of this family.

The Karkamiš Inscriptions[211]

One of the more numerous collections of Luwian inscriptions comes from the city of Karkamiš . The city of Karkamiš played a prominent role for the Hittite administration over the Syrian territories during the Bronze Age. In the era following the Bronze Age collapse, Karkamiš appears to have survived the subsequent disintegration of the Hittite Empire with relative ease compared to several other surrounding regions during the period.[212] The city was situated at the convergence of several literate polities, and as a result is remembered in the literary record spanning the ancient Near East, from coastal Ugarit to Assyria proper.[213]

[211] Note the following conventions used to discuss the city and the inscriptions. For all references pertaining to the city, the spelling Carchemish will be used; for all those referring to the inscriptions, the capitalized KARKAMIŠ will be used followed by the inscription letter and number.

[212] Annick Payne, *Iron Age Luwian Inscriptions*, 5.

[213] Carchemish is mentioned during the Bronze Age in the corpus of Ugaritic texts, which describe the political and economic interests of Ugarit with Carchemish. To illustrate, KTU 4.779 records the bill of merchandise bound for Carchemish. KTU 2.83, the fragments of a letter, relays the desire to keep secure borders between the king of Ugarit and the king of Carchemish (see Cunchillos & Ruiz, *Ugaritic Data Bank*, 750). Akkadian texts yield a wide variety of data on and from Carchemish, ranging from litigation to political posturing. The Akkadian language also had been in use at Carchemish, where it exhibited its own dialectical features. In the succession treaty of Esarhaddon, Kubaba the chief goddess of Carchemish is invoked in the curse formula in order to hinder the oath-breaker's ability to produce an heir. (See Simo Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties*, SAA 02 006:469).

As previously noted by Payne above, inscriptions A6 and A11a provide similar literary topoi for the contextualization of MARAŞ 1. Several of the KARKAMIŠ inscriptions echo many of the sentiments of MARAŠ 1, as do other Aramaic inscriptions in the Luwian sphere of influence (e.g., the Zakkur inscription from Hama, as well as Sefire and Tell Fekheriye inscriptions). Principally, the phrases "who shall take aawy this stele, or who shall erase my name," followed by a curse (cf. KARKAMIŠ A3, A6, etc.).

The KARKAMIŠ A11a inscription provides several insights into the cultic consciousness of the Luwian culture from the tenth to early-ninth century BCE[214] Rather than reproduce the corpus of inscriptions from KARKAMIŠ , I provide portions of the transcription (following Hawkins[215]) and translation of the inscription below. The A11a inscription will serve as a reference point for the relevant features of the other texts from KARKAMIŠ .

Like Halparuntiyas at Maras (MARAŞ 1), Katuwas introduces himself with the "I am" statement and as the ruler (Tarwan) of KARKAMIŠ . The genealogy provided by Katuwas is noticeably shorter than Halparuntiyas, only going back two generations prior;

1 § 1 [I]*su-hi-si* REGIO DOMINUS]-‹*ya-i-sa*› [|(INF]ANS)*ni-mu-wa/i-za-sa* [I]*á-sa-tú-wa/i-ta*$_4$*-ma-za-si-i* |REGIO-*ní* DOMINUS-*ya-i-sa* |INFANS.NEPOS-*sa*
…son of the Country-Lord Suhis, grandson of the Country-Lord Astuwalamanzas.

Several inscriptions from KARKAMIŠ open in a similar fashion, though like the MARAŞ 1 inscription, KARKAMIŠ A11a actively serves to trigger the living memory of Katuwas's father Suhis.

[214] Payne, *Iron Age Luwian Inscriptions*, 66.

[215] Hawkins, *CHLI* I/1, 94-100.

This introduction is followed by the recognition of the gods over his authority, however the potentially most important portion of the text is broken.

§ 2a wa/i-m[u-x] DE[US... (b) ... "MA]NUS"-tara/i-ti
2 |PUGN[US... || ...]
§ 3 [wa/i-mu ... á-ma-za t]á-ti-ya-za "LIGNUM"[...]-za [|]pi-‹ya›-tá
§ 4 wa/i-mu-´ DEUS-ní-zi mi!?-ya-ti-´ <">IUSTITIA"-wa/i-ní-ti PUGNUS-mi-la/i/u |PUGNUS-ri+i-ta
§ 2a and me the god… … *raised*[216] by the hand
§ 3 and they gave me my paternal succession
§ 4 and the gods raised me in strength because of my justice

The broken portion likely indicates that the identity of the gods, whether by name or the phrase "paternal" if they were to have any specific identification other than "the gods." What these gods seem to do is to provide Katuwas with his paternal success. This recalls §§2-3 of the MARAŞ 1 inscription, where the paternal gods place Halparuntiyas on his paternal throne. The gods mentioned here may be inferred (though without certainty) to be the paternal deities.

The gods love Katuwas and in §7 are revealed to be the Storm God (i.e. Tarhunzas), Karhuka, and Kubaba. Of course, one may conjecture that Katuwas could be loved or favored by two different sets of deities as the first set is not clear. Be that as it may, the twice invoked Runtiyas in the MARAŞ 1 inscription in the context of the theophoric naming of Halparuntiyas suggests that the deities performing the same or similar function for the devotee would be the same characters. The inscription records Katuwas as declaring that this triumverate of gods "loved me because of my justice." Already in §4 the gods raised Katuwas in strength because of his justice, and now they love him for the same reason; again, the line recalls §2 and §7 of the MARAŞ 1 inscription where the paternal gods love Halparuntiyas (§2) and in §7 a similar phrase providing the reason, "because of my justice, they…" More likely, this combination of deities

[216] Hawkins takes this as the verb "to raise" based on line 4 of the same inscription. Hawkins, *CHLI*, 95.

reflects the personal (and by extension familial) devotion in addition to the gods of the city of KARKAMIŠ , Karhuhas and Kubaba.[217] From at least the Old Babylonian period the goddess Kubaba had been the divine patron of the city of KARKAMIŠ ,[218] so the question of whether these deities mentioned are gods of the state or gods of family religion takes another dimension since Katuwas is a leader of the state.[219]

§§11-20 describe the building projects of Katuwas, with attention given to temple for Tarhunzas of Carchemis, the gate area passed down to Katuwas by his ancestors, and the erection of the orthostats. Following the discussion surround the erection of the orthostats and the upper floors, Katuwas states:

> § 20 |za-ha-wa/i (DEUS)á-tara/i-su-ha-na za-ti-ya-za |PORTA-na-za BONUS-sa5+ra/i-ti (SOLIUM)i-sà-nu-wa/i-ha
> And this god Atrisuhas I seated at these gates with goodness.

More woodenly, we might translate "this god, Suhas is the soul" recalling the notion of apotheosis previously observed in Hittite religion.[220] The notion of deification suggested by the combination of iconography and orthography of the MARAŞ 1 inscription is here explicit. What

[217] Van der Toorn states that "These personal gods, worshipped by families and kin groups, are normally local gods with a sanctuary in the city district or the neighborhood. Through the worship of such gods, families asserted the local dimension of their identity." Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 66.

[218] Bryce, "History" in *The Luwians*, 100.

[219] This distinction is preserved by Yarīm-Līm, the king of Aleppo, who in articulating his readiness for combat in an oath states that "by Adad the god of my city, and by Sîn the god of my head." Here the god of one's head refers to the personal god. See Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 66. Note also the regionalism of the head being a euphemism for one's person as observed in the Hittite use of the Sumerian logogram SAG.DU ("head, person").

[220] Here the order of elements in Atri-Suḫa- is wrong for an ordinary "determinative" compound "Atri of Suha." The formation constitutes a Satzname where the predicate comes first: "Suha is the Atri." This type is well-attested in the neighboring languages of the ancient Near East such as Akkadian (note the formation of the names DINGIR-*ki-nu-um* "The-real-god," DINGIR-*da-ri* "The-god-endures"; and DINGIR *ḫa-bil* "The-god-was-snatched-away"; see Chapter Three), Hurrian [as in Šarri-teššup, "Teššup is king"; see Mauro Giorgieri, "L'onomastica hurrita" in *La civiltà dei hurriti* (*La parola del passato* 55 (2000) fascicolo I-VI), 290], and West Semitic languages (the majority of theophoric names take this pattern).

exactly seating the soul of Suhis ("Atrisuhas") means is not entirely clear. This phrase evokes an allusion to the KULULU 4 inscription that discusses the mobility of the soul (as being something the gods place and remove; cf. KULULU 4 §5 and §9).[221] If an object, "Atrisuhas" may be titular for material thing it represents. Warnings of curses follow those who would deface the name of Katuwas, overturn the orthostat or the god Atrisuhas.

We learn more about the god Atrisuhas from the KARKAMIŠ A4d inscription. The inscription is carved on the bottom of a robed statue of an enthroned deity weilding an axe in his left hand and a mace in his right hand. The monument has since been lost, but the preserved inscription reads "for this god Atrisuhas with (among) the gods; he who does not [give] annual bread, an ox, and two sheep, may Atrisuhas come fatally against him." Here the deified father is accounted with the ability to damage the life of one who does not fulfill the usually filial obligation of offering sacrifice. This power, attributed to the deified ancestor recalls the medical texts from Mesopotamia which treat conditions ailing the living and caused by inattention to the cult of the paternal deity and/or the deified ancestor.

JISR EL HADID 4

The JISR EL HADID 4 inscription was found at Demirköprü (Jisr el Hadid) on the bank of the Orontes. The stone was revealed to be the base of a stele or a statue that had suffered damage from a sledge hammer by treasure hunters who were in search of gold hidden inside the statue. Only a fragment of Portion A of the inscription remains, while Portions B+C are lost.[222] The remaining portion of the text, Portion D, is of primary interest to the present study.

[221] See also the discussion of the Katimuwa inscription in Chapter Four of the present study.

[222] See A. Dinçol, B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins and H. Peker "A New Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription from Hatay," *Anatolica* XL, (2014), 63.

Transcription:

D 1. §1. [... ...] x-x-ta
§2.| á-mu-pa-wa/i-na CERVUS+RA/I-ta-pi-sá á-pi-si-na COR-tara/i-i-na i-zi-i-ha
§3. wa/i-na á-pi-sa-za tá-ti-za DEUS-na-za COR-ni-i-na <wa/i?->li-nu-u-ha
D 2. §4. ("VIA") ha+ra/i-w[a/i]-ta-z[a] ||-pa-wa/i-tu-ta za-a X-ha
§5. (DEUS)TONITRUS-ti-i 1 ARIES/OVIS-ni-sa |("X.X") ku-wa/i-za-i
§6. POST+ RA/I-ta-pa-wa/i "1" BOS(ANIMAL) |1 GAZELLA(ANIMAL) CRUS+X-i
§7. a-mi-pa-wa/i tá-ti PRAE+i sà-mi-ia-sa-na STATUA-r[u]-t[i [...

Translation:

D 1. §1. He[… …] x-x ...ed.
§2. But I, Runtapis, made him (as) his own *atri-* [person/soul].
§3. I exalted him, (as) an *atri-* [person/soul] for his fathers' gods,
D 2. §4. but for the travelers I x-ed this for him.
§5. For Tarhunt one ram/bull will *kuwa-*.
§6. Afterwards, one ox and one gazelle will stand.
§7. Before my father Sami(ya)s' statue [ ]'

The inscription concerns the actions of filial piety the son takes in honoring the memorial of his father. The term contained in the inscription, *atri*, will be left untranslated as the nuances of the term have important implications for understanding the cultic ideology of Luwian inscriptions. The term can mean either 'person' or 'image,' but often is referred to the non-physical aspect of the self. Hawkins initially provides a discussion on the term *atri-* in his monumental work, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*.[223] The initial discussion surrounding the Hawkins' translation of the term was later criticized by Yakubovich on account of Hawkins' inconsistent rendering of the term in English.[224] The problem however belongs to the English language and not the Luwian. Hawkins argues for a semantic progression of the

[223] See Hawkins, *CHLI* I/2, 460.

[224] See Yakubovich, "Nugae Luvicae," *Anatolian Languages*, eds. Vitaly Shevoroshkin and Paul J. Sidwell. (Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 2002), 189-209. Later, Theo van den Hout produced a secondary discussion on the topic, though Hawkins' rejoinder has since addressed some of van den Haut's initial observations. See John David Hawkins, "The Soul in the Stele?" in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Alfonso Archi (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 49-56.

term toward from 'person, being' to 'image, likeness.'[225] The Hittite *ēš(ša)ri-* lies at the root of Hawkins' understanding of the Luwian *atri-*, and is effectively an *–ri* formation on the *es-* stem, 'to be.'[226] Puvel interprets the Hittite *ēš(ša)ri-* as "shape, form, (body-)frame, likeness, image, icon, statue," and notes the Hittite *ēšri-* and *ēššari-* to be cognate with the Akkadian *ṣalmu*.[227] More recently however, van den Hout has shown that *atr(i)-* does NOT mean "image," nor is it cognate with Hittite *ēš(ša)ri-* "image," but cognate with Lycian *atra-/atla-* 'person, self' and Carian *otr-* "idem." This argument demonstrates that the Luwian cannot come from a prehistoric **-sr-*. Furthermore, the overall contextual use of the word argues decisively for "person, self" and "soul."[228]

The *atr(i)-* is put into a person's bodily vessel by the gods and departs the body upon death. Here it is the surviving "soul" of Atri-Suḫa- that confirms him as a deity. Following Melchert, in describing the non-physical aspect of the person, the term 'soul' is most appropriate, though this term too requires some clarification. Due to its long use in theological discourse, 'soul' may or may not carry a certain set of assumptions for those whose use of the term is ultimately rooted in Platonic dualism, where the notions of soul and body are specifically distinct.[229] In both the Anatolian and Semitic traditions of the ancient Levant, the body and soul

[225] Hawkins, *CHLI* I/2, 51-53.

[226] *Ibid*., 51.

[227] Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary, Vol. 2: Words Beginning with E and I*. (Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1984), 313.

[228] Van den Hout, "Self, Soul, and Portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian," in Piotr Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Warsaw: Agade, 2002), 171-86. As per van den Hout, the real HLuwian word for 'image, depiction' is *iri(ya)an=za*. Contra Hawkins' *ēš(ša)ri-*assertion, the Hittite equivalent is *ištanza(n)-*, which has the same sense.

[229] The discussion proceeds from both the initial Platonic distinction of forms and the subsequent development by the Neo-Platonists of Late Antiquity carrying on in this tradition where the body and soul are themselves categorized by their own inner duality: soma/sarx (body/flesh) and psyche/nous (mind/soul). As this

do not maintain the radical separateness found in the dualist perception of the terms. Rather, there is an inherent unity between the soul and malleable body or bodies through which the soul expresses itself. [230]

It is only appropriate then to leave the term *atri-* untranslated in the English translations of Luwian inscriptions. The Hieroglyphic Luwian uses the logogram of an image of a heart (COR/VAS) for *atri-*, followed by the appropriate phonetic compliments. As Luwian also utilizes the term *zart-* for the 'heart,' the use of the logogram suggests the heart as the seat of soul in the Hieroglyphic Luwian tradition.[231] Any secondary derivation rooted in the notion of the 'shape' or 'form,' is effectively an assertion about the nature of the person or soul itself. Conceptually, the *atri-*, that is the immaterial self, must be understood as the immutable, and thus ideal self. In this way, the congruity of what in English is disjointed into a semantic range, is maintained in a conceptual unity of "soul, person (and by extension form, shape, image)," in the Luwian *atri-*. An *atri-* can be placed within a stela, or the *atri-* can be an object raised as is the case from the JISR EL HADID 4 inscription above. Thus, what is *exalted* is his soul/person as the raised object (cf. Aram. *napš-* נפש to refer to funerary monuments).[232]

---

discussion has had a major impact on scholarship concerning the biblical tradition, scholars of the Hebrew Bible have been hesitant to engage in the dualistic definition proceeding from theological discussions of the Greek tradition. See recently the treatment by Suriano, "Breaking Bread with the Dead: Katumuwa's Stele, Hosea 9:4, and the Early History of the Soul" in *JAOS* 134:3 (2014): 385-405.

[230] A helpful study on this topic is Benjamin Sommer's recent work, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[231] Here may be conjectured a common Indo-European tradition concerning the heart. Aristotle for instance interpreted the heart as the seat of intelligence, motion, and sensation. See Aristotle, *Parts of Animals*, 656a; 666a.

[232] Note the contrast of "soul/person" as a common gender with neuter *za-a* in §4, which is the real object made/built/erected for travelers to see.

Working under the assumption that the object raised was done so in honor of Runtapis's father Sami(ya) (cf. §7), Runtapi indicates in §3 the efficacy of his action, exalting him as an *atri-* for his fathers' gods. The text subsequently provides instructions for sacrificial offerings, presumably done in a continual offering on behalf of his father's soul. By exalting his father as a person *to* his paternal deities, Runtapi fulfills the obligations of a son in the cultic tradition concerning the god of one's fathers by maintaining continuity of the family devotee with his divine devotion. The erection of father's *atri*-preserves his immaterial image for his paternal gods, assuring the permanence of his person.

Luwian-Semitic Interaction

The collision of the Indo-European and Semitic worlds is best observed in the multilingual inscriptions of Syro-Anatolia to have survived until today. These inscriptions are included here with the Indo-European discussion because they are primarily set in the Indo-European legacy remaining in the shadow cast by the Hittite Empire. As the echo of the Indo-European rule over the Levant gradually waned, the Semitic inscriptional tradition grew ever more prominent, until becoming completely silenced by the westward expansion of the Assyrian Empire. The complimentary use of Phoenician alongside Hieroglyphic Luwian marks a transitionary period between the previously dominant Anatolian literary tradition and the rise of the importance of communication with the Semitic speaking populations of the region.

Three inscriptions comprise this corpus of multilingual inscriptions. The first two inscriptions consist of the ÇİNEKÖY and KARATEPE Hieroglyphic Luwian and Phoenician bilinguals, while the third of the collection, the İNCIRLI inscription, is too damaged to be of significant use. The bilingual inscriptions mark two opposite ends of the inscriptional tradition.

The ÇİNEKÖY inscription is short and partially broken, whereas the KARATEPE inscription is quite long and is presented in multiple versions monumentally decorating a palace.

ÇINEKÖY

The ÇİNEKÖY inscription was discovered in 1997 in a field ca. 30 km to the south of Adana and published three years later.[233] While the size of the inscription is considerably shorter than the KARATEPE bilingual, the ÇİNEKÖY inscription shares many common features with the larger KARATEPE inscription. In their initial publication on the inscription, Tekoğlu and Lemaire provide the following transcription of the Hieroglyphic Luwian text:

Transcription and Translation

§1 [EGO-*mu*] *wa/i+ra/i-i-[ka-s*]*á* [x-x-x-x (/-x) (INFANS) *ni-*]*mu-wa/i-za-sa* [*mu-ka*]-*sa*-[si]-*sa* || |INFANS.NEPOS-*si-sà* |*hi-ia-wa/i*[*-ni*]-*sá* [URBS] |REX-*ti-sa* |(DEUS)TONIT[RUS]-*hu-t*[*a-sa* SERVUS-*ta*$_4$*/i*$_4$-*sa*(DEUS)SOL-*mi-sa* CAPUT-*ti-i-sa*]

§2 [*á-wa/i-mu*] *wa/i+ri-i-ka-sá* [MAN]US»?(-) *la-tara/i-ha* [*hi-ia-wa/i-na* (URBS)]

§3 [*ARHA-ha-wa/i la+ra/i+a-nú-ha hi*]-*ia-wa/i-za*(URBS) *TERRA+LA+LA-za* || (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-ta-ti* |*á-mi-ia-ti-ha* |*tá-ti-ia-ti* |DEUS-*na*<-ti>

§4 |wa/i-ta (EQUUS.ANIMAL) *zú-na* (EQUUS) *zú-wa/i* |SUPER+*ra/i-ta* |*i-zi-ia-ha*

§5 EXER[CITUS-*la/i/u-za-ha*] (||) EXERCITUS[*-la/i/u-ni*] |SUPER+*ra/i-ta* |*i-z*[*i*]-*ia-h*[*a*]

§6 |REL-*p*[*a*]-*wa/i-mu-u* |*su+ra/i-wa/i-ni-sa*(URBS) |REX-*ti-sá* |*su+ra/i-wa/i-za-ha*](URBS) |DOMUS-*na-za* |*ta-ni-ma-za* |t*á*-[*ti-sa* MATER-*sa-ha*] (||) |*i-zi-ia-si*

§7 |*hi-ia-wa/i-sa-ha-wa/i*(URBS) |*su+ra/i-ia-sa-ha*(URBS) |"UNUS"-*za* |DOMUS-*na-za* |*i-zi-ia-si*

Translation

§1 I am Warikas, son of… Muk]sas's grandson, the Hiyawaean king, Tarhun[zas's servant, the Sun God's man.

§2 And I, Warikas extended [Hiyawa]

§3 And I caused the plain of Hiyawa to prosper on account of Tarhunzas and my paternal gods.

§4 And I made horse upon horse,

§5 And I made army upon army.

§6 And to me, the king and house of Assyria became fa[ther and mother].

§7 And Hiyawa and Assur became one house.

[233] For the initial publication, see Tekoglu Recai, "La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy," *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 144:3 (2000): 961-1007. For the transcription utilized here, see Payne, *Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 43.

On its own, the ÇINEKÖY inscription articulates the function of the paternal deities (along with Tarhunzas) as empowering Warikas to cause the plain of Hiyawa to prosper. The use of the ablative-instrumental (tatiyati) in the inscription confirms the nominative *tatinzi massananzi* "paternal deities" reading of the MARAŞ 1 inscription with the adjective *tatiya-*, as opposed to "father gods."[234] When compared with the Phoenician version, the paternal gods are rendered by the term *ʾēlim* אלם, regularly meaning "gods" when not otherwise qualified. The default interpretation of this term over the years has been to regard *ʾēlim* simply as "gods," though a major caveat to the term is in order. Rather than revising the interpretation, we may be inclined to interpret the term *ʾēlim* in its Northwest Semitic context as a general term for paternal deities as discussed in the previous chapter (see also **Chapter Five**).

Following the previous discussion on the *atri-* ("person, soul") from JISR EL HADID 4, §11 of the ÇINEKÖY inscription provides another attestation of the term: "and it was I through my own soul made the lands (to be settled?)."[235] In this instance, the soul (COR-*na-ti*) may likewise be rendered "self," though the understanding of the immaterial aspect of one's being is clear in the Luwian tradition. The relationship between §3 and §11 is not entirely clear on the one hand, it is Tarhunzas and Warikas's paternal deities who cause the plain of Hiyawa to prosper. On the other hand, it is Warikas's own soul that settles the lands. A similar topos is recorded in the MARAŞ 1 inscription §4-§5 (see above). I tentatively suggest this as evidence for the power of immateriality. To put it another way, the power of one's being is a power that

[234] The importance of this distinction must be highlighted due to the fact that the nominative plural of the adjective and the noun are indistinguishable in HLuwian orthography and may have been true homonyms.

[235] §11 || wa/i-a |*á-mu* | *á-mi-ia-ti* COR-*na-ti* || ("TERRA")*ta-sà*-REL+*ra/i*-REL$^{?}$/*zi*$^{?}$ || |*i*$^{?}$-*zi*$^{?}$-*ia*-[x$^{?}$](-)*á*$^{?}$-wa/I URBS-*MI*$^{?}$-*ni-zi* SOLIUM$^{?}$ [ ] | || [. See Tekoğlu–Lemaire 2000.

transcends physicality. In a like manner, the Luwian tradition would speak of "grain" and "wine" not as purely physical commodities, but the fruits of the Grain god and the Wine god (see below).

The ÇINEKÖY inscription precedes the events described in the KARATEPE inscription and bears many literary similarities with this subordinate inscription. Both inscriptions note similar personalities—namely, Warikas, use similar language, and are Hieroglyphic Luwian and Phoenician bilinguals. These similarities, according to Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, occur as the result of the two inscriptions emerging as products of the same scribal school that would have produced these inscriptions within a short time of one another.[236]

KARATEPE

Two city gates in the fortifications surrounding the hill-top of Karatepe-Aslantaş, bear this lengthy monumental inscription. At the walls of these gates stood basalt orthostats bearing sculptures and inscriptions. Each gate has one hieroglyphic and one Phoenician inscription. The lower gate (or north gate), is marked by the abbreviation Hu: Hieroglyphic *unten*, and the upper gate (or south gate) is marked by the abbreviation Ho: Hieroglyphic *oben*. Hawkins divides the Luwian portion of the text into 75 clauses, totaling some 412 words.[237] Full versions of both the Luwian and Phoenician elements have been previously published by Hawkins and Payne; the Phoenician portions only have been published by Gibson in his collection on Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Here only the relevant portions of the text will be reproduced.

[236] Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, "The Luwian-Phoenician bilinguals of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE" in *Getrennte Wege? Kommunikation, Raum und Wahrnehmung in der Alten Welt* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike e.K., 2007), 180-181.

[237] Hawkins, *CHLI, Vol. 1*, 45.

Continuity with the ÇINEKÖY Inscription

As noted in the previous section, the two inscriptions bear some relationship to one another in terms of language presentation, political patronage, and literary forms. Virtually every line in the ÇINEKÖY inscription is reproduced in the KARATEPE inscription. To summarize the texts, both Warikas and Azitiwadas present themselves the servants of Tarhunzas and the Sun God's men. Both extend their lands and cause the lands to prosper. They attribute this ability to benefit their lands to Tarhunzas and the (paternal) gods. Both boast of multiplying horses, armies (or shields), smiting fortresses. Whereas Tarhunzas made Azitiwadas a father and mother to all in Adanawa, the ÇINEKÖY inscription indicates that Assur became father and mother to Hiyawa.

The differences between the two inscriptions are however noteworthy. The Hieroglyphic Luwian is clear to indicate that Tarhunzas and the paternal gods are those which enable Warikas to be of benefit to his lands whereas the Luwian text of the KARATAPE inscription only survives in one of the two inscriptions. In the Ho. version of the inscription, Tarhunzas and the gods are responsible for this prosperity. The Phoenician versions of both of these inscriptions read *ʾēlim*, which by itself is the plural form of the term *ʾēl*, or god. In the immediate context, there is no specific reason to read these *ʾēlim* as paternal gods. The issue itself is not as straightforward as it first appears however, and will be addressed in Chapter Six. With the Luwian portion of KARATEPE, what remains is at best a cultural implication of paternal deities though the texts only contains the mention of the gods more generally.

Even though the KARATEPE inscription does not directly attest to the term "paternal gods," it does contain several interesting features that assist in framing our understanding of the term El. The Luwian portion of the text (Hu. And Ho. §LIII, 303-308) each provide the

characters of the Grain-God and Wine-God (see also KARKAMIŠ A11a §9; A2 §7): "And so let this fortress become (one) of the Grain-God and the Wine-God…" The Phoenician on the other hand reads a little differently: "And may this fort (walled-city), bearing grain and wine."[238] On the face of the observation, the preliminary conclusion regards the Luwian tradition as perceiving a divine order behind the presence of these vital commodities, whereas such a perception would be absent from the Phoenician presentation.

The Luwian Tarhunzas – Here the inscription echoes Hittite literature attesting to the presence of multiple manifestations or localizations of the Storm God. CAELUM (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sa* – is rendered three ways by the Phoenician account: Ba'al, Ba'al *krntryš* (Phu/A III. 2, 4), and Ba'al *šmm* (Phu/A III. 18). The entire Luwian construction consists of two logograms and a divine determinative, for which the name Ba'al *šmm* is the most accurate rendering. Ba'al as a stand-alone name reflects the local Phoenician rendering of Tarhunzas marked by TONITRUS logogram, though the etymology of Ba'al alludes to the one above,[239] rendering redundant the *šmm* "of heaven" affixed as the genitive of the construct Ba'al. The character of Ba'al *krntryš* is but a local manifestation or devotion Ba'al himself, most likely reflecting the reflect known from other Luwian and Semitic inscriptions from the region as "the Storm God of the Vineyard."[240]

---

[238] For the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, see Hawkins, *CHLI, Vol. 1*, 55. Hu. REL-*pa-wa/i za* ("CASTRUM")*há+ra/i-ní-sà-||za i-zi-ia-ru* (DEUS)BONUS-*sa* (DEUS)VITIS-*sá-há* and Ho. REL-*pa-wà/î* |*za-*` [… || …] (DEUS)VITIS-*tí-ti-há*. The Phoenician on the other hand reads: *w-kn h-qrt z bʿlt šbʿ w-trš*. The translation of the Phoenician provided by Hawkins reads, "And may this city be mistress of grain and wine." The context however necessitates a rendering of 'ownership' or 'possession,' the feminine form of the noun agreeing with the gender of the fortress.

[239] The Semitic *baʿal* בעל quite woodenly means the one who is "in the" *ba-* (ב) "above" *ʿal* (על).

[240] I am currently arguing this in an as-of-yet unsubmitted paper for publication treading the topic of religion and viniculture in the Levant.

The inscription ends with an invocation of several gods for a curse on the one who would remove the name of Azitiwadas or do evil to the inscription.

> Luwian (Hu): *wa/i-ta* || *ARHA* |MANUS(-)*i-ti-tu* CAELUM (DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sá* CAELUM (DEUS)SOL-*za-sá* (DEUS)-*i-ia-sá* OMNIS-*MI-zi-ha* DEUS-*ní-zi á-pa* |REX-*hi-sá* |*á-pa-há* "REX"-*na á-pa-há-wa/i* |CAPUT-*ti-na*
>
> And may celestial Tarhunzas, the celestial Sun, Ea, and all the gods delete that kingdom and that king and that man!
>
> Luwian (Ho): |*wa/i-ta* || *ARHA* |"*69"(-)*i-ti-tu* (DEUS)-*i-ia-sá* |"CAELUM"(DEUS)TONITRUS-*hu-za-sá-ʻ* |"CAELUM"(DEUS)SOL-<*za*>-*sá* OMNIS-*MI-zi-há* DEUS-*ní-zi* |*á-pa-sá* REX-*ta-hi-sá* |*á-pa-há* "REX"-*ti-na á-pa-há-wa/i* |CAPUT-*ti-na*
>
> And may Ea, celestial Tarhunzas, the celestial Sun, and all the gods delete that kingdom and that king and that man!
>
> Phoenician: *w-mḥ bʿl šmm w-ʾl qn ʾrṣ w-šmš ʿlm w-kl dr bn ʾlm ʾyt h-mmlkt hʾ w-ʾyt ʾdm hʾ ʾš ʾdm šm*
> Then may Ba'al *šmm* and El *qn ʾrṣ* and the Eternal Sun and all the circle of the sons of gods delete that kingdom and that king and that man who (is) a man of name.

The selection of these deities forms a totality for the divine charge over the world. Deities of heaven and earth, to include the Sun deities who acts as judge and may travel between both realms forecasts an inescapable warning for the would-be perpetrator. What is more interesting perhaps is that the inscription equates Ea with EL *qn ʾrṣ*, "El Maker of the Earth." Because the mythology surrounding the identity of Ea (also referred to by his Sumerian name Enki) is well-established, a one to one correspondence between Ea and a standalone El does not seem to be entirely appropriate; rather, the appropriate equivalence is directed toward El *qn ʾrṣ*. The question that proceeds from this inscription is whether *qn ʾrṣ* is a quality of El, or if El *qn ʾrṣ* should be considered a separate deity, if not something else altogether (see **Chapter Six**).

TÜNP

The final Luwian inscription highlighting religion and contact with the Semitic world is the TÜNP inscription. Ilya Yakubovich's recent treatment of the TÜNP inscription reassesses previous translations of this inscription by observing a potential combination of the Northwest Semitic El with the Mesopotamian Ea as deities evoked in the inscription. Apart from several southern Luwian inscriptions dedicated to Baʿalat,[241] this would be the only other inscription to mention a specific Northwest Semitic deity.

The inscription was found at Tünp in the Oğuzeli district of Gaziantep province of Turkey, not far from ancient KARKAMIŠ. Just over half of the fragmentary inscription is preserved. Inscribed upon a basalt boulder, the inscription may have functioned originally as a *kudurru*-style boundary stone commemorating the transfer of land.[242]

The relevant portion of the text, §§3-4, Yakubovich translates as "Below the earth belongs to Ea, but above the sky belongs to El." The reading proposed by Yakubovich depends on reading the *tà* of *i-tà-wa/i-za* as a phonetic *la*, thereby producing *i-la-wa/i-za*, "belonging to El."[243] (Perhaps a more wooden translation would follow Hawkins' initial reading: "below the

[241] These come from the reign of Urhilina, who ruled Hama in the mid-9th century BCE Four inscriptions are dedicated to the Lady ("Baʿalat"). All four of these inscriptions originated in southern Syria, though one of these was found outside the area. Cf. RESTAN, QAL'AT EL MUDIQ, TALL ŠṬĪB, HINES. All of these inscriptions read: "I (am) Urahilina, son of Paritas, king of Hama. I built this city and I set up this stele for Baʿalat." See also HAMA 4 for a lengthier account of one of these building inscriptions; also HAMA 8. See Hawkins, *CHLI*, 398-410.

[242] Yakubovich, "The West Semitic God El in Anatolian Hieroglyphic Transmission" in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, eds. Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, and Jared L Miller, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 386.

[243] Ibid., 388.

earth is Ea-ian, but above the sky is El-ian"). The argument Yakubovich cites for the *tà* sign as *la* is affirmed by Rieken, and not entirely unfamiliar to Semitic phonology.[244]

If Yakubovich's assertion is correct, placing El and Ea together to reflect heaven and earth is easily the most interesting feature of this inscription. The correlation suggests that Ea, the deity of the earth (cf. Sum. EN.KI), is contrasted by El and the sky. Whether El was a sky deity or the creator of the earth has been a subject for much discussion (see **Chapter Six**). "Heaven and earth" are a known divine binary from Ugaritic literature, Halab, Alalaḫ, and other localities in the region.[245] The joint recognition of El and Ea (West Semitic "Yah;" see **Chapter Six**) may suggest a cultic tradition pairing the two deities that woulc come to be reflected in the language of biblical literature. If the reading proposed by Yakubovich is correct, there could be far-reaching implications for the discussion surrounding the identity of El as a potential candidate for the biblical "God of the Fathers," as Cross has previously proposed.

Conclusion

The importance of continuity is articulated by divine paradigms and memory of the human lineage. The contribution of the Indo-European Anatolian tradition is in more clearly defining the powers through which the the gods of the fathers operate (as there is no compelling data to suggest that the Anatolian language material attest to anything but the god(s) of the fathers). Apart from maintaining identity through patrimony, the paternal deities act as agents for preservation of said patrimony. Within the paternal paradigm, the gods of the fathers exhibit limited power related to identity and destiny of their devotees (establishing, enthroning,

[244] See Chapter One in the present study and the discussion surrounding dental fricatives and the lateral approximant in regards to the identity of *kaśdim*.

[245] See Haas, *Geschichte der Hethitischen Religion*, 554-556.

empowering, etc.). The mention of the paternal deities in the bilingual Hittite-Hurrian parables as well as the story of Appu and his sons reveal rhetoric indicating the role of the gods of the fathers with the continuity of the family line. Children are named as a reflection of the work of the paternal deities, suggesting that the paternal gods set the life course for one's progeny.

This is not so different in the Luwian literature. In the MARAŞ 1 inscription, a genealogical recitation reminiscent of the *kispu* traditions precedes the works of king Halparuntiyas, who is enthroned by his paternal gods. The KARKAMIŠ inscriptions closely follow MARAŞ 1, implying the same sensibilities but in addition, perceives a world divine. From the KARKAMIŠ inscriptions however, we learn that the father who has become a god (deified) can inflict damage upon the living. Both the tradition of the paternal gods and the deified father are able to impact the identity and destiny of the living. The JISR EL HADID 4 inscription suggestively addresses the features of MARAŞ 1 and the aforementioned KARKAMIŠ inscriptions, where Runtapis exalted his father as a soul for his father's gods. This inscription points to the act of filial piety as an agent for elevating the deceased father into the divine class as it were, whereby the identity maintained by the father in devotion to his paternal gods is fulfilled by the son who comes to stand in his stead.

The ÇINEKÖY inscription attributes the prosperity of Warikas (and thus shaping his destiny) to his paternal gods, and in addition to this, sets the stage for the discussion of interaction between the Indo-European (Luwian) and Semitic (Phoenician) worlds. From this discussion emerges the question of the identity of El, thought by many to be the "God of the Fathers" of ancient Israel. The Anatolian data, whether in transcription or translation, is not conclusive on the matter, but certainly will contribute to the ongoing discussion of El literature.

Chapter Five

The Northwest Semitic Traditions and the "God of the Fathers"

Northwest Semitic Literature in Contact

Utilizing the Semitic traditions of the Levant and Mesopotamia in order to better contextualize the cultic world of the Hebrew Bible has been the standard scholarly approach in biblical research. Here, I expand upon a briefly treated conversation concerning the Indo-European legacy of Anatolia and Northern Mesopotamia and the extent of socio-religious contact these communities had with their Semitic neighbors as this phenomenon pertains to the major concerns identifying the "God of the Fathers" in the biblical tradition. Researchers have often overlooked these connections, as recently noted by Harry Hoffner in his comments regarding the state of Hittitology and biblical studies in an introductory piece for the third volume of *Context of Scripture*, "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels." In this article, Hoffner notes the mutual disinterest exhibited by both Hittitologists and biblical scholars.

> "For Hittiteologists do nothing to assist non-specialists by finding and making known to biblical scholars potentially relevant material. Be that as it may, it is a fact that if graduate students in Biblical Studies learn any languages other than Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic, they are Ugaritic, Phoenician or Akkadian, not

> Hittite. As a language Hittite is too different from the Semitic languages that are the standard fare of Old Testament scholars. I can attest to that unhappy situation even at the University of Chicago. In my 26 years on its faculty, one Egyptology major, two or three Assyriology majors, and no West Semitics majors have enrolled in beginning Hittite. One faculty member in Assyriology took two years of Hittite."[246]

For Hittitologists, there are three prominent concerns distancing their interaction with biblical scholarship: 1) the secularization of ancient Near Eastern scholarship, 2) unfamiliarity with biblical material, and 3) the geographical and cultural distance between the Bronze Age Hittites and Israel. Hoffner observes biblical scholars possessing three similar apprehensions toward engagement with the Indo-European (i.e., Hittite) milieu: 1) the geographical and cultural distance, 2) the dating of biblical texts after the fall of Hatti, and 3) the investment of time and energy in learning Hittite.[247]

The Levant, as a geographic bridge connecting the major empires of the Bronze and Iron Ages did not exist in a cultural vacuum. Researchers of the Hebrew Bible recognize this with their utilization of comparative Semitic material from the northern Levant. When including this literature as a platform for comparative research with the Hebrew Bible, they effectively incorporate into their research the thoughts and sensibilities of these Indo-European cultures (Hittite, Luwian, and by extension Hurrian) in contact with this Semitic literature. In this chapter, several prominent Northwest Semitic traditions will be evaluated in light of contact with the Indo-European cultures from the same regions in order to establish a dialogue between the

[246] Hoffner, "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels" in Hallo, William W, and K L. Younger. *COS* 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2003) xxiv.

[247] Ibid.

divergent language traditions and bring this dialogue into converation with the Hebrew Bible and the religion of the patriarchs.

Ugarit and Ugaritic Literature[248]

The discovery of the city state of Ugarit on the Syrian Coast in the early part of the 20th century stands as one of the most important archaeological finds for studying the biblical tradition among its neighboring peoples. The discovery yielded a treasure trove of literary data in the West Semitic linguistic tradition, providing a local Levantine perspective into the lives of those who shared linguistic and socio-cultural commonalities with the later Israelites of the Iron Age. Prior to its discovery, the city of Ugarit was previously known from other ancient sources lying well within the sphere of Indo-European (namely, Hittite) influence. The surviving literature from Ugarit was impressed upon clay tablets and written using cuneiform technology.[249] Several languages from the region are represented at Ugarit (Akkadian, Hittite, Hurrian, Linear B), but the most important corpus comes in the local Ugaritic cuneiform script used to represent the local coastal Levantine dialect of Northwest Semitic (sometimes considered "Canaanite" in the literature, though not without qualification).[250]

[248] All citations of Ugaritic literature are from the *Ugaritic Data Bank* (*UDB*:. Jesús-Luis Cunchillos, José-Angel Zamora, and Juan-Pablo Vita, *Ugaritic Data Bank: The Texts*, (Madrid: Instituto de Filologia, CSIC, 2003).

[249] The archives from Ebla are the first to record the location of Ugarit, followed by several other instances from Mesopotamia. See Gordon D. Young, *Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic*., (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981) 4-29. The city is also noted in several of the Amarna letters. EA 210 records the correspondence of the king of Carchemish with the king of Ugarit. (See also EA 45-49).

[250] See especially Anson Rainey, "Who Is a Canaanite? A Review of the Textual Evidence," in *BASOR* 304 (1996): 1-15. Rainey defers to the terminology used at Ugarit during the time of the composition of Ugaritic texts, declaring that "the entire scholarly myth that the people of Ugarit are Canaanites and that the kingdom of Ugarit is a part of a geographical entity known as Canaan is false." (6) From the perspective of those at Ugarit, it would appear that Rainey's conclusion holds firm. Nevertheless, the scholarly community has used the term "Canaanite" loosely to describe inhabitants of the Levant in much the same way as the term "American" is used in the Western Hemisphere to refer to people of the Americas (to include inhabitants of North and South America) in contrast to the use of the term "American" to refer to someone exclusively from the United States. Cf. Von Dassow, who utilizes

Ugarit serves as an important conduit tying Mesopotamian and Indo-European civilization with the Northwest Semitic world. This proximity is best observed in the Ugaritic writing system. The cuneiform texts that survived until today utilize the writing technology of their Anatolian and Mesopotamian neighbors, though the shape of the characters of the Ugaritic alphabet suggests a familiarity with the ink-based West-Semitic alphabetic tradition. Though Ugarit met its demise sometime between 1190-85 BCE (barely more than a century prior to the establishment of the Israelite monarchy), there is evidence to suggest that regional scribal tradition persisted into the period of the early Israelite monarchy.[251] The glimpse into the Levantine literary tradition provided by the literature of Ugarit as a predecessor to later Israelite scribal tradition illustrates the co-operation of writing with the state and religion, whereby religious characters and themes would persist over time through the scribal apparatus.[252]

Ugaritic literature attests to the paternal paradigm and exhibits a basic theology of family not unlike the traditions described in Chapters Two and Three. Family devotion plays a major role in the broader cult, where familial devotion to a deity and the care for one's ancestors

---

the term Canaanite as a "convenient simplification" to represent the multifaceted landscape of scribal culture in Canaan in her article "Canaanite Cuneiform," *JAOS*, 124 (2004): 643-644.

[251] Cassuto asserts that "biblical literature was but a continuation of the antecedent Canaanite literature." Umberto Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies: Vol. 2: Bible and Ancient Oriental Texts*, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), 17. An affinity between Ugaritic and early biblical poetry also indicates continuity in scriptal tradition. See Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 47; *A Social History of Hebrew*, 40-44. Additionally, early paleographic traditions of the alphabet from the region are indistinguishable from one another; see Naveh, *Early History of the Alphabet: An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Palaeography* (2nd ed.: Jerusalem: Magnes, 1987): 23-28..

[252] See Wingert, "Ancient Near Eastern Literary Influences on the Hebrew Bible" in the *Wiley-Blackwell Handbook to the Ancient Near East*, (forthcoming). "The bulk of the textual artifacts discovered at Ugarit were found in the royal complex and the house of the 'High Priest,' so called because of the number of ritual and mythological texts found at the location. The allocation of Ugarit's literary deposits lends credence to the assertion that writing as a profession was restricted to elites within the governmental apparatus and the ritual cult." See also Marguerite Yon, *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006) for a breakdown of the location of the various textual finds from Ugarit.

remain the hallmarks of family religion. Familial relationships are paradigmatic for the world of the divine as well as the state. To illustrate, the Hittite term for "father" (*attaš*) exists as a loanword for "father" when written at Ugarit as *ʾad* (without the Hittite nominative *–aš* ending), and is invoked to refer to one's "lord" *(ʾadn*; lit. "our father").[253] Both mythological and ritual texts from Ugarit testify to this attention given the notion of fatherhood.

The evidence for paternal paradigm at Ugarit is much more heavily weighted toward the principle of ancestor care for the divinized fathers than it is in evidence for gods of the fathers or paternal deities. This has led to considerable confusion over the years, framing a discussion around whether the paternal deities are in fact the divinized fathers or not. The confusion is however only natural considering the nature of the paternal paradigm, which aims to bridge the divine world with that of the living. Furthermore, the distribution of these topics forming the paternal paradigm most likely results from the genres of literature that have survived. Ritual texts are much more prevalent at Ugarit than monumental inscriptions like the surviving Luwian (**Chapter Four**) and Aramaic inscriptional literature from the region.

El, or *ʾilu* as he is known in the Ugaritic corpus, is consistently regarded as the "father of the gods" at Ugarit.[254] Most titles possessed by El reflect his fatherhood of some type or another. In the Baal Cycle, El is known as the bull and father to certain gods (*tr . ʾabh . ʾil*, KTU 1.2 I 33, 36; 1.3 V 35; 1.14 II 6; IV 6; 1.117 2; also *ʾil ʾabn* "El our father"). Ugaritic literature frequently refers to the fatherhood of El by terming the assembly of deities as the *bn ʾil*, the "sons of El." In

[253] Several Ugaritic texts utilize the term to mean "lord" and/or "noble father" (KTU 1.1 IV 17; 1.2 I 17; 1.24, etc.).

[254] See also KTU 1.123:1, 1:12 I:19 and the discussion in Aicha Rahmouni and J N. Ford, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts*, (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3-7.

addition to being a father to the gods, the Kirta Epic, El is regarded as the "Father of mankind" (*ʾab ʾadm* KTU 1.14 III 32, 47; V 43; VI 13).[255]

In the Baal Cycle, El is regarded as "father" by Baal whom he did not sire (Baal is regarded as the son of Dagan; KTU 1.3 V 35; 1.4 IV 47; cf. 1.4 I 5).[256] El is also known from the Baal Cycle as the "King, Father of the Years" (*mlk ʾab šnm* KTU 1.1 III 24; 1.3 V; 1.4 IV 24; 1.5 VI 2; 1.6 I 36), a euphemism for the antiquity of the deity and reminiscent of the Hebrew Bible's "Ancient of Days." Mark Smith sees further evidence for the connection between El in the Baal Cycle and the biblical "Ancient of Days" in the description of El's grey beard and iconography from Ugarit that is typically regarded as depicting El enthroned.[257] This title evokes the imagery of the fatherly predecessor and is congruent with the Greek *Chronos* ("time") and to a lesser extent the Sumero-Akkadian *An/Anu* ("sky").[258]

In addition to being regarded directly as a father, El is also indirectly regarded as such by being recognized as the creator deity. Following the previous discussion on the antiquity of El, the deity is also referred to as *drd<r> dyknn*, "the "ageless one who created us" (KTU 1.10 III

[255] Ibid., 10; 335-337. Rahmouni states "Many scholars have compared *ʾab ʾadm* with *bny bnwt* "the creator of creatures" (Ep. 29), which refers to ʾIlu more generally as the creator of the world, including mankind and the gods. As the latter epithet refers to ʾIlu's relationship with both mankind and the gods, it quite naturally occurs in both the anthropocentric Epic of Aqhat (KTU 2 1.17:I:23) and theocentric mythological texts. With respect to the Epic of Aqhat, *bny bnwt* occurs in a context dealing with a request by the protagonist that ʾIlu grant him an heir, much like the general context of *ʾab ʾadm* in the Epic of Kirta. Thus, in both epics these epithets express ʾIlu's patronage of mankind."

[256] Mark. S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle,* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 91.

[257] Ibid., 185-186.

[258] Both Chronos and AN/Anu possess well-developed mythological traditions beyond the recorded scope of El's mythology at Ugarit (and beyond for that matter). Chronos and El are both first-order deities that produce subsequent generations of gods, whereas Anu, who is a father to the gods is a third-generation deity (at least according to tradition found in the Enuma Eliš). Like El, Chronos is regarded as *ageraos*, "ageless;" See Marvin Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts,* (Leiden: Brill, 1955), 35.

6).[259] El is also regarded as the *bny bnwt*, "Creator of creatures," and the like. Marvin Pope observes the likely probability that El was a Creator God, even though this is not overt at Ugaritic. More important is Pope's observation that "all the Ugaritic allusions to El's creativity are in terms of generation and paternity."[260]

The second feature of the paternal paradigm, care for the departed and divinized ancestors, is quite prominent in the Ugaritic corpus. So prominent is this portion of the paternal paradigm that the discussion surrounding paternal deities often intersects with that of ancestor care in the case of enigmatic figures such as the *ʾil ʾib*. For issues related specifically to the divinized fathers, the bulk of this literature concerns the *rpʾum* (*rapiʾūma*) and the ritual traditions commemorating their memory. At Ugarit, text KTU 1.161 is a strong candidate for a localized expression of the *kispu* tradition mentioned in the Amorite world and Mesopotamia.[261]

KTU 1.161 is the only funerary ritual from Ugarit and has undergone numerous studies since its initial publication in 1975.[262] The text summons ancestors, who are titled *rpʾum*, to

[259] See Smith and Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 185.

[260] Marvin H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, 47-48.

[261] This is noted by both Malamat and Pardee (See Abraham Malamat, *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*, (Oxford: Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1989), 100). Pardee is less certain in his presentation of a minimalist view on the topic, stating "It does not appear implausible to me that the prayer may have been uttered in association with a *kispu*-type ritual, but there is presently no way of proving or disproving such a hypothesis." See Dennis Pardee, "Marziḥu, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult" in *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquim on Ugarit, Religion, and Culture*, eds. N. Wyatt, W.G.E. Watson and J.B. Lloyd, (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996), 277.

[262] A number of texts have followed the initial publication by Johannes C. De Moor, "Rāpiʾūma – Rephaim," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 323-345; Pope, "Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit," in Maria de John Ellis (ed.), *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstien* (Hamden: Connecticut Academy of Arts & Sciences, 1977), 163-182; Wayne T. Pitard, "The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 65-75; John F. Healey, "Ritual Text KTU 1.161 – Translation and Notes," *UF* 10 (1978): 83-88; Conrad E. L'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods, El, Baʿal, and the Rephaʾim* (HSM 21; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 187-193; M. Dietrich – O. Loretz, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): No. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161," *UF* 15 (1983): 17-24; Baruch A. Levine & Jean-Michel de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim: the Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty," *JAOS* 104 (1984): 649-659; G. del Olmo Lete, "The 'Divine' Names of the Ugaritic Kings," *UF* 18 (1986): 83-95; de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (NISABA 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987): 165-168; J. Glen Taylor, "A First and Last Thing to do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some

come and accompany the deceased (King Niqmaddu) as he joins them in the underworld, where according to Tsumura, Niqmaddu would descend and appear before his lord, the *ʾil ʾib*, and join the ancestors of his family.[263] The only major deity to be present in this funerary liturgy is the sun-goddess Šapšu, who like other permutations of the Sun-deity travels into the underworld. Here Šapšu commands the "lords" to descend to the earth; the implications is that the lords who have been summoned as *rpʾum* have ascended and now with the deceased re-descend into the earth. A series of seven sacrifices are offered on behalf of (presumably) the deceased as well as the living.[264] This tradition is attested for royalty at Ugarit, but comparative data from ancient Yaʾudi/Samʾal suggests that the tradition would have extended beyond its royal attestations.[265]

Evidence of ancestor veneration goes well beyond the *rpʾum* literature. Although the *rpʾum* literature is more pronounced and direct to its purpose, indirect testimony for this practice is observable in the Ugaritic terminology for deified ancestors as well as the material culture testifying to the care of the ancestors. In the first instance, the Ugaritic term *ʾilh*, a term that in later Semitic (namely Aramaic, but also Arabic, literature, comes to be the singular form for the

---

Parallels," in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical & Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*, eds. Lyle Eslinger & Glen Taylor (JSOTS 67; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 151-177; Theodore J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 5-46; Joseph Tropper, *Nekromantie: Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (AOAT 223; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1989), 144-150; Pierre Bordreuil & Dennis Pardee, "Les textes Ougaritiques" in Pierre Bordreuill (ed.), *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: les textes de la 34th campagne (1973)* (RSO 7; Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1991), 151-163; David Toshiro Tsumura, "Official Cult and Popular Religion in the Ancient Near East," in *Papers of the First Colloquium on the Ancient Near East – The City and its Life held at the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka, Tokyo)*, ed. Eiko Matsushima, (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1993), 40-55; Brian B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 100-131; Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 85-88; Suriano, *The Politics of Dead Kings: Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings and Ancient Israel*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 141-170.

[263] Tsumura, 55.

[264] The thematic number seven is prevalent in inscriptions that commemorate the ancestors. Cf. the Hieroglyphic Luwian MARAṢ 1 inscription.

[265] See also Barkay, "Mounds of Mystery." *BAR* 29:3 (2003): 32-39, 66-68.

word for "god"; אלה *ʾlōh* and its plural form אלהין *ʾlōhîn* "gods") consistently refers to the deified fathers. These ancestors receive sacrificial offerings apart from El and other recognizable deities (e.g., KTU 1.39:5, 1.41:6, 12, 14, 18, 28, 30; 1.87:7, 13, 19, 30, 32-33). The occurrence provides an interesting contribution to the discussion for the word אלהים *ʾlōhîm* "god" (a plural form; lit. "gods") in the Hebrew Bible. The curious phrase from the Deir Alla inscription noting that "the *Elāhin* became one and were replaced on the divine council by the Shaddayin," if accurate, could reflect a monotheizing (or henotheizing) trend in the Levant during the Iron Age. Such a phenomenon may account for the re-rendering of more traditional terminology regarding the El/Elohim/Elim traditions if previously connected to more poly- or henotheistic traditions concerning paternal deities (see **Chapter Six**).[266]

The relationship between the divinized ancestor kings (*rpʾum*), and the "god of the father" *ʾil ʾib* is not entirely clear, though there is enough distinction between these characters in the texts to approach them separately. The deity leading most of Ugarit's god lists and lists which order appropriate sacrifices to the deities, registers *ʾil ʾib* as the first deity to whom sacrifices were to have been rendered among most of these lists.[267] The order of the deities must indicate different liturgical traditions of the cult when not specifically indicated (be they sacrificial, mythological, or commemorative); In most of these instances, the *ʾil ʾib* is listed with but before the remainder of the high gods.

[266] Wyatt similarly observes the aversion of the E source to the *ʾēl* name in favor of *ʾelōhîm* (*The Mythic Mind*, 3).

[267] The exception to the prime position of *ʾil ʾib* is for the deity *ʾil ṣpn*, read a number of ways: "the god of Mt. Ṣapānu," "El of Mt. Ṣapānu," or "divine Mt. Ṣapānu." See Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 11-23.

The nature of *ʾil ʾib* has been the subject of much discussion. Pardee takes the term to mean literally, "the God-of-the-Father" (for this Pardee provides the vocalization *ʾilu ʾibī*).[268] So too does Schloen, who addresses the interpretation in the final portion of his work, *The House of the Father*, in the context of material culture.[269] Schloen observes the duties of filial piety from the story of Aqhat, requiring the son to set up a stela to his *ʾil ʾib* in a sanctuary or temple, and asks, "Is this ilib a divinized ancestor, hence a 'divine father,' or is it the householder's 'paternal god' or 'god of the father'?"[270] Fleming is equally divided on the reading of the term, suggesting either "god of the father" (ʾilu ʾibi), or "god-father" (ʾilu ʾibu).[271]

In refining the position taken by van der Toorn, Schloen argues for the *ʾil ʾib* being a clan deity, "who is also, like the chief god ʾIlu himself, a divine father" and "not just any ancestor spirit but the protective 'spirit of the clan,' the corporate representative of the members of the patrilineal clan, both living and dead."[272] Schloen's conclusion has fused the final two portions of the paternal paradigm into the "god of the father" as the deified ancestor *par excellence*. For

[268] Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 15.

[269] The Ugaritic divine name ʾIlu ʾIbī (written ilib) corresponds to DINGIR *a-bi* (literally, "the god of the father") in an Akkadian god-list from Ugarit (RS 20.24:1 = Ug 5.18:1). Schloen, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*. (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 343.

[270] Ibid.

[271] "Van der Toorn observes that "the gods of the house" (DINGIR^{meš} *ša* É-*ti*) follow the family when a house is sold to an outsider in a document from nearby Ekalte. They are mobile, as opposed to a burial. In this connection, Ugarit's *ʾilʾib*, "god of the father" (*ʾilu ʾibi*), or "god-father" (*ʾilu ʾibu*) may offer indirect support for van der Toorn's approach. The term is not rare and appears frequently in lists of offerings to deities. By far the most illuminating usage, however, is found in a repeated description of what a man hopes for in a son, in the tale of Dan'el and Aqhat. As father, Dan'el longs for an heir "to set up the sacred stone of his father's god; in the sanctuary, the votive emblem of his kinsmen."17 It is important to recognize that these ritual responsibilities do not involve care for the father himself after death. The son must honor the father's *ʾilʾib* and kin (*ʿm*) as did the father. The father will go down to dishonor unless his *ʾilʾib* and his *ʿm* pass to the care of a son." Fleming, "The Integration of Household and Community Religion in Ancient Syria" in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, 41.

[272] Schloen, 344.

Schloen, the *ʾil ʾib* was the patriarchal clan deity of the gods themselves.[273] The inference that may be gleamed from Schloen's proposition suggests that the *ʾil ʾib* is the sum of the *rpʾum*; structurally, this understanding of the divine paternal deity loosely parallels the Egyptian notion of the deceased becoming (one with) Osiris upon death.

Ugarit's cuneiform textual archives greatly outnumber the inscribed stelae from the site, though some of these stelae offer additional insight into the memorial traditions of Ugarit. Two of the 19 stelae found at Ugarit bear inscriptions that Pardee classifies as promoting a mortuary theology. Pardee arrives at this conclusion based on the use of the term *pgr* on the stelae and the Amorite mortuary ritual known as the *pagrû*,[274] an observation initially proposed by Neiman in 1948 and also noted by Malamat in 1956.[275] In a footnote addressing one of Dagan's titles, "Lord of the Mortuary Offering," William L. Moran concludes that the term *pagrû* is the West Semitic synonym for the *kispu* of the East Semitic world.[276] Additionally, the rhytons found at Ugarit were utilized as libation vessels for religion ceremonies. Most of these were found in the so-called Temple of the Rhytons along with a cult stand and a statue of the god El; others have been found with funerary utensils accompanying the dead in various Ugaritic tombs.[277] The dead at

[273] Ibid., 345. Schloen articulates this by arguing for parallelism between the divine realm and the human world. The divine realm reflects the mythological explanation of the state of human social structures: "Thus it is argued that the term ilib refers both to the 'dead' ancestor of the 'living' gods, whom they were supposed to honor, and, in parallel fashion, to the spirit of a deceased human patriarch who was to be honored by the living members of his household."

[274] Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit,* 124-126. See also the discussion on the funerary offering in Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee, "Textes ougaritiques oubliés et 'transfuges': *Semitica* 41/42 (1991-1992): 23.

[275] Malamat pointed out two differing meanings for *pagrû*: a funerary stele or statue (i.e. the 'corpse of a god or king, frt, Lev 26:30; Eze 43:7-9), as initially proposed by Neiman (1948); accepted by Albright (1957); or a funerary offering or sacrifice. See, Malamat, *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*, 97.

[276] William L. Moran, "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy." *Biblica* 50:1, (1969): 43.

[277] Yon, *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*, 82-3, 151.

Ugarit were regularly buried beneath homes, as was often the case among the Amorites earlier.[278] Assuming the families of the deceased remained in the homes where the dead were buried, a modicum of identity continuity would be preserved where the ancestors remained dwelling with the living.

Conclusion – Ugarit

The Late Bronze Age city of Ugarit has left a considerable corpus reflecting the extent to which the paternal paradigm was interwoven into the cultic fabric of the city's inhabitants. El, the patriarch of the pantheon of Ugarit, was perceived as the quintessential father figure. The commemoration of the divine ancestors is represented by the commemoration of the departed kings as *rpʾum*. The commemoration of these fathers is complicated by the divine figure *ʾil ʾib* or "god of the father" who is a clan deity representing the clan through the leadership of a common ancestor, reflected in both the world of the deities and human social structure. This god of the father is an identity marker for the people of Ugarit, representing them in the divine realm. The question left unanswered at Ugarit then is whether this *ʾil ʾib* is a specific (i.e. historical) ancestor or a paternal deity that represent the idealized image of a family identity. (This material will be dealt with in part in the subsequent chapter: see **Chapter Six**).

Yaʾudi/ Samʾal at Modern-Day Zincirli

The community at ancient Yaʾudi is the quintessential location for observing contact between Semitic and Indo-European peoples. Yaʾudi is perhaps its Luwian name (*yadiye*, possibly meaning "the ruins"); the Semitic name is Samʾal, meaning "left" and by tradition

[278] See the discussion in Schmit, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, 197. See also See Burke, "The Archaeology of Ritual and Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant and the Origins of Judaism," 901 (noted in **Chapter Three** of this study).

meaning "north,"[279] likely referring to the northern most extent of the Semitic world; the site is located at present-day Zincirli, Turkey. The inhabitants of the region can boast of inheriting the broader sensibilities associated with Hittite/Luwian and Ugaritic cultures that preceded them textually. Both Cross and Smith utilize the Semitic language data from Zincirli in their analysis of the deity El, and in the case of Cross, when the Zincirli tradition addresses the gods of the fathers.[280] In addition to the Syro-Anatolian setting for the emergence of the patriarchs in the biblical narrative, incorporating the Semitic language material from Zincirli also invites the Syro-Anatolian Indo-European backdrop to the discussion by virtue of Yaʾudi's place as a Neo-Hittite state.

The extent to which contact occurred between Luwians and Arameans is not clearly identified at Yaʾudi. It may be more appropriate to cast the communities as native Luwian-speakers or native Aramaic-speakers. Both a cursory or detailed evaluation of the site will testify to Luwian cultural influence—that is, the features of sites spread throughout the region already considered Luwian. The only oddity is the use of Semitic languages at the site instead of Luwian. It may be that those who came to inhabit the formerly abandoned Bronze Age site were Luwians living in the southern Levant who, after having adopted the Aramaic language, migrated northward to settle among their kin.[281] Another option would simply indicate that these Neo-Hittites—a term I will use to represent the undefined multitude of Luwians and Arameans

[279] "Left" and "right" are regular designations for "north" and "south" in the ancient Near East. The prime direction always faces east, the place of the rising sun (cf. Heb. *mizraḥ* מזרח, Akk. *nipiḫ šamši*). In Mesopotamia proper, the word for the west was often synonymous with the Amorites whose homeland was along the western portion of the Euphrates River.

[280] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 19, 33; Smith, *Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 139.

[281] "Research Goals," *Research Goals | The Neubauer Expedition to Zincirli | The University of Chicago*, N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

succeeding the polities in the region of the former Hittite Empire—made a conscious effort to image themselves in the mold of the Northwest Semitic cousins of the expanding Neo-Assyrian Empire by producing Semitic language inscriptions. The city went through an official name change from Yaʾudi to Samʾal, which may explain reflect the shift in control from one ethnic group (Luwian) to another (Aramean). The earliest inscription from the site is a Phoenician inscription, followed chronologically by the regional Aramaic dialect, and finally finishing in standard Aramaic of the Assyrian Empire. The choice of Phoenician as the primary Semitic language of inscriptions contrasts with the use of Aramaic (presumably by Arameans or native Aramaic speakers) at Guzan as attested in the earlier Tell Fekheriyeh bilingual inscription.[282] A number of other possibilities have been suggested for this situation, the most interesting of which states that the Semitic population have been Amorite and not at all Aramean.[283]

Whatever the solution to the question may be, the evidence suggests a hybrid community at Yaʾudi. Certain cultic norms, such as the separation of the body and soul and the soul's indwelling in non-corporeal bodies like stelae were common to the Hittite and Luwian traditions of the region but *scandalous* within informal conversation among some biblical scholars. These concerns have previously been addressed from the Ind-European-Anatolian perspective by Melchert following the discovery of the KTMW stele.[284] Hawkins takes the comparison between the cultures one step further, stating that Zincirli was dependent on the city of KARKAMIŠ for

[282] The Tell Fekheriyeh inscription is commonly regarded to date to the mid-ninth century BCE, though earlier dating has also been proposed based on paleographical analysis of the Aramaic portion of the inscription. See Joseph Naveh, "The Date of the Tell Fekheriyeh Inscription" (in Hebrew), *Shnaton* 5-6 (1978-1979): 131-140.

[283] "Research Goals*," Research Goals | The Neubauer Expedition to Zincirli | The University of Chicago*, N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

[284] Melchert, "Remarks on Kuttamuwa." *Kubaba* 1 (2010), 3-11.

its culture. Specifically, Hawkins identifies the architecture, statuary and iconography, and inscription production as the key features of this commonality.[285]

> "The Sam'alite inscriptions themselves follow the Hieroglyphic Luwian tradition, both in external form (the Semitic letters being executed, uniquely, in relief rather than incised), and in literary style (e.g. the old Hittite-Luwian topos of the author having achieved what his forebears did not achieve)."[286]

As a site that has been well-integrated into biblical studies for its Semitic inscriptions, we are well reminded that those observations we find valuable from the site are equally important in the Luwian culture. Indeed, the reciprocal is also the case, where the Luwian language rhetoric also proves valuable for biblical studies.

The textual material remains from the site demonstrate the extent to this hybrid Neo-Hittite tradition. Names from the site are both Semitic and Luwian. Yet in the lone Luwian text has been found at the site—a small signet ring excavated from a small room in the Kulamuwa building in 1902 bearing the inscription *pa+ra/i-ki-pa-sa*, "of Parakipas" or of Bar-rakib,[287] a late 8th century ruler—the name preserved is an Aramaic name written in Luwian orthography. Within the Semitic inscriptions present at site, several members of the royalty and at least one of

[285] "…the architecture, particularly the architectural decoration of sculptured orthostats, and the motifs of the sculpture as seen in the Outer Citadel Gate compared with those of the King's Gate and Long Wall of Sculpture at Karkamiš; the practice of erecting colossal ruler statues (that from Zincirli perhaps from a Karkamiš workshop itself), and the inscription of such statues with commemorative deeds of the ruler; the individual memorials showing the deceased seated at a funerary meal, holding a cup (the present stele stands at the end of a long line of such monuments mostly coming from nearby Maraş, ancient Gurgum)." Hawkins, "The Soul in the Stele?" in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 49-50.

[286] Ibid, 50.

[287] Hawkins, *CHLI*, 576.

their elites bear Luwian names: KLMW (Kulimuwa), PNMW (Panamuwa),[288] and KTMW (KTMW).

The Semitic inscriptions testify to a number of parallels with the Luwian inscriptions from the region (several of these inscriptions were mentioned previously in **Chapter Four**). Visually, the Semitic inscriptions share a striking similarity with the raised relief work of the Hieroglyphic Luwian tradition.[289] These commonalities go beyond suggesting a common scribal culture, attesting to the same rhetoric of the religious cult. The recognition of the paternal deity or god(s) of the father, care for the departed, and the life of the soul beyond its corporeal vessel comprise the major features of the paternal paradigm present in these inscription. The cultic homogeneity between these two languages traditions present in the Aramaic inscriptions.

Seven inscriptions comprise the Zincirli corpus. All of these inscriptions are monumental save one. This small dedicatory inscription (KAI 25) is written upon a cylindrical gold object as some sort of ritual container.[290] The inscription reads: "SMR that made Kulamuwa son of Hayya, made for Rākibʾēl. May Rākibʾēl give to him length of life." The meaning of the first word of the inscription, SMR, is not entirely clear; it may possibly refer to a pointed object or something that holds something else.[291] The deity Rākibʾēl is otherwise unknown outside of ancient Yaʾudi/

[288] The feminine form of this name (Panamuwatis) is mentioned in two Luwian inscriptions, BOYBEYPINARI 1 and 2.

[289] Hawkins, "The Soul in a Stele?" in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Alfonso Archi (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 50.

[290] Lemaire argues for the text being an amulet holder, whereas Gibson suggests that the object was the handle of a staff or scepter. See also André Lemaire, "SMR dans la petite inscription de Kilamuwa (Zencirli)," *Syria* 67, (1990): 323-327; John C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 39.

[291] See Alessandro Grassi, "Il Sostantivo SMR Nell'Iscrizione Breve di Kilamuwa (KAI 25): Proposte d'Interpretazione" *Isimu* VII, (2004): 251-262.

Samʾal, but at this site and for this dynasty, Rākibʾēl is the family god worshipped by the ruling fathers.

Kulamuwa's monumental stele (KAI 24) is the far more popular of his inscriptions, if not of all of those found at Yaʾudi/ Samʾal. The inscription is rendered in the Phoenician language, though there are traces of Aramaic present. The evidence is strongest in the names, which attest to a hybrid Aramaic-Luwian tradition. Kulamuwa is widely recognized as a Luwian name,[292] as is that of his surname, *br ḥy* (*bar Hayya*); this second name is a bilingual compound featuring the Aramaic term *br* "son of," followed by the name *hy*, a name attested in another Luwian inscription.[293] Several of the names of the ancestors, typically unvocalized in translation due to their uniqueness among Aramaic names, are likely to be Luwian as well.[294]

The initial use of Phoenician instead of Aramaic is a curious choice in light of the question surrounding the Semitic identity of the inhabitants of the region. The issue is solved if Phoenician is regarded as a prestige language from the earlier Semitic alphabetic traditions of the region (to include Ugarit—arguably a Phoenician dialect) employed by Luwians rather than the

[292] Frank Starke proposes the name Kulanamuwa, "die Wehrhaftigkeit des Heeres besitzend," which normally would be rendered in Semitic orthography as KLNMW. See Starke, *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31), (Wiesbadeen 1990), 236. The debate regarding the meaning of this name, whether Kula(na)muwa or the more traditional rendering of Kilamuwa each accept an Anatolian source to the name itself. For the traditional Kilamuwa vocalization, see Josef Tropper, *Die Inschriften Von Zincirli: New Edition Und Vergleichende Grammatik Des Phönizischen, Sam'alischen Und Aramäischen Textkorpus*, (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1993), 30; and the discussion in Edward Lipiński, *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion*, (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 234. Lipiński argues contra Starke's insertion of the /*na*/ phoneme since "the element kila is well attested in Anatolian onomastics. Additionally, Lipiński cites the Greek rendering of a similar name κελλιμωτας as a possible variation of KLMW. Against this view, see K Lawson Younger, *A Political History of the Arameans: From Their Origins to the End of Their Polities*, (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2016), 403; Younger eschews Starke's conclusion and responds to Lipiński by comparing the initial KL of the name with the Greek κουλας. For further consideration, I will also suggest the Anatolian name Kuli(ya), which is attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian (KULULU lead strips 1 and 2) and would render KLMW as Kulimuwa.

[293] See the KULULU lead strip 1.

[294] For BNH, the Luwian name with apherisis "Appani(ya)" (cf. KULULU lead strip 1); for TMH, the Luwian name "Tami(ya)" (cf. Gelb seals).

Aramaic language of their Arameans neighbors or co-habitants. Considering each multilingual Luwian inscription utilizes Phoenician as the Northwest Semitic language of choice (the bilingual inscriptions from Karatepe, Çineköy, and the İncirli trilingual), the choice for Phoenician is no surprise at all.

Based on the rhetoric alone, the identity of the inscription comes across as a Luwian writing about himself in a Semitic language. KAI 24 follows several major topoi of the Luwian tradition,[295] but of primary interest is the invocation of the deities found at the conclusion of the inscription. The relevant lines (§§15-16) invoke the family gods, providing the following curses: [15] "And whomever destroys this writing, may Baal-Ṣemed who belongs to Gabbar smash his head, [16] and may Baal- Ḥamon who belongs to BMH and Rākibʾēl, lord of the house, smash his head." Cross interprets Baal-Ṣemed, "the lord of the warclub" as Hadad the Storm-god; he follows with an interpretation of Baal-Ḥamon, "the lord of Ḥamon" as El.[296] These gods are followed by Rākibʾēl, the god of the house, whom Cross is less certain to identify specifically but notes the commonality with the Storm-god who is also known as a rider.[297]

The Phoenician inscriptions give way to a local dialect of Aramaic in the successive series of inscriptions from Zincirli, beginning with KAI 214. This inscription, also named the

[295] See for example the discussion already noted by Hawkins; see also the connection to the MARAṢ 1 made by Gilbert: See Gilbert, *Syro-hittite Monumental Art and the Archaeology of Performance*, 82.

[296] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 10.

[297] Ibid. Ugaritic literature attests to this title for Baal: *rkb ʿrpt* "cloud-rider" (e.g., KTU 1.2 IV 7-8). An extensive literature exists on this topic, especially as it relates to Yahweh in biblical literature; a summary of this may be cleaned in G J, Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament: Volume Xiii*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 488. See for example Moshe Weinfeld, "'Rider of the Clouds' and 'Gatherer of the Clouds,'" *JANES* 5 (1973), 421–426; Alberto R. W. Green, *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 190. Edward Ullendorff has also noted that a similar title is used for Zeus in the Hellenic tradition that closely parallels the pantheon of Ugarit. See Edward Ullendorff, "Ugaritic Studies within Their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46:1 (1963): 236-249; see also a confirmation of this position by Sebastian Brock, "Νεφελληγερέτα = Rkb ʿrpt." *VT* 18:3 (1968): 395–397.

Hadad inscription because of the statue bearing the inscription, recounts a dedication to the deity Hadad by king Panamuwa of Samʾal. Though dedicated to Hadad, Panamuwa honors a cohort of deities, beginning with the Storm-god (Hadad), followed by El, Rākibʾēl, Shemesh, and Resheph (line 2). Panamuwa acknowledges these deities as giving him the חטר חלבבה "scepter of succession." In light of the parallel Luwian tradition spelled out in the MARAŞ 1 inscription, royal authority is bestowed by the gods of the fathers. There remains a question of the relationship between deities of a royal devotion, and the "lord of the house," who is identified as Rākibʾēl in the Yaʾudi/ Samʾal tradition. In the Hadad inscription, the Storm-god is mentioned apart from Rākibʾēl, so it is unlikely that these are names reflect the same deity. The lord of the house Rākibʾēl, a deity known only from Yaʾudi/ Samʾal, recalls a paternal deity that would have preceded kingship and instead epitomizes a charioteer[298] as a divine character. Whether or not this "rider" was a long unnamed idealized ancestor à la Schloen's proposed Ugaritic *ʾil ʾib*, the name of the deity, "the rider divine," supposes an idealized notion of such a rider. The connection proposed by Cross is not entirely off the mark, as the Storm-god is often given the title "cloud rider," thus making Hadad a suitable supernatural deity with whom this Rākibʾēl would share fellowship. Lines 8 and 9 of the inscription does reiterate the place of Hadad and echoes a topos common in the Luwian inscriptional tradition: "I sat on my father's throne and Hadad gave into my hands the scepter of succession." The invocation of the Storm-god who fulfills the work of the paternal deity may suggest that this Rākibʾēl was more than a conceptual ideal of a charioteer and may refer to some sort of commemorated ancestor.

[298] Though it is the case that there were mounted cavalry in the region during the period of the inscription (see for example the name *ᵐáš-pa—ba-ra* as mentioned in *SAA* 15 101 obv. 12; the name is a Median name for "horseman," and known from its Old Persian cognate as "cavalryman."), the long history of chariotry in the region supports a translation of "charioteer" for the specific type of rider. Note also the narrative of the Bar Rakib inscription supporting such an activity by the kings of Samʾal (see below).

Fellowship with the gods has long been a major discussion surrounding the Hadad inscription. Lineד 17-18a of the inscription call on the son who succeeds Panamuwa to bless his father by addressing the Hadad statue saying, [תאכל נב]ש פנמו עמך ותש[תי נ]בש פנמו עמך עד יזכר נבש פנמו עם הדד "May the soul of Panamuwa eat with you (Hadad), and may the soul of Panamuwa drink with you. Let him keep remembering the soul of Panamuwa with Hadad" (also noted in lines 22-23).[299] Here Panamuwa's entry into the divine realm follows in a line of continuity connecting the departed ancestors with the living. To this end, the curses at the end of the inscription address a potential break in continuity by potential treachery from within the family. Lines 29b-30a of the inscription call on the accused to defend himself by invoking his paternal deity: הן ... [י]שא ידיה לאלה אבה נשה יאמר הן אם שמת אמרת אל בפם (30) זר אמר קם עיני או דלח או [שמת אמרת]י אנשי צרי "if he (the accused) lifts up his hands to the god of his father, and says by his oath, 'if I have put these words in the mouth of a stranger, say that my eye is fixed or fearful or that I have put the words in the mouth of enemies…'"[300] followed by standard topoi concerning such a person's own demise for taking what is not lawfully his. Here too it is the god of the father who maintains the continuity of the house and royal succession.

The lengthier Panamuwa inscription (KAI 215) is a memorial inscription erected by Bar-Rakib to commemorate his father Panamuwa and so does not begin with the declarative EGO ("I am") statement found in other Luwian and Northwest Semitic inscriptions. The inscription gives an account of the inner-conflict present at Yaʾudi/ Samʾal and chronicles the demise of Panamuwa. The inscription bears several similarities to Luwian inscriptions that boast of land development and surplus commodities (cf. KARATEPE) and Tiglath Pilesar's erection of a

[299] Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Vol. 2*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) 66-67.

[300] Ibid., 68-69.

statue for Panamuwa (line 18) finds a parallel with the JISR EL HADID 4 inscription. Line 13 of the inscription alludes to the chariotry of Panamuwa, who בגלגל מראה תגלתפלסר מלך אשור "[ran] at the wheel of his lord Tiglath Pilesar, king of Assyria."[301] While the inscription does allude to the soul of Panamuwa eating and drinking (line 18), the interesting twist provided in this inscription follows the standard topos justifying the rule of the monarch. Here the inscription states, "because of my father's righteousness and my own righteousness, my lord Tiglath-pilesar, king of Assyria, made me to sit upon the throne" (line 19). Here the role of the paternal deity in enthroning the monarch has been ascribed to the king of Assyria. This would suggest that the relative autonomy offered by the king of Assyria within the shadow of the Assyrian Empire parallels the autocephaly of the monarch over his city-state as granted by the paternal deities.

The last of the inscriptions written in the localized Aramaic of Yaʾudi/ Samʾal is a funerary inscription of a non-royal figure, one KTMW. The KTMW inscription was discovered in 2009 and soon thereafter published by Pardee.[302] The KTMW inscription begins with the EGO statement and follows with a prescriptive list of offerings for the deities and soul of KTMW akin to the Luwian JISR EL HADID 4 inscription. Like the Panamuwa references above, the inscription is noteworthy for its recognition of the soul dwelling in the presence of the deities and the role of the sons in maintaining the continuity of the father's memory with regular sacrifices.

The final inscriptions from Yaʾudi/ Samʾal, KAI 216 also known as the Bar-Rakib inscription and the shorter Bar-Rakib inscription (KAI 217), come in standard Imperial Aramaic. These inscriptions are the companion pieces to the Panamuwa inscription (KAI 215) but are self-narrated and begin with the standard EGO statement. Curiously, the Bar-Rakib inscription

[301] Ibid., 80-81.

[302] Pardee, "A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli," *BASOR* 356 (2009): 51-71.

combines the work of the paternal deity Rākibʾēl with that of Tiglath Pilesar in the topos justifying Bar-Rakib's rule: "Because of my father's righteousness and my own righteousness, my lord Rākibʾēl and my lord Tiglath Pilesar seated me upon my father's throne" (lines 4b-7a). Here Bar-Rakib also identifies himself as a charioteer (lines 8b-9a). The more fragmentary KAI 217 has several gaps in the inscription, leaving more questions than answers. Nevertheless, the inscription does mention that Bar-Rakib is servant to Tiglath Pilesar and presumably some other deities, including "the god of the house of my father," seemingly Rākibʾēl. The deity Rākibʾēl is mentioned in the inscription, though the context does not permit for clarity: כבאל חני קד[ם מראי ר אשור (9) [מלך … "and he gave Rākibʾēl my favor before my lord the king of Assyria and before…"[303] Whatever the inscription originally declared, Rākibʾēl still persists as the family deity of the house of Yaʾudi/ Samʾal.

Other Inscriptions from the Northwest Semitic World

Apart from the Zincirli Corpus, a few other inscriptions from the Northwest Semitic world attest to this common Neo-Hittite tradition. Certain themes persist thematically across the region, but the style of the inscriptions generally follows the geographic distribution of these texts and is highly suggestive of differing scribal traditions at work behind similar regional concepts. The expectations provided by the geographic landscape and the contact between linguistic, and by extension scribal traditions, illustrates the influence certain cultural trends exert throughout the region. It is also worth noting that the other Phoenician inscriptions from the region (Karatepe, Çineköy, and the İncirli) comprise the Northwest Semitic component of the multilingual inscriptions predictably display an affinity with the Hieroglyphic Luwian tradition,

[303] KAI 217:8-9. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, Vol. 2*, 92.

whereas the tradition of Phoenician inscriptions along the southern Levantine coast do not contain the stylistic markers found in the Syro-Anatolian tradition.

Located in the Jazireh region of modern Syria, the bilingual inscription from Tel Fekheriyeh stylistically has more in common with the encroaching Assyrian inscriptional tradition than with those of the Neo-Hittite tradition, though there are some common themes present in both it and the Hadad inscription from Zincirli. The Tel Fekheriyeh inscription is a dedicatory inscription for the Storm-god (Hadad) like the Hadad inscription from Zincirli. The primary importance of the Tel Fekheriyeh inscription consists of the ruler[304] Ḥadīsʿy[305] being remembered by name in the presence of the local manifestation of the Storm-god. The memory of Ḥadīsʿy is conveyed through the agency of the inscription itself as well as the vessels bearing his name accompanying the statue (according to the inscription).[306] In the Hadad inscription of Panamuwa, memory is to be conveyed by ritualized action: "If any of my sons should grasp the

[304] The Tel Fekheriyeh bilingual is an interesting case for comparison with the evolution of the tradition coming out of Zincirli. The Aramaic inscription records Ḥadīsʿy as the "king" (*malkā* מלך) of Guzan, whereas the Akkadian inscription reads "governor" (*šakin*) as opposed to the expected "king" (šarru). To the Aramaic literate (or at least speaking if the inscription would merely have been read aloud) crowd, Ḥadīsʿy could still be considered the *malkā* מלך, though his place within the broader context of the Assyrian Empire would merely conceive of his status as that of a governor. This may account for the paternal deity enthroning the ruler of previously autocephalous city-state Yaʾudi/ Samʾal and later the same action being performed by the Assyrian king Tiglath-Pilesar once Yaʾudi/ Samʾal lost its autocephaly, becoming a client-state of the Assyrian Empire.

[305] On the pronunciation of this same, see Douglas M. Gropp and Theodore J. Lewis, "Notes on Some Problems in the Aramaic Text of the Hadd-Yithʿi Bilingual*," *BASOR,* 259 (1985): 45-61. Here I have transliterated the name according to the Aramaic spelling. While I agree with the etymological background of the name calling for a spirantized [t̲], the dynamic nature of sibilant shifting in the region does not provide enough evidence to suggest that the locals of Guzan would have pronounced the samekh/simkath ס as a spirantized [t̲], even if the etymological root would have called for one. This would be akin to ascribing an aspirated velar [kh] to the name Michael, when in English pronunciation the name has no aspiration and is pronounced with a voiceless velar [k].

[306] In view of the memorializing of the fathers through ritual acts such as the *kispu,* the Tel Fekheriyeh inscription proves to be a useful text for *extrapolating name* ideology in the Northwest Semitic world. While current trends in scholarship have focused on the power of the name, a subtle reading of the Tel Fekheriyeh inscription reveals more specifically that the *name* is the hallmark of the personal existence, and its invocation is life-generative. Moreover, where the *name* of the being takes its abode effectively becomes the limb of the *being*. This tradition is likely to be in conversation with or derivative from a common cultic understanding with Luwian texts that highlight the placement of the soul in objects such as a stele.

scepter and sit on my throne as king over Yaʾudi and maintain power and do sacrifice to this Hadad, and should not remember the *name* of Panamuwa saying, "May the soul of Panamuwa eat with Hadad, and may the soul of Panamuwa drink with Hadad…" (20b-22a). Both inscriptions, while evincing differing scribal traditions, demonstrate the importance of the personality being remembered in concert with the deity.

Further south and in the western Levant, the Aramaic language Zakkur inscription from Hamath (modern Hama) provides a stronger parallel to the inscriptional tradition from Zincirli. The Arameans having overtaken the Luwian leadership of Hama around 800 BCE maintain certain Luwian features in this inscription. The implication standing behind this occurrence suggests a common scribal rhetoric along the major highway system from Syro-Anatolia to the lower Levant. This inscription was constructed as a dedicatory inscription to the weather deity Ilu-wer, commemorating Baal-Šamayīn, the "Lord of Heaven" standing with king Zakkur and delivering him from an attack by 18 kings and their armies. In addition to Ilu-wer and Baal-Šamayīn, the collection of the deities "heaven and earth" found in the Hittite and Luwian tradition[307] is similarly found here ("Sun" Šamaš and "Dawn" Šahar, gods of heaven and gods of earth) as litigators against anyone who would (presumably) remove the name of Zakkur from the inscription. The implication of the Zakkur inscription is that Ilu-wer is the paternal deity with the "Lord of Heaven" being either an additional paternal deity or perhaps royal deity if associated with the Storm-god (frt. cf. the relationship between Rākibʾēl and Hadad at Zincirli).

[307] See for example the ARSUZ 1 and 2 inscriptions: Dinçol et al, "Two new inscribed Storm-god stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2," *Anatolian Studies* 65 (2015): 59-77.

Conclusion

The Northwest Semitic tradition did not exist within a cultural vacuum. Like the city-state of Ugarit that prospered within the Hittite sphere of influence, the same rhetoric of the Syro-Anatolian tradition persisted in the Northwest Semitic literature composed in Phoenician or Aramaic. This corpus of literature dialogues with the texts, be they oral or textual, which would eventually form the Hebrew Bible.

Within this framework, the paternal paradigm was a consistent tradition of the northern Levant that informs our understanding of the paternal deities. Although there is no direct evidence of "father gods" in the comparable corpus of literature (chiefly, the Zincirli corpus), there remains the phenomena of divinized fathers and the devotion to the paternal deity Rākibʾēl. This "God of the Fathers" for the royal dynasty of Yaʾudi/ Samʾal bore a name describing a title, "the (divine) rider." Taken with the chariotry asserted in the inscriptions of the rulers of Yaʾudi/ Samʾal, this deity may be inferred to be an idealized charioteer to whom the family held a special devotion as a marker of identity. Within the totality of material presented thus far, paternal deities lie within the framework of lineal succession, both for the deceased fathers and the future progeny—in order to preserve the past through maintenance of the present and future divinely sanctioned or bestowed identity of a family.

Chapter Six

The "El" Traditions and the "God of the Fathers"

El, the mythologized father known from the corpus of texts at Ugarit, has long been regarded as the source of the theophoric element *ʾēl* in Israelite names. Such a conclusion bears several problems that have not been appropriately addressed thus far by scholars of the Hebrew Bible. The El traditions consist of the following points for investigation: 1) the word's etymology; 2) the use of *ʾēl/ʾil* in the general sense to mean "god" or "deity;" 3) El as a person referring to a specific deity. The final topic contains a sub-category treating the differing versions of this specific deity El. To be clear, here *person* refers to the classical usage of the term à la the Latin *persona* to describe the specific being and character of the deity El.[308]

Etymology

Whether as a specific deity or general divine term, the elusive etymology of *ʾēl/ʾil* has proven to be an enigmatic starting point for scholars of West Semitic religious traditions. "Much

[308] Persona (Lat.) or prosopon (Gk.) each permit me to write about El as a unique character beyond the general sense of deity without investing in a claim to the range or limitations of how divinity was understood in the ancient Near East. Different periods and regions may be nuanced beyond the present discussion.

ink has been expended on the problem of the etymology of *ilu*, *ʾēl* with no sure results except the emphasis of uncertainty."[309] In the time since Pope, not much has developed in terms of sorting out the etymology of *ʾēl/ʾil*. Pope's chapter treating the etymology of this term covers the history of the discussion and the various proposals given prior to 1955; rather than repeat the work of Pope, I will here highlight the most prominent of these uncertain etymologies. Though several etymologies for the name El have been proposed over the years, those related to "being at the front" (from the root *ʾy/wl*) present the strongest case: ram (אַיִל), chief, strong, lofty, and preeminent (from the root *ʾy/wl*). The breadth of possible meanings for this term has previously been sufficiently treated by Smith in the introduction to his work, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*.[310] The most likely choice as I see it should be the sense of "forerunner" or "predecessor." Because there are no other verbal forms that work off of a root from which אל is one morpheme, the strongest candidate on linguistic grounds for producing the term is the Akkadian *awīlu* ("citizen, first class").[311] Ultimately, nothing conclusive can be asserted based on the various proposed etymologies of the name alone, though the tradition recognizing the "first" or "prime" fits the contextual presentation of the *ʾilu* tradition.

Use of ʾēl/ʾil *(*אל*) in the General Sense of Deity*

[309] Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, (Leiden: Brill, 1955), 16.

[310] See Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 7.

[311] This argument employs the common *w* to *y* shift commonly attested between the East and South Semitic *w* to the Northwest Semitic (Aramaic, Phoenician, Hebrew), *y*. The end product *awīlu* → *ayīlu* → *ēīlu* → *ilu*. There are of course problems with this conclusion; namely, how might we account for this shift in Akkadian literature as *ilu*? Would *ilu* be a Northwest Semitic reflecting older family religion that entered into the life of sedentary Mesopotamian civilization at an early stage? In its Akkadian form, the *i* in *ilu* is a short vowel, though Dhorme has argued it is a long vowel based on a plene account in an Amorite text (*i-il*); see the discussion in Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, 16. It is worth mentioning here that the Syriac orthographical tradition for El (*ʾyl*) reflects such a shift (to which we may further ask, is the *y* [*yod*] of the term part of the root or a mater lectionis vowel inserted to clarify the length of the e-class vowel?).

The earliest attested uses of the term *ʾēl/ʾil* (אל) comes from the East Semitic Akkadian traditions of Mesopotamia where it is used to convey the general sense of deity. As a term, *ilu* in Akkadian literature predominantly means "god" or "deity," though it can also refer to powers or persons within the realm of the divine and never is it used to mean El as a person. The Sumerian logogram used to represented *ilu* also represents the Sumerian deity AN, expressed as Anu in Akkadian. The conceptual commonality between the specific god Anu and the general sense of *deity* more than likely found in the notion that divinity as being "high" or "lofty," and generally found in the sky.[312] The Sumerian AN means "sky" and when written logographically to specifically mean "sky" is rendered by the Akkadian *šamû* (cf. Heb. *šāmayim* שמים).

In the term's Akkadian usage, *ilu* is regularly thought to convey the sense of a personal god without specifically naming that god. Leo Oppenheim considered *ilum* to be a protective spirit or demon (in the classical sense, à la *daimon*), linking the usage of the term with more readily identifiable protective spirits *lamassu* and *šēdu*.[313] As a term, *ilu* connoted the personal god, "a god passed down from father to son and standing presumably in a life-long relationship to the individual and his family."[314] In other words, the term *ilu* is the paternal deity or god of the father for anyone and everyone in the ancient Near East for the very reason that this term possesses the quality of substitutability for the name of one's paternal deity. The nuance is even

[312] See the discussion in Ch. 2 of this study and Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, 2-5.

[313] See A. Leo Oppenheim and Erica Reiner, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977) 199-200. In commenting on the supernatural power accompanying prayers of the ancient Mesopotamians, Oppenheim asserts that "when only one such power is referred to, it is called *ilu* (god), but at times it is called *lamassu*, for which one may use—as a kenning rather than as a translation—the term angel. Ilu is masculine, *lamassu* is feminine. Both appear frequently with companion spirits, *ilu* with *išaru* (goddess), *lamassu* with *šēdu*, who is masculine. At times, all four spirits are said to, or are requested to, protect their ward." (199).

[314] Di Vito, cited by Archi. *Ebla and Its Archives*, 642.

attested in the Pentateuch in Exodus 18:4: וְשֵׁם הָאֶחָד אֱלִיעֶזֶר כִּי־אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי בְּעֶזְרִי וַיַּצִּלֵנִי מֵחֶרֶב פַּרְעֹה, "and the name of the (other) one (was) Eliezar, for the God of my Father was my help and he delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh." The name Eliezar, literally "my god helps" is named such because of the implicit association of the *ʾēl/ʾil* with the paternal deity.

To echo Pope, the main reason to doubt the use of *ʾēl/ʾil* as initially the proper name El, was the lateness of specific references to the person of the god El in the textual remains, beginning with the Ugaritic archives and followed by the Northwest Semitic inscriptional tradition. The deity El as a person is a later development in Northwest Semitic tradition. Archi states emphatically that "during the third millennium El not only was not a creator god, but he was not even included in the pantheon."[315] This stands in sharp contrast to Cross who proposed that the Amorite theophoric *–il* names assertions of the god El as a specific deity.[316]

El as a Person

The mythological backdrop to El is important in ways that it is not for other deities of the ancient Near East by virtue of the fact that El's bi-form *ilu* simply means "god" or "deity." The only deities that are comparable to this case are perhaps Ištar and Hadad, whose names manifest according to the locale they inhabit. Lacking a specific mythology of El from the earliest attestations in Akkadian, we may ask how and when El emerged in the Northwest Semitic world as a specific deity possessing his own character and surrounding mythology.

El as a person is less clear in the Amorite world. Cross suggests one potential interpretation of an Amorite divine name from Mari as El: "From Mari comes the interesting

[315] Ibid., 654.

[316] According to Cross: "Frequently we find this element compounded with 'Il ('El): su-mu-la-AN /sumū (hu)-la-ʾil/ "'El is indeed his personal god": su-mu-AN /sumūʾil]/ "'El is his personal God": and so on." Cross compares this instance to the Hebrew name Samuel (שְׁמוּאֵל). Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 11.

name of a patriarchal deity of the Amorites (DINGIR.)*yakrub-il*, 'the god (or 'El) blesses.'"[317] The divine name here is indicated by the preceding divine determinative DINGIR,[318] but questions still remain as to the final *il* affixed to the end of the name. Asserting that this *il* refers to the person of the god El requires arguing that the suffixed *il* is used rather than a more generic logogram (DINGIR) in order to make clear that the one who blesses is El himself. Still, without a present mythological tradition the name most likely functions in the tradition of other Northwest Semitic theophoric names likewise found in the East Semitic world (e.g., *ra-bí-il* "the god increases," *iš-lul-il* "the god plunders[?]").[319] As noted earlier in Chapter Three, the Amorites frequently attest to a devotion toward Amurru the Amorite god (par excellence) among other devotions toward the Storm-god Adda and Dagan. The devotion to Amurru complicates the discussion surrounding the identity of a character El if van der Toorn is correct in his speculation that the Amorite term for "god" (^{d}AN) equates to Il or El (not Anu), such an instance seriously deserves considering the possibility of Amurru being an allomorph of El, according to van der Toorn.[320] A building inscription from Mari of Yahdun-Lim records the founding of the city by *ilum*: *ša ištu ūma ṣât ālam Mari ilum ibnû*, "from the days of long ago, *ilum* built the city of Mari." Abraham Malamat interprets *ilum* as the proper name of El, making El a bestower of places not unlike the gods who founded temples in the ancient Near East,[321] whereas Stephanie

[317] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 67.

[318] Cross uses the convention of the parenthetical Sumerian logogram to connote the superscripted *d*.

[319] For a survey of the theophoric *il* in names, see I.J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian, Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary* 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 28.

[320] Van der Toorn, *Household and Family Religion*, 31.

[321] The most widely cited example is observed in the Enuma Eliš, which records the bestowal of the temple in Babylon by Marduk and the construction of the city by the gods.

Dalley however takes the passage to refer to Itur-wer, the first king of Mari who was deified after his death.[322] At Ebla however, there is no evidence to point to a person of the deity El as noted by Archi, citing Robert Di Vito that the element il is just the writing of the common noun *ilum*.[323] To reiterate the problem, El was not a specific deity during the third millennium BCE nor included in Amorite pantheons.[324]

At Ugarit, *il* is used for both the general designation "god" as well as the specific person, the god El, better rendered by the local ʾIlu[325]. As a person, Cross considers the ʾIlu of Ugarit to be the "deity par excellence."[326] Several myths from Ugarit testify to the character of El, such as the KTU 1.114 (the *marzihu* text), KTU 1.23 sometimes known as "The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods" or "Shahar and Shalim,"[327] the fragmentary story about birth-giving in the wilderness (KTU 1.12), but most notable and prolific among these is the Baal Cycle.

The **Baal Cycle** is comprised of six tablets (KTU 1.1-1.6) treating the decline of an aging deity (El) with the emergence of the Storm god, Baal.[328] It is not known precisely how many

[322] See the discussion in Victor Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992) 333.

[323] See Robert A. Di Vito, *Studies in Third Millennium Sumerian and Akkadian Personal Names: The Designation and Conception of the Personal God*, (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1993), 238-242. See also the discussion in Archi, *Ebla and Its Archives*, 648-655.

[324] Ibid.

[325] In its plural form, the term is also used to designate departed ancestors or "spirits" (see Theodore J. Lewis, "The Rapiuma" in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 196-205.

[326] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 13.

[327] Lewis, "The Birth of the Gracious Gods" in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 207.

[328] Baʿal, meaning "lord" or "the one above" is the title regularly given to Adda or Hadad, the storm god in Northwest Semitic rendering.

tablets in total formed this narrative of it is one narrative or several narratives.[329] The major theme emanating from El's character in this story is one of a by-gone figure who uses paternal authority in support of his alliance against an upstart rival (Baal).There is little to El's character other than being a facet of antiquity, old and opposing change initiated by the protagonist Baal. It is no wonder then why scholars of Ugaritic would refer to this collection as the Baal Cycle rather than the El Cycle.

Another important text (KTU 1.114) for the study of the person of El (and perhaps funerary ritual) comes in the form of the *marziḥu* "feast," an enigmatic text depicting a drunken El followed by what has been thought of as a cure for a hangover.[330] During the festival encountered in *marziḥu* text, El is the chief celebrant of the feast who begins the text by "slaughtering game in his house." The scene follows with the gods drinking and reveling. In this text, the doorman yells to El "his father" before El sits in his *marziḥu*, drinking copious amounts of wine until he is utterly satiated. If the text has any association with funerary rituals, the rite would place El the father figure as the orchestrator of transition for the departed from one world to the next.[331]

In KTU 1.23, El is depicted as an old man who impregnates women who subsequently bear children, the gods Dawn and Dust and the "*Gracious* Gods." Theodore Lewis notes the differing positions taken in the scholarly world on this text, ranging from different types of festal

[329] Smith, "The Baal Cycle" in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 81.

[330] I am not at all convinced that this text is merely a myth and a hangover cure appended to the end. This conclusion, which has long been standard, is in the absence of any other data a good jumping off point for further discussion. Nevertheless, in my studies of healing ritual and pharmacopoeia from the region, this conclusion does not seem likely.

[331] This *marziḥu* is commonly associated with Jer 16:5. See Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989); Pardee, "Marziḥu, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult," 273-287; Pope, "The Cult of the Dead at Ugarit," 159-179; MacLaughlin, *The Marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature: References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

liturgies to cures for impotence. The text does contain performative instructions, suggesting its use for a broader audience.[332] El's role in this text consists of a detailed, suggestively raunchy, account of his preparation for intercourse and a command to the gods to search for food in light of the newborn gods' insatiable appetite. Both acts of El reflect that of a father figure, who because of his order commanding others to provide rather than himself suggests his age and inability to do so.

KTU 1.12 records a myth concerning deities who are cast out by El to bear beasts in the wilderness. The damaged state of the text does not help much in constructing a mythology of El. In this instance however, El decrees commands, and potentially pronounces the names of the offspring.[333] The text ends where the female deities are drawing water from the "spring of El" and "the deep of the house of the diviner." There is little to contribute mythologically to the tradition of El, and if not for the presents of other deities mentioned in the Baal Cycle, the text could just as easily refer to a deity in general.

---

[332] The instructional prompt necessitates cultic participation. *šbʿd yrgm ʿl ʿd wʿrbm tʿnyn* "Seven times it shall be exclaimed upon the Lute, and antiphonal response by ministrants." See Theodore J. Lewis, "The Birth of the Gracious Gods," in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 205-214 (esp. 208).

[333] Simon B. Parker accounts for both possibilities, though provides "the gods" as his primary translation. Lines 28-29 read: *ʾilm.ypʿr / šmthm* "let El/the gods proclaim their names." Interpreting the subject *ʾilm* as either the singular El or the plural "gods" depends on whether or not the *m* attached to *ʾil* should be taken as poetic mimation drawing attention to the subject (a frequent phenomenon in Akkadian poetry) or as a plural marker. I tend to agree with Parker's official translation rather than his footnote as the only major force of El that survives in this text is his expulsion of these lesser gods from his presence; thus, "the gods" naming the offspring seem more appropriate than El providing names for them. Nevertheless, the use of the masculine in this case to describe the female deities is odd but not entirely uncommon. Furthermore, there is the matter of whether El is speaking or not. If he is, he would issue a jussive for himself in the third person to name the beasts. See Mark S. Smith, and Simon B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997). 188-191. When compared to the biblical tradition, the work of naming is ascribed to a lower-level being (Adam/*ʾādām*), suggesting that the translation of the Ugaritic text should similarly follow a lower-level order rather than an emphatic translation for El. While such a parallel tradition may be observable, it is by no means canon for the region; at Ugarit in the Baal Cycle for instance, El provides a name for Yamm in 1.1 IV 15, 17, 19 (cf. 29), and similarly Kothar declares the names of the weapons, effectively personifying them in 1.2 IV 11, 18 (also noted in Smith, *The Baal Cycle Vol. 1*, 154).

Different Versions of Person El

Not every account of the person of the god El is the same. From the Hittite world, the story of Elkunirša preserves a Semitic myth in the Hittite language. If this story is about the specific deity El (rather than a different deity named Elkunirša), it would be the oldest mythological account of the deity El. The name of the deity, Elkunirša, is unmistakably Semitic; the deity *ʾl qn arṣ* is attested several times in Phoenician (KAI 129)[334] and a later Aramaic inscription from Palmyra,[335] and the Hittite orthography parallels the Phoenician rendering[336]. If this narrative is taken in league with the later Ugaritic Baal Cycle—and note, the characters El, Athirat, and Baal, parallel with Elkunirša, Ašertu, and Baal of the Hittite account—then an argument can be made that the Elkunirša figure is an older character, yet the age of the character is not defined in the Elkunirša myth. Still, in the Hittite account Baal regards Elkunirša as his father. Though presented differently than the Ugaritic Baal Cycle, this Elkunirša is a father-figure like the El of the Ugaritic texts.

Is El an earth deity or a sky deity? In cuneiform literature, *ilu* is sometimes written with the DINGIR logogram. As noted above, this logogram can convey AN, "the sky," or DINGIR, "god" or "deity." Orthographically, a division of nuances may be feasible due to the fact that

[334] V. G, Levi, Della and Guzzo M. G. Amadasi, *Iscrizioni Puniche Della Tripolitania (1927-1967)*, (Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1987), IPT 18.

[335] Harald Ingholt et al, *Recueil Des Tessères De Palmyre*, (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1955), 220-223.

[336] For the Hittite *š* as a dental-alveolar fricative [s] or even palatal [ç], see Hoffner and Melchert, *Grammar of the Hittite Language*, 38. The precise pronunciation of Akkadian orthography has proven to be a complicated issue. See also Parpola, "The Alleged Middle/Neo-Assyrian Irregular Verb *NAṢṢ and the Assyrian Sound Change š > s." in *Assur: Monograph Journals of the Near East* 1:1, (Malibu, CA: Undena Publications, 1974): 2. Parpola in fact concludes that this shift represents a change in the phonological system of Neo-Assyrian, though the Hittite pronunciation of the graphemes suggests an earlier phenomenon (cf. the name *sargon* סרגן vs. *šarru-kīnu*). Additionally, this shift continues to this day in various Neo-Aramaic speaking villages from Northern Mesopotamia (cf. the /*s*/ the Jewish dialect from Zakho vs. the /*š*/ of the Walṭo-Ṭiyari dialect for the interdental [t̲]). In Neo-Assyrian orthography, ṣ at times reflects the palatal [ç] of modern Neo-Aramaic.

Semitic culture (especially of the Northwest Semitic variety) need not be dependent upon conceptual associations of nuances otherwise joined in Sumerian thought. The prevailing question from this example asks why then the AN (Akk. Anu) logogram is used to write out the general term for the personal deity *ilu* and what relationship if any may be pared with an earth deity. In support of El as a sky deity, a text from Ugarit (KTU 1.100:3, *ʾil.mbk nhrm.b ʿdt.thmtm*) identifies El's abode at the meeting point of the upper and lower cosmic oceans.[337] As previously discussed (see **Chapter Four**), the Luwian TÜNP inscription suggests the combination of El and Ea as the gods of the sky and the earth respectively. In light of the presentation of Ea in the KARATEPE inscription, this divine pair could be read as El and *ʾl qn arṣ* (Elkunirša), suggesting two different deities.

The Limitations of El's Power

Even within the mythological framework of El, El bears very little mythological substance save his role as father of the gods. El is a father figure (forerunner: *the prime*) who comes to represent the divinized world. The fact that the Akkadian rendering of the Sumerian AN is Anu and not *ilu* suggests that the West-Semitic El exists independent of the Mesopotamian religious tradition as there is little in the way of accretion from Anu towards El. Both characters serve as father of the gods[338] and the correlation of with the sky may be a reflection of El's etymology.

[337] Noted also in Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 136-137. Smith sees El's home as conceptualized in both terrestrial and cosmic terms through the imagery of the "tent" and the unity of the Ugaritic El with the Elkunirša myth. Smith contrasts the El tradition as an *astral* tradition vs. the Baal tradition as a *sky* tradition. I prefer to use the term *sky* with El (based on the logographic association) and reserve the imagery and tradition of the *storm* with Baal.

[338] Anu, while a father, is begotten. El on the other hand appears fatherless.

The point at which the person of the god El became significant is not entirely clear, but evidence points to the increasing prominence of the Storm-god under the influence of the Hittite Empire.[339] The personification of El thus is likely to have resulted in reaction to devotion to the Storm-god or Baalism. Fleming's analysis of Amorite personal names and the socio-political devotions to each deity (Hadad vs. Dagan) hints at this trend.[340] By the time that the Ugaritic literary corpus was being produced, the Baal Cycle conveys the usurpation of El by the upstart Storm-god Baal; in light of the present discussion, the Baal Cycle can be interpreted as a repudiation of familial religion in favor of trends set out by the Hittite Empire. Such a conclusion would foreshadow the work of Albertz and his assertions of the dynamics shifting family to state religion in the Israelite tradition. This observation is anticipated by Pope, who in writing about the Hurrian presence of Ugarit and the Hurrian devotion to Kumbari the father of the gods, sees a similar displacement: "For the Hurrians, Kumarbi, like El, was the father of the gods, but Hittite texts of about the 14th century B.C. or earlier mythologize the displacement of this god before the Storm-god, and the Ugaritic texts, we believe, do the same in regard to El and Baal."[341] Still, veneration to the Storm-god was not solely a Hittite phenomenon, as has previously been discussed in regard to Adad among the Amorites (see **Chapter Three**).

Determinative El

To the present discussion I will contribute a fourth category treating the topic of El as a determinative marker. Here I assert that orthographic Semitic *ʾēl/ʾil* (אל) quite often in Northwest

[339] This phenomenon may be connected to Schniedewind's ongoing work centered on locating the setting for storm imagery in the Psalms along the northern and coastal regions of the Levant where the local weather befits storm imagery more than the lower Levant and specifically the land of Israel.

[340] Fleming, "Household and Family Religion in Syria," 43-45.

[341] Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, 103-104.

Semitic languages functions in the same way that the Akkadian Sumerogram DINGIR does to indicate a divinity or divine force (as noted in previous chapters, this occurs in transcription and normalization as a superscripted "d": e.g., ^{d}UTU for Šamaš, the sun deity). In many instances from Northwest Semitic literature, to include the Hebrew Bible, reading a prefixed or suffixed *ʾēl/ʾil* (אל) as determinative indicating deity or a divine force provides more effective translations than previously rendered.

Smith approaches this conclusion in the introduction to his work, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, but ultimately avers arguing for a determinative use of El. This may be a result of the focus of his work targeting the eventual monotheism of the Hebrew Bible instead of the question of El language in the memory of the patriarchal narratives. Smith writes:

> A basic approach to this question would be to take an inventory of figures called "divine" (Akkadian *ilu*, Ugaritic *ʾil*, BH *ʾēl*). Such a list in different Semitic languages would turn up not only major deities but also a wide variety of other phenomena: monstrous cosmic enemies; demons; some living kings; dead kings or the dead more generally; deities' images and standards as well as standing stones; and other cultic items and places. In addition to words for "divine," Akkadian uses a special sign (called a "determinative") to mark divinity. The special sign for divinity applies not only to deities but also to many other phenomena such as demons, stars, the images of monstrous creatures, the determined order (*šimtu*), and legendary human heroes of old, such as Gilgamesh and Enkidu. On the whole, such an inventory suggests that divinity was attributed not only to major and minor deities but to a whole host of associated phenomena. It is further evident that distinctions were recognized among the figures and phenomena called "divine."[342]

Smith's observations emerge in response to a question posed to him by Victor Hurowitz while reading through a draft of his text *The Early History of God*: "what is an *ilu*?" The answer Smith provides is comprehensive, but here the question now shifts from "what is an *ilu*?" to "how

[342] In this passage, Smith cites numerous references in support of these examples. See Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 6.

might we read Northwest Semitic El literature, including the appropriate portions of the Hebrew Bible, in light of what an *ilu* is?"

The cultic apparatus is by its very nature a divine enterprise.[343] Thus, one may expect discussions of the divine world to include ancillary topics such as sacred space, cultic or ritual objects, and sacred rites. As such, a number of texts from the northern Levant and western Mesopotamia are likely candidates for bearing the determinative El marker. To illustrate, several of these instances from the early Syro-Anatolia milieu (the Hurrian and Amorite world) suggest that the determinative use of *il* was expressed vocally.

Old Assyrian (Kanesh)

In the witness formulae found in the Old Assyrian documents from Kanesh (c. 1900 BCE), the god Aššur is paired with Ilabrat as the *il abīni*, the "god of our father." Apart from personal names, Ilabrat was a minister to the god Anu (cf. the Sumerian deity Ninšubur).[344] Ilabrat is known as the messenger who was sent by the god Anu to inquire why the south wind ceased blowing.[345] What the name specifically means is not entirely clear, though it is possibly connected to the pluralitantum term *abrātu*, "humankind."[346] Cross notes Jacobsen as suggesting the name came from *il(i)abrātum*, "god of the people/folk."[347] Richard S. Hess speculates a connection in the formation of the name Il-abrat with biblical names like ʾēl šaddai, El Bethel,

[343] The cult becomes imbued with divinity. Ibid., 77.

[344] Black, et al, G*ods, Demons, and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*, 141.

[345] Charles R. Coulter, and Patricia Turner, *Encyclopedia of Ancient Deities*, (Jefferson, N.C: McFarland, 2012), 234.

[346] See *CAD* A 1, 62. Cf. Syr. *beryōṯō*.

[347] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 9.

and ʾēl ʿōlam.[348] Shlomo Izre'el states that such an etymology contributes to the symbolism of Ilabrat as the bridge between the divine world and man.[349] Ilabrat is normally written with the Sumerian logograms ^{d}NIN.ŠUBUR (^{d}ilabrat),[350] but also ^{d}*ì-li-ab-rat* (^{d}ilī-abrat).[351] If the proposals by Jacobsen and Hess are correct, the initial *il* or *ilī* serve as the vocalic determinatives that are supplemented in some written instances with an additional DINGIR determinative.

The Amorite World

This study has previously addressed the deity Amurru in the Amorite context. The name of the deity is written as both ^{d}MAR.TU (alternatively read, AN.MAR.TU) and ^{d}AN.MAR.TU respectively.[352] The second form contains two identical cuneiform signs, represented in transliteration as the divine determinative superscripted /*d*/ and the logogram AN. Still, some degree of orthographic confusion should be afforded. Although MAR.TU, the logographic name for the Amorites and synonymous with the Mesopotamian term for the "West" has no initial /*a*/ as the term Amurru, the initial AN could be a logographic attempt to counteract apheresis in the defective spelling.

An additional attestation from the Amorite world for the determinative use of *il* is found in the orthographic expression for the god of the city of Aleppo. This deity is recorded as both

[348] Hess, *Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 148.

[349] See the discussion in Shlomo Izre'el, *Adapa and the South Wind: Language Has the Power of Life and Death*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001), 118. If correct, this observation could operate in dialogue with Schloen's conclusion of an idealized father/ancestor, implying a bridge between the divine and human worlds.

[350] See *CAD* I/J, 64, 95.

[351] For the transcription, see for example Ferris J. Stephens, "Notes on Cappadocian Tablets." *JAOS* 46, (1926): 179–181.

[352] Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 90.

^{d}*ḫa-lab* and ^{d}*il-ḫa-lab*.[353] The first instance can be interpreted in two ways. If the sign that precedes the name of the city is interpreted as the logogram DINGIR, it can be read and vocalized as *il- ḫa-lab*; the second interpretation would be to vocalize *ḫa-lab* and recognize the cuneiform sign as a determinative marker indicating the divine status of the noun being determined. This second interpretation could also suggest the divinization or divine personification of the city of Aleppo, though such an instance may simply be a euphemistic way of articulating the notion of the "God of Aleppo."[354] No matter the case, the second example, ^{d}*il-ḫa-lab*, contains both the orthographic divine determinative and the vocalic pronunciation *il*, suggesting that the prefixed *il* functions as a vocalic determinative for this West Semitic tradition of pronouncing the name or title of the deity.

The vocalic pronunciation of the determinative is also observable in an Amorite rendition of the Hurrian deity Astabi (^{d}*aš-ta-bi*$_5$). In the Amorite version, the divine name takes a suffixed *il* determinative and is rendered, ^{d}*áš-da-bíl*.[355] The Semitic variation of the Hurrian deity includes a suffixed *il* affixed to the name Astabi. The orthographic initial determinative is complimented with the West Semitic vocalic determinative. To be sure, the vocalic determinative in this case is an oddity in light of other Hurrian deities in West Semitic

[353] Archi, *Ebla and Its Archives. Texts, History, and Society*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 2015), 627.

[354] Ibid. According to Archi, the name of the city can stand for the name of the god. Given this position, one may surmise Ebla's primary deity ^{d}*ku-ra* as reflecting the deity of the city (in general): cf. קריה. Ibid., 501-503, 619.

[355] Ibid. 602-605. Compare this with the phenomeon of theophory in the Hebrew Bible, where theophoric names carry either a prefixed or suffixed divine compnent.

transcription. A thorough investigation into the distribution of syllabic and logographic renderings of these divine names is in order, though the case of Astabi is a starting point.[356]

Ugarit

The textual corpus from Ugarit is ripe with examples of El names and titles.[357] Of these, two of the many portentous examples of the potential determinative use of *ʾil* are found in the titles *[ʾil] gṯr w yqr* "the Powerful and Honorable One" (KTU 1.108) and the *ʾil šiy* (Divine) Wilderness (KTU 1.12 22). In the example from KTU 1.108, the title is positioned immediately after [xxn] *yšt rpʾu mlk ʿlm* "[xxn] may *rpʾu* (that is, the "dead ancestor") the eternal king drink, where *[ʾil] gṯr w yqr* follows parallel to *rpʾu mlk ʿlm*. The phrase is then followed by two other instances prefixed with *ʾil* (*ʾil yṯb bʿttrt* ,"*ʾil* dwelling in Attarti," followed by *ʾil ṯpṭ bhdrʿy* "*ʾil* judge in/over Hadra'ay"). In total, three lines with the prefix *ʾil* are present, but the matter is complicated when the first of these lines is broken, the second has a word divider between *ʾil* and *yṯb*, and the third line shows no word divider between *ʾil* and *ṯpṭ*. The two options for interpreting the first phrase are then to equate the *rpʾu* specifically to *ʾil* or to take the prefix *ʾil* as a determinative marker showing these qualities of the *rpʾu* as divine.[358]

The second example is observed in the previously illustrated example from KTU 1.12 (see above) concerning the *ʾil šiy* or (Divine) Wilderness. The construction is formed from a prefixed *ʾil* followed by a word divider to the term "forest" *šiy* in line 22 of the text. Simon B. Parker translates the phrase as "god-awful wilderness" but notes an alternative reading as a

[356] This case is furthered by the phenomenon at Ebla where names ending in /iʔ/ can indicate the loss of a final element such as /l/. See Archi, *Ebla and Its Archives*, 648. Such names may be candidates for a suffixed *il*.

[357] For a comprehensive survey of the these names and titles, see Aicha Rahmouni, and J N. Ford, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts*, (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[358] A third, but less likely instance would be to equate the *rpʾu* with the specific person El.

topographical name, Il Shiy.[359] Del Olmo Lette and Sanmartín however translate the passage as the "divine desert."[360] Whether the location is itself mythical or the divine association attached to the brightness of the desert,[361] the context is an adjectival account syntactically necessitating a determinatival understanding of the use of the *ʾil* prefix.

A deity-list from Ugarit is highly suggestive for the determinative use of El. The list is comprised of names that possess either a prefixed or suffixed *ʾilu*. Pardee notes that this enigmatic text, KTU 1.65 (RS 4.474), has been subject to a "plethora of interpretations."[362] Of the first ten lines from the obverse side of the text, all but two of the lines have something to do with *ʾilu*. Two potential readings exist for the first three lines and will be discussed below. Lines 6-9 are of particular interest, potentially possessing suffixed (and presumably vocalic) determinative *il* markers.[363]

KTU 1.65	Translation	Pardee
(6) *ḫnn ʾil*	(Divine) Grace	the grace of *ʾIlu*
(7) *nṣbt ʾil*	(Divine) Uprightness	the solidity of *ʾIlu*
(8) *šlm ʾil*	(Divine) Peace	the well-being of *ʾIlu*
(9) *ʾil ḫš ʾil ndd**	(Divine) Mountain,[364] (Divine) Adad[365]	solicitous *ʾIlu*, active *ʾIlu*

[359] Parker, "The Wilderness" in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 189-191.

[360] *DULAT*, 798.

[361] Cf. Syr. *šʾy*, "to shine brightly" and *šehyā* "desert."

[362] Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 21.

[363] Ibid., 22-23.

[364] *DULAT Pt. I*, 412: "the God of the divine mountain." Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín compare *ḫš* with RS Akk. Mt. *ha-zi*, where at times the mountain is attested as bearing the divine determinative (cf. Ug 5 170:19).

[365] The *ʾa* and *n* look very similar in Ugaritic paleographic design. The difference between the characters is an additional stroke for *n*, which is how Pardee reads the text. Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín however read the text with the *ʾa*. While Pardee's interpretation most probably reflects the look of the text, *ndd* is an odd construction, whereas the divine mountain and Adad (perhaps a variant construction of Adad of the Mountain) preceding an invocation of *baʿal ṣapāni* and *baʿal ʾugrt* in line 10 is a better fit contextually.

To complement the examples from the obverse, the reverse portion of the text contains several other examples of the suffixed *ʾilu*. These examples are all prefixed with the preposition *b*. Pardee interprets these prepositions in an instrumental sense: e.g., "by El's blade," etc. Because the text is comprised of a list, how one interprets the prefixed *b* (the most versatile of all Semitic prepositions, both generally and specifically here at Ugarit) largely depends on how one understands the text as a whole. Pardee's interpretation is presumably based on the list comprising tools and instruments, positioning the interpretation "by" as the most natural. If, however, the text is a list of items to be sanctified in the course of a sacrificial liturgy,[366] translating the *b* as "on" would be the most appropriate in such a case.

KTU 1.65	Translation	Pardee[367]
(12) *bmrḥ ʾil*	*Upon the* (Divine) Blade	by *ʾIlu*'s blade
(13) *bnʾit ʾil*	… (Divine) Axe	by *ʾIlu*'s axe
(14) *bṣmd ʾil*	… (Divine) Yoke	by *ʾIlu*'s yoke
(15) *bdṯn ʾil*	… (Divine) Fat offering	by *ʾIlu*'s crusher
(16) *bšrp ʾil*	… (Divine) Fire	by *ʾIlu*'s flame
(17) *bknt ʾil*	… (Divine) Dais	by *ʾIlu*'s foundation
(18) *bġdyn ʿʾiˀl*	… (Divine) Gift[368]	by *ʾIlu*'s care

The final line of the text *ʿbˀn ʿʾilˀ* (line 19) is translated by Pardee as "did *ʾIlu* build," where Pardee takes the initial *ʿbˀn* as a verb (root: *bny*; cf. Heb. בנה) rather than the presumably more common expression "son (of)." Pardee does note that writing the III-y verb without the final {y}

[366] As with many texts from Ugarit, how one interprets the text is dependent upon what one believes the text to be. The alternative translation I have provided (mostly following *DULAT*), suggests a list progressing through the instruments of a liturgy, presumably being offered to the deities being mentioned in the text.

[367] Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 23.

[368] This term is unclear. Del Olmo Lette and Sanmartín list the term as a personal name; *DULAT*, 318. Here my translation follows the root *ġẓy*, where the *ẓ* and *d* work within the same phonological spectrum.

is an uncommon occurrence at Ugarit.[369] When such defective orthography is the case, it would reflect the verbal 3ms verbal form (*bānā*). How then might the first three lines of the text be translated? Lines 1-3: (1) *ʾil bn ʾil*, (2) *dr bn ʾil*, (3) *mpḫrt bn ʾil*. It is unlikely that the *bn* in these expressions is verbal; "the god (who) built the god," "the god (who) built the circle," and "the god (who) built the assembly." The upper edge of the tablet that Pardee interprets as the verbal use of *bn*, may be an indexical tag categorizing the list as those of the divine class.[370] In such an instance, one may interpret line one (*ʾil bn ʾil*) as a (albeit redundant) determinative marker. The strength of such an interpretation diminishes in light of other parallel passages from Ugarit. KTU 1.40 (RS 1.002) provides a parallel in several lines of an atonement rite, forming effectively the same three in parallel (lines 34 and 42): "Let it be given to the Father of the Sons of *ʾIlu*, let it be given to the Circle of the Sons of *ʾIlu*, to the Assembly of the Sons of *ʾIlu*." While there are several ways in which these titles may be translated, none of them easily work with the determinative use of *ʾil*. Further, the parallel list found in KTU 1.40 renders the first deity as the "Father of the Sons of *ʾilu*" (*ʾab bn ʾil*) and would suggest that the initial *ʾilu* mentioned at the start of the KTU 1.65 was to be understood as the divine person El, who himself is conceptualized as the divine ancestor or father-figure. The divine person El thus colors the reading of the remainder of the text so that the determinative use of *ʾil* is entirely neglected in interpretation.

[369] Ibid., 24.

[370] The use of *bn* "son of" in the Semitic languages (though the tradition is strongest in the Aramaic use of *br*) often designates a class of a thing.

An Example from the Northwest Semitic World

The corpus of Northwest Semitic inscriptions does not yield enough data to suggest a consistent tradition of determinative use of *ʾil*. There is however an instance in the Zakkur inscription that commemorates the deity Il-wer (*ʾlwr*). This deity is also rendered without the prefixed *ʾil*, and at places like Mari the deity is written as Mer, Wer (*we-er*) among the Cappadocian merchant Assyrian merchant, and Ber (^{d}*be-er*) in Middle and Late Assyrian texts.[371] The absence of the prefixed *ʾil* in personal names suggests a determinative reading for examples of Akkadian orthography; similarly, the presence of the prefixed *ʾil* in the Zakkur corpus suggests a determinatival function of the name for the Aramean community at Hamath.

The following chart consists of a proposed list of the determinative use of El throughout Syro-Anatolia and the lower Levant.

Language	Determinative *il* Form	Without Determinative *il*	Translation
Ugaritic	il šiy	šiy	divine wilderness
Amorite	^{d}*il-ḫa-lab*	^{d}*ḫa-lab*	Aleppo
Aramaic	ilwr	mr	Mer
Ugaritic	ʾl bn ʾl	bn ʾl	The Divine Ones
Hittite*	^{d}Elkunirsa	Elkunirsa	The Maker of Earth
Hurrian	^{d}*aš-ta-bíl*	^{d}*aš-ta-pi*	Astapi

Perceiving the World Divine

Smith's recognition of divine tiers, where different gods occupy specific spaces of the pantheon is an important observation that suggests that mundane qualities of the divine world exist right alongside the remarkable stories and characters of Ugaritic mythology.[372] Like the

[371] For an investigation into the deity Wer/Mer/Ber, see the discussion in Wilfred G Lambert, Andrew George, and Takayoshi Oshima, *Ancient Mesopotamian Religion and Mythology: Selected Essays*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2016), 74. The variable orthography of this name is merely a reflection of local traditions to articulate a labial consonant.

[372] Smith, *Memoirs of God*, 104.

mythological traditions of the ancient Near Eastern societies, the divine worlds reflect an elevated expression of the terrestrial existence. This observation bears important implications for the discussion of the divinized fathers, those once early beings who after experiencing the physical death are accorded divine determinatives in their commemorations.

A further area of interest marking the world of the divine come in the form of sanctified objects. Here the term sanctified better renders the reality lying behind certain objects of the cult that have undergone a sanctification process as opposed to a process of apotheotic deification. Like those deceased human beings who in their memory bear notice of their presence in the world of the divine by their prefixed divine determinative, objects of cultic interest too may bear the divine determinative. Such objects include but are not limited to: ^{d}*ḫuṭāru*, the staff or scepter; ^{d}*išpatu* the quiver; ^{d}*kakkabtu*, a star-shaped branding iron; ^{d}*urigallu*, the *Urigallu* standards; ^{d}*zaqiptu*, *Zaqiptu* standards (or perhaps, "impaling stakes").[373] These determinative-bearing cultic objects suggest both a process of sanctification for the object itself, but also the object's role within the divine realm replicated in the life of the temple.[374]

What then of these titles of El found throughout the patriarchal narratives of the Hebrew Bible? Rather than interpret these as titles of the person of the deity El, an alternative reading would render these various titles as titles of divinity and not necessarily attributes of El.

אל עלם	ʾēl ʿōlam	^{d}Olam	The Eternal One
אל ראי	ʾēl rōʾi	^{d}Roi	The Shepherd
אל עליון	ʾēl ʿelyon	^{d}Elyon	The Exalted One
אל שדי	ʾēl šaddai	^{d}Shaddai	The Companion

[373] See for example the list in Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Pantheon of Uruk During the Neo-Babylonian Period*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 351.

[374] To what degree the implications made here would reflect a later platonic or dualistic understanding of reality is not entirely definable. Nevertheless, this phenomenon diverges from later platonic or dualistic categories of reality specifically due to the participatory nature of these objects with both worlds. In other words, the staff, quiver, etc. do not exist *en theoria* abstractly; rather, they are divine material objects participating in both worlds.

These are titles, not of the character El (nor "manifestations" of El), but of the broader understanding of the deity of the patriarchs. These names have been important discussion pieces in identifying the "God of the Fathers."[375] In other words, a capitalized El is not appropriate, though a lower case el in construct or vocalic determinative that expresses an understanding of the/a deity serves as a better translation. The importance of these names is directly connected to their use in the patriarchal narratives. While the name ʾēl šaddai prevails not only in the patriarchal narratives, but permeate throughout the discourse of the Hebrew Bible, the other names occur once in the patriarchal narratives far more infrequently throughout the Hebrew Bible: *ʾēl ʿōlam* (Gen 21:33), *ʾēl rōʾi* (Gen 16:13), *ʾēl ʿelyon* (Gen 14:20).[376]

Another instance of interest is the sanctified object El Bethel. Twice in the Jacob cycle is the Bethel mentioned with a prefixed El. The first instance attests to the deity speaking and self-identifying:אָנֹכִי הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל אֲשֶׁר מָשַׁחְתָּ שָּׁם מַצֵּבָה אֲשֶׁר נָדַרְתָּ לִּי שָׁם נֶדֶר "I am the El (of) Bethel, where you anointed there a pillar, you made a vow to me there" (Gen 31:13a); this announcement is followed by a warning for Jacob to leave his present location in the north and return to Canaan. The initial self-identification phrase is traditionally interpreted in the construct, "I am the God of Bethel…" though an alternative rendering "I am the god Bethel" is not out of the question either. A third interpretation is suggested by the statement in Gen 35:7 where an

[375] Cross concludes that these epithets (e.g. *ʿolam*) as epithets belonging to the person of the deity El. Cross however does not come to this conclusion so easily in view of contrary expressions at places like Ugarit: *ʾil mlk* ("El the King") vs. *ʾil hdd* ("the god Haddu"). The simple solution to both of these is to read the ʾil in determinative usage: "The (divine) King" (referring to the High God) and "(divine) Haddu," See Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 49-50.

[376] The El Olam is also found in Pss 90:1-3, 93:2; Isa 26:4. See also the inscription from Serabit el-Khadim, ʾl d ʿlm, "El/the god who is eternal" in W.F. Albright, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and their Decipherment*, (Cambridge, MA: 1969), 6, 11, 42. Elyon is also present (without the prefixed El) in Ps 9:3.

etiology is given to explain the name of the place El-Bethel: וּיְבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ וַיִּקְרָא לַמָּקוֹם אֵל בֵּית־אֵל כִּי שָׁם נִגְלוּ אֵלָיו הָאֱלֹהִים בְּבָרְחוֹ מִפְּנֵי אָחִיו "and be built there an altar and he called the place El-Bethel, for there the gods (*ʾlōhîm*) were revealed[377] to him in his flight from his brother." In view of the determinative use of El, a third interpretation would be to take Gen 31:13 as "I am [d]Bethel…" and Gen 35:7 as "and he called the place [d]Bethel..." In the ancient Near East, and the Hittite world in particular, it is not irregular to see temples and their vessels personified and marked with the divine determinative.[378] Additionally, Bethel is a deity recorded elsewhere in the Northwest Semitic world, attested in the Akkadian Tell Tayinat version of the succession treaty of Esarhaddon[379] and later as the deity Baitylos noted by Philo of Byblos.[380]

Several other instances of divine naming occur outside the purview of the patriarchal narratives. These El-constructed names are infused in various genres of biblical literature and may reflect different settings for the presentation of the names. In some instances, the name better reflects a determinative and in other cases the instances better reflect a nominal construct chain. The El names comprising the best candidates for determinative names are manifold, and in several instances the nuance of the tradition does not effectively alter the inherited translation.

[377] Here is an instance in the Hebrew Bible where *ʾlōhîm* is used with a plural verb.

[378] Michael B. Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2013), 100.

[379] Written as [d]*ba-a-a-ti*-DINGIR. See the "Tell Tayinat of Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty" (JCS 64 091) in *SAA* 2 15, Ch. 2. Note a similar account in the treaty between Baalu of Tyre and Esarhaddon.

[380] Philo of Byblos, *The Phoenician History*, 809:23. There is evidence to support the notion of Phoenicians worshipping standing stones or stone habitations of a deity. See also Albert I. Baumgartner, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*, (Boston: Brill, 1981), 201-203.

Even though the meaning does not always change the way the passage is understood, the determinatival tradition is an important convention to recognize in reading the Hebrew Bible.[381]

The most prolific example is found in the name (or title) *ʾēl qannā* (*ʾēl qannō*) "The Jealous One," typically translated as "a jealous god."[382] This name occurs in two forms in biblical literature: אֵל קַנָּא *ʾēl qannā* and אֵל קַנּוֹא *ʾēl qannō*. The first divine title אֵל קַנָּא *ʾēl qannā* is limited to five instances in the books of the Pentateuch, namely Exodus and Deuteronomy. In four of these five instances, אֵל קַנָּא *ʾēl qannā* is paired with the phrase יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ "Yahweh, your god."

> יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קַנָּא "Yahweh, your god—The Jealous One" (Exod 20:4)
> כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, אֵשׁ אֹכְלָה הוּא אֵל קַנָּא "For Yahweh your god is a consuming fire—the Jealous One." (Deut 4:24)
> כִּי אָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, אֵל קַנָּא "For I am Yahweh your god, the Jealous One" (Deut 5:8)
> כִּי אֵל קַנָּא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּקִרְבֶּךָ "For the Jealous One, Yahweh your god is in your midst." (Deut 6:15)

In each of the aforementioned instances, אֵל קַנָּא *ʾēl qannā* is used as a name to qualify יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ "Yahweh, your god." The final example from the Pentateuch cites the adjective "jealous" as the name of Yahweh, followed by an equation with the determinatival name אֵל קַנָּא *ʾēl qannā* : כִּי יְהוָה קַנָּא שְׁמוֹ אֵל קַנָּא הוּא "for Yahweh, his name is Jealous; he is *ʾēl qannā* (Exod 34:14b).[383]

---

[381] The degree of the importance is gauged in one's purpose for encountering scripture at large. To illustrate, several variations persisting between the Greek New Testament and Syriac New Testament translations often illustrate the nuances born out in oral tradition translated and textualized in different languages. Here, the assumption is that the teachings of Jesus were first conveyed according to the Aramaic [i.e. Syriac] language and then textualized in Greek. These Greek texts were later written down in Syriac, though they were written maintaining the nuances of spoken Aramaic, such as idiomatic expressions and word play. While in many cases the meaning of the text slightly differs or conveys a cleverness not found in the Greek version, the essential meaning does not change enough to be of any consequence for the casual or devotional reader.

[382] Exod 20:4, 34:14; Deut 4:24, 5:8, 6:15; Jos 24:19, Nah 1:2. Compare with the verbal description of the deity as a "jealous" god: 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Eze 39:25; Joel 2:18, Zech 1:14, 8:2. Here I am translating according to the conventional translation "jealous" and not making any theological statement.

[383] The Hebrew Bible attests to a variant form of this name אֵל קַנּוֹא *El Qannō*, occurring twice in the biblical text (Josh 24:19 and Nah 1:2).

Other possible examples run throughout the Hebrew Bible, but are concentrated in certain collections of literature. From the Pentateuch, the book of Deuteronomy is home to several of these instances. The largest collection however is found in the Writings portion of biblical literature from the book of Psalms, followed by the book the prophetic literature where most instances are found in the book of Isaiah. The ritual or performative backdrop to these books indicates that these titles were likely to have been spoken aloud, and as such are more likely to have reflected the religious language of the community over the articulated language of the religion of the state.

Deuteronomy: "The Compassionate One" אֵל רַחוּם *ʾēl raḥūm* (Deut 4:31a), "The Faithful" הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן *ha-ʾēl ha-neʾemān* (Deut 7:9b), "The Great One" הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַגִּבֹּר *ha-ʾēl ha-gaddol ha-gibbor* (Deut 10:17), "The Faithful One" אֵל אֱמוּנָה *ʾēl ʾēmūnah* (Deut 32:4c), "The Stranger" אֵל נֵכָר *ʾēl nekar* (Deut 32:12b), "The Birth-giver" אֵל מְחֹלְלֶךָ *ʾēl meḥolilka* (Deut 32:18b), "The Upright(?)" אֵל יְשֻׁרוּן *ʾēl yĕšurūn* (Deut 33:26).

Psalms: "(Divine) Glory" אֵל-הַכָּבוֹד *ʾēl ha-kavod* (Ps 29:3), "The Truth" אֵל אֱמֶת *ʾēl ʾēmet* (Ps 31:6), "My Life" אֵל חַיָּי *ʾēl ḥayyāy* (Ps 42:9), "My Rocky Mountain" אֵל סַלְעִי *ʾēl salʿi* (Ps 42:10), "God Yahweh" אֵל אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה *ʾēl ʾelōhîm yahweh* (Ps 50:1a), "The God of Our Salvation" אֵל יְשׁוּעָתֵנוּ *ʾēl yĕšūʿatenu* (Ps 68:20), "The God of Israel" אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל *ʾēl yisrāʾel* (Ps 68:36); "The Heavens" אֵל הַשָּׁמָיִם *ʾēl ha-šāmāyim* (Ps 136:26).

Prophetic Literature: There is one instance in the Deuteronomistic History found in 1 Sam 2:3, "(Divine) Knowledge" אֵל דֵּעוֹת *ʾēl deʿōt*. Apart from two other instances in the Minor Prophets ("The One" אֵל אֶחָד *ʾēl eḥād* Mal 2:10, "The Awesome One" הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא *ha-ʾēl ha-gaddōl ha-gibbōr ha-nōra* Neh 9:32; cf. Deut 10:17), the rest of the potential readings are contained in the book of Isaiah: "The Holy One" הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ *ha-ʾēl haq-qadōš* (Isa 5:16), "The

Mighty" אֵל גִּבּוֹר *ʾēl gibbōr* (Isa 9:6), "The Righteous" אֵל-צַדִּיק *ʾēl ṣaddiq* (Isa 45:21), "The God of My Salvation" אֵל יְשׁוּעָתִי *ʾēl yĕšūʿati* (Isa 12:2). Noteworthy among these examples is the divine name, "The Mighty" אֵל גִּבּוֹר *ʾēl gibbor* (Isa 9:6) inserted within the larger name Pele-joez-el-gibbor-Abi-ad-sar-shalom. This theophoric name bears a divine marker like those from cuneiform literature that take the divine determinative.

The determinative use of *ʾēl* אל affords the opportunity to reexamine various portions of the Hebrew Bible without being bound to the Masoretic tradition. Lorenzo Vigano proposes several unique readings for the divine name in biblical literature. While not directly declaring the determinative use of El in the Hebrew Bible, Vigano asserts a number of alternative readings of the spelling אל based on the term's repointing from a *segol* אֶל to a *sērē* אֵל. Vigano's collection of names are constructed from both prefixed Els and suffixed Els. The suffixed names typically follow the pattern Yahweh-El, whereas the prefixed Els indicate El Yahweh and El Elohim.

Vigano's examples of "the full name of the god of Israel" consisting of the divine name (Yahweh) and the suffixed El occur in the literature of the Major Prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah. Contra the MT,[384] Vigano reads Isa 30:29b without the conventional pointing of the Masoretic tradition: ושמחת לבב כהולך בחליל לבוא בהר־**יהוה אֵל** (אֶל־)צור ישראל as "Rejoice in your heart as one walks to the sound of the flute, to reach the mountain of YHWH God, the Rock of Israel."[385] According to Vigano, צוּר is a commonly accepted title attributed to YHWH and must not be considered parallel to בְּהַר־יְהוָה, since this title never equates to the noun הַר in the Hebrew Bible,

[384] The MT reads וְשִׂמְחַת לֵבָב כַּהוֹלֵךְ בֶּחָלִיל לָבוֹא בְּהַר־יְהוָה אֶל־צוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל and according to such pointing is regularly translated, "and gladness of heart, as when one goes with the pipe to come into the mountain of the LORD, to the Rock of Israel."

[385] I have inserted the key difference between Vigano's rendering and the MT in bold.

except in Job 14:18 and 24:8, where it cannot be considered divine epithet.[386] He thus proposes the usage of צוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל as in 2 Sam 23:3 where it is parallel to אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, whereby the יְהוָה אֵל from Isaiah would form the full name of the God of Israel in parallel to צוּר יִשְׂרָאֵל. If Vigano is correct in his assertion, the instances of יְהוָה אֵל in the Hebrew Bible, along with those of a prefixed El tradition may be interpreted as determinative components of the divine name and not necessarily a reflection of the deity El.[387]

Conclusion: Naming the Gods

The basic pattern that leads to the personification of ideas and forces into a deity of a specific character begins with the observation of a property that becomes titularized over time. In time, the title accrues a mythology that defines the nature of the character bearing the title.

Property → Title → Name

The property may be a constitutive noun or it may be an attribute. As devotional traditions develop, the greater the devotional connection, the more one becomes familiar with the devotion, understanding its function in the divine realm and ultimately personifying the devotion to the deity. *Ilu* transitions from a generic term for deity employed for use in one's devotion to the personal (i.e. paternal) god into a term with its own mythology. In time, this tradition transitions from a variable term for a paternal deity to a specific deity by the name El who in becoming his own person or character embodies paternity, representing the quintessential ancestor figure.

[386] See Lorenzo Vigano, *Nomi E Titoli Yhwh Alla Luce Del Semitico Del Nord-Ovest*, (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 2.

[387] Vigano proposes a number of other examples. His methodology may be extended further to verses such as Josh 24:7 וַיִּצְעֲקוּ אֶל-יְהוָה where instead of crying to Yahweh אֶל-יְהוָה, the crowd invokes the name El-Yahweh אֵל יְהוָה. Rather than take this as a dual deity, one could take this as Yahweh in the determined form.

The range stretching from *ʾilu* to El runs the gamut of the paternal paradigm—the divine person El as a father god, *ʾil ʾib* as the emphatic divine ancestor, and *ʾilu* as a general term for personal/paternal deities. More importantly however, the earliest attestations of *ʾilu* display a personal or paternal deity without any specific mythological tradition. In time and under the shadow of the greater Hittite cultural influence where devotion to the Storm-god was especially prominent, *ʾilu* eventually developed a mythological tradition, transforming into the deity El. Even so, the mythological tradition that eventually did develop around El conveyed an old, often bumbling father figure.

To date, much of the interpretation surrounding El in the Hebrew Bible has been misinformed, failing to take into account the complex traditions behind the use of the term and name. Frank Moore Cross's conclusion that El was the Israelite "God of the Fathers" is only partially correct. To echo Albertz, Israelite Els have little in common with the bumbling father figure comprising the Ugaritic El other than the name.[388] Since the term *ʾilu* represented paternal deities, the use of *ʾēl* as *ʾilu* can support Cross's conclusion in that limited sense. Still, the divine person or character El is not the Israelite "God of the Fathers."

[388] Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, Vol. 1*, 32.

Chapter Seven

The "God of the Fathers" and the Narratives of the Patriarchs

Thus far, the paternal paradigm has been employed as a means of sorting out the legacy of the memory of fatherly identity in the myths and cultic perspectives of the ancient Near East at large and the Syro-Anatolian traditions among Indo-European Anatolians and local Semites in particular.[389] Moreover, the invocation of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible is, like the traditions of the Syro-Anatolian north, an appeal to divinely bestowed identity. The topic of identity extends beyond self-knowledge or self-awareness and proceeds to encompass issues of continuity with the fathers in the divine world, safeguarded by the god of one's fathers who protects and sustains the legacy of future progeny.[390]

[389] This study makes the assumption that the patriarchal narratives are all traditions of a northern (i.e., Syro-Anatolian) character. The source critical approach to the Pentateuch is of a lesser or secondary importance to this study.

[390] It was through the proximity of one's god, according to Albertz, that the personal deity protected them from external, superior groups (*A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Vol. 1*, 36)

The bulk of the primary attestations[391] of the "God of the Fathers" in the Hebrew Bible occur in the patriarchal narratives of the book of Genesis, punctuated by the revelation of the divine name as the "God of the Fathers" in the Sinai narrative of Exodus (Ex 3:6-16, cf. 6:3). As noted previously in this study, Thompson sees these instances as uniting smaller chain narratives by common language referring to the God of the ancestor.[392] The importance of the investigation is not whether or not such rhetoric linked anything, but why such rhetoric was used in the first place. The concern of the patriarchal narratives focuses on the question of identity of the ancestors as a common bond framing the memory of the community. Thus, the question of the "God of the Fathers" is more so a question of the identity of Israel (i.e., the Children of Israel) as a people than a question of which specific deity (if such a thing can be ascertained) the community worshipped.

Framing the Patriarchal Narratives

The need to forge a common identity of a unified people historically arose in the eighth century BCE. The Assyrian westward expansion forced refugees from the Northern Kingdom of Israel into Judah, swelling the size of Jerusalem and increasing the diversity of cultic traditions. It was against this setting that Hezekiah enacted his cult reforms, standardizing the devotion of Yahweh at Jerusalem. Standardization required utilizing the language and ritual traditions that would have been familiar to those more closely aligned with religion of the household rather than solely the religious traditions of the state. The influx of refugees from the Northern

[391] These refer the unique constructions found in the patriarchal narratives and the use of the term in Exodus Ch. 3 to reveal the divine name Yahweh. Here the term "primary" is preferred instead of any term that may elicit a discussion on the dating of texts; the primary quality of the constructions comprise the necessary conditions from which all subsequent permutations of paternal divine language are articulated in the biblical literature. These distinctions have been previously outlined in May, "The God of My Father—A Study of Patriarchal Religion," *JBR* 9:3, (August, 1941): 155-158; and Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *RHR* 110 (1934): 29.

[392] Thompson, *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel*, 171.

Kingdom into Jerusalem presented the officials of the Yahwistic cult the opportunity to weave together the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph into a single narrative binding the northern religious ideas with those of Yahwism centered in Jerusalem.

The patriarchal narratives begin with a *kispu* like commemoration of the ancestors in the second portion of Gen 11 (vv. 10-26) as the transition point between the primeval history and the patriarchal narratives. Previous scholarship has focused on secondary features of the patriarchal narratives. Thompson's notion of the genealogical *Toledoth* structure linking narrative chains of the Pentateuch approaches the name recitation as a literary device rather than a memorial device. To be sure, the genealogies of Genesis have gone through the textualization process and frame the chronology of the broader narrative of the patriarchs.[393] Nevertheless, the genealogies of the book of Genesis, and particularly here in Gen 11:10-26, connect the departed past with those who would commemorate the names of the genealogy (be it oral-liturgical or textual commemoration) to the same end as the *kispu* recitation of the ancestors. The names of the ancestors of Abraham are invoked by their placement in the text connecting the narrative tradition of the patriarchs with the specific cultural and geographic region of Syro-Anatolia (see **Chapter One**).

Allusions to the Paternal Deity in the Abraham Narratives

Not surprisingly, the Abraham narratives do not invoke any variant of the title "God of the Father," due to Abraham being reckoned as the father of the faith community. The Abraham narratives (Gen 12-25) follow Abraham's departure from the Syro-Anatolian north and

[393] See also the observation by Jonker, noting "the written word ceased being used exclusively as a support for oral tradition and became in itself the starting point for tradition" (*The Topography of Remembrance*, 92). Jonker's comments come in regard to the tradition of *narû* literature—literature of the stone inscriptional tradition. This sort of transition requires stable, fortified societies for large scale stone production; transition to mobile (i.e. scroll) textualization serves as an alternative to the production of monumental literature.

immigration to the land of Canaan (the lower Levant), where the proliferation of Abraham's descendants and the promises of their inheritance of land clams are prevailing themes. While the Abraham narratives do not invoke the title "God of the Fathers," they still convey the force of the Syro-Anatolian identity of the patriarchs and employ titles for the deity that provide clues for the investigation of the identity of the later-defined "God of the Fathers" and the backdrop to the mindset of the religion of the patriarchs.

The El names of interest to scholars of ancient Israelite religion all belong to the text of the Abraham narratives. As noted in the previous chapter, these names have regularly been regarded as local manifestations of the specific god El, though a reinterpretation is in order. The first instance is found in the El name "*ʾēl ʿelyon*" (Gen 14:18-22) during Abraham's encounter with the Melchizedek of Salem, who is described as a priest of ʾēl ʿelyon. The phrasing used to describe *ʾēl ʿelyon* conjures up imagery from the Syro-Anatolian tradition. Verses 19 and 22 each render the phrase אֵל עֶלְיוֹן קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ "*ʾēl ʿelyon*, maker of heaven and earth." The deity Elyon is attested at Ugarit, though without the nominal particularizing suffix *–ān*.[394] In syllabic Ugaritic, this deity is attested as ^{d}*a(?)-li-yi* (PRU 6 55:4).[395] In the eighth century BCE Sefire inscription from Arpad (Northern Syria in the environs of Aleppo), El and Elyon are commemorated together as two separate deities in a long list of divine witnesses.[396] The two

[394] The form here is written *–ān* in order to mark the long [ā] of Semitic languages and presumably the form as it would have been attested at Ugarit, without the Canaanite shift that prevails in the Hebrew form viz. *–ōn*; (cf. Elyon).

[395] See John Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*., (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 160. See also the entry for *ʿly* in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DULAT*, 161.

[396] The text of Sefire, where it is readable, invokes the witness of the following deities: (7b) "before … (8) and MLX, and before Marduk and Zarpanit, and before Nabu and Tashmet, and before Irra and Nusk, (9) and before Nergal and Lac, and before Shamash and Nur, and before Sin and Nikkal … (10) and before NKR and KD'H, and before all the gods of the open country and the cultivated ground, and before Hadad of (11) Aleppo, and before the Seven (presumably the Pleiades), and before El and Elyon, and before Heaven and Earth, and before the Deep (12)

divine forces that follow El and Elyon are Heaven and Earth, suggesting a proximate connection between these deities with these divine forces; even though these deities and divine forces are mentioned among 20 or so deities (the text breaks at a certain point so it is not known how many divine witnesses were named), the nearness of these forces is especially suggestive in light of the Gen. 14:18-22 passage that equates these separate forces as one.

Not much is known about the person of the deity *Elyon*, though Philo of Byblos (64-141 C.E.) provides an approximation between the Phoenician deities and those of the Hellenistic world. The order of the deities presented by Philo parallels the order of certain god lists found at the city of Ugarit. Philo's list runs according to the following order: 1) *Elioûn*, 2) *Gê, Ouranos*, 3) *Elos/Kronos*, 4) the seven daughters,[397] 5) *Dagōn*.[398] The Ugaritic god list (KTU 1.148/RS 24.643:23-45) proceeds with a similar order: 1) *ʾilʾib* "the God of the Father," 2) *arṣ w šmm* "Earth and Heaven," 3) *ʾil* "El," 4) *kṯrt* "Kathirat," 5) *dgn* "Dagan."[399] According to Archi, the first two sets of deities (if Earth and Heaven are a divine pair), enter the Ugaritic tradition through Hurrian influence[400]. The construction of the divine name in Gen 14:18-22 could arguably have reflected the plurality of the deities prior to being redacted to reflect Yahweh

and the Springs, and before Day and Night. Witnesses all you gods of KTK and all you gods of Arpad." John C.L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syriac Semitic Inscriptions*, Vol. 2, 29.

[397] For a provoking discussion on the seven deities in the ancient Near East, see Lorenzo Verderame "Pleiades in Ancient Mesopotamia," *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 16:4 (2016): 109-117.

[398] Noted in Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 23. See also Philo of Byblos [and Harold W. Attridge], *The Phoenician History*, (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 46-55.

[399] Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, 23.

[400] See Archi, "How a Pantheon Forms: The Cases of Hattian-hittite [*sic*] Anatolia and Ebla of the 3rd Millenium [*sic*] B.C." in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen Zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien Und Dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposion Hamburg, 17.-21. März 1990*, eds. Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm, (Freiburg: Universitätsvelag, 1993), 15.

(whether such a redaction would have originally been oral or textual). The second part of the statement about *ʾēl ʿelyon*'s identity, "Maker of Heaven and Earth," is recognizable from the deity mentioned in Phoenician version of the Karatepe inscription, *ʾl qn ʾrṣ* "El maker of Earth" and equated with the deity Ea in the Luwian version. This deity is also the one recognized from Hittite inscriptions as Elkunirša.

Text	Deity Pairings		Qualifier	(Deity) Pairings	
Gen 14:9	El-Elyon		"Maker of…"	Heaven	Earth
Gen 24:3	-	-	"God of…" (x2)	Heaven	Earth
Sefire	El	Elyon	-	Heaven	Earth
Karatepe (Ph)	El	*	"Maker of…"	-	Earth
Karatepe (Luw)	**	Ea	(God of the Earth)		
TÜNP	El	Ea	-	Heaven	Earth

The relationship between the god pairs in the inscriptional literature is not entirely clear in light of the Luwian presentation of the texts. The Phoenician version of the Karatepe inscription equates "El Maker of Earth" with Ea the deity of the earth. In the TÜNP inscription, El and Ea are paired preceding Heaven and Earth, similar to the language of Sefire. Nothing conclusive can be drawn from this data, save the inference that Heaven and Earth form an expression of totality; thus, El and Elyon (or El and Ea) may similarly reflect language expressing totality.[401]

ʾēl rōʾi אל ראי (Gen 16:13), typically translated as "God (who) sees" or read with the determinative El simply "the Seeing One," occurs once in the Hebrew Bible and was not spoken of by a patriarch, but by Hagar on her encounter with the messenger of Yahweh's annunciation that she would bear Ishmael. Hagar's recognition of the deity by this name operates in concert with the following verse's etiology of the place name *Beʾer-Laḥai-Roi* בְּאֵר לַחַי רֹאִי, the "Well of

[401] Also note the divine pair of Gen 24:3, where Heaven and Earth serve as divine witnesses. "And I will make you swear by Yahweh: the God of Heaven (אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם), and the God of Earth (וֵאלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ)."

the Living One (who) Sees" (Gen 16:14). Either the story of Hagar's encounter with the deity was used as a foil for the etiological explanation of the place name, or the place name etiology was later appended to the story by a redactor. Hagar's choice to label the deity as the "Seeing One," may be a reflex of her Egyptian heritage; אל ראי *ʾēl rōʾi*, mentioned nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible, may be a euphemistic title for the all-seeing Egyptian solar deity.[402] While the general theme of an all-seeing deity or a deity that sees is also implicit in the broader Near East,[403] the presentation of the deity in this manner by the Egyptian Hagar may be pointing to a presentation of a well-known Egyptian paternal deity more so than describing the deity as experienced by Abraham.

During the establishment of a covenant with Abram, the deity reveals himself by another El name, אל שדי *ʾēl šaddai*, regularly translated as "God Almighty" (Gen 17:1). The self-revelation of the divine begins with the common EGO statement of the major inscriptional traditions of the region, whereby the first person declaration proclaims the name of the being. The three other El names of the Abraham Cycle are spoken by the messenger of Yahweh (*ʾēl rōʾi*), Melchizedek (*ʾēl ʿelyon*), and Abraham (*ʾēl ʿōlam*). It is also in this pericope that that Abram is renamed Abraham (Gen 17:5; Sarai is also renamed Sarah in v. 15), followed by the

---

[402] See for example, the discussion in Mark Smith, *Following Osiris: Perspectives on the Osirian Afterlife from Four Millennia*, (Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2017), 275. In addressing the features of Amarna religion, Smith remarks that "it concentrates very much upon what is visible, what can be apprehended or perceived by the senses. The light of the sun and its life-giving properties are stressed again and again. As a consequence of the fact that so much emphasis is given to the visible aspect of the celestial body, texts of the Amarna Period contain numerous references to the eyes and faces of those who view the sun disk, many different words for light and brightness, and a wide range of terms to denote the acts of seeing and beholding."

[403] This has been proposed by Benjamin Foster for the sun-deity Shamash: see Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005), 531; also Benjamin R. Foster, *The Age of Agade: Inventing Empire in Ancient Mesopotamia*., (New York, NY : Routledge, 2016), 136. In describing Shamash, Foster states: "The sun as a radiant, all-seeing lord, high above the human race, was also the judge of the universe, whom no subterfuge could deceive."

deity's promise to sustain the patrilineal descent of Abraham along with the paternal deity besowing upon Abraham claims of land ownership.[404] Unlike the other El names, *ʾēl šaddai* is ubiquitous in both the patriarchal narratives of the book of Genesis and throughout the Hebrew Bible. *ʾēl šaddai* remerges in the Jacob Cycle; this designation will later prove to be a name central to the identity of patriarchal devotion during the transformation of this tradition to the tradition of Yahweh in Exodus 6:3.

As an El name, *ʾēl ʿōlam* (El eternal, or "the Eternal One") is mentioned once in the patriarchal narratives (21:33), but alluded to outside the book of Genesis. These allusions are few and generally confined to the liturgical texts of the Psalms and the song in Isaiah 26. Ps 93:2b records מֵעוֹלָם אָתָּה "you are from eternity" to describe the deity. Eternity is however not a quality limited to deities with El names, as the same epithet is ascribed to the sun deity at both Ugarit (KTU 2.42 7) and the Karatepe inscription (see **Chapter Four**). Additionally, the term is ascribed in parallel with a divinized king at Ugarit (KTU 1.108 1).[405]

The Abraham narratives introduce Isaac as a brief fulcrum to shift the patriarchal narratives into the Jacob cycle. In Genesis 24, the continued importance of the Syro-Anatolian identity of the patriarchs is expressed in Abraham's desire for his son Isaac to marry an Aramean from the north and after Abraham's death, his burial in the field of a Hittite (Gen 25:9). Abraham sends Isaac to Aram-Naharaim, where he meets and marries Rebecca, the sister of Laban the Aramean. Almost immediately into the Isaac narrative, the twins Esau and Jacob are introduced

[404] The name El Shaddai has a long history of interpretation. In the twentieth century, Albright states that the original form was Shaddai (sans El), only later followed by a form formal rendition as El Shaddai. See Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram." *JBL* 54:4, (1935): 180. Additionally, Albertz notes that three theophoric names bear the name Shaddai (*A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Vol. 1*, 30-31.)

[405] Pope, "The Status of El at Ugarit," *UF* 19 (1987): 219-230.

into the narrative. As noted in Chapter One, the use of *twins* as a character device is a hallmark of Indo-European story-telling that stretches across an expansive geographic region for the Indo-European peoples.[406]

Genesis 26

The Jacob Cycle introduces the first mention of a paternal deity in Genesis 26:24-25: Within v. 24 is the statement, וַיֹּאמֶר אָנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אָבִיךָ, "and he said, I am the god (*ʾlōhēi*) Abraham your father." Here too the self-identification of the deity follows the EGO statement invoking the title, "God of Abraham, your father." Genesis 26 tells the story of Isaac's dwelling in Gerar. His ascent to Beer-Sheba was met by the revelation of the god of Abraham, his father. The story consists of several topographical etiologies that may have accrued numerous emendations in later periods. The mention of the paternal deity is juxtaposed with the building of an altar and the establishment of a covenant. Here, the appearance of the "God of Abraham your father" reiterates the blessing of *ʾēl šaddai* given to Abraham previously (Gen 17:1-8), reinforcing the role of the paternal deity in the maintenance of one's identity throughout multiple generations.

The use of the term *ʾlōhēi* Abraham in the chapter following Abraham's death is intriguing in light of terminology from Ugaritic, where *ʾlh* refers to a deceased ancestor. Contextually (even assuming the identification of the deity as Yahweh being a redacted insertion), the passage only makes sense if *ʾlōhēi* Abraham is understood as "the god whom Abraham worshipped," as the passage goes on to describe Abraham as the servant of the deity.

Given that Abraham's death occurs in the previous chapter and in light of the differing foci of the paternal paradigm, the term *ʾlōhēi* in this context deserves another look. Taken in its

[406] See Chapter One of this dissertation.

secondary definition, *ʾelōhēi* could potentially (though less likely[407]) refer to the "divinized" ghost or spirit of Abraham as was the case of the appearance of a divinized Samuel referred to as *ʾelōhîm* (cf. 1 Sam 28:13-14). While an unlikely interpretation, the question of how the term *ʾelōhîm* transitioned from a reference to a deceased, divinized ancestor to the Hebrew word for "god" has been a long discussed problem.

One useful solution within the context of the paternal deity comes from the Deir Alla inscription. The inscription was originally written on plaster with black and red ink, where the text had fallen off the wall and landed on the floor most likely due to an earthquake.[408] In the inscription, Balaam, son of Beor has "a vision like an oracle of *ʾēl*."[409] In the inscription, Balaam explains to his kinsmen (עמה) why he is fasting and crying: שבו אחוכם מה שד[ין פעלו] ולכו ראו פעלת אלהן אל[ה]ן אתיחדו ונצבו שדין מועד "Sit down! I shall inform you what the *šadd(a)in* have done. Now come, see the work of the *gods* (*ēlāhin* אלהן, plural of *ʾēlāh*). The *gods* אתיחדו "became one," and the *šadd(a)in* positioned themselves (i.e., "took their spots; stood") in the *sacred* assembly."[410] The prophecy of this Balaam may reflect the prophetic life of the non-Israelite prophet mentioned in the book of Numbers. If *ʾēlāhin* אלהן are taken in the secondary connotation to reflect divinized beings (apart from the more common notion of "gods"), the

[407] This would require taking the final portion of the verse בַּעֲבוּר אַבְרָהָם עַבְדִּי "on account of Abraham, my servant" as a later emendation to the *uhr* phrase.

[408] Shmuel Ahituv, *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period*, (Jerusalem: Carta, 2009), 433. See also Jo Ann Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir ᶜallā*. (Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1984); J. Hoftijzer, and G . Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'alla*, (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

[409] KAI 312:2. Here I opt for ambiguity in my transliteration, where the text could refer to the oracle of a paternal deity or of the divine person El.

[410] This verbal pattern is a reflexive of the root אחד/יחד, referring to oneness. Other translations have rendered the term "gathered," which would be a peculiar formation in light of the extant verbs meaning "to gather." See for example Rendsburg, "The Dialect of the Deir ʿAlla Inscription." *Biblioteca Orientalia* 50 (1993): 316.

inscription implies that these departed, divinized ancestors, who without *kispu* or *pagrû* traditions, went unnamed and "became one" in the divine realm. The juxtaposition of the *ʾēlāhin* with the *šadd(a)in,* the protective deity/spirit/supernatural force suggests a shift in attitude toward these terms as they were used in the lower Levant. In the case of this inscription reflecting actual cultic trends in the region, *ʾelōhîm* that had *become one* would best render the translation "divinity" in the abstract sense, but "god" in the practical sense.

Tacked on to the end of the chapter, as a pivot for introducing the beguiling of Esau in the following chapter, is the sentence "And when Esau was forty years old, he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite (הַחִתִּי), and Basemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite (הַחִתִּי). And they were a bitterness of spirit unto Isaac and to Rebekah" (Gen 26:34-35). Here the passage alludes to an implicit rivalry between the Aramean Rebekah and the Luwian (biblical "Hittite") wives of her son Esau as the reason for Rebekah's bitterness of spirit (מֹרַת רוּחַ).

Genesis 28

Chapter 28 of Genesis begins with Isaac sending Jacob away to find himself a wife. Jacob proceeds to the north, to the region of Paddan-Aram to take a wife from the daughters of his maternal uncle Laban. In going back to the north of his family heritage, Isaac begins the blessing he bestows upon Jacob in v. 3 with the following words, "and may *ʾēl šaddai* bless you" (וְאֵל שַׁדַּי יְבָרֵךְ אֹתְךָ)." Previously in Gen 17:1, the divine presence revealed himself as *ʾēl šaddai* and charged Abraham to walk before him. In this verse, it is Isaac who blesses his son Jacob by the name revealed to Abraham. Previously, I proposed that these El names need not always be ascribed to titles of the person of the god El, but determinative markers that indicate the sanctity of the noun being expressed. The translation of *Shaddai* is traditionally rendered "Almighty" (following the LXX, "Pantocrator"). Several other etymologies have been proposed over the

years, from breasts to mountains.[411] A less cited suggestion is the protective spirit, known in Akkadian literature as *šēdu*.[412] Contra the standard "God Almighty" or more conservative *ʾēl šaddai*, Gen 28:3 may be interpreted as "and may the (divine) *šēdu* (protective spirit) bless you," etc. Such an interpretation fits the understanding of Oppenheim and his conclusion that in Mesopotamia the *šēdu* were effectively equivalent to the *ilu* tradition (See **Chapter Six**). This blessing binds the legacy of the forerunner Abraham with Jacob and his own future lineage through the topic of land inheritance. Additionally, the interpretation of *ʾēl šaddai* in this manner would provide another instance of the EGO statement (cf. Gen. 17:1) self-identifying with a title (cf. "the God of Abraham, your father;" Gen. 26:24) rather than a specific name.

The topic of land inheritance proceeds further when Jacob sets off toward the northern reaches of Paddan-Aram. On his journey, Jacob falls asleep on a rock, where he encounters an *axis mundi*, and witnesses the messengers of *ʾelōhîm* ascending and descending the ladder. Although the movement up and down this ladder is reminiscent of the *rapiʾūma* and their ascent from the pit, the source of the movement for each of these instances resides at opposite ends of the vertical plane: heaven for the *ʾelōhîm*, and the pit for the *rapiʾūma*.

> וְהִנֵּה יְהוָה נִצָּב עָלָיו וַיֹּאמַר אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אָבִיךָ וֵאלֹהֵי יִצְחָק הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה שֹׁכֵב עָלֶיהָ לְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה וּלְזַרְעֶךָ
>
> And behold! Yahweh stationed himself upon him, and he said: I am Yahweh, the God of Abraham your father, and the God of Isaac. The land that you settle upon, to you I shall give it and to your descendants.
>
> Gen 28:13

[411] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 55-56.

[412] See also the excursus in Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Vol. 1*, 31.

Putting aside the question of the presence of Yahweh in the Genesis accounts prior to the revelation of the divine name at Sinai,[413] v. 13 identifies the paternal deity as bestowing land for Jacob in light of his paternal succession. The first curiosity raised by the text is the formation of the phrase, "the God of Abraham your father, and the God of Isaac." In offering the blessing of *ʾēl šaddai*, Isaac prayed for the blessing of Abraham and his inheritance to fall unto Jacob (v. 4) This blessing is revealed in the dream with the deity's self-identification as the God of Abraham your father, and the God of Isaac, whom the narrative recounts as Jacob's father (v. 12). The more direct phrasing would have been to state "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac your father." Here the revelation of the "God of the Father" is an identity marker for Jacob, whereby the narrative conveys the paternal relationship specifically between Abraham and Jacob. Stavropolou notes that "the control or appropriation of land is often correlated to notions of lineal descent,"[414] suggesting that the order presented in v. 13 may be better understood as a land assertion than anything else.

Jacob marked the location of the revelation of the "God of the Father" with the erection of a pillar to commemorate the event. Because this place marked a location where the divine and earthly worlds interact, Jacob named the location Bethel, "the divine dwelling." As discussed in previous chapters of this study, a standing stone can be considered the dwelling place of the divine as in the *btʾl* tradition, or the habitation of souls as described in the Luwian and Samʾalian Aramaic inscriptions. Stones also served as boundary markers (à la the Mesopotamian *kudurru*

[413] This very observation was one of the major factors driving early modern biblical scholarship, beginning with Witter and Astruc in the Eighteenth century. The literature published on the topic spanning more than two hundred years is prolific and well-beyond the scope of this study.

[414] See Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims*, (New York: Bloomsbury, 2012), 4.

tradition); in the presentation of this narrative, the establishment of the *btʾl* would seem to bind the inheritance claims of Jacob with a physical extension of the divine's sanctioning of Abraham's blessing.

Genesis 31

Genesis 31 remains the most important passage from the patriarchal stories for penetrating into the cultic life of ancient Israelite religion. The chapter bears several markers of pre-canonical family religion that better reflect the cultic life of ancient Israel's neighbors than the notions later espoused in the biblical literature: namely, the presence of multiple deities as witnesses to oaths, the erection of standing-stones, and the presence of familial statues bearing divine status. Genesis 31 continues the principal theme of inheritance, though this time the presentation of this issue extends outside the *promised land* proper and into the Syro-Anatolian north, using this locale as a setting for demarcating boundaries in the south.

The narrative recounts the departure of Jacob, and his wives Rachel and Leah from the north and their flight southward toward the land of Canaan. Their departure from the region of Paddan-Aram is rooted in the distrust engendered by the sons of Laban toward Jacob. Four different times the "God of the Father" is invoked. In the first instance, Jacob reacts to the sons of Laban who accusing Jacob of taking that which belonged to their father, saying the following to Rachel and Leah:

> וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶן רֹאֶה אָנֹכִי אֶת־פְּנֵי אֲבִיכֶן כִּי־אֵינֶנּוּ אֵלַי כִּתְמֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם וֵאלֹהֵי אָבִי הָיָה עִמָּדִי
> And he said to them: I see the face of your father, surely/indeed it is not toward me as yesterday nor the day before, but the God of my father was with me. (Gen 31:5)

The occurrence of this phrase contrasts the presence of the God of Jacob's father ("my father") with the way in which Laban, the father of Rachel and Leah ("your father"), regarded Jacob.

While this may be an appeal to ancestral identity for Jacob, the statement more likely functions to set up the subsequent invocations of the paternal deity later in the chapter.

An underlying issue concerning wealth and inheritance compounded the eventual distrust that would frame Laban's view of Jacob. Laban changed Jacob's wages, paid in livestock, ten times while Jacob worked for Laban in the Aramean north. The flock bore livestock that reflected what Laban agreed to pay Jacob, and thus the wages received by Jacob proved advantageous toward him and the opposite toward Laban (vv. 6-10). Jacob then encounters a messenger/angel of the deity (*ʾlōhîm*) who instructs him to depart Paddan-Aram and return to the land of his birth. When Jacob informs Rachel and Leah and their impending departure, to which they question what portion their inheritance from Laban should be. Before departing, Rachel stole objects of great value to Laban: "Rachel stole the *teraphim* of her father" וַתִּגְנֹב רָחֵל אֶת־הַתְּרָפִים אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיהָ (v. 19).

The Teraphim

The identity of the *teraphim* have long eluded scholars of biblical literature who have been wrought with disagreement as to the meaning of the term. To echo van der Toorn, the Hebrew Bible's own presentation of the *teraphim* has not presented a universal, coherent understanding of the term, pushing scholars to explore the extra-biblical evidence as the means to uncover the meaning of the term in its broader regional setting.[415] Outside of the biblical data, scholars beginning with Sydney Smith and Anne Draffkorn-Kilmer preceded the work of van der Toorn in addressing the *teraphim* through functional parallelism with neighboring cuneiform

[415] Van der Toorn, "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence," *CBQ* 52:2 (1990): 203.

literature in Mesopotamia.[416] These investigations have led to the conclusion that the *teraphim* are akin to the *ilāni* of the Nuzi texts (see **Chapter Three**).

As noted previously in Chapter Three, the full range of connotations carried by the term *ilāni* has proven challenging; the question of whether to read these *ilāni* as gods or ancestral spirits extends to the discussion of the *teraphim*. Scholars have regarded these *teraphim* as both domestic deities (gods of the house, effectively family/paternal gods) and/or ancestral spirits. Moshe Greenberg following the ancient writer Josephus takes the *teraphim* to be domestic deities.[417] Van der Toorn however is inclined to interpret the *teraphim* in the same manner he reads the *ilāni*, as ancestral spirits in the form of concrete objects. Albertz states that Rachel's *teraphim* are not Laban's guardian deities because he swears by god of Nahor (Gen. 31:53), but stops short of declaring them deified ancestors.[418]

A second approach taken to shed light on the identity of the *teraphim* comes through the investigation of the term's potential etymological background and the subsequent clues that such an etymology may provide. Unfortunately, the attempts undertaken to discern the meaning of the term through its etymology have not settled the matter. C.J. Labuschagne states that the term comes from the root *ptr*, "to interpret,"[419] where metathesis produced the *trp* pattern. Other studies reaching back to the translation of the LXX (cf. 1 Sam 15:23) have connected the *terephim* to notions of therapy (θεραφὶν); an induction such as this is only natural considering the similarity between the presumed root *trp* and the consonantal pattern of θεραφὶν. This conclusion

[416] Ibid., 204.

[417] Moshe Greenberg, "Another Look at Rachel's Theft of the Teraphim," *JBL* 81:3 (1962): 239–248.

[418] Albertz, *History of Israelite Religion, Vol. 1*, 37-39.

[419] C. J. Labuschagne, "Teraphim: A New Proposal for Its Etymology," *VT* 16:1 (1966): 115–117.

also links *trp* to the Hebrew root *rpʾ* meaning "to heal," also related to the term Rephaim. Another proposal offered by Harry Hoffner was to link the biblical term with the Anatolian (Hittite) term *tarpi-*, a term in Hittite texts often presented in parallel with the Akkadian *šēdu* a malevolent or protective spirit[420] (See **Chapter Two**).

The biblical accounts of the *teraphim* consistently present the *teraphim* as material objects,[421] and this is the context behind Rachel's theft of the objects belonging to her father Laban. If the term is Semitic in origin, the root *rpʾ* may be reconsidered as the source of the term. The form most likely is akin to the Akkadian *taprīs* nominal pattern[422] that can personalize certain verbal roots (cf. *tarbītum* "offspring," *talmīdum* "student"): thus *tarpi*, similar to the Hittite vocalization. There remains a discrepancy between *teraphim* and the root *rpʾ* through the loss of the final *alef* in the term *teraphim*. The loss can be explained if the term entered Anatolian literature as *tarpi-* and reentered the Northwest Semitic dialects as its personalized *taprīs* form to refer specifically to the material cult objects as opposed to the essence of the divinized ancestor Rephaim as suggested by the Hittite equivalence with the Akkadian *šēdu*.[423]

The MT however vocalizes *teraphim* according to the standard nominal pattern for triradical roots, suggesting the Masoretes did not understand the term to be related to *rpʾ*. Van der Toorn however connects the *teraphim* to the Rephaim (*rpʾ*), not through etymology but

---

[420] Harry A. Hoffner Jr., "Hittite Tarpiš and Hebrew Terāphîm," *JANES* 27:1 (Jan., 1968): 61-68.

[421] Also noted in Van der Toorn, "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence," 205.

[422] This pattern is generally associated with the D-stem.

[423] The speculative conclusion proceeds from the absence of the *taprīs* form in Northwest Semitic languages. Whether theoretically in a Northwest Semitic language or via Hittite *tarpiš*, the phonological shift would have followed the standard Hebrew shift of segolate nouns following the loss of case endings: *tarpu* → *tarp* → *tarep* → *terep* → pl. *terāphīm*.

through functional equivalence in the role of the two in the act of necromancy. The two are distinguished, according to van der Toorn, by materiality: "the teraphim were images; they were statuettes representing the dead."[424]

Laban's Pursuit of Jacob

Laban's pursuit of Jacob and his family is allayed by the appearance of *ʾlōhîm* to Laban (v. 24), who instructs Laban to speak dispassionately during his encounter with Jacob.

> יֶשׁ־לְאֵל יָדִי לַעֲשׂוֹת עִמָּכֶם רָע וֵאלֹהֵי אֲבִיכֶם אֶמֶשׁ אָמַר אֵלַי לֵאמֹר הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ מְדַבֵּר עִם־יַעֲקֹב מִטּוֹב עַד־רָע
>
> It is in the power of my hand to do evil with you, but the God of your father the past night said to me: "you take care of yourself when speaking to Jacob, whether for good or evil." (Gen 31:29)

One of the more enigmatic phrases of the Hebrew Bible is found here at the beginning of v. 29, traditionally translated as "It is in the power of my hand to do evil with you." The phrase "power of my hand" comes from the Hebrew *yeš lʾēl yādi* יֶשׁ-לְאֵל יָדִי that can similarly be understood as "the god/El of my hand."[425] It is also worthwhile to consider the determinative use of El in this statement, not as a synonym for "power," but as referring to the *divine hand* as an emphatic statement articulating righteous violence.[426] The *ʾēl yādi*, "the divine hand" is contrasted with the

[424] Van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 224.

[425] The problematic phrase has been discussed on numerous occasions. שמחה ,קוגוט, and Simcha Kogut, "The Biblical Phrase 'יש/אין לאל יד': On the Interpretations and Development of a Mistake / הביטוי המקראי 'יש/אין לאל יד' – לפירושיו ולתולדותיו של שיבוש." *Tarbiz / תרביץ*, נז, no. 1988 ,ג, 435–444 (in Hebrew).

[426] A statement such as this has parallels in different emphatics and phrases of force. In Italian culture, a parent may refer to the *schiafff(o) Italian*, literally the "Italian Slap." This slap is a much more violent form of parental battery upon naughty children that the fear of the Italian Slap differentiates the seriousness of the speech act in a way that a normal slap would not. This sense of the term is preferred for interpreting Laban's statement "the El-*yadi*" or "El of my hand," against other interpretations such as "power of my hand" or even "god of my stele." While the term *yad* (hand, though used euphemistically for "limb") can refer to a stele and one is later erected in this chapter, the positioning of the phrase within the narrative does not support a reading of *yad* for stele, interesting as it may be.

ʾlōhēi abīkem אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיכֶם, "the god of your father" as a mitigating agent of Laban's anger for the theft of his goods, the most important of them being described in the following verse.

> וְעַתָּה הָלֹךְ הָלַכְתָּ כִּי־נִכְסֹף נִכְסַפְתָּה לְבֵית אָבִיךָ לָמָּה גָנַבְתָּ אֶת־אֱלֹהָי
> And now, you have certainly gone, for you yearned after the house of your father. Why did you steal my gods? (Gen 31:30)

The gods that Laban is referring to are the *teraphim* mentioned earlier in v. 19, stolen by Rachel. The key piece of information provided by this passage equates the *teraphim* that are known objects with the term for "gods."

> לוּלֵי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם וּפַחַד יִצְחָק הָיָה לִי כִּי עַתָּה רֵיקָם שִׁלַּחְתָּנִי אֶת־עָנְיִי וְאֶת־יְגִיעַ כַּפַּי רָאָה אֱלֹהִים וַיּוֹכַח אָמֶשׁ
> Except the god(s) of my father, the Elohim of Abraham, and the PḤD of Isaac were with me, surely now empty you sent me away. My affliction and the toil of my hands Elohim saw, and gave reproof last night. (Gen 31:42)

The invocation of each deity, the God/Elohim of Jacob's father, the "God of Abraham" and the "God of Nahor" has long alluded to the multi-theistic backdrop of the region.[427] Even though the canonical reading of the text stipulates reading these three instances as descriptions of the one deity of Israel, the construction of the phrase seems to invoke at least two deities if not three. The two names of the patriarchs may be clarifying the *ʾlōhei abi* אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי, the "God of my father." To take this construction as one god would require the patriarchal-bound names as clarifying markers for the *ʾlōhei abi* אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי, the "God of my father." Here, the first instance recalls the "God of Abraham" who too was the deity worshipped by Isaac, and the *pḥd yiṣḥaq* not as a deity, but as another construction that could serve as a witness to Jacob's sincerity.

[427] The formula is restated in the oath at the end of the chapter: אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם וֵאלֹהֵי נָחוֹר יִשְׁפְּטוּ בֵּינֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיהֶם וַיִּשָּׁבַע יַעֲקֹב בְּפַחַד אָבִיו יִצְחָק The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, they will judge between us, the God of their father. And Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac. (Gen 31:53)

The centerpiece of Alt's investigation into the patriarchal deities is this statement, where the *ʾelōhîm* of Abraham is supplemented by the enigmatic פחד יצחק *pḥd yiṣḥaq*. The title *pḥd yiṣḥaq*, vocalized by the MT as *paḥad yiṣḥaq* was initially taken by Alt to be a title of a separate deity associated with Jacob going back to the pre-literary tradition of Israelite faith community. To this point, Alt states that "it is therefore much more likely that we have here the last traces of an older usage no longer found elsewhere, in which פחד may be used for God, in poetry at least if perhaps not in prose."[428] For Alt, *paḥad* is interchangeable with the construct *ʾelōhei* "god of (X);" thus the *paḥad yiṣḥaq* פחד יצחק is equal to the *ʾelōhei yiṣḥaq* יצחק אלהי.[429] The interpretation of the term *pḥd* typically follows the MT tradition, providing "the fear of" for the translation. Because of the uniqueness of the phrasing, other options for the term have been difficult to incorporate into the conversation.[430] Another noteworthy suggestion offered by Albright was that the term relates to the Palmyrene Aramaic *paḥdâ*, "family, kin."[431] M. Köckert disagrees with this conclusion based on philological grounds; the conclusion necessitates the shift from the standard /*d*/ to an emphatic /*ḍ*/, and the term is only attested in this sense in later comparative data (Palmyra and Arabic).[432] Based on where this term is attested geographically, I propose that the term may not be Semitic, but Egyptian: *p-ḫt*, "body of gods or man, generation, people." If originally an Egyptian term loaned into Semitic languages, this would account for the variable

[428] Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 33.

[429] Ibid., 36.

[430] See also Van der Toorn, et al, *DDD*, 329-331.

[431] Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*, (sec. ed.; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1946), 327. The term is also comparable to the Ugaritic *pḫd*, meaning "flock" and the Arabic *faḫiḍ*, "a small branch of a tribe consisting of a man's nearest kin;" (See *DDD*, 329.)

[432] *DDD*, 329.

spelling (e.g., emphatic consonants are often used to articulate foreign words in Semitic languages) in the Semitic languages. Contextually, this term accords well with other Semitic terms like *nepeš* נפש that could be used in an oath formula. Typically swearing by the life of someone would involve evoking the *ḥay* חי of that being, though context suggests *nepeš* נפש could be used in a similar manner. The choice of *pḥd* appears at the outset to be an appeal to kin language, be it a reference to "family" or a "body." Though these theoretical model may adequately explain the etymology of the familial nuance to the Semitic use of *pḥd*, swearing by the life of another is reserved for the gods.[433] As a divine title, *pḥd* may be akin to the Akkadian *paḫatu* and thus a title of lordship.[434]

The chapter concludes with Jacob piling a heap of stones piled and erecting a pillar erected (vv. 45-54). These cult objects stand as witness to the oath taken by Laban and Jacob not to do harm to one another.

> אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם וֵאלֹהֵי נָחוֹר יִשְׁפְּטוּ בֵּינֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיהֶם וַיִּשָּׁבַע יַעֲקֹב בְּפַחַד אָבִיו יִצְחָק
>
> The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, shall judge between us, the God of their fathers; And Jacob swore by the *pḥd* of his father Isaac. (Gen. 31:53)

Verse 53 concludes the oath spoken by Laban to Jacob by invoking the divine witnesses belonging to their respective predecessors. Major English translations usually render the *ʾᵉlōhēi ʾaḇīhem* אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיהֶם according to the singular "God of their father," rather than a plural "gods of

[433] Donald L. Magnetti, "The Function of the Oath in the Ancient Near Eastern International Treaty," *The American Journal of International Law* 72:4 (1978): 815–829. Such is also the case for Egypt, where the term for "oath" *ʿnḫ* is derived from the same term for "life." See also John A. Wilson, "The Oath in Ancient Egypt," *JNES* 7:3, (1948): 129–156. Note also the formula in Dan. 12:7 וַיִּשָּׁבַע בְּחֵי הָעוֹלָם, "and he swore by the Eternal One."

[434] There a few reasons to cast doubt on this explanation: the Akk. *pāḫatu* is more regularly written as *pīḫatu* and attested in a number of uses, ranging from an office or position of responsibility, to provincial regions, to a shortened form for governing (during the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods). See *CAD* P, 360-369. In this instance, the meaning conveyed would reflect one who has a position of authority and responsibility over Isaac.

(each one's) their father." The statement is a textual note that was incorporated into the text after the verb. Had Laban spoken it, the statement would have been nonsensical unless he was referring to the deity worshipped by Terah "their father." As a textual note, the commentator or redactor makes an identity assertion in the event that Laban's statement could have been understood as implying worship of the same deity by Abraham and Nahor. Jacob follows swearing by the *pḥd* of his father Isaac, a divine title for the paternal deity.

Genesis 32 – "The Camp Divine"

Genesis 32 follows the previous chapter by using the return of Jacob into Canaan in order to address three topographical etiologies through the narrative of Jacob's potential encounter with his brother Esau. The chapter concludes with one of the key events in the patriarchal narratives (and Hebrew Bible for that matter), where Jacob is renamed Israel, a radically different naming and event than the previous renaming of Abraham and Sarah.

The first topographical etiology occurs after Jacob's departure from his encounter with Laban, where Jacob is said to have gone on his way and the angels of the divinity met him (v. 2). In reaction to this encounter (v. 3a), Jacob proclaims, מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים זֶה "this is the camp of God."[435] Jacob's reaction to the angels or messengers of the divinity suggests that the statement made by Jacob was made prior to the redactional insertion to follow in the second portion of the v. 3, providing an explanation for the place name: וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם-הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא, מַחֲנָיִם "and he called the name of that place, *Maḥanaim*." The name *Maḥanaim* is a dual-form noun meaning, "the two camps." Jacob's original statement reflects one camp, but the name *Maḥanaim* reflects the story to come when Jacob's servants who have gone before him return with news that they have encountered

[435] Alternatively, "the camp divine."

his brother Esau (v. 7). The news distressed Jacob and he split his cadre לִשְׁנֵי מַחֲנוֹת "into two camps" (v. 8).

The notion of a divine camp reflects the era of the mobile community, where the presence of the deity was bound to the camp by the presence of the Ark of the Covenant. R. van der Hart connects the Camp of Dan (Num 2:25, 31) with the Camp of Yahweh (2 Chr 31:2), whereby "Dan" served as a title of the divinity and connected with the Ark, "a divine role which later was fulfilled by Yahweh himself."[436] Accordingly, the camp may be interpreted in accord with the ancient Near Eastern conception of a temple. Similarly, the infrequently attested deity of the camp from Egypt (likely due to the mobility of the camp communities) presents a comparable setting for the notion of the divine camp. The deity *Horus-of-the-Camp*, also written *He-of-the-Camp* (*pꜣ-n-pꜣ-iḥꜣy*), was thought to be the patron deity of camp (Eg. *iḥw*) installations.[437]

The invocation of the "God of the Fathers" that follows in Jacob's prayer most likely plays off the language of the previous narrative of Jacob's encounter with Laban.

> וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי אַבְרָהָם וֵאלֹהֵי אָבִי יִצְחָק יְהוָה הָאֹמֵר אֵלַי שׁוּב לְאַרְצְךָ וּלְמוֹלַדְתְּךָ וְאֵיטִיבָה עִמָּךְ
>
> And Jacob said: O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac: Yahweh who said to me to return to your land, your birth, and I will be good with you. (Gen 32:10)

Here in v. 10, the formula is regularized. As previously noted, the juxtaposition of the "God of my father Abraham" and the "God of my father Isaac" could be read as separate deities (cf. *pḥd* Isaac), though the Semitic ו /*w*/ could equally (and more likely) be used in the same way that a *comma* is used in present European orthography; this would place the names in succession rather

[436] R. van der Hart, "The Camp of Dan and the Camp of Yahweh," *VT* 25, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 1975): 724.

[437] See Kim Ryholt, "A Pair of Oracle Petitions Addressed to Horus-of-the-Camp," *JEA*, vol. 79 (1993): 189-198. Ryholt states that these were most likely military installations.

than in apposition to one another. The only reason for doubting the succession of the names is the clarification of the name Yahweh, which would not necessarily be a redactional insertion entirely if the whole pericope were a later insertion. Whatever the case may be, the instance reveals Jacob channeling his heritage by an appeal to the authority of the paternal deity and the implicit promises presented by the "God of the Fathers" to Abraham and extended unto Jacob.

The record of Jacob's inheritance ties to Abraham, a prominent theme running through the Jacob Cycle, become bound to the socio-cultural collective Israel through the renaming of Jacob in v. 29. While Israel is well attested in the archaeological record, the Jacob tradition appears to have been confined to the tradition of orality until eventually becoming textualized in the patriarchal narratives. Here too the community of Israel becomes bound to the tradition of Jacob's paternal deities through this renaming process as memorialized in the text.

The chapter ends with the renaming of Jacob as Israel in what amounts to a word-play incorporating the northern designation "Israel" into the narrative framework of the patriarchal narratives. Beginning the chapter with the "God of the Camp" (מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים) the chapter concludes with the redefinition of Jacob as *yisra-ʾēl*, suggestive of the same or similar meaning. As a divine name, *yisra-ʾēl* consists of two terms: *yisra* ישרא and *ʾēl* אל. The initial term, from the northern (i.e., Aramaic) root שרא, "to loosen, to dwell, to pitch camp" refers to the totemistic act of the idealized sustainer of the community.[438] Like Rakkabel the divine rider and paternal deity of the house at ancient Yaudi, the one who pitches the camp is marked by a suffixed determinative *ʾēl*.

[438] The shift from a שׂ to שׁ is a common occurrence between northern and southern permutations of West Semitic dialects. Note also the euphemistic title for Israel אֵל יְשֻׁרוּן *El Yešurun* "The Upright(?)" (cf. Deut 33:26) where the שׂ differentiates the congruent name. The Hebrew language provides an interesting case study for this occurance, positioned geographically between the Aramaic and Phoenician north against the Arabic (including Sabaic) and Ethiopic south. At times and/or among different corpora of literature, the Hebrew dialect reflects a northern strand and at other times southern traditions. For a comprehensive examination of northern influences, see Gary A. Rendsburg, "A Comprehensive Guide to Israelian Hebrew: Grammar and Lexicon." *Orient*. 38 (2003): 5-35.

The deity as a reflection of the people (or vice versa) is not entirely unique and previously noted for the god Amurru with the Amorites and the god Aššur with the Assyrians. As such, the God of the Israelites would operate according to the tradition of other Northwest Semitic theophoric names likewise accounted for in the East Semitic world (e.g., *ra-bí-il* "the god increases," *iš-lul-il* "the god plunders[?]").[439]

Jacob's "God of the Fathers" in the Joseph Cycle

The Joseph Cycle comprises the glue binding the narratives of the patriarchal stories with the southern strand of the Pentateuch set in Egypt. Four occurrences of the invocation of the paternal deity are present in the Joseph Cycle, where the presence of the paternal deity is in one way or another bound to the person of Jacob.

Genesis 43:23

> וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם אַל־תִּירָאוּ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וֵאלֹהֵי אֲבִיכֶם נָתַן לָכֶם מַטְמוֹן בְּאַמְתְּחֹתֵיכֶם כַּסְפְּכֶם בָּא אֵלָי וַיּוֹצֵא אֲלֵהֶם אֶת־שִׁמְעוֹן
>
> And he said: 'Peace be to you, fear not; your God, and the God of your father, has given you treasure in your sacks; I had your money.' And he brought Simeon out unto them.

Joseph's steward's invocation of the paternal deity follows the greeting he presented to the brothers of Joseph. The instance follows an earlier blessing by Israel (Jacob) invoking *ʾēl šaddai*. How this blessing plays into Joseph's steward's phrasing "your god and the god of your father" is not entirely clear. As noted above, the ancient Semitic (*sic*, Hebrew) character ו /*w*/ can function as a comma; in such an event, the invocation of the paternal deity would be clarifying the preceding "your god." Still it would be an odd clarification considering the relationship of

[439] See Chapter Six of this study and suffixed *il* names in the Northwest Semitic record by I.J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian, Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary* 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 28.

Jacob's sons with Jacob who had sent them to Egypt. The other possibility suggests two deities being invoked and separated by the ו /*w*/. In this case the initial god would be conceived as a different deity than the *ʾēl šaddai* who may be implicitly indicated as a name for the paternal deity by virtue of the blessing in v. 14 earlier in the chapter.

Genesis 46:1-3

> וַיִּסַּע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וַיָּבֹא בְּאֵרָה שָׁבַע וַיִּזְבַּח זְבָחִים לֵאלֹהֵי אָבִיו יִצְחָק וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמַרְאֹת הַלָּיְלָה וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב יַעֲקֹב וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּנִי וַיֹּאמֶר אָנֹכִי הָאֵל אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ אַל־תִּירָא מֵרְדָה מִצְרַיְמָה כִּי־לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל אֲשִׂימְךָ שָׁם
>
> [1] And Israel took his journey with all that he had, and came to Beer-sheba, and offered sacrifices unto the God of his father Isaac. [2] And God spoke unto Israel in the visions of the night, and said: 'Jacob, Jacob.' And he said: 'Here am I.' [3] And He said: 'I am the El, the God of your father; fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation.

Instead of an invocation, here the deity presents himself as the paternal deity to Jacob. The passage begins with a textual narrative introduction describing Israel journeying to Beer-Sheba, where he offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac.[440] In this initial verse, the narration invokes the paternal deity rather than the invocation being present in the dialogue of the characters. When the deity reveals himself, the definite article is used. "I am *the* El/god (הָאֵל): the God of your father." While some may be inclined to interpret this instance as identifying the "God of the Fathers" with the person of the deity El, this construction provides a stronger case for being a determinative El being used emphatically to highlight the paternal connection to the deity. Thus rendering the reading, "I am the ^{d}God of your father."

Genesis 49:24-26

[440] It is enough here to recognize the redactional element introducing the text without immediate concern for the discussion of identifying potential sources behind the composition of the text.

Genesis 49 is an archaic Hebrew poem/song, presented in the text as vocalized by Jacob. This poem/song is a ballad memorializing the Tribes of Israel and has long been recognized for its antiquity. Verses 24-26 use a set of language that has drawn the attention of numerous researchers since the time of Alt. Principally, the titles ascribed to the deity—the Mighty one of Jacob, the Shepherd, the Sone of Israel, the God of your father, the Almighty—have been of major interest.

> וַתֵּשֶׁב בְּאֵיתָן קַשְׁתּוֹ וַיָּפֹזּוּ זְרֹעֵי יָדָיו מִידֵי אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב מִשָּׁם רֹעֶה אֶבֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֵל אָבִיךָ
> וְיַעְזְרֶךָּ וְאֵת שַׁדַּי וִיבָרְכֶךָּ בִּרְכֹת שָׁמַיִם מֵעָל בִּרְכֹת תְּהוֹם רֹבֶצֶת תָּחַת בִּרְכֹת שָׁדַיִם וָרָחַם בִּרְכֹת
> אָבִיךָ גָּבְרוּ עַל־בִּרְכֹת הוֹרַי עַד־תַּאֲוַת גִּבְעֹת עוֹלָם תִּהְיֶיןָ לְרֹאשׁ יוֹסֵף וּלְקָדְקֹד נְזִיר אֶחָיו
>
> [24] But his (Joseph's) bow abode firm, and the arms of his hands were made supple, by the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob, from there the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel, [25] From the God of your father, and he will help you, and from Shaddai who will bless you, with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that crouches below, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb. [26] The blessings of your father are mighty beyond the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills; they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of the prince among his brethren.

The divine title *ʾabīr yaʿaqob* אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב was one of the second major passage to grab the attention of Alt in his study of ancient Israelite religion. Along with the *pḥd yiṣḥaq* of Gen. 31:53, the *ʾabīr yaʿaqob*, regularly translated as "the Mighty One of Jacob" or alternatively, "the Bull of Jacob," stood out as another potential paternal deity for the pre-monarchic Israelite community. In accord with these titles associated with specific patriarchs, Alt commented that the rarest of such titles of the "God of the Fathers" give the impression of the greatest antiquity.[441] In spite the bifurcation of meanings for the term *ʾabīr yaʿaqob*, the imagery associated with the Bull is certainly might, so the translation "Bull of Jacob" is appropriate. Still, v. 24 lists numerous titles that on the surface appear directed toward one being: *ʾabīr yaʿaqob*,

[441] Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 32.

the *Shepherd*, the *Stone of Israel*, but do not form a single litany. The divine names span vv. 24b-25a and are framed by prefixed מ /*m*/ "from" (Heb.).

From the hand of the *Bull of Jacob*;	מִידֵי אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב
from there the *Shepherd*, the *Stone of Israel*;	מִשָּׁם רֹעֶה אֶבֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל
from *ʾēl-Abīka* and he will help you	מֵאֵל אָבִיךָ וְיַעְזְרֶךָּ
and Shaddai (and) he will bless you;	וְאֵת שַׁדַּי וִיבָרְכֶךָּ

The progression of these מ /*m*/ statements sets up the *ʾēl-Abīka*, the "God of your father."

The following verse however provides two other divine names juxtaposed against one another: *ʾēl-Abīka* and *šadday*. Previously when a reference was made to the "God of the Father," the term consisted of the construct *ʾelōhēi* and a possessive rendering of "the Father" (i.e., my, your, his). Although *ʾēl-Abīka* appears as a unique variant, the determinative El invoking a divine father is not likely here based on the presentation of the poem/song by Jacob himself. Here, there may be an allusion to the person El in the Hebrew Bible as opposed to a generic or determinative use of the term. The combination of "your father" following *ʾēl*—known from the literature of Ugarit to be the epitome of divine fatherhood—with the second deity *šadday*, without the El prefix, forms a similar pairing to the Sefire construction El and Elyon. Additionally, the paring is followed by blessings of *heaven* and the *deep* as in line 11 of the Sefire inscription.

Genesis 50:17

The final invocation of the paternal deities in the patriarchal narratives comes from a command issued forth from Jacob intended for his son Joseph.

> כֹּה־תֹאמְרוּ לְיוֹסֵף אָנָּא שָׂא נָא פֶּשַׁע אַחֶיךָ וְחַטָּאתָם כִּי־רָעָה גְמָלוּךָ וְעַתָּה שָׂא נָא לְפֶשַׁע עַבְדֵי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ וַיִּבְךְּ יוֹסֵף בְּדַבְּרָם אֵלָיו
>
> Thus shall you say unto Joseph: "Forgive, I pray you now, the transgression of your brethren, and their sin, for they completed evil unto you. And now, we pray you, forgive the transgression of the servants of the God of your father." And Joseph wept when they spoke unto him. (Gen. 50:17)

The last of these invocations in the patriarchal texts forms a sealing of the invocations of the paternal deity, attached to the will of Jacob. The language of the Jacob Cycle persists in the Joseph Cycle through the character of Jacob.

Exodus 3

The Exodus tradition provides a different setting for the next evolution of the notion of the paternal deity. The "God of the Fathers" has been distanced from the patriarchs by time and is no longer tied to the narrative of Jacob. The presentation of the paternal deity in Exodus initiates the equivalence formula binding Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as a specific identity marker for both individual subjects addressed (e.g. Moses) or the community of the Children of Israel at large. The transformation from the singular "God of the father (אב)" to the plural "God of the Fathers (אבות)" coincides with the Egyptian setting, where the biblical *ʾabōṯ* compares orthographically to the earlier Egyptian *ỉbwt*.[442] The Egyptian term *ỉbwt*, referring to *teraphim*-like images of the family or forefathers, differs from the Egyptian *ỉt* meaning "father"[443] and suggests that the Egyptian usage may reflect a loan from the Semitic world.

Moses's encounter with the burning bush has long been one of the more visually memorable scenes conveyed in biblical literature. The invocation of the "God of the Fathers" occurs at a seminal moment in the text, when the divine name is revealed to Moses. The initial invocation sets up the conversation between Moses and Yahweh, preparing for the revelation of the divine name (v. 6):

---

[442] The Hebrew *ʾabōṯ* as a plural developed from the contracted form of the irregular masculine plural for "father," observable in Aramaic אבהותא (cf. also אכהין), where the infixed ה marks the plural (cf. also Aramaic words like שמהא vs. Heb. שמות); this contracted form appears orthographically the same as the feminine form. See Chapter Three of the present study.

[443] Cf. vocalized Coptic ιωτ.

וַיֹּאמֶר אָנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִיךָ אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וַיַּסְתֵּר מֹשֶׁה פָּנָיו כִּי יָרֵא מֵהַבִּיט אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים

> And he said: I am the God of your father; the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob; and Moses hid his face for he feared looking at the deity. (Exod. 3:6)

The invocation is reiterated to front the revelation of the name in v. 14:

> וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי בָא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם וְאָמְרוּ־לִי מַה־שְּׁמוֹ מָה אֹמַר אֲלֵהֶם וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה תֹאמַר לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶהְיֶה שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם וַיֹּאמֶר עוֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כֹּה־תֹאמַר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וֵאלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב שְׁלָחַנִי אֲלֵיכֶם זֶה־שְּׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְזֶה זִכְרִי לְדֹר דֹּר לֵךְ וְאָסַפְתָּ אֶת־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב לֵאמֹר פָּקֹד פָּקַדְתִּי אֶתְכֶם וְאֶת־הֶעָשׂוּי לָכֶם בְּמִצְרָיִם

> [13] And Moses said to the divinity, behold (when) I am coming to the sons of Israel and I should say to them, the **God of your fathers** sent me to you and they say to me, what is his name, what do I tell them?[444] And God said to Moses "I will be what I will be." And he said thus, "say to the Children of Israel, I will be sent me to you." [15] And again the divinity said to Moses, thus you shall say to the Children of Israel, "Yahweh the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob sent me to you; this is my name forever and this is my commemoration from generation to generation. [16] Go and gather the elders of Israel and say to them, Yahweh the God of your fathers appeared to me; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "Surely I appointed you all and your deeds in Egypt." (Exod 3:15-16)

Once more, the self-identification of the deity follows the EGO introductions known from the inscriptional tradition. More importantly, the revelation of the divine name constitutes the definitive EGO introduction, forming an *introductio perpetuum*. Anthony and Lucy Phillips state that the revelation of the divine name was a redactional insertion into the text, reaffirming the covenant in light of the broken covenant espoused by the prophet Hosea.[445] Implicit in this assertion is the originality ascribed to the phrase invoking the paternal deity. Of the four

[444] cf. *ʾbwt* for אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם "your fathers."

[445] A. Phillips and L. Phillips, "The Origin of 'I Am' in Exodus 3.14," *JSOT* 78 (1998): 81-84.

invocations of the paternal deity, only one of these is not followed by the identification formula invoking the names of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Schniedewind notes that the revelation of the divine name *Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh* was inserted into the text during the exilic or post-exilic era as an inner-biblical commentary on the name of God.[446] Verse 15 answers the question posed by Moses in the fitting context. Thomas Römer notes the awkwardness of the apposition and the emendation of the passage by the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch as a way of dealing with the oddness of the construction.[447] Following Weimar, the divine construction was an attempt to link the Exodus passage with the patriarchal traditions.[448] The qualifying identification of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with the God of "your (pl) fathers" was inserted into the text (vv. 6, 15-16) as a way of binding the patriarchal tradition with the devotion to Yahweh, the deity known from Egypt.[449] Exodus 3:6, 14-16 forms a seminal text for the use of textual rhetoric as a means of creating a common ethnicity by the establishment of a communal memory of a collective memory of a former unity.[450]

This equivalency established in Exodus 3:6; 14-16 is later punctuated by the P tradition as *ʾēl šaddai* (Exod 6:3). According to Garr Exodus 6:3 expresses a relationship of identity

[446] Schniedewind, "Calling God Names: an Inner-Biblical Approach to the Tetragrammaton," 80-81.

[447] Thomas Römer, "The Revleation of the Divine Name to Moses and the Construction of a Memory About the Origins of the Encounter between YHWH and Israel," in *Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*, Pages 309.

[448] As noted by Römer, Ibid. See Peter Weimar, *Die Berufung Des Mose*, (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1980), 38, 341.

[449] Similarly observed by Römer and others. Ibid., 310.

[450] See this notion as applied by archaeologist Elizabeth Bloch-Smith in her essay "Israelite Ethnicity in Iron I: Archaeology Preserves What is Remembered and What is Forgotten in Israel's History," *JBL* 122:3 (2003): 401-425.

through invocation of the name.[451] The implication behind the work of binding the patriarchal tradition with Yahweh of the Exodus tradition suggests that this Yahweh tradition stood in opposition to the Jacob tradition. The identification of the deity as Yahweh then was, according to Römer, an attempt to prevent the Jacob tradition from being the primary origin story of the Israelites (via Hosea 12).[452]

Exodus 15

Exodus 15, the "Song of the Sea," has long been regarded as one of the earliest passages preserved in the Hebrew Bible.[453] Exodus 15 recounts in song the flight of the Children of Israel from the pursuit of Pharaoh. Exodus 15 comprises the poetic interpretation of events also described by the preceding prose chapter (Exod. 14), structuring the narrative of the Red Sea crossing.[454] The invocation of the "God of my father" is the final portion of a stanza invoking the names of the deity.

> עָזִּי וְזִמְרָת יָהּ וַיְהִי־לִי לִישׁוּעָה זֶה אֵלִי וְאַנְוֵהוּ אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי וַאֲרֹמְמֶנְהוּ
> Yah is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation; this is my God, and I will glorify Him; O God of my father, and I will exalt Him. (Exod 15:2)

[451] Garr, "The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3." *JBL*, vol. 111, no. 3, (1992): 385–408.

[452] Römer, ibid., 305-316.

[453] On the early dating of Exodus 15, see Schniedewind, *A Social History of Hebrew. Its Origins Through the Rabbinic Period*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 70-72; Angel Sáenz-Badillos and John Elwolde, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 56-62. Brian D. Russell, *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21*, (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2007). Noted also in Hayyim Rabin, *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*, (Jerusalem: Jewish Agency, 1974), 26.

[454] This literary style buttressing prose narrative with poetic interludes is a tradition especially utilized in Egyptian literature. See James W. Watts, "Song and the Ancient reader," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22 (1995): 135; Richard D. Patterson, "Victory at Sea: Prose and Poetry in Exodus 14-15," *Biblioteca Sacra* 161 (2004): 42.

Three different terms are used in v. 2 to name the deity: יָהּ *Yāh*, אֵלִי my *ʾēl*, and אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי *ʾelōhēi ābī*, "the God of my father." Additionally, v. 3 qualifies this collection of names with the name Yahweh: יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה יְהוָה שְׁמוֹ "Yahweh is a man of war; Yahweh is his name." Taken together, these two verses represent a collection of two traditions. Exodus 15:2 reflects the Syro-Anatolian influenced tradition, and v. 3 reflects the southern tradition set in the Egyptian-Sinai wilderness context.

Exodus 15:2 utilizes the language thus far familiar to Syro-Anatolian textual tradition. The combination of Yah and my *ʾēl* may reflect two potential concepts: 1) *ʾēl* reflects the generic usage of the paternal deity, thereby regarding Yah as the identity of this deity; or 2) the combination of Yah and my *ʾēl* reflects the god-pair cited in the Luwian TÜNP inscription, whereby El and Ea parallel Heaven and Earth. The biblical deity Yah is well known from cuneiform and cognate literature as Ea.[455] Though geographically removed from the lower Levant (or perhaps the Sinai if Exod. 15 dates back further), the TÜNP inscription notes Semitic deities worshipped as diametrically opposed forces, described in parallel with Heaven and Earth. This tradition also is attested in Aramaic language text of the Sefire inscription as well as in the compound construction of the divine name "Maker of Heaven and Earth" in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Gen. 14:19, 22). If the *ʾelōhēi ābī* "the God of my father" is original to the text, then the second option is to be preferred over the first, which would provide a redundant reading. The possibility of the *ʾelōhēi ābī* "the God of my father" being a later insertion after the

[455] This connection has been pointed out as early as Ferris J. Stephens, "Notes on Cappadocian Tablets." *JAOS* 46 (1926): 179–181.

redefinition of *ʾēl* as El may be worth considering. Whichever the specific case may be, this this portion of the text reflects the previously established northern discourse.

Yah and Yahweh, while appearing similar are not the same deity and must be disambiguated.[456] The following clarification in v. 3 of the chain of divine names in v. 2 is the link in biblical literature bonding the northern Yah devotion with the southern Yahweh tradition. One may ask what the distinction between Yah and Yahweh might mean for rereading the theophoric *–yāh* names of the Hebrew Bible in relation to a generic understanding of *ʾēl* as the term for paternal deity. To be sure, Exodus 15 is a poem central to the devotion of Yahweh and the framing of the book of Exodus as such, reinforcing Yahwistic devotion while at the same time equating Yahweh with the "God of the Fathers."[457]

Conclusion

The patriarchal narratives in the book of Genesis attest to the weight of the paternal paradigm in the background memory to these stories. The passages from the patriarchal narratives focus on the third aspect of the paternal paradigm, the "God of the Fathers" as the feature of primary importance to the cult of the patriarchs. The other two

[456] Yah (Ea) has long been thought to be a contracted form of Yahweh, but the geographic distribution of the two names does not easily support such a conclusion. Recently, Anne Marie Kitz at the 2016 annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association (Santa Clara, CA), presented the paper "To Be or Not to Be, That is the Question: YHWH and Ea" that provides a philological investigation into the common etymological link that produced the divine names Yahweh (West Semitic) and Ea (East Semitic). Kitz's investigation was not done to equate the two deities as one, but to note the common etymology of both divine names. ." Kitz, "To Be or Not to Be, That is the Question: YHWH and Ea," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association, Santa Clara, CA, 7 August 2016).

[457] Brian D. Russel notes that the importance of Israel in the function of Exodus 15 is of a secondary character, stating that "Yhwh alone is exalted in the song. Israel is only known by implication as the inheritor defined by a particular relationship to Yhwh." Brian D. Russell, *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21,* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2007), 149.

portions of the paternal paradigm are not present in these narratives, and if they were, have since been leveled by the authors and redactors of the biblical text.[458]

The Jacob Cycle in the book of Genesis sees the use of the invocation of the "God of the Fathers" as an identity statement. Like the paternal deities in the Syro-Anatolian north, the "God of the Fathers" is presented as maintaining the continuity of the identity of one's lineage with subsequent blessings, land claims, mitigation of an opponent's anger, as well as divine witness to peace and stability. While exhibiting all these characteristics, the "God of the Fathers" remains a mode of rhetoric that eventually was utilized in the Exodus narrative to bind the identity of individual persons with the community of Yahweh worshippers through their personal and familial divine devotion(s).

[458] This averts any discussion related to the title *adōnāi* אֲדֹנָי "father," a euphemism for "lord" attested at Ugarit and used later to vocalized the tetragrammaton. The title is used by Abraham for Yahweh in Gen. 15:2.

Chapter Eight

Synthesis and Conclusion

What might the tradition surrounding the "God of the Fathers" in the patriarchal narratives suggest about either Israel's pre-monarchic past or how Israelite religion intends to present itself in light of the development(s) and/or practices of the surrounding peoples? Further, what might these observations suggest about the movement toward oneness found in the Exodus accounts (Ex 3:6, 15-16; 4:5; 6:3) and taken up elsewhere in the Pentateuch? The Exodus narrative binding the tradition of the "God of the Fathers" with the self-identification language proclaimed by Yahweh fits well within the framework for the creation of ethnicity, establishing the collective memory of a common past. This type of cultic identity convergence differs from the repackaging of the language articulating the divine world, where the ancestors *ʾelōhîm*/*ʾelāhin* became one and thus a euphemism for "divinity." In each instance, the imprint of fatherhood binds the discourse surrounding the specific deity Yahweh as well as the general concept of the divine *ʾelōhîm*. The ambiguity that developed from the El/*ʾlu* traditions emerging from embedded

notions of fatherhood resolved itself through the theological transformation of ancient Israelite religion.

As a term of rhetoric, the "God of the Fathers" is a twofold appeal to authority: to antiquity and to the familial line through which continuity is maintained. This continuity bears further implications for issues such as inheritance rights and land claims. The underlying assertion behind the Hebrew Bible's equating of the rhetorical phrase "God of the Fathers" with Yahweh is a specific effort to bind the culture of the south (Judah) with the culture of the north (Israel) by utilizing the common perspective of the paternal paradigm. The comparative data reveals that the southern Judahite tradition would have known the paternal paradigm and utilized this language to bind the divergent traditions of the northern kingdom into the canonical Yahwism that later came to dominate the Judean monarchy.

The paternal paradigm provides a structure for understanding, in the language of mythologists, the world of mankind's delayed adolescence—the condition all human beings encounter as successors to authority figures who precede each present generation. The three marks of fatherhood in the cult—father gods, divinized ancestors, and paternal deities or gods of the fathers—while different in purpose, each serve to fortify one's identity in this life. The father gods are mythologically didactic, teaching and reinforcing through myth, the familial structure led by the father. Like those father gods who exist in the divine realm, those fathers who have died attained divine status through apotheosis. They exist in and among their predecessors and constitute divine powers through whom the living may appeal. These divinized ancestors and their progeny who remain alive find and declare their mutual identity through their familial devotion to the god or gods of the fathers. The gods of the fathers guide the destiny of their successors by serving as typological models for the identity of the living while safeguarding

those identities in the divine realm, putting them in positions of authority, and sustaining for them the blessings of their inheritance.

The Syro-Anatolian North and the Egyptian/Midianite South

Thus far, I have presented the tradition of remembrance of the paternal paradigm in terms of the broader ancient Near East, but especially in light of data coming from the Syro-Anatolian north. The major contribution of the Syro-Anatolian north combines the Indo-European Anatolian traditions of the region with Northwest Semitic culture. Perceiving the *world divine* is an observable northern tradition. It is in this tradition that the otherwise mundane are reassessed with determinative markers—argued here to be vocalic determinatives—that reorient the devotee toward a way of perceiving divinity in life's encounters. This has opened the door for reinterpreting several portions of the patriarchal narratives that have previously been ascribed to El as a person and a high god.

Reassessing an Identity of the Paternal Deity

The "God of the Fathers" in the collective memories of ancient Israel is first and foremost a rhetorical marker prior to being defined by the Sinai covenant as Yahweh (cf. Exod 6:3). Previous identification of the Israelite collective paternal deity as El has been seriously undermined in light of Syro-Anatolian discourse. The recognition of El as the paternal deity is in part rooted in Israel's own theophoric name. Even so, El names from the Bronze Age do not suggest a connection to the person of the deity El later found at Ugarit and presumably behind the mention behind El in later Iron Age inscriptions. The term *ilu* was fundamentally a generic term for one's paternal deity that exhibited substitutability with the specific names of other deities to whom the members of the family held their devotion.

Large chunks of the historical literature of the Hebrew Bible contain folk etymologies designed as mnemonic or memorial devices to explain the names of places or persons. These often clever etymologies, including those of Israel and the divine name Yahweh, while functioning to reinforce the theological or spiritual association of the term in question, often miss the broader historical or socio-cultural backdrop to the terms.[459] In this context one may ask how the (or an) identity of the paternal deity may be deciphered.

The initial "God of the Fathers" for the entire community of Israel, if one can be spoken of with any certainty, was likely to have followed the pattern of theophorically named deities (see **Chapter Six**), producing the *yisra-ʾēl*, the god of the camp. As noted in Chapter Six, *yisra-ʾēl* consists of two terms: *yisra* ישרא and *ʾēl* אל. These compound term *yisra-ʾēl* in the context of the "God of the Camp" suggets a similar meaning. The totemistic deity *yisra-ʾēl* is a northern expression of what parallels with the Egypto-Sinai tradition and the deity Yahweh. For the southern communities, this notion is marked by the Egyptian term *ỉhw* "camp" and its totem deity. Herein lies a temptation to view Israel (*yisra-ʾēl*) in the context of the deity Horus of the Camp, the god of the camp among non-sedentary communities of Lower Egypt.[460] Cross's proposal for an *ʾēl zū yahwi* as a means of understanding how an El tradition could relate to a Yahwistic cult would perhaps be correct in principle were it taken in the context of the God (Horus) of the Camp, the DINGIR-*ỉhw* or even ^{d}*ỉhw*.[461] Further, would the camp deity better be

[459] Some of the more remarkable differences in the historical literature between the Hebrew Bible and the LXX for instance propose different etiologies for different place names.

[460] Ryholt, "A Pair of Oracle Petitions Addressed to Horus-of-the-Camp," *JEA*, vol. 79 (1993): 197.

[461] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 71.

understood in the collective divinized camp rather than one who erects and maintains the camp?[462]

At this point, the etymological congruence shared between *yisra-ʾēl* and ^{d}*ihw* must only be considered a starting point for further research. Even though these new etymologies may be a sufficient correspondence to one another, any subsequent implications must incorporate research within the sphere of mobile societies where currently the record of material culture vastly outweighs the textual data left by those communities. As Albertz has noted, "the features [of Israelite religion] shared with the Near Eastern environment are very much greater at the level of personal piety than at the level of official religion."[463] Yet a major question remains as to the separation of personal piety and official religion among mobile peoples whose clan presents the social condition of an extended familial and thus its interrelated structure as opposed to sedentary communities of multiple families where the powers of state rule supreme.

The Hebrew Bible's rhetoric concerning the paternal deity reflects the transformation of a northern cultic tradition to a southern (Judahite) cultic tradition. The compilation of the patriarchal narratives into the Genesis tradition (as a text; not necessarily according to the *uhr* narrative maintained in oral tradition) serves as a foil for the revelation of the divine name in Exodus 3. Prior to this revelation however, the Jacob traditions of the northern community needed to be unified accordingly in order to provide the framework for the eventual cultic hegemony of Jerusalem religion.

[462] An additional question that may be asked concerns whether the henotheistic movement attested in the Deir Alla inscription was a social phenomenon occurring among different people groups from the region (cf. the Amarna religion of Akhenaten and its singular devotion to the Sun Disc).

[463] Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament*, 20.

Renaming Jacob

The renaming of Jacob as "Israel" is an extraordinary occurrence in the narrative history of the people of Israel. Abraham was previously named Abram, is a subtle transformation, and short of the etiological explanation provided by the Genesis narrative, may simply account for variant traditions pronouncing his name.[464] Jacob's transformation to the name Israel is radically different. Exploring the emergence and/or relevance of the name "Israel" and the name's relationship to Jacob is a major factor in determining the identity of the "God of the Fathers" in ancient Israel.

The transformation of Jacob's name comes at the climax of Genesis 32. This chapter begins as the transition from Jacob's flight from and oath taken with his father-in-law Laban, where Jacob encounters messengers of the *ʾelōhîm* (מַלְאֲכֵי אֱלֹהִים). This encounter prompted Jacob to declare this place (v. 2) the *maḥanēh ʾelōhîm* (מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים), the "Camp of God." The term *maḥanēh* used here for "camp" is a word not found in the northern Aramaic[465] or Akkadian traditions, and is limited in its usage to southern regions of the Levant where Hebrew and similar dialects are prevalent.[466] At the opposite end sealing the chapter, the name Israel is introduced as a counterpart to the term *maḥanēh ʾelōhîm*. The underlying implication proposes two separate identities for Jacob and Israel that coalesce into one. The merging of separate communities into a monolithic Israel identity harkens back to the notion of a mixed-multitude and addresses the diversity of the inhabitants of Canaan.

[464] The same may be surmised for the transformation of Sarai to Sarah.

[465] A Late Jewish Literary Aramaic usage based on the Hebrew is attested.

[466] For more southern uses, cf. Arabic *ḥayama* خيم, "to bivouac, to erect a tent (to stage)."

Toward Further Research

If not the person of the deity El, then which deity may be identified as the "God of the Fathers?" This study has recontextualized such a question if not undermined it entirely. Paternal deities will not always be reflected in the names of their adherents and families would have had to have attained some degree of prominence for such deities to have been recorded in the historical records. The greater pantheon of the ancient Levant has been known for some time, much of which is addressed both directly and indirectly in the Hebrew Bible. The term ʾēl has been problematic like no other in the ancient Near East, referring to generic notions of deity and eventually a specific deity by the same name. Disambiguation of Yah from Yahweh is also required in view of this study. These two separate deities bearing similar names were, like the El traditions, absorbed into the person of the deity Yahweh by the canonical authors of the biblical text. The Luwian TÜNP inscription from the northern reaches of Syro-Anatolia illustrates a relationship between El and Ea (Yah), suggesting devotion to these two deities in a divine pairing paralleling Heaven and Earth. The deity Yah most likely served as a bridge connecting the northern traditions with southern Yahwism.

Even if the proposition that the "God of the Camp" is equivalent to the paternal deity of that specific community (tribal or extended family), there remains the matter of rhetoric. The Priestly account in the book of Exodus (Exod. 6:3) does identify one deity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as ʾēl šaddai. Nevertheless, whether this was a specific El deity or a generic name for one's protective deity is still an outstanding matter. Having no identifiable temple or worship site does suggest the name ʾēl šaddai reflected more of a generic divine concept rather than a specific person of a deity even if the Priestly author bore a different understanding.

At issue then is not name of any family's deity from ancient Canaan, but the rhetoric behind the term "God of the Father." The divine title "God of the Fathers" remains in the biblical narrative as a textual record of spoken discourse conveyed through the rhetoric of northern memory instead of stone monumentality. Ancient Israel's neighbors commemorated their predecessors through rituals naming the deceased ancestors and materially in inscriptions left on stone monuments. Unfortunately for example, the god Rakkabel is only known to us from these monumental inscriptions of the royals from Sam'al and so paternal deities of specific families among the ancient Israelites may have been as unique as this family deity.

The relationship between the departed and divinized fathers to their paternal gods was bonded by a unity of identity whereby the living and the departed fathers participate in the identity of their paternal god. Invocation of the "God of the Father" calls forth a history of one's personal and familial identity. It is an identity marker, and when fused with the divine name in Exod. 3:6-15, the rhetoric transformed the identity of the individual person and his (or her) family with that of the canonical deity of the nation state ruled from the city of Jerusalem. To invoke the "God of the Father" is thus a means of appealing to the continuity of oneself spanning the ages of time defining one's identity.

APPENDIX 1

Primary References

Gen 28:13 And behold! YHWH stationed himself beside* him, and he said: I am YHWH, the God of Abraham your father, and the God of Isaac. The land that you settle upon, to you I shall give it and to your descendants.

Gen 31:5 And he said to them: I see the face of your father, surely/indeed it is not toward me as yesterday nor the day before, but the god(s) of my father was with me.

Gen 31:29 It is in the power of my hand to do evil with you, but the God of your father the past night said to me: “you take care of yourself when speaking to Jacob, whether for good or evil.”

Gen 31:42 Except the god(s) of my father, the *Elohim* of Abraham, and the *PḤD* of Isaac were with me, surely now empty you sent me away. My affliction and the toil of my hands Elohim saw, and gave reproof last night.

Gen 31:53 The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, they will judge between us, the God of their father. And Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac.

Gen 32:10 And Jacob said: O God of my father Abraham, and God of my Father Isaac: YHWH who said to me to return to your land, your birth, and I will be good with you.

Gen 43:23 And he said: 'Peace be to you, fear not; your God, and the God of your father, has given you treasure in your sacks; I had your money.' And he brought Simeon out unto them.

Gen 46:1-3 [1] And Israel took his journey with all that he had, and came to Beer-sheba, and offered sacrifices unto the God of his father Isaac. [2] And God spoke unto Israel in the visions of the night, and said: 'Jacob, Jacob.' And he said: 'Here am I.' [3] And He said: 'I am the El, the God of your father; fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation.

Gen 49:24-26 [24] But his bow abode firm, and the arms of his hands were made supple, by the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob, from thence, from the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel, [25] Even by the God of your father, who shall help thee, and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee, with blessings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that crouches below, blessings of the breasts, and of the womb. [26] The blessings of your father are mighty beyond the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills;

they shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of the prince among his brethren.

Gen 50:17 So shall you say unto Joseph: Forgive, I pray you now, the transgression of your brethren, and their sin, for that they did unto thee evil. And now, we pray you, forgive the transgression of the servants of the God of you father.' And Joseph wept when they spoke unto him.

Exod 3:6 And he said: I am the God of your father; the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob; and Moses hid his face for he feared looking at the deity.

Exod 3:13 And Moses said to the divinity, behold (when) I am coming to the sons of Israel and I should say to them, the God of your fathers (*3bwt*) sent me to you and they say to me, what is his name, what do I tell them?

Exod 3:15-16 [15] And again the divinity said to Moses, thus you shall say to the Children of Israel, "Yahweh the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob sent me to you; this is my name forever and this is my commemoration from generation to generation. [16] Go and gather the elders of Israel and say to them, YHWH the God of your fathers appeared to me; the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "Surely I appointed you all and your deeds in Egypt."

Exod 15:2 Yah is my strength and song, and He is become my salvation; this is my God, and I will glorify Him; my father's God, and I will exalt Him.

Secondary References

Yahweh, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob (Exod 4:5; 1 Kgs 18:36; 1 Chron 29:18; 2 Chron 30:6).

Yahweh, the God of your fathers (Deut 1:11; 21; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7; 27:3; 29:25; Josh 18:3; Jdg 2:12; 2 Kgs 21:22; 1 Chron 5:25; 12:17; 2 Chron 7:22; 13:12, 18; 14:4; 15:12; 19:4; 20:6, 33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:9, 25; 33:12; 34:32, 33; 36:15).

God of your father (1 Chron 28:9).

God of their fathers (1 Chron 29:20; 2 Chron 30:19, 22).[467]

[467] Additional references to God identifiers (e.g., God of Israel, God of heaven, etc.) are not listed in this study.

Ancillary References

Gen 14:18-20 [18] And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was priest of ʾēl ʿelyon. [19] And he blessed him, and said: 'Blessed be Abram of ʾēl ʿelyon, Maker of heaven and earth; [20] and blessed be ʾēl ʿelyon, who has delivered thine enemies into your hand.' And he gave him a tenth of all.

Gen 14:22 And Abram said to the king of Sodom: 'I have lifted up my hand unto the Yahweh, ʾēl ʿelyon, maker of heaven and earth.

Gen 17:1 And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him: 'I am ʾēl šaddai; walk before Me, and be whole.

Gen 21:33 And Abraham planted a tamarisk-tree in Beersheba, and called there on the name of Yahweh, ʾēl ʿōlam.

Gen 31:13 I am the El Beth-el where you anointed the pillar, where you made a vow to me. Now arise. Depart this land and return to the land of your birth.

Gen 31:24 And Elohim came to Laban the Aramean in a dream at night and he said to him: You take heed, lest you speak with Jacob good or evil.

Gen 31:51-52 [51] And Laban said to Jacob: 'Behold this heap, and behold the pillar, which I have set up between me and you. [52] This heap is a witness, and the pillar is a witness, that I will not pass over this heap to you, and that you shall not pass over this heap and this pillar unto me, for evil.

Gen 35:11 And God (Elohim) said unto him: 'I am ʾēl šaddai. Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be yours, and kings shall come out of your loins.

Gen 43:14 and El-Shaddai give you mercy before the man, that he may release unto you your other brother and Benjamin. And as for me, if I be bereaved of my children, I am bereaved.'

Exod 6:2-3 And God (Elohim) spoke unto Moses, and said unto him: 'I am Yahweh; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as ʾēl šaddai, but by my name Yahweh I did not make myself known to them.

Num 24:4 The saying of him who hears the words of El, who sees the vision of Shaddai, fallen down, yet with opened eyes

Num 24:16 The saying of him who hears the words of El, and knows the knowledge of Elyon, who sees the vision of Shaddai, fallen down, yet with opened eyes:

Deut 32:8 When Elyon gave to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the borders of the peoples according to the number of the *sons of Israel** (frt. “sons of God”).

Ps 78:35 And they remembered that God was their Rock, and ʾēl ʿelyon their redeemer.

Ps 89:27 He will call out (to) me, “You are my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation.”

Bibliography

Abusch, I Tzvi. *Babylonian Witchcraft Literature: Case Studies*. Atlanta: GA: Scholars Press, 1987.

Ahituv, Shmuel. *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period*. Jerusalem: Carta, 2009.

Al-Maqdissi, et al. "Introduction" *in Excavating Qatna: Documents D'Archeologie Syrienne*. IV
Edited by Michel al-Maqdissi, Marta Luciani, et al. Damascas: Direction Général des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie, 2002.

Albright, William F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process : Z. Edited by with a New Introduction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1967.

_____. "The Names Shaddai and Abram." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 54:4 (1935): 173-204.

_____. *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Abou Assaf, Ali, Pierre Bordreuil, and Alan R. Millard. *La Statue Del Tell Fekherye Et Son Inscription Bilingue Assyro-Arameenne*. Paris: Editions Recherches sur les civilisations, 1982.

Allen, Spencer L., *The Splintered Divine: A Study of Istar, Baal, and Yahweh Divine Names and Divine Multiplicity in the Ancient Near East*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter Inc., 2015.

Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, Vol. 1*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.

Albertz, Rainer, Beth A. Nakhai, Saul M. Olyan, and Rüdiger Schmitt. *Family and Household Religion: Toward a Synthesis of Old Testament Studies, Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Cultural Studies*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

Alt, Albrecht. "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Trans. R. A. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Alfonso Archi, "Associations des divinités hourrites," *Ugarit Forschungen* 11 (1979): 7-12.

_____. *Ebla and Its Archives. Texts, History, and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 2015.

_____. "How a Pantheon Forms: The Cases of Hattian-hittite [sic] Anatolia and Ebla of the 3rd Millenium [*sic*] B.C." Pages 1-18 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen Zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien Und Dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposion*

Hamburg, 17.-21. März 1990. eds. Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsvelag, 1993.

Aristotle. *On the Parts of Animals*. Raleigh, N.C: Alex Catalogue, 1990.

Assmann, Jan. *Death and Salvation in Ancient Egypt.* Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.

_____. *God and Gods: Egypt, Israel, and the Rise of Monotheism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008.

_____. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

_____. *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Assmann, Jan, and Bill Templer. "Guilt and Remembrance: On the Theologization of History in the Ancient near East." History and Memory 2:1 (1990): 5–33.

Austin, John L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Azize, Joseph. *The Phoenician Solar Theology: An Investigation into the Phoenician Opinion of the Sun Found in Julian's Hymn to King Helios*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2005.

Barkay, Gabriel. "Mounds of Mystery." Biblical Archaeology Review 29:3 (2003): 32-39, 66-68.

Beal, Richard H. "The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I." Pages 13-35 in Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr: On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. *The Pantheon of Uruk During the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Beckman, Gary. "The Religion of the Hittites," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 52: 2/3 (1989): 98-108.

Berger, Peter L. *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1963.

Black, J.A., Cunningham, G., Fluckiger-Hawker, E, Robson, E., and Zólyomi, G., *The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (http://www-etcsl.orient.ox.ac.uk/), Oxford 1998-2017, accessed: December 01, 2016.

Black, Jeremy and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons, and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992.

Elizabeth Bloch-Smith. “Israelite Ethnicity in Iron I: Archaeology Preserves What is Remembered and What is Forgotten in Israel’s History.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122:3 (2003): 401-425.

Bodi Daniel. “Is There a Connection between the Amorites and the Arameans?” in *ARAM* 26:2 (2014): 383-409.

Bordreuil Pierre and Dennis Pardee. “Les textes Ougaritiques.” Pages 151-163 in Pierre Bordreuill Edited by, *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: les textes de la 34th campagne (1973)*. RSO 7; Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1991.

_____. “Textes ougaritiques oubliés et ‘transfuges’: *Semitica* 41/42 (1991-1992): 23-58.

Bottéro, Jean. *Bottéro/Bahrani: Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Botterweck, G. J., Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament: Volume XIII*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Bradshaw, Paul F. “Reckonings 7 The Reshaping of Liturgical Studies” *Anglican Theological Review* 72:4 (Fall 1990): 481-487.

Baumgartner, Albert I. *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary*. Boston: Brill, 1981.

Braun-Holzinger, Eva Andrea. *Mesopotamische Weihgaben der früh-dynastischen bis altbabylonischen Zeit*. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 1991.

Brettler, Marc Z. *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Brock, Sebastian. “Νεφεληγερέτα = Rkb ʿrpt.” *Vetus Testamentum* 18:3 (1968): 395–397.

_____. *The Syriac Fathers on Prayer and the Spiritual Life*. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications Inc., 1987.

Bryce, Trevor. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

_____. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

_____. *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia: From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire*. London: Routledge, 2012.

_____. *The World of The Neo-Hittite Kingdoms: A Political and Military History*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Buccellati, Giorgio. “Eblaite and Amorite Personal Names” *Namenforschung* 1: *An International Handbook of Onomastics*. Edited by E. Eichler et al.; Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

_____. “Ebla and the Amorites,” *Eblaitica* 3, (1992a): 85-106.

Burke, Aaron A. “Amorites, Climate Change and the Negotiation of Identity at the End of the Third Millennium B.C.” Pages 261-308 in *The Late Third Millennium in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14, and Climate Change*. Edited by F. Höflmayer. Oriental Institute Seminars 11, Oriental Institute, Chicago, 2017.

_____. “The Archaeology of Ritual and Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant and the Origins of Judaism.” Pages 895-907 in *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*. Edited by T. Insoll. Oxford University, Oxford, 2011.

Burke, Aaron A. et al. “Excavations of the New Kingdom Fortress in Jaffa, 2011–2014: Traces of Resistance to Egyptian Rule in Canaan,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 121:1 (2017): 85–133.

Çambel, Halet. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions: Volume II, Karatepe-Aslantaş*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.

Campbell, Joseph. Flight of the Wild Gander. South Bend, IN: Regenery/Gateway, Inc., 1979.

Cassuto, Umberto. *Biblical and Oriental Studies: Vol. 2: Bible and Ancient Oriental Texts*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975.

Clemens, David M., *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice: Vol. 1 Ugaritic and Ugarit Akkadian Texts*. Muenster: Ugarit-Verlad, 2001.

Cogan, Mordechai “Locating mat Hatti in Neo-Assyrian Inscriptions.” Pages 86-92 in *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume: Studies in Archaeology and Related Disciplines*. Edited by Eliezer D. Oren and Shmuel Ahituv. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2002.

Cohen, Mark E. “Another Utu Hymn, *Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie* 67 (1977): 1-19.

Cohn, Robert L. “Negotiating (with) the Natives: Ancestors and Identity in Genesis,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 96:2 (2003): 147-166.

Collins, Billie Jean. “The Bible, the Hittites, and Construction of the ‘Other’.” Pages 155-161 in Detlev Groddek and Marina Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2007.

_____. “The First Soldiers’ Oath (1.66).” Pages 165-167 in *Context of Scripture, Vol. 1*. Edited by William W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. Boston: Brill, 2003.

Conklin, Blane. *Oath Formulas in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Coulter, Charles R. and Patricia Turner. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Deities*. Jefferson, N.C: McFarland, 2012.

Cross, Frank. M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

_____. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Cross, Frank M. and David N. Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Biblical Resources Series. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.

Cunchillos, Jesús-Luis, "Correspondence at Ugarit." Pages 359-389 in the *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Edited by W.G.E. Watson and N. Wyatt. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Cunchillos, Jesús-Luis, Juan-Pablo Vita, and José-Ángel Zamora. *Ugaritic Data Bank*. Madrid: CSIC, Laboratorio de Hermeneumática, 2002.

_____. "Rāpiʾūma – Rephaim," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88, (1976): 323-45.

_____. *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. Leuven: University Press, 1997.

del Olmo Lete, Gregorio. "The 'Divine' Names of the Ugaritic Kings." *Ugarit Forschungen* 18 (1986): 83-95

del Olmo Lete, G. and Joaquín Sanmartin. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, Second Revised Edition, Part One [ʔa/i/u-k]. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

_____. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Second Revised Edition, Part Two [l-z]. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Di, Vito R. A. *Studies in Third Millennium Sumerian and Akkadian Personal Names: The Designation and Conception of the Personal God*. Roma: Pontificio istituto biblico, 1993.

Dietrich, M. and O. Loretz, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): No. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161." *Ugarit Forschungen* 15 (1983): 17-24.

Dinçol, A., B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins and H. Peker. "A New Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription from Hatay." *Anatolica* XL, (2014): 61-70.

Dinçol, Belkis, Ali Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins, Hasan Peker and Aliye Ôztan with a contribution by Ômer Çelik. “Two new inscribed Storm-god stelae from Arsuz (İskenderun): ARSUZ 1 and 2.” *Anatolian Studies* 65 (2015): 59-77.

Dossin, Georges. “A propos du dieu Lim.” *Syria* 55, (1978): 327-332.

Faber, Alice. “Akkadian Evidence for Proto-Semitic Affricates.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 37, No. 1, (Spring 1985): 101-107.

_____. “Second Harvest: šibbōletθ Revisited (Yet Again).” in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 37 (Spring 1992): 1-10.

_____. “Semitic Sibilants in an Afro-Asiatic Context.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 29 (1984): 189-224.

Feliu, Lluis and Wilfred G. E. Watson. *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Feyerick, Ada, Cyrus H. Gordon, and Nahum M. Sarna. *Genesis: World of Myths and Patriarchs.* New York: NYU Press, 1996.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.

Fleming, Daniel E. “The Integration of Household and Community Religion in Ancient Syria.” Pages 37-59 in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*. Edited by John P. Bodel and Saul M. Olyan. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, Boston, 2015.

_____. *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition*. New York, N.Y: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Foster, Benjamin R. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005.

_____. *The Age of Agade: Inventing Empire in Ancient Mesopotamia*. New York, NY : Routledge, 2016.

Freedman, David N. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 2*. New Haven, Conn. [u.a.: Yale University Press, 2008.

Friedrich, Johannes. “Churritische Märchen und Sagen in hethitischer Sprache.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 49 (1950): 213-255.

García, Juan Carlos Moreno. “Ancestral Cults in Ancient Egypt.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia*

of Religion. 2016-08-31. Oxford University Press. Date of access 10 February. 2017, http://religion.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-242

Garr, W. Randall. *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 BCE*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

_____. "'Image' and 'Likeness' in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh." *Israel Exploration Journal* 50: 3/4 (2000): 227-34.

_____. "The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111:3 (1992): 385–408.

Gelb, I.J. *Glossary of Old Akkadian, Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary* 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Gelb, Ignace J., et al. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 21 Volumes. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2010.

George, Andrew. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*: *The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian*. London: Penguin, 2000.

Gibson, John. C. L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, Volume 1: Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

_____. *Textbook of Syriac Semitic Inscriptions. Volume 2: Aramaic Inscriptions Including Inscriptions in the Dialect of Zenjirli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

_____. *Textbook of Syriac Semitic Inscriptions. Volume 3: Phoenician Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Gilbert, Alessandra. *Syro-Hittite Monumental Art and the Archaeology of Performance: The Stone Reliefs at Carchemish and Zincirli in the Earlier First Millennium BCE.* Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG: 2011.

Giorgieri, Mauro. "L'onomastica hurrita: La civiltà dei hurriti." *La Parola del Passato, Rivista Di Studi Antichi* 55 (2000): 278-95.

Glatz, Claudia and Aimée M. Plourde. "Landscape Monuments and Political Competition in Late Bronze Age Anatolia: An Investigation of Costly Signaling Theory." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 361 (2011): 33-66.

Gordon, Cyrus H. "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 17:1 (1958): 28-31.

Gordon, C.H. and Rendsburg, G.A. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1997.

Grabbe, Lester. *The Land of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age*. Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017.

Graham, W.A. *Beyond the Written Word*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Grassi, Alessandro. "Il Sostantivo SMR Nell'Iscrizione Breve di Kilamuwa (KAI 25): Proposte d'Interpretazione" *Isimu* VII, (2004): 251-62.

Green, Alberto R.W. *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Greenberg. Moshe. "Another Look at Rachel's Theft of the Teraphim." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81:3 (1962): 239–48.

Greenfield Jonas C. and Aaron Shaffer. "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherya." *Iraq* 45:1 (1983): 109-16.

Greenstein, Edward L. "Verbal Art and Literary Sensibilities in Ancient Near Eastern Context." Pages 457-75 in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Ancient Israel*. Edited by Susan Niditch. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2016.

Gropp Douglas M. and Theodore J. Lewis. "Notes on Some Problems in the Aramaic Text of the Hadd-Yith'i." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 259, (1985): 45-61.

Gütterbock, Hans G. "Hethitische Götterdarstellungen und Götternamen." *Belleten* 7 (1953): 295-317.

Hajnal, Ivo. *"Lydian: Late Hittite or Neo-Luwian?"* Innsbruck, Universität Innsbruck - Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen: 2001. Accessed November – December 2012.

Halpern, Baruch. "'Brisker Pipes Than Poetry': The Development of Israelite Monotheism." Pages 77-116 in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Edited by I. Neusner, B. A. Levine, and E.S. Freichs. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

_____. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988.

Handy, Lowell K. *Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian Pantheon as Bureaucracy*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Haas, Volkert. *Geschichte Der Hethitischen Religion*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Hackett, Jo Ann. *The Balaam Text from Deir ᶜallā*. Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

Hawkins, John David. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.

_____. "The Soul in the Stele?" in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*. Pages 49-56 Edited by Alfonso Archi. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Hays. Christopher B. *Death in the Iron Age II and in First Isaiah*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Healey, John F. "Ritual Text KTU 1.161 – Translation and Notes." *Ugarit Forschungen* 10 (1978): 83-88.

Hendel, Ronald, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hess, Richard S. *Amarna Personal Names*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.

_____. *Israelite Religions: An Archaeological and Biblical Survey*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Hirsch, Hans."Gott Der Väter." *Archiv für Orientforshung*, Supplement 21, (1966): 56-59.

Hoffner Jr., Harry A. *Hittite Myths.* 2nd. Edited by *SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series* Atlanta, GA. Society of Biblical Literature: 1998.

_____. "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels." Pages xxix-xxxiv in *The Context of Scripture, Vol. 3: Archival Documents from the Biblical World*. Edited by William M. Hallow and K. Lawson Younger Jr. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Hoffner, Harry A, and H C. Melchert. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Hoftijzer, Jacob, K Jongeling, Richard C. Steiner, Adina M. Moshavi, Bezalel Porten, and Charles-François Jean. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Boston, Mass: Brill, 2003.

Hoftijzer, Jacob and G . Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'alla*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Huehnergard, John. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Hundley, Michael B. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2013.

Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Hutter, Manfred. "Aspects of Luwian Religion." Pages 211-80 in *The Luwians*, Edited by H. Craig Melchert, Boston: Brill, 2003.

Ingholt, Harald, André Caquot, Henri SEYRIG, and Jean STARCKY. *Recueil Des Tessères De Palmyre. Par H. Ingholt, Henri Seyrig, Jean Starcky, Suivi De Remarques Linguistiques Par André Caquot, Etc*. Pl. XLIX. Paris, 1955.

Issar, Arie S. *Strike the Rock and There Shall Come Water: Climate Changes, Water Resources and History of the Lands of the Bible*. New York: Springer, 2014.

Izre'el, Shlomo. *Adapa and the South Wind: Language Has the Power of Life and Death*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. *Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976.

Jagersma, Bram ."The Calendar of the Funerary Cult in Ancient Lagash." *Biblioteca Orientalis* 64 (2007): 289-307.

Jones, Gwilym Henry. *The Nathan Narratives*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Jonker, Gerdien. *The Topography of Remembrance: The Dead, Tradition and Collective Memory in Mesopotamia*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Kassian, Alexei, and Korolëv, Andrej and Sidel′tsev, Andrej. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš: Volume 288 of Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2002.

Kitz, Anne Marie. "To Be or Not to Be, That is the Question: YHWH and Ea." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association, Santa Clara, CA, 7 August 2016.

Klengel, Horst and Fiorella Imparati, Volkert Haas, and den H. T. P. J. Van., *Geschichte Des Hethitischen Reiches*, (Leiden: Brill, 1999

Kuhrt, Amelie. *The Ancient Near East, C. 3000-330 BC*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Koehler, Ludwig & Baumgartner, Walter. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden, Brill: 2001.

Kogut, Simcha. "The Biblical Phrase 'יש/אין לאל יד': On the Interpretations and Development of a

Mistake / הביטוי המקראי 'יש/אין לאל יד' – לפירושיו ולתולדותיו של שיבוש." *Tarbiz / תרביץ*, נז, ג 1988, 435–444. (in Hebrew)

Krebernik, Manfred. "Lim." *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7, (1987): 25-27.

Labuschagne, Casper J. "Teraphim: A New Proposal for Its Etymology," *Vetus Testamentum* 16:1 (1966): 115–117.

Lambert, Wilfred G. Andrew George, and Takayoshi Oshima. *Ancient Mesopotamian Religion and Mythology: Selected Essays*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2016.

Lanfranchi, Giovanni B. "The Luwian-Phoenician bilinguals of ÇINEKÖY and KARATEPE." Pages 179-217 in *Getrennte Wege? Kommunikation, Raum und Wahrnehmung in der Alten Welt* Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike e.K., 2007.

Laroche, Emmanuel. *Recherches Sur Les Noms Des Dieux Hittites*. Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve, 1947.

Lauinger, Jacob. "Some Preliminary Thoughts on the Tablet Collection in Building XVI from Tell Tayinat." *Journal of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 6 (2011): 5-14.

Lemaire, André. "SMR dans la petite inscription de Kilamuwa (Zencirli)," *Syria* 67 (1990): 323-7.

L'Heureux, Conrad E. *Rank among the Canaanite Gods, El, Baʿal, and the Rephaʾim*. HSM 21; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Levi, Della V. G, and Maria G. Amadasi. *Iscrizioni Puniche Della Tripolitania, 1927-1967*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1987.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*. trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963.

Levine Baruch A. and Jean-Michel de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim: the Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 (1984): 649-659.

Lewis, Theodore J. *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

_____. "Feasts for the Dead and Ancestor Veneration in Levantine Traditions." Pages 69-74 in *In Remembrance of Me: Feasting with the Dead in the Ancient Middle East.* Edited by V. R. Herrmann and J. D. Schloen. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2014.

_____. "How Far Can Texts Take Us? Evaluating Textual Sources for Reconstructing Ancient Israelite Beliefs about the Dead." Pages 169-217 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archaeology and the Religion of Israel.* Edited by B. M. Gittlen. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Lewy, Julius. "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'Ancien Testament," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 110 (1934): 29-65.

Lipinski, Edward. "Le dieu Lim." Pages 151-60 in *La civilization de Mari.* 15th RAI: J.R Kupper Edited by J.R. Kupper, Liegè: Université de Liegè, 1967.

_____. *The Aramaeans: Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

_____. "The Bilingual Inscription from Tell Fekheriye." Pages 19-81 in *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* II. Edited by E. Lipiski; OLA 57; Leuven: Peeters, 1994.

Magnetti, Donald L. "The Function of the Oath in the Ancient Near Eastern International Treaty," *The American Journal of International Law* 72:4 (1978): 815–829.

Malamat, Abraham. *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1989.

Mandell, Alice. *Scribalism and Diplomacy at the Crossroads of Cuneiform Culture: The Sociolinguistics of Canaano-Akkadian*. PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2015.

May, Herbert G. "The God of My Father: A Study in Patriarchal Religion," *Journal of Bible and Religion* 9:3 (1941): 155-158.

McGinnis, John. "A Neo-Assyrian Text Describing a Royal Funeral." *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 1. Padova: Sargon Editrice e Libreria, (1987): 1-13.

MacLaughlin, John L. *The Marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature: References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Mellaart, James. "Western Anatolia, Beycesultan and the Hittites." *Melanges Mansel 1* (1974): 493-526.

Melchert, H. Craig. *Comments on the Kuttamuwa Stele*. Accessed Nov.-Dec., 2012. URL: http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/KuttamuwaStele.pdf

_____. "Remarks on Kuttamuwa." *Kubaba*: *The Journal of Ancient Southwest Asia and Eastern Mediterranean Studies* 1 (2010): 3-11.

_____. *The Luwians*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003.

Michael the Syrian. *The Chronicle of Michael the Great, Patriarch of the Syrians*. Robert Bedrousian (trans.). Bedrousian: Long Branch, NJ, 2013.

Moor, Johannes C. *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Moran, William L. "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy." *Biblica*, 50:1 (1969): 15–56.

Mouto, Alice, Ian Rutherford, and Ilya Yakubovich, *Luwian Identities Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Müller, Miriam. "Household Archaeology in Egypt and its Benefits for the Reconstruction of Ancient Egyptian Social Structure." Lecture, UCLA Near Eastern Languages and Cultures Deptartment. Nov., 13, 2012.

Nakata, Ichiro. *Deities in the Mari Texts: Complete Inventory of All the Information on the Deities Found in the Published Old Babylonian Cuneiform Texts from Mari and Analytical and Comparative Evaluation Thereof with Regard to the Official and Popular Patheons of Mari*. Ann Arbor, MI, 1983.

Naveh, Joseph. "The Date of the Tell Fekheriyeh Inscription" (in Hebrew). *Shnaton* 5-6 (1978-1979): 131-140.

Neu, Erich. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1996

Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word. Ancient Israelite Literature*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Niehr, Herbert. "The Katumuwa Stele in the Context of Royal Mortuary Cult at Sam'al." Pages 57-60 in *In Remembrance of Me: Feasting with the Dead in the Ancient Middle East.* Edited by V. R. Herrmann and J. D. Schloen. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2014

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Oppenheim A. Leo and Erica Reiner. *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Ornan, Tallay. "The Long Life of a Dead King: A Bronze Statue from Hazor in its Ancient Near Eastern Context." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.* No. 366 (May 2012): 1-33.

Oriental Institute, "Research Goals," *Research Goals | The Neubauer Expedition to Zincirli | The*

University of Chicago, N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Mar. 2017.

Pardee, Dennis. "A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 356*, (2009): 51-71.

_____. "Marziḥu, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult." Pages 273-87 in *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquim on Ugarit, Religion, and Culture*. Edited by. N. Wyatt, W.G.E. Watson and J.B. Lloyd. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996.

_____. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature: 2002.

_____. "The Katumuwa Inscription." Pages 45-48 in *In Remembrance of Me: Feasting with the Dead in the Ancient Middle East.* Edited by V. R. Herrmann and J. D. Schloen. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2014.

Parker, Simon B. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Parpola, Simo. *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki University Press, 1993.

_____. *Queries to the Sungod: Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki University Press, 1990.

_____. "The Alleged Middle/Neo-Assyrian Irregular Verb *NAṢṢ and the Assyrian Sound Change š > s." in *Assur: Monograph Journals of the Near East* 1:1. Malibu, CA: Undena Publications, 1974.

Parpola, Simo, Kazuko Watanabe, and Julian Reade. *Neo-assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988.

Patterson, Richard D. "Victory at Sea: Prose and Poetry in Exodus 14-15." *Biblioteca Sacra* 161 (2004): 42.

Payne, Annick. *Hieroglypic Luwian: An Introduction with Original Texts*. 2nd Revised Edition. Wiesbaden: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2010.

Pecchioli Daddi, Franca and Polvani Anna Maria. *La Mitologia Ittita*. Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1990.

Pfälzner, Peter. "Royal Funerary Practices and Inter-regional Contacts in the Middle Bronze Age Levant: New Evidence from Qatna." Pages 141-156 in *Contextualising Grave Inventories in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by P. Pfälzner, H. Niehr, E. Pernicka, S. Lange, and T. KösterQaṭna Studien, Supplementa 3. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2014.

Phillips, Anthony and Lucy Phillips. "The Origin of 'I Am' in Exodus 3.14," *Journal for the*

Study of the Old Testament 78 (1998): 81-84.

Pinches, Th. G. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylon in the British Museum, Vol. 45: Old Babylonian Business Documents*. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1964.

Pitard, Wayne T. "The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 232, (1978): 65-75.

Pope, Marvin H. *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1955.

_____. "Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit." Pages 163-182 in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstien*. Edited by Maria de John Ellis Hamden: Connecticut Academy of Arts & Sciences, 1977.

_____. "The Cult of the Dead at Ugarit." Pages 159-79 in *Ugarit in Retrospect*. Edited by G.D. Young. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981.

Person, Jr. Raymond F. "Education and the Transmission of Tradition." Pages 366-378 in *Companion to Ancient Israel*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2016.

Puhvel, Jaan. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary, Vol. 2: Words Beginning with E and I*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1984.

Rabin, Hayyim. *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Jewish Agency, 1974.

Radner, Karen. *Die Macht des Namens: Altorientalische Strategien zur Selbsterhaltung.* Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005.

Rahmouni, Aicha and J N. Ford. *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Rainey, Anson. "Who Is a Canaanite? A Review of the Textual Evidence." *Bulletin for the American School of Oriental Research.* No. 304 (Nov., 1996): 1-15

Tekoglu Recai, "La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy." Pages 961-1007 in *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 144:3 (2000).

Redford, Donald B. "The Literary Motif of the Exposed Child." *Numen* 14 (1967): 209-228.

_____. *The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Reiner, Erica. *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*. Graz: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1958.

Rendsburg, Gary A. “A Comprehensive Guide to Israelian Hebrew: Grammar and Lexicon.” *Orient*. 38 (2003): 5-35.

_____. “Moses as Equal to Pharoah.” Pages 201-19 in *Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion*. Brown Judaic Studies 346; Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006.

_____.. “Moses the Magician” Pages 243-58 in *Israel’s Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective:*
Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience. Berlin: Spinger, 2015.

_____. “The Dialect of the Deir ʿAlla Inscription.” *Biblioteca Orientalia* 50 (1993): 309-28.

_____. *The Redaction of Genesis*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986.

_____. “Reading David in Genesis.” *Bible Review* 17:1 Feb. 2001.

Richter, Thomas. “Die Lesung des Götternamens AN.AN.MAR.TU.” Pages 135-7 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi* 10/2, Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 9. Edited by David I. Owen and Gernot Wilhelm. Bethesda, MD.: CDL Press, 1998.

Roccati, Alessandro. “A Stone Fragment Inscribed with Names of Sesostris I Discovered at Qatna.” Pages 172-4 in *Excavating Qatna: Documents D’Archeologie Syrienne.* IV Edited by Michel al-Maqdissi, Marta Luciani, et al. Damascas: Direction Général des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie: 2002.

Römer, Thomas. “The Revleation of the Divine Name to Moses and the Construction of a Memory About the Origins of the Encounter between YHWH and Israel.” Pages 305-16 in *Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*. Edited by Levy, Thomas E, Thomas Schneider, William H. Propp, and Brad C. Sparks. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2015.

Russell, Brian D. *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21*, New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2007.

Ryholt, Kim. “A Pair of Oracle Petitions Addressed to Horus-of-the-Camp,” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 79 (1993): 189-198.

Sáenz-Badillos, Angel and John Elwolde. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Sanders, Seth. “Naming the Dead: Funerary Writing and Historical Change in the Iron Age Levant,” *MAARAV* 19:1-2 (2012): 11-36.

Schade, Aaron. “Fronted Word Order in Phoenician Inscriptions.” Pages 111-37 in *Linguistic Studies in Phoenician*. Edited by. R.D. Holmstedt and A. Schade. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Schloen, J. David. *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Schmidt, Brian. *Israel’s Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Schniedewind, William M. *A Social History of Hebrew*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

_____. “Calling God Names: an Inner-Biblical Approach to the Tetragrammaton.” Pages 74-86 in *Scriptural Exegesis: The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination: Essays in Honour of Michael Fishbane*. Edited by Deborah A. Green and Laura S. Lieber, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

_____. *How the Bible Became a Book*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Schudson, Michael. “The Present in the Past versus the Past in the Present.” *Communication* 11 (1989): 105-13.

Schwartz, Barry, Yael Zerubavel, and Bernice Barnett. “The Recovery of Masada: A Study in Collective Memory,” *Sociological Quarterly*, 27, no. 2 (1986): 147-64.

Schwartz, Benjamin. “The Hittite and Luwian Ritual of Zarpiya of Kezzuwatna.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 58:2 (1938): 334-53.

Searle, John R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

_____. *Intentionality an Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Seow. C.L. “Lim.” Pages 521-3 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, K, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Shryock, Andrew. *Nationalism and the Genealogical Imagination: Oral History and Textual Authority in Tribal Jordan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Siegelová, Jana. *Appu-Märchen und Ḫedammu-Mythus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1971.

Singer, Itamar, *Hittite Prayers*. Atlanta, GA. Society of Biblical Literature: 2002.

_____. "'The Thousand Gods of Hatti': The Limits of an Expanding Pantheon." Pages 47-53 in *Israel Oriental Studies* XIV (1994) = *Concepts of the Other in Ancient Near Eastern Religions*, Edited by Ilai Alon, Ithamar Gruenwald and Itamar Singer. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Smith, Mark. *Following Osiris: Perspectives on the Osirian Afterlife from Four Millennia*. Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2017.

Smith, Mark S. *The Early History of God*. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

_____. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

_____. *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.

_____. "Monotheism and Redefinition of Divinity." Pages 278-93 in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Ancient Israel*, Edited by Susan Niditch. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 2016.

_____. *The Rituals and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods of KTU/CAT 1.23: Royal Constructions of Opposition, Intersection, Integration, and Domination.* SBL Resources for Biblical Study, 51; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Smith, Mark S. and Simon B. Parker. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997.

Smith, Mark S, and Wayne T. Pitard. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Vol. I*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

_____. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Vol. II*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Sommer, Benjamin. *Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2009.

Stager, Lawrence E. "The Archaeology of the Family in Ancient Israel." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 260, (1985): 1–35.

Starke, F. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31: Wiesbadeen 1990.

Stavrakopoulou, Francesca. *Land of Our Fathers: The Roles of Ancestor Veneration in Biblical Land Claims*. New York: T & T Clark International, 2010.

Stephens, Ferris J. "Notes on Cappadocian Tablets." *Journal of the American Oriental Society,*

46 (1926): 179–181.

Struble and Hermann. “An Eternal Feast at Samal: The New Iron Age Mortuary Stele from Zincirli in Context.” *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research 356* (2009): 15-49.

Suriano, Matthew J. “Breaking Bread with the Dead: Katumuwa’s Stele, Hosea 9:4, and the Early History of the Soul.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134:3 (2014): 385-405.

_____. *The Politics of Dead Kings: Dynastic Ancestors in the Book of Kings and Ancient Israel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Taylor, J. Glen. “A First and Last Thing to do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some Parallels.” Pages 151-177 in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical & Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. Edited by Lyle Eslinger & Glen Taylor. JSOTS 67; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

Thompson, Thomas L. *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel: 1*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Triebel, Lothar. *Jenseitshoffnung in Wort und Stein: Nefesch und Pyramidales Grabmal als Phänomene Antiken Jüdischen Bestattungswesens im Kontext Der Nachbarkulturen.* Lieden, Brill: 2004.

Tropper, Josef. *Die Inscriften von Zincirli.* Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 1993.

_____. *Nekromantie: Totenbefragung Im Alten Orient Und Im Alten Testament*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1989.

Tsukimoto, Akio. *Untersuchungen zur Totenplege (kispum) im Alten Mesopotamien*. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.

Tsumura, David Toshiro. “Official Cult and Popular Religion in the Ancient Near East.” Pages 40-55 in *Papers of the First Colloquium on the Ancient Near East – The City and its Life held at the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan (Mitaka, Tokyo),* Edited by Eiko Matsushima. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1993.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Ullendorff, Edward “Ugaritic Studies within Their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46:1 (1963): 236-249.

Van den Hout, Theo. “Self, Soul and Portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian.” Pages 171-86 in *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th*

Birthday. Edited by Piotr Taracha. Warsaw, 2002.

Van der Hart, R. "The Camp of Dan and the Camp of Yahweh." *Vetus Testamentum* 25, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 1975): 724

Van der Toorn, Karel. *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

_____. "Family Religion in Second Millennium West Asia (Mesopotamia, Emar, Nuzi)." Pages 20-36 in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*. Eds. John P Bodel and Saul M. Olyan. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub. Ltd, 2008.

_____. "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52:2 (1990): 203-22.

Van der Torn, Karel, Becking, Bob, and van der Horst, Pieter W. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Van Seters, John. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Verderame, Lorenzo. "Pleiades in Ancient Mesopotamia." *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 16:4 (2016): 109-117.

Vigano, Lorenzo. *Nomi E Titoli Yhwh Alla Luce Del Semitico Del Nord-Ovest*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.

Von Dassow, Eva. "Canaanite in Cuneiform." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124:4 (2004): 641–674.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. trans. J. H. Marks; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.

Watts, James W. "Song and the Ancient reader." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 22 (1995): 135.

Wegner, Ilse. *Einführung in Die Hurritische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.

Weimar, Peter. *Die Berufung Des Mose*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1980.

Weinfeld, Moshe. "'Rider of the Clouds' and 'Gatherer of the Clouds.'" *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 5 (1973): 421–426.

White, J.E. Manchip. *Ancient Egypt: Its Culture and Its History*. New York: Dover Publications, 1970.

Wilson, John A. "The Oath in Ancient Egypt." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 7:3 (1948): 129–156.

Wingert, Michael. “Ancient Near Eastern Literary Influences on the Hebrew Bible” in the *Wiley-Blackwell Handbook to the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., forthcoming.

Wyatt, Nick. *The Mythic Mind: Essays on Cosmology and Religion in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature*. New York : Routledge, 2014.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in Light of Archaeological Discovery*. London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1963.

Yakubovich, Ilya. “Nugae Luvicae.” Pages 189-209 in *Anatolian Languages*. Edited by Vitaly Shevoroshkin and Paul J. Sidwell. Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 2002.

_____.*Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Boston: Brill, 2010.

_____. “The West Semitic God El in Anatolian Hieroglyphic Transmission.” Pages 385-98 in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*. Edited by Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan, Jared L. Mille Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag: 2010.

Yon, Marguerite. *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Young, Gordon D. *Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981.

Younger, K Lawson. *A Political History of the Arameans: From Their Origins to the End of Their Polities*, Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2016.

_____. “Two Epigraphic Notes on the New Katumuwa Inscription from Zincirli,” *MAARAV* 16.2 (2009): 159-79.

Zhakevich, Philip. *The Tools of an Israelite Scribe: A Semantic Study of the Terms Signifying the Tools and Materials of Writing in Biblical Hebrew*. Austin, TX: PhD Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin. Ann Arbor: Proquest/UMI, 2015.