Unburning Fame

Horses, Dragons, Beings of Smoke, and Other Indo-European Motifs in Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible

Wikander, Ola

2017

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

OLA WIKANDER

Unburning Fame

Horses, Dragons, Beings of Smoke, and Other Indo-European Motifs in Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible

CB

CONIECTANEA BIBLICA

OLD TESTAMENT SERIES 62

Unburning Fame

Horses, Dragons, Beings of Smoke, and Other Indo-European Motifs in Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible

Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 62

by
Ola Wikander

Originally published by Eisenbrauns, 2017 (that version copyright © Eisenbrauns 2017)
.

This PDF text of the book, after the addenda/corrigenda page, is identical to the 2017 edition, and should be cited using 2017 as publishing year.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

- On the question of the reconstructed proto-phrase for "He killed the Serpent" discussed on pp 65–67 (and underlying a part of the book's "quotation motto" on p. v), I now refer to my forthcoming article "L's and S's in the Land of Israel" (*SEÅ* 2021), in which the relevant verb is reconstructed with an emphatic lateral, **maḫaṣa*; see that publication for further arguments concerning the phrase and references to relevant literature.

- On p. vii – for "Wakins" read "Watkins". For *ḥārāš* read *ḥāraš*.

- In footnote 19, for "2015" read "2015c".

- On p. 27 – for *à-zú-wi* read *á-zú-wi.*

- In fn. 143, for "1963" read "Rabin 1963".

- On pp. 100 and 104, for "Lluis" read "Lluís".

- Concerning the Vercelli inscription (discussed on p. 107), it has now come to my attention that the reading is uncertain, and that a different reading (**teuou-ton+[..]neu**) can be found in María José Estarán Tolosa (2016), *Epigrafía bilingüe del Occidente romano : el latín y las lenguas locales en las inscripciones bilingües y mixtas* (p. 233; I would like to thank David Stifter for bringing this to my attention).

- On p. 110, for "'voiced'/fortis/non-geminate" read "'voiced'/lenis/non-geminate".

- In fn. 232, the date for Feliu (given there twice as 2005) should be 2003.

- In fn. 254, after the quotation from Mallory, insert "(the fourth version he refers to is a word in Kartvelian)".

- In fn. 281, remove "(in a footnote, no less)".
.
- On p. 175, the date for Waldman should be 1989.

Echoing words…

**eg^{wh}ent og^{wh}im –*

****maḫaṣa naḥaša.***

**n̥d^{h}g^{wh}itom h$_1$estu k̂lewos!*

… ʾim ʾeškaḥēk… tiškaḥ yĕmînî!

Preface

This book is a labor of love. It represents, from various angles, my love both for the writings of the Hebrew Bible and their "uncle," the texts from Ugarit, and the epic, mythological and linguistic traditions of the early Indo-Europeans—and, in all of these cases, for the discipline and methodology of comparative linguistics used as a tool for deepened exegetical understanding of texts.

The title of the book, *Unburning Fame*, is based on one of the poetic motifs studied in it, one involving burning heat as a metaphor for forgetting past famous deeds as well as important events and places—and thus its opposite, "unburning," as a piece of imagery signifying their resilience. As we shall see, this type of imagery appears both in biblical and Indo-European literature, and thus provides a perfect metaphor for the resilience of these inter-cultural motifs themselves. They have, most certainly, never burned. And if the connections may at one point or another seem to have been obscured, then the title has another possible significance (due to the grammatical intricacies of the English language): that the aim of the book, then, is "unburning" them.

The first steps in the writing of this book were taken at about 8.16 AM on July 15, 2012, at the Swedish Institute in Rome (*Istituto Svedese di Studi Classici a Roma*), where I was staying with my father and wife. As I entered into the final phase of working on the manuscript in the summer of 2016, I was once again at the Institute, which seems a fitting *inclusio* for the project. The Institute was and is a marvelous and inspiring place to work in, and it is certainly happy for me to be able both to start and to (almost) end the writing of this book with a stay in its magical and "cloistral hush," as Evelyn Waugh might put it.

I have also benefitted from a short visit to the Warburg Institute, London, in October of 2015; I would like to extend my thanks to Charles Burnett for the warm reception I was given and for the permission to work in the wonderful Warburg library, which provided a number of important pieces of secondary literature.

To various scholars and colleagues who have helped me with discussions both concerning parts of my manuscript and more general questions that turn up in it (as well as access to certain secondary literature), I also extend my most humble thanks. On the exegetical/Semitist side of the fence, I would especially like to mention Noga Ayali-Darshan, Kevin Cathcart, Philip R. Davies, Göran Eidevall, Sten Hidal, Antti Laato, Fredrik Lindström, Tryggve Mettinger, Blaženka Scheuer, Terje Stordalen, Sophia Tranefeldt, and David Willgren. The entire Old Testament seminar at Lund has been very helpful and supportive along the way, and thus, thanks are also due to Jessica Alm, Erik Aurelius, Linnéa Gradén, Bo Johnson, Sophie Lovén, and Elisabet Nord. Two of the chapters making up the present volume have been presented and discussed (in earlier versions) at the OTSEM conferences in Oxford (2012) and Tartu (2013), and I would like to express my thanks to all those that took part in the discussions. Among scholars of Indo-European languages, I have enjoyed fruitful discussions and interactions with Martin Gansten, Adam Hyllested,

Alwin Kloekhorst, Jenny Larsson, H. Craig Melchert, and Sergio Neri. I would especially like to thank Jenny Larsson for inviting me as a guest lecturer to the "Historical Linguistics Seminar" (*Språkhistoriska seminariet*) at Stockholm University (April 2015), to present (*inter alia*) some of the ideas appearing in chapter 4 of this book. Craig Melchert has been extraordinarily generous in answering my many questions and in discussing various philological/linguistic problems. Thanks are also due to Folke Josephson, who once upon set me on the wonderful path of studying Anatolian. From the Lund History of Religions seminar, I would especially like to extend my gratitude to Paul Linjamaa, Johan Nilsson, and Olle Qvarnström for valuable discussions and suggestions. My long talks with Martin Lund have been highly invigorating. Kåre Berge deserves thanks for his reading and positive assessment of my manuscript during the summer of 2016.

Any errors or infelicities are of course my own responsibility.

I offer my warm thanks to Göran Eidevall and Fredrik Lindström, the editors of ConBOT, for accepting the volume into that series, for which I have great respect—and for many valuable comments.

As I have done in many of my writings, I extend a very heartfelt thank you to my father, Örjan Wikander, who actually was the first to introduce me both to the study of Hebrew and to Indo-European linguistics and also did me the enormous service of compiling the indexes for the volume (indexing is a well-known superpower of his). A great お疲れ様 to YOHIO for his constant encouragement. Magnus Halle (also a member of the Lund OT seminar) has been a great and inspiring dialogue partner during much of the writing of the book, and our discussions of Northwest Semitic texts have been a constant source of joy.

As mentioned above, the intial sketches for the book were produced in 2012, a year during which I was employed as a so-called RQ08 researcher at Lund University. In 2013-2014, the project took a substantial step forward, as it received funding from the Swedish Research Council. This book is the direct result of that work, more specifically of the research project "Dragons and Horses—Indo-Europeans and Indo-European in the Old Testament World," number 421-2013-1452. I would like to thank the Council for the opportunities this funding created. Without it, this book would not exist.

Finally, and as always, I extend my love and gratitude to my *Dear Lady* Rebecca Bugge, who not only helped type the index into the computer and proofreading it but supported my work from the get-go.
お疲れ様 … 愛している!

Early 2017

Ola Wikander

1. Introduction

1.1 Aims and form

The biblical poets sang of the deeds of YHWH and his heroes, of the Israelite people, and of battles against the Sea and the Leviathan. Ancient Indo-European singers told of the imperishable, undying fame of other heroes, of dragons they slew and enemies they conquered. The purpose of this book is to see how these stories met. How they intertwined.

No man is an island, as the old and clichéd saying goes. No culture is alone. No barrier is impenetrable—neither linguistic nor religious. This is true now, and it was true in Antiquity. The "imperishable fame" the ancient Indo-European poets sang about was not limited or fenced in: it spread, it crossed seen and unseen borders. And one of the places to which it spread was the Northwest Semitic-speaking world of the Hebrew Bible.

From the poetic and literary tradition of the Proto-Indo-Europeans came some of the most influential textual and religious traditions of the world. The literary/religious tradition represented in the Hebrew Bible is perhaps its only rival in terms of influence on the religious history of our planet. And the two interacted. This interaction is the subject of the present book.

In the studies making up the present volume, I will delve into the relationship between the world of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament and that of the Indo-European cultures that were its early neighbors, particularly the Anatolian cultures of the Hittites, Luwians, etc. I will paint a picture of connection, of interrelations, of interaction—of cultural spheres and literary traditions mixing and influencing one another. My goal is to examine certain cases exemplifying how poetic ideas, concepts and (in some cases) words from Indo-European sources came to be integrated into the cultural sphere that we know as that of the Old Testament, and to study if these patterns of integration can tell us something of the way in which the peoples involved interacted with one another. We are dealing with two of the most historically influential cultures of ideas, thought and mental production that the world has known, and what I wish to do in this book is look at a few instances where they can be shown to have influenced each other. I make no claims as to being all-encompassing or all-inclusive: this volume is a collection of *studies*, of individual forays into a field both vast and complicated. The endeavor, though based in religio-historical and linguistic methodology, is exegetical in its goals. By looking at the interactions between the Indo-European and biblical worlds, the understanding of the writings of the Hebrew Bible and its kindred literatures (especially the Ugaritic writings) can be increased.

This way of approaching the material—producing a collection of studies circling around a common theme—has resulted in what I like to refer to as a "polyphonic monograph": the studies making up the book are separate, to be sure, but they are meant to be read in connection with one another. They are

based in similar questions, phenomena and objects of study, and they are also (taken together) meant to illustrate and discuss certain methodological ideas that arise concerning the possibility of reconstructing literary/cultural interaction at the level of motifs. Thus, the various chapters are not meant to be viewed as individual *Lesefrüchte*, but as parts of a wider picture: one in which Indo-European and Semitic-speaking peoples of Antiquity collaborated in creating the multi-faceted tapestry that we know today as the Ancient Near East.

The study of the relationship between the Old Testament milieu and the Indo-European cultures of antiquity may help shed light on the cultural and linguistic contexts out of which the Hebrew writings grew—and help us understand how that language came to look the way that it does in the texts preserved to us. And, as suggested above, this is not all. As I hope to show in the pages of the book, finding and illuminating cases of Ugaritic and/or biblical reception of Indo-European mytho-poetic motifs is not merely a question of antiquarian interest or abstract philology: in many cases, showing this background provides concrete *explanatory power* for the real and basic exegetical questions: why do the texts look the way they do, and how can we understand them better?

1.2 Scope

It should be stated right out at the forefront what type of examples this book looks at. I am not investigating interactions and borrowings into the world of the Hebrew Bible from or involving the large first millennium BCE political powers that spoke Persian and Greek. In the context of seeing the culture that shaped the Hebrew writings as exponents of a greater Northwest Semitic milieu, the Persian and Hellenistic influences on the biblical text and its language must be regarded as quite late indeed. This by no means implies that I find those influences less important or less interesting—indeed, there is a growing consensus that the Persian- and Greek-dominated periods were extremely important for the formation of the texts we know today as the Hebrew Bible, and I have absolutely no qualms with this view. The Hebrew Bible that we read today is ultimately a product of these post-exilic eras (and, for the purposes of canonization, the Roman period), but the influences of these major and late Indo-European cultures—the Persian and the Greek—on the writings of the Hebrew Bible have been extensively studied and are being studied by others as I am writing this. I intend instead to look at examples of interaction with Indo-European culture at an earlier stage, mainly the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. This means that the Indo-European cultures that come into focus in this volume are mainly the Anatolian ones (Hittites, Luwians etc.) and the Indo-Aryan ones (or, in some cases, Iranian).

One reason for this choice of focus is the way in which I view the Hebrew and Ugaritic literary cultures in this book (and generally). It is my contention that, notwithstanding the undeniably strong influence of post-exilic culture, one cannot productively understand the background of much Biblical Hebrew literature without viewing that literature as an exponent of a shared Northwest

Semitic cultural milieu. As I like to put it, the Israelites did not "borrow" from Northwest Semitic culture, nor were they "influenced" by it: they *are* Northwest Semitic culture.[1] And thus, in order to study how Indo-European influences are reflected in that background, we must look at the level that is held in common by Israelite and Ugaritic literature (i.e., that historically and linguistically underlies them), and see how that level and its individual descendants reflect such influence. If this is the level at which one is searching, Anatolian and Indo-Iranian become the obvious influences to look for.

In this book, the phrase "the world of the Hebrew Bible" is meant to signify both the texts of the Hebrew Bible itself and parallel and closely related textual material, especially, but not limited to, the mythological texts from Ugarit. It is an undeniable fact that the religious culture reflected in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament and that preserved in the texts from Ugarit form two tightly-grown branches of the same Northwest Semitic tree, both from a linguistic and a religio-historical point of view. As I shall discuss in greater detail later on, the shared Northwest Semitic background of which both these textual corpora are representatives or descendants provides the common point at which borrowings from Indo-European sources will mainly be searched for in these studies. Influences at a wider scale (including, say, East Semitic or even extra-Semitic Afro-Asiatic linguistic cultures) will be referred to on occasion, but the main focus will be on the Hebew Bible and the Ugaritic literature. This is due not only to the main spheres of competence of the author, but also to the linguistic and literary closeness of these textual cultures. As mentioned, I believe it highly important always to underscore that these two corpora are part of a Northwest Semitic whole, and one way of doing that is—perhaps ironically—to show how that "whole" interacted with linguistically "foreign" cultures, such as the Indo-European ones.

It could be asked why this book is organized around the concept of *Indo-European* influence in general. Why use such a wide-ranging term for cultures and languages as different from each other as Hittite and Indo-Aryan? To be sure, they *are* linguistically Indo-European, but some readers might object that this is not really relevant in their interaction with the "world of the Hebrew Bible" sketched above. To this I would answer that the Anatolian and Indo-Aryan (and in a wider perspective, Indo-Iranian) branches of Indo-European provide such a glimpse into the early world of Proto-Indo-European thought, and give such important data for the reconstruction of the poetic/religious universe of that world, that it would be folly indeed only to regard the two as atomic entities and not as exponents of "Indo-European." This implies another basic methodological basis for the present book, which will become even clearer in what follows: that it tries to take into account and build upon certain of the results of comparative Indo-European poetics and mythology. It is not in the

[1] I speak of the Hebrew Bible not "borrowing" from Northwest Semitic culture but *being* Northwest Semitic culture in Wikander 2017: 119. Similarly, Wikander 2014: 15.

main to specifically Indo-Aryan or Anatolian phenomena as such that these studies are looking, but to the shared Indo-European background of which they are exponents. Thus, given what was stated above about the Northwest Semitic "world of the Hebrew Bible" and its central role in the book, we arrive at a view of interaction that is (at least partly) operating at the levels of two different reconstructed linguistic cultures, the shared Northwest Semitic culture of Israelite and Ugaritic writings, and the shared Indo-European background of Anatolian and Indo-Aryan. To be sure, we shall in certain cases focus more squarely on individual exponents of both of these cultural spheres, yet the macro-perspective is always there in the background.[2] This methodological choice is, of course, fraught with difficulty, yet it is also, I believe, the only way of highlighting which words, motifs and ideas in the Hebrew and Ugaritic writings carry something inherently Indo-European with them and, by so doing, illustrating the cultural interactions that break down the artificial cultural borders created by difference in linguistic background. To see how Northwest Semitic and Indo-European cultures interacted, and to challenge assumptions of walls between them, we must first start in the basic fact that these walls exist in a *linguistic* sense. And to do that, we must have a firm grounding in a philologically oriented methodology. It is not enough to find pieces of ideas that "feel Indo-European." Indo-European is a linguistic and philological concept, and therefore, finding Indo-European motifs demands a philologically and linguistically grounded method. To this question we now turn.

1.3 Methodological Self-Reflection

After having gone through the process of finishing up my doctoral dissertation and preparing it for publication in the ConBOT series (Wikander 2014), as well as working out the perimeters of the research project of which the present book is a result, I was in the happy and interesting position of being able to take a step back and take a look at what I had actually been doing during all those hours of research—from a broader and hopefully well-informed perspective. What, I asked myself, is the special methodological approach that I have grown fond of using in order to study textual material from the Ancient Near East? What has my own methodological contribution looked like? If someone asks me what my specific attitude towards the study of the Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic material is, what would I answer?

The answer that I came to is that I am working in the methodological field of *etymologically based history of motifs*, or (as I like to call it) *etymological poetics*. What I examined in my 2014 study of drought motifs in Ugaritic literature and in the Hebrew Bible was how ancient religious and poetic material can survive for long periods of time, being carried between authors, redactors,

[2] This also means that some of the more previously well-known and oft-proposed connections between, e.g., Hittites and the Old Testament are not discussed in this volume; one example of this is the connection suggested between the Azazel/scapegoat ritual of Lev 16 and Hittite ritual practices. On this, see Janowski and Wilhelm 1993, with references to further literature.

centuries and texts using lexical or semantic material as their vectors. This was my approach in the previous book, and this will be the approach of the present one.

This methodological attitude towards material from the Hebrew Bible and other Ancient Near Eastern texts stands at the intersection of three scholarly fields: Biblical Exegesis, Comparative Linguistics, and History of Religion. The book is not, however, a sociological or even "historical" study in the narrow sense of reconstructing historical events: the format is almost entirely textually centered. What I intend to explore in this volume is how possible Indo-European/Northwest Semitic interactions are reflected *in actual preserved texts*, trying to draw lines between them in a way that hopefully grants some new layer or depth to the interpretative process. It is but rarely that I venture into discussions of actual, "physical" pathways of transmission: it is my opinion that such are in the main impossible to reconstruct in their details. Often, we cannot know or even plausibly imagine exactly how a specific mytheme or motif was transported between the cultures involved; we can only note and argue for the case that it appears to have happened.

This, of course, creates a vast methodological problem of "sifting the real connections from the imagined." However, this difficulty is not fundamentally different from what would be the case regarding any study of history of ideas crossing long periods of time. Within the field of Old Testament study, the great ideological currents of Deuteronomism, Priestly thinking, etc., are presupposed to be real without anybody actually being able to pinpoint the historical or sociological realities underlying them.[3] They are definitely convenient analytical constructs well suited for describing vast rivers of theological and ideological developments, but they cannot necessarily be correlated easily with actual historical figures; there have, of course, been many attempts at doing so—and many of these are certainly interesting and thought-provoking—but they are often quite difficult to verify or falsify. This means that the kind of relationships between motifs that I am discussing is not as easily verifiable or falsifiable as, say, a description of an ancient building that can perhaps be correlated (or contrasted) with archaeological finds.

The type of "etymological poetics" that I am studying in this book (as well as in my 2014 study on drought motifs in Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible) instead uses the medium of motif transmission based on *words and phrases* as its most important method of testability. What I am trying to work on is cases in which the words themselves appear to have acted as carriers of motifs and mythological information. In some of the cases appearing in this book, this process is very apparent and clearly recognizable; in others, it is more nebulous. Nevertheless, this is the basic methodological approach that I am taking towards my material.

---

[3] As an indicator of this fact, one need only think of the amount of scholarly articles and writings on the issue of "who the Deuteronomists really were." One indicative title is that of the anthology *Those Elusive Deuteronomists* (Schearing and McKenzie [eds.] 1999).

This is why the reader will find a number of references to possible loan-translations of mythological titles, creative word-play on the part of the ancient authors, and other such-like phenomena. In the cases where we can show such connections, the mythological comparisons between differing textual corpora become less prone to accidental "parallelomania." That is also the reason for the first study in the book being centered on two possible cultural-interactional loanwords (words for "horse" and "to plow," respectively) rather than on more abstract mythemes (which appear later in the volume). I want to underscore the idea of etymological study as a basic and quite necessary tool in the search for mythological and literary parallels, as well.

What makes such a quest more perilous for this study than for studies of purely inner-Indo-European mythological patterns, for example, is of course the fact that we are dealing with different linguistic cultures in the present case, cultures that cannot "inherit" (in the etymological sense) anything from each other but between which borrowing is the only pathway open. Studying etymological connections here is much trickier, and, in fact, the word "etymology" must here be thought of as being enclosed in quotation-marks. It is not a question of etymology in the sense of direct inheritance, but in that of lexical interaction (borrowings and calques) and interaction at the level of literary, theological and mythological motifs. Still, anchoring one's comparisons in the study of words (be they borrowed or calqued) provides some type of scholarly control, as opposed to more purely typological parallel-finding (which is interesting in and of itself but does not necessarily imply any type of historical connection between the phenomena being compared).[4] This means that I will not, in general, be working with that type of general typological and mythological comparison that can, for example, be found in the work of Grottanelli (1999), when he discusses a general (and transcultural) "battle" myth as being historicized and instantiated in the story of Deborah and Barak. Grottanelli expressely does not want to be fettered by the necessity of demonstrating historical connectedness: typology is enough for him. Yet, one cannot help being slightly bemused that even Grottanelli uses a form of "etymological poetics" when he analyzes the names of Barak and Lappidoth as having to do with "lightning" and "flashes" as part of his typological comparison. Even though he purports only to employ a more general form of comparative mythology, Grottanelli uses a type of historical linguistic method to try to find a deeper level in the story (which in itself seems to imply a historical background for the mythological connections).[5]

---

[4] As part of the research project leading towards the present study, I have also published an article based in this purely "typological" form of comparison. That article (Wikander 2015a) discusses the phenomenological similarities between Josiah's and Hilkiah's supposed discovery of a holy book in the Temple in 622 BCE and a discovery of an inscribed cultic image of that in a sense most Indo-European of deities, Indra, in the temple Shibamata Taishakuten, on the outskirts of Tokyo, in 1779 CE.

[5] Grottanelli 1999; the discussion of the Deborah-Barak episode can be found in chapter 4 (originally published in article form as Grottanelli 1987) and the discussion of the names on pp. 74-75.

So, in general, I will try to keep to the "etymological poetic" methodology, searching for historically connected poetic phrases, motifs and mythemes by searching for linguistic material that may have carried them through history. As I have pointed out previously in the introduction to Wikander 2014,[6] this methodology builds upon the work of Calvert Watkins (1995) and his studies of dragon myths in Indo-European cultures and their linguistic inheritability. We shall return to this topic in greater detail in chapter 4. In a few cases, I will start by showing a more general "typological" similarity even at the motif/word level, but even in those cases, I will argue that historical connections are quite possible. And again, the lexical phraseology (both in the sources from the "world of the Hebrew Bible" and in the Indo-European ones) are in constant focus.

One should note that searching for contacts between Indo-European and Northwest Semitic culture and mythology has not been seen as very strange when going in the opposite direction from what is mainly studied in this book. Influence from Semitic (or other Ancient Near Eastern) sources upon the world of classical antiquity has been foregrounded many times (and with various degrees of persuasiveness), for example in works by Gordon (1962), Astour (1967), West (1997), and Bachvarova (2016). Looking for Indo-European motifs in biblical and Ugaritic mythology need be no stranger; yet, as I mentioned above, methodological stringency is needed, and it is for this reason that I believe "etymological poetics" to be such a viable and valuable tool.

A recent reading of Philip R. Davies' *In Search of "Ancient Israel"*—one of the modern classics of the tendency often, though perhaps not very precisely, referred to as "biblical minimalism"[7]—provoked another type of methodological self-reflection. I am not myself an adherent of the above-mentioned "school" or tendency, yet I readily concede that it has provided a very good and welcome methodological challenge to certain often unspoken axioms of older biblical scholarship while highlighting the important roles of the Persian and Hellenistic eras in the literary genesis or background of many texts in the Hebrew Bible. Even though I am generally much more open to early datings of biblical texts than is Davies, the challenge of "minimalist" methodological criticism is one that all scholars of the Hebrew Bible need to take seriously—and that challenge may in fact help in making one's own axioms clearer and more consciously known and opted for, even if one does not always agree with the specific points of that challenge.

---

[6] Wikander 2014: 14-15.

[7] One should note that Davies himself rejects this label, viewing it as pejorative and as not really referring to a cohesive school of thought that can fruitfully be talked of as a scholarly collective (see Davies's web article "Minimalism, 'Ancient Israel,' and Anti-Semitism," available at http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Minimalism.shtml [accessed latest May 6, 2016], and also Davies 2015: xvi-xvii). However, I will continue to use the term, though in quotation marks, to signify a tendency made up by scholars such as Davies and the so-called Copenhagen school. This is just a matter of simplicity.

The basic idea underlying many forms of "minimalism" is a very, very thoroughgoing application of Occam's razor. The fewer historical postulates one makes, the better—so to speak. If the texts of the Hebrew Bible can be explained without positing an extensive "Ancient Israel" but mainly by cultural memory during the Persian and Hellenistic periods, then it should, so the argument goes (stated in an extremely simplistic way).

My own basic methodology is different. The goal of the present studies is not to reconstruct "Israelite" history with as few (and late) postulates as possible, but to offer models that make the texts as preserved to us (biblical, Ugaritic or otherwise) easier to understand and explain. The point, actually, is not to make abstract historical statements at all, but to present models of historical interaction that explain the literary material of concrete texts from an exegetical point of view. The important thing, then, is not necessarily which explanation contains the fewest postulates, but which one provides the clearest religio-historical and linguistic background for interpreting the textual entity at hand. We are working here not in the realm of historical facts in a general or abstract sense but in that of literary, poetic and mythological motifs. This will, perforce, sometimes have purely historical implications—and will often require tests of plausibility by comparing with known historical facts—but the issue remains one in which the text or motif itself is the primary object of study (and not necessarily its material-political background).[8]

I would like to return for a moment to the methodological choice alluded to above: that the motif comparisons carried out in this volume are mainly based in those that can be associated with specific pieces of lexical material, i.e., words (either borrowings or calques/loan translations). Why, it could be asked, have I chosen such an approach? As I will mention at a number of points during the book, there have been attempts to find Indo-European motifs and poetic materials in the Hebrew Bible and other Northwest Semitic literature that do not show such lexical connections (the endeavors to find traces of Dumézilian trifunctionalism in the biblical writings provide one such example, to which I will be returning later). The reason for me refraining from such more "abstract" comparison is methodological in nature. If a possible historical connection is to

[8] There are of course cases in which these two different ways of studying the genesis of textual entities cannot be separated: one example among many is the discussion focusing on Josiah's putative cultic reforms in 622 BCE and the background of Deuteronomic/Deuteronomist ideology. The classical view of that ideology in essence going back to the specific historical events of 622 provides a very clear example of literary developments that are not seldom regarded as impossible to understand without reference to specific historical events. One should not forget, however, that even this classical dictum of historical-critical study is being challenged today: see, for example, the study of Pakkala (2010), who concludes that there were no Josianic reforms at all. Even though I do not really agree with that conclusion myself, the fact that the discussion concerning even such a classical connection between event and text is still ongoing proves that this type of "event-based" textual study (often regarded as one of the analytical bedrocks of biblical scholarship) is certainly not without its difficulties from a methodological point of view.

be posited between two mythemes or motifs in two (linguistically unrelated) religious literatures, one should rather like to anchor that in something more concrete than just noting that "two ideas or motifs seem similar." If one has no such mooring post whatsoever, the risk of intrusive coincidences becomes very high indeed. While it is not possible to do so in each and every case, I have tried as far as possible to demonstrate possible pieces of lexical data that could have carried the motifs with them.

The process just delineated is, in fact, exactly what I mean by "etymological poetics." The basic idea is that pieces of poetic diction carry motifs with them, and that such phrases and collocations are often transferred in a rather verbatim fashion. If one can follow words that have been inherited and borrowed, one can also follow the differing strands of a tradition in its constantly changing creations of meaning, i.e., one may find a tool with which to separate continuity from discontinuity. When one can show that words or collocations have survived (or have even been borrowed between languages, as in the Indo-European/biblical case), one can see a way of sifting the static from the changing.

This is a field of inquiry that I have been working in before. In an earlier research project, which was carried out with funding from the Swedish Nuclear Waste Management Company, I discussed various ways in which religious intelligentsias have been instrumental in preserving vast amounts of textual, technical and ideological material for long periods of time (examples such as the Rabbis and Brahmins come to mind). Such a method has been suggested as a way of preserving information about nuclear waste deposits into the far future, for example by semiotician Thomas Sebeok, who proposed creating what he called an "Atomic Priesthood," a sort of self-perpetuating intelligentsia that would preserve the vital (and lethal) information as a kind of religious corpus, while not telling the people at large of what they were doing; the people would instead take part in recurring rituals that would preserve the memory of the necessity of not disturbing the dangerous places, without actually describing the dangers in any real detail.

In one of the articles that came out of the above-mentioned project,[9] I criticized Sebeok's scheme by looking at other pieces of long-term transmission of religious material which, even though preserving basic motifs and lexical carriers thereof, was fundamentally reinterpreted as time went on. I mentioned examples such as the Israelite Feast of the Unleavened Bread being reinterpreted and historicized through its integration with the Pesach celebration and—from the Indo-European context also relevant to the present volume—the oft-proposed possibility of tales of dragon-slaying and rituals of horse sacrifice having been inherited from Proto-Indo-European times. The problem is that all of these traditions, however ancient they may be, have been reinterpreted over time and given vastly different explanations as opposed to what may have been

[9] Wikander 2015b; the original proposal concerning the "Atomic Priesthood" and their recurring rituals can be found in Sebeok 1984: 24.

their original significance. This, I argued, makes Sebeok's proposal rather less workable: even if a lexical and ritual transmission were successful, there would be no guarantee that their contents would not be reinterpreted by later generations.

All of this brings us back once more to the present investigation and "etymological poetics." What the problems with the "Atomic Priesthood" show is that identifying inherited narrative and ritual structures separated by great temporal or cultural gaps can be very difficult indeed if one does not separate that which continues on from that which is reinterpreted. It is here that lexical transmission comes in: anchoring the study in words and phrases at least has a chance of focusing on the more resilient links in the chains of tradition. If one looks not only for seemingly parallel cultural constructs or rituals but for words that either have a common origin (through etymological inheritance or, as in this case, loans or calques) or an identifiable semantic overlap, one has a control for the—on the face of it—rather abstract comparisons one is carrying out.

1.4 Implied Readership; Nomenclature, Transcriptions, and Protocols

Because of the dual objects of study and, thereby, dual disciplinary background underlying the present volume, something should be said about the intended readership of the studies contained herein. The book is mainly intended for scholars with a background in Old Testament Exegesis and/or the study of Northwest Semitic religious literature (mainly, of course, Ugaritic), but it is also meant to be of use to readers with a more general interest in Ancient Near Eastern religious history or, for that matter, Indo-Europeanists. However, given that the first point in this list of "implied readerships" is Old Testament scholars, hardcore Indo-Europeanists will have to accept that terms that are quite basic in that field (Brugmann's law, *thorn*-clusters, etc.) are given what may appear to be handbook-like explanations in footnotes. On the other hand, exegetes and Semitists may find that certain parts, which abound more in such Indo-Europeanist terminology or presuppose knowledge of concepts from Indo-European studies, are heavy going. In these cases, I refer both to the explanations that I have myself tried to give and to the standard handbooks of Indo-European studies, which cover most of these concepts.[10]

I use the standard transcriptions of Semitic languages (for Hebrew, I use the "Anglo-American" type of transcription). The names of the most well-known Ugaritic deities are often given in their common, Hebrew based, forms (Baal, Anat). Personified terms such as "Storm God," "Sea," "Serpent," etc. are written with initial capital when it seems appropriate (where it is actually a matter of an individual, personified being), although I cannot vouch for complete consistency in this regard, as there are many borderline cases. For Sanskrit, I use the standard IAST transcription. Renderings of reconstructed

[10] See, for example, Beekes 2011 (specifically introducing the "Leiden school" of Indo-European studies, out of which the work of Alwin Kloekhorst, referred to on many occasions in the present study, also comes), Clackson 2007, Fortson 2010, Meier-Brügger 2010, and Sihler 1995.

Proto-Indo-European words are, except when explicitly quoting sources using different systems, given in the ordinary way in the field, with superscript letters showing coarticulations such as aspiration and labialization and subscripts for the "largyngeals" *h_1, *h_2, and *h_3; in line with the general consensus, I reckon with three laryngeals in Proto-Indo-European. The "palato-velar" stops of Proto-Indo-European are written *$\hat{k}$, *$\hat{g}$, and *$\hat{g}^h$. It should be noted that I render the consonantal glides as *w and *y at the start of Proto-Indo-European syllables.

Old Testament texts are given according to the Masoretic Text (*BHS*) unless otherwise noted. Ṛg-Vedic texts are quoted according to the metrically restored edition of van Nooten and Holland (1994).[11] Ugaritic texts follow *KTU*, third edition; in the main text, I have indicated uncertain letters with roman type, as done in that edition, marking word dividers as well. In footnotes, however, I have dispensed with such details, writing "bare" Ugaritic words. I have not included signs marked as erased by the editors; also, in a (very) few instances, I have inserted a blank space after a conjunction where *KTU* does not. Quotations from the LXX follow the Rahlfs-Hanhart edition. Translations of ancient textual passages are my own, if not stated otherwise. The texts from the Enūma Eliš are based on the edition of Lambert (2013).

[11] However, for simplicity's sake, I do not include the Vedic accents. The text of van Nooten and Holland 1994 is now available online at the University of Texas Linguistics Research Center: https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/lrc/rigveda/, accessed latest Jan 30, 2017.

2. Preamble:
The Semitic and Indo-European Language Families, and Possible Arenas of Interaction

2.1 The Two Families and their Linguistic Typology

As a preamble to our more detailed studies of Indo-European/Northwest Semitic interaction, it may be fruitful to think for a short while about the typological similarities (and differences) between the Indo-European and Semitic linguistic families (in the latter case, of course, necessarily expanding the question to the greater Afro-Asiatic phylum in certain instances). The point of presenting such a comparison will not be to imply any type of "Indo-Semitic" or "Nostratic" relationship between the phyla. Such endeavors are, to my mind, beset with the most thoroughgoing methodological problems—so much as to make them more or less impossible. Rather, the typological similarities that—it must be said—do exist between the Indo-European and Semitic linguistic families should be seen as either being interesting chance resemblances or (possibly at least) signs of common areal features due to early cultural interaction between their speakers. Such a possibility is of course relevant to the present study.

In an earlier article (Wikander 2010), I discussed certain typological parallels between the Indo-European and Semitic verbal systems, or more specifically, the developments of the ways in which they grammatically encode tense, aspect and *Aktionsart*. There, I noted how both Indo-European and Semitic seem to have begun with a system basically divided into one category expressing some sort of "stativity" and one expressing fientic/eventive verbal predication. Both families split the latter into a durative and a perfective/aoristic subcategory (often reinforcing their temporality using an "augment"-like particle, in the Indo-European case the tense augment **e*- or **h*$_1$*e*- and, most clearly in Classical Hebrew, the "consecutive *wāw*"), whereupon the originally stative category gradually took on fientic uses, especially for perfective past time.[12]

The similarity in this "two-categories-and-a-half" typology of the verbal system is certainly a rather remarkable point of commonality between the Indo-

[12] This argument does not take into account more radical (though intriguing) reformulations of the Proto-Indo-European verbal system, such as the "**h*$_2$*e* conjugation" proposed by Jay Jasanoff (2003). After the finishing of Wikander 2010, it came to my attention that points similar to some of the ones put forth in that article had been made by David D. Testen (1998: 197-198); Testen also compares the temporalization of the Hebrew consecutive imperfect to the Indo-European augment, but his anaysis differs from mine in the crucial point of seeing the temporalizing action not in the consecutive *wāw* itself but in an intervening particle that Testen sees as coming between the *wāw* and the actual verbal form. His interpretation is thus different than mine: we both see the consecutive imperfect as temporalized in a way similar to the Indo-European augmented tenses, but we view the Hebrew "augments," so to speak, as consisting in different morphological units.

European and Semitic linguistic families. Proto-Indo-European possessed the "present" stem (durative) and the "aorist" stem (perfective), both basically inflected with similar endings, and it also had a parallel so-called "perfect" (originally stative) system. In quite a similar way, Semitic languages have (at least) two prefix conjugations used for fientive actions: *yaqtul* (perfective) and *yaqattal* [or *yaqtulu* in Central Semitic] (imperfective), as opposed to the old stative (turned into the *qatala* "perfect" in West Semitic).[13] In both Indo-European and Semitic, the old stative gradually acquired perfective/past meaning.

Of course, the question is whether this striking typological similarity is due to some type of areal contact or simply to coincidence. Again, it cannot be any matter of actual linguistic relatedness: the formation of the forms is completely and utterly different between the families. If anything, it could only be a question of very early *Sprachbund*-like areal influence.

When looking at this type of general parallels of linguistic typology on a wide scale, one has to exercise great caution. It is a well-known phenomenon that different linguistic phyla can develop similar features quite independently of one another, even in cases where the parallels appear to be very substantial and concrete indeed. One such example directly involving the Indo-European and Semitic phyla can be found in the fact that languages from both families exhibit a system of two categories of nominal gender referred to as masculine and feminine, and that a number of these languages (in both families) appear to mark the feminine gender using a morpheme looking something like *-a* (Hebrew *-â*, dialectal Arabic *-a*, Latin *-a*, Sanskrit *-ā*, etc.). However, a basic historical insight into the development of these forms shows that the origin of these seemingly almost identical morphemes is completely different. The Semitic *"a*-feminines" are, in fact, shortened or apocopated versions of the actual historical ending *-(a)t-*, in which the *t* and not the *a* is the central part of the morpheme. And the Indo-European feminine *ā*-ending originally appears to derive from a more complex ending **-eh₂*.

Another example of how Indo-European and Semitic languages have developed in similar ways (a sort of "convergent evolution," if one wants to use Darwinian terminology) is Old Irish, which has developed several features seemingly more typical of Semitic languages than Indo-European ones, regardless of that language having a secure Indo-European (Celtic) pedigree. Old Irish has inflected prepositions, Verb-Subject-Object word order, and direct object markers incorporated into the verbal chain (similar phenomena occur in other Insular Celtic languages as well). The typological similarities between Insular Celtic and the Semitic languages have even led to the proposal that there

[13] The development of Semitic stative, nominal-based, forms into verbal predications was in fact used by Warren Cowgill (1979: 34) as a typological argument concerning the genesis of the Hittite so-called *ḫi*-conjugation (cf. Jasanoff 2003: 17-21, esp. p. 18, with following criticism).

was a Semitic (or generally Afro-Asiatic) substratum in the areas subsequently inhabited by speakers of Insular Celtic.[14]

The phonologies of Proto-Indo-European and early Semitic (and Afro-Asiatic in general) also seem to have possessed certain parallels with each other. Proto-Indo-European possibly had pharyngeal sounds (or at least a number of back fricatives, referred to as "laryngeals" in Indo-European scholarship, despite their exact articulation being unknown or debated), and both Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European display a similar system of "triads" in the consonantal system (in the Indo-European case, only in the stop system). Indo-European has a triad traditionally described as being made up of "unvoiced, voiced, breathy voiced/voiced aspirated" (for example, in the dental series, **t, *d,* and **d^h*) with the "voiced" sound sometimes being reconstructed as glottalized instead;[15] Semitic has "unvoiced, emphatic, voiced" (for example *t, ṭ, d*). In both cases, the exact phonetics of these triads is under constant and vociferous debate. Yet, the triadic systems are similar, and (as Lutz Edzard points out), there is nothing self-evident or especially common about having consonantal triads in the phonemic inventory of a language.[16] Another clear typological parallel between Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic (including Semitic) is the reliance on verbal roots and fusional morphology (as opposed to agglutination, for example).[17]

It is of course possible that some of the typological similarities that can be found between Semitic and Indo-European languages could have something to do with very early interaction and areal contact, but this is by no means certain and definitely enters into the realm of the purely speculative. The similarities mentioned above in the area of historical verbal morphosyntax are certainly interesting, but no clear historical conclusions can be drawn from them. It is quite possible (even probable) that such similar typological developments could appear purely due to chance, and the same applies to the alleged pre-Celtic Semitic substrate. A connection is possible, but other possibilities could seem quite as or even more likely. And as any interactions on this level would need to have begun at an extremely early point (at the level of Proto-Afro-Asiatic rather

---

[14] For an overview of the question and a skeptical assessment, see Hewitt 2009.

[15] Or, according to a recent suggestion (Kümmel 2012, esp. pp. 303-304), implosive or "non-explosive."

[16] Edzard 2012: 27.

[17] Indeed, the parallel focus on root-based, fusional morphology, has been taken even further by Roland A. Pooth (2009, esp. p. 234-236 and 248-250), who radically argues that the traditional analysis of Proto-Indo-European roots as containing a vowel subject to gradation/*Ablaut* is methodologically misconstrued, and that it would make more sense to compare the Indo-European root system to that of a Semitic language, with a consonantal skeleton as the basis of root formation (he specifically mentions Classical Arabic and Proto-Semitic as examples of what he is thinking of). This is a very radical proposal, but it does highlight some of the typological parallels that exist between the Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic languages. Yet, it is still only a matter of a typological similarity and not of any distant genetic relationship, as Pooth himself clearly points out on p. 248.

than Proto-Semitic) it would be very hard indeed to prove them. Words, phrases and motifs are, however, a different matter.

2.2 Different Levels of Possible Historical Interaction

One of the first things clearly to ponder before attempting any search for Indo-European-derived motifs in Ugaritic and Ancient Hebrew literature is the multitude of levels at which such motifs could have passed between the cultures studied and the various types of influence and interaction this may entail.

The first level:

The areal influence delineated above that may or may not have affected the early Indo-European and Semitic verbal systems would (if true) have to have occurred at a very early point indeed (probably at one in which speakers of proto-languages interacted with each other). Contacts and borrowings at that early level may certainly be quite hard to process in a methodologically stringent way. One thinks of extremely early possible loan words, such as the oft-noted correspondence between Proto-Indo-European **k̂(e)r-n-(o)-* (with various suffixes, giving Latin *cornu*, Sanskrit *śṛṅ-ga-*, etc.) and Semitic **qarn-*, both meaning "horn" (the modern English word is, in fact, a reflex of the Indo-European complex of forms). In this book, a few possible examples of transmission at this early level will be taken up for discussion, even though the necessary methodological caveats must be remembered to apply.

The second level concerns influences that may have taken place at a time when the (to a large extent Semitic) literature of the Ancient Near East had come into being (or at least not too far from that point), even though the exact linguistic background of the putative Indo-European interacting culture cannot always be certainly known. One possible such example from the present volume is the divine name Dagan (see chapter 7).

The third level (and the one with the least amount of methodological pitfalls present—even though they are still many!) is the one for which one can plausibly argue a direct path of influence between an attested Indo-European-speaking culture of the Ancient Near East and the Ugaritic or biblical writings.

In some cases (as we shall see) more than one of these levels of interaction may well have been involved, i.e., an influence at a very early point in time may later have been "buttressed" by a later one. There may also have been instances in which Indo-European influence was indirect, i.e., mediated through some third party.[18] Both these problems will make themselves known when we discuss the serpent-slaying mythology of Indo-European and biblical culture.

[18] On the more general question of how OT authors viewed and interacted with (to them) foreign languages generally, I would like to refer to the recent doctoral dissertation Power 2015.

2.3 A Case of Demonstrable Interaction: The Elkunirša Text

Before moving into actual analyses of concrete words, motifs, and texts, I would like to remind the reader, just as an illustration, of a very concrete example of Indo-European/"proto-biblical" interaction, one that directly shows how such borrowings could happen in practice (and how motif and meaning could be transferred by means of lexical material). When dealing with motif- and word-level relationships between Indo-European-speaking Anatolia and the Northwest Semitic-speaking cultural sphere reflected at Ugarit and in the texts of the Hebrew Bible, there is one textual entity that cannot be ignored, as it attests directly to such a relationship, albeit in the opposite direction from what I will be mainly discussed in this book. I am speaking of the story of Elkunirša, an originally Northwest Semitic myth which has only been preserved in a Hittite translation. The name of the main character himself, Elkunirša, shows the linguistic background of the story. The name is a Hittite version of a Northwest Semitic expression essentially identical with that in Gen 14:19 and 14:22, *ʾēl* […] *qōneh* […] *ʾereṣ/ʿāreṣ*, "El, Creator of the Earth." Interestingly, the rounded vowel *u* of the Hittite form *Elkunirša* suggests that the immediate background of the name was not a Syrian language similar to Ugaritic but a southern Canaanite tongue, displaying as it does the Canaanite shift of **ā* to an *o* or *u*-quality vowel. In Ugaritic, the G active masculine participle of the verb *qny* ("to create") would be /*qāniyu*/ with the original long **ā* preserved. The -*kun*- of the form as appearing in the Hittite text is closer to the Hebrew form *qōneh*. Thus, the language from which the myth was translated/adapted was in all probability a Canaanite one (given the early period, perhaps "Canaanite" is the only name that we should give such a language).[19]

This fact is important for our purposes, since it shows beyond doubt a direct contact between Hittite (Indo-European) speaking Anatolia and the exact linguistic culture out of which the Hebrew writings grew—in all probability not a mediated interaction, but a direct one. Of course, what the existence of the Elkunirša text shows is the opposite direction of exchange to what will mainly be studied in the present volume (*from* "Canaanites" to Hittites rather than the other way around), but it provides a very clear example of the two cultural spheres interacting at a literary level at an early period. As the title *ʾēl qōneh ʾereṣ* appears to be something of a relic or a fossil in the Hebrew Bible (appearing as it does as the title of Melchizedek's god in Genesis 14), one could actually argue that the Hittite-language Elkunirša text is closer to the Canaanite (and general Northwest Semitic) heritage level on this point than the biblical

[19] The Hittite rendering may include yet another hint about "early Canaanite" phonology, at least in relation to one dialect thereof. The fact that the Northwest Semitic divine name is rendered with an *š*- grapheme suggests that (despite the early period) the dialect from which the name was taken did not pronounce *ṣ* with a clear affrication. I have argued earlier (Wikander 2015) that affrication was preserved here and there for a very long time (indeed, until Ashkenazi Hebrew), but this preservation was probably dialectal, which is also suggested by the Elkunirša example.

text itself. Also, as shown by Harry A. Hoffner, the text includes a creative mistranslation, in which Anat transforms herself into a "cup" when the original text apparently talked of a type of owl, which also appears in the text (both words being identical in Canaanite, as shown through the Hebrew *kôs*, which can mean both "cup" and "owl"). Hoffner's inspired insight goes to illustrate the basic methodological premise of the present study: that knowledge of the background of mythological motifs—even if (or actually *especially* if) they derive from "foreign" linguistic cultures—is necessary to understand the literary level of the texts.[20] To be sure, the Elkunirša example is more extreme, as the text is in all probability an actual *translation* from a Northwest Semitic original, but the point stands for shorter textual entities and motifs as well.

Even though the Elkunirša story is clearly "Canaanite" in context and background, it provides a perfect example of "translatability" of deities, as the Storm God (who is clearly the Northwest Semitic Baal/Hadad) is rendered by the Hittite translation as ^{d}U, one the normal Sumerographic spellings used for the Hittite Storm God(s), often standing for the Storm God *par excellence*, *Tarḫunna-*. This provides an ideal (and in no way unique) example of how these divinities could be conflated with one another, highly relevant for the upcoming discussion of the serpent stories, for example. The Northwest Semitic goddess Anat (or possibly Athtart) also appears in the Hittite text, written using the Akkadogram *IŠTAR*, as does El's wife, Athirat/Asherah (called *Ašertu*).

This is not the place to enter into a lengthy analysis of the Elkunirša story; what is necessary for the present purposes is noting its existence as proof positive of the Anatolian-biblical interaction that is one of the main points of the present volume. It shows that some of the lines of interaction that will be discussed in this book are no mere speculation: they were demonstratively there.

2.4 Why Generally "Indo-European"?

So, there are a number of different historical and linguistic levels at which Indo-European influence could have made itself known in the "world of the Hebrew Bible." The possible question then again suggests itself: why search for "Indo-European" influences at some type of meta-level, when such influence could in fact mean very different things? Would such a search not constitute an unnecessary conflation of several very different kinds of investigation, muddying the "methodological purity" of the enterprise? Why not simply talk of "Hittite" influence, "Luwian" influence, "Indo-Aryan" influence (etc.), without seeing these as representatives of Indo-European influence on a larger scale?

To this I would answer that there *do* appear to be a number of more generally "Indo-European" mytho-poetic tropes and images which seem to have been inherited from the proto-language level into the various attested Indo-European linguistic cultures (in a literary and linguistic sense as opposed to a

[20] The "owl/cup" suggestion is found in Hoffner 1965: 13-14. He translated the text in Hoffner 1998: 90-92. The Hittite text is edited in transliteration in Laroche 1969: 139-144. On translatable deities in general, see Smith 2010 (esp. pp. 82-83 on Elkunirša).

biological one), and that these have proven to be studiable at the meta-level of Proto-Indo-European. In a number of interesting cases, words, expressions and mythological tropes very similar to these appear in Ugaritic and Hebrew literature. To get at the various possible levels of transmission that may have given rise to these correspondences, I believe it necessary to study them as "Indo-European" ones as opposed to atomizing them into Hittite, Indo-Iranian or even language-specific levels, while not forgetting that the "common Indo-European background" will almost always have manifested itself through one of these sub-languages (attested or unattested).

Just as I firmly believe that one must reach for the level of shared Northwest Semitic poetic inheritance if one intends in a meaningful way to study the remarkable correspondences that exist between Ugaritic and Old Testament literature, in the same way I believe that the shared Indo-European mytho-linguistic stock of literary tropes and words can be seen, on a meta-level, as a background for influences on that shared Northwest Semitic cultural milieu. One must be able to move conceptually back and forth between the "proto"-level and the level of concrete, attested languages if such a comparative study is to be undertaken.

With these methodological caveats in mind, we shall now start our investigations at the most concrete of levels: that of words for concrete beings and implements: the horse and the plow.

3. Horse and Plow: Case Studies in Technological Indo-European/Hebrew Vocabulary

Before entering in earnest into the land of poetic or religious motifs, we shall begin with something more down to earth, viz. two possible cases of cultural/technical loanwords from Indo-European into the Northwest Semitic cultural sphere of which Hebrew and Ugaritic are parts. One of the words involved is the one that is often regarded as a sort of "poster boy" for comparative Indo-European linguistics as such: the word for "horse." Given the near-ubiquitous attestation of the "horse" word in the various branches of Indo-European, it is a very common stance to view the horse—and the mastery thereof—as one of the most defining traits of Proto-Indo-European culture and its early descendants. A possible borrowed representation of this word in Semitic is an important example case of Indo-European/Semitic cultural interaction. Thus, the "horse" word is the first case study of the present chapter.

On the topic of non-Semitic loan-words in Biblical Hebrew, James Barr writes the following:

> Where a non-Semitic origin for a word in the Old Testament is considered, attention should be given to the date both of the passage itself and of the events described in it. The probability of Hittite words would be higher in the earlier period. Accadian words may have come into Hebrew from early times down to the Babylonian exile. Persian words are conceivable from the sixth century or so onwards, but acknowledged examples of these (and also of Greek words) in the Hebrew parts of the Old Testament are very few; the Aramaic sections contain many more.[21]

Disregarding the fact that Akkadian words are not, in fact, "non-Semitic" (if one discounts loanwords that are in turn Sumerian in origin), Barr's words would of course seem to ring true, in the sense that a temporal overlap with the culture giving the loan would be preferable to the lack thereof. However, the problem of dating specific biblical passages needs no introduction to readers versed in Old Testament Exegesis, and thus the issue is not so clear cut in practice. Actually, loanwords are not seldom the means *by which* specific passages in the Hebrew Bible tend to be dated. And for a word as ubiquitous as "horse," such a practice

[21] Barr 1987: 104. There has been an increased interest in the systematic study of loanwords into Northwest Semitic during the last decades; one could mention the works of Mankowski (2000), on loanwords from Akkadian in Biblical Hebrew, Muchiki 1999, on Egyptian words in Northwest Semitic, Watson 2005, some of the sections in Watson 2007, as well as the recent Watson 2015, on loans appearing in Ugaritic (in the latter case focusing on a Hittite loan), and Watson 2013 (on loans in Phoenician and Punic). On possible loans from Indian languages in Biblical Hebrew, see Rabin 1994. For a summary of earlier work and references on suggested loanwords in Hebrew, including Indo-European ones, see Waldman 1989: 57-61. I would like to thank Prof. Kevin Cathcart for pointing out some of these references to me, as well as for many fruitful suggestions concerning this chapter.

(judging the question of possible loanwords on the basis of textual dating) becomes impossible. I would like to remind the reader of what was said in section 2.2 about different levels of possible interaction: the receiving language need not have been "Hebrew" as such, but may just as well have been a predecessor language, out of which what we now know as Hebrew subsequently grew. One should also not discount the possibility of several stages of borrowing through various languages. With these points in mind, we shall now take a look at the Hebrew word *sûs* and its possible background, whereafter we shall discuss another possible "technical word" that may represent an Indo-European/Semitic interaction, the word for the verb "to plow."

*3.1 "Case Study" 1: The Hebrew Word for "Horse" (***sûs***), and Its Cognates*

The Semitic word appearing in Hebrew as *sûs* has a long, earlier history. The earliest possible appearance of the lexeme may be represented by the writing ANŠE.ZI.ZI, which occurs already in the Ur III period as a variant of the ordinary Sumerian spelling of "horse" (ANŠE.KUR.RA, literally "donkey from the mountains").[22] The classical, Akkadian version of the word is the well-attested *sīsû(m)/sīsāʾum*, and there are of course attestations of the lexeme in many Semitic languages (Ugaritic *ssw/ṥṥw*, Aramaic *swsh/swsyh/sûsĕyâ*, Phoenician *ss* etc.) It is a common assumption that this word represents some form of loan from Indo-European.[23] Specifically, the supposition is that the Semitic word has its origin in a borrowing from some form of the Indo-European word reconstructed as **(h₁)ek̂w(o)-* in Proto-Indo-European, the very word that by normal processes of inheritance (and in some cases derivation) gave rise to Sanskrit *aśva(s)*, Latin *equus*, Old Irish *ech*, Gothic *aíhwa-*, Gaulish *epo-*, Lithuanian *ašvienis*, Tocharian *yakwe/yuk*, Median *aspa-* and (by somewhat aberrant and unclear processes) Greek ἵππος/ἵκκος. This word is one of the most prominent and well-attested of all inherited lexemes in the Indo-European family, and the idea that *sûs* represents a borrowing from it in some fashion is the proposition that I shall discuss here.

3.1.1 Is sûs *Really a Loan, and if so, from what Language?*

The first question one has to ask oneself is whether or not the Semitic word is really a plausible candidate for being a foreign loan. This question must be answered in the affirmative, a fact clearly underscored by the Ugaritic evidence. It is certainly no coincidence that the Ugaritic form of the words is sometimes written using the uncommon grapheme *ṥ*,[24] which was probably used to

[22] See Civil 1966: 121-122.

[23] For this type of general reference to "Indo-European" without further specifying qualifications, see, for example, Rainey 1970: 77 and the *CAD*, vol. S: 328 (s.v. *sīsû*). References to more specific suggestions will be found below.

[24] The spelling with *ṥ* is mainly used in prose texts, the one with *s* in poetic texts. The transcription *ś* (which one sometimes comes across for the former) is unfortunate and

represent an affricate sound [ts] at a time when the ordinary *sāmekh* (which, according to modern Semitological consensus, originally represented an affricate sound) had already been deaffricated.[25] The same phenomenon occurs in the case of the word *kṣ̀u*, which is certainly a loan, ultimately from the Sumerian *gu-za*. In both of these cases, it appears that the use of the unusual grapheme serves to underscore the affricate pronunciation in a period when that realization of the phoneme *s* had already mostly been given up in purely native Ugaritic words.[26]

The fact that the scribes thought is necessary to use a specific sign to underscore the affricate pronunciation of the word points quite clearly to the word being regarded as foreign. This means that—even though it had existed in the Semitic linguistic ambit for a long time—it may still have been regarded as somewhat alien to the Ugaritic language at the end of the second millennium BCE.

Another important point implied by the use of the affricate sign is that—if the word does, indeed, originate in some form of Indo-European—the Anatolian language Luwian (or something closely related to it) stands out as a probable source of the loan. It has many times been suggested that the origin should have been an Indo-Aryan language (cf. Sanskrit *aśva-*, nominative *aśvas*, perhaps from the Indo-Aryan superstrate language of the Mitanni kingdom), such as was undoubtedly the case with the hippological terminology of the Hittite texts associated with the Mitannian horse trainer Kikkuli, which includes non-native words for various horse-related concepts.[27] But in the Kikkuli material, the

---

should ideally be avoided, as it invites confusion with the Hebrew *śīn*, to which the letter is completely unrelated.

[25] On the affricate value of *s* (originally) and *ṣ̀* (later), see Tropper 1995 (specifically on *ṣ̀*) and later Tropper 2012: 40-50 (with ample references and examples). The fact that *sāmekh* and its equivalents originally represented [ts] must always be kept in mind when studying early Semitics. For simplicity's sake, I write simple [ts] for the affricate [ˈs].

[26] The affricate pronunciation of the letter *ṣ̀* is indicated not only by arguments from comparative Semitics and transcriptions into and from other languages (such as Egyptian and Hittite), but also by inner-Ugaritic evidence in the form of the substandard writing *ḫdṣ̀*, for *ḫdṯ* ("month") in KTU 1.78, line 1, both probably representing something like phonetical [ḥudsu]/[ḥutsu] (I personally find it more than likely [with Cross 1962: 250, *pace* Tropper 2012: 112-113] that the Ugaritic phoneme *ṯ* had shifted to something like [s], at least in the later phases of the language; for my specific views on the development of the Ugaritic sibilants and interdentals, see Wikander 2015c). For the word *ḫdṣ̀* being variant of *ḫdṯ*, see Tropper 1995: 521 and 2012: 49.

[27] The idea that the Semitic word (in its various versions) derives from Indo-Aryan *aśva(s)* was supported, e.g., by O'Connor (1989: 30, n. 30), by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 809), and (with a question mark added) by Watson (1995: 547). One should note that later, in Watson 2007: 70, the latter opts for the Ugaritic "horse" word being a loan from Hurrian, via Akkadian, while still stating an Indo-Aryan ("Sanskrit") origin on p. 146—perhaps "Hurrian" is there meant to be read as a sort of shorthand for "the part of the Hurrian lexicon that was probably derived from the once-existing Indo-Aryan superstrate language of the Mitanni kingdom," which would make the apparent

morpheme meaning horse is spelled *aššu-*, with a simple sibilant and not an affricate (and thus fitting better with Sanskrit *aśva-*; the Sanskrit *ś* sound was a palatal, unaffricated sibilant).[28] This (and the difficulty in explaining away the initial *a-*, which does not appear in the Semitic words) means that Indo-Aryan is not very likely as a source for *sûs*, despite how well that would fit with the well-known association between Indo-Aryan culture and equestrian prowess. The one attested Indo-European language in the Ancient Near Eastern region in which etymological **k̂* can regularly appear as an affricate—and therefore could reproduce that sound in **(h₁)ek̂w(o)-* in this way—is Luwian.[29] In Luwian, the word for "horse" seems to have been *azzu-*; it is written $^{\text{EQUUS}}$*á-sù-* in the modern standard transcription of the Hieroglyphic Luwian dialect—but $^{\text{EQUUS}}$*á-zú-* would probably be more accurate.[30] The Luwian sound transcribed *z* was probably phonetically [ts],[31] and would thus provide a perfect fit for the *sāmekh*, *z* or *ṣ* of the Semitic forms.

The supposition that *sûs* (etc.) represents a loan-word from Indo-European has not been without detractors. For example, G.R. Driver was sceptical, suggesting the possibility that *sûs* was instead a kind of *Lallwort*, which could

---

contradiction disappear. In Watson 2013: 332, a more general idea of an Indo-European loan is argued, mentioning Hittite and Luwian but not appearing to take a decided position on the source language (he just says "quite early"). Rabin (1994: 26-27) discusses the Indo-Aryan possibility but dismisses it in favor of an original Semitic word. For further references on the idea of an Indo-Aryan etymology, see Stendebach 2000: 180.

[28] Kikkuli calls himself *aššuššanni*, which was probably borrowed into Akkadian as *šušānu*, "horse trainer" (cf. *CAD*, vol Š III: 379 [s.v. *šušānu*]). On Kikkuli, see Raulwing 2009. An unusual stance is taken by Puhvel (1983: 671), who suggests viewing West Semitic **sūsu* as the source of Mittanni-Indian *aššu-* rather than the other way around.

[29] For the historical implications of this, see Melchert 1987 and (with a somewhat revised perspective) Melchert 2012. Note that Melchert expressly uses the argument of the affricates in the Luwian "horse" word to show that this word cannot be borrowed from Indo-Aryan but must represent an authentic inheritance from Proto-Indo-European into Luwian (Melchert 2012: 210), in a way similar to how I argue against an Indo-Aryan background for the Semitic word. The great difficulties in trying to derive Hebrew *sûs* from Indo-Aryan are well pointed out by Stendebach (2000: 181). Luwian as a probable source of the Semitic word was also endorsed by Tropper (1995: 514-515; 2012: 45), but it should be noted that he did not propose the same analysis of the plural source of the word that I do below. Also, one should be aware that Tropper's point is the other way around from what I am arguing: he presupposes the Luwian origin of the Ugaritic word and uses the Luwian phonological shape of the word (with the affricate sound) as an argument for the affricate vale of Ugaritic *ṣ*. However, he has so many other good examples for this affrication of *ṣ* that my referring to his arguments here could hardly be regarded as circular. I do not really understand, however, how Tropper accounts for there being two affricates in the Ugaritic word (even one at the beginning), when there is only one affricate segment in Luwian (albeit perhaps a geminate one).

[30] Melchert (2012: 210) argues convincingly that Luwian Hieroglyphic sign no. 448 must be read *zú*, not *sù* (*contra* Hawkins 2000: 35-36). See also Younger 2014: 180-181.

[31] Melchert 1987: 190.

be indicated by the "double" forms such as *su-su, zi-zi* etc. Stendebach seems to regard this possibility with favor, holding that "sibilants are characteristic of words describing quick, impetuous movements."[32] This, however, does not seem like much of a solution to my mind. At least within the context of Ugaritic, a *Lallwort* explanation would not solve very much, as the use of the *ṯ* grapheme would fit better with a borrowed word, whatever its ultimate origin. I would therefore like to argue the case for an Indo-European borrowing a bit further.

3.1.2 Problems in the Form of the Semitic Word—and a Proposed Solution

Regarding the form of the word as it appears in various Semitic languages, one has to admit that there are problems to solve—most pertinent is the question of the double sibilant/affricate *s-s* in the Semitic words. The common assumption of an Indo-European background for the word is sometimes challenged because of this. The double *s-* (originally [ts]-) sound of *sûs* is often seen as suspect given an origin in Proto-Indo-European *(*h*$_1$*)ek̂w(o)-*, which shows only a single **k̂* (the proto-phoneme that later developed into a sibilant or similar sound in many of the attested Indo-European languages and often into an affricate in Luwian).[33] There have been various attempts to circumvent this problem. One such is proposing an alternative version of the Indo-European lexeme, one beginning with a sibilant, which would account for the additional sibilant in the Semitic word. However, postulating such a variant version of the word appears to me to be much too *ad hoc* to satisfy the demands of rigorous etymological scholarship.[34]

---

[32] The original suggestion is found in Driver 1954: 73, n. 2 (*non vidi;* reference in Stendebach 2000: 180, who appears to find the idea attractive). One should note that the "revised and abridged" version of Driver's book (Driver 1957: 29, n. 2) no longer mentions the *Lallwort* theory but does, however, seem to retain a certain healthy scepticism towards a derivation from Indo-Aryan *aśva(s)*. Driver's argument that a theoretical Indo-Aryan loan must have taken place "at a very remote date before the tendency to drop the final *-s* of Skt. words" is, however, not compelling: even in the Classical Sanskrit of the first millennium BCE the nominative *-s* is retained in certain contexts (before voiceless dental stops and—as *ś*—before voiceless palatal ones).

[33] This objection is, for example, raised by Kogan (2006: 270, esp. n. 53), who is rather sceptical towards the possibility of an Indo-European origin for *sûs*.

[34] One early example of this line of reasoning can be found in Goetze 1962: 35. Goetze reconstructs a word **sik̂wo-*, which, he argues, would also explain the difficult Attic Greek form ἵππος, the initial aspiration and vocalization of which has never been adequately explained (the Greek aspiration should most easily go back to an *s* according to the normal sound laws). Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 478, n. 21) postulate that the Semitic words represent a reduplicated version of the Indo-European source word (thereby explaining the double *s* of the Semitic lexemes). Alternatively, they suggest (with a great deal of apprehension) taking Goetze's idea further by postulating a form **ŝek̂hwo-*, beginning with a special, palatalized version (**ŝ*) of the sibilant phoneme. The latter idea seems very *ad hoc* to me, as does, in fact, the idea of a spontaneous reduplication. If *sûs* is to be interpreted as an Indo-European loan, its phonetic structure

I believe, however, that the solution may be relatively simple—without having to resort to ideas of spontaneous reduplication, etc.[35] In order to explain the double affricates of the Semitic form, the easiest solution to my mind is to suppose that it was borrowed not from the singular nominative of the Luwian word, but from the plural.[36] The plural nominative of Luwian *azzu-* is not yet clearly textually attested, but according to the morphological rules of the language, it would have been **azzunzi* (or less probably, in decending order of likelihood, **azzuwanzi* or **azzuinzi*, in the latter, and most improbable, case with the Luwian phenomenon of "*i*-mutation").[37]

---

must be explainable in terms of the Indo-European word itself, which is what I will attempt to do here.

[35] Such as was done by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 478, n. 21).

[36] One could also imagine a solution in which the second *s*-sound came from the *s*-ending of the Luwian nominative *singular*, which would probably have been something like **azzus*. However, this would fail to explain why the Semitic forms have the original *affricate* [ts] in both places and would also provide no hint as to why the *a-* is missing. Neither would the "reduplicated-looking" forms of words such as ZI.ZI be easily explainable on such a basis.

[37] There is a spelling $^{\text{ANIMAL}}$EQUUS-*zi/a* (in TOPADA §21), which could represent the nom. plur., but it does not show the stem of the word (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 238 [s.v. **ekku-*]), and thus cannot help us (Kloekhorst reconstructs /ʔasuntsi/; cf. my n. 30 on the *s* or *z/ts* question). "*I*-mutation" is a phenomenon of Luwian grammar in which the vowel *i* is inserted between the stem and the ending of animate nouns in the nominative and accusative singular and plural—but nowhere else. It affects many words, but was not normally a feature of Luwian *u*-stem words (as *azzu-* probably was); see Melchert 1993: iii and 2009: 114, n. 3. A third possibility mentioned above for the plural nominative of "horse" in Luwian is **azzuwanzi*, a thematic (cf. n. 42) form (which could be argued based on attested Cuneiform Luwian *azzuwanza*, prob. dative/ablative plural). However, as Kloekhorst has argued (2008: 237-239, [s.v. **ekku-*]), most of the Anatolian evidence points not to a thematic noun but to a *u*-stem. The possible evidence from Lycian (*esbedi* and *esbehi*) can be interpreted in both ways, though, and the lack of Lycian "Umlaut" in other comparable forms (like *ladi*, dat. of "wife") could point to there having been a proto-Anatolian thematic stem, as a *u*-stem would yield a Lycian *a*-stem with a form like ***asbadi* (Craig Melchert [pc., email August 17, 2014]). The synchronic Luwian *u*-stem seems clear, though. Also, the strange initial ι of the Greek form ἵππος/ἵκκος may possibly also point towards an *u*-stem in a roundabout way. This, however, depends upon an interpretation of Indo-European phonetic developments with which one may or may not agree. de Vaan (2009: 200-202) and (following him) Kloekhorst (2014 [2016]: 56-57) argue that the common, thematic versions of the "horse" word (with initial **h₁e-* and a thematic nominative in **-os* at the end), as represented in Sanskrit, Latin, etc., are reformations of an original genitive of an athematic *u*-stem noun, a form which would have been **h₁ḱuós*. According to them, the initial ι of the Greek form would be a remnant of the original form that began with the cluster **h₁ḱu*, the idea being that such clusters in Greek inserted an extra ι vowel to break up the cluster (the model word for this putative sound-law is the imperative ἴσθι, "be!", from a reconstructed form **h₁s-dʰi*). Craig Melchert informs me (pc., as above) that he is still of the opinion that the "horse" word *was* originally thematic in Indo-European, but that the attested Luwian and Hittite forms show syncope of the thematic vowel and thus have been secondarily transformed into *u-*

If one presupposes that the source of the lexical borrowing was the plural **azzunzi* (or possibly**azzuwanzi*), we suddenly have an explanation not only of the double affricate of *ssw*/*sûs*/*sīsû*/ZI.ZI, but also if the varying vocalism of the words. The vacillation between *i*- and *u*-vowels in the different languages becomes eminently understandable: both were actually present in the original Luwian word (first the *-u-* of *azzu-* and then the *–i* of the ending *–nzi*). A plural origin also provides a possible hint for explaining the lack of the initial vowel *a-* in the Semitic words. If the original recipients of the borrowed word heard a Luwian speaker refer to a number of horses as **azzunzi* or **azzuwanzi*—probably without very good knowledge of the Luwian language as such—the two syllables starting with affricates would probably have stood out and would have appeared to be the center of the word. The central part registered would have been something like [tsuntsi] or [tswantsi], and given the apparent (but not etymologically accurate) reduplication of [ts], the *n* could easily have been regarded as redundant (or might not even have been registered as a distinct sound at all), as could very well have been the case with the *a-* as well (also, Luwian sometimes shows aphaeresis of initial *a*-sounds, at least in the later period).[38] The disappearance of the problematic *-n-* may actually have been an inner-Luwian development, as well: in historically attested Luwian, *n* has a tendency to disappear (possibly with nasalization of the preceding vowel) before affricates; the phenomenon is actually attested in the case of the nominative plural ending *-(vowel)nzi*, which sometimes appears as *-(vowel)zi* in Cuneiform Luwian, thus providing a perfect fit for the present case of *(a)zzu(n)zi*.[39]

The "borrower" would then have been left with something like [tsutsi] (most probable option) or possibly [tswatsi]. It is not hard to imagine how such a sequence of sounds could indeed have been secondarily interpreted as a sort of *Lallwort* or reduplicated root syllable, later regularized as ZI.ZI, *sīsû*, *sûs*, etc.[40] The underlying loan-form [tsutsi]/(later) [susi] (from **azzunzi*) may possibly be

---

stems. He is also rather skeptical towards the Lycian evidence, in which the meaning "horse" is not actually assured for the relevant words. Melchert regards **azzunzi* (/atsuntsi/) as the likeliest form for the Luwian nom. plur. of the word, followed by **azzuwanzi* (/atswantsi/), the "mutated" **azzuinzi* (/atswintsi/) being improbable.

[38] Note that there is an 18th Dynasty Egyptian word *smsm* meaning "horse," which was probably borrowed from Semitic (see Rabin 1994: 27). The nasals in that word could possibly represent a remnant of a stage at which the nasal was present in Semitic as well. On aphaeresis of sounds spelt with intial *a-* in later Luwian, see Yakubovich 2015: 7, 23.

[39] For the disappearance of Luwian *n* before affricate, see Yakubovich 2015: 10.

[40] As an example of the process of a previously existing word with an established etymology being secondarily "*Lallwort*"-ized, one could mention the Swedish expression *lyckost* (literally "cheese of luck," used as an appellation of an uncommonly fortunate person), which in the years of my own youth in southern Sweden had degenerated in children's speech into *lyllo*, completely obscuring the etymological origin of the word and also looking like a classic, reduplicated nursery word, yet not being one originally. Reinterpreting a borrowed word as something reminiscent of a pattern fitting one's own language is similar to *phono-semantic matching*, an analytical concept developed by Ghilʿad Zuckermann, that will be taken up in greater detail in chapters 7, 8, and 9.

seen quite clearly in the Aramaic form *swsyh/swsyʾ*, which appears to attest the *u*/*i* vocalization appearing in the Luwian plural form.

One still has to explain the specifically Ugaritic form, *ssw*, with its strange *w* at the end.[41] If one supposed that the Semitic word were borrowed either from Indo-Aryan *aśva-* (nom. sing. *aśvas*) or from the similar-sounding, putative Luwian thematic[42] form **azzuwa-* (theoretical nom. sing. **azzuwa/is*?) one would have a plausible reason for the *w* in the labial glides inherent in these two words. However, as seen earlier, a derivation from Indo-Aryan *aśva-* is unlikely on other grounds, and it is rather uncertain whether a Luwian word **azzuwa-* even existed (cf. footnote 37). And if one supposed the *w*/*v* of one of these words to be the source of the *w* of the Ugaritic word, one would still have trouble explaining why the Ugaritic *w* occurs *after* the sibilants and not between them.

Two more plausible explanations suggest themselves: (a) that the *u*-sound or *w*-diphthong of the first syllable of [tsutsi]/[tswatsi] was transplanted to the second one, as the word was increasingly seen as being made up of one, reduplicated syllable beginning with [ts], or (b) that the *w* of Ugaritic *ssw* represents an attempt to reproduce Akkadian *sīsāʾu(m)*, thus implying that Akkadian would be the immediate source of the loan in Ugaritic. Of these two possibilities, I would find the former more likely. If one presupposes an initial, borrowed form with a diphthong in the first syllable (e.g. [ts(u)watsi] from **azzuwanzi*), one could well imagine a process leading to the attested Ugaritic form based on adding the nominative singular or plural endings (*-u* and *-ūma*, respectively) to this word: [ts(u)watsi-u] would create a type of "reverse echo" in the vowels—[tsu(w)a-tsi-u]— which could very easily have been reinterpreted in the quasi-reduplicated *Lallwort*-eque manner mentioned above, leading to the insertion of a *w* in the second part as well: [tsuw(a)-tsiw-u]. This could have happened even easier with the less likely Luwian form **azzuinzi*: the "echo" would then be perfect: [tsuwi-tsiwu]. And if the borrowed form was **azzunzi*, one could still imagine a [tsu-tsi-u] being reinterpreted as a quasi-reduplicated [tsuw-tsiw-u], and we would still arrive at the attested *ssw*, by way of a simplification to [tsutsiwu] (and similar in the other possible cases).

3.1.3 Some conclusions

If we now regard it as established that early Luwian was the probable source of *sûs*/*sīsû(m)*/*ssw*, what does this tell us of the relationship between early Anatolian Indo-European and the world of the Hebrew Bible?

---

[41] There is also a similarly structured Targumic Aramaic plural *swswn*, in addition to the more common word *swsyʾ* discussed earlier. In Imperial Aramaic, the word is *ssh*.

[42] In Indo-European linguistics, a "thematic" form is one that inserts a connective vowel between the stem and the ending (in nouns, we are talking here of stems in **-o*, such as the many Greek words in –ος, Latin ones in *–us*, etc.). In Luwian (as well as in Hittite and, for that matter, Sanskrit), the thematic vowel in such nouns appears as *-a-*.

First of all, it is surely no coincidence that a word meaning "horse" found its way between the two linguistic families. The horse does, after all, appear to have been *the* animal that was most characteristic of early Indo-European culture as a whole—and a very important cultural marker probably involved in the spread of the Indo-European language phylum as such.[43] It has often been taken for more or less granted that this focus on the horse as an Indo-European "cultural emblem" was specifically tied to Indo-Aryan or Vedic culture, represented in the Ancient Near East by the Indo-Aryan linguistic component in the Mitanni kingdom and exemplified by the Kikkuli texts, which do indeed attest to an Indo-Aryan hippological vocabulary. However, as I hope to have demonstrated, a Luwian origin (and specifically an origin in the Luwian plural form of the word) is much more probable for *sûs*, etc., which means that this concentration upon Indo-Aryans/Mitannians has to be abandoned, or at least qualified. The horse was clearly associated with speakers of Indo-European, but in this case with Anatolians and not with Indo-Aryans. This is historically probable, as the presence of Indo-Europeans in Anatolia was probably quite early.[44] The importance of the horse as sign of power in Luwian-speaking society is attested in the inscriptions from Karatepe (c. 8th century BCE), in which the ruler Azatiwada boasts:

> EQUUS.ANIMAL-*zú-*$^{(n)}$*ha-wa-ta* (EQUUS.ANIMAL)*à-zú-wi* SUPER-*ra/i-ta i-zi-i-ha*[45]
>
> "Horse I added to horse [lit. "horse I made upon horse] …"

The horse was apparently an important piece of Indo-European cultural identity, but not only (or primarily) in the form of Indo-Aryan charioteers. Indeed, it is worth keeping in mind that the Indo-Aryan superstrate language of Mittanni was probably a rather obsolescent entity in the historical period—the main Mitannian language was Hurrian, not Indic. The Anatolian languages, however, were present in one form or another for most of the second and first millennia BCE and therefore provide an excellent explanation for Hebrew *sûs*. The prominent appearance of a Luwian word for the horse in the world of the Old Testament is indicative of the central cultural role played by the animal in cultural interaction, and identifying the ultimate source of *sûs* may become a link in a chain binding the Old Testament to its linguistic and cultural context.

---

[43] This is a very common stance; see, e.g., Beekes 2011: 37, 52. A modern exposition of the horse as a central feature in the spread of Indo-European is Anthony 2007.

[44] This modern consensus in underscored in Melchert 2003: 23-26 (with references).

[45] Somewhat idealized transcription, based partly on the edition in Werner 1991: 66, because of its clear and simplified reading of the signs, and partly on the purer edition in Hawkins 2000: 49 (KARATEPE 1: §VIII). I have replaced the *sù* signs with *zú* (see above, n. 30). An almost identical expression occurs in the ÇINEKÖY inscription of the 8th century BCE ruler Warika (known in Assyrian as Urikku), §4 (transcription and translation in Beckman, Bryce and Cline 2011: 264-266 [text 28 in that volume]).

3.2 "Case Study" 2: Hebrew **ḥāraš***, "to Plow", and Its Cognates*

For a long time, there has been a scholarly awareness that there appears to be some kind of relation between the Semitic word meaning "to plow", appearing in Hebrew as *ḥāraš* and in Ugaritic as *ḥrṯ*,[46] and the Hittite verb *ḫarš-* or *ḫaršiya-*, which also means "to plow" or "to till the soil." That both Indo-European and Semitic should have so similar-sounding verbs expressing the same technological advance purely by chance seems somehow too good to be true.

Already in 1954, Jaan Puhvel published a rather thorough discussion of the "plow" word, which he concluded was not a loan from Indo-European into Semitic (as appears to have been the case with the "horse" word), but rather the other way around.[47] Puvhel's view has been taken up after him on a number of occasions and can be found referred to in many places, although other opinions certainly exist.[48]

During the first half of the twentieth century, the suggestion was, however, often made that the Hittite verb was not a Semitic import, but rather an Anatolian reflex of the original Indo-European root for "plowing", the root underlying Latin *arō*, Greek ἀρόω, Gothic *arjan*, Old Irish *airim*, Tocharian *āre* ("a plow"), etc., the modern Proto-Indo-European reconstruction of which is **h₂erh₃-*.[49] This root is also the background of the nominal derivation **h₂erh₃-tro-m* ("a primitive plow"), reflected in Latin *arātrum*, Greek ἄροτρον, Old Irish *arathar*, English *ard* and Swedish *årder*.

Puhvel's suggestion of a Semitic loan underlying Hittite *ḫarš-* was to a large extent meant as a counter-proposition against the idea of an inheritance from this Indo-European root. His point was partly that the phonological structure of the Hittite word was hard to explain given the proposed Indo-European etymology. These two proposed explanations of Hittite *ḫarš-*/*ḫaršiya-* have therefore been viewed as mutually exclusive.

One of Puhvel's main arguments against Hittite *ḫarš-* being a genuine Indo-European word but rather a Semitic import is the fact that both it and the verb *ḫarr(a)-* (meaning something like "to pulverize" or "to crush") tend to occur regularly together with what appears to be a synonym thereof—he mentions the combination *ḫaršzi terippzi* (possibly meaning something like "plows and turns", "plows and tills" or similar). Puhvel's explanation of this phenomenon is the idea that one word in the collocation would represent a genuine, Hittite word while the other one would be a newly imported, technological loanword from Semitic, a process for which he adduces the

---

[46] Also attested as Arabic *ḥaraṭa*, Old Ethiopic *ḥarasa* and Akkadian *erēšu*.

[47] Puhvel 1954. He maintained his position in Puhvel 1964: 183-184.

[48] The view that *ḫarš-*/*ḫaršiya-* is a loan from Semitic is reflected in Olsen 2006: 237, n. 4, Weeks 1985: 104 and, not surprisingly, in Puhvel's own Hittite etymological dictionary (*HED*, vol. 3: 184-185 [s.v. *har(a)s-*, *harsiya-*]), which cites a number of (different!) Semitic roots as possible sources.

[49] On the root and its reconstruction, see (for example) Beekes 2011: 36.

Homeric expression ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης ("from a faraway land", with the non-Greek word ἀπίη being paralleled by its genuine, Greek counterpart γαίη) as a typological analogue. This latter comparison is unconvincing in two respects: firstly, because the non-Greek provenance of ἀπίη is by no means certain (it can also be taken as an adjectival formation based on the preposition ἄπό, an explanation preferred by the etymological dictionaries of Chantraine, Frisk, and Beekes) and, secondly, because such a parallel (even if correct in terms of its own philology) appears to be rather far-fetched.[50] Yes, the Homeric example would show that such a solidified combination of a native and an imported word could appear in this way, but in no way would it prove that this is what happened in the case of the Hittite expression.

The view that the Hittite word is an actual Indo-European inheritance from **h₂erh₃-* is, however, represented in modern literature as well. One highly interesting example of this is Alwin Kloekhorst's analysis in his *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. He there makes the point that the Anatolian verb *ḫarš-* should actually be regarded as a relative of the verb *ḫarr(a)-*, "to crush" (in the sense of "to crush the land"), and that the specified meaning "to plow" found in the rest of the Indo-European family (outside of Anatolian) must be regarded as secondary (though in the process of appearing in Hittite as well).[51] Regarding the form of the Hittite word, Kloekhorst posits an expansion of the original root with **-š*.[52]

The existence of this apparent relationship between *ḫarš-* and *ḫarr(a)-* to my mind makes it less than necessary to assume a Semitic loan into Indo-European. Also, Puhvel's original suggestion looked not only to *ḥāraš* (etc.), but also to a number of other "sound-alike" Semitic roots.[53] This, to me, looks like casting the net a little too wide methodologically.

One possibility to explain the similar-sounding roots in Semitic and Indo-European could be to posit a loan in the opposite direction: from Indo-European to Semitic. This would make the relationship between Hittite *ḫarš-* and *ḫarr(a)-* easy to explain (as they both would represent the same original Proto-Indo-

[50] Puhvel 1954: 86-87; the collocation is also discussed in Weeks 1985: 104. The data in the Greek etymological lexica can be found in Frisk 1960: 122 (s.v. ἄπό, with some doubt as to the derivation), Chantraine 1968: 98 (s.v. ἀπό), and Beekes 2010: 116 (s.v. ἄπιος).

[51] Kloekhorst 2008: 313-314 (s.v. *ḫārš-*).

[52] Another possibility in deriving Hittite *ḫarš-* from Indo-European **h₂erh₃-* would be regarding the *-š* as a remnant of **h₃*—a proposed sound-development that one sometimes comes across in the literature (see, for example, Olsen 2006, with references). However, this supposed sound-law is not generally accepted, and even if it is in fact true in some fashion, one still has to explain why *ḫarš-* has an *-š* and *ḫarr(a)-* does not. Kloekhorst's *š*-suffix seems to make more sense here. In a recent presentation by Cohen & Hyllested (2006), it is argued that Proto-Indo-European **h₃* did sometimes yield Anatolian *s* (the sound written *š* in Hittite), but only in the vicinity of labiovelars, which would make the sound-development irrelevant to the present case.

[53] Puhvel 1954: 87.

European root). However, there is a clear problem with such an approach, and this is the fact that the Semitic word *ḥrṯ/ḥāraš* itself has been suggested to go back to an earlier, biliteral root without the final *ṯ/š*—a root that appears in a wider Afro-Asiatic context and not only in Semitic. This is an uncertain—but interesting—suggestion. Such a root would have an approximate meaning "to scratch" or "to scrape [off]."[54] A basic meaning "to cut" has been suggested for the Hebrew root itself.[55]

These facts point to an interesting correlation: both in Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic (including Semitic), there may have been an original root having to do with a more general form of "mechanical manipulation" (such as crushing, pulverizing, cutting, or scratching), which later was expanded by an *-s*, *-ṯ* or similar sound and thus acquired the meaning "to plow." This suggests the possibility of a *very* early loan (in one direction or other), in which the root-expansions continued playing a role in the borrowing process—that is, a situation in which the Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic roots have continued to influence one another over time, possibly in connection with the development of agricultural technology. This is, of course, a *highly* tentative line of reasoning, but one which invites further research. If it could be argued that these roots of both linguistic families developed in some kind of "tandem" with one another, it would create a fascinating illustration of the interaction of Semitic/Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European in the world of the Old Testament, and create new layers of understanding for the word *ḥāraš* in the Hebrew text. It would, then, not be a simple case of borrowing in either direction but of a possibly reciprocal *Wanderwort* illustrating the complexities inherent in trying to map the cultural-linguistic background that ultimately is reflected in the Old Testament. This would not be the only case in which a term from agricultural technology wanders between the linguistic families: one thinks, for example, of the word for "wine," which appears in a Semitic form as Hebrew *yayin*, Ugaritic *yn* (with initial *y-* from **w-*, as normally in Northwest Semitic), and Arabic *wayn-*, but also in various forms in Indo-European, such as Hittite *wiyana-*, Greek οἶνος (from ϝοίνος, which appears as a dialect form), and various others (such as Latin *vīnum*). A version of the word also appears in Georgian (neither Indo-European nor Semitic).[56] It is quite difficult indeed to pinpoint the origin of this complex of words, which apparently wandered far and wide, and such may also be the case with the "plow" word.

Thus, both "horse" and "plow" may turn out to be interesting focal points in the larger context of Indo-European/Afro-Asiatic interaction in the world of the Hebrew Bible, showing different types of lexical interaction: one at a very

---

[54] Ehret 1995: 375 (no. 757); such a basic root was also suggested in Bomhard and Kerns 1994: 543, in the context of the speculative "Nostratic" macro-family that allegedly includes both Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic (as well as many other families). Bomhard and Kerns also saw this Afro-Asiatic root as being related to Hittie *ḫarš-* (etc.), but in this "Nostratic" context and not as a loanword in either direction.

[55] See, for example, Loewenstamm 1959.

[56] On some of the "wine" words, see, e.g., Beekes 2011: 36.

early level, with words apparently developing in tandem and perhaps being borrowed back and forth across linguistic boundaries, and one in which the trajectories are at least somewhat easier to fathom and show a more direct influence from Indo-European culture upon the Old Testament world.

4. Biblical Chaos Dragons—and Indo-European Ones

Now we move into the main part of the present "polyphonic monograph": that involving the study of borrowed poetic motifs, carried through lexical material. In the previous chapter, we made some initial remarks on possible technological interaction at the lexical level, as a sort of preamble. But—and this is in fact the main point of this book—cultural contacts between the Indo-European and Old Testament worlds are not only possible in terms of specific words or concepts, technological or otherwise. If one is to take a more thorough investigative view of how Indo-European cultures influenced the world of the Hebrew Bible, one must look not only at words but greater units of cultural interaction and transmission. It is time now to tackle what is probably the most salient piece of "etymological poetics" in both Indo-European and Northwest Semitic: that of the battle against the dragon or serpent.

As this type of investigation will indicate, larger pieces of ideology, motifs or mythemes could also be regarded as having been borrowed between the two cultural spheres (as opposed to simply borrowing specific words), which would of course open up possibilities of highly interesting cultural interactions being unearthed—and of the biblical texts being given yet another layer of interpretation. Indeed, it is here that "etymological poetics" will really come into its own as an investigative and interpretive methodology. Mythological patterns are, however, notoriously fickle items to work with, and (as mentioned in the Introduction) methodological restraint and rigor must be exercised when this type of comparison is undertaken. One must always ask oneself what is really compared with what, and I believe, try solidly to ground one's comparison in preferably quite concrete parallels, rather than merely to look at rather vague similarities.

I would like to reiterate some of the points I made in the Introduction and argued earlier in an article on certain parallels between the Hurrian/Hittite *Epic of Liberation* and Deut 32:15—a quite specific instance of cultural transmission between (partly) Indo-European-speaking Anatolia and the Hebrew Bible. I there highlighted the necessity of separating general survivals of motifs from the type of more literal correspondences that are the focus of most of the present volume, and pointed to the fact that inherited motifs and poetic expressions can be radically reinterpreted through history and put into radically new contexts by later writers (or, for that matter) redactors.[57]

The sort of "literal correspondences" mentioned forms the very basis of "etymological poetics," and in this chapter, I shall attempt to show its implications in a way that clearly illustrates how ancient words could be used to carry motifs on their shoulders, even across linguistic boundaries. It is time to talk of dragons, and those who slay them.

[57] Wikander 2013a: 144.

4.1 The Chaos Battle as an Indo-European/Biblical Motif in Earlier Scholarship; Problems with Dumézilianism

One of the instances that have often been suggested as a possible link between Indo-European and biblical traditions and thought constructs is that of the battle against the dragon or sea monster, that is, a special instance of the *Chaoskampf* motif. Suggestions in this direction have been put forth by Nicolas Wyatt and by Ajoy Kumar Lahiri,[58] who have argued that Semitic tales concerning the divine battle against aquatic monsters may be somehow connected to Indo-European, or specifically Indo-Aryan, traditions of a similar nature. A more recent contribution to this line of historical comparison was published in 2014 by Robert D. Miller, who attempts to trace the dragon mythology across a large part of the Ancient Near East (including looking at the cross-sections with Indo-European materials).[59] Some kind of connection between the Near Eastern, Semitic speaking tales of serpent slaying and the Greek tale of Zeus and Typhon is suggested by Carolina López-Ruiz (but in the context of understanding Greek mythological literature as opposed to studying Near Eastern texts in their own right).[60] A recent contribution on the background of the chaos battle myths in the Hebrew Bible and the Semitic-speaking Ancient Near East (including comparisons with some Indo-European texts) is the 2016 doctoral dissertation by Joanna Töyräänvuori.[61] These are only some examples. To be sure, the idea of a divine hero battling a serpentine monster is thoroughly ensconced both in the greater Old Testament world and in many ancient Indo-European cultures.[62] It is my purpose to discuss such possible links and evaluate them, and hopefully to add some ideas of my own.

Wyatt's general arguments concerning possible Indo-European influences on Northwest Semitic thought are heavily slanted towards the Dumézilian trifunctional approach, which he believes to be in evidence for example in the Ugaritic mythological texts—and, indeed, in the Hebrew Bible—indicating Indo-European influence. Wyatt believed that evidence of Indo-European-influenced tripartite thinking could be found both in parts of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle and in the story of King David's census.[63] This "tripartite" thinking refers

---

[58] Lahiri 1984: 110-128; Wyatt 1987, 1988—the former applying a cosmological perspective on the Ugaritic and Vedic text..

[59] Miller 2014. Other contributions by the same author on various aspects of the dragon mythology are Miller 2013 and 2016. I have been informed that, in early 2017, Miller will be publishing a forthcoming book on the biblical dragon mythology, entitled *The Dragon, the Mountain, and the Nations: An Old Testament Myth, its Origins and its Afterlives*, further laying out his views on the subject. Due to the date of finishing the present volume for press (Jan/Feb 2017), I have not been able to consult that work.

[60] López Ruiz 2014: 179.

[61] Due to the recent appearance of this dissertation (defended August 2016), I have only been able to make limited reference to it.

[62] A handy overview of various dragon/serpent-slaying myths in ancient and Christian sources can be found in Ogden 2013.

[63] Wyatt 1985; Wyatt 1990.

to the famous putative division of ancient Indo-European social organization and thought into three functions: the priestly, the warlike and the productive.

A somewhat similar line of reasoning can be found in the volume *The Hebrew God: Portait of an Ancient Deity* (2002) by Bernhard Lang, which also uses the theories of Dumézil as tools with which to analyze Northwest Semitic theological and mythological material, in this case the character of the Israelite God himself. There is, however, a crucial difference between the latter study and those of Wyatt, namely that Lang only uses this theoretical framework as a heuristic implement and does not imply the necessity of an actual historical influence from any type of "Indo-European ideology," thus effectively transforming the tripartite scheme of Dumézil from a template for Indo-European religion into an analytical classification applicable to many different mythologies, regardless of linguistic or cultural provenance. Bernhard Lang writes:

> Borrowing could have taken place in both directions, and elements of ideological tripartism may have found their way from the Indo-Europeans to the Semites.
>
> There could have been a much simpler explanation, however, for the tripartite structure may be considered as somehow *universal*, reflecting an elementary mode of organization. Dumézil described the three functions with great virtuosity, but, placing the emphasis on specific cultural traditions, he neglected their archetypal and universal character.[64]

The fact that such an application of the Dumézilian theory appears to work rather well regardless of its in no way implying an Indo-European influence on the Hebrew Bible would actually militate against finding this kind of influence using such a method.[65]

In this study, I will not venture into the area of trifunctional analysis; the theories of Dumézil are, after all, subject to serious doubts even within the field of Indo-European studies itself, and this fact makes it rather precarious to try to find borrowed traces of such a scheme in biblical or Northwest Semitic material.[66]

4.2 Storm Gods and Serpents: Some Parallel Texts

The mythology of the battle against the dragon or serpent monster is, however, a much more concrete textual concept, which is demonstrably present in the Old

---

[64] Lang 2002: 4.

[65] This point (that the possibility of finding pieces of "trifunctional ideology" in the Hebrew Bible weakens the case for such an ideology being specifically Indo-European) was in fact made more than 40 years earlier by John Brough (1959: see especially the concluding remarks on pp. 84-85). Wyatt (1990: 352-353) sees this as just another impetus for regarding trifunctional ideology as having been transmitted from the Indo-Europeans into the Bible.

[66] See, for example, Belier 1991 and Beekes 2011: 41 for scathing criticisms of Dumézil's trifunctional hypothesis.

Testament material and the larger Northwest Semitic cultural sphere (Ugarit, Mari)—and in East Semitic materials as well (Enūma Eliš). And this type of story is also very prominent in many ancient Indo-European cultures and text complexes (the Vedic story of Indra and Vṛtra, the Hittite one of the Storm God Tarḫunna- and the Serpent, *Illuyanka-*, the Greek tales of Typhon, Ophion, and many others). This motif occurs in much of the Indo-European world, and it has been argued by Watkins, West and others that these stories constitute remnants of an ancient Proto-Indo-European myth,[67] perhaps the most central of all inherited Indo-European myths, actually. This means that a historical comparison between the biblical/Semitic versions of the story and the parallel Indo-European ones can be carried out with greater methodological stringency and rigor. The focus is no longer simply on "shared ideological characteristics" (such as when discussing alleged trifunctional mythologies) but on actual, comparable pieces of texts from the cultures involved.

Of all those mythological items in the Hebrew Bible which have been successfully and productively compared with similar ones in the neighboring Near Eastern World, the motif of the battling thunder god destroying the forces of chaos has long been perhaps the most classic. The descriptions of YHWH's battle with the dragon-shaped monster (Leviathan, Rahab etc.) lend themselves excellently to comparison with parallel stories about Baal at Ugarit, Marduk in the Mesopotamian Enūma Eliš, and also with the myth of the Hittite Storm God and his conflict with the "Serpent." It has for a long time been apparent that what we are dealing with here is a common Ancient Near Eastern mythological concept, one concerning the main divine protagonist of the stories creating order out of the chaos which the serpent or monster personifies. The concept of a powerful male thunder deity battling and destroying a serpentine monster is ubiquitous in the Ancient Near Eastern world.

But such a statement shows us only one part of the situation. The fact that a mytheme or *theologoumenon* is spread over a whole complex of closely-knit but fundamentally differing cultures also implies another thing: that this common motif might be expressed and handled in quite different ways in its various instances, and that those differences might tell us something important about the religious and ideological histories of the cultures in question, or at least about the theological outlooks of the individual authors of the texts involved. Thus one might argue that, the similarities having been very thoroughly studied for many years, it is equally important to look at the *differences* between the accounts in greater detail.

What concerns us here is, as seen above, that similar concepts occur further outside the classical Semitic world. The most salient example of this is the story of the Vedic god Indra and his battle against the serpent Vṛtra. It is a fact that this story shows many parallels with the classical Northwest Semitic battle myths: a young storm god fights (and destroys) a monstrous serpent, a representative of the chaotic powers, using weapons that he has been given by

[67] Watkins 1995; West 2007: 255-259, 430, *etc*. Cf. the recent Slade 2008 [2010].

other members of his pantheon. This battle appears to be connected with the fertility-giving functions of the storm deity and with his imposing order on the universe. It is not surprising that such a comparison has been made.

In his volume dedicated to the battle between the Vedic Indra and his opponent, Lahiri draws wide parallels between that story and similar "cosmic contest" motifs preserved in a Semitic-speaking linguistic context. Somewhat surprisingly, however, he does not focus on the Northwest Semitic versions of this motif but on the Babylonian Enūma Eliš. Lahiri enumerates sixteen common points between the two stories, some more weighty than others.[68] In a number of cases, the parallels are rather tenuous. For example, Lahiri notes that both Tiāmat and Vṛtra are "very intimately associated with the water" and that the "action of both Vṛtra and Tiamat leads to the extinction of vegetal life, as it were."[69] Neither of these connections really holds up to closer scrutiny. To be sure, Tiāmat is an aquatic monster (her name even means "Deep" and is probably connected etymologically with the Hebrew *tĕhôm* of Gen 1:2) and Vṛtra does indeed have to do with waters, but in quite a different sense. In fact, the Vedic serpent is the one that *holds back* the waters, which have to be liberated by the divine hero Indra, of whom the Ṛg-Veda says:

> *Yo hatvāhim ariṇāt sapta sindhūn*
>
> … he who after slaying the serpent released the seven rivers …
> (ṚV II 12:3)

A similar reference can be found in what is perhaps the most famous Vedic verse about Indra's battle with the Serpent:[70]

> *Indrasya nu vīriyāṇi pra vocam*
> *yāni cakāra prathamāni vajrī*
> *ahann ahim anu apas tatarda*
> *pra vakṣanā abhinat parvatānām*
>
> Indra's valorous deeds I shall now proclaim,
> the first ones that he, the *Vajra* [lightning-bolt]-bearer, carried out.
> He slew the Serpent and broke forth the waters,
> he split the innards of the mountains!
> (ṚV I 32:1)

---

[68] Lahiri 1984: 117-124.

[69] Lahiri 1984: 117-118.

[70] The serpent-battling adventures of Indra are most fully expounded in this hymn of the ṚV (I 32), but they also appear or are mentioned in hymns I 52, 1.80, II 11, II 12, III 32, IV 18, V 32, VI 17, VI 29, VIII 96, and X 113 (the list is not exhaustive). Cf. the overview in Ogden 2013: 259.

Note here the alitterative phrase *ahann ahim* ("he slew the Serpent"), the first part of which is derived from the verb *han-* ("to slay, strike"). We shall return to this phrase later on. The verse also clearly refers to Indra letting the water loose, rather than defeating it.

Nor can it be truthfully argued that Tiāmat is instrumental in destroying vegetation; there is no direct reference to anything of the sort in the Babylonian text. Lahiri himself seems to acknowledge this when he says:

> Although this is not directly stated in the *Enuma Eliš*, we believe it was so. Because, as we have pointed out before, it was the yearly flood of the two rivers that led to the inundation of the valley region as also to the extinction, as it were, of the vegetal life of the world.[71]

One should note that Lahiri's interpretation of the parallels between the Enūma Eliš and the Vedic narrative does not make him imply an Indo-European influence on the Babylonian myth. Rather, he supposes the opposite possibility, that the Indian story was influenced by Babylonian thought.[72]

The more obvious parallel to the figure of Indra and his battle with Vṛtra is to be found in the Northwest Semitic ambit, which of course includes the Hebrew Bible. Not only the motif of the battle against a chaos dragon or sea monster but the very conception of the heroic deity himself offers obvious parallels. The classical representation of the Northwest Semitic storm deity has much in common with the imagery that is applied to Indra. The most famous exponent of the Northwest Semitic storm god "persona" is that of the Ugaritic Baal, of whom the texts say the following:

qlh . q[dš .] trr . ar*ṣ*	His holy voice shakes the earth,
*ṣ*at . [šp]th . *ġ*rm [.] a*ḫ*šn	the issue of his lips makes the mountains fear.
(...)	
bmt . ar[*ṣ*] *ṭṭṭn* .	The heights of the earth quake.
ib . *b*ʿl . *tiḫd yʿrm* .	The enemies of Baal take to the forests,
šnu . *hd* . *gpt ġr* .	the haters of Haddu to the slopes of the hills.
(...)	
ydh k tġḏ .	His hand shakes,
arz . *b ymnh*	the cedar in his right hand.
(KTU 1.4 VII 31-41)	

This storm god theophany is replete with thunder and lightning-based imagery: note especially the references to Baal's "voice" (his thunder) directly impacting topographic details of nature and to his "cedar weapon," apparently meant as a reference to a lightning-bolt, which he wields against with his right hand.

---

[71] Lahiri 1984: 188, n. 312.
[72] Lahiri 1984: 127-128.

Compare this with the following description of Indra from the Ṛg-Veda:

Dyāvā cid asmai pṛthivī namete	Even heaven and earth bow down to him,
śuṣmāc cid asya parvatā bhayante	from his might even the mountains fear,
yaḥ somapā nicito vajrabāhur	he who is called *soma*-drinker, he with the lightning-bolt at his arm,
yo vajrahastaḥ sa janāsa indraḥ	he with the lightning-bolt in his hand—he, O men, is Indra!

(ṚV II 12:13)

And, returning to the area of the Hebrew Bible, both of these textual passages resonate well with what we find in the famous "storm god hymn" that is Psalm 29:[73]

Qôl YHWH ʿal hammāyim
ʾēl hakkābôd hirʿîm
YHWH ʿal-mayim rabbîm
qôl-YHWH bakkōaḥ
qôl YHWH behādār
qôl YHWH šōbēr ʾārāzîm
wayšabbēr YHWH ʾet-ʾarzê hallĕbānôn
wayyarqîdēm kĕmô-ʿēgel
lĕbānôn wĕśiryôn kĕmô ben-rĕʾēmîm
qôl-YHWH ḥōṣēb lahăbôt ʾēš
qôl YHWH yāḥîl midbār
yāḥîl YHWH midbar qādēš
qôl YHWH yĕḥôlēl ʾayyālôt
wayyeḥĕśōp yĕʿārôt

The voice of YHWH over the waters!
The God of Glory thunders—
YHWH over the great waters!
The voice of YHWH in strength,
the voice of YHWH in majesty!
The voice of YHWH breaks the cedars,
YHWH breaks the cedars of Lebanon!
He makes them jump like a calf,
Lebanon and Siryon like an ox.
The voice of YHWH carves out fiery flames—
the voice of YHWH shakes the wilderness,

[73] For the storm god theophanies of YHWH, comparare the classic work of Jeremias (1977).

YHWH shakes the wilderness of Kadesh.
The voice of YHWH makes the hinds give birth
and strips the forests bare.
(Ps 29:3-9*b*)

All three of these passages describe what looks like a classical Northwest Semitic storm theophany. They talk of the thunder or lightning of the god in question: in two of the cases—the Semitic ones—poetically referred to as his "voice," while the Baal Cycle passage and the Vedic one agree in symbolically hypostasizing the lightning bolt as an almost physical weapon of the deity (Baal's "cedar weapon," depicted on the well-known "Baal stele" from Ugarit, and Indra's *vajra*-weapon, probably symbolic of a lightning-bolt). In all of the cases, mountains are shaken by the thunderous appearance of the warrior god—they are visibly frightened (literally in the Ugaritic and Vedic passages, and in Ps 29:6 the mountains Lebanon and Siryon are made to jump like startled animals).

One thinks also of Ps 18:8-16, a passage that shows earth and mountains quaking before the God of the storm going into battle against the powers of chaos:

Wattigʿaš wattirʿaš hāʾāreṣ
ûmôsĕdê hārîm yirgāzû
wayyitgāʿăšû kî ḥārâ lô
ʿālâ ʿāšān bĕʾappô
wĕʾēš-mippîw tōʾkēl
geḥālîm bāʿărû mimmennû
wayyēṭ šāmayim wayyērad
waʿărāpel taḥat raglāyw
wayyirkab ʿal-kĕrûb wayyāʿōp
wayyēdeʾ ʿal-kanpê-rûaḥ
yāšet ḥōšek sitrô sĕbîbôtāyw
sukkātô ḥeškat-mayim ʿābê šĕḥāqîm
minnōgah negdô ʿābāyw ʿābĕrû
bārād wĕgaḥălê-ʾēš
wayyarʿēm baššāmayim YHWH
wĕʿelyôn yittēn qōlô[74]
wayyišlaḥ ḥiṣṣāyw waypîṣēm
ûbĕrāqîm rāb wayhummēm
wayyērāʾû ʾăpîqê mayim
wayyiggālû môsĕdôt tēbēl
miggaʿărātĕkā YHWH
minnišmat rûaḥ ʾappekā

[74] I have removed the repeated *bārād wĕgaḥălê-ʾēš*.

> And the earth shook and trembled
> and the bases of the mountains quaked,
> they shook, for he was angered.
> Smoke rose from his nose
> and devouring flame from his mouth.
> Charcoal burned from him.
> He folded the heavens and descended,
> and gloom was under his feet.
> He rode on the Cherub and flew
> he swept on the wings of the wind.
> He put darkness as a covering around him,
> his booth was dark waters, dense clouds.
> In the radiance before him his clouds passed forth
> hail and charcoals of flame.
> YHWH thundered in the heavens,
> the Most High gave forth his voice.
> He sent out his arrows and spread them around,
> he threw lightning-bolts and created confusion.
> The stream-beds of water became visible,
> the bases of the world were uncovered,
> by your roar, O YHWH,
> by the breath of your raging wind.

All of these three divine characters—Indra, Baal and YHWH—fight a monster of some kind, a representative of chaos. In the case of Baal and Indra, we have actual preserved mythological accounts of how this was thought (at least by some) to have taken place—and in these, there are certain striking correspondences. One of these is the fact that both Baal and Indra are presented with specific weaponry with which to battle the chaos monster, and the one preparing this gift and donating this is the "craftsman god" of the respective pantheon—in Baal's case, the responsible party is the deity of handicrafts and magic, Kothar-wa-Hasis, who presents Baal with his weapons *ygrš* ("it drives away"/"Driver") and *aymr* ("it expels all"/"Expeller"), and in the Vedic story it is the god Tvaṣṭṛ, who has a similar sphere of influence, who prepares the *vajra*.[75]

Also parallel is the somewhat strange circumstance that the actions of both Baal and Indra against the monster/serpent are regarded at some point in the stories as being in some way negative or going against established custom or law, so that the divine hero of the stories is not necessarily always regarded as

[75] The exact type of weapon represented by the *vajra* is not entirely clear; one suggestion is a type of club (see Dahlquist 1977: 153-155), or "cudgel" (thus Watkins 1995: 302), but (as will be seen below) there are also later descriptions more suggestive of a stabbing weapon. For an illuminating discussion of the iconography of the *vajra*, and its possible inherited Indo-European connection with the iconography of the weapon of the Hittite Storm God, see Miller 2016.

such by the divine establishment. In the case of Indra, the negativity of the chaos battle consists in the deity thereby acquiring a kind of "sin," which is apparently due to Vṛtra being regarded by the text as a sort of priest and thereby, apparently, sacrosanct. This leads to Indra having to go into hiding.[76]

In the Baal Cycle, this state of affairs comes to light when it is recounted that El, the divine patriarch, has actually ordained that Yamm, the sea god, should act as the king of the gods and has thereby granted him his sanction, and also when Baal flies into a rage at Yamm's messengers, who try to get him to submit to the sea god's rule, and is subsequently restrained by the other gods due to the "diplomatic" status of the messengers. In the latter case, El even tells the messengers that Baal is to be Yamm's "servant" (*ʿbd*) and the "prisoner" (*asr*) of the messengers.[77] Another instance of this "negativity" apparently inherent in Baal's battle against the powers of Sea occurs when, at the beginning of KTU 1.5, Mot (the god of death) apparently accuses Baal for his killing of the sea monster Litan[78]/Lotan/Leviathan and implies that the ensuing killing drought and powerlessness of the heavens to provide rain is somehow a consequence of this act (this episode is the background of Dietrich's and Loretz's article "Der Tod Baals als Rache Mots für die Vernichtung Leviathans in KTU 1.5 I 1-8," 1980). The Ugaritic text in question is the following (and we will come back to it again in section 4.8):

k tmḫṣ . ltn . bṯn . brḥ	As/because you smote Litan, the fleeing serpent,
tkly . bṯn . ʿqltn .	killed off the writhing serpent,
šlyṭ . d. šbʿt . rašm	the ruler with seven heads,
ttkḥ . ttrp . šmm .	the heavens will burn hot and shine/be weakened.
krs ipdk . ank .	I, even I, will tear you to pieces—
ispi . uṭm ḏrqm . amtm .	I will swallow elbows, blood, and forearms.
l yrt b npš . bn ilm . mt .	You will surely descend into the throat of divine Mot,
b mhmrt . ydd . il . ġzr	into the gullet of El's beloved, the hero.[79]
(KTU 1.5 I 1-8)	

This passage appears to imply that Baal's battle against the powers of the Sea may have led to some unintended consequences, at least from a rhetorical point of view. However, the fact of the "negativity" of the battles against the chaos

[76] Wendy Donniger in *EOR*, vol. 14: 9646 (s.v. "Vṛtra"). This occurs in later (post-Vedic) textual material.

[77] The apparent support from El for Yamm as divine king is found in KTU 1.1 IV (although that column is in a highly damaged state and certain conclusions as to its contents are highly difficult to draw). The aggressive behavior of Baal during his being handed over to Yamm's messengers occurs in KTU 1.2 I 36-41.

[78] On the most probable vocalization of this name (**līt̄ānu*), see Emerton 1982.

[79] This translation is mine (also used in Wikander 2014: 52, here with one small correction of a typographic error). It has been especially influenced by the ideas of van Selms (1975), Emerton (1976), Wyatt (2002: 115-116) and Barker (2006).

monsters is a rather superficial link, given the methodological and criteria-based argument given earlier.

4.3 Shadows of an Epic Lost: YHWH, the Sea Monster, and the Weapons

It is lamentable fact that the Hebrew Bible does not preserve in its entirety a version of the story that must once have existed—"the tale of YHWHs battle with the sea monster." Such a text (or type of texts) must in all probability have been composed at some period in time, given how many and persistent references to the *Chaoskampf* motif that can be found scattered throughout the biblical text.[80] All we can do in absence of such a preserved text is to try to piece together what scraps and fragments we may find in the Hebrew Bible, in order to get an idea how such a "YHWH and the Sea"-epic may have sounded. We shall begin by looking at some of these fragments and return later to a sort of synthesis, which we shall then compare with similar work done on the Indo-European texts.

In Isaiah 51:9, it is a matter of course that YHWH (or, metonymically, his "arm") has "cut down Rahab" and "pierced the Dragon." Yet the complex of myths which these and other such lines suggest is nowhere spelled out in full. One is reminded of how the classical Greek tragedians wrote plays on mythological themes not in order to tell a new, and previously unknown story to a riveted audience, but rather to make a new artistic interpretation of a story which was already well known. There must once have been such a story (or most probably a complex of stories), which described the battle between YHWH and the chaos monsters; this is indicated very clearly by the author of Isa 51:9, who calls upon the arm of YHWH to clothe itself in strength and awake *kîmê qedem* ("like in the days of old"), clearly implying a reference to a concrete story about these ancient times. But for reasons we will probably never know (perhaps religious tendency played a part, as Deuteronomistic theology grew stronger) it was not preserved to us. Thus, we have to "read between the lines" to synthesize the beliefs and ideas concerning YHWH's battle with the chaotic powers.

It would, for example, have been highly interesting indeed to see whether YHWH was ever thought to be given some form of divine weaponry with which to defeat the Leviathan or Rahab, just as Baal and Indra were.[81] The parallels

[80] This point was implicitly made already in Gunkel 1895: 88. Gunkel believed that the original myth must have had its place in a hymn to YHWH. This is certainly possible, though to my mind not necessary.

[81] For some other views on the weaponry of YHWH and other Semitic gods in their respective Chaos battles, see Töyräänvuori 2012. She also connects the weapons of YHWH specifically to the battle traditions inherited from the Northwest Semitic cultural background, and points to Aleppo as one of the most central focus points for the idea of the weapons of the weather deities (also discussing physical "divine weapons" from the Ancient Near East). Discussing the various weapons implied to be used by YHWH in the fight against the Dragon is a classical scholarly pastime, going all the way back to Gunkel, who gives his own summary in Gunkel 1895: 85, mentioning many of the same

with the Ugaritic and the Indo-European story invite the question whether such a "weapon of YHWH" was once part of the mythology of the Israelite God. In his large study of the Indo-European dragon-slaying tales, Calvert Watkins makes the point that the mention of the weapon of the hero is an important (though optional) part of the poetic structure (a matter that we shall be returning to later on).[82] Even though no such overt description of YHWH's weapon is available to us, it is interesting to note that in the quite subdued reference to the battle against Leviathan found at the end of the Book of Job, a specific implement is mentioned as the means by which the sea monster can be handled:

Timšōk liwyātān bĕḥakkâ	Can you pull up Leviathan with a fishhook,
ûbĕḥebel tašqîaʿ lĕšōnô	and with a rope restrain his tongue?
hătāśîm ʾagmôn bĕʾappô	Can you set a ring through his nose,
ûbĕḥôaḥ tiqqôb leḥĕyô	and with a hook pierce his jaw?
(Job 40:25-26)	

This passage, though in a sense satirically meant (referring as it does to the great sea monster as a rather demythologized being which YHWH is capable of handling in a way similar to a fish) may well contain within it a reference to a weapon used by YHWH to defeat the Leviathan in an actual (unpreserved) tale concerning that great feat. The "fishing hook" would then be a demythologized and perhaps partly humorous variant of that weapon, which was believed to have been wielded by the Israelite God in the battle.[83] It is probably no coincidence that the above passage uses the verb *nqb* ("to perforate" or "to pierce")[84] with Leviathan as its object—the same verb occurs much earlier in the Book of Job, in the passing reference to certain imagined evil sorcerers, who are called upon to curse the night on which Job was born:

---

possible weapons that I discuss here, though without, of course, comparing them to Indo-European sources. He also adds the net as a weapon, appearing in Ez 32:3.

[82] Watkins 1995: 302.

[83] It might of course be objected that the "Leviathan" of the Job passages—and the corresponding terrible animal Behemoth—is simply a reference to the rather mundane and non-mythological animal, the crocodile (as the Behemoth appears to refer to a hippopotamus). Indeed, this is supported by the well-known analogy with the iconography of the Egyptian battle between Horus and Set, the latter taking the forms of precisely these two animals (see, for example, the classical account in Keel 1978: 136-154), as well as by the ingenious suggestion of Keel's (1978: 142) that the word *timšōk* ("Can you pull up") is meant to play on the Egyptian word *msḥ*, "crocodile": note that, with the definitite article, the Coptic form of this word ("the crocodile") is *ti-msah*, which matches the Hebrew word extremely well.

[84] The same verb occurs in the line preceding the ones here quoted, Job 40:24, which talks of the other monstrous animal, the Behemoth, in the following way: *bĕʿênāyw yiqqāḥennû / bĕmôqĕšîm yinqob-ʾāp* ("Can one grab him by his eyes / or pierce his nose with snares?").

Yiqqĕbūhû ʾōrĕrê-yām[85]	Let them pierce through it—those who curse Sea,
hāʿătîdîm ʿōrēr liwyātān (Job 3:8)	those who are ready to awaken Leviathan.

This bicolon, which apparently refers to some sort of curse-magic (boring through "voodoo dolls" or similar) being performed by sorcerers so skilled as to be able to summon the terrible sea monsters,[86] may also contain traces of a reference to a weapon of YHWH. Can it really be a coincidence that both Job 3:8 and 40:26 use the same verb *nqb* in connection with the sea monster Leviathan (in widely diverging contexts)? The evil sorcerers who are powerful enough to command Leviathan are called upon to "pierce" the moment when Job was born (indicating that "piercing" was a standard way of describing power over the sea monster), and Job himself is mockingly asked by YHWH whether he can "pierce" the jaw of Leviathan. It is quite possible to interpret this as an indicator that the traditional telling of YHWH's battle against the serpent to which the Joban poet appears to be alluding included a weapon with which the Israelite God was thought to have slain the serpent—more specifically, then, a stabbing (or "piercing") weapon of some kind, as opposed to the club-like weapons that Baal is given by Kothar-wa-Hasis in the Ugaritic text. When the author of the Book of Job has YHWH ask the protagonist if he can "pull up Leviathan with a fishhook," the reader of the text is apparently meant to know exactly the mythological concept to which this phrase refers, again reinforcing the idea that there must have been at least one actual textual entity recounting the "YHWH and Leviathan"-epic.

The above-quoted line about "pulling up Leviathan with a fish-hook" is certainly not only a piece of mythological inheritance—it probably also refers to the more mundane practices of fishing or hunting more ordinary reptiles. The two images (that of fighting a chaos monster and that of catching animals) are superimposed. However, these two interpretations need not contradict each other: an older, mythological motif may well have been reinterpreted in a more "near to earth" fashion. This is indicated by the fact that the motif of "piercing" the serpent occurs in other places as well. The idea of the Israelite God using some form of piercing weapon to defeat his serpentine enemy is in part reinforced by the above-mentioned verse from Deutero-Isaiah (51:9), which addresses the arm of YHWH with the following words:

---

[85] MT has *yôm* instead of *yām*. The reading *yām* goes back to Gunkel's (1895: 59) publishing of an idea by Gottfried Schmied. This emended reading has won many adherents, not least because of its increasing the parallelism between the lines. The prominent motif of the "day" (*yôm*) in Job 3 would make it easier for *yôm* to have crept into the text as a *lectio simplicior*. For further discussion and references concerning this problem, see Wikander 2010: 265, n. 1.

[86] For my views on this passage, see further Wikander 2010.

Hălôʾ ʾatt-hîʾ hammaḥṣebet rahab Indeed it was you that cut down Rahab,
měḥôlelet tannîn that pierced the Dragon!
(Isa 51:9*c*-*d*)

A similar reference is found at another place in the Book of Job, where it is said of YHWH:

Ḥōlălâ yādô nāḥāš bārîaḥ His hand pierced the fleeing serpent.
(Job 26:13*b*)

If this analysis is correct, some sort of stabbing weapon seems indeed to be referred to. One should however, note that Ps 74:13 talks of "crushing" (*šibbēr*) the heads of Rahab, which does sound more club-like. A similar double description of the type of weapon used by the victorious divine warrior occurs in the Enūma Eliš, in which it is first stated that Marduk defeats Tiāmat using an arrow that pierces her heart...

Issuk mulmulla iḫtepi karassa

He shot the arrow, and it ripped through [her] belly.
(EE IV 101)

... after which the other version of destruction is recounted:

Ina miṭṭīšu lā padî ulatti muḫḫa

With his unsparing mace he crushed [her] skull.
(EE IV 130)

The double (both beating and piercing) victory over the serpent may possibly be in evidence in the following half-verse from Psalm 89:

ʾattâ dikkāʾtā keḥālāl rāhab

You crushed Rahab like one pierced through …
(Ps 89:11*a*)

In this case, it is usual to translate *keḥālāl* with "as one slain" or similar, but I believe that keeping the actual root meaning of *ḥālāl* ("pierced") may hint at an older tradition.

The overt description of a "crushing" type of violence against the monster is also in evidence in the Vedic material—notice for example a line from the

more magically oriented Atharva-Veda,[87] where the poet addresses Indra in the following way:

> *Tvaṃ rauhiṇaṃ vyāsyo vi vṛtrasyābhinac chiraḥ*
>
> You scattered Rauhiṇa and crushed the head of Vṛtra …
> (AV XX 128:13)

This imagery is highly reminiscent the following lines from the Psalter:

> *ʾattâ pôrartā bĕʿozzĕkā yām*
> *šibbartā rāʾšê tannînîm ʿal-hammāyim*
>
> You split (?) the Sea with your power,
> you crushed the heads of the Dragons on the waters.
> (Ps 74:13)

Going back to the Vedic material, these lines (with a 2nd person dual imperative directed to the gods Indra and Agni) may possibly indicate a type of crushing violence:

> *Ābhogaṃ hanmanā hatam*
> *udadhiṃ hanmanā hatam*
>
> Slay, you two, the Serpent with the slayer/blow/striker!
> Slay, you two, the water-holder with the slayer/blow/striker!
> (ṚV VII 94:12)

Here, the instrument used to slay the Serpent is described using the word *hanman-*, from the root *han-*, "to strike, slay," itself derived from Proto-Indo-European **g^{wh}en-*, to which we will be returning later on. This derived word would mean something like "blow," "strike," "slaying," or the like. The imperative *hatam* is from the same root, so that we get "slay with the slayer," "strike with the striker," or something similar. Compare this with the weapons

[87] Another interesting parallel exists between the Israelite and Vedic serpent demons in their later religious history. Both Vṛtra and Leviathan later become stock characters in various forms of magic or curses—or sometimes the victory of the heroic deity against them is used in such contexts. Such is the case already in Job 3:8, where some evil sorcerers are referred to who are powerful enough to command the Leviathan; a similar motif appears in a number of the Jewish-Babylonian Aramaic incantation bowls from Late Antiquity, which refer to spells that once bound the great chaos serpent as threats against enemies of the user of the bowl (see Wikander 2010 for my views on the relationships between these texts with one another—and further references). In Vedic India, the Atharva-Veda is the natural repository for this type of "magical" material, and here too, we find such references (see Lahiri 1984: 229-232).

of Baal mentioned above, using the same paronomasia ("Driver, drive Yamm!" and "Expeller, expel Yamm!").[88] The poetic constructions are startlingly similar: "Slay with the slayer!"/"Driver, drive Yamm!"/ "Expeller, expel Yamm!"

There are post-Vedic accounts of Indra's battle which seem to point to piercing damage to Vṛtra as well:

> *Bhittvā vajreṇa tatkukṣiṃ* After piercing his [Vṛtra's] belly with his *vajra*
> *niṣkramya balabhidvibhuḥ* and emerging, the powerful slayer of Bala [=Indra]
> *uccakarta śiraḥ śatror* cut off the head of the enemy,
> *giriśṛṅgam ivaujasā* which was like a mountain peak, with force.
> (Bhāgavata-Purāṇa 6:12:32)

Regardless of whether one is talking of piercing or crushing, the biblical pieces of text referred to above seem to point to a notion of YHWH destroying the dragon monster using some form of implement, in the same way that Baal and Indra do in their respective stories. Note that this question of YHWH's weaponry is most easily brought up as a result of a comparison not only with surrounding Semitic-speaking cultures but with Indo-European ones as well. We shall return to the matter of the possible original formulation of a Yahwistic dragon-killing tale or phrase when discussing the corresponding reconstructed Proto-Indo-European phrase in section 4.8.

4.4 The Hittite Serpent Story

Another Indo-European parallel to the Northwest Semitic serpent slaying stories is the Hittite narrative (CTH 321) of the battle between the Storm God and his enemy, the serpent Illuyanka (the latter is not actually a name but literally means "serpent"). This story is rather different than the ones about YHWH, Baal and Indra: the Hittite god is painted as a rather weak character, one who has to be helped not only by the goddess Inara, but also by a mortal named Ḫūpašiya, in order to slay the serpent:

> *nu* ^{d}*Inaraš* ^{m}*Ḫūpaš*[*iyan p*]*ēḫutet nan mūnnāit*
> ^{d}*Inaraššz-a-z unuttat n-ašta* ^{MUŠ}*illuyank*[*an*] *ḫantešnaz šarā kallišta*
> *kāša-wa* EZEN-*an iyami*
> *nu-wa adanna akuwanna eḫu*
> *n-ašta* ^{MUŠ}*illuyankaš QADU* [DUMU^{MEŠ}-*ŠU*] *šarā uēr*
> *nu-za eter ekue*[*r*]
> [*n*]-*ašta* ^{DUG}*palḫan ḫūmandan ek*[*uer n*]*e-za ninkēr*
> [*n*]*e namma ḫattešnaš kattand*[*a*] *nūmān pānzi*

[88] The Ugaritic text has *ygrš grš ym* […] *aymr mr ym* (KTU 1.2 IV 12, 19).

> ^{m}*Ḫūpasiyašš-*[*a uit*] *nu* ^{MUŠ}*illuyankan išḫimā*[*nta*] *kalēliēt*
> ^{d}IM-*aš uit nu-kan* ^{MUŠ}*illuy*[*ankan*] *kuenta*
> DINGIR^{MEŠ}*-š-a kattišši ešer*
>
> And Inara transported Ḫūpašiya and hid him.
> Inara dressed herself, and she called the Serpent up from his hole:
> "See, I am making a feast,
> come eat and drink!"
> And the Serpent came up together with [his children],
> and they ate and drank.
> They drank every vessel, and they were satiated.
> And they could no longer go down into their hole;
> Ḫūpašiya came, and he tied the Serpent up with a cord.
> The Storm God came, and he killed the Serpent;
> the gods were with him.[89]

We see here that the serpent is killed not by mighty force, but rather by trickery. No specific weapon is mentioned, and neither is any storm theophany—but the victorious deity is the storm god (written with the Sumerogram IM, "wind/storm"). Another interesting detail in the Hittite story is the fact that the Storm God and the serpent do battle once earlier in the story, at which point the hero is actually defeated. This could possibly parallel the humiliating submission Baal is forced into before Yamm at the beginning of the Ugaritic story (and perhaps his fear of and surrender before Mot).[90]

4.5 Sea and Creation: Characteristic Differences

There are a few significant differences between the Indo-European and Semitic serpent slaying narratives. The most apparent of these is the connection existing in the Semitic stories with the two concepts of creation—and the association with the battle against the personified Sea. None of these central associations are as clearly present in the Indo-European narratives.[91] However, it should also be noted that the creation-theme is not always present in the Semitic ambit, either: the Ugaritic Baal Cycle lacks all reference to a creation narrative. But the role of the personified Sea is certainly an important and specific part of the Semitic-

---

[89] I have kept my translation from Wikander 2010: 269-270. The transcription is normalized based on the text as edited by Beckman (1982: §§ 9-12).

[90] One may note with some interest Haas's (1994: 104-105) assertion that the Hittite Illuyanka forms a parallel to the Ugaritic Mot, rather than Yamm and the chaos dragons!

[91] Though one can note with some interest that Töyräänvuori (2016: 130) regards the motif of creating the world by "halving a whole" and a "war between the generations of the gods" in the Enūma Eliš as "distinctly Sumerian" and "possibly Indo-European." If this is intended to suggest an Indo-European connection for the splitting creation, so to speak, I agree that there are certainly such stories in Indo-European languages; this motif is, however, generally not woven together with the dragon battle in a clear way in the Indo-European material.

language stories: one may note with some interest that both the Hebrew and Ugaritic versions of the narrative vacillate between just talking of the "Sea" (Yamm/*yām*) and the various serpentine monsters. Could it be that the idea of the Serpent was shared through some medium of transmission with various Indo-European cultures, while Semitic-speakers combined this motif with the more specifically Near Eastern idea of the chaotic Sea, which had to be pacified by a deity? The idea of the battle against the Sea as such seems to be very much at home in the western Ancient Near Eastern milieu: note for example the so-called *Song of the Sea*, which is preserved in fragmentary form in both Hurrian and Hittite but is Hurrian in origin: in that text, the Hurrian storm god Teššob fights no dragon—but confronts the personified Sea itself.[92] Some of the Indo-European dragons do live in the sea, to be sure, but the "Sea as a being" idea that is so clearly tied up with the serpent battle in the Semitic sources is not present.

Noga Ayali-Darshan has argued that the idea of battling the Sea is an essentially Levantine conception, specifically having its origin in the Phoenician coastal territories, whence it subsequently spread into Canaan, Egypt, the Hittite territories, and finally Mesopotamia.[93] I concur with this general assessment, even though one could add that there are certain early Mesopotamian attestations as well, like in one of the Gudea texts (from the 2100s BC), in which the god Ningirsu is referred to in Sumerian as *a ḫuš gi₄-a* ("the one who made the raging/terrifying waters turn back").[94] Yet, the point that the battle against the personified Sea is an autochthonous entity from the Near East is highly probable, and it fits well with the lack of this element in the Indo-European serpent slaying stories.[95]

---

[92] On the Hurro-Hittite Song of the Sea as relevant piece of comparative material for the Hittite Illuyanka story, see e.g. Gilan 2013: 99 (with further references). For a deeper treatment of the text, see Rutherford 2001. Rutherford also basically agrees (p. 601) that the most probable main theme of the fragmentary text is a battle between the Storm God and the Sea.

[93] Ayali-Darshan 2011 (in Modern Hebrew); her point is summarized in English in Greenstein 2015: 34. She also makes the argument in Ayali-Darshan 2015, especially in the Conclusion and Appendix on pp. 49-51. Ayali-Darshan herself (2015: 22, n. 4) points out that the Hittite story of the battle against Illuyanka does not actually include the personified Sea as a protagonist (or rather antagonist) in the story, which makes it different from the main mytheme of storm gods battling the Sea that she is studying.

[94] Cylinder A, l. 8.15; text available online at the *ETCSL*.

[95] A similar point is made by Töyräänvuori (2016: 426), who points out that Watkins' basic formula for the Indo-European serpent slaying stories (see below) is subtly different from the "Amorite" one partly because latter focuses upon the Sea and not a dragon in general. Wakeman (1973: 25-26, 29-30) also argues that the dragon battle as secondary to the battle against the Sea in the Northwest Semitic stories. Töyräänvuori (2016: 421) holds that the serpent stories are older than the "Sea" ones, but that there were local "river" stories—and that political developments motivated the combination between the Sea and Dragon battles.

The Hittite word for serpent *can* be associated with the sea, such as in the phrase *arunaš* ^{MUŠ}*illuiyankaš* ("serpent of the sea") which appears at *KUB* XXXVI 55 ii 28.[96] The sea also does appear in the Illuyanka text itself, in the second telling of the story, in §25' of Beckman's (1982) edition (line 22'), as the *place* where the Storm God meets the Serpent for a second battle. The sea is, however, not the one doing battle, nor is the association between the Serpent and the sea unequivocal: in the first version of the story (§11, line 14'), the Serpent is said to live in a "hole" (*ḫatteššar*), which would seem to have more chthonic associations. There are references to sea dragons in other parts of the Indo-European phylum: for example, the Old Irish *Saga of Fergus mac Léti* includes one, referred to as *muirdris*, which probably literally means "sea-dragon."[97] Another example is the Vedic monster Ahi Budhnya ("the Serpent of the Deep").[98] M.L. West refers to the Indo-European tellings of the battle against the Serpent as stories of a "Water Dragon,"[99] but it should be remembered that the relationship between, e.g., the Vedic Vṛtra and the waters are subtly different than that between the biblical and Ugaritic dragon monsters and the watery deeps: Vṛtra *holds the life giving waters back* until the hero Indra can release them (see the above quotes from ṚV I 32:1 and II 12:3 on p. 36). West even refers to the Avestan chaos monster Apaoša (who, while not a dragon, is connected with Vṛtra by both etymology and function) as a "demon of drought," an epithet that could hardly be used of Leviathan or Rahab.[100] In the Ugaritic texts, the "demon of drought" would be Mot, not one of the monsters of the side of personified Sea.

There are certainly "sea serpents" in Indo-European tellings, but the battle against the personified Sea as such (and, thereby, its integration into the dragon battle motif) definitely seems to be an autochthonous, Ancient Near Eastern development.[101] We shall return to this matter later on.

---

[96] Mentioned in Katz 1998: 320. See also footnote 121, on Katz's ideas about the possibility of the word *illuyanka-* itself etymologically meaning "eel-snake" (and thus carrying with it an aquatic association).

[97] Watkins 1995: 447

[98] Watkins 1995: 460.

[99] West 2007: 255. Miller (2016: 150) uses the expression "the dragon-who-is-water." He also points out (2014: 227) how the Vedic Serpent lies in "the deep" after the great battle (ṚV I 32:8).

[100] West 2007: 257.

[101] And in the Levantine material as well, the Serpent and Sea battles, though closely connected with one another, need not necessarily be *identified* with each other. In the Baal Cycle, for example, the serpentine monster is mentioned in a way that appears to indicate that it is separate from Yamm himself, though allied with him (in the monster list in KTU 1.3 III 38-46; for my analysis of this passage, see Wikander 2014: 238-240). According to Miller (2014: 236), the Serpent *ltn* in the Baal Cycle is identical with Yamm; I am rather skeptical of this (even though it is possible that Yamm has some serpentine characteristics in another text, KTU 1.83; see Pitard 1998). Töyräänvuori (2016: 428) argues the opposite of what I suggest above, that *Indo-European* tales may

4.6 Conquerors and Encirclers: The Names of the Storm Gods and Serpents

After this overview, we must return to what was stated in the Introduction to be a main part of the project of the present volume: grounding the religio-historical comparisons made in specific terminology, lexical material or poetic phrases. So far, we have seen some clear correspondences in the ways in which Northwest Semitic sources, Vedic, and Hittite texts express themselves, but in order to argue more clearly for an actual connection between the texts from the "world of the Hebrew Bible" and the Indo-European ones, such lexical or phrasal correspondences are needed. And I believe that they can be found.

One tantalizing point of intersection between the stories here in question is the way of referring to the heroes themselves. As we have seen, the name of the Hittite Storm God was *Tarḫunna-*, which probably means "the Conqueror." This word is derived from the Hittite verbal root *tarḫu-* ("to defeat, conquer, be mighty, be able"), which in turn is a reflex of the Proto-Indo-European verb **terh₂-u-*, with similar meanings of "overcoming."[102] In the Ugaritic myths, Baal is very often given the epithet *aliyn*, an elative of the root *l'y*, "to be able, to be mighty", which apparently meant something like "supremely mighty," "victorious" or "conquering." These two descriptions of the storm gods are quite similar, and one could imagine some form of conceptual link between the two words (especially as we do not find many comparable instances of descriptions such as *aliyn* in the Baal cults of the neighboring Semitic cultures).[103]

If such a link really exists, the religio-historical connections between the Indo-European and Northwest Semitic religious motifs involved may go one step further—and quite a fascinating step, at that. As has been pointed out by earlier scholars, the Hittite name (or title) *Tarḫunna-* ("the Conqueror"), as well as its Luwian relative *Tarḫunt-* or *Tarḫunza-* (with the same meaning), form a close and even striking parallel to the Vedic participle *tūrvant-* ("overpowering, conquering"), which is derived from the same Indo-European root, is formally identical in its derivation, and was applied to a number of Vedic deities, among them Indra, the very serpent-battler god himself.[104] Interestingly, a quite similar

---

have inspired the "anthropomorphization of the sea" in Northwest Semitic mythology; I personally cannot find any evidence for this direction of influence.

[102] As demonstrated by Kloekhorst (2008: 835-837 [s.v. *tarḫuᶻⁱ*]), the verbal root in question in Hittite is definitely *tarḫu-*, not simply *tarḫ-*, as has often been supposed in the past. I have applied this reading consistently in Hittite texts.

[103] The points made in this section about the etymologies of the terms for the storm gods and serpents at Ugarit and in the Hittite and Indo-Iranian materials also appear (in somewhat different form) in Wikander 2017.

[104] The link between the name of the Anatolian Storm God and the Vedic word was made in a quite abbreviated form in Eichner 1974: 28. It was seized upon (and expanded) in Kloekhorst 2008: 838 (s.v. *tarḫuᶻⁱ*), where Eichner's idea is expounded in the form of saying that the Cuneiform Luwian form *Tarḫuwant-/ Tarḫunt-* "forms an exact word equation with [Sanskrit] *tū́rvant-* 'overpowering', which is used as an epithet of Indra, Agni and Mitra." Kloekhorst considers the underlying paradigm (at least of the Luwian forms) to have been nominative **trh₂-u-énts* and genitive **trh₂-u-nt-ós*, probably a frozen

participle occurs in Avestan in the expression *vərəθra.tauruuąᵭ* ("the one who overpowers/conquers resistance"), a compound word that includes the Avestan version of the name of the serpent Vṛtra (*vərəθra*, here with the lexical meaning of "resistance").[105] This word expresses very clearly the association between the "Conqueror" title and the title of the great serpent in the Vedic tales. An expression made up from the same etymological material, *Vṛtra-tura-* (something like "overpowerer/conqueror of Vṛtra"), also occurs in Vedic texts as an epithet of Indra,[106] proving that the expression is probably of Proto-Indo-Iranian provenance.

If, indeed, the Ugaritic term epithet *aliyn* which is applied to Baal represents a kind of loan-translation from some form of the Anatolian words mentioned earlier, and the Northwest Semitic tales of a storm deity slaying a serpent monster also include elements borrowed from Indo-Iranian sources, then the use of the term "mighty/conqueror" in Ugaritic could in a strange way represent a kind of confluence of material from two Indo-European branches using an etymologically identical expression for talking poetically about the victorious storm god. The non-Indo-European, Ugaritic language becomes an apex at which the Indo-Aryan and Anatolian legs in the triangle can meet.

The above-mentioned Avestan compound word *vərəθra.tauruuąᵭ* and its Vedic counterpart *Vṛtra-tura* become even more interesting in this context, as I would suggest that Ugaritic texts imply a sort of word-play between the roots *ʾly* ("be powerful, conquer") which is used of the storm deity in the title *aliyn* and *lwy* ("to encircle") which is used as the basis of one of his aquatic enemies, Lotan/Litan/Leviathan.

While the Avestan and Vedic compound expressions mentioned above put the opposites "resistance/'coverer'" and "Conqueror" together, Ugaritic uses highly poetically similar words for the two concepts, as a way of expressing the same mythological antonymity. In both Indo-Iranian and Ugaritic, the concepts of conquering on the one hand and resisting/covering/encircling on the other are opposed to each other in a similar way. This, I believe, is not a coincidence.

If this argument holds true, it would mean that both the name of the divine warrior and that of his enemy constitute pieces of "etymological poetic" material that have been borrowed from one or more Indo-European origins into a Northwest Semitic context. The fact that the titles of the storm deities meaning

---

participle. The Vedic Sanskrit form *tūrvant-* is a present participle as well, showing that the use of this etymological material for describing a storm deity is indeed ancient and can confidently be counted as "Indo-European" in the more general sense.

[105] For the Avestan form, see Sims-Williams 1997: 338.

[106] The connection between the name of the Anatolian Storm God and the Vedic word *tūrvant-* is also mentioned in Watkins 1995: 344, where the Vedic epithet *Vṛtra-tura-* of Indra is also pointed out. The connection between the Hittite and Vedic titles is also referred to by Jasanoff (2003: 142, n. 320) and by Schwemer (2008: 18), the latter rendering the relevant Vedic title as "storming along." The Vedic verbal root for "to overcome, to conquer" is also highlighted as being central to the Indra/Serpent story in Miller 2016: 150 (along with other relevant roots).

"Conqueror" are represented by the exact same inherited etymological material in Hittite and Vedic (with parallels in Avestan) substantially increases the likelihood of the Indo-European versions of these stories being primary in relation to the Semitic ones, as does the fact of the Indo-European serpent slaying-myths being spread almost over the entirety of the Indo-European linguistic area (from Germanic sources to Indian ones), as delineated by Watkins (1995). A borrowing of the motif from Indo-European sources into Semitic ones seems much more likely than a movement in the other direction.[107]

And even more spectacularly: it is a possibility that the Ugaritic epithet *aliyn* applied to Baal, the supreme Conqueror of enemies in that culture, may actually represent a loan-translated conflation derived from *two* different Indo-European cultures: Anatolian and Indo-Iranian![108] To this, the Ugaritic poet seems to have added his own literary flourishes, using wordplay as a means of connecting the relevant roots (*lʾy* and *lwy*) in a way similar to what happened in the Indo-European loan-giving cultures. Just as the Indo-Aryan cultures juxtaposed "resistance/the coverer" and the "Conqueror," so does Ugaritic oppose the "Conqueror" (*aliyn*) to the "Enveloper" (Leviathan/Lotan/Litan).

But we can go one step further. The above-mentioned type of wordplay occurs also in the Anatolian sources. The fact that the name of the Hittite Storm God, *Tarḫunna-*, literally means "Conqueror" provided the Hittite authors with an excellent means of such creative paronomasia. The example that I am thinking of also clearly shows that this name was interpreted in antiquity as having a direct, lexical sense, not just as an ossified, seemingly arbitrary name without inherent semantic reference.

In the text about the battle between the Storm God and the serpent Illuyanka, the protagonist is not immediately successful (as mentioned earlier). His first attempt at battling the Serpent ends in defeat. The Hittite text puts it this way (Beckman 1982: §3, l.11; end preserved whole in the parallel in §21):

Nu-za ^{MUŠ}*illuyankaš* ^{d}IM-*an* [*taru*]*ḫta*

Given that the Sumerogram ^{d}IM ("Storm God") was read in Hittite as the name *Tarḫunna-*, the line when read in pure Hittite becomes as brilliant example of etymologizing wordplay:

---

[107] Again, see also my exposition in Wikander 2017.

[108] The possibility of the Ugaritic poets having in a sense combined the occurrences of the "Conqueror" terminology from two different Indo-European subphyla reminds one of Ghilʿad Zuckermann's (2003: 53) *congruence principle*, which states that if more than one language contributes to a target language, those features that occur in more than one of the contributors are more likely to appear in the target. To be sure, Zuckermann discussed purely *linguistic* phenomena (in his case, the hybridized emergence of Modern Israeli Hebrew), but a similar argument could be used for materials of "etymological poetics" being borrowed as well. The presence of the "Conqueror" motif in two different Indo-European languages interacting with Northwest Semitic may well have strengthened the incentive for borrowing.

Nu-za ^{MUŠ}*illuyankaš* ^{d}*Tarḫunnan taruḫta*

The same verbal root *tarḫu-* is used both for the name of the Storm God/Conqueror and for the "conquering" to which he is subjected. A succinct translation getting this point across would be the following:

The Serpent conquered the Conqueror.

The most conquering god of all, the Storm God, is forced to swallow his own medicine.[109] This pattern of showing the subjugation of a deity by having him be "beaten at his own game" is a common one in the Hebrew Bible as well, as we will see also in chapter 7, on the possible Indo-European background of the divine name Dagan/Dagon.[110] Also, the association between the name of the Storm God and the battle against the Serpent suggests the possibility that such a battle was one that Hittites would think of when hearing the name of the "Conqueror" spoken. Such a possibility could definitely be there concerning the Ugaritic Baal as well—his title *aliyn* could be a reference not to a generic tendency to conquer things but to specific mythemes, such as the battle against the Serpent (note again what I suggested above, that the roots of the names Leviathan/Litan/Lotan and *aliyn* are deliberately similar).

Of course, later on in the Hittite story, the fortunes of the Storm God are reversed, and he defeats the Serpent with the assistance of the goddess Inara and the mortal man Ḫūpašiya.

But how is this piece of Hittite etymologizing wordplay ("conquering the Conqueror") in itself relevant to the Northwest Semitic literatures? After all, neither the Ugaritic texts nor the Hebrew Bible includes any reference to the divine protagonist having been defeated by the Serpent prior to his victory. There are, however, other instances of a similar nature. In the Baal Cycle, the hero is at first humiliated and extradited to his enemy, the sea god Yamm (as mentioned earlier). This constitutes a type of defeat prior to the victory against the side of the sea beings, of which Leviathan/Litan/Lotan can be considered to be a part.

However, the really interesting parallel can be found in another part of the Baal Cycle—the one concerned with the battle between Baal and Mot, the god of death. In this part of the story (which mainly consists of tablets KTU 1.4 and 1.5, but has precursors in 1.3 as well), Baal is indeed defeated by his enemy and is forced to descend into the netherworld. As a result, a great drought ensues, striking the land and killing all verdure, thus manifesting the rule of personified

[109] For the importance of this collocation using *tarḫu-* and its etymological cogeners in Vedic writings, and on the Hittite wordplay, see Watkins 1995: 343-346.

[110] One may note Mettinger's (1988: 82-91) suggestion that the appellation *ʾēl ḥāy* ("living God") used of YHWH was intended to oppose/contrast him to gods who were thought to die and rise again. The Hittite text, it seems, does something similar, but it does it to the same god that it wants to extol!

Death in the world.[111] As I have discussed in detail in Wikander 2014, this drought is specifically described as being mediated through the goddess of the sun, Shapshu. The relevant phrase (which I have referred to as the *Refrain of the Burning Sun*), occurs three times during the course of the Baal Cycle, with very small variations:[112]

*nrt . il*m . *špš . ṣḫrrt*	The divine lamp Shapshu burns/will burn red-hot,
la . šmm . b yd . bn ilm . mt	the heavens are wearied/dried up in the hand of Mot, the divine one.

As I and others have argued earlier, the use of the verb *la* in the sense of "to be weary, to be exhausted" (and by extension, perhaps, "to be dried up") represents an inverted meaning of the same root that also means "to be strong, to conquer" ("inverted" in the sense of a verbal root also meaning the opposite of its basic meaning).[113] This is the same root used in the "Conqueror" title of Baal (*aliyn*): the same root that underlies Baal's epithet signifying his victories is here used to recount the terrible effects of his defeat. Again, the *Conqueror is conquered*.

It is perhaps no accident that Mot refers to the defeat of Leviathan/Lotan/Litan when he challenges Baal and scares him into descending into the realm of the dead at the beginning of KTU 1.5 I (see above, p. 41). He talks of skies that "burn hot" and "shine" or have been "weakened" because of this—exactly the dangers that are described in the Refrain of the Burning Sun. Could a conscious pun be intended here between *lwy* ("to encircle," the root of Leviathan/Litan/Lotan) and *lʾy* ("to be strong" or, in its inverted sense, "to be weak"), a possible pun I referred to earlier? It is certainly interesting that the two passages that express such similar phenomena seem to use both these roots, roots that semantically correspond to the names of the Conqueror gods of the Indo-European texts and of the serpent Vṛtra. And again, note the use of the root *lʾy* to denote both the title of the conquering storm deity and the results of his being conquered. Just as the Hittite text says *Tarḫunnan taruḫta* ("he conquered the Conqueror"), the Ugaritic text calls Baal *aliyn* ("Victorious, Mighty, Conquering") and then describes the result of his defeat using the same root *lʾy*. This, I argue, is too much to be a coincidence.

It might be objected that it is overreaching to search for parallels to the Hittite Storm God/Serpent story in that part of the Ugaritic Baal Cycle that deals not with the battle against Yamm (the sea god) but against Mot, the god of death. However, I believe this objection to be less weighty for a number of

[111] The way in which this is recounted and made into a literary structure is a large part of the object of study in Wikander 2014. See, especially pp. 23-81 (but the matter recurs throughout the course of the book).

[112] KTU 1.3 V 17-18, 1.4 VIII 21-24, and 1.6 II 24-25. The version quoted here is the last of these. My views on this Refrain make up the whole of section 2.2.1 of Wikander 2014 (pp. 23-45), to which I refer for my underlying linguistic and prosodic analysis.

[113] See Wikander 2014: 41, esp. n. 97, with references to previous literature.

reasons. One of these is the fact that neither the Yamm nor the Mot battle actually provides a perfect counterpart to the Hittite story. Illuyanka is a serpent—not necessarily a sea serpent but one sometimes living in a hole in the ground. While the Baal Cycle does mention the Leviathan/Litan/Lotan in two places, the main "water enemy" in that text is Yamm, the sea god himself, who does not appear as a serpent (at least not in that text). Because of the association between "the Sea" and "the Dragon" that is often (and quite correctly) made in studies of texts from the Semitic ambit, it may be easy to downplay the relationship between Mot and serpentine monsters. But it is, after all, Mot who mentions Baal's struggle against the sea serpent as a reason for or background to their own battle. Also, it should be noted that Mot lives in the earth, as does the Hittite Serpent in one of the stories about him. As mentioned earlier, the association between the serpent mythology and the personified Sea seems to a large extent to be an inner-Semitic (or at least inner-Near Eastern) phenomenon.[114] I find it quite probable that this idea was combined with an imported Indo-European-derived concentration on battling serpents, creating the well-known fusion that appears to us in the Hebrew Bible.

This type of fusion is actually in evidence already in the Hurro-Hittite material itself. The text CTH 785 mentions "when the Storm God defeated the Sea" (*arunan-za maḫḫan* ^{d}U [*t*]*aruḫta*),[115] using the same creative wordplay between the verb *tarḫu-* ("to defeat") and the name of the Storm God himself, *Tarḫunna-* (here written logographically as ^{d}U). This may show the inherited association between the Storm God and his victorious battle against the serpent (cf. the Vedic uses of the same inherited Indo-European verb) being transposed to the battle against the Near Eastern personified Sea itself.

4.7 Different Levels of Mythological Correspondence and Possible Vectors

When considering the possible implications of these parallels between the Northwest Semitic (including Old Testament) narratives concerning the battle against the great serpent or sea monster with that found in certain Indo-European cultures, we must distinguish between two possible levels of historical connection (cf. section 2.2). The first of these concerns the very general motif of a divine hero (often, but not always, a storm god) slaying a serpent. As we have seen, there are a number of similarities between this type of myth and the dragon-fighting stories of the biblical and Semitic cultures, and these similarities should be explained. One such explanation would be cultural influence or "co-operation" at some level and in some direction, most probably at an early point

[114] Or perhaps better: Syro-Palestino-Mesopotamian, which mostly means "Semitic" in practice. But note, for example, the story of the serpent Ḫedammu (preserved in Hittite as CTH 348), a serpent who also lives in the sea.

[115] See Ayali-Darshan 2015: 23-25; she also mentions a few other texts with similar expressions. Here and in other places, I have changed the common transcription of the word "he defeated," *taraḫta*, to the more probable *taruḫta*, in line with the findings of Kloekhorst (as mentioned above, n. 102).

and possibly during a prolonged period. The other possible type of connection would be shown by looking at more detail-oriented correspondences, such as the descriptions of mountains being "afraid" at the thunderous roar of the battling storm god (found both in the Hebrew Bible and at Ugarit on the one hand and in the Vedic story on the other). Another such detailed similarity is the handing over of the divine weapon by the craftsman god (found both in the Baal Cycle and in the Ṛg-Veda)—and last but not least the startling similarities in the naming conventions of the Storm God hero and the serpent enemy ("Conqueror" and "Encircler/Coverer"), which, as I argue above, clearly suggest a historical connection.

I believe that to provide an understanding of the various types of correspondences and similarities that appear to exist between the water-dragon slaying stories of the biblical ambit and the serpent myths of Indo-European provenance, we must be open both to a more general idea of early cultural interaction and of one involving specific loans or cultural back-and-forth concerning specific motifs. For example, the rather significant detail-centered similarities between motifs in the Baal Cycle and those occurring in the Indian Vṛtra story would probably need to be explained through the latter type of scenario. In this case, there is a possible cultural link that suggests itself as the transporting agent, making such specific borrowings possible. This is the kingdom of Mitanni, with its well-known presence of Indo-Aryan onomastics, technincal terminology and divine names. It is a fact the Mitannians included Indra (*in-da-ra*) in god lists, showing a familiarity with that deity. Also, as pointed out by Nicolas Wyatt, there is evidence of Hurrian/Mitannian influence in the Hebrew Bible, for example in the name Arauna, which may represent a Hurrian word like *iwer-na* or *ewirne*, meaning something like "the lord."[116] Even though the Mitannians were mainly a Hurrian speaking people, it is well established that there was a (possibly somewhat fossilized) Indo-European (Indic, to be specific) linguistic stratum as part of their culture (shown, for example, by the onomastics of their rulers). At Ugarit, the Hurrians had a pervasive influence, and the El Amarna literature attests great amounts of Indo-Aryan names,[117] showing the Mitannians as quite a possible vector of cultural transmission between the Indo-European and Old Testament world. In the 2013 article mentioned earlier, I have argued for a direct influence from a Hurrian/Hittite bilingual upon Deuteronomy 32 (including some very close parallels).

Another thing that makes the Hurrians especially important in the present context is the fact that they also showed a distinct cultural symbiosis with the Indo-Europeans of Anatolia (especially pronounced in the way in which the Hurrian culture exerted a pervasive influence upon the Hittite one). The dual directions of contact with Indo-European cultures—Anatolian as well as Indo-Aryan—makes the Hurrians ideal candidates as cultural vectors into the

[116] Wyatt 1985: 372; Lipiński 2004: 500 (with ample references).

[117] For many examples of this, see Hess 1993.

linguistic milieu of Northwest Semitic. The fact that the name of the "Victorious Baal" at Ugarit could be construed as a confluence of (etymologically identical) poetic material from these two Indo-European cultures would fit very well with such a view. In the next chapter, I will provide some further examples of dual Hurrian/Indo-European influence on poetic motifs in Ugaritic literature and in the Hebrew Bible.[118]

The other type of correspondence—that which does not concern details of mythology that are easily traceable but larger and more abstract mythemes and motifs—may go back to a much earlier phase of Indo-European/Semitic interaction. This type of explanation is much more difficult and far-reaching, and we are talking now of the earliest type of cultural correspondence mentioned in section 2.2—that which may have occurred already at the proto-language level. Such interactions are, of course, much harder to study with methodological rigor.

4.8 Phrasal Correspondences and Watkins' Proto-Myth

Even though this is so, however, I shall allow myself to suggest that such earlier correspondence (going back to very early Indo-European times) may in fact be demonstrable as part of the Northwest Semitic material itself. Again, the way of discussing this should ideally be based not in general semantic similarity or (even worse) just in apparently parallel ways of thinking, but in methodologically studiable, borrowed phraseology. One could object that such an enviable state of affairs would be an impossible thing to hope for when it comes to very early interactions or retentions such as this, yet I would argue that there may in fact be a very viable example.

To find it, we must go to the most famous reconstruction there is of the putative Proto-Indo-European serpent/dragon slaying myth, the one proffered in Calvert Watkins' seminal study *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, which looks at the serpent myths in their various Indo-European incarnations and tries to reconstruct an Proto-Indo-European *Vorlage* from which they may have been derived.[119]

As we have already seen, Watkins makes the point of the weapons of the serpent slayers being important, but he does more than this: he actually argues that a specific Proto-Indo-European formula underlies the preserved Indo-European serpent slaying stories, a euphonically impressive piece of poetic diction that Watkins reconstructs as:

---

[118] The Hurrians/Mitanni as a possibe vector between Indo-Aryan and Northwest Semitic chaos battle traditions (in the former case, the Indra-Serpent battle especially) is also stressed in Töyräänvuori 2016: 427-428, though it should be noted that her view of the interaction is quite different than mine.

[119] Watkins (1995: 10) quite fittingly refers to this method of etymological poetics—reconstructing proto-language poetic formulae on the basis of their attested reflexes in daughter languages—as "genetic intertextuality."

**eg^{wh}ent og^{wh}im*[120] He slew the serpent.

The most direct basis of the reconstruction is the Vedic phrase *ahann ahim*, with which we have already made an acquaintance; the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European phrase is, in fact, the exact phonological "parent" of the Vedic expression. The Hittite reflex is also rather close to the proposed Proto-Indo-European parent phrase; *Illuyankan kuenta* has modified (somewhat)[121] the title of the serpent, but the verb ("slew") is etymologically identical, though lacking the so-called augment marking past time, which does not exist in Hittite and appears to have been optional in Proto-Indo-European itself. Remnants of the phrase also occur in Greek myth, especially in the use of the noun ὄφις to designate the serpent, this being the exact cognate of Vedic *ahi-* and thus a key component in the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European noun **og^{wh}i-*.[122]

Even though an inherited poetic formula meaning "he killed the serpent" may seem less than revolutionary, one should not discount the importance of the proposition. The appearance of the phrase in Proto-Indo-European itself may serve as a kind of sign in the same direction, the phoneme **g^{wh}* being one of the rarest sounds of the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European language, which makes it extremely significant that the reconstructed phrase includes no less than two instances of this sound, thus providing a beautiful and very distinctive poetic

---

[120] Watkins 1995: 154, 301-303, 365.

[121] One notes with some interest Katz' suggestion that the second half of the word *illuyanka-* ("serpent") is in fact derived from a word related (though not identical) to the Proto-Indo-European **og^{wh}i-*, which has been combined with the element appearing in English as *eel* (Katz 1998, esp pp. 320-329). If this is so, the step from Watkins' proto-phrase to the attested Hittite one is a short one indeed. One should note, however, that Kloekhorst (2008: 384 [s.v. ^{MUŠ}*illu̯anka-*, ^{MUŠ}*elliu̯anku-*]) does not accept this derivation of the Hittite word but postulates a loan from some unknown, non-Indo-European source. The same view (that the word is "[a]utochthonous" and not derived from Indo-European), can be found in Puhvel (*HED*) vol 2: 358-359 (s.v. *illuyanka-, elliyanku-*).

[122] If one follows the Leiden school of Indo-European linguistics, one would object to an **o-*vowel in the reconstructed word for "serpent" and prefer a vowel-coloring laryngeal **h$_3$* followed by an **e* (the Leiden school in general is quite prone to finding laryngeals—for structural and formal reasons—in places with other Indo-Europeanists would not). In fact, the Greek etymological dictionary of Beekes, who is part of the Leiden school, reconstructs the word in this very way, as **h$_3$eg^{wh}i-*, based on the absence of Brugmann's law in Sanskrit (a contested and somewhat unreliable sound-law, which would ideally have yielded a long vowel in Sanskrit as a result of an **o* in an open syllable, i.e., the nonexistent ***āhi-*)—see Beekes 2010: 1135 (s.v. ὄφις). For the purposes of the reconstruction of Watkins' proto-phrase, it does not matter greatly whether it was **eg^{wh}ent og^{wh}im* or the more "Leiden-esque" **h$_1$eg^{wh}ent h$_3$eg^{wh}im*: both provide the word play on the **g^{wh}-*sounds discussed later in the main text. In fact, a laryngeal **h$_3$* could possibly even strengthen that factor, as the sound appears to have been labialized (due to its *o*-coloring effects) and may well have been pronounced something like [γ^{w}], thus providing yet another sound quite similar to **g^{wh}* as part of the same phrase!

"sound" in the proto-language itself.[123] This phonological distinctiveness is not preserved unadulterated in any of the descendent languages, increasing the probability that the phrase actually goes back to Proto-Indo-European, as the totality of the euphonic wordplay would only be discernible in the reconstructed proto-language.

4.8.1 The Formulation of a Possible Northwest Semitic Proto-Phrase, and Its Reconstruction

Now, if we are to examine ways in which the dragon/serpent slaying motif may have moved from an Indo-European to a Northwest Semitic context, I believe that it would serve our purposes to carry out a similar exercise to the one discussed by Watkins, i.e., to think about what an early Northwest Semitic formulation of the serpent slaying motif may have sounded like. This is of course a very difficult task, yet one cannot disregard the fact that we possess quite a viable candidate for such an inherited phrase preserved both in the Hebrew and in the Ugaritic material. This is in the famously connected passages KTU 1.5 I 1-8 (quoted earlier) and Isa 27:1, one of the most famous Hebrew-Ugaritic parallels of all, including as they do the extremely striking correspondence of terminology (*ʿăqallātôn*/*ʿqltn* for "twisted/writhing" and *bārīaḥ/brḥ* for "quick, fleeing," the first of which is a hapax legomenon in Hebrew, making an accidental correspondence practically impossible):

k tmḫṣ . ltn . bṯn . brḥ	As/because you smote Litan, the fleeing serpent,
tkly . bṯn . ʿqltn .	killed off the writhing serpent,
šlyṭ . d . šbʿt . rašm	the ruler with seven heads,
tṯkḥ . ttrp . šmm .	the heavens will burn hot and shine/be weakened.
krs ipdk . ank .	I, even I, will tear you to pieces—
ispi . uṭm ḏrqm . amtm .	I will swallow elbows, blood, and forearms.
l yrt b npš . bn ilm . mt .	You will surely descend into the throat of divine Mot,
b mhmrt . ydd . il . ġzr	into the gullet of El's beloved, the hero.

(KTU 1.5 I 1-8)

Bayyôm hahûʾ yipqōd YHWH	On that day, YHWH will punish
bĕḥarbô haqqāšâ wĕhaggĕdôlâ wĕhaḥăzāqâ	with his hard, great and strong sword,
ʿal liwyātān nāḥāš bārīaḥ	Leviathan, the fleeing serpent,
wĕʿāl liwyātān nāḥāš ʿăqallātôn	Leviathan, the writhing serpent,
wĕhārag ʾet-hattannîn ʾăšer bayyām	he will kill the Dragon in the sea.

(Isa 27:1)

[123] See Watkins 1995: 365 for the importance of the **g^{wh}*-sounds.

As I have argued in greater detail in Wikander 2017, these correspondences are neither due to coincidence (which would be almost impossible) nor to borrowing from Ugaritic into Hebrew (which would be highly unlikely due to the great distance between the places of origin and temporal situations of the texts).[124] Rather, the correspondence must be regarded as an instance of shared poetic inheritance, i.e., as testimonies to the shared and inherited Northwest Semitic poetic language that both Ugaritic and Hebrew poets could take recourse to—and which underlay their respective poetic traditions. This means that the correspondence is of the same sort as the one that Watkins posited for the Indo-European serpent killing phrases: various inherited instances of an original, poetic proto-phrase, which served to carry the mythological motif with it as it developed into different languages/linguistic cultures.

The apparently poetically inherited formulations that the Hebrew and Ugaritic passages share are after all the name of the Serpent (*ltn/liwyātān*), a verb for committing violence, and certain stock epithets of the Serpent. The fact that that the verb *pāqad* in Hebrew carries a certain theological load that fits well with the specific context of Isaiah 27 (a proto-apocalyptic eschatological vision of the end of days) would render it probable that the original Proto-Northwest Semitic phrase included a verb with a more simple meaning of "fight" or "slay," quite possibly the same verb *mḫṣ* that the Ugaritic text uses (in its Hebrew incarnation, *mḥṣ*), as I shall argue below.

As hinted at above, if we want to compare the preserved Northwest Semitic serpent slaying data with the Indo-European material, it will not do simply to compare attested texts from various ages. To be able to carry out a comparison at an earlier level (cf. sections 2.2 and 4.7), we must try to go behind the Ugaritic and Hebrew instances of the serpent myth and try to reach at a common Northwest Semitic proto-formulation. To do this, we will be carrying out a parallel reconstructive search to that attempted by Watkins in the Indo-European linguistic sphere. And, as we shall see, such a search may in fact tell us something new about certain textual entities from the Hebrew Bible, showcasing the exegetical applicability of "etymological poetics" as we perform our search, which may finally help explain the connections between the biblical story and its Indo-European parallels..

Even though the various biblical text examples of the dragon story (or better: the preserved biblical pieces of reception of that story that must one day have existed) use a number of different Hebrew verbs when describing the striking/slaying/piercing action of the storm god YHWH against the Serpent, I believe that we can postulate that behind all these there probably lies an original phrase or number of phrases quite similar to the Ugaritic one quoted above. As, mentioned, I would find it very plausible that this reconstructed proto-phrase originally included the verb **mḫṣ*, "to strike, slay," the same verb used in the Ugaritic text. We have already looked at a couple of places in the Hebrew Bible

[124] This means that I disagree with Barker (2014: 214-216), who posits the possibility of an actual, historical connection between the Ugaritic text and the Isaian one.

that suggest *nqb*, "to pierce," as a more specific possibility for describing the mode in which the battling was thought to have occurred, but I think that the more general fact of YHWH (or storm gods generally) having slain a serpent may well have been expressed using **mḫṣ*,

The reasons for this are multiple. For one, the various other verbs used in the bits and pieces of reception of the dragon story that the Hebrew Bible actually preserves are very often specializations of the general meaning "slay/kill/strike," when applied to specific forms of weaponry (as discussed above). Behind these different verbs—which appear to be used in order to preserve specific types of "anti-dragon violence" inherent in the weapons used (or certain theological implications, such as in the use of *pāqad* in Isa 27:1)—there should probably once have been a single proto-phrase. For this, the verb **mḫṣ* (Hebrew *mḥṣ*, "smite, strike, slay") is a likely candidate, as that verb is (a) clearly tied to ancient Northwest Semitic poetic diction, (b) more general in its meaning, (c) attested in the same context in the Baal Cycle, and (d) actually attested itself in one of the biblical dragon slaying passages (Job 26:12). Also, it is a verb used generally in archaic or archaizing Hebrew poetry for destroying enemies: we have examples such as Deut 33:11, Judg 5:26, 2 Sam 22:39, Pss 18:39, 68:22, 110:5, 6, and Hab 3:13.

Even though these instances of **mḫṣ* do not in themselves concern a dragon or serpent, some of them may show traces of such a reference in a sort of subliminal way. Take the case of Deut 33:11. The second half of this verse says (of Levi; the one addressed is YHWH):

> *Měḥaṣ motnayim qāmāyw*
> *ûmĕśanʾāyw min-yĕqûmûn*
>
> Smite the loins of his adversaries
> and his enemies, so that they cannot rise up!

The syntax of this passage is rather strange: the absolute state of *motnayim* ("loins") stands out. One would expect the construct state *motnê* (a form which is in fact represented in the Samaritan Pentateuch).[125] One possible solution to this problem—which would fit extremely well with the search for a Northwest Semitic dragon-slaying proto-phrase—would be to argue that *motnayim* here is actually a textual corruption of *tannīnîm*, so that the half-verse would read:

[125] See Ronning 1997: 112, in which it is argued that this word is to be analyzed as a part of a double accusative (if one does not follow the Samaritan text). It is rather interesting that Ronning adduces this passage when discussing the cursing of the serpent (!) in Gen 3:15, which also appears to include such a double accusative. He also includes *mḫṣ* as a relevant verb of comparison. He does not, however, try to amend the text in the way that I suggest above.

Měḥaṣ tannīnîm qāmāyw
ûmĕśanʾāyw min-yĕqûmûn

Smite the serpents, his adversaries,
and his enemies, so that they cannot rise up.

After all, the root *qwm* is used of the enemies of the Storm God at Ugarit,[126] which would fit very well with such a reconstruction. The emendation would only entail a change from attested *MTNYM* to reconstructed *TNNYM* in unpointed Hebrew.

There is contextual support for such an emendation, as well. As pointed out by Kloos,[127] the context of the line argues for an association with the sphere of water motifs (note the mention of *tĕhōm* in 33:13, which speaks of Joseph; Kloos does not, however, bring 33:11 into the discussion of that line, but rather focuses on "beneficent moisture").

2 Sam 22:39 and Ps 18:39 are variants of the same line, both of which have Psalmist declare that he "smote them [the enemies]" (*wāʾemṣāḥēm/ʿemṣāḥēm*); it should be noted that this is used in a psalm abounding in Northwest Semitic storm god imagery (including the destruction of the sea), which is of course one of the reasons that I quoted it above in section 4.2. Even though the subject of the sentence(s) with *mḥṣ* here is a human being and not the deity himself, it shows the association of the verbal root with this type of poetic diction and with the motif sphere of the raging, chaos-battling god of the storm.

A similar context can be found for the attestation in Ps 68:22. The verse and the one following it run:

ʾak-ʾĕlōhîm yimḥaṣ rōʾš ʾōyĕbāyw
qodqōd śēʿār mithallēk bĕʾăšāmāyw
ʾāmar ʾădōnāy mibbāšān ʾāšîb
ʾāšîb mimmĕṣūlôt yām

Yes, God strikes the head of his enemies,
the hair-covered skull of him that walks around in his shame.
The Lord said: "From Bashan/the Serpent I will bring [them] back,
I will bring them back from the depths of the sea. […]"
(Ps 68:22-23)[128]

[126] KTU 1.10 II 24-25. The collocation involving enemies and *qwm* also occurs in Exod 15:6-7, as part of the biblical Song of the Sea, a text not without relevance in the present context (a parallel noted, e.g., in Kloos 1986: 133).

[127] Kloos 1986: 79-80.

[128] The MT includes the verb again in 68:24, but this is probably a textual corruption for *tirḥaṣ* (cf. BHSApp and LXX).

Here, the context of the chaotic sea (with which the serpent monster is almost always associated in the Northwest Semitic tradition) is quite clearly stated. The echoes of the combat myth are, to my mind, quite clear. If the "enemies" are to be regarded as human (with "hair-covered skulls"), they proably represent a historization of the enemy *par excellence*, the Dragon. The word *bāšān* itself has been plausibly suggested to be a reflex of the same word as the Ugaritic *bṯn*, meaning "serpent," which would fit very nicely indeed with a "serpent battle interpretation" of these lines.[129] And the verb used is, again, *mḥṣ*.

One may note that Deuteronomy 33 (which we just looked at) has also been suggested to include a reference to the Serpent under the guise of the word *bāšān* in 33:22,[130] strengthening the possibility that Deut 33:11 indeed includes a reference to the Serpent battle tradition.

In Ps 110:6*b*-7*a*, we find another possible connection between the verbal root and the battle against the sea (subtextually, as the context ostensibly deals with human kings):

> *Māḥas rōʾš ʿal ʾereṣ rabbâ*
> *minnaḥal badderek yišteh*
>
> He strikes head(s) over the great land.
> From a brook on the way he drinks.

The root also occurs in Hab 3:13; again, its objects is the "head" of enemies, yet the text clearly abounds in imagery from the chaos battle tradition, and vv. 8-9 clearly name the "rivers" (*nĕhārîm*) as YHWH's enemies. This, again, means that the verb *mḥṣ* is associated with the motif of the chaos battle, supporting its reconstruction in a Proto-Northwest Semitic formulation of the same.

So, we are on our way to a probable reconstruction of what such a reconstructed version of the serpent motif may have sounded like. We have:

---

[129] As noted by Robert D. Miller (2013: 207), following Charlesworth 2004: 355-356, 358 (note also the summary on pp. 370-372). The idea that the word *bāšān* here has to do with the serpent monster is far older, though, going back to Albright 1950/1951: 27-28, also mentioning the importance of *mḥṣ*. It was followed in Dahood 1968: 131, 145-146, where an even more "Ugaritoid" interpretation was argued (translating the second *ʾāšîb* of the MT as "muzzled," from the root *šbm*, reading the following *m* as part of the word). The serpent interpretation can also be found, e.g., in Seybold 1996: 261-262 and Wakeman 1973: 83-84. As pointed out by Miller in his footnote 7, however, there is the problem of Ugaritic *bṯn* perhaps having a cognate in Hebrew *peten* as well. However, the sound correspondences in the latter case would be anomalous, rendering the equation difficult (Ugaritic *ṯ* should equal Hebrew *š*, which indeed it would in *bāšān*, and the *b*-*p* correspondence is non-standard, too). Borrowing may well be involved in the *peten* case. The "Bashan as serpent" interpretation has not been without detractors: Day (1985: 115) rejects it, partly due to the existence of *peten*.

[130] Proposed, based on a suggestion from Albright, in Cross and Freedman 1948: 208 and followed, e.g., in Mayes 1981: 409.

**Mḫṣ* (3rd person singular), a word for "serpent" and (possibly) a weapon.

What I would suggest now is the following: if one strips this Northwest Semitic phraseology down to its bare bones, one arrives at this semantic load:

HE (the hero) SLEW THE SERPENT (with WEAPON)

4.8.2 The Proto-Phrases as Connected

This, in effect, is exactly the same type of poetic phrase that Watkins postulated for Proto-Indo-European, and I would argue that this is no coincidence. What if the background of the "Leviathan-phrase" (in its different guises) actually represents a calque of the very phrase that Watkins reconstructed—or at least a descendant thereof?[131] The correspondence is perfect.[132] And it would explain why, in both Indo-European and Northwest Semitic, a poetic formula about slaying a serpent or dragon is one of the clearest instances of "etymological poetic" inheritance to be found: it is, in essence, the same phrase.

If this is so, we have yet another sign that the question is not simply one of a motif having been borrowed. In combination with the terminology used to refer to combatants (see section 4.6), I would say that this is highly significant evidence for the dragon-slaying motif having been borrowed from Indo-European to Semitic cultures. The distinctiveness of the terminology in the Indo-European versions (the **g*^{wh}-sounds, the use of the verb **terh*$_2$*-u* in both Anatolian and Indo-Iranian) points strongly to the Indo-European version being primary. Also, I would argue that it is quite probable that the transmission of the motif occurred in stages: the bare-bones version of the "Watkins formula" could theoretically have been transmitted at a very early period (perhaps temporally closer to Proto-Indo-European itself than the attested Indo-Iranian and Anatolian versions of the story), but this possibly very early borrowing could then have been "buttressed" by later influence, probably both from Anatolian and Indo-Iranian sources.

---

[131] To be specific, both the calqued Semitic phrases and the original Indo-European phrase from which they are herein argued to be ultimately derived/calqued may be "descendants," each in its own sense: the Indo-European phrase that was calqued may well be a descendant of the oldest Proto-Indo-European version (though still probably very early, near the proto-language level, if one counts with the euphonic word play upon **g*^{wh} having been reflected in the Semitic calque, as argued below), and the Semitic phrases are descendants of an early calque which was subsequently inherited within Northwest Semitic. That is: the calquing in all probability took place at a point earlier than both the Ugaritic and the Hebrew passages.

[132] And the correspondence is even better if one accepts the arguments of García-Ramón (1998), who is of the view that the original root meaning of Proto-Indo-European **g*^{wh}*en-* is not simply "slay, kill," but an iterative one, "wiederholt schlagen," "töten." This would match the semantics of Semitic **mḫṣ* very well, as that verb can (in different stem forms) mean both "kill, smite" and "fight with." For further variants of the Indo-European phrase (with "splitting," **b*^{h}*eid-*), see Slade 2008 [2010].

If one wishes to allow oneself a little further leeway in speculating, one may consider the possibility of a reconstructable Proto-Northwest Semitic serpent slaying formula having included some piece of distinctive word-play similar to the one probably found in the Proto-Indo-European phrase. As mentioned earlier, the Proto-Indo-European phrase appears to have involved a playing and beautifying use of the highly unusual sound **g^{wh}* in both its major constitutent parts (the verb "slew", **[e]g^{wh}ent*, and the accusative form of the "serpent" word, **og^{wh}im*). If, as I have suggested, the Proto-Northwest Semitic formula was in fact loan-translated from the Indo-European one (at some stage of its development), it could possibly be suspected that the borrowers would try to create a parallel piece of word-play in their own, Semitic, language. If one looks at the etymological material that appears to have been used when describing serpent battles in the Northwest Semitic ambit, such a possible playing collocation actually suggests itself.

Whereas the use of the root **mḫṣ* as the verb for expressing the battle itself is highly likely to represent an ancient piece of Proto-Northwest Semitic diction (see above), the word used for the serpent (the object of the verb) is less clear. One finds various terms: the name Leviathan/Litan, the word *nāḥāš/nḥš*, the Ugaritic *bṯn* (also meaning "serpent"), and others. However, one of these possibilities would provide just the sort of distinctive wordplay mentioned above as having been present in the Proto-Indo-European template of the borrowing, namely *nāḥāš/nḥš*.[133] If one reconstructs the poetic phrase in Proto-Northwest Semitic using that particular lexeme, one arrives as something like the following collocation (presupposing a narrative short-*yaqtul* as the verbal form used and adding the accusative *-a*):

**yimḫaṣ naḥaša* "He killed the Serpent."

Such a phrase would form almost as beautiful a play on phonemes as Proto-Indo-European **eg^{wh}ent og^{wh}im*: both words would have at their core a sequence of (1) a nasal sound, (2) an unvoiced "guttural" fricative, and (3) a sibilant. This would constitue a highly loaded phonetic sequence indeed. If one presupposes the somewhat less likely yet still possible case of the verb having been put in the *qatala* form instead, the correspondence between the sounds becomes even more apparent:

**maḫaṣa naḥaša* "He killed the Serpent."

The phonemic patterning would be beautiful indeed:

---

[133] Note, though, that the Ugaritic version quoted above has created a piece of wordplay of its own, manifested in the alliterative phrase *bṯn brḥ* ("fleeing serpent"). This, though differing from the reconstructed phrase that I posit above, may well show a surviving propensity for expressing the chaos battle in wordplay—or it is possible that this phrase is of Proto-Northwest Semitic provenance as well.

NASAL-*a*-GUTTURAL-*a*-SIBILANT-*a* (**maḫaṣa*)
NASAL-*a*-GUTTURAL-*a*-SIBILANT-*a* (**naḫaša*)

It is certainly hard to prove beyond doubt that such a formula existed, but it would fit the preserved textual data very well as well as provide a perfect vector for Watkins' reconstructed Indo-European phrase to have entered Northwest Semitic: it carries the same semantic load while providing a counterpart to the phonetic wordplay inherent in its presumed *Vorlage*. The latter could also be said (to an extent) for the version of the phrase including the verb *nqb*:

**naqaba naḫaša* "He pierced the Serpent."

However, the fit with **mḫṣ* is better—so good, indeed, that it suggests a historical dependency, which must then go back to a period when the Proto-Indo-European wordplay was "hearable," which means that the borrowing would have to have been quite early indeed. Later, the Ugaritic poets (or their forebears) imported the "Conqueror"-terminology and buttressed the mythological pattern with even more Indo-European material. And finally, the motifs ended up in the Hebrew Bible. Only through following the etymological poetic material can this great river of mythological tradition be uncovered, and, as we have seen, such a study can be of direct exegetical relevance for our understanding of biblical texts. The slayers of serpents become pointers to religio-historical tradition, and that tradition helps us read the texts as preserved for us.

5. Beings of Smoke: Terms for Living Breath and Humanity in Indo-European, Ugaritic and Hebrew— and Remarks on Fatlings and Merciful Bodies

From dragons and serpents, we move on to the semantic sphere of anthropology, as expressed in mythological terms, and to its intersection with that of liturgy. This chapter will deal with a number of Ugaritic and biblical mythological motifs concerning life and bodies that may have an Indo-European background. The most important is that of "smoke" as a piece of imagery illustrating the life-spirits or vital force of humankind and that of animals growing "puffed up," overfed or swollen as an illustration of upstart, rebellious and ungrateful behavior. These two motifs are both interesting enough in and of themselves to merit individual sections or chapters; I have, however, chosen to discuss them "in tandem," as some of the textual passages that I will analyze include both of them, which results in it making better sense to do a bit of jumping back and forth between the two. As a point of departure, we shall begin with the "life as smoke" motif at Ugarit, and see where that takes us.

5.1 "Life as Smoke" in the Ugaritic Aqhat Story

The Ugaritic *Epic of Aqhat*—that deals with the exploits of the hero Danel, his quest for a son, and the subsequent murder of that son (the young hero Aqhat) at the instigation of the goddess Anat—includes a recurring passage concerning the duties of the ideal son in relation to his father, a passage that has become well known among students of Ugaritic by virtue of its rather amusing description of those duties including having to mend one's father's roof, as well as supporting him when he is inebriated. As the Epic is to a large extent centered on the question of the importance of producing an heir, the relation between masculine generations, and the role of somewhat stereotypical "manliness," it is no wonder that such a list turns up and is repeated a number of times. This formulaic passage does, however, not only discuss the above-mentioned rather mundane aspects of filial duty: there are also references to overtly religious practices that are to make up parts of the ideal relationship between a son and a father. Indeed, these religious duties stand at the beginning of the list, which says the following when describing the ideal son:

nṣb . skn . ilibh . *b qdš ztr . ʿmh .*	One who can set up a stele for his father-god, a *ztr* for his kinsman in the sanctuary OR: in the *ztr*-sanctuary of his kinsmen/the sanctuary for the "lying down" of his kinsmen,[134]

[134] See below, section 5.2.1, for a detailed excursus on my views of the enigmatic and much-discussed word *ztr* and its relevance to the present passage.

l arṣ . mšṣu . qṭrh	one who can bring out his "smoke" from the earth/netherworld,
l ʿ*pr . ḏmr . aṯrh .*	who protects/sings forth his remains from the dust.

(KTU 1.17 I 26-28)

As with many (most?) passages of Ugaritic poetic text, there are many uncertainties of interpretation in these lines. The one that concerns us here is the expression *l arṣ mšṣu qṭrh*, which is made up of the adverb *l arṣ* ("from the earth/netherworld"), a masculine singular participle of the causative Š stem of the verbal root *yṣʾ* ("to exit, to go out" and thereby in the present form "one who brings out" or "one who can bring out") and a direct object *qṭrh*, meaning something like "his smoke" or "his incense."

The main debate concerning this expression has centered on what this "smoke" or "incense" is referring to. There have basically been two lines of argument proposed here. The first is that the expression refers to some form of physical incense ceremony (which also implies that *arṣ* is here to be translated "earth" or "land") and the second one is that the word is meant to signify the spiritual "smoke" or, in a way, the soul of the deceased father, who would then be brought out of the earth (in the sense of "netherworld") by the means of ritual action.[135]

5.2 An Anatolian Background for the "Smoke" Motif

The common Hittite word for "human being" is interesting to bring into the discussion at this point. The word in question is *antuwaḫḫaš-* (with a later by-form *antuḫša-*), and it is almost unanimously interpreted as representing a univerbation of an old Indo-European compound involving the root **d^{h}weh$_2$-* (more common in the zero grade of Indo-European *Ablaut*, as **d^{h}uh$_2$-*), a root having to do with "smoke." The Hittite word is usually explained as representing the expression **h$_1$n-d^{h}wéh$_2$-ōs* (with the genitive **h$_1$n-d^{h}uh$_2$-sós*), which would literally mean something like "having smoke inside [him]."[136] The root itself appears in words like Sanskrit *dhūma-* (meaning "smoke"), Latin *fūmus*, etc. As pointed out by Kloekhorst (following an analysis by Eichner), there is an almost perfect parallel to the Hittite word for "human" ("having smoke inside") in the Greek expression ἔνθυμος, "spirited" (="having spirit

[135] For an overview of the different positions, with references to earlier scholarlship, see Schmidt 1994: 60-62.

[136] See Kloekhorst 2008: 188-189 (s.v. *antuuaḫḫaš-/antuḫš-*), including the formal reconstructions; the same root etymology is cautiously endorsed as "more suggestive" than other proposals in Puhvel (*HED*), vol. 1: 82 (s.v. *antu(wa)hha-, antusa-*). The etymology goes back to Heiner Eichner 1979 (see next footnote). One notes with some surprise that *NIL* does not include any instance of the **d^{h}weh$_2$-*root.

inside," where "spirit" is the old "smoke" word).[137] One may also note with some interest that there is a quite similar Indo-European root **d^{h}wes-*, meaning "breathe"; that root is the background of the Germanic word that appears in Swedish *djur*, "animal," and English *deer*, and it has been suggested that this root is related to the "smoke" root.[138] A connection between "breath" and "smoke" is not hard, after all (as shown by the Hittite word discussed above—and note that the Hittite verb *tuḫḫai-*, from the "smoke" root, means "to cough").

What I would like to propose is that the fact of a root having to do with "smoke" serving as derivational basis for a word for "human being" in Hittite may create a background for the strange expression about "bringing out the smoke" in the Aqhat epic. If we reckon with the possibility of an Anatolian influence on the (background of) the text, the reference to "bringing out the smoke" of the dead father is no longer that much of a conundrum: it is not a matter of smoke *or* spirit—it is both at the same time. The human being would *be* a thing with "smoke" inside, and the act of bringing that smoke out could refer both to some necromantic/ancestral worshipping ritual and to the role of "smoke/incense" in a liturgical setting. However, we have to adduce some further arguments for this interpretation to convince. Are there other signs that Anatolian influence could be in play here?

I believe that there are. Another indication that the Anatolian conception of human beings as ones "with smoke inside them" could be obliquely referenced here is the fact that there is another word having to do with "smoke" or incense in the Aqhat epic, one which has a clear and definite Hittite pedigree. This is the word *dġt*, which only occurs in two places in the entire Ugaritic corpus, both of them in the Aqhat text (close to each other: KTU 1.19 IV 24 and 1.19 IV 31). This word is used to describe the incense (?) that Aqhat's father Danel sends up into the sky after wailing women have visited his house as a result of the young hero Aqhat having been slain by the goddess Anat. It is normally regarded as representing a loan from Hittite *tuḫḫuiš* (nominative of the stem *tuḫḫui-*), a word meaning "smoke" (or, by extrapolation, "offering of smoke"),[139] that is derived

[137] Kloekhorst 2008: 189 (s.v. *antuuaḫḫaš-/antuḫš-*); Eichner 1979: 77 (the latter renders the literal meaning of the compund as "der Atem in sich hat"). Also mentioned in Puhvel (*HED*), vol. 1: 82 (s.v. *antu(wa)hha-*, *antusa-*).

[138] So, apparently, Lehmann 1986: 92 (s.v. **dius*). A relationship between the roots also seems to be implied in Starostin's IE database, s.v. ***dhū (starling.rinet.ru, Proto-Indo-Hittite **dhuH*, last accessed Dec 10, 2016). The *LIV* however, clearly regards the two roots as separate.

[139] The origin of this idea is found in an article by Harry A. Hoffner (1964). One should note, however, that Hoffner's suggestion entailed an interpretation squarely situating the *Sitz im Leben* of the term in a cultic context. He even argues (p. 68) that the Hittite term was transferred to Ugarit and Ugaritic specifically through the mediation of foreign cult functionaries. The connection with the Hittite word has been further elaborated by de Moor (1965: 355 and 1970: 200), who specifically looked to the derivation *tuḫḫueššar* (allegedly meaning "incense"). It need to be borne in mind, however, that the translation of Hittite *tuḫḫueššar* as "incense" is not certain (as opposed

*from the very same Indo-European root *d^hweh$_2$-/*d^huh$_2$-* that formed the basis of *antuwaḫḫaš-* ("human," being with smoke inside"). The use of this Hittite-derived term for "smoke/incense" at another place in the same text strengthens the possibility of the root being referenced in the "filial duties" passage as well.

The passage from Aqhat concerning Danel's sending up of "smoke" is interesting for two reasons:

(1) The use of a Hittite-derived word for the "smoke" that Danel sends up to the gods shows that an association between the inherited Semitic *qṭr* ("smoke, incense") and the borrowed Indo-European concept could be made in Ugaritic culture, thus making it easy to identify the one with the other. To bolster this point, it should be pointed out that there is in fact an Akkadian/Hittite bilingual in existence which clearly equates a form of the Hittite word *tuḫḫuu̯ai-* (a variant stem of *tuḫḫui-*) with Akkadian *qutra* ("smoke," from the same root as Ugaritic *qṭr*).[140] This shows that the Hittite and Semitic roots could be identified with each other outright already in antiquity, reinforcing the connection.[141] This makes the earlier, filial duty concerning *qṭr* easy to read with the Anatolian root in mind.

(2) Given what was stated earlier in the text about a son having as a duty to bring out the "smoke/incence" (*qṭr*) from the "earth/netherworld," a startling possibility suggests itself: that both these attestations are to be read as references to the Anatolian/Indo-European concept of the "smoke" or breath that forms the central life essence of a human being (as shown in the Hittite word *antuwaḫḫaš-*). If both these passages actually refer to that idea, or at least have it as a punning background when talking of "smoke/incense," the tragic irony of the text becomes almost palpable: bringing out the "smoke" of the father was stated to be the duty of the ideal son, but it is the father who has to perform this sad duty for his own, murdered heir. Aqhat was an *antuwaḫḫaš-*, and now Danel has to bring his *tuḫḫuiš* out of the earth. Thus the father takes the role of the son, underscoring the gravity of the situation and

---

to the relatively clear meaning of *tuḫḫui-*). It has also been interpreted as meaning "sponge" (see Kloekhorst 2008: 892-893 [s.v. *tuḫḫueššar / tuḫḫueššn-*] for a discussion and arguments in favor of the latter interpretation). The connection with the Hittite root having to do with "smoke" is followed in Margalit 1989: 446, where it is argued that the point is not the smoke as such, but the perfume-like fragrance. This view is, of course, quite different than what I argue above. The *DUL* (p. 266, s.v. *dġṯ*) also translates the word as "offering of perfumes (?)"

[140] The Akkadian word has a non-emphatic *t* due to the operation of Geers' Law (causing dissimilation of one of two emphatics in the same Akkadian word).

[141] The words occur in KBo X 2 iii 40 and KBo X 1 *verso* 23—see Kloekhorst 2008: 895 (s.v. *tuḫḫuu̯ai- / tuḫḫui-*).

showing how the murderous plans of Anat metaphorically turn the world of the story upside down.

These points show a deeper poetical level to the Aqhat story and also hint at a piece of religio-historical interaction: the Ugaritic poet appears to have taken over a piece of philosophical anthropology from his or her Anatolian-speaking neighbors. The deep and sad irony in the text only becomes understandable if one knows something of this background of cultural interaction.

Taken by itself, this idea might seem like an attractive but somewhat farfetched connection. It is, however, directly supported at another place in the Aqhat text itself. At KTU 1.18 IV 24-26, Anat instructs her hired-hand Yatpan and describes their forthcoming murder of the young hero Aqhat using the following words:

tṣi . km rḥ . npš	May his life/soul go out like wind,
km . iṯl . brlth .	like spittle of his gullet,
km qṭr . b aph	like smoke from his mouth!

Here, Aqhat's vital power/soul (*npš*) is identified outright with the "smoke" (*qṭr*) that will exit his mouth. Note also that the verb used is *yṣ*ʾ ("to go out," "to exit"), exactly the same verbal root that occurred in the list of filial duties (albeit in a different stem form). A clearer confirmation of the above analysis could not be asked for. One should also note that this passage also includes a probable Hittite loanword, *iṯl* from Hittite *iššalli-*, meaning "spittle." This becomes even more poignant when one realizes that this Hittite word is etymologically derived from Hittite *aiš* ("mouth"), making the word fit exactly in the context.[142]

The lines said by Anat show clearly that killing someone is, in the mind of the Aqhat poet, the same thing as driving his "smoke" out. Aqhat is, for lack of a better word, an *antuwaḫḫaš-*. He is a being "with smoke inside."

One of the most poetically impressive features of this use of the "smoke" imagery is the fact that it in a sense combines anthropology and liturgy. Using the simile of the "smoke" brings an etymologically motivated expression of the nature of humankind (at least from the Anatolian point of view) into contact with the liturgical/sacrificial idea of the incense offering. Therein, I argue, lies much of the dramatic irony. This association between a specific view of the nature of human life and a certain form of ritual or liturgical practice in a way

[142] This fitting relationship as well as the beautiful and perfect poetic parallelism between the second and third cola are convincing signs that Margalit's (1989: 342-343) objection against the common translation "spittle" (and the Hittite etymology) is wrong. Margalit is of the view that "spittle" does not fit with the "soul" and "smoke" words. This, however, misses the point of the poetic parallelism (the combining factor being things exiting through the mouth). The suggestion of *iṯl* being a loan from the Hittite "spittle" word was made by de Moor (1965: 363-364). For the etymological connection between Hittite *aiš* ("mouth") and *iššalli-* ("spittle"), see Kloekhorst 2008: 166 (s.v. *aiš / išš-*).

brings to mind the majestic conception of the Priestly author in Genesis 1, which uses its vision of the creation of the world as a motivation for a recurring Sabbath service.

The liturgical sense of the passage is even more clearly underscored if we presuppose the interpretation of the verb *ḏmr* to be "to sing" (rather than the other common proposed translation, "to guard, to protect"). In that case, the line containing this word could actually refer to an act of ritualistically calling forth the "smoke" of the dead ancestor by means of song, a kind of "musical necromancy," so to speak. If this interpretation is correct, one cannot help but associate it with the interesting fact that the one clear description of necromancy in the Hebrew Bible, Saul's visit to the witch of Endor in 1 Sam 28, describes the necromancer and her acts using one of the Hebrew words not seldom explained as representing a borrowing from Hittite (or possibly Hurrian): the witch is called a *baʿălat ʾôb*, and the word *ʾôb* is itself used as a reference to the action that she performs. This word may well be identical with the Hittite *āpi-*, meaning "sacrificial pit" (as mentioned, possibly a Hurrian word originally). A concept of "singing" forth the "smoke" of the dead would fit very well with Hittite-derived expressions for the power of life itself. Was perhaps this type of "singing forth the smoke" exactly what the story about Saul and the witch of Endor was meant to convey?[143]

The tendency to use the root $*d^hweh_2$-/$*d^huh_2$- to denote the vital force of humanity is not restricted to the Anatolian subgroup of Indo-European. As mentioned in passing earlier, we also find it in Greek, where the word θυμός (from Proto-Indo-European $*d^huh_2$-*mo*-) is used to mean "spirit", "soul" or even (in the words of Liddel/Scott) "*the principle of life, feeling and thought.*"[144] Given what was stated earlier about the "smoke" motif integrating anthropology with liturgy and ritualism, one should note the Greek verb θύω, which means "to sacrifice (especially by burning)," and also the noun θυμίαμα, meaning

[143] A "necromantic" interpretation of the filial duty of "bringing out the smoke" in Aqhat can be found, e.g., in Margalit 1989: 217 (talking of the *ilib* or "father-god"). The interpretation of *ʾôb* as a Hurro-Hittite loan can be found in 1963: 115-116. On the Hurrian origin of the Hittite word (at least in the first instance), see Puhvel (*HED*), vol. 1: 100-101 (s.v. *api-*); note also that Ugaritic *ilib* (see below) has also been drawn into the discussion. The classical study on the possible background of *ʾôb* is Hoffner 1967. A conservative—to say the least!—attitude towards discussing the etymology of *ʾôb* can be found in Cryer 259-260, esp. n. 1; Cryer does not accept a borrowing as proven but gives many references (sometimes acerbic) to contributions on the subject. Beal (2002: 204, n. 41) accepts the connection. For a rather recent discussion of the Hurro-Hittite term in relationship to archaeological remains from Urkesh, see Kelly-Buccellati 2002, who speaks of a "Hurrian passage to the netherworld" (in the English version of the article), also accepting the relationship of the Hebrew word with the Hurro-Hittite one as more or less given (p. 136-137, n. 8, also pointing out the Hurrian background of the term).

[144] Liddel and Scott 1996: 810 (s.v. θῡμός); they give, among other possibilities, *"soul*" and "*spirit*" as well (and, it should be noted, the "physical sense" of "*breath, life*"). Beekes (2010: 564 [s.v. θῡμός]) defines the word as "spirit, courage, anger, sense."

"incense." We shall return to the Greek cognates of the "smoke" root later on in the chapter.

5.2.1 An Excursus on one Possible (and one Impossible) Anatolian Background of the Word ztr *and a note on* ilib

If, before moving on to the reception of the "life as smoke" motif in the Hebrew Bible, we return once more to the passage on the duties of the ideal son (given in section 5.1), there is one other possible Anatolian influence which could make the present argument even weightier. The passage also includes the much-debated hapax legomenon *ztr*, which has been suggested to be a loan from Hittite: Tsevat connected the word with Hittite *šittar*, or *šittar(i)-*, as he writes the word, supposedly meaning "votive (sun) disk."[145] This suggestion has been followed by others,[146] and it would indeed be nice for the present argument if it could be shown that another technical religious term directly derived from Hittite occurred in the same passage as the "smoke" terminology. The meaning of the original Hittite word has been called into question, however, and it now appears clear that it never meant "sun disk" at all, but rather was a word for some sort of pointed object, perhaps as part of a spear, a meaning which would make no sense at all in the Ugaritic passage.[147] Attempts to argue for *ztr* as a borrowed Anatolian term for a cult object in Ugaritic would thus appear to have reached a dead end.

However, the problem of the identity of the Ugaritic word still remains. Attempts to find a Semitic etymology have been forced at best.[148] What I would like to propose in this context is *another* interpretation of the word based on an Anatolian prototype—one involving no sun disks whatsoever. Rather, I want to suggest the possibility of Ugaritic *ztr* representing a loan from *Luwian* (rather than its relative, Hittite). The hypothetical prototype word that I am thinking of would be **zittar-*, a lexeme that is sadly not in itself attested in Luwian, but is built in a completely regular way and may very probably have existed in that language. It is made up of the verbal root *zī-*, "to lie down," (from Proto-Indo-European **k̂ei-*, appearing in Hittite form as *ki-*, in Palaic as *kī-*, and in Lycian

---

[145] Tsevat 1971: 352.

[146] For example, see the *DUL*: 985 (s.v. *ztr*), which gives "cippus, votive stela" (referring to the Hittite word) as its first option and Watson 1995: 542, though later rejected in Watson 2007: 124, due to the same reasons I describe above in the main text.

[147] See Starke 1990: 408-416 and, following him, Kloekhorst 2008: 761-762 (s.v. *šittar(a)-*). Kloekhorst translates the word as "sharp pointed object" or "spear-point(?)." The same rejection of Tsevat's hypothesis can be found in Tropper 2012: 106-107. Also, the initial *z* would be uncommon as a rendering of the Hittite sibilant (except for the *ztr* possibility, which he rejects, Tropper gives only two quite uncertain cases).

[148] One idea that has been put forward is to connect Ugaritic *ztr* with Akkadian *zatēru* and Arabic *zaʿtar*, meaning "thyme" (Pope 1977: 164, later reiterated in Pope 1981: 160), which would demand a loan via Akkadian to account for the loss of the pharyngeal present in the Arabic word. There are various other suggestions.

as *si-*)[149] and the common deverbal suffix *-ttar* (in the nominative, *-ttn-* in the oblique cases).[150] Combined, **zittar-* would have to mean something like "act of lying down." This would fit extremely well in the "funerary" context of the lines in which the Ugaritic *ztr* occurs. One could even reinterpret the words *qdš ztr* as a construct chain: "sanctuary of lying down," i.e., "mortuary sanctuary." The whole phrase *qdš ztr ʿmh* would then be "the mortuary sanctuary of his kinsmen" or "the sanctuary of his kinsmen's lying down." This makes excellent sense in the passage, it would explain the strange hapax, and it would provide another piece of Anatolian-derived context for the phrases about "smoke." Alternatively, one could translate the putative **zittar-* as "thing lying, thing placed," which would then refer to the stele (*skn*) that the ideal son is to set up in the sanctuary (or be in antonymic parallelism with it: standing stele vs. lying object). Either way, an Anatolian ritual term seems somehow to be in play in the Ugaritic text.

Yet another such "Anatolianism" may actually be present in the passage. The word *ilib* (mostly translated "father-god" or "father's god," or something similar) has drawn much attention over the years; in this context, I would like to point out the expression *tadinzi massaninzi*, "father-gods, fatherly gods," in Hieroglyphic Luwian. As the Ugaritic expression *ilib* is rather special (otherwise only occurring in a few god lists with literal translation into Akkadian and Sumerian), the Luwian expression may be a worthy comparandum.

5.3 A Few Points Thus Far

We thus have, in the same contexts:

(1) "Smoke" as an image of life, especially the vital spirit after death,
(2) An originally Hittite word used to signify this in one instance,
(3) This very root for "smoke" underlying the Hittite word for "human,"
(4) A hapax that can be explained as a Luwian loanword meaning "lying down," i.e. dying., or a "placed object" in the shrine,[151]

---

[149] And, outside of the Anatolian subfamily of Indo-European, as Greek κεῖμαι and Sanskrit *śī-*.

[150] For this Luwian suffix, see Yakubovich 2015: 14 and (in great detail) Starke 1990: 435-525. There is also another suffix *-ttar-* which does not have the nasal in the oblique stem, based on Indo-European **-tro-* (cf. Starke 1990: 399-418) that could alternatively be involved here. I would like to thank Craig Melchert for an illuminating discussion concerning these suffixes. As pointed out by him (email Aug 9, 2016), the possible objection that the long vowel in the root would cause the *-ttar* to "lenite" to *-tar* (which would probably be rendered at Ugarit as ***-dr*) carries no weight, as the Luwian word is probably of late provenance, *-ttar* already being the ensconced form of the suffix.

[151] One may note that the word *skn* (often translated "stele," as above) has been suggested to have Anatolian connections, as well (regardless of its origin; cf. the Hittite writing NA_4*.zi-kin*—the suggestion was made in Durand 1988). However, as argued by Watson (2007: 123), a West Semitic background is probable for this word. See *DUL*: 747-748 (s.v. *skn* [II]) for further possibilities. See also Schmidt 1994: 50-51.

(5) A probable reference to "singing forth" the smoke of the dead one, similar to what happens in the Endor story, in which a Hurrian or Hittite word is used in context of the necromancy,
(6) An Anatolian loanword being used for the "spittle" that signifies the life that Anat wants to drive out of Aqhat's mouth,
(7) A possible parallel between the "father god" and an Anatolian expression.

All in all, I would say that the Anatolian influence on these Aqhat passages is undeniable, and that the etymologically grounded image of "life as smoke" is prominent in it, harking back to Proto-Indo-European imagery concerning life or vital breath and its transience. We shall now look at how this imagery has lived on in Israelite literature, probably having been carried there through the shared Northwest Semitic poetic heritage of which Ugarit is also a part.

5.4 "Smoke" as a Simile for Life in the Hebrew Bible and the Deuterocanon

There are not too many clear and unambiguous examples of the "soul as smoke" imagery in the Hebrew Bible itself. There are some, to be sure, and we will look at a number of them. One can, however find a very similar motif in the Deuterocanonical literature, in a text written in Greek, at that. In the Wisdom of Solomon, we do find this type of imagery in vv. 2:2-3, when the text poetically states the reasoning of the unenlightened and ungodly ones, who say the following:

> ὅτι αὐτοσχεδίως ἐγεννήθημεν
> καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐσόμεθα ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρξαντες·
> ὅτι καπνὸς ἡ πνοὴ ἐν ῥισὶν ἡμῶν,
> καὶ ὁ λόγος σπινθὴρ ἐν κινήσει καρδίας ἡμῶν,
> οὗ σβεσθέντος τέφρα ἀποβησεται τὸ σῶμα
> καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διαχυθήσεται ὡς χαῦνος ἀήρ.
>
> For we came to be through chance,
> and after this we will be as though we had never existed;
> for the breath in our nostrils is smoke,
> and thought is a spark in the movement of our heart,
> and when it is extinguished the body will turn to ashes
> and the spirit will be dissolved into empty air.

At the outset, this isolated instance of the "spirit as smoke" motif could be regarded as no more than a chance resemblance to the Anatolian-derived motif seen in Aqhat, especially given the great temporal distance. However, it is interesting to note that it occurs in the very context that it does. I have argued earlier that lines occurring later in this passage from the Wisdom of Solomon contains a number of very old motifs (specifically concerning drought and the

sun as symbols for death), which I believe to be inherited from ancient North-West Semitic mythological material—but here put into the mouths of the ungodly, whom the author of the text wishes to oppose.[152] If I am correct in that assumption—that the author of Wisdom chap. 2 uses ancient mythopoetic material to make his points, or rather the points that he puts into the mouths of his ideological enemies—then the present instance of "smoke" as an image of the human breath of life could theoretically also be ancient. This would mean that a chain of transmission has carried the motif as a quiet river through the centuries.

One link in this chain is clear enough. As I mentioned above, the "smoke" imagery is not very common in the Hebrew Bible, but we do find one interesting example in the passage Hos 13:3-6, which, amongst other things, speaks of what will happen to the Ephraimites by saying that they will go away like "smoke from a window." In this passage, "smoke" appears as a symbol of life, and (as will later be the case in the passage from the Wisdom of Solomon quote above) this is used to underscore its inconstancy. The Wisdom of Solomon passage's use of the motif is certainly borrowed from the Hosea text. Later in this chapter, I will provide an in-depth exegetical discussion of this pericope from Hosea based on what I believe to be its religio-historical background, but in order to do so, I must first digress and talk a bit about the role of the Hurrians in the transmission of Indo-European mythopoetic material into Ugaritic and Hebrew literature, as well as of their own contributions.

5.5 The Hurrians as Middle-Men—and the Motif of Fattened Animals

Before moving on to other relevant Old Testament texts, we must do a detour outside of the realm of direct Indo-European/Northwest Semitic interaction. When discussing spread of words, motifs and ideas between Indo-European and Old Testament culture, one at one point or another has to ask oneself which paths these interactions and borrowings may have taken. There are, of course, an almost innumerable amount of such possible avenues of interaction in addition to direct contact (cf. section 2.2), but, for the present purposes, there is one of these that really stands out, as mentioned at the end of the chapter on dragon slaying: the Hurrians and Mitanni.

The Hurrians were not an Indo-European people, nor were they Semitic (or Afro-Asiatic-speaking in any sense). Their language, Hurrian, has only one certain linguistic relative, namely Urartian, the language of the first millennium BC kingdom of Urartu on Lake Van (a kingdom much involved in military conflict with the Neo-Assyrian empire). Outside of that, there have been suggestions that the Hurrian language has some sort of distant relationship with some of the modern languages of the Caucasus (specifically, the Northeast Caucasian languages), but this suggestion is highly uncertain and has not met with any sort of consensus acceptance.

[152] See Wikander 2014: 215-217.

However, regardless of the linguistic relationships of the Hurrian language itself, it is an incontestable fact that the Hurrians as a culture were ideal carriers of Indo-European motifs, ideas and influences into the milieu of the Old Testament. As mentioned earlier, this is because the Hurrians had a special relationship with not only the Indo-Aryan cultures (through what appears to be an Indo-Aryan social superstrate) and with the Anatolian ones (due to their longstanding interaction with the various Anatolian-speaking peoples of the Hittite empire).

I have argued elsewhere[153] for one piece of direct influence on a text in the Hebrew Bible from the Hurrian/Hittite bilingual textual entity known as the *Epic of Liberation* or *Song of Release* (or traditions very similar to it).[154] This is the case of an expression from one of the animal fables that make up a large part of the preserved text of that epic, which shows a close parallel with an analogy used in Deut 32:15, so close, indeed, that it can hardly represent a case of accidental similarity.

The parable in the Hurrian/Hittite text talks of a roe-deer (Hurrian *nāli*, Hittite *aliyan*-) that pastures on a mountain, grows fat, and subsequently leaves its mountain, going to another. The animal then utters curses directed either towards the old or the new mountain that fattened it (the text is somewhat unclear as to which of the mountains is involved here). The mountain utters a curse of its own, pointing out the ungracious behavior of the animal and wishing that various hunters destroy it. The narrator of the story then interjects that this story is not really about a roe-deer but about a human being, who leaves his city and spurns its gods.

In Deut 32:15, extremely similar imagery is used (Jeshurun as ungrateful grazing animal), and the context even contains references to YHWH as a "rock." Actually, the parallel between the two passages is even closer than what I argued in my 2013a article. I pointed out that the Hurrian triple phrase *fūru tēlu tapšū*, rendered in the Hittite version of the text as *šullēt*, meaning something like "he grew arrogant," provides the direct model for the words *šāmantā ʿābîtā kāśîtā* ("you grew fat, you grew thick, you grew obstinate") of Deut 32:15.

However, what I didn't point out there is the fact that at least one of the Hurrian words—*tēlu*— seems actually *to mean* something along the lines of "swell", "become big" or "go over one's limits" (based on an original root meaning of something like "make much"), as cogently and convincingly argued by Mauro Giorgieri, who translates the entire phrase as "er wurde auffällig", "er ging über die Maßen hinaus" and "er überschritt/empörte sich."[155] Thus, the parallel between Deut 32:15 and the Hurrian text is even greater and is manifested not only at the level of narrative and motifs but at the lexical level as well: both texts include tripartite phrases, consisting of three verbs that describe

[153] Wikander 2013a.
[154] The *Epic of Liberation* is edited in Neu 1996.
[155] Giorgieri 2001, esp. p. 132-133.

the metaphorical "swelling" of the richly fattened animal. This would be very hard to explain indeed without positing a direct influence from the Hurrian text (or a tradition very close to it and using the same type of language) on the biblical one.

One may note with some interest that the Hittite (Indo-European!) text in this case does *not* involve the same artful tripartite lexical collocation. Thus, the influence must be directly from the Hurrian source. It might be argued that this points only to Hurrian influences in the Israelite literary milieu, not Indo-European ones as such, and that the animal fable tradition represented in this cultural interaction was a purely Hurrian phenomenon in origin. However, I would like to point out that we know for a fact that animal fables such as the ones in the *Epic of Liberation* and in Deut 32:15 were in occurrence in purely Hittite texts as well. One (admittedly fragmentary) example of this can be found at the end of the Hittite text known as "The Indictment of Madduwatta" (CTH 147), which includes what appears to be a sort of cautionary tale about a stag and a pig. The fable is too broken to be understood, but in genre it looks quite a lot like the moralistic animal fables of the *Epic of Liberation*.[156]

Also, the use of the Hittite word *šulle-* points to the motif of the fattened animal having been internalized in Anatolian Indo-European thought as well. To be sure, it does not consist of three parts, as do the Hurrian and Hebrew expressions, but this verb, which contextually means something like "to grow arrogant" is etymologically derived from a root that actually means "to swell," as has been shown in a brilliant article by Craig Melchert (2005). Thus, both the Hittite and the Hurrian tradition in this text attest to the imagery of the fattened animal reacting in an arrogant way towards the one who has given him shelter and pasture.

5.6 Smoke and Fatlings in Hosea 13

All this brings us back to Hos 13:3-6, a passage of the Hebrew Bible that shows not only the influence from Hurrian/Hittite literature but also its integration with inherited "etymological poetic" material from the Northwest Semitic background:[157]

Lākēn yihyû kaʿănan-bōqer	Therefore they will be like a morning cloud,
wĕkaṭṭal maškîm hōlēk	and like the dew that goes away early,
kĕmōṣ yĕsōʿar[158] *miggōren*	like chaff blown from the threshing-floor,
ûkĕʿāšān mēʾărubbâ	and like smoke from a window.
wĕʾānōkî YHWH ʾĕlōhêkā	But I am YHWH, your God,

[156] For the text (with translation and discussion), see Beckman, Bryce and Cline 2011: 69-100. The animal fable itself can be found in §37 (lines 91-94), pp. 96-97 in that edition.

[157] As do Anderson and Freedman (1980: 633), I regard the chapter as basically making up a redactional unity, albeit one including motifs of differing backgrounds.

[158] Read as puʿal with BHSApp.

mēʾereṣ miṣrāyim	from the land of Egypt,
wēʾlōhîm zûlātî lōʾ tēdaʿ	and you know no God but me,
ûmôšîaʿ ʾayin biltî	and there is no one to save except me.
ʾănî rĕʿîtîkā[159] *bammidbār*	I shepherded you in the wilderness,
bĕʾereṣ talʾūbôt	in the land of dry heat.
kĕmarʿîtām wayyiśbāʿû	As they pastured, they were satiated,
śābĕʿû wayyārom libbām	they were satiated, their heart grew proud:
ʿal-kēn šĕkēḥûnî	thus they forgot me/grew hot against me.[160]

In this passage, we find an astonishing collection of motifs, some having a background in Northwest Semitic mythopoetic diction and some representing borrowings from the Anatolian/Hurrian background represented in the *Epic of Liberation.*[161] In Wikander 2014, I studied how the Ugaritic texts—our foremost window into the poetic world of the extra-biblical Northwest Semitic cultures—express the relationship between drought and death, and how these ancient motifs survived into the Hebrew Bible. The chapter in which the present passage appears was important in that study as well, and I will discuss the passage here as an example of how biblical authors could combine material from their inherited Northwest Semitic "etymological poetic" background with extra-Semitic borrowings. First, I will provide a "bird's eye" list of these differing motifs, and then work through them in order and detail.

The passage contains a combination of:

- The description of the inhospitable, drought-stricken land, reminiscent of Ugaritic "drought theology."
- The imagery of life's inconstancy as "smoke" (cf. Aqhat and the Hittite terminology of humans as "beings of smoke," as well as the reception of the motif in the Wisdom of Solomon, chap. 2); note also the connection with "smoke from a window," which brings to mind the expression *luttauš kammaraš IṢBAT* ("smoke seized the windows") which occurs at the beginning of the Hittite *Tale of Telepinu* as part of a description of the terrible, lifeless fate of the world when Telepinu, the Storm God's son, has gone into hiding.[162]

---

[159] Conjecture according to LXX, which has ἐποίμανόν σε, suggested as possibility in BHSApp.

[160] See below for an argument concerning the latter translation.

[161] Which is not to say, however, that the motifs are in any way alien to their context in the Book in which they appear; to quote Dearman (2010: 320), the imagery in 13:3 is "vintage Hosea" in its "literary expression." Again, it is not a question of the author of the text importing something foreign or extraneous but of that person reaching into the shared background of Northwest Semitic poetic diction, a background which, I argue, imported (and assimilated) Indo-European motifs.

[162] Normalized; text available in *EIET* (Telepinu); printed edition in Laroche 1969: 29-50. Note also that *tuḫḫuiš* ("smoke") occurs in the next line!

- The use of the verb *škḥ*, which may possibly have a (punning) background in the verbal root appearing in Ugaritic as *ṯkḥ*, meaning something like "be burned, be exceedingly hot or parched" (see further on this in chapter 9).
- And last, but certainly not least, the motif of the arrogant, over-fattened animal, which the passage has in common with the parable from the *Epic of Liberation* and with Deut 32:15.

The first of these points puts us squarely in Northwest Semitic, "Ugaritoid" mythological territory. YHWH has guided his people through an arid land, devoid of greenery, the metaphorical "dead land" (later in Hosea 13, personified Death is even addressed outright).[163] As seen from the perspective of inherited motifs, this is the land of Death itself (as I have argued at length in my 2014 study). Hosea 13 generally contains much of the old Northwest Semitic imagery concerning this problem sphere (drought and death).

But this type of imagery is joined by another motif that we have seen to be connected with Indo-European (Anatolian) traditions: the imagery of life as "smoke." In his commentary to Hosea, G.I. Davies states that the smoke in this instance "is a common image for what is transitory," and refers to Ps 37:20 and Isa 51:6.[164] The first of these certainly does provide a parallel to the "smoke" of Hos 13:3 (and the second perhaps also, though not quite as compelling an example), but be that as it may: such motifs may still have a prehistory, and (as noted above) the motif is actually not that common in the Hebrew Bible.

In the Ugaritic *Aqhat* text, this motif was associated not only semantically with what I believe to be its Anatolian language origins, but also etymologically (using Hittite loanwords). Hosea 13, however, is one of the clearest examples of how this motif was received and developed in the Hebrew Bible.

It appears that the author of Hosea 13 has wed the idea of "smoke" as a piece of imagery for life and the breath of being (*a là* Hittite *antuwaḫḫaš*-) with the drought motif as known from the Northwest Semitic literary tradition represented at Ugarit. Life is smoke as it disappears (just as in *Aqhat*, into which I argued that the motif was borrowed from Indo-European Anatolian sources), but this happens as the "dew" (*ṭal*) goes away (a piece of dryness imagery), and the motif of the dry Exodus desert is directly invoked. By combining these motifs with that of the over-fattened, ungrateful animal, the poet has created a most artful fusion of mythopoetic material from various Ancient Near Eastern cultures.

---

[163] Note the use of the strange expression *ʾereṣ talʾūbôt*, the second half of which is a hapax legomenon. I personally believe that this word may harbor an earlier, religio-historical piece of "etymological poetics"; for more on my arguments concerning this word, see Wikander 2014: 165-168.

[164] Davies 1992: 288.

5.7 The Fatling Motif in the Song of Deborah

The motif of the animal that has grown too fat (and thereby arrogant) may perhaps have an echo in the Song of Deborah as well: Judg 5:6-7 talks of the rulers of Israel having "grown fat" (root *ḥdl*) until the rise of Deborah:

Bîmê šamgar ben-ʿănāt	In the days of Shamgar, son of Anat,
bîme yāʿēl	in the days of Jael,
ḥādĕlû ʾŏrāḥôt	the roads had ceased to be,
wĕhōlĕkê nĕtîbôt yēlĕkû	and wayfarers used to walk
ʾŏrāḥôt ʿăqalqallôt	on crooked roads.
ḥādĕlû pĕrāzôn bĕyiśrāʾēl	The warriors/people[165] of Israel grew fat,
ḥādēllû ʿad šaqqamtî dĕbôrâ	they grew fat until[166] you[167] rose, Deborah,
šaqqamtî ʾēm bĕyiśrāʾēl	until you rose, O mother in Israel!

The root *ḥdl* meaning "to become fat" is not common; there are seven known instances of this root (cognate with Arabic *ḫadila/ḫadula*, with similar meaning). Here, it appears in wordplay with the more common verb *ḥdl* meaning "to cease, to stop." Another case, Ps 36:4, may also represent an instance of the same motif. The occurrence in the Song of Deborah is especially interesting, given that Jael/*yāʿēl* (literally "ibex") also appears. Is Jael the prototypically "good" unfattened animal in 5:6, to be contrasted to the fattened rulers in 5:7? Such a possible pun must be reckoned with, especially as the reference to Jael is situated so near the one to "growing fat." Freedman and Lundbom (in *TDOT*) convincingly compare with the "fattening" (root *šmn*, hipʿîl) of the people in Isa 6:10.[168] It is a fascinating perspective to imagine that this type of imagery, occurring as it does at a number of important points in the

[165] The exact meaning of *pĕrāzôn* is unclear in the extreme. One comes across translations and explanations such as "yeomanry" (Freedman 1980: 150) or "a collective term for the unwalled villages […] or their inhabitants" (Stager 1988: 225). The Vulgate has *fortes* ("brave ones"). There are many others (see Stager 1988: 224-225 for an overview of various suggestions, including some that presuppose loanwords into Hebrew; another overview of widely divergent suggestions can be found in Lemche 1985: 278; *HALOT* has a good overview on p. 965 [s.v. *pĕrāzôn*]). The exact translation of the word is not of essential relevance for the present purposes, however, and thus I have chosen the more general "warriors/people." The main point is that the word is some sort of reference to Israelite people, of whatever social class or stratification.

[166] Unless, of course, it is a question of being prosperous and fat *because* Deborah rose (for an example of this view, see the translation of the *New Revised Standard Version*).

[167] Taking the forms in *-tî* as archaic 2nd person singular feminine of the suffix conjugation.

[168] See, generally, Freedman and Lundbom 1980: 220-221 for a discussion of the root *ḥdl*, its attestations and etymology. They also mention the wordplay with the root meaning "cease."

Hebrew Bible, may at least partly owe its background to motifs represented in a Hurro-Hittite wisdom tale!

One should note that the Song of Deborah also speaks of people leaving their God (Judg 5:8). Precisely as the fattened animals in Deut 32:15 and the *Epic of Liberation*, the reference is to being inconstant towards one's divine protector(s).

The appearance of the "fatling" motif in the Song of Deborah is in itself hardly surprising. I am among those who do not discount the possibility that the Song is quite ancient indeed (as I believe to be the case concerning the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32, though I would not dare give a *responsum* as to their relative chronology). If this is so, two of the archaic poems of the Hebrew Bible carry in their midst a motif inherited from a Hurro-Hittite background. And one text in which this motif occurs, Hosea 13, also includes the very Indo-European imagery of life as smoke, which was borrowed (earlier) into the Ugaritic Aqhat epic, in which it was combined with physical incense (expressed using a Hittite loanword!) as an ironic remark on the inverted relationship between life's inconstancy and the ideal liturgical state of the world. The motifs seem almost to be alive.

5.8 The "Smoke" and "Fatling" Motifs in the Psalms

There are a few more examples to be found of the "smoke" imagery being applied to life (or its end in the Hebrew Bible). One of these is found in Ps 102:4, which uses the imagery of a burning furnace:

Kî-kālû bĕʿāšān yāmāy	For my days disappear in/like smoke,
wĕʿaṣmôtay kĕmôqēd[169] *niḥārû*	and my bones burn as (in) a furnace.

This verse, which I have earlier argued to be part of a greater piece of reception of the ancient Northwest Semitic drought motif,[170] uses the imagery of the smoke in a very fitting context: that of a burning furnace. It is quite difficult to know whether this instance of the simile is an expression of the same borrowed motif we studied earlier or if it is only a matter of chance resemblance. The main point here could well be the destroying heat rather than smoke as a symbol of life. The matter is, however, not quite easy to decide one way or the other.

There is another verse from the Psalms that uses "smoke" as an image of (disappearing) life in a way that may also involve a hot furnace. This is Ps 37:20, which reads (according to the MT):

[169] Read as a single word with many manuscripts, as opposed to the reading of Codex Leningradensis.

[170] Wikander 2014: 60-61.

Kî rĕšāʿîm yōʾbēdû	For evildoers will be destroyed,
wĕʾōyĕbê YHWH	and the enemies of YHWH.
kîqar kārîm kālû	Like the choicest of lambs they are lost,
beʿāšān kālû	they are lost in smoke.

The reading *kîqar kārîm* ("like the choicest of lambs") has understandably been challenged. A reference to lambs does sit oddly in the context, and there has been a suggestion that one should read the word *kîqar* as *kîqōd* ("like a burning" or perhaps "like a furnace").[171] Some authors propose emending the following word as well, but that is not of material importance here.

The main question is whether or not we should keep the MT (which speaks of "the choicest of lambs") or emend the text into referring to smoke emanating from a glowing furnace. At first glance, the change to *kîqōd* seems almost self-evident; it would match the imagery in Ps 102:4, and references to a drought motif similar to that in Psalm 102 appear in other verses of the text (vv. 2 and perhaps 19). Also, a misreading of a *dālet* as a *rēš* is quite easy to imagine. This is perhaps the most probable reading.

However, I believe that there is still is a possibility of defending the MT reading. The text in the Hebrew Bible that reflected the Anatolian "life as smoke" imagery in the clearest way of all—Hosea 13—did, after all, include what appears to be a reference to the motif of the overly fattened animal. What if the *kārîm* of the MT to Ps 37:20 also represent an instance of this motif?

In that case, the dynamics of the verse would change. The smoke-like inconstancy of the lives of the evildoers would then be implicitly due to their wayward arrogance, their "overfedness." And if we also presuppose a thinly-veiled reference to the sacrificial cult here (choice lambs and smoke!), we are once more back at the integration between anthropology and liturgical terminology that we found at Ugarit, when the "smoke" terminology was used in the Aqhat epic.

If we allow ourselves some more freedom to speculate, we may look at another verse from Psalms, which could actually represent a very spriritualized version of this combination of smoke imagery and liturgy. In Ps 141:2, the Psalmist says to the Israelite God:

Tikkôn tĕpillātî qĕṭōret lĕpānêkā	Let my prayer be incense before you,
maśʾat kappay minḥat-ʿāreb	the raising of my hands be an evening sacrifice!

This verse does, to be sure, not express the life of the supplicant in terms of smoke or incense; however, his prayer, his "spiritual offering," so to speak, is talked of in this way. The words that he is offering up are presented as a sort of metaphorical incense and burnt offering. Given that the rest of the Psalm talks a

[171] See *HALOT*: 430 (s.v. *yĕqōd*). Also mentioned, e.g., in Dahood 1965: 230 (though he did not necessarily accept the emendation).

great deal about the "inner" psychological workings of the praying individual, it may perhaps be possible to regard the "incense" of this passage as a reference to the inner, mental being of the supplicant as well—perhaps something akin to the concept of a "soul" (even though this is, it must be added, quite an anachronistic term).[172]

Thinking of the "smoke" of a human being in these terms of course opens another pathway: that of associating this motif with the idea, occurring in many places in the Hebrew Bible, of the "breath of life" that has been blown into the nostrils of humans. Too clear an equation of these concepts does, however, run the risk of getting too far from where we started. Still, I would regard it as very probable that the idea of a human as a "being of smoke" was associated with the idea of the "breath of life," making the concepts somewhat difficult to distinguish.

5.9 Later (Hermetic) Reception of the "Smoky Offering" Motif as an Image of the Life of the Petitioner

Later on in this book, I will discuss what is sometimes known as the "pizza effect," which is what happens when cultural loans are subsequently reborrowed into its source culture. Already at this juncture, I would like to give one such example, having to do with the idea of "spiritual offerings" as "smoke." The text comes from the late antique *Corpus Hermeticum*, from the majestic prayer at the end of *Poimandres*, the first Hermetic tractate. After the anonymous narrator has undergone a mystical and salvific experience, having had the titular being Poimandres explain the mysteries of God and man to him, he utters an extatic prayer of thanks in chapter 31. At the end of this prayer, the following words can be found:

> Δέξαι λογικὰς θυσίας ἁγνὰς ἀπὸ ψυχῆς καὶ καρδίας πρὸς σὲ ἀνατεταμένης, ἀνεκλάλητε, ἄρρητε, σιωπῇ φωνούμενε.[173]
>
> Receive spiritual, pure sacrifices from a soul and a heart lifted up towards you, O unspeakable, unutterable one, expressed in silence!

---

[172] It has been pointed out (North 2001: 411) that Hebrew *ʿāšān* and *qĕṭōret* never occur in parallel, which would allegedly show that they refer to two types of completely different smoke (an unpleasant and a pleasant one, respectively). However, I do not believe that this dichotomy needs to be absolute. The Anatolian-derived Ugaritic concepts do not appear to be so absolute (at least, the Indo-European root underlying them is not), and given that I believe that the examples enumerated here of "life as smoke" in the Hebrew Bible represent pieces of reception of that motif, I think it unwise to draw an absolute line between the two types of smoke. North points out that "[s]moke is also a symbol of transitoriness and evanescence," referring to some of the texts I discuss here, and in this he is certainly right. However, as seen in this chapter, I believe there to be more to the story.

[173] Text edited in Nock and Fèstugiere 1960.

In these words from the *Hermetica*, the "sacrificial smoke," so to speak, is identified with the "spiritual sacrifices" that the poet is offering up in the form of his prayer. The offerings come from his heart and soul, from his innermost being. It is clear that the Poimandres tractate includes numerous biblical and/or Jewish references,[174] and I would propose that these majestic words represent a reinterpretation of the Old Testament imagery, ultimately received and transformed from Indo-European sources, of the inner essence of a human being appearing similar to smoke, and of that "smoke" being offered up to God and identified with the smoke of a sacrificial cult (as in Ps 141:2). The reference to the "heart and soul" of the speaker makes this association even more salient. Note that the text uses the word θυσία, which is derived from the very root *$*d^hweh_2$-/*d^huh_2- with which we began. Here, inherited Indo-European terminology seems to have been remarried to its own biblical reception, a phenomenon to which we will be returning in chapter 10, on the "pizza effect."

5.10 A Late Example from Jewish Liturgy

The tradition of motifs discussed here has given rise to even later reminiscences. The passage from the Wisdom of Solomon mentioned earlier uses the imagery of life as fleeting smoke as a kind of "straw man" representation of what the ungodly are saying (probably representing some type of Hellenistic Hedonist or Epicurean philosophy). However, the borders between orthodoxy and the dangerously cynical attitude of this text were apparently not too strict after all. This is shown by the fact that wordings extremely similar to Wisdom 2 appear in a somewhat different form in Jewish prayer liturgy, in the *Ûnětanneh Tôqep* prayer, a *piyyuṭ* recited on Yom Kippur and Rosh HaShana and representing the day of judgment, a poem which includes references to man being as transient as a drifting cloud.[175] The prayer, which is of a later date,[176] uses imagery quite close to that in the second chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon—and to the imagery of the drying vegetation in Isaiah 40—in order to paint a picture of the transience of man.[177] It does not speak of "smoke" as such, but when one reads it, one gets an inkling that the tradition appearing in Wisdom 2 (which did use "smoke" overtly) is here carried on further:

---

[174] See Pearson 1981 and (recently) Wikander 2013b.

[175] This parallel was first suggested to me in as unscholarly a place as the Wikipedia articles "Book of Wisdom" and "Unetanneh tokef" (accessed latest May 25, 2016). I have tried (in vain) to find a more reputable source for the connection, but it is quite apparent when the two texts are compared.

[176] The *terminus ante quem* of the prayer is given by the fact that fragments of it have been recovered from the early parts of the Cairo Geniza in a manuscript tentatively dated to the late 8th century CE—see Werner 1959: 253. According to M. Zulay, quoted (p.c.) by Werner, the traditional dating of the poem to the end of the 11th century (based on a semi-legendary story about Rabbi Amnon of Mayence) is not convincing, as the legend only states that R. Amnon *recited* the poem, not that he wrote it.

[177] For the text, see e.g. Birnbaum 1989: 361-364.

ʾādām yĕsôdô mēʿāpār	A man—his source is dust
wĕsôpô leʿāpār	and his end is dust.
bĕnapšô yābîʾ laḥmô	By risk of his life/breathing he wins his bread,
māšûl kĕḥeres hannišbār	he is like a broken potsherd,
kĕḥāṣîr yābēš ûkĕṣîṣ nôbēl	like parched grass and like a wilting flower,
kĕṣēlʿôbēr ûkĕʿānān kālâ	like a fleeing shadow and like a dissipating cloud,
ûkĕrûaḥ nôšābet	and like a blowing wind
ûkĕʾābāq pôrēaḥ	and like flying dust
wĕkaḥălôm yāʿûp	and like a fleeting dream.

This piece of text includes the dust/ashes, the wind, the shadow and the dissipating cloud as metaphors for the ephemerality of human life, just as ch. 2 of the Wisdom of Solomon does. As I mentioned, it does not explicitly say "smoke," but I would argue that the lack of the word itself is not of great consequence. The underlying motif is the same. This close parallel shows that much of what the author of the Wisdom of Solomon attributes to godless Hedonists is actually poetic material that could very much be a part of the Jewish literary and religious milieu, and thus substantially diminishes the chance that the use of the drought and smoke imagery in Wisdom 2 is simply a coincidence and an invention of the author without an earlier history behind it, as it occurs together with extensive material that is demonstrably part of a greater tradition.[178]

5.11 Merciful Laps and Bodies: Some other Metaphors of Anthropology in Hebrew and Indo-European

Before we end this chapter, I may be fruitful to look at some other metaphorical or semi-metaphorical expressions for living beings and their characteristics that may attest to contact with speakers of Anatolian Indo-European. It has long been noted that the Semitic languages abound in expressions originating in body metaphors. Expressions like *ʿal yad* ("by the hand of," "beside"), *lipnê* ("to the face of," "before"), *ḥārâ ʾappô* (lit. "his nostril burned," meaning "he was angry") are quite typical of Classical Hebrew. I here intend to look at a few collocations of this type in Anatolian.

An interesting parallel between Biblical Hebrew and Anatolian when it comes to body metaphors is the one connecting someone's "lap" or female

[178] The other possible explanation, that the author of *ûnĕtannê tôqep* was actually quoting literally from the text of the Wisdom of Solomon, is to my mind much less probable than there being a common poetic tradition: it is asking rather a lot to propose that a Jewish *payṭān* would use as his *Vorlage* a text that is stated outright to represent the views of heretical thinking, and a text that was originally written in Greek, at that. Rather, I think that this is yet another instance of the type of shared poetic milieu I presuppose for earlier Northwest Semitic literature.

reproductive system with the abstract idea of "mercy." This connection is very well known indeed from the Hebrew Bible: the classical example is the word *reḥem*, which appears originally to have meant "lap" or even "uterus," but is commonly used to express the idea of compassion. The same thing happens with derived terms such as *raḥămîm*, a plural that has become the normal Hebrew word for "mercy." These expressions form the nucleus of a type of theological thinking that has sometimes been regarded as expressing a more "feminine" side of the Israelite God, by implying that he has feminine physical attributes, or rather that metaphors concerning such can be suitably applied to him.

It just so happens that an extraordinary parallel to this phenomenon occurs in the Hittite language as well. The Hittite word *genzu-* is defined by Kloekhorst as "abdomen, lap"; it is etymologically derived from the Indo-European root **ĝenh₁-* ("to beget, to give birth, to procreate, to bring into existence"), the root underlying words such as Latin *genus* and *(g)nātus*, Greek γίγνομαι, Sanskrit *janati* ("generates") and others. From *genzu-*, Hittite has created a further derivation, the adjective *genzuwala-*, which means "kind," "merciful" or "gracious." Literally, this adjective must mean something like "lap-like," i.e. the attribute of kindness or graciousness is associated directly with the same parts of the body signified by Hebrew *reḥem*.

Just as the Semitic *rḥm* root is used to express theological aspects of the relationship between the divine sphere and humans, the Hittite word *genzuwala-* is applied in a theological context. The Great Hymn to the Hittite Sun God says in line 7: *zik-pat genzuwalaš* ^{d}UTU-*uš*, "you are the merciful Sun God."[179] Just as *raḥămîm* is ascribed to the Israelite God despite him not being imagined as female, the male Hittite solar deity is associated with the root of *genzu-*.

Even though there are Indo-European languages outside the Anatolian subfamily that use derivations from the **ĝenh₁-*root to express notions of kindness and graciousness (Latin *gentilis*, for example), they are usually not built upon the use of the root to express "abdomen/lap," which forms the perfect parallel to Hebrew *reḥem* and its relatives. This exact correspondence is specific to Hittite *genzu-* ("lap", abdomen") and *genzuwala-* ("gracious, merciful, kind"). The other Indo-European examples of **ĝenh₁-* being used for expressing this type of attributes may thus be regarded as separate from the Hittite example. In fact, there are other Hittite collocations also including *genzu-* in expressing notions of kindness (and similar concepts), viz. *genzu dā-* ("take pity on," lit. "take *genzu-*"), *genzu ḫar(k)-* ("have fondness for," lit. "have/hold *genzu-*"), *genzu pai-* ("to extend kindness," lit. "give *genzu-*") as well as the derived verb *genzuwae-* ("to be gentle with").[180] This shows that, in Hittite, the "lap" or "abdomen" word had acquired a much wider type of semantic reference than

[179] For the text, see Güterbock 1958.

[180] Examples from Kloekhorst 2008: 468 (s.v. $^{(UZU)}$*genzu-*). Transcriptions have been adapted to the system used here; I have left out Kloekhorst's superscript indications of inflection. The semantic translations are Kloekhorst's, the literal translations are mine. Note that Puhvel (*HED*), vol. 4: 155 (s.v. *genzu-/ginzu-*) also interprets the Hittite expressions for taking pity, etc., as calques of Semitic (Akkadian, in his case).

what is inherent in the Indo-European root **ĝenh₁-* as such. Anatolian has gone its own way in Indo-European with regard to this type of expression.

In Semitic, however, the situation is different. Hebrew *raḥămîm* is definitely not alone within that linguistic family in uniting the ideas of graciousness, loving or kindness and the abdomen or lap. In Akkadian, for example, we find the verb *râmu*, meaning "to love," which is derived from that very same Semitic root.

All this suggests the possibility that it was actually the Anatolian languages that borrowed (or rather, calqued) this type of expression from the Semitic family, and not the other way around. The Anatolian languages are alone in their linguistic family in making the clear association between "lap/abdomen" and "mercy," whereas the association is common in Semitic languages.

One case of body metaphorics in which one can, however, regard Anatolian as the probable loan-giver is in the case of the word appearing in Hebrew as *tāwek* (mostly in the construct form, *tôk*), meaning "center," "inside," or "inner part," giving rise to the frequent expression *bĕtôk* ("in the middle of"). This word appears also in Ugaritic, as *tk*, but it has no Semitic cognates outside of the Northwest Semitic subphylum, making it a likely candidate for being a loanword from some other source. It just so happens that there is a perfect candidate in Hittite that was suggested by Chaim Rabin: the rather common word *tuekka-*, meaning "body."[181] I would regard it as highly likely that this is indeed the origin of Hebrew *tāwek*.

If this is indeed so, it would provide an interesting example of a word that was originally a body metaphor being "de-bodified" as it was borrowed into Northwest Semitic. After all, the Hebrew word means nothing more than "center" or "inside," often having weakened into a part of a prepositional expression *bĕtôk*. It is noteworthy, however, that the Hurrian/Hittite bilingual *Epic of Liberation*, that has been mentioned earlier, uses the word *tuekka-* in a way that does not seem necessarily to imply a physical "body" when it speaks of the mountain driving away the roe-deer in one of the fable-like paradigmatic stories:

Aliyan[*an*]*-za apel tuegga*[*z-šet*] ḪUR.SAG-*aš awan arḫa šūet*[182]

A mountain drove away a roe-deer from its body.

Here, the body is somewhat abstract even in the Hittite text. The mountain is personified, to be sure, but the main point of the meaning is still only that the roe-deer leaves a physical place. Though the text here is a translation of a Hurrian original (which uses the word *idi-*, meaning "self" or "body"), it shows that the Hittite *tuekka-* could be used as a more general term for the "physical

[181] Rabin 1963: 136-137. The idea is mentioned with some apparent liking by Watson (2007: 123-124), although he also points out as another possibility a relationship with the Akkadian word *tikku*, meaning "neck," a connection that seems less convincing to me.

[182] Normalized text of KBo XXXII 14 *recto* II, line 1, edited in Neu 1996: 75.

essence" of an object or a person, thus providing an example of both the movement from Indo-European to Northwest Semitic and perhaps also the conceptual movement of a view of personhood or human nature, carried through the medium of specific terminology.

5.12 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have sketched a slow-moving river of motif tradition that can be traced (at least in part) to Anatolian Indo-European linguistic and poetic material, specifically terms for smoke and of humans as "beings with smoke in them." This motif, appearing in a form quite close to its linguistic origin in the Ugaritic Aqhat story, recurs in a few places in the Hebrew Bible, and, I argue, also found a later reception in liturgical texts both from Hermetic and Jewish milieux. We have seen how imagery concerning the nature of humanity, human emotions and characteristics appear to have been shared between speakers of Anatolian Indo-European and Northwest Semitic. In one of the cases (the "smoke" one), we have studied how such anthropological terminology can cross the line into liturgical terminology (already at Ugarit and then subsequently in the Hebrew Bible and later texts).

In the next chapter, we shall look at a very specific, liturgical phenomenon from Anatolia that may be reflected in biblical writings, and in the one following that (chapter 7), at the possibility of an important divine name occurring in the Hebrew Bible having an Indo-European background. The anthropological thread is taken up again in chapter 8, when we will speak about terms for boundary-crossers, strangers and people on the fringe of ancient societies. And yet again, an animal metaphor will come into play there—but in that case, the matter will not be one of overfed or fattened deers, ibexes or lambs, but of dangerous, threatening wolves.

6. When Jeroboam Divided his God

One of the most hated events in Deuteronomistic theology—and therefore, in effect, in the Hebrew Bible as a whole—is the supposed relocation of the cult of YHWH from the "sanctioned" temple in Jerusalem to Bethel and Dan said to have been carried out by Jeroboam:

> *Wayyōʾmer yorobʿām bĕlibbô ʿattâ tāšûb hammamlākâ lĕbêt dāwīd / ʾim-yaʿăleh hāʿām hazzeh laʿăśôt zĕbāḥîm bĕbēt-YHWH bîrûšālayim wĕšāb lēb hāʿām hazzeh ʾel-ʾădōnêhem ʾel-rĕḥabʿām melek yĕhûdâ wĕhărāgūnî wĕšābû ʾel-rĕḥabʿām melek-yĕhûdâ / wayyiwwāʿaṣ hammelek wayyaʿaś šnê ʿeglê zāhāb wayyōʾmer ʾălēhem rab-lākem mēʿălôt yĕrûšālayim hinnēh ʾĕlōhêkā yiśrāʾēl ʾăšer heʿĕlûkā mēʾereṣ miṣrāyim / wayyāśem ʾet-hāʾeḥād bĕbêt-ʾēl wĕʾet-hāʾeḥād nātan bĕdān*
> (1 Kgs 12:26-29)
>
> And Jeroboam thought: "Now the kingship will return to the House of David, if this people continues to go up to perform sacrifices in the House of YHWH in Jerusalem, and the heart of this people will return to their lord Rehoboam, king of Judah, and they will kill me and return to Rehoboam, king of Judah." The king took counsel, and he made two golden calves, and he said to them [the people]: "It is enough for you with your going up to Jerusalem—see here, Israel, your God(s), that brought you up from the Land of Egypt!" And he put one of them in Bethel, and the other one he placed in Dan.

Note that the event portrayed as sinful by the Deuteronomist historian is not the splitting up of the kingdom: this is said in 1 Kgs 12:24 actually to have been the work of YHWH all along. The sinful behavior consists in moving the worship of YHWH to another place, all in line with the Deuteronomist ideology of cult centralization.

But what is the supposedly awful thing that the Jeroboam character is really doing in this text? His splitting up of the kingdom appears not to be the central issue. Or, put in a different way: why are the Deuteronomists so preoccupied with cult centralization? It is always accepted that they are—and, perhaps, that this has something to do with the reforms of Josiah in 622 BCE—but the question remains: what is really the problem here?

6.1 A Hittite Background for the Concept of "God-Splitting"

I would ague that what the authors are reacting to here is a cultic practice known from Indo-European, specifically Hittite, sources, one elucidated by Richard H. Beal: that of "dividing a god."[183]

[183] The idea of such a Hittite religious practice is put forward and described in Beal 2002. I am not the first one to note a parallel between this Hittite concept and Israelite

The idea, argued by Beal, is that a difficult and unclear usage of the Hittite verb *šarra-* (normally meaning either "to cross," "to transgress" or "to divide"; Kloekhorst [2008: 727-729] analyzes it as *šārr-/šarr-*) when applied to deities in texts actually has to do with "dividing" them (as opposed to "transferring" them, or something similar to that). Beal argues convincingly that the point of the expression is to refer to a specific ritual, by which a deity was thought to be divided up, so to speak, as a preparation for installing them in a new sanctuary (without thereby stopping the cult in the previous cult place).

One interesting sign that could work as a piece of circumstantial evidence for this "dividing a god" interpretation is the fact that the Jeroboam texts uses the rare construction of a plural verb (*heʿĕlûkā*) combined with *ʾĕlōhîm* when the latter refers to YHWH. Of course, one could argue that the verb is plural because the golden calves are more than one (this is, for example, the solution opted for in the JPS translation, which has "behold thy gods"), but this argument could be thought of as substantially weakened by the fact that the exact same utterance (including the plural verb) is used in the context of the golden calf story in Exodus (Exod 32:4 and 32:8), where there is no talk of more than one calf (note that JPS chooses the singular here).[184] However, it is a rather common stance to regard the text in Exodus as a retrojection of "the sin of Jeroboam" into a much earlier time, and the plural verb is the *lectio difficilior* in this case, which points to that reading indeed being original and at home in the Jeroboam setting.[185]

---

thinking. Beal's idea is discussed *in extenso* in Taggar-Cohen 2014: 38, in an article explicitly devoted to describing possible parallels between Hittite and ancient Israelite religion, yet the article only contains a short reference to the Jeroboam story in this context (p. 42). It does, however, use the Hittite concept of "dividing" a god as an explanatory model for local versions of YHWH, including regarding the *YHWH ʾeḥād* of Deut 6:4 as a prohibition against such. Thus, Taggar-Cohen also pointed towards the idea of Deuteronom(ist)ic ideology reacting negatively towards Hittite style "dividing" of YHWH, which is the basic idea of this chapter.

[184] Also, the fact of Jeroboam's calves probably only having been meant as thrones for YHWH as opposed to gods themselves argues against the idea of the number of calves being the cause for the use of a plural verb (see, eg., Sweeney 2007: 177; Sweeney, however, still uses the translation "gods" on p. 172!). Of course, the Deuteronomists probably presented a warped image of this idea, yet the problem is again why the verb is plural in Exod 32:4 as well.

[185] For the plural verb as the preferable reading due to *lectio difficilior*, see Modéus 2005: 256, n. 112. He also notes that the Exodus text is probably secondary to the Jeroboam one, and gives many references to earlier literature on the subject. Modéus himself opts for regarding the matter as involving one "double-calf" (2005: 255-256, nn. 111-112), arguing that the mention of Dan is a secondary insertion, and that only Bethel is historically relevant here. Given the possible scenario sketched in this chapter—that the "dividing" and moving of the Israelite deity was construed by the Deuteronomists as something intrinsically "foreign," such an insertion could serve to portray Jeroboam's actions as even more repugnant: he not only divides YHWH once, but then he does it again!

The "single *ʾĕlōhîm* with plural agreement" construction is not common in the Hebrew Bible.[186] It is possible that its use in the Jeroboam passage and its parallel in Exodus is due to the theological idea of "dividing a god" being alluded to (regardless of the number of calves). When Jeroboam (and, by implication, Aaron) tries in a sense to "move" YHWH, they have to "divide" him, in order for the deity to be available in a new place (without thereby negating his existence in his former place of worship). Therefore, the god presented is "temporarily plural" while the dividing ritual is being performed.

All this means that the Deuteronomist authors are probably reacting not only to an alleged event contrary to their Jerusalemite ideology of cult centralization but also to a ritual practice that may well have been perceived as quite "foreign." As Beal shows, the idea of "dividing a god" was apparently well-known in official Hittite religion, and it may thus have been present as a concept in Late Bronze Age Syria-Palestine, whence it could subsequently have been incorporated into (proto-)Deuteronomist ideology as an image of the inimical religious views of the "other."

6.2 Other Ancient Near Eastern Comparanda in the Jeroboam Story: The Young vs. Old Motif as Known from Gilgamesh and Aga

It could be objected that the distance between the Hittite sources and the biblical texts from Exodus and 1 Kings is too great, both in geographic and temporal terms, for it to be plausible that the concept of "dividing a god" could have been subtextually in play here. One could object that it would be unlikely for so ancient and un-Israelite a motif to be present in a text so thoroughly Deuteronomistic as the present one—it is, after all, one of the most clearly programmatic texts of Deuteronomistic theology, creating the backdrop for much of the critique that theological tradition offers against the entire Israelite (and, by extension, Judahite) monarchy. However, one should remember that ancient retentions of motifs can turn up in more recent texts as well, and it so happens that there is concrete evidence of that state of affairs in the present context as well. There is another feature in the Jeroboam text that clearly seems to hint at the retention of an ancient Bronze Age motif—not an Indo-European one in that case, but still an ancient extra-biblical motif which may serve as a "proof of concept" for the possibility of such old material being present in the text.[187]

I am referring to the following words in the story of the rupture of the United Kingdom, in the same chapter as the above passage on Jeroboam's new sanctuaries, words that describe the reaction of Rehoboam and two different groups among his followers when it comes to the question of how the upstart "party" of Jeroboam is to be dealt with, when the Northeners demand a decrease in forced labor and taxes:

---

[186] See Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 122 (7.4.2b).

[187] The parallel between the Jeroboam story and the Gilgamesh tale was also noted briefly in, e.g., Nelson 1987: 78, Fleming 2012: 111, n. 61, and Ben Zvi 2006: 136, n. 25.

> *Wayyiwwaʿaṣ hammelek reḥabʿām ʾet-hazzĕqēnîm ʾăšer-hāyû ʿōmĕdîm ʾet-pĕnê šĕlōmōh ʾābîw bihyōtô ḥay lēʾmōr ʾêk ʾattem nôʿāṣîm lĕhāšîb ʾet-hāʿām-hazzeh dābār / waydabbĕrû*[188] *ʾēlāyw lēʾmōr ʾim-hayyôm tihyehʿebed lāʿām hazzeh waʿăbadtām waʿănîtām wĕdibbartā ʾălêhem dĕbārîm ṭôbîm wĕhāyû lĕkā ʿăbādîm kol-hayyāmîm / wayyaʿăzōb ʾet-ʿăṣat hazzĕqēnîm ʾăšer yĕʿāṣūhû wayyiwwaʿaṣ ʾet-haylādîm ʾăšer gādĕlû ʾittô ʾăšer hāʿōmĕdîm lĕpānāyw / wayyōʾmer ʾălêhem mâ ʾattem nôʿāṣîm wĕnāšîb dābār ʾet-hāʿām hazzeh* […] */ waydabbĕrû ʾēlāyw haylādîm ʾāšer gādĕlû ʾittô lĕʾmōr kōh-tōʾmar lāʿām hazzeh* […] *wĕʿattâ ʾābî heʿmîs ʿălêkem ʿōl kābēd waʾănî ʾôsîp ʿal-ʿullĕkem ʾābî yissar ʾetkem baššôṭîm waʾănî ʾăyassēr ʾetkem bāʿaqrabbîm*
> (1 Kgs 12:6-11)
>
> And King Rehoboam took counsel with the old men that had stood before his father Solomon when the latter was alive, saying: "How do you suggest we answer these people?" And they said to him: "If today you agree to be the servant of these people, and serve them, answer them and speak pleasing words to them; then they will be your servants for all time. But he rejected the counsel that the old men gave him, and he [instead] took counsel with the young men who had grown up together with him, those who stood before him. And he said to them: "What do you suggest we answer these people? […]" And the young men who had grown up together with him said to him: "Thus you shall say to these people: "[…] And now, my father laid on you a heavy yoke, yet I will increase your yoke [even more]. My father chastised you with lashes—I will chastise you with scorpions!"

The motif shown in this passage—that of the older men in a ruler's council being afraid and urging moderation whereas the younger men urge aggressive confrontation—is clearly a retention of an older Ancient Near Eastern trope. It occurs in quite a similar way in so early a text as *Gilgamesh and Aga*, one of the episodic Gilgamesh stories handed down from Sumerian times, prior to the composition of the Gilgamesh Epic as such. In that text, the manuscripts of which are from Old Babylonian times but is itself probably to be dated to the Ur III period, the following exchange takes place when Gilgamesh, ruler of Uruk, has been challenged by Aga, son of Enmebaragesi, ruler of the neighboring city of Kish:

> *Lú-kíĝ-gi$_4$-a ag-ga dumu en-me-barag-ge$_4$-si-ke$_4$ kiš^{ki}-ta ^{d}gilgameš$_2$ unug^{ki}-šè mu-un-ši-re$_7$-eš. ^{d}gilgameš$_2$ igi ab-ba iri^{ki}na-šè inim ba-an-ĝar inim ì-kíĝ-kíĝ-e. túl til-le-da túl kalam til-til-le-da* […] *é kiš^{ki}-šè gú nam-ba-an-ĝá-ĝá-an-dè-en. ^{ĝiš}tukul nam-ba-an-sàg-ge-en-dè-en. unken ĝar-ra ab-ba iri-na-ka ^{d}gilgameš$_2$ mu-na-ni-ib-gi$_4$-gi$_4$. túl til-le-da túl kalam til-til-le-da.*

[188] Qere reading.

[…] é kiš^{ki}*-šè gú ga-àm-ĝá-ĝá-an-dè-en.* ^{ĝiš}*tukul nam-ba-sàg-ge-en-dè-en.* ^{d}*gilgameš*$_2$ *en kul-aba*$_4$^{ki}*-a-ke*$_4$ ^{d}*inana-ra nir-ĝál-la-e inim ab-ba iri-na-ke*$_4$ *šag*$_4$*-šè nu-mu-na-gíd. 2-kam-ma-šè* ^{d}*gilgameš*$_2$ *igi ĝuruš iri*^{ki}*-na-šè inim ba-an-ĝar inim ì-kíĝ-kíĝ-e. túl til-le-da túl kalam til-til-le-da.* […] *é kiš*^{ki}*-šè gú nam-ba-an-ĝar-re-en-zé-en* ^{ĝiš}*tukul nam-ba-an-sàg-ge-en-zé-en. unken ĝar-ra ĝuruš iri*^{ki}*-na-ka* ^{d}*gilgameš*$_2$ *mu-na-ni-ib-gi*$_4$*-gi*$_4$ […] *é kiš*^{ki}*-šè gú nam-ba-an-ĝar-re-en-zé-en* ^{ĝiš}*tukul nam-ba-an-sàg-ge-en-dè-en. unug*^{ki} *ĝiš-kíĝ-ti diĝir-re-e-ne-ke*$_4$ *é-an-na é an-ta èd-dè diĝir gal-gal-e-ne me-dím-bi ba-an-ak-eš-àm. bàd gal bàd an-né ki ús-sa ki-tuš maḫ an-né ĝar-ra-ni saĝ mu-e-sig*$_{10}$*. za-e lugal ur-saĝ-bi saĝ lum-lum nun an-nè ki aĝ. du-a-ni-ta a-gin*$_7$ *ní ba-an-te. erin*$_2$*-bi al-tur a-ga-bi-ta al-bir-re. lú-bé-ne igi nu-mu-un-da-ru-gú-uš. ud-bi-a* ^{d}*gilgameš*$_2$ *en kul-aba*$_4$^{ki}*-ke*$_4$ *inim ĝuruš iri-na-šè šag*$_4$*-ga-ni an-ḫúl. ur*$_5$*-ra-ni ba-an-zalag*

Messengers from Aga, son of Enmebaragesi, came from Kish to Gilgamesh in Uruk. Gilgamesh put the matter before the old men of his city, searching out his words: "There are wells to complete, wells of the land to complete! […] We should not bow down to the house of Kish—should we not [instead] strike it with weapons? In the assembled council, the old men of the city answered Gilgamesh: "There are [indeed] wells to complete, wells of the land to complete. […] Let us bow down to the house of Kish! Let us not strike it with weapons!" Gilgamesh, the lord of Kulaba, put his trust in Inana and did not take the words of the old men of his city to his heart. For the second time, Gilgamesh put the matter forth, [this time] before the young men of his city, searching out his words: "There are wells to complete, wells of the land to complete! […] You have not bowed down to the house of Kish [at any time]. Should you not strike it with weapons?" In the assembled council, the young men of his city answered Gilgamesh: "[…] You [the old men] should not bow down to the house of Kish—should not we [the young men] strike it with weapons?" Uruk, the handiwork of the gods, and Eana, the house that came down from heaven—it was the great gods that created their form. You watch the great wall founded by An, the majestic dwelling place laid out by An. You are its heroic king, a person that thrives, a prince beloved by An. When he [Aga] arrives, what fear will he experience! That army is small, its rear is scattered. Its men will not be able to confront [us]!" Then Gilgamesh, the lord of Kulaba, was happy in his heart at the words of the young men of his city; his innards rejoiced.[189]

[189] "his innards rejoiced"—literally "his liver shone," an expression showing the closeness of metaphorical diction to what later became the world of the Hebrew Bible. The Sumerian text is based on that of the *ETCSL*, lines 1-41 (with some passages removed for brevity and clarity, and punctuation added). The translation is mine, but inspired by the one found at the *ETCSL*.

This is, of course, not an Indo-European text in any way, but the extremely close correspondence of motifs between the Rehoboam passage and this one shows that so edited, semi-late and ideologically processed texts as that one can still carry within them ancient motifs inherited from the Ancient Near Eastern world of which the Deuteronomists were a part. This fact makes a connection with the Hittite conception of "dividing a god" much less strange as a parallel to the Deuteronomistic texts.

6.3 Conclusions

Given that the Deuteronomist antipathy towards the sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan became an important part of the "only YHWH and only in Jerusalem" ideology that proved so important for later Judaism, one could theoretically argue that the denunciation of "god-dividing" argued here was instrumental in the religio-historical development that led to Jerusalem-centered mono-Yahwism that subsequently came to influence the entire world. If this is so, then Indo-European religio-historical influence on the Hebrew Bible—though projected as an enemy image—is a part of some of the most important ideological developments of the religious history of the world.[190] The idea of the most unpardonable idea in Islam—*širk*—is after all exactly what the Hittite texts appear to be talking about: dividing up divinity. This, of course, is taking the idea very far indeed, but it is certainly fascinating to imagine what religious history would have looked like if the Deuteronomist authors had not minded the concept of "dividing a God."

[190] Theoretically, and even more speculatively, one could argue that this antipathy towards dividing the Israelite God is reflected (much later) in the words of Paul of Tarsus, when he rhetorically asks (1 Cor 1:13) whether "Christ has been divided" (μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός;). This, however, takes the motif so far as to be quite untestable.

7. Dagan/Dagon as a Possibly Indo-European-Derived Name, and Some Methodological Questions Raised by Religio-Historical Etymology

One of the most intriguing—though speculative—proposed borrowings of Indo-European lexical material into the Hebrew Bible from a religio-historical point of view concerns the divine name *Dāgôn* and its possible counterpart in the Hebrew noun *dāgān* (meaning "grain").

The god known as Dagon or Dagan is mainly known in the Hebrew Bible as the god of the Philistines, but the worship of this divine figure was quite widespread in the Ancient Near East in the Bronze and Iron Ages. The cult of Dagan/Dagon appears to have been centered around Syria—there are early attestations at both Ebla and Mari (as well as Emar and Ugarit). Despite the many attestations of this divine figure, his character has remained hazy in modern scholarship. He has no clear role in any mythological text, which has made it hard to make a case for any type of essentialist-sounding "function" for him (a state of affairs which may, of course, be taken as an instructive warning against theologizing too essentialist a picture of any divine being just based on mythological material). The largest modern study of Dagan's character and attestations is Feliu 2003, quite a skeptical piece of scholarship that concentrates on creating a very impressive digest of Ancient Near Eastern textual snippets in which Dagan appears in one way or the other but shies away from making too many clear pronouncements on the "character" of the god, besides stating the he was one of the main deities of many Syrian panthea. It has often been common to regard Dagon/Dagan as some sort of agricultural god based on the proposed—but not certain—equation between the name of the god and the Northwest Semitic word appearing in Hebrew as *dāgān*, "grain," but even this link is rejected by Feliu, who is generally negative towards etymological speculation concerning the name of the deity in question.

It has, it must be said, proven hard to establish the correct etymology for these words (both the divine name and the "grain" word). The first question is, of course, whether or not they are related at all. Even if that is granted, however, difficulties remain. There have been various suggestions as to the origin of the name of the god Dagan. The name has been connected with the "grain" word by many scholars (an interpretation that goes all the way back to Philo of Byblos), but it is highly uncertain whether the name of the god would then originally have been derived from the "grain" word or the other way around. Another (and much more speculative) suggestion has been to connect the divine name with the Arabic verb *dajana* ("to be cloudy, to be rainy") and, thereby, to see a sort of storm god character as being inherent in the name.[191] Some scholars have given

[191] See Healey 1999: 216 for an overview. The connection with the Arabic *dajana* originated in Albright 1920: 319 n. 27, but was later apparently abandoned by Albright himself (see Singer 2000: 25 n. 4). The idea implies some sort of weather god function for Dagan, which is, however, not apparent in the texts at all. There was also once the

up the question of Dagan's etymology and just resign to the solution of the name being pre-Semitic and pre-Sumerian, without taking a stand in any clear direction.

7.1 The Proto-Indo-European Word ***d^{h}(e)ĝ^{h}om-** *("earth") as a Possible Source for Dagan/Dagon*

There is, however, another suggestion for the background of the name Dagan, that will be the focus of the present chapter. It has been proposed that the solution to these questions is that the word has an Indo-European origin, more specifically, that it has its background in a borrowing from some reflex of the well-known Proto-Indo-European word **d^{h}(e)ĝ^{h}om-*, meaning "earth."[192] This Indo-European word occurs in various branches of that linguistic family in forms and derivatives such as χθών (Greek), *tkaṃ* (East Tocharian), *tēkan* (Hittite), *tiyammi-* (Luwian), *kṣam-* (Sanskrit), and others. Itamar Singer argues rather persuasively for this seemingly far-fetched idea in a 2000 article; specifically, he points out that the Akkadian form of the name occurs on a number of occasions written using the Sumerogram ^{d}KUR,[193] i.e., "land" or "mountain," which would possibly express the literal meaning of the word almost perfectly. Singer writes that "[i]n the context dealt with here the important point is, that two of the oldest Indo-European languages in the eastern Mediterranean, Hittite and Greek, possess an etymon, which is both phonetically and semantically very similar to the Semitic earth-god Dagan."[194]

Another factor that would fit with an etymological meaning having to do with "earth" is the association that appears sometimes to have existed between the figure of Dagan and agriculture (note that Singer appears to take this for granted in the above quote). The evidence for this association is, granted, not enormous—and it has sometimes been overstated—but it is there. Philo of Byblos translates the name Dagon as σῖτον ("grain"), but this in itself is not conclusive, as it could be interpreted as an etymologizing back-formation from the Northwest Semitic "grain" word, which may or may not have anything

---

idea that the name Dagon should be derived from *dāg* ("fish")—such an interpretation is found in Jerome, Rashi and other mediaeval commentators, but has no support whatsoever in actual pre-Common Era sources. It is today rightly rejected as a folk etymology. One may note, however, that the interpretation of Dagon as a fish god has influenced his modern pop-cultural portrayal due to his being presented in this way in the fiction of H.P. Lovecraft. On the iconographic evidence for Dagan (which does not tell us much about the questions that are the focus of the chapter), see Otto 2008 (preprint version of article for the *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*, with accompanying image file).

[192] Most clearly in Singer 2000, but, as noted there, the idea was mentioned earlier (and somewhat differently, limiting the idea to a Hittite origin) in Schmökel 1938: 99. Schmökel did, however, not appear to believe in the possible connection himself. Note also that Singer gives Schmökel the incorrect date 1934 instead of 1938.

[193] Singer 2000: 222.

[194] Singer 2000: 228.

originally to do with the name of the god. More interesting, perhaps, is the fact that he also identifies the god as Ζεῦς Ἀρότριος ("Zeus of the plow"). Earlier evidence for some form of agrarian features of Dagan can be found in the personal names Yazraḫ-Dagan and Yaṭṭa-Dagan ("Dagan sows" and "Dagan plants") occurring at Mari[195] and in the identification that was made between him and the Hurrian god Kumarbi (Kumarve), who in turn appears partly to have been a model for the Greek Kronos (who was definitely associated with agriculture), especially in Hesiod.[196]

The idea of this type of semantically transparent onomastic data moving from Indo-European to Semitic sources is certainly not impossible. In the Ugaritic *Epic of Kirta* (KTU 1.14-1.16), there is a name of a (human, but still mythological) figure which may be interesting as a parallel case. This is the name of one of the daughters of Kirta, the hero himself. The text tells us that he has seven daughters, and then an additional one bearing the significant name *ṯtmnt* (often transcribed as Thitmanit or Thitmanitu). This name is a direct feminine formation from the common Semitic word for "eight," and, therefore, its direct semantic meaning is "The eighth one." There has sometimes been a (somewhat unncecessary) habit of translating her name into English as "Octavia." As shown by the "Octavia" translation, this type of name has made modern scholars think of Roman naming conventions. However, it is probably not insignificant that there is an early Anatolian name very similar to Thitmanit in its structure. In the early texts from the Assyrian merchant colony at Kanesh, one finds a feminine personal name *Šaptamanika*, which probably means "The seventh sister" (being a compound of an Anatolian reflex of an ordinal based on the Indo-European word ***septṃ***, "seven," and the Hittite word *nika-* or *neka-*, meaning "sister").[197] This example suggests that this type of "meaningfully borrowed name" could well travel between mythological/linguistic traditions.

7.2 Criticism of the Indo-European interpretation of Dagan/Dagon

The suggestion that the name Dagan/Dagon was somehow derived from some Indo-European source has been criticized from various angles. One of these is represented by Gregorio Del Olmo Lete, who argued that the connection is unlikely on chronological grounds. The name Dagan is attested in Eblaite sources that come from a period quite some time earlier than the earliest positive

---

[195] As pointed out by Feliu (2003: 283), the reading of the second name is uncertain, however. He entirely rejects using these names as evidence for an agrarian association of Dagan.

[196] The possible association between Kumarbi/Kumarve, Kronos and Dagon is mentioned e.g., by Dietrich (1974: 63), who, however, unnecessarily brings El into the mix as well. There is little to suggest that El was ever thought of as an agrarian god.

[197] It should be pointed out that the old idea that names such as Sextus and Decimus (and their familial derivatives, such as Octavius) originally referred to the sixth or tenth (etc.) child has been proven wrong; rather, Roman names of this sort appear originally to have alluded to the *month* in which the child was born (see Petersen 1962, and, following him, Salomies 1987: 114). On *Šaptamanika*, see Kloekhorst 2008: 756 (s.v. *šiptamiia-*).

identification of Indo-European linguistic material in the Ancient Near East, and this, he argues, makes the connection untenable.[198] The earliest attested instances of Indo-European in the area date from the 19th century BCE, whereas the Eblaite texts are from the middle of the third millennium. This line of reasoning, though seemingly hard to counter, is, however, not quite compelling. In today's scholarship, it is normal to reckon with the speakers of Anatolian Indo-European having been present in Asia Minor from quite an early period, and if this view is accepted,[199] the possible presence of a divine name derived from Indo-European in the third millennium becomes much less of a problem.

The writing of Dagan's name as ^{d}KUR ("land" or "mountain") has, as we have seen, been adduced as support of the name having to do with the Indo-European "earth" word. Lluis Feliu, however, rejects this line of reasoning, positing instead that it is derived from Dagan's association with Enlil, whose name is sometimes written in this way (but with the sense of "mountain"). Feliu does, however, not argue very extensively for this point—he just says that the writing of Dagans name using ^{d}KUR must originate with a title of Enlil having to do with mountains, and leaves it at that. I personally see no difficulty in imagining two meanings being present in the writing, one of which could have to do with "land" and could subsequently have been identified with Enlil's title. The two possibilities are hardly mutually exclusive, and I believe that Feliu is perhaps too hasty in rejecting the one involving "land."[200]

---

[198] Del Olmo Lete 2001: 86.

[199] See Melchert (forthcoming), with references to further literature propounding this view. Melchert writes: "Contrary to earlier views, there has now developed a consensus among linguists that entry of Indo-European speakers into Asia Minor was much earlier than previously assumed. […] The gist of the argument is that the attested degree of differentiation of the IE Anatolian languages such as Hittite and Luvian already by the beginning of the second millennium requires at a minimum that their divergence from Proto-Anatolian began by the middle of the third millennium. It may easily have begun as early as the end of the fourth." (Note that this quote is from the 2012 preprint version of the article).

[200] On pp. 215-216 of Feliu 2003, the author simply states the commonality of the ^{d}KUR writing (as well as ^{d}KUR-GAL) as applied to Dagan and Enlil. On p. 285, he says that it is "quite clear" that the writing "must be related to one of Enlil's epithets ('The Great Mountain') and not with one of Dagan's attributes in connection with 'land.'" As mentioned above, this need not be the only possibility. It must, however, be conceded that the interpretation "mountain" was demonstrably present in antiquity, as shown through the Akkadian (phonetic) writing *šadû rabû* ("the great mountain"), appearing in a bilingual letter from Mari (A.1258+ :9) as the equivalent of Dagan's Sumerian title *kur-gal*. So if the ^{d}KUR writing could be read as "earth," it must have been a question of a dual interpretation or superimposition, so to speak, as argued above. It could be pointed out that Akkadian *šadû* may on occasion mean "open country" as well (cf. *CAD*, vol. Š I: 58-59 [s.v. *šadû*]), which would perhaps allow for some similar possibility of semantic superimposition in Akkadian as well (although the "mountain" meaning was certainly the most apparent one in the expression). On the Mari letter, see Fleming 1994.

Thus, I do not think that these counterarguments are in themselves weighty enough to reject an Indo-European connection out of hand. There is scattered but clear evidence for Dagan/Dagon as a god connected with grain or sowing—and thereby with the arable land, and the etymology of the name is unclear. Therefore, I believe that the impulse to search for a background in neighboring Indo-European languages is not unsound as such.

7.3 The Questions of Vocalization and Phono-Semantic Matching

As pointed out by Singer,[201] Hebrew makes a clear lexical distinction between the use of the word to signify "grain" generally and the divine name Dagon specifically: in Hebrew, "grain" is *dāgān*, whereas "Dagon" is, of course, *Dāgôn*. Singer interprets this difference in vocalization as consisting in the name of the god having undergone the Canaanite **ā->ō* shift, Hebrew being the only language that attests to an *ō*-shifted version of the word. This, by itself, seems well and good, but one has to ask oneself: why would Hebrew show this double reflex of what appears to be the same word? The easiest answer to this question is, of course, to posit that *Dāgôn* is a borrowing from whatever language the Philistines were speaking, as the Hebrew Bible only refers to him as being a Philistine god (which is in itself somewhat surprising).

In an article published earlier, Itamar Singer argued that the Philistine figure of Dagon was actually a composite character from a religio-historical point of view. Singer argued that the figure was originally a feminine deity, carrying an Indo-European-derived name, who was subsequently fused with the natively Semitic Dagan known from elsewhere.[202] Whether or not such a complex development really took place is difficult to say; however, I would propose that the dual vocalizations of *Dāgôn* and *dāgān* in Hebrew could point obliquely in a similar direction. One possible explanation for the discrepancy in vowels could be that the *Dāgôn* variant does not actually represent any Canaanite shift (at least not originally) but rather a loan from an Indo-European source that actually retained the *o*-vocalism of the original, Proto-Indo-European word. Additionally, such a form could also be attested in the Babylonian variant version of the name, *Daguna*.

In fact, it is my belief that the forms with *o/u* vocalism may be necessary for understanding where the divine name really came from. For the fact is that it can hardly be denied that there may be a sound inner-Afro-Asiatic etymological origin for the "normal" word *dāgān* ("grain" or "corn"); the suggestion that one comes across in the literature is that the "grain" word is to be connected with a (Proto-)West Chadic word **dang-* ("corn") which, according to Orel and Stolbova, represents a metathesized reflex of the same word found in Hebrew *dāgān* (they actually reconstruct the Proto-Afro-Asiatic form as **dagan-*).[203] If

[201] Singer 2000: 224.

[202] Singer 1992, esp. pp. 445-446.

[203] Orel and Stolbova 1995: 143 (no. 620). The online lexical corpus of Militarev and Stolbova (2003) proposes a wider array of cognates, including Egyptian *ḏd.w* ("a kind of

this is really the source of *dāgān* (etc.), one will have to reckon with a situation in which the borrowed *dāgôn* word was secondarily identified with the inherited Afro-Asiatic root. Indeed, the dual vocalizations could very well support this, and such a scenario would fit quite well with the account proposed by Singer in his earlier, 1992 article. Such a scenario is really not very strange: if an early Semitic language borrowed an Indo-European word meaning "earth" and used it as a name for a divine figure while at the same time possessing a similar-sounding word meaning something like "corn," it would be hard not to associate them with one another. It might be objected that this would obviate any need to bring Indo-European into the equation at all, but it should be pointed out that (a) the attested writing ^{d}KUR of Dagan's name does not mean "grain" but possibly "land/earth," and that (b) the "grain" word is unattested in East Semitic, whereas the name of the god occurs there as well. The Afro-Asiatic etymology mentioned above is not very certain, either. A simple equation between the divine name and the "grain" word seems too easy to me, whereas a secondary identification between the two words appears more plausible.

This type of adaptation, identifying a borrowed word with a phonetically and semantically similar inherited one in order to associate not only the meanings of the words but also their phonological shapes with each other, actually has a specific name in linguistic theory: *phono-semantic matching*. This term, created by Ghilʿad Zuckermann in reference to Modern Hebrew (or Israeli, as he likes to refer to the language) is used to describe a situation in which one language borrows a word from another but modifies the borrowing to fit with a word in the inherited lexicon that both sounds somewhat like it and has a similar meaning.[204] In essence, a phono-semantic matching can be thought of as a sort of folk-etymology in action while borrowing takes place. One of Zuckermann's examples from Modern Israeli Hebrew is the Mediaeval Hebrew word *dibbûb* ("speech" or "inducing someone to speak"), which produced the Modern Israeli word *dibbuv*, "dubbing," partly because of its phonetic similarity to precisely that English word.[205] Similar cases occur in other languages as well. This, I argue, is a relevant possibility for *dāgôn* in relation to *dāgān*. We shall return to the idea of phono-semantic matching later on, as I believe that it may be relevant as an analytical tool for understanding other Indo-European influences in the biblical world as well.

---

grain"), a reconstructed Proto-Berber word **digi(n)* ("leguminous plant"), words for "beans" in Central Cushitic and Saho, etc. They reconstruct the original Proto-Afro-Asiatic form of the word as **da/ingw-*. Many of these suggestions seem rather far-fetched to me.

[204] For a presentation of the concept (and examples from various languages), see Zuckermann 2003: 34-37. Further presentations can be found in Zuckermann 2009: 58-60, in which phono-semantic matching is described (p. 58) as a case/process "in which a lexical item derives simultaneously from two (or more) sources which are (usually serendipitously) phonetically and semantically similar."

[205] Zuckermann 2009: 59. The notations of the words are my own, the translations are Zuckermann's.

7.4 Baal and Dagan at Ugarit, and the Title ḫtk dgn

A very interesting fact in the context of Dagan/Dagon as a possibly Indo-European-derived name is the association that appears to have existed between the divine figures of Baal and Dagan.[206] At Ugarit, for example, Baal is consistently associated with Dagan in a familial sense, being called *bn dgn* ("son of Dagan") and once *ḫtk dgn* (often translated as something along the lines of "descendant of Dagan"). One may well argue that this is to be read in the context of (a) the story of Baal's descent into the netherworld and (b) his title *zbl bʿl arṣ* ("the prince, Baal/Lord of the earth/netherworld"). If one posits the possibility that *dgn* originally means something like "earth," these associations between Baal and the earth/netherworld and the name Dagan become different ways of expressing the same idea.

Regarding the unclear expression *ḫtk dgn*, it has been suggested that the first half of the expression is actually derived from the *verbal* root *ḫtk*, meaning "to rule." Thus, a meaning "Lord [i.e., ruler] of rain" has been proposed by Nicolas Wyatt (interpreting *dgn* as "rain").[207] However, if we posit that the actual meaning is "earth," this line of reasoning would lead to the rather startling possibility that *ḫtk dgn* means "Ruler/Lord of the Earth," thus providing an exact parallel to *zbl bʿl arṣ* ("Prince, Lord of the Earth")!

Such an implied meaning could provide yet another clue to the strange fact of the Ugaritic Baal being said to be the "son" of both El and Dagan at the same time. This fact has been well elucidated by Noga Ayali-Darshan as having a background in Hurrian ideas concerning Teššub/Teššob (the closest Hurrian analogue of Baal), who appears to have been thought of as having two fathers, Anu and Kumarve[208] (and I agree with her conclusions), yet the present argument may have made the expressions even more fitting in Ugaritic, thus leaving the Ugaritic version of the relationship less of a "fossil" than Ayali-Darshan argues.[209]

7.5 Dagan and the Netherworld

Especially interesting from this point of view is the expression *dgn pgr*, which appears in KTU 6.13, line 2. A reference to *pgr* in connection with *dgn* also occurs in KTU 6.14, line 2.The exact meaning of this word is hotly debated and unclear, but most analyses of the word associate it in some way with death or

---

[206] Pointed out, e.g., in Green 2003: 205-206.

[207] Wyatt 1980: 378.

[208] The fact of the Hurrian storm god Teššob being described as having two fathers is due to the mythological story (preserved in Hittite translation in the text called *Kingship in Heaven*) of Kumarve biting off the penis of his own father Anu and thereby becoming "impregnated" by him, giving birth to Teššob. This story is usually seen as having influenced the tale of Kronos castrating his father Ouranos in Hesiod's *Theogony*. More on this will follow later in the chapter.

[209] Ayali-Darshan 2013; the remarks about the Ugaritic state of affairs representing a mythological "fossil" are found on p. 657.

funerary characteristics.[210] The text here thus seems to associate Dagan/Dagon with the sphere of the netherworld, which would be highly relevant if the name did indeed carry a connotation of "earth" (cf. the use of Ugaritic *arṣ* to designate the land of the dead). In the same way, it could be argued that Baal's association with *dgn* could have to do with the stories about his death and sojourn in the netherworld.

It is a rather often recurring idea that Dagan was in some way or another a deity of the netherworld, or at least one intimately connected with the religious sphere of death and dying. The most important point that has been argued in this direction is the fact that the type of sacrifice known as *pagrû(m)* (etc.) is attested many times as having Dagan as their recipient—not only at Ugarit but also at other Syrian sites such as Mari. This type of reasoning is, however, flatly rejected by Lluis Feliu in his large study of the Syrian attestations of Dagan worship. He contends that Dagan was the recipient of these sacrifices simply because he was the greatest and most central god and not because of any specifically chthonic characteristics. Feliu states that "Dagan is the recipient because he is the creator father god [sic]," an explanation that I personally find rather weak.[211] Another piece of evidence associating Dagan with the netherworld is the fact that a reference to a temple of Dagan occurs in connection with a *bīt kispi* (a funerary temple) at Terqa in an inscription of Adad-Nirari I.[212] In sum, if one accepts some form of netherworld connection as being associated with Dagan, the proposed Indo-European "earth" background fits extremely well. The god Dagan is the ruler of things connected with the earth since his name actually means "earth."

If one looks at the epithets that Dagan is given in early texts from the Ancient Near East, one finds one in particular that fits well with an interpretation of the god as being connected with the "earth," both in the sense of the physical earth and in that connected with the "earth" as underworld. This is the expression (occurring at Emar) *Dagan bēl ḫarri*, which appears to mean something like "Dagan, lord of the hole."[213] This title goes together well with an image of Dagan as being related to the earth in general, and the netherworld more specifically.

7.6 An "Indo-European" Dagan/Dagon and the Hebrew Bible

An analysis of the name Dagon as being derived from (some form of) the Indo-European "earth" word may provide more than an etymological curiosity. If one presupposes that the original meaning was alive or present at some level in the Hebrew use of the name also, the passages in which Dagon appears in the Hebrew Bible gain a new level of possibly intended meaning.

---

[210] For an overview, see suggestions and references in *DUL*: 655 (s.v. *pgr*).

[211] Feliu 2003: 306.

[212] Healey 1999: 217.

[213] Feliu 2003: 106, 242. Notably written ^{d}KUR EN *ḫarri*, using the "earth/mountain" Sumerogram as the writing of his name.

The name of the Philistine Dagon appears in 1 Sam 5, in the story about how the Ark of the Covenant ended up in the hands of the Philistines in Ashdod. Here we read:

> *Ûpělištîm lāqĕḥû ʾēt ʾărôn hāʾĕlōhîm waybīʾūhû mēʾeben hāʿēzer ʾašdôdâ / wayyiqḥû pělištîm ʾet-ʾărôn hāʾĕlōhîm wayyābīʾû ʾōtô bêt dāgôn wayyaṣṣîgû ʾōtô ʾēṣel dāgôn / wayyaškīmû ʾašdôdîm mimmoḥŏrāt wĕhinnēh dāgôn nōpēl lĕpānāyw ʾarṣâ lipnê ʾărôn YHWH wayyiqḥû ʾet-dāgôn wayyāšībû ʾōtô limqômô / wayyaškīmû babbōqer mimmoḥŏrāt wĕhinnēh dāgôn nōpēl lĕpānāyw ʾarṣâ lipnê ʾărôn YHWH wĕrōʾš dāgôn ûštê kappôt yādāyw kĕrūtôt ʾel-hammiptān raq gēwô*[214] *nišʾar ʿālāyw / ʿal-kēn lōʾ-yidrĕkû kōhănê dāgôn wĕkol-habbāʾîm bêt-dāgôn ʿal-miptan dāgôn bĕʾašdôd ʿad hayyôm hazzeh*
> (1 Sam 5:1-5)
>
> The Philistines took the Ark of God and brought it from Eben Haezer to Ashdod; the Philistines took the Ark of God and brought it into the temple of Dagon, and they placed it before Dagon. The Ashdodites awoke early on the following day, and Dagon had fallen on his face towards the earth before the Ark of YHWH. They took Dagon and returned him to his place. They awoke early in the morning on the following day, and Dagon had fallen on his face towards the earth before the Ark of YHWH; the head of Dagon and his two hands were [lying] severed on the threshold. Only his central trunk was left on him. For this reason, the priests of Dagon and the people who come to the temple of Dagon do not step upon the threshold of Dagon—until this day.

This embarrassing defacement of the statue of Dagon may carry with it an even more subtle association if the possible Indo-European background of the name is taken into account. If one reckons with the possibility that the author of the text was at some level aware of a connotation "earth" inherent in the name of the god, the repeated phrase *wĕhinnēh dāgôn nōpēl lĕpānāyw ʾarṣâ* ("Dagon had fallen on his face towards the earth") suddenly represents a cruel irony: the god called "Earth" has fallen to the earth! The collapse of the statue becomes even more poignant, and it appears that the old, etymological meaning was used for literary purposes (as a pun) by the author.[215]

---

[214] Reading follows, among others, McCarter 1980: 119; MT has *dāgôn* here as well. The adopted reading is based on Vulgate (*truncus*) and LXX (ῥάχις, normally something like "lower part of the back"). The MT reading is clearly secondary and represents the *lectio simplicior* in this case. The reading *dĕgô* (something like "his fish" or "[the part of] him that was a fish"), originally proposed by Wellhausen and appearing in BHKApp, has been rightly rejected in BHSApp, probably due to its being based on the folk-etymology deriving the name Dagon from *dāg* ("fish"); for the latter point, see Healey 1999: 218.

[215] This, of course, is not the only instance of a combination of the verb *nāpal* and *ʾarṣâ*, but the background sketched here may make it especially poignant.

This possible dual layer of meaning becomes even more suggestive, as we know from other texts in the Hebrew Bible that mock non-Israelite divinities that this is often done by arguing that they fail within their own supposed sphere of competence—see, e.g., how Elijah mocks the worshipers of Baal on Carmel in 1 Kings 18 by implying that Baal cannot bring rain and battle drought and how the "anti-idol" texts in Deutero-Isaiah complain that the Babylonian gods can neither eat nor speak (though offerings were made to them and oracles were supposedly received from them) and that they have to be carried around the city by their devotees, being themselves unable to walk.[216] If a god etymologically associated with the earth falls to the earth, this could be construed as a similarly embarrassing situation.

A similar reference may perhaps be found in another passage[217] that mentions Dagon, i.e. the story of Samson and his capture by the Philistines. Judg 16:23 says the following:

> *Wĕsarnê pĕlištîm neʾĕspû lizbōaḥ zebaḥ-gādôl lĕdāgôn ʾĕlōhêhem ûlĕšimḥâ wayyōʾmĕrû nātan ʾĕlōhênû bĕyādēnû ʾēt šimšôn ʾôyĕbênû*
>
> The governors of the Philistines gathered together to offer up a great sacrifice to Dagon, their god, and for a feast. And they said: "Our god has delivered Samson, our enemy, into our hands!"

Note here the clear opposition between Dagon, the Philistine god, and Samson, the Israelite warrior. Again, if we look at the etymologies of these two names, an artful literary construct appears. The name Samson*/šimšôn* is derived from the noun *šemeš*, "sun," which means that the name etymologically signifies something like "the little sun" or "the one of the sun."[218] And if Dagon means "earth," the above verse becomes in effect an artful juxtaposition of earth and sun. The god Earth and the hero Sun are doing battle with each other.

Such a juxtaposition can be read in (at least) two ways, which are not necessarily mutually contradictory. The first possibility is seeing the binary opposition of earth and sun as symbolizing the one between the fertile land (and grain!) and the burning, destructive sun. Such appears to be the point of view articulated by Philippe Guillaume in his exegesis of the Dagon texts of the Old Testament.[219] Another possible reading would be to think of the proposed "netherworld" aspect of Dagon (and of his putative etymological origin in the

---

[216] I want to thank Blaženka Scheuer (p.c.) for pointing this aspect out to me. My analysis of the Carmel narrative and Elijah's mocking of Baal in that text (in relation to Ugaritic narratives) can be found in Wikander 2014: 131-143 (esp. pp. 136-137).

[217] A further reference to Dagon also occurs later on in 1 Sam 5 (in v. 6).

[218] For an overview of the discussion concerning Samson's name, see *HALOT*: 1592-1593 (s.v. *šimšôn*), with many references to further literature.

[219] "The Samson cycle presents another one of the grain's enemy [sic]: the scorching sun that regularly dries up the ears before the full development of the grain." (Guillaume 2005: 190).

Indo-European word for "earth") in combination with the well-established "chthonic" characteristics of the figure of the sun in many Ancient Near Eastern religious traditions (the sun passing into the realm of the dead at night).

As I have argued in Wikander 2014, Northwest Semitic religious tradition (especially the Ugaritic texts) symbolically combine the idea of the sun travelling into the subterranean land of the dead with the role of the sun in bringing death-inducing drought to the land.[220] If one presupposes that the name Dagon did at some point actually mean "earth" (and thereby, by implication, "netherworld"), the fact of a god with that name being overpowered by a hero bearing a name meaning "little sun" provides quite an interesting mythological parallel to the Ugaritic motifs of the sun goddess Shapshu burning the land while serving the god of death, Mot.[221]

In the above-mentioned biblical cases, then, reading the name Dagon as being derived from the Indo-European word for "earth"—and presupposing that this meaning was at some level known to the authors—renders the text deeper and more significant and exposes yet another layer of literary sophistication in them. Doing so may in fact reveal yet another subtext to the narrative of Samson ("the little sun") overcoming Dagon. In early Indo-European sources, it is not uncommon to divide the world of deities and humans into two spheres, that of the "heavenly" (i.e., divine) and "earthly" (i.e., human) beings, respectively. Such is the thinking underlying a word occurring in a Gaulish inscription from Vercelli, mentioning *TEUOXTONION* ("heavenly and earthly beings," i.e., "gods and humans"), in which the second half (*-XTONION*) represents a derivation ("earthly") of exactly the complex **$d^h(e)\hat{g}^h$om*-word which is the subject of the present chapter, and the first half is derived from the Proto-Indo-European **deiwo-* ("heavenly, i.e., divine").[222] If we toy with the possibility of such an Indo-European-derived thinking being alive under the surface of the Samson text, another stratum of meaning suggests itself. Samson, the "little sun," bears a name that is decidedly "heavenly," yet he is the mortal man. The divine being, Dagon, is the "earthling" that is defeated. The story thus mocks this Indo-European theological idea by inverting it. The heavenly one is the man, and he conquers the earthly one, who was supposed to be a god.

A possible later sign of the interpretation of the words/names Dagon and *dāgān* as having a chthonic association can perhaps be found in the early Jewish reception of Hos 14:8, a verse that includes the following words about those who dwell "in his [YHWH's] shadow":

---

[220] For a brief presentation of my results in this area, see esp. pp. 247-257 in Wikander 2014.

[221] For my exegesis of the relevant texts from the Baal Cycle, see Wikander 2014: 23-47.

[222] On the Indo-European division into heavenly gods and earthly humans, see, e.g., West 2007: 124-125 (also mentioning the Gaulish inscription, as well as other examples of the phenomenon).

[…] *yĕḥayyû dāgān*	They shall make grain live (=grow?),
wĕyiprĕḥû kaggāpen	and they shall bloom like a garden.
[…]	

The words are quoted according to the MT, which is almost certainly textually corrupt here; however, it is that specific text which concerns us, as it seems to be the one reflected in the rather free rendering of Targum Yonathan, which instead of talking of "making grain live" tries to interpret the strange expression *yĕḥayyû dāgān* using the Aramaic phrase *yēḥôn mîtayyâ*, "the dead shall live." Apparently, the translator had trouble understanding what *yĕḥayyû dāgān* meant, and inserted a reference to the resurrection of the dead. It seems that the word *dāgān* carried with it some kind of association with the semantic sphere of the netherworld or dying. This could be a sign that the possible background of the words *dāgān* and/or *dāgôn* as having to do with earth or the netherworld was conceptually alive in the mind of the targumic translator, even though the different vocalizations (*dāgān* and *dāgôn*) appear here to be conflated. If the figure of Dagan/Dagon—or rather his name—once carried a lexical connection to "earth," this could be yet another reflex of that background.[223]

7.7 Excursus: Methodological Issues Inherent in Searching for Etymological Meanings of Divine Names

These possibilities do, however, raise several methodological questions. Even if one does accept that the name Dagan/Dagon *is* derived from the Indo-European "earth" word, the question remains how much of such an "original" meaning can have been preserved into the time of the writing of the Deuteronomistic history. There appears to be no sign of the name ever meaning "earth" in ordinary Hebrew discourse.[224] This means that it is highly unlikely indeed that an Israelite audience "heard" the name Dagon as referring to "earth" when the text was read to them. However, one may well imagine a situation in which the name was generally associated with a "chthonic sphere," as it were, especially given a possible conflation with an inherited Afro-Asiatic etymon meaning something like "grain" (*vel sim.*).

As a typological parallel to such a state of affairs, one can mention the ancient Norse god Thor (in his various etymological manifestations). Most speakers of Nordic languages today are probably unaware that this name etymologically means "thunder" (Old Norse *Þorr*), but they may still well be aware of the mythological association that once existed between him and the powers of thunder and lightning (and in this case, also, there is a contemporary Swedish word *tordön*, meaning "thunder," which is both etymologically and

[223] I want to thank Magnus Halle for rewarding discussions concerning the Targum to Hosea 13-14.

[224] This very point (in fact extended to Semitic in general) is made in Feliu 2003: 285. A similar criticism is found in Del Olmo Lete 2001: 86. See however, the above argument concerning Targum Yonathan.

superficially easily connected with the name of the deity). It could of course be objected that these associations being alive among modern speakers represents reception of earlier religio-historical scholarship, but a similar situation may have been part of the process concerning Dagon as well: even though the peoples of the Ancient Near East did not know religio-historical method, it is clear that they discussed and compared the roles of the various deities worshiped. This has been well pointed out by Mark S. Smith in his book *God in Translation*, in which he posits that ancient *interpretatio* of gods between various cultures in essence constituted a type of pre-scholarly study of comparative religion.[225]

There are other cases in the Hebrew Bible in which "proto-history-of-religion" type arguments appear to be made—see, for example, 1 Kgs 18:28, where it is mentioned that the priests of Baal on Mt. Carmel cry and maim themselves *kĕmišpāṭām*, "according to their manner." This expression does seem to imply that the author of the text (and, implicitly, his audience) were privy to a form of proto-religio-historical speculation about the believed essence of Baal and the ways of worshiping him.[226] In a similar manner, one could well imagine a situation in which ancient Israelites knew that the divine figure Dagon had something to do with earth, ground or grain, without them thereby having any notion of the original etymology of the name (which would anyway be lost in the mists of time by the writing of the Deuteronomistic History).

There are, in fact, signs that Dagon's name could be associated with the idea of a verdant land (specifically connected to the semantic sphere of "earth") even during Old Testament times. An example of this can be found in the funerary inscription of Eshmunazar II of Sidon, which refers to the plain of Sharon as "Dagon's rich land" (*ʾrṣt dgn hʾdrt*).[227]

These methodological questions point to a major one: that of the general risk of falling into the "etymological fallacy" when performing studies of the sort carried out here. This fallacy consists in consciously or unconsciously presupposing that there is a "basic" or even "real" sense inherent in a word or a name, and that this sense is always built into the word, regardless of temporal situation or semantic change. The idea that words have an "actual" and unchangeable meaning has been justly criticized, especially when used for doing history of religion. However, I believe that it is possible to work with "etymological poetics" without falling into this trap.

It is a fact that a word, name or mythological construct can carry multiple levels of meaning with it. In this context, I would like to refer to the argument made in section 4.6 about the multilayered meanings of the name of the Hittite

---

[225] See esp. Smith 2010: 47, where it is stated that ancient translating deity-lists (in this case, those from Ugarit) represent "an implicit theory of typology of divinity, and thus an indigenous form of analysis corresponding to the classification of deities found in the modern study of comparative religion."

[226] I made this point previously in Wikander 2014: 139.

[227] Pointed out in Guillaume 2005: 190. The words are found at *KAI* 14:19.

Storm God (called "the Conqueror") and the title of the Ugaritic Baal as *aliyn* ("Victorious," "Conqueror," or "extremely powerful")—as well as relevant cognates of the Anatolian epithet in Indo-Aryan—in connection with the names of the serpents they battle. That argument shows, I believe, how etymological meanings can lie behind names and titles as a source of references and puns, without them actually "controlling" the contemporary meaning of a particular word, name or title.

7.8 Phonological Implications for the Source Language

If the various Dagon/Dagan words do, indeed, represent a loan from some Indo-European language or other, the form of the word may yield some interesting results when studied from a linguistic perspective. In that case, it is quite important that the Semitic versions of the word consistently show two voiced consonants—a *d* and a *g*—when representing some sort of reflex of Proto-Indo-European **d^h(e)$\hat{g}^h$om*. This fact means that the putative Indo-European language or dialect from which the word was borrowed was one in which (a) the complex phonotactic structure sometimes known in Indo-European linguistics as a "*thorn* cluster"[228] had the sound order "dental-dorsal" (as in Anatolian and Tocharian) and not "dorsal-dental" (as in Greek) or other variants (such as Indo-Aryan, which puts the dorsal first and turns the other sound into a sibilant) and (b) one in which the reflexes of the "voiced aspirate" sound here appearing in such a cluster at least appeared to have voice as a relevant phonetic trait. The only known Indo-European sub-family for which both of these criteria are probably true is the Anatolian one, and even in that case the evidence is very convoluted when it comes to the question of voice. It is highly unclear if voice was really phonemic in Anatolian languages or if the corresponding distinction was rather one of geminate/non-geminate or fortis/lenis (Proto-Indo-European voiced and voiced-aspirate stops falling together as "voiced"/fortis/non-geminate in Anatolian), and Craig Melchert also posits a possible "de-voicing" of initial consonants over the whole sub-phylum.[229] Also, as mentioned above, the forms of the name showing an *ô*-vowel could possibly point to different routes of transmission having been involved. Still, Anatolian languages provide the most plausible background for a borrowing.[230]

---

[228] *Thorn* clusters are combinations of sounds in Proto-Indo-European that appear in some descendant languages as a dorsal followed by some kind of sibilant, wheras others have a both a velar/dorsal and a dental stop (cf. the relationship between Sanskrit *kṣam-* and its Greek cognate χθών, both representing the "earth" word). Anatolian and Tocharian has shown that the clusters in question were apparently originally of the structure dental-dorsal, which was later metathesized and changed in various ways.

[229] Melchert 1994: 18-20.

[230] One may note with some interest that in Hittite, the locative form of the reflex of **d^h(e)$\hat{g}^h$om-* is actually no less than *dagan* (=*dgan*?). This form does, however, seem an unlikely source of a divine name: it is hard to imagine somebody calling their god "in the earth." More interesting would be the oft-occurring compound *dagan-zipa*, meaning something like "earth-spirit," with the second part of the compound being a borrowing

7.9 The Question of Gender

As I see it, one of the most potent objections to Indo-European as the source of the name Dagan/Dagon is the matter of gender. In most Indo-European languages, the reflexes of the **$d^h(e)\hat{g}^h$om-* word are feminine. Hittite is, it must be granted, an exception (in that language, the word is neuter), but the compound *daganzipa-* (the "earth spirit") was regarded as a feminine being, even though Hittite does not show a morphological distinction between masculine and feminine. This means that—if we want to accept a derivation of Dagan from **$d^h(e)\hat{g}^h$om-* as at least plausible—we must somehow account for the fact that Dagan/Dagon is universally described as a masculine deity in Northwest Semitic and Syria-Palestine generally.

This is, I would argue, not impossible, however. Given the presence of numerous male deities connected with (a) the arable land and (b) the netherworld in the Semitic-speaking Ancient Near East (the Ugaritic Baal being a prime example), it is not hard to imagine the word being transferred into the masculine semantic realm. This would be especially fitting in the Syrian milieu, given that the solar deity was there often construed as feminine (as in the case of the Ugaritic Shapshu), whereas the East Semitic Shamash was masculine. The "sun" word itself is a good example of how easy it apparently was to change the gender of gods representing natural phenomena—even in the Hebrew language itself, the word *šemeš* can be both masculine and feminine. Thus, the apparently great obstacle of the Indo-European word having been feminine is, I believe, not as difficult as one might think.

7.10 A Possible Parallel Case: ʿAṯtar(t) and Indo-European *h₂ster-

In order to put the possibility of Dagan/Dagon being derived from Indo-European into perspective, one could compare with the case of the various Semitic deities derived from the root *ʿṯtr* (among these are the Ugaritic *ʿAṯtar*, his feminine counterpart *ʿAṯtart*, the Hebrew *ʿAštōret*/*ʿAštārôt* and probably the Akkadian *Ištar*), which can be plausibly argued originally to be a borrowing from the Indo-European root reconstructed as **$h_2$ster-*, meaning "star" (a root which actually happens to be the etymological origin of the modern English

---

from the non-Indo-European Hattic language, which was spoken indigenously in Asia Minor prior to the arrival of the Hittites. The beginning of this word does, after all, look exactly like the name of the Syrian god.

There are a number of cases in the preserved textual material about Dagan in which he is associated with armies or troops—Akkadian *ṣābu(m)*—or otherwise involved with warfare. One could image an unattested epithet of Dagan sounding something like **Dagan ṣābi* ("Dagan of the army"), which could in turn have represented a reinterpretation of a borrowing from Anatolian *dagan-zipa*. This, however, is entirely speculative, as no such epithet has been preserved in actual texts, only a general association with armies and warlike activities, from which such an epithet could theoretically be reconstructed.

word "star" itself).[231] If the root of the names of these Semitic divine figures represent loans from Indo-European (which I find highly likely), it provides a sort of template of comparison for Dagan/Dagon. Also, it would certainly be interesting if two cases in which Indo-European words have been borrowed into early Semitic as divine names happen to be (a) a word for the earth and (b) a word for a star.

One is almost reminded of the famous passage from the Baal Cycle:

rgm ʿṣ . w lḫšt . abn	[…] A word of wood and whisper of stone,
tant . šmm . ʿm . arṣ	a talk between heaven and earth,
thmt . ʿmn . kbkbm	from the depths to the stars:
abn . brq . d l . tdʿ . šmm	I understand the lightning that the heavens know not,
rgm l tdʿ . nšm .	the word that the people do not know,
w l . tbn hmlt . arṣ .	and the masses of the earth do not understand.
atm . w ank ibġyh .	Come, and I will reveal it!
(KTU 1.3 III 22-29)	

The two concepts envelop the whole world, which could possibly entail the possibility that they were borrowed together. Also, one may note that the Semitic deities based on *ʿṯtr* are both masculine and feminine, thus proving that the question of gender need not be deciding in and of itself.

7.11 Dagan/Dagon, Kumarve/Kumarbi, and Kronos

One highly intriguing possibility raised by the interpretation of Dagan/Dagon as having to do with the Indo-European "earth" word is what such an exegesis could imply in the light of parallel divine figures and mythological motifs involving them in the greater Ancient Near East—and in ancient Greece. This possibility rests upon the equation/syncretism/*interpretatio* sometimes made in antiquity between Dagan and the Hurrian deity Kumarve (often rendered, somewhat incorrectly, as Kumarbi).[232] In mythological contexts, Kumarve is

[231] For a recent statement of some arguments for the Indo-European "star" word being involved in background of the Semitic words, see Wilson-Wright 2015.

[232] As mentioned by Feliu (2005: 299), there is no preserved god list that equates Dagan and Kumarve outright; however, he goes on to mention that he believes that there is clear indirect evidence for the equation at Ugarit, where the Ugaritic sacrifice order *ilib* ("father-god"), El, Dagan is matched by the order *in atn, il, kmrb* in a Hurrian sacrificial list, also from Ugarit. The Ugaritic text involved is lines 1-3 of KTU 1.118, which has exact parallels in KTU 1.147, lines 2-4 and 1.148, lines 1-2 (in the latter cases with some damaged names). The same order is attested in the Akkadian-language list RS 20.024, lines 1-3. All of these texts are available for synoptic reading in Pardee (*RCU*), text number 1. The Hurrian parallel text from Ugarit is KTU 1.42 (=RS 1004); however, one should notice that the three deities are not directly adjacent in that text: *in atn* ("father-god") is in line 1, whereas *il* (El) and *kmrb* (Kumarve) appear in line 6 (and then again, in

perhaps best known from the story often referred to in scholarship as *Kingship in Heaven* but now known to have had a title meaning approximately *The Song of Going Forth*;[233] it is preserved only in a Hittite version. A central motif in that story is that of Kumarve emasculating Anu, his father, by biting of his genitals, which leads to Kumarve being in a sense impregnated and giving life to the Storm God (referred to in Hittite by a writing with a phonetic complement clearly implicating the Hittite Storm God, *Tarḫunna-*,[234] whom we have already met in this study, but probably originally representing the Hurrian Teššob). As is well-known, this story is often regarded by modern scholarship as having been the template for Hesiod's description of Kronos castrating his father Ouranos and the resulting birth of Zeus in the *Theogony*.[235] What Noga Ayali-Darshan suggested in her above-mentioned article on Baal's dual parentage is that a similar tradition underlies Baal at Ugarit being said to be the son both of El and of Dagan. This possibility is especially alluring as (a) Dagan and Kumarve appear at times to have been identified with each other, and (b) the parallel between Baal and Teššob was common.

A similar story is also recounted by Philo of Byblos about the birth of Zeus Demarous (the latter a known epithet of Baal, also attested at Ugarit in the form *dmrn*). Philo's story is, however, somewhat different, in that it identifies Kronos not with Dagon but with "Elos" (i.e. El) and mentions Dagon as a separate character, who acts as a sort of "extra father" to Demarous. Yet, the basic idea of Baal/Demarous's double parentage is present here as well, and Dagon and Kronos are given as parts of the same generation of gods.[236]

---

the directive case, in line 7). However, the fit may perhaps be good enough to be taken as a piece of support for the Dagan/Kumarve equation at Ugarit. For a recent study of KTU 1.42, interpreting it as a ritual of anointment of deities, see Lam 2011, who, however, regards the combination of *il* and *kmrb* in the text not as talking of two different deities but as a single one, "Ilu-Kumarbe" (p. 159, n. 57), an interpretation that would render the text useless as an argument for a Dagon-Kumarve syncretism. Feliu (2005: 299-300) does, however, adduce various other pieces of evidence for the Dagan-Kumarve equation in the Ancient Near East, for example in the form of a common association with the city of Tuttul.

[233] On the ancient title of the work, see van Dongen 2011: 182, n. 3 (whose rendering of the title I have followed). The original discoverer of the ancient title of the text is Corti (2007), who renders it (pp. 119-120) as "Song of Genesis/Beginning." The original expression (in Sumerograms) is SÌR GÁ×È.A. Strauss Clay and Gilan (2014) use the rendering "Song of Emergence," and connect this term to the usage of verbs for making things "emerge" (ἀνίημι and ἴημι) as signs of the close relationship between the Greek *Theogony* story and the Hurro-Hittite background thereof.

[234] Pointed out in van Dongen 2011: 182, n. 4.

[235] For an early example of the connection, see Güterbock 1948. A modern study presupposing a very close correspondence is Strauss Clay and Gilan 2014. For a general survey, see Scully 2015: 50-55.

[236] See Ayali-Darshan 2013: 654-655 and Smith 2001: 57-59. The central passage from Philo of Byblos is preserved in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* 1.10.18-19.

The stories, though similar, are certainly not identical. The Philo version, for example, posits a further generation, represented by Ouranos, which has no clear counterpart in the Ugaritic story (but does, however, fit very well with the sky god Anu in the Hurro-Hittite version). There was clearly a conflation of various generations and stories: is Kumarve to be compared to El or Dagon in the story, for example?

Regardless of whether one regards Dagan and El as allies in a single divine generation fighting the sky god (as in the Philo of Byblos version) or believe that somehow El himself stood in for Anu/Ouranos in a putative Ugaritic myth, the similarity of motifs becomes even more fitting if one presupposes that the name Dagan originally carries with it a meaning connected to "earth." Then, one would get an even clearer illustration of the concept of an "earthly" or agriculturally connected deity rising against an elder (heavenly?) progenitor, thus giving rise to the thunder god. And what does this make of Baal's mythological roles, as they are described at Ugarit? The answer is that Baal in effect becomes the perfect combination of the "heavenly" and "earthy" characteristics that may have been implicit in his coming-to-be. He is a Cloudrider (*rkb ʿrpt*), a thunder god, who yet descends to the dark netherworld.[237] Compare this opposition of "above" and "below" to what was suggested about Dagan and Samson earlier in this chapter.

7.12 Conclusions

Is there, then, enough evidence to say conclusively that the divine name Dagan/Dagon derives from Indo-European? To a question put that harshly, one would have to answer a *non liquet*; however, such an interpretation fits very well with many pieces of circumstantial evidence. An interpretation of this sort would even provide exegetical clues for the two Old Testament texts concerning Dagon. A god whose name is sometimes written with a Sumerogram that may mean "earth," who appears to be associated with agriculture, the etymology of whose name is unclear—such a god could well represent a loan from an Indo-European "earth" root that was undoubtedly present in the Ancient Near East.

[237] As, indeed, does the Hurrian Teššob in the Hurrian/Hittite bilingual *Epic of Liberation*—see KBo XXXII 13 *recto* I 9-10 (Hurrian)/*recto* II 9-10 (Hittite), available in transcription and translation in the edition of Neu (1996: 220-221). In the Hittite version, the name Teššob as translated as ^{d}IM (Storm God, *Tarḫunna-*), as usual.

8. Strangers, Boundary-Crossers, and Young Predators in Hebrew and Indo-European: *gwr*, **h₃erbʰ-*, and *ḫabiru*

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss certain parallels between a Hebrew (Northwest Semitic) and an ancient Indo-European social concept, and possible avenues of interaction between them, as well as illustrative typological parallels in their semantic developments. The intention is that such a comparison may serve to illustrate a few points relevant to the interpretation of both. Certainly, such terms rarely have a one-to-one correspondence between any two languages or linguistic cultures, but comparing and contrasting specific terminology having similar spheres of meaning can help in elucidating these spheres when they overlap in the relevant ancient languages (whereas they may be missing in modern western ones, which thus provide no viable *comparandum*). For an illustration of this methodology one need not look further than the much-discussed comparison between the juridical use of the Hebrew verbal root *zʿq*/*sʿq* and the mediaeval German concept of *Zetergeschrei*, which has often been thought as an illustrative example of a parallel institution which can shed light on the Israelite one.[238]

The two concepts that are the focus of the present chapter are:

- the Hebrew verbal root *gwr* ("to sojourn, to live as a resident alien in a territory") with its nominal derivation *gēr* ("resident alien, stranger, immigrant"),

  and

- the Proto-Indo-European verbal root reconstructed as **h₃erbʰ-*, which appears to have had the approximate meaning "to switch group alliance, to leave one (social) group and become attached to another."

In a third instance, I will also touch upon

- the much-debated Hebrew *ʿibrî* and its putative background in *ḫabiru*, etc.

Thus, I will analyze expressions for boundary-crossing, and groups that operate by performing such actions, in the biblical/Semitic and Indo-European milieux. As we shall see in this chapter, there are a number of interestingly parallel developments in the way that the two linguistic/cultural spheres encode these ideas, and I will also discuss a possible historical connection between them. Such a connection may have been direct in a linguistic sense (i.e., involving loanwords), or it may have been more abstract, entailing shared modes of

[238] For a retrospective of the *Zetergeschrei* discussion with references and a critical assessment thereof, see Albertz 1997: 1091.

encoding social categories (but not necessarily using the same words). Of course, one must also methodologically be open to the possibility that such similarities are completely serendipitous and due to chance (or, rather, to similar social realities requiring some kind of linguistic and/or literary expression); earlier in the book (see section 4.1), I have questioned attempts to find Dumézilian trifunctionalism "imported" into the Hebrew Bible on precisely such a basis. However, in that case, the problem was bigger, as the very existence of the Dumézilian tripartite division of Proto-Indo-European society is debatable, to say the least. If one limits oneself to social concepts that are more or less securely reconstructable for the proto-language, one will perforce stand on more stable ground, with the comparison/parallel between the two relevant cultural spheres (Indo-European and Old Testament, in this case) being the issue to subscribe to or reject, rather than the entire existence of one of the phenomena to be compared, as in the case of comparing Dumézil's pattern with alleged parallels in the Old Testament.

8.1 *Hebrew* gēr*: A Crosser of Boundaries*

The Hebrew word *gēr* has been defined by Frank Anthony Spina in the following way:

> It is generally acknowledged that *gēr* in the Hebrew Bible refers to people who are no longer directly related to their original social setting and who have therefore entered into dependent relationships with various groups or officials in a new social setting […]. The *gēr* was of another tribe, city, district, or country who was without customary social protection or privilege and of necessity had to place himself under the jurisdiction of someone else […].[239]

It is the aspect of the *gēr* as a "crosser of boundaries" that occasions the comparison that I here intend to make. To perform the action signified by the verb *gwr* appears to involve leaving one group, category or social setting and attaching oneself to another. To be a *gēr* is to be a boundary-crosser: it is not merely a question of finding a place to live but one of changing one's social status and allegiance, a fact that is underscored by the use of *gwr*/*gēr* to signify religious conversion to Judaism in Rabbinic Hebrew. A convert is not simply one who is staying in your territory for a shorter duration—it is someone who has left his old religious community and formally attached himself to a new and different one. The use of the root *gwr* to describe the wanderings of Abraham in Genesis is highly interesting in this context, as his sojourns begin with YHWH's famous *lek lĕkā* exhortation in Gen 12:1 (telling Abraham to leave the land of his birth and his original social setting) and then involves him striking a type of "social deal" (a covenant) with that deity, who thereby accepts him into a new religio-social situation. It is this perhaps somewhat nebulous concept of "leaving

[239] Spina 1983: 323. Spina's references removed for readability.

one's social setting and entering another" that I would like to point out has a parallel in ancient Indo-European.

*8.2 The Root *h₃erbʰ- in Indo-European*

The early social sense of the root reconstructed as **h₃erbʰ-*[240] may have been most clearly and accurately preserved in the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European linguistic family, and it is its usage in that branch that has proved most central in elucidating its original social meaning. In Hittite, the best-preserved of the Anatolian languages, the root occurs as *ḫarp(p)-*,[241] and—as established by Calvert Watkins and Craig Melchert—the sense of the verb appears to have been very similar to what was mentioned above: leaving one's own group and becoming part of another. This verb is employed in the Hittite laws to describe both a husband and a wife divorcing each other and an ox straying into the wrong pen. In both cases, the question is one of separating from one group and entering into another.[242]

In other branches of the Indo-European family, the social significance of the verbal root comes especially into focus. Such is the case of the Latin word *orbus* ("bereft", originally "bereft of parents") and the Greek ὄρφανος (whence the English "orphan"). Here, the "passing into another group" consists of leaving one family and being attached to another. Just as was stated in the above quotation from Spina about Hebrew *gēr*, the question is one of abandoning the safe haven of one's social context and being forced into another, to which one is in a very real sense a stranger.

One should also note that in some Semitic languages, the root *gwr* has connotations having to do with being in a sort of patron-client relationship, a meaning which expresses a similar type of semantic development to the one of Indo-European **h₃erbʰ-* being applied to orphans entering into another family than they grew up in.

An especially interesting use of the Indo-European root **h₃erbʰ-* in some of the daughter branches concerns slavery or servitude. In a number of branches of the Indo-European family, the root has come to be used to signify being a slave or having to work. Such is the case in Slavic, where the meaning "to work" or "to serve" has become the primary meaning of the root, as shown in Old Church

---

[240] It could also be quite possible to reconstruct the root as **h₂erbʰ-*, as highlighted in Weiss 2006: 259, n. 11, though **h₃erbʰ-* is probably slightly more likely. I will use the latter reconstruction here.

[241] As pointed out in Melchert 1994: 153 and 2010: 186, the fact that the Hittite root ends in a geminate stop (*pp*) is not problematic for the etymological connection, even though the cognates in other Indo-European languages demand a voiced aspirate (**bʰ*), which is usually and regularly represented by ungeminated stop in Hittite (the so-called law of Sturtevant), since there are other examples of this unusual gemination occurring after the phoneme *r*.

[242] Watkins 2000: 60 (s.v. *orbh-*); Melchert 2010 (esp. p. 180, 186-187). Melchert's article, in particular, is highly illuminating and has created much of the background for the understanding of the Hittite root here presented.

Slavonic *rabŭ*, which means "slave" (representing a Proto-Indo-European nominal derivation *$*h_3orb^ho$-*). From the Slavic use of the root for expressing this type of connotation comes the loanword "robot"; the Germanic word appearing in German as *Arbeit* and in Old English as *earfoþe* (meaning "work" or "toil") may also be derived from the same root.

Craig Melchert and others have put forward the highly interesting (though, of course, somewhat speculative) idea that this use of a verbal root originally related to switching (often social) group-allegiances to signify working or slavery is an indication that this type of non-free hard work was something into which one was not born in Proto-Indo-European society, but that such work-forces were so to speak recruited through other means—presumably warlike ones. That is, slaves in the Proto-Indo-European milieu would primarily have been people that were coerced into passing from freedom into servitude—or, perhaps, people who had left their own social group (in which they were free) and had entered into the hegemony of another one.[243] This would of course not be the only type of "allegiance change" that the root would have signified in Proto-Indo-European, but rather an example of a type of such boundary-crossing that it may originally have indicated.

Another study of the Indo-European root in question has been published by Michael Weiss (2006). He argues that, while the meaning related to switching groups is certainly there in Anatolian, there is a simpler and more concrete basic meaning underlying it. Weiss holds that the Latin word *orbis* ("circle") is derived from the same root—and that this word provides a clue to its original meaning. This original meaning of the root was, according to Weiss, something like "to turn" (as said of a wheel), a meaning which was later expanded and made more abstract—turning from one group to another, so to speak. This makes him propose a somewhat different analysis of the derivatives of the word relating to family relations: for example, Weiss regards a number of words for "inheritance" derived from the root as having semantically developed along the lines of property that has been handed over ("turned over", so to speak—note that Modern English uses the same analogy); the slaves would have been "handed over" as well.

This reinterpretation of the root is certainly fascinating and, in the main, appears to me to be quite convincing. However, I find it most probable that the more abstract meaning related to group switching was present already in the Indo-European proto-language in addition to the more literal meaning of turning (as a circle or wheel does).[244]

8.3 Hebrew **gwr/gēr** *and Indo-European* **h_3erb^h-***: Parallel Social Realities*

All in all, the semantic spheres represented by Indo-European *$*h_3erb^h$-* show many parallels with those that appear to be associated with Hebrew *gwr*. Both verbs signify passing from one state into another, entering into a new social

[243] Melchert 2010: 186.

[244] The same view is held by Craig Melchert (p.c., email August 20, 2014).

contract, so to speak—and, not insignificantly, often into a socially less advantageous one (slavery, for example). To be sure, the semantics are not identical—the notion of living in a place is not inherent in the Indo-European root as it sometimes is in *gwr*, for example—but it should be noted that this meaning appears to be secondary in the case of the Hebrew verb as well (a fact clearly illustrated by the feeling of surprise that can strike a classical Hebraist when he or she is confronted with the fact that Modern Israeli Hebrew uses the verb in the simple sense of "to live [in a place], to reside", without any implied notion of that residence being temporary or "foreign" in any way).[245] The terms can also acquire a juridical nuance.[246]

I would like to propose that Hebrew *gwr* and Indo-European **h_3erb^h-* both represent a common social reality present in the ancient world (not least, of course, the Ancient Near East): that of one's social milieu collapsing and of being forced (by adventurousness or cruel fate) to ally oneself with another such milieu. They thus encode a similar or identical social circumstance.

If the hypothesis of Michael Weiss turns out to be correct, and the Indo-European root originally signified a physical movement and not just a social one, we have another possible parallel between the concepts. All in all, both the Indo-European and the Semitic root seem to have signified both a physical movement and a social one, one of transcending boundaries.

One especially interesting parallel (be it historical or just typological) to this double meaning can be found in the Arabic cognate of Hebrew *gwr*. The Arabic verb *jāra* can mean not only "to depart from" (a physical movement probably related to the "sojourning" meaning) but also "to transgress" or even "to commit a crime." This range of meaning illustrates well the possibility of using this type of root in both a concrete and an analogical, social/abstract way. The question is not only one of moving into a different territory but of transcending socially constructed boundaries as well as physical ones.

As has been pointed out by Karin Tillberg,[247] it is highly interesting that the Israelite exiles in 6th century BCE Babylonia are never referred to as *gērîm* in the extant biblical writings, whereas this term is applied to the Israelites when described as being in Egyptian slavery.[248] Given that the biblical accounts describe the passage of the Israelites into Egypt as being a question of famines forcing them to move there—and their subsequent enslavement by the Egyptian

---

[245] In Classical Hebrew, the verb used for such a situation would no doubt be *šākan* or *yāšab*.

[246] On Hebrew *gēr* as a legal term, see particularly van Houten 1991.

[247] In manuscript materials meant for her forthcoming doctoral dissertation in Old Testament/Hebrew Bible Exegesis at Uppsala University.

[248] Also pointed out by Spina (1983: 322), who notes two possible (but very weak) exceptions (one of them in his footnote 2 on p. 332): the first of these is Ez 1:4, which speaks of the Israelites in the Babylonian Exile using the verbal root *gwr* (though not referring to them by means of the actual noun *gēr*); the second one, Isa 14:1, is even less relevant, as it speaks not of the Israelites themselves but of the *gēr* (in a collective sense) *joining with the Israelites* in their return from Exile.

authorities, it is quite easy to see in this alleged process a social change from one group to another and a consequent loss of freedom (cf. the Indo-European use of **h₃erbʰ-* to designate slavery or servitude). The exiles in Babylon, however, do not appear to have been enslaved, and neither does their "move" to Babylon appear to have constituted a conscious leaving of their own group.

Common to the two roots is not only the idea of changing one's allegiance (often in a "negative" sense) but also the more general conceptualization of social movement being conflated with a physical one. The *gēr* is a person that physically moves into a new geographic setting, but he is also someone who crosses a more invisible border. In a similar way, the Hittite language uses *ḫarp(p)-* to describe animals accidentally erring into the wrong pen, while also applying it to more explicitly "social" contexts such as the splitting up of a married couple. Thus, both roots share this combination of both physical and social motion.

8.4 The Roots as Expressions of Transcending between the Realms of the Mortal and the Immortal

An especially interesting illustration of the way in which Hittite *ḫarp(p)-* can be used to describe someone playing an unexpected role in an unusual social context can be found in the tale of the battle between the Hittite Storm God (^{d}IM, **Tarḫunna-*) and the Serpent (^{MUŠ}*Illuyanka-*), a text discussed *in extenso* earlier in the book (see particularly sections 4.4 and 4.6). In that story, a mortal man named Ḫūpašiya is instructed by the goddess Inara to assist her in tricking the serpent by inviting him (the Serpent) to a feast (whereupon the monster can be slain by the Storm God). When asking Ḫūpašiya to help her (in an earlier part of the text than that quoted in chapter 4), Inara uses the expression *ziqq-a ḫar(a)pḫut*, meaning something like "come along you too and join with me."[249] Here, the Hittite reflex of Proto-Indo-European **h₃erbʰ-* (viz. *ḫarp(p)-*) is applied to a human assisting a divine being, i.e., crossing the boundary between the moral and immortal spheres in a very concrete way. As an additional illustration how much Ḫūpašiya's taking part in the plans of the goddess involves a traversing of the limits between the human and divine worlds, Inara openly invites him to have sex with her, which subsequently happens. The mortal man Ḫūpašiya does indeed take part in a very different sphere:

UMMA ^{d}*Inar* ^{m}*Ḫūpašiya*
kāša-wa kīya kīya uttar iyami
*nu-wa-mu-šša*n *ziqq-a ḫar(a)pḫut*
UMMA ^{m}*Ḫūpašiya ANA* ^{d}*Inar*
māwa katti-ti šešm[*i n*]*u-wa uwami*
kardiaš-taš iyami
[*n-aš katt*]*i-ši šešta*

[249] For the text on which I have based my normalizations, see again Beckman 1982. The passage quoted here (§§ 7-8) is directly followed by that quoted in section 4.4.

Thus spoke Inara to Ḫūpašiya:
"Look, I am doing such and such.
Come along you too and join with me."
Thus spoke Ḫūpašiya to Inara:
"If I get to sleep with you, then I will come
and do what your heart desires!"
And so he slept with her.

As a parallel illustration of how this notion of transcending the borders between immortal and mortal can also be part of the semantic range of Hebrew *gwr/gēr*, one can look at a much later example, viz. the name Geradamas, which occurs as a designation of the prototypical first human in Sethian Gnostic writings from Nag Hammadi. This name has been plausibly suggested by Howard M. Jackson to be derived from Hebrew *gēr* plus *ʾādām*, i.e. "Adam the Stranger" or "Adam the Sojourner."[250] If this derivation is correct, the Hebrew *gēr* is used in this name to express the presence of a semi-divine being in the conditioned world of matter, in a way that expresses "transcending of boundaries" in a manner comparable to what was previously seen.

In fact, such a conception of the human predicament as being one of acting as a a *gēr* in the mortal sphere appears to be present in the Hebrew Bible as well, as can be seen in Ps 119:19, in which the Psalmist states the following:

Gēr ʾānōkî bāʾāreṣ	I am a *gēr* in the earth/land—
ʾal-tastēr mimmennî miṣwōtêkā	hide not your commandments from me!

This sentiment is echoed in Ps 39:13:[251]

---

[250] Jackson 1981. For another view, see Quispel 1986: 412, who explicitly rejects this interpretation and prefers seeing Geradamas as the Greco-Hebraic hybrid "*gerai(os) adam*", related to the Jewish mystical concept of Adam Qadmon. Jackson viewed a derivation from the root meaning "old" as nonsensical, writing (p. 387) that it "simply suggests senility." He even specifically (p. 390) associates the *Ger*-part of *Geradamas* with the social reality of the Samaritans in Palestine and suggests that the Sethians have some sort of Samaritan sectarian pedrigree, thus connecting mystical and social concepts in a very concrete way indeed!

[251] I agree with Lindström (1994: 267), who argues that the point of talking of the supplicant as a *gēr* in this context is not to imply some special right of being taken care of by YHWH (humanity as a sort of protected population), but rather that it refers to humankind's "restricted rights" and limitations (especially the inevitability of death that threatens all living things). The idea that the Israelites as a people are the *gērîm* of YHWH can also be found (in a juridical context) in Lev 25:23; for a discussion of the use of this attestation and other uses of the term in the Holiness Code, see Joosten 1996, esp. pp. 58-60 (though concentrating more on the idea of the Israelites as "tenants" of YHWH's land [p. 58]). Joosten also mentions the poetic passages discussed in the main text, but without deeper analysis. A recent publication in favor of the idea of a sort of tenant being involved in contexts such as these (in the Holiness Code) is Mayshar 2014, in which it is argued that the word *tôšāb* referred to "a rentpaying (farming) tenant" (p.

Šimʿâ tĕpillātî YHWH	Hear my supplication, O YHWH,
wĕšawʿātî haʾăzînâ	and hearken to my cry!
ʾel-dimʿātîʾal-teḥĕraš	Do not keep silent at my tears!
kî gērʾānōkîʿimmāk	For I am a *gēr* with you,
tôšāb kĕkol-ʾăbôtāy	a guest-stranger, like all my fathers.

We also find a similar reference in a hymnal passage in Chronicles, 1 Chr 29:15:

Kî gērîmʾănaḥnû lĕpānêkā	For *gērîm* we are before you,
wĕtôšābîm kĕkol-ʾăbōtênû	and guest-strangers, like all our fathers.
kaṣṣēl yāmênûʿal-hāʾāreṣ	Our days on earth are like a shadow,
wĕʾên miqweh	and there is no hope [for us].

These poetic passages all show the word *gēr* referring to humanity's existence "in a strange land," so to speak. 1 Chr 29:15 underscores this ontological stance very clearly, when it expressely refers to human mortality as a characteristic of the *gēr*-ness being (metaphorically?) talked of. The *gēr*-like human being has come into a world in which he/she is not quite at home. The boundary between divine and mortal has been crossed, but in the opposite direction from what we saw in the Illuyanka text.

In the extremely *tôrâ*-centered context of Psalm 119 (a sure sign of its late provenance, with the teachings of YHWH appearing as an almost hypostasized entity), [252] the Psalmist praying that YHWH should not "hide [his] commandments" becomes a poignant illustration of how the use of *gēr* can be taken to imply a sojourn in an ontologically foreign land, in which a human being cannot make his or her own way without divine guidance. Humankind is made up of *gērîm*, and the yearning for the "commandments" of the Israelite God signifies the crossing of an ontological boundary and the guidance needed to survive in a foreign land. In this way, Psalm 119 becomes one of the texts of the Hebrew Bible that most clearly portray the idea of human beings as "aliens" in a strange land in a way almost reminiscent of later Gnostic thinking. The human being becomes a boundary-crosser, and it is certainly interesting to note

226), and that the combination *gēr tôšāb* means "alien tenant." The question of the exact meaning of *tôšāb* is, however, not of direct relevance for the present argument: the point is the "foreignness" of the alien (*gēr*). Mayshar argues (p. 236) that the reason for Ps 39:13 and 1 Chr 29:15 including the expression *gēr tôšāb* is a dependence upon the Holiness Code and a wish to portray that the Israelites have a "vulnerable hold on on the land." Even though I believe that Ps 39:13 is a more general comment on the state of the human being (rather than just the "juridical" rights of the Israelites in relation to YHWH), this interpretation actually comes rather close to the one espoused here: the matter is one of vulnerability, not protection.

[252] I would like to thank Erik Aurelius (p.c.) for pointing out to me this aspect of the dating and ideology of Psalm 119. In Hossfeld and Zenger 2011: 263 it is stated that the Psalm represents a "proto-rabbinic Judaism." They date the text to the fourth century BCE.

that this stereotypically "Indo-Europeanized/Greek" way of thinking uses a root that has a strong parallel with an Indo-European one in order to express itself.

8.5 Parallels in the Typology of Semantic Development

If Weiss's above-mentioned line of reasoning concerning the original meaning of Indo-European **h₃erbʰ-* as "turn" is correct, there may be an interesting typological parallel to the semantic background of Hebrew *gwr*. According to the—admittedly highly speculative—reconstruction of Proto-Afro-Asiatic vocabulary published by Christopher Ehret, there is a Proto-Afro-Asiatic root **-gʷar-*, to which Ehret assigns the original meaning "turn" (in the intransitive sense).[253] Ehret does not list a Semitic descendant of this root, but limits himself to alleged cognates in Cushitic, Chadic and Omotic. However, given the perspectives pointed out here, one cannot help speculating on the possibility of Semitic *gwr* somehow belonging here as well. If this is so, an exactly typologically parallel development has taken place in Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic: a verbal root originally having to do with "turning" has been transformed into one used to describe shifting between two social groups.

If one allows oneself a further step on the path of unbridled etymological speculation, one may note with some interest that such a proto-root would show great structural similarity with the strangely omnipresent *Wanderwort* root probably appearing in Proto-Indo-European as **kʷel-* ("to turn", the basis of the Indo-European word for "wheel", **kʷ(e)kʷlo-*), in Sumerian in the reduplicated form *gigir* ("chariot"), and possibly in Hebrew itself as *galgal*.[254] If there really is some remote connection between this ancient root and the one appearing in Hebrew as *gwr*, the typological parallel between the Indo-European term **h₃erbʰ-* would be almost perfect: both roots would originally have denoted "turning", which was later (or even, at the same time) expanded into a social sense of "turn to another social group."

Another connection or Afro-Asiatic relative of Hebrew *gwr* (etc.) has also been proposed, namely the Low East Cushitic **gir-*, "be, exist,"[255] but I find

---

[253] Ehret 1995: 192 (no. 302). Note that Ehret also reconstructs a structurally similar root **-gʷil-* (p. 191, no. 301), to which he assigns the almost identical meaning "to bend, turn (intr[ansitive]). He assigns the Semitic root **gl* ("to turn") to this proto-root; if this and his putative **-gʷar-* are somehow connected, we may again have to do with early *Wanderwort*-like dialectal borrowing (note Hebrew *galgal*, mentioned in the main text).

[254] The possible relationship between these words is noted, e.g., in Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 622, n. 32 and (following them) in Mallory 1989: 163. Mallory says that the words show that "we may be witnessing the original word for a wheeled vehicle in four different language families." He also adduces the apparently unborrowed/native form of the Indo-European word (being built upon a solid, Indo-European root **kʷel-*) as an argument for the Indo-European version being primary and, thereby, as a sign that the Indo-Europeans "were in some form of contact relation with these Near Eastern languages in the fourth millennium BC."

[255] This etymology is represented in Orel and Stolbova 1995: 210 (no. 932). It is also supported in Militarev and Stolbova (*AAE*): s.v. **gir-*. Ehret (1995: 186, no. 285) also

this etymological connection difficult, due to the difference in the meanings of the roots. The basic meaning of the roots in Semitic languages does not seem to be "to live (in a place)", but rather appears to represent a multitude of different meanings often having to do with being a stranger, a visitor, a client, a neighbor, etc.[256] This is quite far removed indeed from the meaning of the Cushitic verb.[257]

8.6 The ḫapiru/ḫabiru/ʿpr.w *Question*

One should also note that there is another Hebrew (and possibly wider attested) term that seems also to provide a close typological parallel to the Indo-European root **h₃erbʰ-*, viz. the well-known *ʿibrî* and its much quarreled-about possible "relatives" *ḫapiru/ḫabiru/ʿpr.w*.[258] As has been well described and pointed out

---

reconstructs a **-gir-* root on the basis of, among others, Cushitic "to sit, lie, be low," but the Semitic word that he associates with it is not *gwr* but a **gr* to which he assigns the meaning "to go down."

[256] See the survey in Kellermann 1975.

[257] One should be aware that the reconstruction of Proto-Afro-Asiatic vocabulary is an extremely difficult and contested area. The two main reconstructive lexica (Ehret 1995 and Orel and Stolbova 1995) are testament to this, as they are to a large extent incompatible with each other (as pointed out in Ratcliffe 2012, which uses the discrepancies between the two lexica as basis for discussing the methodological problems involved in reconstructing proto-vocabulary for such an internally divergent language family). This caveat must be kept in mind when discussing possible Afro-Asiatic reconstruction.

[258] For the possible connection with the Hebrew word, see, e.g., Weippert 1971: 82 (in a linguistic sense) and Spina 1983: 331, who take a positive view of the connection, and Rainey 1987: 540, who is strongly negative to the idea and refers to it as "utterly void of validity." On p. 541, Rainey even refers to the "naïvté" (sic!) of OT scholars who entertain such a connection. There is of course an enormous literature representing both camps. One interesting modern take on *ʿibrî* is the one put forth by D.R.G. Beattie and Philip R. Davies (2011), who argue (esp. pp. 78-83) that the term has nothing to do with the ancient concept of *ḫapiru*/*ḫabiru* but is rather a late (post-exilic) term for an Aramaic-speaker, having its background in the name of the Persian satrapy referred to in Aramaic as *ʿăbar nahărā* (originally representing the Assyrian term *Ebernāri*, Akkadian for "on the other side of the river"). According to Beattie and Davies, the term just refers to the Aramaic speaking peoples of the Levant generally (other-siders, so to speak), and has no Bronze Age background whatsoever. I find his suggestion in itself alluring, and if it is true, it would seem that it would defeat any attempt to discuss Hebrew *ʿibrî* as an ancient term for peoples who cross over social borders. This, however, is not necessarily so. One could well imagine a situation in which an ancient expression, the meaning of which was only partly known, came to gain new prominence because of its similarity (or identity) with a much younger expression simply referring to the inhabitants of a certain part of the Achaemenid Empire (again, something like a possible phono-semantic matching, though at a later stage!). Also, it is a disturbing fact for the *Ebernāri* explanation that other Aramaic-speaking populations of the ancient Levant do not appear to have referred to themselves as Hebrews. Yet (and as noted above), even if Beatty and Davies are right in supposing that a "Hebrew" came to refer to a Levantine speaker of Aramaic during the

by Spina, these terms and *gwr* have a close conceptual connection with each other.[259] Certainly, the people referred to in the Ancient Near East using the *ḫapiru/ḫabiru/ʿpr.w* expression appear to have been defined in a way that greatly parallels what we know about the Hebrew concept of the *gēr* and the Indo-European root here in question. Nadav Naaman writes the following:

> Common to all the people designated as "Ḫabiru" is the fact that they were uprooted from their original political and social framework and forced to adapt to a new environment. The different traits and social behavior of the Ḫabiru in each area of Western Asia are the outcome of this adaptation to new circumstances. Among the reasons for breaking off their former political and social ties were wars, disasters, famine, debt, heavy taxes, prolonged military service, and so on.[260]

This description is certainly very close not only to the concept of the Hebrew *gēr* but to the persons subjected to what appears to have been meant by the Indo-European verb **h₃erbʰ-*. Both concepts refer to people who have been forced to forfeit their original social background, becoming "wanderers" and/or mercenaries.

8.7 Reasons for the Parallels: Borrowing?

After a comparison such as this, the question of course presents itself: what has caused these correspondences? Are they the random results of different linguistic cultures encoding the harsh realities of the plight of the stranger in similar ways, or are we dealing with some form of cultural transmission in either direction?

One very audacious idea which does, at least, merit mentioning is that of viewing the famous *ḫapiru* /*ḫabiru*/ *ʿpr.w* (and thence, perhaps, Hebrew *ʿibrî*) as originally representing a borrowing from Indo-European **h₃erbʰ-*, an idea that was suggested to me by Sophia Tranefeldt, and for which she deserves the credit.

---

period of the Second Temple, this does not in itself explain why the term is used to refer to David and Jephthah, for example (see below, section 8.9) and similar proto- or pre-historical (or perhaps fictional) characters. In April of 2015, I had the pleasure of discussing these matters with Prof. Davies at a scholarly meeting in Oslo; as I understood it, his main argument against an earlier history for the term *ʿibrî* was Occam's razor: the *Ebernāri* explanation is simpler and does not postulate anything not securely known from well-dated sources. But I would answer (and this echoes sentiments from the Introduction to the present book) that questions concerning the relationship between text and history cannot simply be reduced to which explanation makes the fewest postulates (*entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*) but that one also has to reckon with the question of which viewpoint has the highest explanatory power in making the text more readable. I would argue that an earlier history of the term (and the motifs associated with it, also in an "etymological poetic" manner) makes the texts that we actually have preserved more understandable.

[259] Spina 1983: 330-332.

[260] Naaman 1986: 272.

If there really is some linguistic relationship between the Indo-European and Hebrew/Afro-Asiatic words, it is quite apparent that some sort of metathesis must have taken place during the process of borrowing. The Indo-European root ends with the labial plosive, whereas the Hebrew, Egyptian and Akkadian words end with the *r*-syllable. One thinkable (though tenuous) way of explaining such a development could be the fact that the Indo-European laryngeal **h₃* appears to have been pronounced with some sort of labial co-articulation (possibly the phoneme was somewhere in the phonetic region of [ɣʷ] or [ʕʷ]); the labial component of the sound could have helped provoke an attraction of the labial plosive sound, thereby facilitating the metathesis.[261]

The reforming of the root with metathesis may also have been facilitated by the existence of the Semitic verb *ʿbr*, "to cross" (again, one thinks of the possibility of a phono-semantic matching of the sort delineated by Ghilʿad Zuckermann). Of course, the exact background of Semitic *ʿbr* (from an Afro-Asiatic standpoint) is not clear; there are suggestions of there having been a Proto-Afro-Asiatic root **ʕabir-*, which would provide the etymon for the Semitic verb, but this reconstruction seems far from certain.[262] One could possibly imagine the Semitic root here actually representing an Indo-European borrowing, or (if the Proto-Afro-Asiatic reconstruction is accepted) an influence from the Indo-European concept on the specifically social meaning of the term could well be imagined. One may also, possibly, consider a connection with the origin of the root *ʿrb* ("to enter"—Hebrew *ʿārab*, Akkadian *erēbu*, etc.), which does not appear to have any secure Afro-Asiatic etymon. At least, one will have to be skeptical about the Akkadian verb *ḫabāru*, which appears simply to be a denominative formation from the word *ḫabiru* itself, and thus does not lend itself well to reconstructing the background of that word.

Regardless of whether one lends credence to a historical connection between **h₃erbʰ-* and *ḫapiru* / *ʿpr.w* (and possibly *ʿibrî*), it is notable that similar connotations may have been attached to the two concepts. I would like to draw attention to the explanation of the latter as referring to ones who cross borders

---

[261] Such a putative process would show some parallels to the one suggested for Proto-Indo-European itself in Cohen and Hyllested 2012. In that case, the question is one of dissimilation of two labial elements, with the combination **h₃w-* turning into **h₂w-*. Another—and similar—process is the one posited by the same two scholars involving a dissimilation of **h₃* in various Anatolian daughter languages when close to a labiovelar sound (the latter development is sketched in Cohan and Hyllested 2012: 63, but was earlier elaborated upon in the as yet unpublished conference presentation Cohen and Hyllested 2006, building upon Olsen 2006).

[262] Such a reconstructed root appears in Militarev and Stolbova (*AAE*): s.v. **ʕabir-*, where it is translated as "traveling (along a road), passing by, crossing (rivers)." The etymological material for this putative root (outside Semitic) is made up of Berber words meaning "road" or "way", East Chadic words for "go" or "go for a walk", Western Chadic words for "escape" or "go out" and a Cushitic (Dahalo) words meaning "go out, depart." None of the non-Semitic branches of Afro-Asiatic seem to attest to the specialized meaning of "crossing." It is worth noting that neither the etymological lexicon of Ehret (1995) nor that of Orel and Stolbova (1995) list this reconstructed root.

and move into the social spheres of influence of others. Again, the parallel between the traditions of being unfree or lacking complete social rights attached to the *ʿibrî*-expression in the Old Testament and the similar uses of **h₃erbʰ*- mentioned above is interesting and noteworthy.

8.8 Self-Definition and Indo-European "War Bands"

After having compared the social meanings inherent in the Indo-European root **h₃erbʰ*- and the relevant Hebrew/Semitic roots, one can note one great difference in their use. The social realities encoded by the roots in the two linguistic cultures are, as has been seen, quite similar, but the difference is that Hebrew literature uses the idea of the *gēr* or the *ʿibrî* in a way that never occurs in the case of Indo-European **h₃erbʰ*-. The two Hebrew terms occur as (at least in a sense) positive terms of self-identification, which does not appear to be common for the Indo-European root in its more basic meaning of "group switching." However, there is a way in which similar ideas may be present in Proto-Indo-European culture as well, as we shall see.

One very interesting similarity between the apparent semantics of *ḫabiru* (etc.) and certain concepts that are thought to have been part of Proto-Indo-European society is suggested by the question of the social organization and leadership structure of the former. Again, quoting Nadav Naaman on the *ḫabiru*:

> As it happened, individuals sometimes moved from their homeland to neighboring countries and served either in the public or private sector for subsistence of wages. Usually, however, they did not migrate alone but formed a band. These bands were independent bodies and were restricted in number and unified, often having a single prominent leader. No further hierarchy or institutional organization was needed for this tiny social structure, and it is for this reason that none of the institutions which typify either clan or tribe ever appeared in connection with the Ḫabiru. The predatory nature of the bands was a direct outcome of their social status.[263]

If one's goal is to study parallels and interactions between the Indo-European and Old Testament worlds, one has to be both blind and deaf not to note the similarities between the above account and the image formed in scholarship of the "war bands" of Proto-Indo-European culture (sometimes—and perhaps rather unfortunately—referred to using the antiquated and ideologically infused term *Männerbund*).[264] These were certainly not identical with the description above, but there are definite parallels. The *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture* speaks of this phenomenon in the following way:

---

[263] Naaman 1986: 273. For typographical reasons, I have removed a footnote of Naaman's, in which he refers to Bottéro 1981: 96f as source of his views of lack of tribal or clan-like institutions among the Ḫabiru.

[264] The *Männerbund* terminology is associated to a large extent with the work of Stig Wikander (1938; no relation to the present author). A much more modern study of the concept (based on different data) is McCone 1987.

> […] a PIE 'war band' comprising an age set of young unmarried and landless (but free) men who lived off the land, engaged in predatory activities, had a particular association with wolves (less so, dogs or bears), were famous for their berserkr-like behavior in battle, and might form the 'shock troops' in military engagements. This was a distinct age set which, when married and settled on their land, entered the **teuteh$_a$*, the tribal organization of adults who were still liable to military service.[265]

The social phenomena described in these two quotations are, of course, not identical, but there are clear similarities. Both refer to a group of people, standing outside the normal bounds of society and using this situation as a basis for "semi-outlaw" activity while still being used by the majority society. They point to ways in which groups such as these can "serve a purpose" in social contexts that generally tend to look down on them; both the *ḫabiru*-groups and the Proto-Indo-European war-bands make up social groups of a "band-like" character that were only "semi-members" of the majority society but could serve a role as warriors.

8.8.1 Warriors as "Wolves" or "Dogs"

Let us dwell a little while on the matter of the Indo-European "war-bands" referring to themselves as "wolves" or "dogs." It is hardly surprising that a group of violent people on the liminal borderlands of society could use this type of appellation for themselves. The imagery of canines can be applied to violent warriors in the Hebrew Bible as well (Ps 22:17), but there, of course, the implication is a strongly negative one. One could, however, imagine that the author of that verse was actually thinking of a group of a similar nature.[266] One should also note that Spina points out the apparent and highly interesting similarity in sound between Hebrew *gwr* and the word *gûr* or *gôr*, "whelp" or "young lion." He points to texts such as Psalm 59, which uses the analogy of dogs for the enemies of the psalmist in v. 7. He also mentions Gen 49:9 and Deut 33:22, both of which refer to the Israelites themselves as *gûr*. The latter is highly interesting, given how often the Israelite people is referred to as *gērîm*.

---

[265] James P. Mallory and Edgar C. Polomé in *EIEC*: 31 (s.v "ARMY": "*War-bands*"). The views put forth are expressly based on the work of McCone (1987), who studied the "wolf" and "dog" terminology in great detail.

[266] An interesting Bible verse in this context (though probably by coincidence) is Isa 11:6, which begins with the wolf (*zĕʾēb*) "sojourning" (root *gwr*) with the lamb. As pointed out by Kellermann (1975: 448), this verse becomes even more poignant if one sees *gwr* not only as a word for living together in a place but factors in the other known meanings of the root (Kellermann himself suggests that "the wolf is the protected citizen of the lamb," based on the attested meaning of the root as referring to "protected citizens" and possibly to the one attested in some languages having to do with being a client or protégé, mentioned earlier in the chapter). Given the points mentioned in the main text above, the co-occurrence of *gwr* and the word "wolf" in this passage is interesting, especially if one regards it as referring metaphorically to humans and not to physical wolves, an interpretation found already in the *Mishneh Torah* of Maimonides (*šôpĕṭîm: mĕlākîm ûmilḥāmôt*, chap. 12).

There is also an Akkadian textual passage in which an enemy is described as a "dog" (*kalbu*) and subsequently is the subject of an Akkadian reflex of the *gwr* word (here in the sense of the "dog" turning against the speaker in a hostile manner).[267] Thus, it appears that "warring sojourning strangers" were associated with young predators, such as lions or canines, both in the Indo-European and OT cultural sphere. This is a highly interesting correlation, of course given special strength in Hebrew due to the phonetic similarity between *gwr* and the "young lion" word.[268]

One may note with some interest that not only the Ancient Near Eastern *ḫabiru* concept but also the root *gwr* itself appears in certain cases to have carried with it an association with warlike activity or martial threat. The Akkadian verb *gērû*, which is often considered to be at least distantly related to Hebrew *gwr*, actually means "to be hostile."[269] Thus, the association between strangers and warring bands appears here as well.[270] And, continuing our comparison with the Indo-European root, one finds in Cuneiform Luwian the word *ḫarpanalla/i-*, which is derived from **h₃erbʰ-* and means something like "rebel" or "turncoat."[271] The use of the Indo-European root also clearly shows that "crossing to the other side" could mean being hostile, rebellious, or dangerous.

8.9 Jephthah and David

Nadav Naaman makes the point that two of the best illustrations of the social conditions of the *ḫabiru*-bands can be found in the Hebrew Bible, in the stories about Jephthah and David (as mentioned by him, David's band is explicitly—and derogatively—referred to as "Hebrews" by the Philistines in 1 Sam 29:3). He describes these conditions in a way quite interesting for the present purposes, pointing out that Jephthah was the son of a "harlot" and therefore unfit for true inheritance, this in turn leading to his forming a band (I would like to point out additionally that Jephthah's conflict with his half-siblings about the right of inheritance is explicitly mentioned in Judg 11:2-3, and in verse 4, Jephthah has to move away, becoming a sojourner, so to speak). Naaman also points out David's conflicts with his father-in-law Saul and escape from him.[272] Both of

---

[267] Spina 1983: 327-328.

[268] The word play between the *gwr* root and *gûr* in the sense of "young lion" must have been very inviting, and it appears in later sources as well. It is used by the 13th century CE Hebrew poet Todros Abulafia (from Toledo), in his poem *ʾāmĕrâ hăkî nôd rāṣĕtâ*, when he has the female character of the poem say: […] *ʾāgûr lĕhitgôrēr ʾănî ʿim gûr ʾărî* ("I am afraid to dwell with the whelp of a lion"). This line uses three similar-sounding words: the *gwr* that means "to be afraid," the *gwr* having to do with dwelling (as a stranger) that is the subject of this chapter, and *gûr* as in "young lion." For the text, see Carmi (ed.) 1981: 411.

[269] See, for example, Kellermann 1975: 440 and Spina 1983: 328.

[270] There may be similar evidence in Biblical Hebrew also; see Spina 1983: 326-327.

[271] Melchert 1993: 59 (s.v. *ḫarpanalla/i-*); Weiss 2006: 256.

[272] Naaman 1986: 279-280.

these situations recall the semantic sphere of Indo-European *$*h_3erb^h$*-; remember the well-attested use of that root to signify changes in *familial* status (words both for inheriting and being an orphan). Being a "warring socially transcending stranger" in this sense could, apparently, be thought of in terms of atypical family relationships.[273] In Jephthah's case (and in a sense, also in David's), this connotation of crossing familial boundaries is joined to the meaning concerned with "moving"—and starting a war-band. These two characters almost personify the semantic sphere of the various terms studied in this chapter.

8.10 Orpheus

Earlier, we looked at certain cases in which the Hebrew *gwr* and Proto-Indo-European *$*h_3erb^h$*- roots have been used in mythological descriptions of religious boundary-crossing. After considering the question of *ḫabiru*/*ʿibrî* in this context—and the central religious role attached to the latter in parts of the development of OT religion—I would like obliquely to mention another such example from the Indo-European sphere, viz. the name of the divine singer and traveler to the realm of the dead, *Orpheus*, whose name has been plausibly explained as being a reflex of *$*h_3erb^h$*-. Given the reasoning of Weiss, one might even venture so far as to translate his name as "Turner" (both in the sense of turning back and forth between the lands of the living and the dead and in the concrete sense of his having "turned" to look at Eurydice!). Thus, it appears probable that both Indo-European and OT culture use terms such as these to reinforce mythological or theological narratives. This is hardly surprising, as this type of words lends itself excellently to illustrating passages, liminality and partaking in different spheres in a way well suited for religious rhetoric.[274]

8.11 Methodological Implications and Conclusions

An enquiry such as this one certainly raises a number of methodological questions. For example, to what extent is it possible to *prove or disprove* that there is an actual historical relationship between the Old Testament/ancient Semitic ways of encoding these social categories and the corresponding Indo-European ones, either at the lexical or more general level? It is certainly no easy task, as the terms are far removed from each other and have themselves gone through long processes of internal semantic change. In cases such as these, one

[273] One could also note the fact that the reflex of Semitic *gwr* in various dialects of Aramaic has developed the meaning "to commit adultery" (Kellermann 1975: 441-442). This meaning can (as Kellermann points out) be interpreted as a use of the root in a sense referring to passing between families.

[274] For more on the intriguing possibility of Orpheus (as well as the Sanskrit *Ṛbhu*-) belonging here (in the latter case in the sense of "one who has left humankind and joined the gods"), see Melchert 2010: 186, n. 17, with further literature and a reference to a comment to that effect at a conference by Hisashi Miyakawa (I do not know whether the formulations within quotes are Miyakawa's original words or Melchert's restatement thereof).

sometimes has to limit oneself to carrying out the action that the Danes express using the verb *sandsynliggøre*, literally "to render probable." And this I do hope to have done—to have shown it to be a probable inference that the similar conceptualizations of otherness and social transcending described in the two cultural/linguistic spheres actually have a historical connection.

But one can go one step further. Even if it is hard to prove such a connection conclusively, the contrastive study of these terms and ideas may illustrate their meanings, as mentioned at the beginning of the chapter. One can of course object to such a methodology (and, as mentioned in the Introduction, it is not the main methodological approach of the present book), but I submit that it is in any case in itself more historically justified than the today rather common way of comparing ancient phenomena with mediaeval or even completely modern instances of a similar nature. In keeping with the main approach of the volume, the comparison has been rooted in lexical material. In comparing this type of data from the Old Testament and its world with ancient Indo-European material, we are at least looking at two cultural areas which we know to have intersected and which were both present in the Ancient Near East at the same time.

The fact remains that both OT/Semitic culture and Proto-Indo-European society appear to have reckoned with similar social constructs involving boundary-transgressing groups of people who were displaced from their homes, families or countries of origin, pursued a semi-assimilated existence, being regarded both as parts of the greater societies and as aliens. This type of group could apparently play the roles of "mercenaries," and both linguistic families show possible traces of a semantic development involving the members of such groups having in a sense being "turned" from one context into another. In both linguistic families, groups such as these could be thought of as wolves, young lions or other dangerous animals.

The way in which both the Indo-European and the biblical terms discussed in this chapter appear to have been repurposed from simply describing social realities to becoming metaphors for religious and/or mythological statements (transcending boundaries between human and divine spheres and, in the case of *gēr*, subsequently even signifying religious conversion) brings to mind a parallel case from the Indo-Aryan cultural sphere, one which may be of methodological relevance as a model for the feasibility of this type of study of concepts carrying etymologically charged semantic loads with them at a deeper level whilst changing in religious or social reference. This is the compound word *yoga-kṣema*, which is attested already in the Vedic literature and then reappears in later Indian religious texts.[275] In a study originally published in 1981 and subsequently republished in 1988, Jan Heesterman followed the associations of the parts this word-complex from their original usage, where they appear to

[275] I want to thank Martin Gansten for bringing this term to my attention and for help with references concerning it.

have had a sociological reference relevant in early Vedic society, at which period the two parts of the word would have referred to the two modes of life of a semi-nomadic community: being on the move (*yoga*) and being settled down (*kṣema*). This original meaning was forgotten, however, and later texts (such as the Bhagavad-Gītā) appear to have used the term as referring to the acquisition of riches, and in the Taittirīya-Upaniṣad, it was esoterically interpreted as referring to in-breath and out-breath. In Buddhist Pāli texts, the corresponding term was thought of as referring to the attainment of peace from attachments.[276] In Heesterman's analysis, this is not all, however. He saw the original sense of *yoga* (literally "yoke" or "yoking together") in this nominal compound—originally, according to him, referring to the yoking together of the animals of the seminomadic warrior when on the move—as having survived and having been transformed into the inner search of the ascetic, the term *yoga* thus acquiring its well-known sense of referring to a spiritual esoteric discipline. The travelling warrior with his *yoga* transforms, in Heesterman's scheme, into the renunciant ascetic mystic, whose *yoga* is of a quite different kind. Note that the opposition between nomadic and sedentary lifestyles (*yoga* and *kṣema*) could then be interpreted as having lived on in the dual religious ideals of the householder and the ascetic, an opposition continuing in Hinduism to this day and forming one of the central issues of the Bhagavad-Gītā.

The way that Heesterman argues here is rather similar to what I have attempted above: tracing terms that originally had sociological import as that original sense grew into something else, a more spiritualized meaning, in which the etymologically earlier meaning was still present below the surface. The same type of methodological and phenomenological analogy could well be applied to my arguments concerning the possible development of the name Dagan/Dagon in chapter 7.

Discussing words for strangers and boundary-crossers in the context of a study involving early (proto)-cultural interaction certainly invites the question of whether these expressions for strangers and "out groups" could actually involve meetings between these very cultures. This is, of course, totally unknowable, but it is definitely interesting to note that both the Northwest Semitic (and, subsequently, Israelite) and early Indo-European cultures—which both have at times been regarded as having been highly ethnocentric—included the idea of "resident aliens" who were, in fact, central to the cultures functioning. When one imagines situations in which early representatives of Indo-European and greater OT cultures met each other and interacted, such words for foreigners, strangers and boundary-crossers may very well have been the terms they used to describe each other.

[276] These later changes are pointed out in White 2009: 76, who gives an exposition on *yoga-kṣema* and the history of word-pair/compound.

9. Fame that does not Burn: The Verb *ṯ̲kḫ*, the Drought Motif, Indo-European **$d^{h}g^{wh}ei$-*, and Etymological Poetics

Having touched in an earlier chapter upon the prominent Northwest Semitic literary and religious motif of destroying drought and its connection with death, I will now discuss a similar "etymologically poetic" development in the Indo-European ambit. Like my elaborations on expressions for strangers and boundary-crossers (chapter 8), this is a case in which it is not methodologically possible to know with certainty whether the similarity I will discuss is due to historical contact and transmission or to a mere parallel development. As in the "stranger" case, I leave this up to the reader to decide for him- or herself (though I will sketch an argument for such a transmission as a possibility, if nothing else—again based in lexical material and possible borrowings).

In Wikander 2014, I carried out a large-scale investigation of the drought/death motif in Ugaritic and biblical literature. As mentioned earlier, the concept of "etymological poetics" plays quite a central role in that book as well. I studied a number of verbal roots that seem to carry the poetic motif of drought and death with them, so to speak. One of these roots, which I discussed rather at length, is the one appearing in Ugaritic as *ṯ̲kḫ* and in Hebrew as *škḫ* II (as opposed to the much more common *škḫ* I, "to forget," which is derived from an actual *škḫ* rather than *ṯ̲kḫ*).[277] I argued (as have a number of scholars before me) that the root in question originally means something like "to be exceedingly hot," whence a more general meaning along the lines of "to wither, to waste away" was sometimes secondarily extrapolated. This root occurs in the Ugaritic corpus, describing the terrible effects of the rule of personified Death (Mot) in the land, when Mot threatens Baal in a passage previously discussed in chapter 4. I quote it again here:

k tmḫṣ . ltn . bṯ̲n . brḥ	As/because you smote Litan, the fleeing serpent,
tkly . bṯ̲n . ʿqltn .	killed off the writhing serpent,
šlyṭ . d . šbʿt . rašm	the ruler with seven heads,

[277] The Proto-Northwest Semitic phonemes **ṯ̲* and **š* fell together in Hebrew as *š*, causing the two roots to look identical in that language. My in-depth discussion of the root (with references to further literature) can be found in Wikander 2014: 56-65. I discuss its occurrence in the "threats of Mot" passage (KTU 1.5 I 1-8) on pp. 55-58 of the same work. My quick recapitulation of the uses of the root in the present chapter is based on the conclusions of my previous study, to which I refer for the fully-argued philological rationale as well as for references to the many earlier scholars of whose work I hope to have created a plausible and furthering synthesis. The discussion concerning this verb and its reflexes in the Hebrew Bible has been very long and variegated, and it would take up too much space to repeat the entire collection of references again, so the reader is definitely advised to refer to Wikander 2014 for the *Forschungsgeschichte*. It may be mentioned that Pope 1966: 240 and Emerton 1972: 62-66 are especially important for my arguments there.

tṯkḥ . ttrp . šmm .	the heavens will burn hot and shine/be weakened.
krs ipdk . ank .	I, even I, will tear you to pieces—
ispi . uṯm ḏrqm . amtm .	I will swallow elbows, blood, and forearms.
l yrt b npš . bn ilm . mt .	You will surely descend into the throat of divine Mot,
b mhmrt . ydd . il . ġzr (KTU 1.5 I 1-8)	into the gullet of El's beloved, the hero.

In this passage, I have translated the relevant verb as "burn hot." It expresses the awful demise of verdure and fertility that is the result of Mot's rule, i.e., it perfectly captures the drought/death motif in and of itself. The root recurs in its Hebrew form in a number of places in the Old Testament, such as Ps 102:5 (*kî šākāḥtî mēʾăkōl laḥmî*, "I am too hot/burned/dried/weakened to eat my bread"), Ps 137:5 (*tiškaḥ yĕmînî*, "may my right hand be burnt/dried out") and possibly (with metathesis of two radicals) in Ps 18:45*b*-46*a* (*bĕnê-nēkār yĕkaḥăšû lî / bĕnê-nēkār yibbōlû*, where the second verb, meaning "they dry up" suggests such a meaning for the previous one as well). Ps 31:13 has also been suggested as an instance of this verb.[278] Some scholars have translated the verb along the lines of "wither" or "be weak" generally, but I belong with those who believe that the idea of extensive heat is inherent in the root in Hebrew as well (as well seen in the close contexts of Ps 102:5, and also when one reads Ps 137:5 together with the line that follows). All in all: I believe it quite clear that the root means something like "be exceedingly hot or burnt" and sometimes, thereby, "to be weak or withered" (though this meaning is only secondary), and that the verb tends to carry with it a poetical reference to the Northwest Semitic association between drought and death that is very apparent in the Baal Cycle.

This dual semantic load (drying up and being destroyed) could seem to be very specific to the Northwest Semitic milieu from which it is attested, with its characteristic natural characteristics of hot summers, etc. There is, however, an Indo-European verbal root, very central in the history of Indo-European poetic diction, that seems to have gone through a very similar sort of semantic development. This is the root reconstructed into Proto-Indo-European as **d^{h}g^{wh}ei-*, the meaning of which is mostly given as something like "to perish" or "be destroyed."

The thing that makes this Indo-European root interesting for the present purposes is the fact that it appears itself to be derived by root extension from another root also existing in the Proto-Indo-European lexicon, namely the root **d^{h}eg^{wh}-*, which means approximately "to burn" or "to subject to heat." In his magisterial *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Helmut Rix states that **d^{h}g^{wh}ei-* ("to perish") is an extension of **d^{h}eg^{wh}-* ("to burn") and that the semantic development is one of being destroyed by drying or heat, exactly the development that we have seen for the Northwest Semitic *ṯkḥ*, an interesting

[278] Dahood 1965: 190 and 1970: 271 (though without the larger association to the drought/death motif). *Contra*: Roberts 1975.

correspondence indeed.[279] Based on this, one could argue that this parallel semantic development could be due to some form of linguistic interaction or calquing (somewhat like what I argued as a possibility in the case of some of the expressions for "boundary crossers" in chapter 8).

However, if one is so inclined, one can go further. It is certainly interesting to note that both the Proto-Indo-European roots and the Northwest Semitic one display a sequence of a dental (or interdental) and a dorsal. In the Semitic case, the first of these is an interdental fricative, but that could perhaps fit with the fact that the Indo-European root shows a so-called *thorn*-cluster (which are sometimes argued to have included fricative sounds at some point in their development).[280] Could this be a sign of an actual lexical borrowing being involved? Such a suggestion is certainly quite speculative, yet the thought bears discussing. The Semitic form has a third consonant—a pharyngeal *ḥ*—that has no clear correspondence in the Indo-European forms, yet one should remember that the Indo-European root contains two breathy voiced/aspirated consonants (**d^{h}* and **g^{wh}*). Theoretically, one could imagine the *ḥ* of the Semitic root as a way crudely to represent that "aspiration" in the target language (though this would, it must be said, be a rather unparalleled rendering). If a borrowing really is involved, it will have to be from an Indo-European language that kept the original sequence of the "*thorn*-cluster" **d^{h}g^{wh}* (dental-dorsal) rather than switching it to dorsal-dental—just as was the case with Dagan/Dagon. There are only two attested Indo-European subfamilies that meet this criterion, and one of them (Tocharian) is out of the question (having been spoken in what is today western China). This, again, leaves Anatolian. The problem is that the *d^{h}g^{wh}ei-* root is not as yet attested in that subfamily, so one will have to reckon either with some early and unattested form of Anatolian—or with something close to Proto-Indo-European itself—as the putative loan-giver. Given that the voicing pattern does not match (as it did with Dagan/Dagon), another interaction than with attested Anatolian seems more plausible.

However, I think that a more probable option exists than a pure loan from Indo-European to Semitic. This is the third case in which I want to suggest a phono-semantic matching, as defined by Ghilʿad Zuckermann: a case in which a borrowed word was attached to an existing word in the receiving language, to a word that had a similar phonetic shape and similar semantics. I do not believe that Semitic languages imported this verb wholesale from Indo-European: rather, I would propose the possibility that the roots influenced each other. Which one was the earlier is not easy to say (even though Indo-European sounds

---

[279] *LIV*: 151, nn. 1 and 2. One interesting possible sign (mentioned there) of the semantic connection between the **d^{h}gw^{h}ei-* ("perish"/"destroy") root and its background in a verb connected with "heat" is the existence of the Latin derivative *sitis*, meaning "thirst" (also mentioned in Beekes 2010: 1571 [s.v. φθίνω]). However, it should be noted that this type of semantic combination is not unique to Indo-European and Semitic. In the Australian language Wardaman, for example, there is a verbal expression meaning (in the words of Merlan [1994: 205, 207]) "die and dry up."

[280] Albeit after metathesis. For an account of this phonological structure, see n. 228.

perhaps somewhat more probable, as the root is securely reconstructible with the meaning discussed here—and a derivational history—back all the way to the Indo-European proto-language). My point is that I find it probable that the roots from the two linguistic families influenced each other from an early point, and the reminiscences of this shared development may be found in texts.

There is one case in the Hebrew Bible where this parallel development of the roots becomes very salient indeed, and that is the famous expression in Ps 137:5, referred to above:

ʾim-ʾeškāḥēk yerûšālayim	If I forget you, Jerusalem—
tiškaḥ yĕmînî	may my right hand burn
	and wither away/shrivel up!

Here, by use of wordplay, the original Northwest Semitic roots *ṯkḥ* ("burn hot, wither from heat") and *škḥ* ("forget") are conflated, as both were transformed by Hebrew sound-laws into becoming phonologically identical (*škḥ*).

But how are Indo-European/biblical relationships relevant here? The answer lies in the choice of poetic metaphors. One of the most celebrated Indo-European poetic reconstructions of all is that of the "imperishable fame," **n̥dg^{wh}itom k̂lewos*, a specific phrase that is reconstructable from the Homeric Greek expression κλέος ἄφθιτον and its etymologically identical Vedic Sanskrit parallel *śravas* […] *akṣitam…* (or *akṣiti śravas*, with a slight difference in the formation of the adjective and the words in opposite order).[281] The word **n̥dg^{wh}itom* is made up of the elements **n̥-* ("un-"), the root **d^{h}g^{wh}ei-* in its vowel-less, zero stage form, and the participle/verbal noun derivation *-to(m)*, i.e., "imperishable, not having perished"—and by extension, given what was stated above about the etymological background of the root, "not having being burnt, not burning." The "fame" (**k̂lewos*) that the Proto-Indo-Europeans sang of was, literally, "unburnt" or "unburning." What is quite remarkable in this case is how the classical, Proto-Indo-European poetic phrase uses such a verbal root to express the imperishability of poetic reputation—in quite a similar way to how Ps 137:5 invokes an ancient Northwest Semitic idiom connected with "burning" or "drying" as an illustration of the consequences of forgetting the fame of the destroyed Jerusalem (and rendering it even more fitting, given the wordplay with the "forget" word). In both the Indo-European and the biblical contexts, "burning" or "drying up from heat" is used as a metaphor for forgetfulness, for fame disappearing, as it were, into smoke. Regardless of whether an actual lexical conncetion is involved or not, the metaphorical similarity is striking. A borrowing of a motif is probable and, as delineated above, a lexical relatedness is not implausible either, given the structure of the

[281] The startling correspondence was noted already in Kuhn 1853: 467 (in a footnote, no less). For an illuminating overview of some further possible analyses of how this phrase was used in Proto-Indo-European, see Watkins 1992: 411-416.

roots in question; howsoever that may be, both traditions seem to be talking about fame that does not burn.

The parallel motifs of burning or drying out as a linguistically coded metaphor for life's inconstancy and the sorrow of nature involved in death and dying may perhaps be found on a wider scale than the Northwest Semitic *ṯkḥ* and the Indo-European **d^{h}g^{wh}ei-*. As I have mentioned in passing previously, the semantic parallel in the expressions appears also in the form of the Sanskrit verbal root *śuc-*, which carries the dual meaning of "to mourn" and "to dry up."[282] This means that the connection between destructive heat and dying could possibly have passed between linguistic families not only in terms of a specific verbal root but as a more general association (but see above, footnote 279, for a typologically similar semantic development in a different linguistic setting).

It is certainly not without interest that the Indo-European root *d^{h}eg^{wh}-* ("to burn") itself probably underlies the Latin word *febris*, the ultimate source of the English word "fever."[283] In my study of the use of the drought/death motif in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic literature, I repeatedly found evidence of a metaphorical association between the powers of death and heat, as expressed through feverish heat and illness, and this was also one of my points in my analysis of the verb *ṯkḥ*. When that Semitic verb occurs in Ps 102:5*b* (*kî-šākaḥtî mēʾākōl laḥmî*), it does so in a context that seems directly to involve heat (the preceding verse expressly speaks of bones burning like a furnace and days disappearing like smoke—see section 5.8 in the present volume for a discussion of that Psalm in the context of the "life as smoke" motif). Based on that and many other attestations, I argued in Wikander 2014 that the main sense of the verbal root is something like "to be excessively hot," and that it is one of the roots that are used in Northwest Semitic literature to express the attacks of personified Death in the form of drought (of the land) or feverish illness (of the human being).

The Latin use of the Indo-European root **d^{h}eg^{wh}-* here under discussion as the one lying behind the expanded root **d^{h}g^{wh}ei-* ("to destroy, make perish") to express the very phenomenon (fever) that carried with it such a metaphorical motif load in Northwest Semitic poetry lends some credence to the idea of the concepts and associations having been imported from Indo-European to Semitic at a very early point.[284] The root connection between the ideas of (a) destruction and death, metaphorically pertaining, for example, to fame or memory, (b) heat in general, and (c) fever, as an expression of illness, is too much to be ignored, especially if one factors in the structural similarity of the Indo-European and Semitic roots and the on the face of it not quite self-evident metaphorics of a

[282] Wikander 2014: 155-156, n. 354. Here, as in that instance, I would like to thank Martin Gansten for pointing out the parallel to me.

[283] For the etymology, see Sihler 1995: 165.

[284] It may be of interest that Indo-European **d^{h}eg^{wh}-* is also the source of the Greek word τέφρα ("ash"), which certainly carries with it a connection with the motif sphere of death and dying (see Beekes 2010: 1475 [s.v. τέφρα]). Note that this word occurs in Wisdom chap. 2, quoted on p. 76.

memory or fame being "burnt." I thus argue that this motif may have been transmitted between Indo-European and Semitic linguistic cultures: probably (though not certainly) from Indo-European to Semitic, given the early reconstructed existence of the collocation **n̥dǵ^{wh}itom k̂lewos* in Indo-European. In Indo-European as well as biblical culture, unforgotten fame could be fame that did not burn.

10. Dragons Returning Home: The "Pizza Effect"

As an ending vantage point for further research and as a view towards later history of ideas growing out of some of the phenomena delineated in this volume, we shall take a quick look at some cases of one of the most interesting aspects of studying patterns of transcultural interaction, the phenomenon sometimes referred to as the "pizza effect." This term refers to cases in which a concept or phenomenon from one cultural sphere is imported into another but is then subsequently received back into the culture that exported it in the first place.[285] These ambidirectional instances of cultural borrowing provide an opportunity for investigating and highlighting how *other* and more culturally specific pieces of ideology or narrative material have created accretions in the original imagery, which then "muddle up" the simple and pure *Stammbäume* of ideological or religious borrowing to which one likes to become accustomed. This means that we will now be looking at a few cases in which it appears that the main cultural motion we have hitherto been studying, the one from Indo-European cultures into "the world of the Hebrew Bible," was subsequently inverted and in which speakers and writers of Indo-European languages reborrowed concepts from the Semitic-speaking world of the Hebrew Bible that other speakers of Indo-European languages had once spread to that world.

The importance of highlighting some of these instances lies not only in the anecdotal "cleverness" of tracing such dual intercultural borrowing but also in that it serves as a welcome remedy to the type of linguistic or cultural exclusivism that somehow serves as a necessary starting point for studies such as the present ones even to be possible. When we started out investigations, we had to posit that certain religious or cultural motifs were essentially "Indo-European" or "Northwest Semitic," if only for the sake of argument. Because of the methodology of "etymological poetics," in which I have tried to look at how these motifs have been transferred by means of and together with linguistic material, such a rather artificial duality has been necessary for the purposes of methodological stringency. Looking at cases in which motifs have been reborrowed into Indo-European-speaking cultures helps us conceptually to tear down unncecessary walls between what is thought of as biblical and Indo-European. We shall look at some such instances now.

10.1 Dragons in Gnostic and Gnosticizing literature

One of the most telling cases of the "pizza effect" in the relationship between Indo-European and Old Testament thinking involves the dragon or serpent motif

[285] The term "pizza-effect" was first used by Agehānanda Bhāratī (1970: 273), with a special description of the background of the term in the history and development of the pizza, which was exported from southern Italy to the US and then imported back to Italy in a thoroughly changed form (in footnote no. 19). Bhāratī himself explains the term using the alternative expression "re-enculturation."

with which we have dealt at length in chapter 4. As argued there, the appearance of this motif in the biblical texts is not understandable without factoring in Indo-European influence. However, in a fascinating instance of dialectic religio-cultural interaction, the same motif was much later exported back into the world of Indo-European thought. I am thinking here of the appearance of the biblicized chaos serpent in the New Testament (to which we will be returning in a moment), but perhaps even more of its role in ancient Gnostic or Gnosticizing literature.[286] That religious current does, after all, represent what is almost a sort of religio-historical *locus classicus* of Indo-European/Semitic cross-fertilization. In its many and varying manifestations, Gnostic and Gnosticizing religions often tended to grow out of the confluence between biblical thinking and imagery and (often "heretically") Platonizing philosophy. A clearer example of Indo-European/biblical cultural interaction can hardly be asked for. I am writing this not because I believe there to be anything "essentially Indo-European" in Platonism, but rather because that type of Hellenistic philosophy is often, and somewhat naively, regarded as the epitome of "Indo-European thought" even today, even though it has few or none of the trappings of plausibly reconstructable Indo-European mythology or ideology (no dragons, no world-trees, no horse-twins, no horse sacrifices, etc.). Rather, and perhaps astonishingly, it is in the encounter with "biblical" or "Old Testament" ideas that the central "Indo-European" motif of the dragon is imported into post-Platonist discourse (in the form of Gnosticism and para-Gnosticism). It was the Hebrew Bible—and its inheritance from earlier Northwest Semitic mythology—that transported the perhaps originally Indo-European serpent imagery into those "hybrid" religions that make up what has sometimes been referred to as the "'underworld' of Platonism."[287]

10.2 An Example: The Dragon in the Hymn of the Pearl

One of the most illustrative examples of this type of re-borrowing of the dragon motif into a milieu grown out of Platonist thinking can be found in the so-called *Hymn of the Pearl*, a piece of text that has been preserved as part of the apocryphal Acts of Thomas (in both Syriac and Greek). In that poem, the role of the biblically derived dragon or serpent is very prominent indeed. Even though it clearly represents the chaos dragon familiar to readers of the Old Testament,

[286] I am well aware of the current battle over the terms "Gnostic" and "Gnosticism" that has been waged in the aftermath of works such as Williams 1996 and King 2003 (both of which argue for removing the words entirely from the scholarly lexicon). However, with Pearson 2007, I remain convinced that the words still have use as loose terms for certain rather similar Judeo-Christian movements sharing certain ideas about the world and salvation (even though the similarities between them certainly should not be exaggerated).

[287] For the term, see Dillon 1996: 384. The whole of Dillon's chapter 8 includes a presentation of the movements that he describes using it; my point is not that I agree with that presentation in all its details, but that the term "'underworld' of Platonism" carries a certain descriptive weight.

the role of the monster has been radically reinterpreted. It is now a symbol of matter and forgetfulness, the ontological chaos into which the human soul or spirit has descended. The unnamed hero of the story (who apparently symbolizes the human soul) descends into "Egypt" (the kingdom of matter) in order to retrieve a pearl of great price. After at first having been lulled to sleep by the food and drink of the Egyptians, he then uses magic incantations to put the dragon itself to sleep, whereupon he finds the pearl and returns to his home, where he is greeted by his father and the whole divine family. I here quote one of the most relevant passages from the Syriac version of the text, a few lines describing the actual "battle" between the protagonist and the serpent, which is carried out not by means of physical weaponry but using a magical spell, identified with the name of the divine parent:

W-šarrît mmaggeš ʾnâ leh
l-ḥewyâ dḥîlâ w-sāyqâ
w-ʾanîmteh w-ʾaškebteh
d-šem ʾāb(y) ʿlaw(hy) ʾnâ ʾetdakret[288]

I started practicing magic upon him,
on the terrible and hissing serpent,
and I soothed him, and I lulled him to sleep,
for my Father's name I recited over him.

Here, we can note an interesting case of ideological *longue durée* resilience despite changes in ontological world-view: just as the sea dragons of old represented "chaos" as imagined by Old Testament and other Ancient Near Eastern writers, the dragon of the Gnosticizing *Hymn of the Pearl* assigns that symbol as a significator of the "chaos" of that text, i.e., material existence. Even though the text quoted here is from the Syriac (i.e., Semitic) version of the tale, that text is part of a Gnostic-like religious milieu that would have been impossible outside the background of Platonist (stereotypically "Indo-European") thinking, and the text was quickly translated into Greek, showing the synthesis of the two traditions returning to the Indo-European linguistic fold.

It is, perhaps, no coincidence that the "dragon of chaos" motif, which is one of the clearest instances of shared material between the Semitic/biblical and Indo-European worlds of Antiquity, appears in Gnostic-like literature, which as mentioned above is one of the most apparent cases of cross-fertilization between these two cultures. The *Hymn of the Pearl* is one of the most impressive examples of this. As I hope to have made believable during the course of the present study, the chaos battle against the dragon monster in Northwest Semitic tradition owed much to Indo-European stories of a similar nature. In the *Hymn*, the dragon is, so to speak, given back to the Indo-European world (as the text was translated into Greek) and "philosophized." The battle against the serpent is

[288] The Syriac text is based on the editions of Kruse 1978 and Wright 1871.

carried out by means of soothing, spell-like words,[289] and the battle symbolizes the return of the soul to its heavenly abode in a way which feels much more stereotypically Indo-European (Greek or Indian, actually) than as something that would have been at home in the Old Testament. Yet, the story includes much clearly Old Testament material (the hero's descent into the—symbolic—land of Egypt, the motif of exile, which ultimately derives from the historical experiences of the Israelite people in Babylon).[290] Also, the motif of using a spell to counter the chaos monster probably goes back to older Ancient Near Eastern conceptions, as evidenced by Ea using a spell to soothe the divine "chaos parent" Apsû in the Enūma Eliš (as I have argued elsewhere).[291]

Thus, the *Hymn* provides a fascinating example of how a motif that was probably Indo-European in origin (cf. the arguments about the names of the serpent killers in section 4.6) was borrowed into the Semitic-speaking milieu of the Ancient Near East, whereupon it was expanded and subsequently (and much later) reborrowed into the "Indo-European" milieu that grew out of Platonizing philosophy. The circle thus becomes complete. To be sure, the text quoted above was originally written in Syriac, a Northwest Semitic language, but, as mentioned, it was quickly translated into Greek and disseminated in that language, completing the "re-importation."

10.3 The Dragon in the Book of Revelation and Christian Dragons

Of course, one of the clearest paths back from the Northwest Semitic dragon tales to the Indo-European speaking cultural milieu can be found in the New Testament itself. In the Apocalypse of John, the Dragon is, after all, a very prominent symbol, appearing in chapters 12, 13 and 16 as an enemy of God and Christ—and one expressely identified with Satan. Even though these dragon texts do not include as many overtly Ancient Near Eastern or "Semitic" motifs as does the story from the *Hymn of the Pearl*, it would be foolish indeed to separate it from the Old Testament background of the serpent battle. Given the Indo-European language used (Greek) and the subsequent spread of the New Testament across the entirety of the "classical Indo-European world," one may safely pose the question whether this extremely famous dragon battle would not have influenced almost every tale of great battles against monstrous serpents in the central Indo-European cultural sphere during late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. This, at least, is one point at which one may quite justly criticize Calvert

[289] For this point, see Wikander 2010: 268.

[290] Although some scholars today would readily question the actual importance of a historical Babylonian exile and would argue instead that exile is better viewed as a type of literary motif or construction in the Hebrew Bible; see for example the various essays from the 2015 volume *Myths of Exile: History and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. by Anne Katrine de Hemmer Gudme and Ingrid Hjelm). See, in particular, the introduction by the editors to that volume (pp. 1-10) for an overview of this point of view.

[291] Wikander 2010: 267-268; see Enūma Eliš I 61-65.

Watkins and those who, in his footsteps, have studied Indo-European dragon myths: since the reborrowing of the motif from Semitic speaking peoples, it becomes hard in the extreme to separate that "pizza effect" from actual Indo-European poetic inheritance. The only way of doing so, to my mind, is keeping the focus on shared etymological material and poetic formulae squarely in one's mind, but, even then, the "inherited" dragons and the "reborrowed" ones have certainly mated, perhaps making an absolute distinction between them impossible. Just as speakers of Semitic languages appear to have borrowed dragon ideas from speakers of Indo-European, so other speakers of Indo-European reborrowed them. The borders are truly fluid.

This, in itself, proves the necessity of engaging oneself in the type of etymologically and textually based mythological comparison that I have here attempted; it helps not only in discerning paths of transmission, but also in problematizing possibly simplistic views of cultural "integrity."

The same can of course be said of the entire Christian reception of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, with all of its (implied) serpent mythology. Even though Calvert Watkins studied the serpent-slaying motif as a specifically Indo-European phenomenon, in the sense of a semi-direct inheritance from Proto-Indo-European times into the various attested Indo-European cultures, one should not ignore the enormous influence of the biblical accounts upon such stories as that of St George and the Dragon. Here, I believe that it is necessary to acknowledge that it is not a question of "either" a Semitic "or" an Indo-European myth: it is one that has been borrowed back and forth and various versions of which can interact with one another and cross-fertilize. I would like to compare this with the scenario that I suggested for the "Conqueror" terminology appearing as titles for the dragon-slayer in Vedic, Hittite and Ugaritic in section 4.6: it is quite possible that a single "receiving" version of the story incorporated parts from differing versions and welded them together into a coherent whole.

10.4 Other Gnostic and Esoteric Reborrowings

A similar reinterpretation of Semitic sea mythology can be found in a Gnostic hymnal fragment preserved in the so-called *Codex Brucianus*. Here we read the following:

> Hear me as I sing praises to thee, O Mystery who existed before every incomprehensible one and every endless one. Hear me as I sing praise to thee, O Mystery, who hast shone in thy mystery, so that the mystery which exists from the beginning should be completed. And when thou didst shine, thou didst become water of the ocean whose imperishable name is this: …
>
> Hear me as I sing praises to thee, O Mystery who existest before every incomprehensible one and every endless one, who hast shone in thy mystery. The earth in the middle of the ocean was purified, of which the incomprehensible name is this: …

> Hear me as I sing praises to thee, O Mystery who existest before every incomprehensible one and every endless one, who hast shone in thy mystery. All the powerful matter of the ocean which is the sea, with every kind within it, was purified, of which the incomprehensible name is this: …
>
> Hear me as I sing praises to thee, O Mystery who existest before every incomprehensible one and every endless one, who hast shone in thy mystery. And as thou didst shine, thou didst seal the sea and all things in it, because of the power within them rebelled, of which the incomprehensible name (is this): …[292]

In this text, we do not find any clear reference to a serpent—or any trace of the Indo-European myth. However, there are repeated references to the "water" as chaos, behind which, I would argue, the Old Testament/Ancient Near Eastern image of the chaos waters lurks. And note the reference to "every kind" within the sea: this may well be a veiled indication of the serpent monster. When the hymnal piece says that God sealed the sea and the rebellious powers within it, it is impossible not to see a background of this motif in the *Chaoskampf* stories of the Hebrew Bible.

This hymnal fragment, then, represents a somewhat different development compared with the Gnosticizing texts that reintroduced the serpent motif into "Indo-European" Platonizing milieux. Here, the motif is simply the sea itself, i.e., the more purely "Semitic" version of the *Chaoskampf* imagery, which now occurs in a Gnostic setting (in a text that may well have been originally in Greek, even though it is only preserved in a Coptic translation). The biblical story once welded the serpent and the water together, but the text in the Bruce Codex only carries on the tradition of the water clearly, whereas the *Hymn of the Pearl* includes the Serpent himself. The underlying imagery, I would say, is the same, a convergence of "biblical" and "Indo-European" imagery.

Another interesting Gnostic reception of the biblical serpent imagery can be found in the so called Ophite Diagram, a schematic of the metaphysical layout of the world according to the views of the Gnostic group known as "Ophites" or "Ophians." This diagram, which is described both by Celsus in his attacks on Christians and in the *Contra Celsum* of Origen, is made up of a number of circles, showing the various planetary spheres, etc. The outermost of these circles is said to be the Leviathan.[293] Here, the Serpent himself envelops the "chaos" of the physical world.

---

[292] The translation is quoted from that found in Schmidt and MacDermot 1978: 139-140 (translation by MacDermot, edition of the Coptic text by Schmidt), also available online at www.gnosis.org (http://gnosis.org/library/frghm.htm, accessed latest June 12, 2016). The ellipsis dots stand for divine names*/voces magicae* in the Coptic text (*Aēzōa, Azōae* and similar). I have removed the roman type signifying Greek loanwords in the Coptic text.

[293] On the Ophite diagram and its interpretation, see especially DeConick 2013 (with further references). The description of the diagram is spread across many places in *Contra Celsum*; I refer to DeConnick for more specific references to textual passages on

This motif of a Leviathan-like dragon marking the outermost sphere of the cosmos is found in the early Kabbalistic work known as Sepher Yetzirah (*sēper yĕṣîrâ* in pure transcription).[294] In this text, a dragon-like being known as the *tly* forms an important part of the esoteric cosmology presented. This being is probably in a sense a representation of the constellation Draco, but it is hard not also to see in it a piece of reception of the ancient Leviathan/Rahab mythology in a way consistent with what we have seen in the case of the Ophite Gnostics. This means that, once again, the attestation of the motif in the Sepher Yetzirah provides an example of the (probably) originally Indo-European serpent imagery appearing in a context that—although written in a Semitic language—probably borrows from Greek philosophical thought. The fact that the Sepher Yetzirah has subsequently become an important text in the (Indo-European speaking) world of Western Esotericism just serves to make the point even stronger.

Another possible example of "re-borrowing" could perhaps be found in the matter of the "stranger/*gēr*" motif as an expression of human "foreignness" in the physical world, which occurs in the Hebrew Bible in Ps 39:13 and 119:19 but later became a mainstay in Gnostic and Gnosticizing thought. Perhaps this motif, if indeed borrowed from the Indo-European ambit (as I very cautiously suggested in chapter 8), was re-borrowed into that syncretic stream of thinking. We have already touched upon the expression Ger-Adamas (possibly meaning "Adam the Stranger"), which would provide an instance of this reborrowing.

10.5 From Borrowing to Fusion: The Case of the Segmented Adam

An even more difficult—yet fascinating—type of interaction is that made up of mythological/theological material that appears continually to have been fused together by the blending of ideas originating in biblical and Indo-European traditions. Such may well be the case concerning the traditions of what is sometimes known as *Adam Octipartite* or *Septipartite*, a type of telling that appears in many vesions in mediaeval Christian thought and to a large extent goes back to Jewish mystical speculation (and to the Henoch literature). The idea is describing Adam, the primordeal human being, as having been created out of various elements or parts of the world, thus creating a type of "world man." The genre appears in many languages; early surviving Western Christian (Indo-European) versions can be found in Latin and Old Irish; in eastern Europe, there are also early versions in Old Church Slavonic.[295]

---

the various parts of the figure. One should note that the text also refers to Behemoth being at the center, and possibly sees this as a sort of *Gegenstück* to the Leviathan (see DeConnick 2013: 48).

[294] An edition (with translation and an inner-traditional commentary) of the Sepher Yetzirah can be found in Kaplan 1993. The discussion of Draco can be found on p. 233.

[295] For a general introduction to and overview of these traditions, see Macaskill and Greenwood 2013. An early Irish manuscript of this type of story is London, Additional MS 4783, folio 7a.

The fascinating thing to notice from the perspective of this book is that the segmented creation of Adam, the prototypical Human Being, closely parallels what is often regarded as a very Indo-European tale indeed: the sacrifice of the world-man, often known as a "Twin" (Vedic *Yama*, Avestan *Yima*, and, according to some, the Norse *Ymir* and the Roman *Remus*, whose name is then assumed to be a corruption of an original **Yemos*, related to Yama and Yima and thus also, ultimately, meaning "Twin").[296] Given that tales of the slaying of an early brother by another is by no means foreign in the Hebrew Bible (Cain and Abel in Gen 4:1-16!), this type of tale is extremely difficult to study in terms of "who borrowed from whom." The stories have an almost folk-tale like character.

However, once the story of the segmented proto-human, Adam, started appearing in Indo-European languages, in a Christian context, the picture becomes both murkier and more fascinating. The Old Irish story of Adam being made up from the various elements of the world has been interpreted in Indo-Europeanist scholarship as a Christianized remnant of the above-mentioned Proto-Indo-European mythic scheme. But it also, without a doubt, represents a piece of reception of Jewish, Semitic language speculation going back go the beginnings of the first millennium CE. The possibility then suggests itself that what we have in early Indo-European tellings of the "Segmented Adam" story (like the Old Irish one) is actually a *fusion* of an inherited Indo-European tale and a biblically derived Jewish story.

All in all, these small forays into originally Indo-European motifs that have been subjected to the "Pizza Effect" serve to remind us that borders—linguistic, cultural, or otherwise—are rarely absolute. The dragons may have come from Indo-European tongues, but the speakers of biblical languages subsequently sent them back home.

[296] For an overview, see West 2007: 356-359.

11. In Conclusion

With the dragons having returned home—where do we find ourselves? What have these varying studies on possible Northwest Semitic reception of Indo-European motifs taught us?

We have learned that borrowed motifs can persist in the receiving linguistic culture even though the origin may be utterly opaque, certain ideas having still persisted subtextually, carried through the etymological material. We have learned that that borrowed motifs may at one point show their origin through actual lexical borrowings, yet can later seemingly be separated from it by adapting native terminology to continue the same motifs. One such example was the "beings of smoke" motif, in which case the actual linguistic borrowing can be seen in the Ugaritic texts (where Anatolian-derived terminology is used to express it), whereas native Semitic vocabulary is used when the motif returns in the context of the Hebrew Bible. A similar situation was found in the matter of the terminology for the victorious Storm God and his serpentine adversary: at Ugarit, the terms occur in a way that appears to be calqued on Indo-European patterns (the "Conqueror" and the "Enveloper/Coverer/Hinderer/Encircler"), but in the preserved text of the Hebrew Bible, these terms do not occur in the same clear-cut way (although the name Leviathan is, of course, still there). Again, this raises the important question of at what point in history this specific piece of Indo-European influence was transmitted into the Northwest Semitic ambit: was it in Proto-Northwest-Semitic times, or (more specifically) in the cultural context of ancient Ugarit? In short, was Baal (or a similar Proto-Northwest Semitic divine figure) thought of as an *ʾalʾiyanu* ("Conqueror") at an earlier point than the attested Ugaritic text, and, if this was indeed the case, was that idea transmitted into Israelite culture as well, although this is not directly visible in the texts of the Hebrew Bible as transmitted to us?

In matters such as these, one would be wise not to limit one's options. It is quite thinkable, for example, that the main "serpent slaying" motif was borrowed into the Northwest Semitic world at a very early period but was later "bolstered" using the Conqueror/Encircler terminology at the level underlying the Ugaritic texts.

In our discussion of social terminology for boundary-crossers and "foreigners," we noted that such ideas can be borrowed both at the level of individual words and at a more abstract level of motifs; we looked at both these possibilities in some detail. Even though I began with a more "typological" form of comparison in that case, I also suggested actual lexical contacts.

At a number of points in the book, I have tried to highlight some of the methodological issues that this lexically based type of investigation raises. One important such question is the matter of the "etymological fallacy," i.e., the mistake of assuming that the etymological background of a word or an expression need in some way imply what the word "actually" means (whatever "actually" is meant to signify in this connection). What I have tried to point to is

a number of cases in which a more ancient (Indo-European-influenced) meaning appears to be hiding beneath a perhaps more well-known synchronous meaning. There is nothing inherently "Indo-European" in the reference to "smoke" in Hosea 13, but if one adds to that text its probable background in Northwest Semitic imagery such as that preserved in the Ugaritic Aqhat text, a new layer of meaning makes itself known, and that Ugaritic text clearly betrays Indo-European (Anatolian) influence in the form of concrete loanwords. Again, the point here is that the reception of extra-Semitic motif material can be carried through specific borrowed words but then be separated from these words during the chain of transmission.

One may also note again that the type of study carried out here is not simply a matter of "comparison" in some abstract sense, or even as a purely historical exercise. Since critical biblical exegesis is perforce a historical discipline, however, the study of the background of biblical motifs and linguistic material is by implication also an aid in the exegesis of concrete texts. If one reckons with the possibility of "etymologically poetic" layers of meaning being present, one learns more about the historical meaning of the text.

The main lesson to be learnt from these studies at a meta-level is perhaps what appears at the surface to be rather a simplistic one: that no linguistic culture can be viewed as monadic and that historical linguistics-based mythological comparison needs to take borrowing and cultural interaction into account. But is this not self-evident?

Not necessarily. Due to the extreme specialization that is certainly a more and more prevalent trend in Academia of today, students of ancient textual cultures run a greater and greater risk of blinding themselves from data from historically relevant yet "foreign" corpora or sets of material (as seen from the vantage-point of their own specific field of study). Yet, there is also the opposite danger: that of disassociating oneself from the historical realities that one is studying, to move entirely onto a kind of meta-level, at which the matter at hand is not specific texts or other forms of human cultural production but rather that which is deemed to be common to "humankind itself," in a more or less ahistorical sense. The example of the dragon/serpent mythology discussed in this volume will make both of these issues clear: on the one hand, one will blind oneself to possible historical backgrounds and interactions if one looks only at material from one specific linguistic phylum where two or many may have interacted, but on the other hand, one does scholarship a great disservice if one leaves the realm of historically probable cases of interaction and starts discussing such questions as "dragons all over the world," adducing evidence from China, South America or various other cultural areas that could never have had any impact whatsoever on Israelite or Ugaritic culture.

Given that the subject of the present book is various forms of intercultural borrowing and interaction, it is rather intriguing that one of the cases that show parallel expressions is one concerned with the very matter of being "foreign" or

outside of the established society. As I mentioned at the end of the chapter on these pieces of terminology (chapter 8), it is fascinating to imagine that ancient Semitic-speaking cultures could actually have used bits of this terminology to refer to the (Indo-European-speaking) "foreigners" with whom the expressions and motifs themselves may have originated. In that case, the idea of the boundary-crossers as metaphorical "wolves" is a highly illuminating connection that may well have been passed along with the more basic expressions as an "etymological poetic" motif. When we know from Indo-European studies that there may have been a social institution in the early periods of that linguistic phylum of warrior-bands, living on the outskirts of society and being referred to as "wolves," then the mention of wolves in connection with the semantically corresponding Hebrew verbal root *gwr* becomes noteworthy indeed. The possibility that a poetic memory of such bands of semi-wild warriors and "boundary crossers" could lie as a subtext here grants the text an additional layer of exegetically relevant meaning.

The question of how "foreign" motifs and concepts were viewed by some authors of the Hebrew Bible came up in the discussion about the concept of "dividing a god." If it is the fact, as I have argued, that the story about Jeroboam creating the sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan was construed by the (proto)-Deuteronomist author as a kind of "foreign" (specifically, Hittite) ritual idea, this idea of "boundary-crossing" religious practices is illustrated in yet another way.

One of the perhaps most startling findings arrived at in the present volume is the way in which etymologically (and in the sense of "etymological poetics") identical material that had been split up and separated by the workings of historical linguistic development in various branches of the Indo-European family appears sometimes to have been "reunited" by means of a non-Indo-European focal point, in this case Northwest Semitic culture, at least as represented at Ugarit. We saw this in action when we discussed the Ugaritic reception of the "Conqueror" terminology as applied to the victorious Storm God, a reception that may well have its origin in material derived from both the Anatolian and the Indo-Iranian branches of Indo-European. When this is combined with the perspective of the "Pizza Effect," it becomes clear that the history of Indo-European/Northwest Semitic cultural interaction in effect constitutes a large web of reception history, in which it is not always easy to separate one culture from the other. And this, again, is an important finding: that the rigid boundaries sometimes posited between the early Indo-European and biblical cultural worlds need to be rethought. The cultural spheres in question did exist, to be sure—their existence is an essential methodological axiom for studies such as these to be feasible—but they are neither static nor "self-being." They should not be unnecessarily hypostasized.

The motifs for which I have argued a connection between Indo-European and biblical/Northwest Semitic cultural milieu must have passed between these linguistic settings in very different ways and at different points in time. Some

probably migrated from Indo-European to Semitic-speaking peoples at a period in history predating at least written Northwest Semitic sources by quite some time—in some cases, we may even be talking about time-depths close to the proto-language level. In other cases, the points of transmission may have been closer to (or even within) the bounds of historically attested Northwest Semitic mythological writings. And the two possibilities need not be regarded as mutually exclusive: I regard it as rather likely that the serpent-slaying motif, for example, was adopted from Indo-European sources at quite an early point (probably during early second millennium BCE or even earlier), but, as we have seen, this early interaction seems to have been "buttressed" by subsequent and additional influence at a later point (a possibility suggested by the appearance of what seems to be specifically translated mythological nomenclature at Ugarit).

Studying how mythological motifs may have spread from Indo-European to Northwest Semitic sources entails a special kind of illustration of some of the processes that may have been involved in the spread of the Indo-European linguistic family itself—and of the ideological features that may perhaps have been attached to it. An intriguing suggestion put forth by David W. Anthony (2007, esp. chapter 17, aptly titled "Words and Deeds") has at its core the idea that among the most important factors involved in facilitating the rapid spread of Indo-European as such were (a) its mythic/ritual/poetic tradition (which, one may venture, would have been exemplified by tales such as the dragon stories and described as "imperishable fame," itself an inherited motif or collocation), a tradition that may have granted the speakers of Indo-European a type of "élite" status, and (b) certain technological advances, such as the domestication of the horse. And these two factors (three, if one counts the expression "imperishable" or "unburning fame" that has given this volume its title) happen to be among those reflected as results of Indo-European/Semitic interaction in the Ugaritic texts and in those of the Hebrew Bible. This, I would propose, is no coincidence. Of course, I do not mean that the fact of these Indo-European words and motifs being represented in the world of the Hebrew Bible carries with it some sort of statistical significance—the studies in this book have not in any way been statistically based, making any such argument nonsensical. However, it appears to be a fact that a word for "horse" and heroic tales about serpent-slaying were *among* the material imported from Indo-European sources, which fits very well with the image of (Proto-)Indo-European culture built up by Anthony, Watkins, West, etc. If borrowed Indo-European words or motifs are to be found in Northwest Semitic, these are ones one might expect to find—and such turns out to be the case. Not only specific words were transmitted, but also the mythological structure that was perhaps the most typical of early Indo-European culture as a whole. If, as Anthony suggests, bardic tales of heroic exploits were important means of transmission of Indo-European linguistic culture itself, then this becomes even more salient when we see this process occurring even in the case of borrowings, without an accompanying language shift.

It is my contention that the élite transmission by means of poetic capital, so to speak, that David W. Anthony suggested can be found represented in the pages of the Hebrew Bible and in the Ugaritic epics—or at least that its results can be. When we read today of YHWH's heroic exploits as a slayer of serpents, of the god Dagon as the enemy of the "Little Sun" Samson, of the boundary-crossing, wolf-like foreigners that threatened the borders of ancient realms and perhaps influenced the self-identification of the Hebrews, and of the vital force of humanity being thought of in terms of "smoke" that passes away—then we may in fact be viewing the remnants of Indo-European storytelling having spread and been adapted by another cultural and linguistic sphere. And when we see Greek language texts that helped shape the entire cultural and religious history of Europe (and the world) import not only "natively Semitic" concepts (to use a simplistic phrase) from the world of the Hebrew Bible but also some of the concepts that had an earlier home among speakers of Indo-European, we see that there is no one-sided or simply "giving" and "receiving" equation at work here, but a continuous process of borrowing and reborrowing. Indeed, early Indo-European sources have borrowed from Semitic sources, as well. One such possible mythological borrowing from Semitic into Indo-European may be present in the Thunder-Sea-Underworld division of the three main Greek male gods (Zeus, Hades, Poseidon), which has an exact parallel in Ugaritic mythology (Baal, Mot, Yamm) but is not that common in other Indo-European sources.[297]

Again, it bears repeating that investigating interactions of the sort that we have done in this volume may serve as a corrective to tendencies to view ancient cultures as isolated from each other in their respective mythologies. Even though we have consistently talked of "Indo-European" motifs (in the sense of "motifs originally carried through Indo-European etymological material"), one should not forget that this has been a matter of methodology. The motifs studied probably *did* cross the boundaries of linguistic cultures; even though we look at them as constructs being at home in a certain language family, what we have been studying is in fact the active defiance of that principle: motifs that "jump the fence," so to speak. The great and ongoing interaction between Indo-European and Northwest Semitic ideological and mythological material is, after all, what gave rise to the entire Christian tradition. The interaction still goes on today. By following motifs from one language family into another, one can see how intertwined ancient cultures actually were. By separating them and reconstructing them, one can paradoxically see how the divides were bridged.

In studying the early and far-reaching interactions between Indo-European and Northwest Semitic culture, the results of which helped shape the religious and literary history of the entire world, we can be reminded that even though we as

[297] The parallel structure of the triple powers Zeus-Poseidon-Hades and Baal-Yamm-Mot was also noted in López-Ruiz 2014: 179. I myself made the same point in Wikander 2008: 189.

humans may be little more than "beings of smoke," the tales and ideas that we share with each other, across borders and into unexpected reaches of history, can still grant us a glimpse of that immortal and indestructible fame that will never, ever burn.

12. Abbreviations

AAE	Militarev, Alexander and Stolbova, Olga V., *Afro-Asiatic Etymology* (online database, available as part of the website of Sergei Starostin, starling.rinet.ru ; accessed latest Dec 28, 2016).
AB	Anchor Bible.
AV	Atharva-Veda.
AOAT	Alter Orient und altes Testament.
BHKApp	*Biblia Hebraica Kittel* critical apparatus.
BHSApp	*Biblia Hebraica Stutgartensia* critical apparatus.
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series.
CTH	Catalogue des textes Hittites.
DDD	*Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 2nd ed., ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill 1999.
DUL	Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, Sanmartín, Joaquín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, 3rd rev. ed., tr. and ed. Wilfred G.E. Watson. HdO 1/122. Leiden 2015.
EIEC	*Enclyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*, ed. James P. Mallory and Douglas Q. Adams. London: Fitzroy Dearborn 1997.
EIET (Telepinu)	Slocum, Jonathan and Kimball, Sara E., *Early Indo-European Texts, Hittite: The Telepnus "Vanishing God" Myth (Anatolian Mythology)*, https://lrc.la.utexas.edu/eieol/hitol/20 (accessed latest Dec 11, 2016).
EE	Enūma eliš.
EOR	*Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2nd ed., ed. Lindsay Jones. Detroit, MI/Farmington Hills, MI: Macmillan Reference USA/Gale 2005.
ETCSL	Black, J.A., Cunningham, G., Ebeling, J., Flückiger-Hawker, E., Robson, E., Taylor, J., and Zólyomi, G., *The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* (http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/), Oxford 1998–2006.
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament.
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.*
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, rev. by Walter Baumgartner

	and Johann Jakob Stamm, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J Richardson. Leiden: Brill 2001.
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik.
HED	Puhvel, Jaan, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Trends in Linguistics: Documentation. Berlin/New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter 1984-.
JANER	*Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions.*
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society.*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society.*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies.*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies.*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series.
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
KAI	Donner, H. and Röllig W., *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften: mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz 1962-1964.
KBo	*Keilschrift-texte aus Boghazköi*.
KTU	Dietrich, Manfried, Loretz, Oswald and Sanmartín, Joaquín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten/The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places: Third, Enlarged Edition, KTU*^{3}. *AOAT* 360/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2013.
KUB	*Keischrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.*
LIV	*Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*.
LXX	Septuagint.
NIL	Wodtko, Dagmar S. Britta Irslinger and Carolin Schneider, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter 2008.
OT	Old Testament.
OTL	Old Testament Library.
RCU	Pardee, Dennis, ed. Lewis, Theodore J., *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 10. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2002.
RS	Ras Shamra.
ṚV	Ṛg-Veda
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok.*
StBT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten.

TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Various translators.
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen.*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum.*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum.
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

13. Bibliography

Albertz, Rainer

1997 "צעק *ṣʿq* to cry out." Pp. 1088-1093 in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 3, ed. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, tr. by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MS: Hendrickson.

Albright, William Foxwell

1920 "Gilgamesh and Engidu, Mesopotamian Genii of Fecundity." *JAOS* 40:307-335.

1950/1951 "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm LXVIII)." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23: 1-39.

Anderson, Francis I. and Freedman, David Noel

1980 *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 24. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Anthony, David W.

2007 *The Horse, the Wheel and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Astour, Michael C.

1967 *Hellenosemitica: An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenean Greece*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.

Ayali-Darshan, Noga

2011 *Těpûṣô šel sippûr milḥemet ʾēl hassaʿar bayyām bĕmizraḥ haqqārôb haqqādûm: mĕqôrôt, mĕsôrôt wĕhisṭôryâ*. (PhD diss. written in Modern Hebrew, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; revised edition Published in Hebrew 2016).

2013 "Baal, Son of Dagan: In Search of Baal's Double Paternity." *JAOS* 133: 651-657.

2015 "The Other Version of the Story of the Storm-god's Combat with the Sea in the Light of Egyptian, Ugaritic, and Hurro-Hittite Texts." *JANER* 15: 20-51.

Bachvarova, Mary R.

2016 *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, William D.

2006 "'And thus you brightened the heavens …'. A New Translation of KTU 1.5 i 1-8 and its Significance for Ugaritic and Biblical Studies." *UF* 38: 41-52.

2014 *Isaiah's Kingship Polemic: An Exegetical Study in Isaiah 24-27*. FAT II 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Barr, James

1968 *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beal, Richard H.
2002 "Dividing a God." Pp. 197-208 in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. Paul Mirecki and Marvin Meyer. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 141. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.

Beattie, D.R.G and Davies, Philip R.
2011 "What does Hebrew Mean?" *JSS* 56: 71-83.

Beckman, Gary
1982 "The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka." *JANES* 14: 11-25.

Beckman, Gary M., Bryce, Trevor R. and Cline, Eric H.
2011 *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Society of Biblical Literature: Writings from the Ancient World 28. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Beekes, Robert S. P.
2010 *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols, with the assistance of Lucien van Beek. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary ¨ Series 10. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill.

2011 *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed, revised and corrected by Michiel de Vaan. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Belier, Wouter W.
1991 *Decayed Gods: Origin and Development of Georges Dumézil's "idéologie tripartite."* Leiden/New York: Brill.

Ben Zvi, Ehud
2006 *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles.* Bible World. London: Equinox.

Bhārati, Agehānanda
1970 "The Hindu Renaissance and its Apologetic Patterns." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 29: 267-287.

Birnbaum, Philip
1959 *High Holiday Prayer Book: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. New York, NY: Hebrew Publishing Company.

Bomhard, Allan R. & Kerns, John C.
1994 *The Nostratic Macrofamily: A Study in Distant Linguistic Relationship*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bottéro, Jean
1981 "Les Ḫabiru, les nomades et les sédentaires." Pp 89-107 in *Nomads and Sedentary Peoples: International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, [Mexico City, 1976]*, ed. Jorge Silva Castillo. México, D.F.: El Colegia de México.

Brough, John
1959 "The Tripartite Ideology of the Indo-Europeans: An Experiment in Method." *BSOAS* 22: 69-85.

Carmi, T. (ed. [and transl.])
1981 *The Penguin Book of Hebrew Verse*. Harmondsworth/ New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Chantraine, Pierre
1968 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Vol. 1. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

Charlesworth, James H.
2004 "Bashan, Symbology, Haplography, and Theology in Psalm 68." Pp. 351-372 in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*, ed. Bernard F. Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Civil, Miguel
1966 "Notes on Sumerian Lexicography I", *JCS* 20: 199-124.

Clackson, James
2007 *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Paul S. and Hyllested, Adam
2006 "Initial h_3 in Anatolian: Regularity in Ostensible Chaos." Abstract/summary of unpublished conference presentation at the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 4, 2006. Available online at http://www.pies.ucla.edu/WeCIEC/ Cohen_P_Hyllested_A_2006.pdf (accessed latest Jan 26, 2017).

2012 "A New Sound Law of PIE: Initial $**h_3\underline{u} > *h_2\underline{u}$." Pp. 53-72 in *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics*, ed. Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Birgit Anette Olsen and Jens Elmegård Rasmussen. Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 4. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press/University of Copenhagen.

Corti, Carlo
2007 "The So-Called 'Theogony' or 'Kingship in Heaven': The Name of the Song." *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 49: 109-121.

Cowgill, Warren
1979 "Anatolian *ḫi*-Conjugation and Indo-European Perfect: Installment II." Pp. 25-39 in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*, ed. Erich Neu and Wolfgang Meid. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 25. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Cross, Frank Moore
1962 "Yahweh and the Gods of the Patriarchs." *Harvard Theological Review* 55: 225-259.

Cross, Frank Moore and Freedman, Noel
1948 "The Blessing of Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67: 191-210.

Cryer, Frederick H.
1994 *Divination in Ancient Israel and its Near Eastern Environment: A Socio-Historical Investigation*. JSOTSup 142. Sheffield: JSOT Press/Sheffield Academic Press.

Dahlqvist, Allan
1977 *Megasthenes and Indian Religion.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Dahood, Mitchell
1965 *Psalms I: 1-50*. AB 16. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

1968 *Psalms II: 51-100*. AB 17. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

1970 *Psalms III: 101-150*. AB 17A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Davies, Graham I.
1992 *Hosea*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall Pickering/Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.

Davies, Philip R.
2015 *In Search of 'Ancient Israel.'* 2nd ed. London/New York, NY: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Day, John
1985 *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dearman, J. Andrew
2010 *The Book of Hosea*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

DeConnick, April D.
2013 "The Road for the Soul is through the Planets: The Mysteries of the Ophians Mapped." Pp. 37-44 in *Practicing Gnosis: Ritual, Magic, Theurgy and Liturgy in Nag Hammadi, Manichaean and Other Ancient Literature. Essays in Honor of Birger A. Pearson*, ed. April D. DeConick, Gregory Shaw and John D. Turner. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 85. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill.

Dillon, John
1996 *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Rev. ed. with new foreword. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dietrich, Bernard Clive
1974 *The Origins of Greek Religion*. Berlin/New York, NY: De Gruyter.

Dietrich, Manfried & Loretz, Oswald
1984 "Der Tod Baals als Rache Mots für die Vernichtung Leviathans in KTU 1.5 I 1-8." *UF* 12: 404-407.

Dongen, Erik van
2011 "The 'Kingship in Heaven'-Theme of the Hesiodic *Theogony*: Origin, Function, Composition." *GRBS* 51: 180-201.

Driver, Godfrey R.
1954 *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1957 *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* Abridged and Revised edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Durand, Jean-Marie
1988 "8) Le nom de Bétyles à Ebla et en Anatolie." *N.A.B.U.* 1988:1: 5-6.

Edzard, Lutz
2012 "Introduction: Semitic and Afro-Asiatic." Pp. 23-58 in *Semitic and Afro-Asiatic: Challenges and Opportunities*, ed. Lutz Edzard. Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie 24. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Ehret, Christopher
1995 *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian): Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 126. Berkely, CA/Los Angeles, CA/London: University of California Press.

Eichner, Heiner
1974 *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination*. Printed *Teildruck* of doctoral dissertation. Friedrich-Alexander-Universität zu Erlangen-Nürnberg.

1979 Review of Johannes Friedrich and Annelies Kammenhuber: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed., fascicule 2. *Die Sprache* 25: 76-77.

Emerton, J. A.
1972 "A Difficult part of Mot's speech to Baal in the Ugaritic Texts." *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1.5: 50-71.

1982 "Leviathan and *Ltn*: The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon." *VT* 32: 327-331.

Feliu, Lluís
2003 *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*. Tr. by Wilfred G.E. Watson. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 19. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill.

Fleming, Daniel E.
1994 "The Mountain Dagan: ^{d}KUR and (^{d})KUR.GAL." *N.A.B.U.* 1994: 17-18.

2012 *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics, and the Reinscribing of Tradition*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Fortson, Benjamin W.
2010 *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics 19. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Freedman, David Noel
1980 "Early Israelite History in the Light of Early Israelite Poetry." Pp. 131-166 in *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Collected Essays on Hebrew Poetry/Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Freedman, David Noel and Lundbom, Jack R.
1980 "חָדַל *chādhal*." Pp. 216-221 in *TDOT*, vol 4.

Frisk, Hjalmar
1960 *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Gamkrelidze, Thomas V. & Ivanov, Vjačeslav V.
1995 *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. 2 vols. Tr. by Johanna Nichols. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 80. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

García-Ramón, J.L.
1998 "Indogermanisch **g$^{u̯h}$en-* '(wiederholt) schlagen', 'töten'." Pp. 139-154 in *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 92. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Gilan, Amir
2013 "Once upon a Time in Kiškiluša: The Dragon-Slayer Myth in Central Anatolia." Pp. 98-111 in *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis*, ed. JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Giorgieri, Mauro
2001 "Hurritisch *te-li-(i-)ip-pa* / hethtitisch *nu- … ma-ak-nu-ut* in der hurritisch-hethitischen Bilingue aus Boğazköy." Pp. 125-138 in *Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Richter, Doris Prechel and Jörg Klinger. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.

Goetze, Albrecht
1962 Review of Annelies Kammenhuber: *Hippologia Hetthitica* (1961). *JCS* 16: 30-35.

Gordon, Cyrus H.
1962 *Before the Bible: The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilisations*. London: Collins.

Green, Alberto R.W.
2003 *The Storm God in the Ancient Near East*. Biblical and Judaic Studies 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Greenstein, Edward L.
2015 "The Fugitive Hero Narrative Pattern in Mesopotamia." Pp. 17-36 in *Worship, Women and War: Essays in Honor of Susan Niditch*, ed. John J. Collins, T.M. Lemos and Saul M. Olyan. Brown Judaic Studies 357. Providence, RI: Brown University.

Grottanelli, Cristiano
1987 "The Story of Deborah and Baraq: A Comparatve Approach." *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 53: 149-164.

1999 *Kings & Prophets: Monarchic Power, Inspired Leadership & Sacred Text in Biblical Narrative*. Some chapters tr. by Lesley Antonelli Sullivan. New York, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guillaume, Philippe
2005 *Waiting for Josiah: The Judges*. JSOTSup 385. London/New York, NY: T&T Clark International.

Gunkel, Hermann
1895 *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap. Joh. 12: mit Beiträgen von Heinrich Zimmern*. Göttingen.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav
1948 "The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod." *American Journal of Archaeology* 52: 123-134.

1958 "The Composition of Hittite Prayers to the Sun." *JAOS* 78: 237-245.

Haas, Volkert
1994 *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. HdO 1/15. Leiden: Brill.

Hawkins, John D.
2000 *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Vol. 1: Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Part 1*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Healey, J.F.
1999 "Dagon," Pp. 216-219 in *DDD*.

Heesterman, J.C.
1988 "Householder and Wanderer." Pp. 251-271 in *Way of Life: King, Householder, Renouncer: Essays in Honour of Louis Dumont*, 2nd ed., ed. T.N. Madan. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass [originally published in *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 15 [1981]: 251-271].

Hemmer Gudme, Anne Katrine de and Hjelm, Ingrid (eds.)
2015 *Myths of Exile: History and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. Copenhagen International Seminar. London/New York, NY: Routledge.

Hess, Richard S.
1993 *Amarna Personal Names*. American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series 9. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Hewitt, Steve
2009 "The Question of a Hamito-Semitic Substratum in Insular Celtic" *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3: 972-995.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr.
1964 "An Anatolian Cult Term in Ugaritic." *JNES* 23: 66-68.

1965 "The Elkunirsa Myth Reconsidered." *Revue Hittite et asianique* 23: 5-16.

1967 "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *ʾôḇ*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86: 385-401.

1998 *Hittite Myths*. Ed. By Gary M. Beckman. 2nd ed. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Zenger, Erich
2011 *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101-150*. Tr. by Linda M. Maloney, ed. Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Houten, Christiana van
1991 *The Alien in Israelite Law*. JSOTSup 107. Sheffield: JSOT.

Jackson, Howard M.
1981 "Geradamas, the Celestial Stranger." *New Testament Studies* 27: 385-394.

Janowski, Bernd and Wilhelm, Gernot
1993 "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt: Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10.21f." Pp. 109-169 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposion Hamburg 17.-21. März 1990*, ed. Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 129. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jasanoff, Jay
2003 *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. New York, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jeremias, Jörg
1977 *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. 2nd rev. and expanded ed. Wissenschaftlichen Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 10. Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Joosten, Jan
1996 *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26*. VTSup 67. Leiden/New York, NY/Köln: Brill.

Kaplan, Aryeh
1993 *Sepher Yetzirah: The Book of Creation*. York Beach, ME: Samuel Weiser.

Katz, Joshua T.
1998 "How to Be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite *Illuyankaš* and its Linguistic and Cultural Cogeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic." Pp. 317-334 in *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 92. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universitet Innsbruck.

Keel, Othmar
1978 *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob: Eine Deutung von Ijob 38-41 vor dem Hintergrund der Zeitgenössichen Bildkunst*. Forschungen zur Religion und Litteratur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 121. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kellermann, Dieter
1975 "גּוּר *gûr;* גֵּר *gēr;* גֵּרוּת *gērûth;* מְגוּרִים *mᵉghûrîm*." Pp. 439-449 in *TDOT*, vol 2.

Kelly-Buccellati, Marilyn
2002 "Ein hurritischer Gang in die Unterwelt." *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 134: 131-148. English language version available at the Urkesh website: http://www.urkesh.org/attach/Kelly-Buccellati_2002_Ein_hurritischer_Gang_English_-_MDOG_134.pdf (accessed latest Dec 11, 2016).

King, Karen L.
2003 *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, MA/London: Belknap.

Kloekhorst, Alwin
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill.

2014 [2016] "Proto-Indo-European 'Thorn'-Clusters." *Historische Sprachforschung* 127: 43-67.

Kloos, Carola
1986 *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. G.A. van Oorschot: Amsterdam/Leiden: Brill.

Kogan, Leonid
2006 "Animal Names in Biblical Hebrew: An Etymological Overview." Pp. 257-320 in *Babel und Bibel 3*, ed. L. Kogan *et al*., Orientalia et Classica 14. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Kruse, Heinz
1978 "The Return of the Prodigal: Fortunes of a Parable on its Way to the Far East." *Orientalia* 47: 163-214.

Kuhn, Adalbert
1853 "Ueber die durch nasale erweiterten nasalstämme." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 2: 455-471.

Kümmel, Martin Joachim
2012 "Typology and Reconstruction: The Consonants and Vowels of Proto-Indo-European." Pp. 291-329 in *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics*, ed. Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander, Birgit Anette Olsen and Jens Elmegård Rasmussen. Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 4. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press/University of Copenhagen.

Lahiri, Ajoy Kumar
1984 *Vedic Vṛtra*. Dehli: Motilal Banasidass.

Lam, Joseph
2011 "A Reassessment of the Alphabetic Hurrian Text RS 1.004 (KTU 1.42): A Ritual Anointing of Deities?" *JANER* 11: 148-169.

Lambert, W.G.
2013 *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 16. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Lang, Bernhard
2002 *The Hebrew God: Portrait of an Ancient Deity*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Laroche, Emmanuel
1968 *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. 1: Mythologie anatolienne*. Paris: Éditions Klincksiek.

Lehmann, Winifred P.
1986 *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.

Lemche, Niels Peter
1985 *Early Israel: Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society before the Monarchy*. Tr. by Frederick H. Cryer. VTSup 37. Leiden: Brill.

Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert
1996 *Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lindström, Fredrik
1994 *Suffering and Sin: Interpretations of Illness in the Individual Complaint Psalms*. ConBOT 37. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Lipiński, Edward
2004 *Itineraria Phoenicia*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 127: Studia Phoenicia 18. Leuven: Peeters.

Loewenstamm, Samuel E.
1959 "The Hebrew Root חרש in the Light of the Ugaritic Texts." *JJS* 10: 63-65.

López-Ruiz, Carolina
2014 "Greek and Near Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters." Pp. 154-199 in *Approaches to Greek Myth*, 2nd ed., ed. Lowell Edmunds. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Macaskill, Grant and Greenwood, Eamon
2013 "Adam Octipartite/Septipartite: A New Translation and Introduction." Pp. 3-21 in *Old Testament Pseudepigraphia: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, vol. 1, ed. Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

Mallory, James P.
1989 *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Mankowski, Paul V.
2000 *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*. Harvard Semitic Studies 47. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Margalit, Baruch
1989 *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT: Text, Translation, Commentary*. BZAW 182. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Mayes, A.D.H.
1981 *Deuteronomy*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans/London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Mayshar, Joram
2014 "Who Was the *Toshav*?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133: 225-246.

McCarter, Kyle P.
1980 *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. AB 8. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

McCone, Kim
1987 "Hund, Wolf und Krieger bei den Indogermanen." Pp. 101-154 in *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*, ed. Wolfgang Meid. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 52. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Meier-Brügger, Michael
2010 *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. In collaboration with Matthias Fritz and Manfred Mayrhofer. 9th revised and expanded ed. De Gruyter-Studium. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Melchert, H. Craig
1987 "PIE Velars in Luvian." Pp. 182-204 in *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, ed. Calvert Watkins. Berlin: de Gruyter.

1993 *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*. Lexica Anatolica 2. Available online at www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/webpage/LUVLEX.pdf (accessed latest Dec 28, 2016).

1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3. Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

2003 "CHAPTER TWO: Prehistory." Pp. 8-26 in *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert. HdO 1/68 Leiden: Brill.

2005 "Latin *īnsōlescō*, Hittite *šulle(šš)-* and PIE Statives in *-ē-*." Pp. 90-98 in *Hṛdā́ Mánasā: Studies Presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg on the Occasion of his 70-Birthday*, ed. Nikolai N. Kazansky with the assistance of Eugenia R. Kryuchkova, Alexander S. Nikolaev and Andrey V. Shatskov. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

2009 "The Animate Nominative Plural in Luvian and Lycian." *Die Sprache* 48: 112-117 [=**h₂nr: Festschrift für Heiner Eichner*, ed. Robert Nedoma and David Stifter. Wiesbaden: Wiener Sprachgesellschaft/Harrasowitz].

2010 "Hittite *ḫarp(p)-* and Derivatives." Pp. 179-188 in *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, ed. Jörg Klinger, Elisabeth Rieken and Christel Rüster. StBT 52. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

2012 "Luvo-Lycian Dorsal Stops Revisited." Pp. 206-218 in *The Sound of Indo-European 2: Papers on Indo-European Phonetics, Phonemics and Morphophonemics*, ed. Roman Sukač and Ondřej Šefčik. LINCOM EUROPA.

Forthc. "The Position of Anatolian." To be published in *Handbook of Indo-European Studies*, ed. M. Weiss & A. Garett. Available in digital pre-publication version (latest revision from 2012) at http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/The%20Position%20of%20AnatolianRevised3.pdf (accessed latest Dec 28, 2016).

Merlan, Francesca C.

1994 *A Grammar of Wardaman: A Language of the Northern Territory of Australia*. Mouton Grammar Library. Berlin/New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D.

1988 *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names.* Tr. by Frederick H. Cryer. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Miller, Robert D. II

2013 "What are the Nations doing in the *Chaoskampf*?" Pp. 206-216 in *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis*, ed. JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

2014 "Tracking the Dragon across the Ancient Near East." *Archiv Orientální* 82: 225-245.

2016 "Iconographic Links between Indic and Ancient West Asian Storm Gods." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 166: 141-152.

Forthc. 2017 *The Dragon, the Mountain, and the Nations: An Old Testament Myth, its Origins, and its Afterlives*. Explorations in Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Modéus, Martin
2005 *Sacrifice and Symbol: Biblical* Šĕlāmîm *in a Ritual Perspective*. ConBOT 52. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Moor, Johannes C. de
1965 "Frustula Ugaritica." *JNES* 24: 355-364.

1970 "The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit." *UF* 2: 187-228.

Muchiki, Yoshiyuki
1999 *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 173. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Naaman, Nadav
1986 "Habiru and Hebrews: The Transfer of a Social Term to the Literary Sphere." *JNES* 45: 271-288.

Nelson, Richard D.
1987 *First and Second Kings*. Interpretation. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press.

Neu, Erich
1996 *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textenseble aus Ḫattuša*. StBT 32. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Nock, Arthur Darby and Festugière, André-Jean
1960 *Hermès Trismégiste: Corpus Hermeticum: Tome I: Poimandrès, Traités II-XII*. 2nd ed. Collection des universités de France Série grecque – Collection Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Nooten, Barend A. and Holland, Gary B.
1994 *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*. Harvard Oriental Series 50. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies. Available online at https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/lrc/rigveda/ (accessed latest Dec 28, 2016).

North, R.
2011 "עָשָׁן *ʿāšān*." Pp. 409-411 in *TDOT*, vol. 11.

O'Connor, Michael
1989 "Semitic **mgn* and its Supposed Sanskrit Origin." *JAOS* 109: 25-32.

Ogden, Daniel
2013 *Dragons, Serpents, and Slayers in the Classical and Early Christian Worlds: A Sourcebook.* Oxford/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Olmo Lete, Gregorio Del
2001 "Origen y decandencia de Dagan." Pp. 85-90 in *… ir a buscar leña: Estudios dedicados al Prof. Jesús López*, ed. Josep Cervelló Autuori and Alberto J. Quevedo Álvarez. Aula Ægyptiaca – Studia 2. *Aula Ægyptiaca* Fundación privada: Barcelona.

Orel, Vladimir E. and Stolbova, Olga V.
1995 *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for a Reconstruction*. HdO 1:18. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

Olsen, Birgit Anette
2006 "Hittite š from h_3?" Pp. 237-247 in $^{GIŠ.ḪUR}$*gul-za-at-ta-ra: Festschrift for Folke Josephson*, ed. Gerd Carling. Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning 32. Göteborg.

Otto, Adelheid
2008 "Dagan." In *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*, ed. J. Eggler and Ch. Uehlinger.
Digital preprint version (last updated March 25, 2008):
http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_dagan.pdf .
Illustrations:
http://www.religionswissenschaft.uzh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_illustrations_dagan.pdf (Both accessed latest Jan 28, 2017).

Pakkala, Juha
2010 "Why the Cult Reforms in Judah Probably did not Happen." Pp. 201-235 in *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*, ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann in cooperation with Björn Corzilius and Tanja Pilger. BZAW 405. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Pearson, Birger
1981 "Jewish Elements in *Corpus Hermeticum* I (*Poimandres*)." Pp. 336-348 in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Roelof van den Broek and Maarten Josef Vermaseren. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 91. Leiden: Brill.

2007 *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Petersen, Hans
1962 "The Numeral Praenomina of the Romans." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93: 347-354.

Pitard, Wayne T.
1998 "The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Ugaritic Text KTU 1.83." *JNES* 57: 261-280

Pooth, Roland A.
2009 "Proto-Indo-European Ablaut and Root-Inflection: An Internal Reconstruction and Inner-PIE Morphological Analysis." Pp. 229-254 in *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European: Methods, Results, and Problems: Section Papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, 11th-15th August, 2003*, ed. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen and Thomas Olander with the cooperation of Anders Richart Jørgensen. Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 3. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Pope, Marvin H.
1966 Review of J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra Texts and their Relevance to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed., 1965. *JSS* 11: 228-241.

1977 "Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit." Pp. 163-182 in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, ed. Maria de Jong Ellis. Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19. Hamden, CT: Archon Books for the Acad.

1981 "The Cult of the Dead at Ugarit." Pp. 159-179 in *Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic: Proceedings of the Symposium of the Same Title Held at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, February 26, 1979, under the Auspices of the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society and the Mid-West Region of the Society of Biblical Literature*, ed. Gordon Dougas Young. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Power, Cian Joseph
2015 *Many Peoples of Obscure Speech and Difficult Language: Attitudes towards Linguistic Diversity in the Hebrew Bible*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University.

Puhvel, Jaan
1954 "Semitic Affinities of Hittite *ḫar-aš-zi*." *JAOS* 74: 86-88.

1964 "The Indo-European and Indo-Aryan Plow: A Linguistic Study of Technological Diffusion." *Technology and Culture* 5: 176-190.

1983 Review of Johannes Friedrich and Annelies Kammenhuber: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*. *JAOS* 103: 670-672.

Quispel, Gilles
1986 Review of Williams, Michael Allen, *The Immovable Race*. *Vigiliae Christianae* 40: 411-412.

Rabin, Chaim
1963 "Hittite Words in Hebrew." *Orientalia* 32: 113-139.

1994 "3. Lexical Borrowings in Biblical Hebrew from Indian Languages as Carriers of Ideas and Technical Concepts." Pp. 25-32 in *Between Jerusalem and Benares: Comparative Studies in Judaism and*

Hinduism, ed. Hananya Goodman. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rainey, Anson F.
1970 *El Amarna Tablets 359-379: Supplement to J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. AOAT 8. Kevlaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/Neukirchner Verlag.

1987 Review of Loretz, Oswald, *Habiru-Hebräer, eine sozio-linguistische Studie über die Herkunft des Gentiliziums* ʿibrî *vom Apellativum* ḫabiru. *JAOS* 107: 539-541.

Ratcliffe, Robert R.
2012 "On Calculating the Reliability of the Comparative Method at Long and Medium Distances: Afroasiatic Comparative Lexica as a Test Case." *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 2: 239-281.

Raulwing, Peter
2009 "The Kikkuli Text. Hittite Training Instructions for Chariot Horses in the Second Half of the 2nd Millennium B.C. and their Interdisciplinary Context."
Available online at http://www.lrgaf.org/Peter_Raulwing_The_Kikkuli_Text_MasterFile_Dec_2009.pdf (accessed latest Dec 16, 2016).

Roberts, J.J.M.
1975 "*NIŠKAḤTÎ ... MILLĒB*, Ps. XXXI 13." *VT* 25: 797-801.

Ronning, John L.
1997 *The Curse on the Serpent (Genesis 3:15) in Biblical Theology and Hermeneutics*. Doctoral dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary. Available in online pdf version at: http://postbiblical.info/PDFS/The_Curse_on_the_Serpent.pdf (accessed latest March 14, 2016).

Rutherford, Ian
2001 "The Song of the Sea (*ŠA* A.AB.BA *SÌR*): Thoughts on KUB 45.63." Pp. 598-609 in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie: Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*, ed. Gernot Wilhelm. StBT 45. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Salomies, Olli
1987 *Die römischen Vornamen: Studien zur römischen Namengebung*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 82. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Schearing, Linda S and McKenzie, Steven L. (eds.)
1999 *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism*. JSOTSup 268. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Schmidt, Carl and MacDermot, Violet
1978 *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex*. Nag Hammadi Studies 13. Leiden: Brill.

Schmidt, Brian B.
1994 *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*. FAT 11. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schmökel, Hartmut
1938 "Dagan." Pp. 99-101 in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, ed. Erich Ebeling and Dietz Otto Edzard, vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Schwemer, Daniel
2008 "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies: *Part II*." *JANER* 8: 1-44.

Scully, Stephen
2015 *Hesiod's* Theogony*: From Near Eastern Creation Myths to* Paradise Lost. New York, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sebeok, Thomas
1984 *Communication Measures to Bridge Ten Millennia*. Springfield: National Technical Information Service, US Department of Commerce.

Selms, Adrianus van
1975 "A Systematic Approach to CTA 5,I,1-8". *UF* 7: 477-482.

Seybold, Klaus
1996 *Die Psalmen*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament I/15. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Sihler, Andrew L.
1995 *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sims-Williams, Nicholas
1997 "A Bactrian God." *BSOAS* 60: 336-338.

Singer, Itamar
1992 "Towards the Image of Dagon, the God of the Philistines." *Syria* 69: 431-450.

2000 "Semitic *dagān* and Indo-European **$d^{h}eĝ^{h}om$*: Related Words?" Pp. 221-232 in *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, ed. Yoël L. Arbeitman. *Orbis*/Supplementa 13. Leuven/Paris: Peeters.

Slade, Benjamin
2008 [2010] "How (Exactly) to Slay a Dragon in Indo-European: PIE **bheid-* {*$h_{3}ég^{w}him$*, *$k^{w}ṛmi$-*}." *Historische Sprachforschung* 121: 3-53.

Smith, Mark S.
2001 "The Divine Family at Ugarit and Israelite Monotheism." Pp. 40-68 in *The Whirlwind: Essays on Job, Hermeneutics and Theology in Memory of Jane Morse*, ed. Stephen L. Cook, Corinne L. Patton, and James W. Watts. JSOTSup 336. London/New York,NY: Sheffield Academic Press.

2010 *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World.* Orginally published 2008 by Mohr Siebeck as FAT 57. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

Spina, Frank Anthony
1983 "Israelites as *gērîm*, 'Sojourners,' in Social and Historical Context." Pp. 323-335 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. Special Volume ¨ Series/*ASOR* 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Stager, Lawrence E.
1988 "Archaeology, Ecology and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah." Pp. 221-234 in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, ed. J.A. Emerton. VTSup 40. Leiden: Brill.

Starke, Frank
1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. ¨ StBT 31. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Stendebach, Franz J.
2000 "סוּס *sûs*." Pp. 178-187 in *TDOT*, vol 10.

Strauss Clay, Jenny and Gilan, Amir
2014 "The Hittite 'Song of Emergence' and the *Theogony*." *Philologus* 58: 1-9.

Sweeney, Marvin A.
2007 *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville, KY/London: Westminster John Knox.

Taggar-Cohen, Ada
2014 "Concept of the Divine in Hittite Culture and the Hebrew Bible: Expression of the Divine." *Journal of the Interdisciplinary Study of Monotheistic Religions* 9: 29-50.

Testen, David D.
1998 *Parallels in Semitic Linguistics: The Development of Arabic la- and Related Semitic Particles.* Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 26. Leiden/Boston, MA/Köln: Brill.

Töyräänvuori, Joanna
2012 "Weapons of the Storm God in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Traditions." *Studia Orientalia* 112: 147-180.

2016 *"I Will Set his Hand on the Sea, and his Right Hand on the River": North West Semitic Kingship and the Sea of Combat Myth: A Survey of Hebrew Poetry in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Evidence.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki. Helsinki: Unigrafia.

Tropper, Josef
1995 "Das letzte Zeichen des ugaritischen Alphabets." *UF* 27: 505-528.

2012 *Ugaritische Grammatik*. 2nd rev. and expanded ed. AOAT 273. Ugarit-Verlag: Münster.

Tsevat, Matitiahu
1971 *"*Traces of Hittite at the Beginning of the Ugaritic Epic of Aqht." *UF* 3: 351-352.

Wakeman, Mary K.
1973 *God's Battle with the Monster: A Study in Biblical Imagery*. Leiden: Brill.

Vaan, Michiel de
2009 "The Derivational History of Greek ἵππος and ἱππεύς." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37: 198-213.

Waldman, Nahum M.
1981 *The Recent Study of Hebrew: A Survey of the Literature with Selected Bibliography*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press/Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Waltke, Bruce K. and O'Connor, M.
1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Watkins, Calvert
1993 "The Comparison of Formulaic Sentences." Pp. 391-418 in *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*, ed. Edgar C. Polomé and Werner Winter. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 58. Berlin/New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

1995 *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

2000 *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. 2nd edition. Boston, MA/New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Watson, Wilfred G.E.
1995 "Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon." *UF* 27: 533-558.

2005 "Loanwords in Semitic." *Aula Orientalis* 23: 191-198.

2007 *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic*. Aula Orientalis, Supplementa 19. Sabadell, Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.

2013 "Loanwords in Phoenician and Punic." Pp. 327-346 in *Ritual, Religion and Reason: Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella*, ed. Oswald Loretz, Sergio Ribichini, Wilfred G.E. Watson, and José Á. Zamora. AOAT 404. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

2015 "Yet Another Hittite Loanword in Ugaritic?" *Historiae* 12: 25-31.

Weeks, David M.
1985 *Hittite Vocabulary: An Anatolian Appendix to Buck's* Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. ¨ Doctoral dissertation, University of Los Angeles, California.

Weippert, Manfred
1971 *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine: A Critical Survey of Recent Scholarly Debate*. Tr. by James D. Martin. Studies in Biblica Theology 2: 21. London.

Weiss, Michael
2006 "Latin *Orbis* and its Cognates." *Historische Sprachforschung* 119: 250-272.

Werner, Eric
1959 *The Sacred Bridge: The Interdependence of Liturgy and Music in Synagogue and Church during the First Millennium*. Vol 1. London: Dennis Dobson.

Werner, Rudolf
1991 *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 106. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

West, Martin L.
1997 *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford/New York, NY: Clarendon/Oxford University Press.

2007 *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. New York, NY/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, David Gordon
2009 *Sinister Yogis*. Chicago, IL/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Wikander, Ola
2008 *Ett träd med vida grenar: de indoeuropeiska språkens historia.* Stockholm: Prisma.

2010 "Job 3,8 – Cosmological Snake Charming and Leviathanic Panic in an Ancient Near Eastern Setting." *ZAW* 122: 265-271.

2013a "Ungrateful Grazers: A Parallel to Deut 32:15 from the Hurrian/Hittite *Epic of Liberation*." *SEÅ* 78: 133-146.

2013b "Old Testament Prototypes for the Hermetic *Trishagion* in *Poimandres* 31 – and Support for an Old Conjecture." *GRBS* 53: 579-590.

2014 *Drought, Death, and the Sun in Ugarit and Ancient Israel: A Philological and Comparative Study*. ConBOT 61. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

2015a "Finding Indra, Finding Torah: The Story of Shibamata Taishakuten and Josiah's Renovation." *SEÅ* 80: 69-77.

2015b "Don't Push this Button: Phoenician Sarcophagi, 'Atomic Priesthoods' and Nuclear Waste." *Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund Årsbok* 2015.

2015c "Emphatics, Sibilants and Interdentals in Hebrew and Ugaritic: An Interlocking Model." *UF* 46: 373-397.

2017 "From Indo-European Dragon Slaying to Isa 27:1: A Study in the *Longue Durée*." Pp. 116-135 in *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology, and Reception*, ed. Greger Andersson, Tommy Wasserman, and David Willgren. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies. London/New York, NY: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark.

Wikander, Stig

1938 *Der arische Männerbund: Studien zur indo-iranischen Sprach- und Religionsgeschichte*. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei.

Williams, Michael Allen

1996 *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ/Chichester: Princeton University Press.

Wilson-Wright, Aren

2015 "A Star is Born: On the Etymology of *ʕAṯtar- and ʕAṯtart-." Conference handout from SBL, Atlanta 2015, available from Academia.edu.

Wright, William

1871 *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. 2 Vols. London: Williams and Norgate.

Wyatt, Nicolas

1980 "The Relationship of the Deities Dagan and Hadad." *UF* 12: 375-379.

1985 "Possible Indo-European Influence in Ugaritic Thought." *UF* 17: 371-374.

1987 "Who Killed the Dragon?" *Aula Orientalis* 5: 185-198.

1988 "The Source of the Ugaritic Myth of the Conflict between Baʿal and Yamm." *UF* 20: 375-386.

1990 "David's Census and the Tripartite Theory." *VT* 40: 352-360.

2002 *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Seminar 53. New York: Sheffield Press.

Yakubovich, Ilya

2015 "The Luwian Language," Oxford Handbooks Online: http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18 ; also available (with pagination and minor differences) at http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/library/Luw-grammar.pdf (both accessed latest Feb 9, 2017).

Younger, K. Lawson, Jr.

2014 "The Scripts of North Syria in the Early First Millennium: The Inscription of Yariri (KARKAMIŠ A15b) Once Again." *Transeuphratène* 46: 169-183 [=*Volume d'hommages pour André Lemaire*, ed. Jean-Marie Durand and Josette Elayi. Paris: Gabalda].

Zuckermann, Ghilʿad

2003 *Language Contact and Lexical Enrichment in Israeli Hebrew*. Palgrave Studies in Language History and Language Change. Houndmills/New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

2009 "Hybridity versus Revivability: Multiple Causation, Forms and Patterns." *Journal of Language Contact – VARIA* 2: 40-67.

14. Index of Personal Names

15. Index Locorum