



Hittite Tarpis and Hebrew Teraphim

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 27, No. 1. (Jan., 1968), pp. 61-68.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28196801%2927%3A1%3C61%3AHTAHT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

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

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

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

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HITTITE *TARPIŠ* AND HEBREW *TERĀPHĪM*

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR., *Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts*

IF biblical scholars are today not yet in possession of a convincing etymology for *terāphīm*, it is certainly not due to any lack of theories.¹ As early as the Septuagint there seems to be evidence for an attempt to connect the word with the verb *θεραπεύω*, "to heal."² From the period of the Targums comes the statement "Why are they called *terāphīm*, if not that they are works of *tōreph* (obscenity)?"³ Another early Jewish interpretation was that *terāphīm* was a metathesized form from an original *PTRYM*, "interpreters."⁴

Most of the views which are current in Old Testament studies today are developments of these very early theories. They may be classified as follows: (1) Views which presume textual corruption, whether deliberate or otherwise, (2) views which assume the *t* to be a preformative, and (3) views which conclude that the triconsonantal root is *TRP*. In the first group falls the recent brief study of the word by C. J. Labuschagne.⁵ Labuschagne elaborates on the view first proposed in Tanchum (cited above) without apparently realizing that this view is not original with himself.⁶ He argues that the original *PTRYM*, "interpreters," has been intentionally deformed into *TRPYM* as a cacophemy to denote objects "repugnant to later religious thought."⁷ The mention of the real name was avoided out of respect for tabu. Such an interpretation of the name allows us to understand how the *terāphīm* can be coupled with the ephod, which is also used for cultic inquiry. Labuschagne does not insist upon a particular physical appearance of these "interpreters," but maintains: "whatever their form may have been—masks, or images of the figurine type, or perhaps a combination of these—what is certain on the strength of the etymology of the word, is that they were mantic devices designed to be consulted on the interpretation of dreams."⁸ He attempts also to reconcile this view with the narrative of I Samuel, chap. 19, suggesting that the emissaries of Saul sent to bring the (presumed) ailing David from his bedchamber to the king feared to enter the room "while the *teraphim* stood by his bedside, for a sick man consulting the interpreters of dreams on questions of life and death, might not be disturbed."⁹ Of course, in order to defend such an interpretation of I Samuel, chap. 19, one is forced to alter the wording of the text or at least misconstrue the Hebrew. For, although the phrase אֶל-הַמִּטָּה of verses 13 and 16 might conceivably be rendered "at the bed(-side)" as well as "in/on

¹ For a complete bibliography of studies of this term see the article in RGG³, A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, p. 31, n. 3; P. R. Ackroyd, "The Teraphim," *ET*, 62 (1950/51), 378 ff.; G. F. Moore, *Judges* ("ICC"), pp. 381–82; and C. J. Labuschagne, "Teraphim—a New Proposal," *VT*, 16 (1966), 115, n. 1.

² Thus in addition to the writings *Θεραφίν*, *Θεραφεῖν*, *Θεραπεῖν*, and *Θεραφεῖμι* in the LXX, one finds *Θεραπεῖα* (Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, p. 648).

³ *Tanḥûma*, *Wayyēšē* cited in G. F. Moore, *Judges*, p. 382.

⁴ *Tanḥûm*; *ibid.*

⁵ *Op. cit.*

⁶ At least he does not cite *Tanḥûm* anywhere in his brief article. Doubtless his was an innocent oversight.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 116–17.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

the bed," the rest of the context makes it abundantly clear that the *terāphîm* were made to look from a distance like the recumbent form of the ailing David.¹⁰ It was only when the messengers on their second visit *entered the room* so as to have a close view of the bed, that they discovered the ruse. Michal had employed this image, which was consequently no "figurine" but a life-size statue,¹¹ as a substitute for the body of her husband. Labuschagne's view does have in its favor a possible explanation for the grouping with the ephod. Yet it is unfortunately true here, as in general with all cases of "reconstruction" of earlier forms by means of presumed metatheses, that one can prove almost any theory if he is permitted to tamper with the evidence. It may be that whatever "deformation" is assumed took place before any of the manuscripts or versions in our possession today were composed.¹² But this cannot be proved. Until there is some concrete evidence from an early text that פִּרְיָם or some other form once stood where תְּרִפְיָם now stands, theories which assume this cannot be considered more than vague and remote possibilities.

Belonging to our second category are theories which derive *terāphîm* from either the root רִפ, "to heal," or רִפַּי, "to be languid, limp." As noted above, the similarity between the transliteration of *terāphîm* into Greek letters and the Greek verb *θεραπεύω*, "to do service to the gods," "treat medically,"¹³ may have set the Jewish translators of the OT into Greek to thinking about an etymological relationship of תְּרִפְיָם and רִפ, "to heal." As has been long observed, one interpretation of the I Samuel 19 incident accords well with the theory that the *terāphîm* were "healing deities."¹⁴ Yet certain phonological and morphological considerations stand in the way of deriving *terāphîm* from a root רִפ. The omission of the aleph from the orthography has not been satisfactorily explained. Furthermore, the vocalic pattern *qetālîm* as a masculine plural points to a singular with one of only four possible vocalizations: (1) *qātāl*, (2) *qaṭl*, (3) *qiṭl*, or (4) *quṭl*, the last three of which would appear in the singular as segholates in massoretic Hebrew. Neither of these four singulars would accord with the expansion of the root רִפ by means of a preformative ט.¹⁵ The same objection applies to a derivation from the root רִפַּי, "to be limp, languid." Indeed, if the evidence of the vocalic pattern is taken seriously, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the tri-consonantal root was considered to be תִּרַפ.

But if תִּרַפ is the true root of *terāphîm*, where else is this root attested either in Hebrew itself or in the other Semitic languages? From the post-biblical period we know of Hebrew words like *tōreph* and *tarpûth*, which connote "obscenity," "vileness," and the like. And some scholars, following the early etymological judgment of *Tanchûma*, *wayyēšē*² (cited above), believe that biblical Hebrew *terāphîm* originated from just such a notion ("the vile things" as a pejorative).¹⁶ There is, however, no guarantee that these words from post-biblical Hebrew are not themselves creations from the earlier *terāphîm*, the original

¹⁰ Thus verse 13 says that she placed a pillow at its head and covered it with a garment. The intention seems perfectly clear, and it has long been recognized by OT scholars.

¹¹ It is vaguely possible that a mask was allowed to protrude from under the covers to look like David's face, but the greater probability is that the major part of the *terāphîm* was covered with a garment, hence, it must have been anthropomorphic and life-size. See C. H. Gordon, "Teraphim," *Interpr. Dict. of Bible*, IV, 574.

¹² There is no evidence for any earlier meta-

thesized form in any of the early Hebrew manuscripts or in the early versions. As noted above, the LXX transliterates it so as to presuppose תְּרִפְיָם or תְּרִפְיָן (a variant plural formation).

¹³ Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.), p. 793.

¹⁴ Ackroyd, *op. cit.*, p. 379.

¹⁵ Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, pp. 237-38.

¹⁶ W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1957), p. 311.

meaning of which had long since been forgotten. Consequently, they can offer no independent witness for the existence of a Semitic root TRP. The Arabic lexicon has been aptly dubbed by native speakers of the language as *al-qāmūs* ("the ocean"), for its contents are inexhaustible. It is not, therefore, surprising that by searching therein one may produce a verb *tarifa* (root: TRP), "to live in opulence or luxury," "enjoy a soft existence."¹⁷ From this meaning one can even proceed to establish a proto-Semitic root TRP, "to be soft, limp." Yet once again the matter is complicated by questions of dating and provenience of the Arabic term. Most of the literature on which modern Arabic lexicons are based is post-Christian. The principal body of Arabic literature which antedates the Christian Era is the corpus of Old South Arabic Inscriptions, where apparently this root is not yet attested.¹⁸ When we examine the Semitic inscriptions from the third and second millennia B.C.E., we find no such root.¹⁹ Only in one place, in a Ugaritic poem about Baal and Anat, do we find any form which might possibly be construed as deriving from a root TRP. In the line *ttkḫ ttrp šmm*, which has been translated "the heavens will wear away and will sag,"²⁰ some scholars have regarded *ttrp* as a G-stem third person masculine plural imperfect of the root TRP.²¹ Others, willing to concede the translation, prefer to analyze the form *ttrp* as a *Hithpael* (or tD) from the root RPY.²² The form, therefore, is so problematic that no case for the existence of a proto-Semitic root TRP can be based upon it.

There appears then to be no evidence outside of *terāphīm* itself from the earlier periods of the Semitic languages for a root TRP. What then are we to say about the linguistic origins of *terāphīm*, if there is no ready Semitic etymology? The only avenue still open to us is to consider the possibility that the word was non-Semitic and perhaps borrowed at an early period from some other major linguistic group in the Near East. Among the influential peoples of the Near East during the third and second millennia B.C.E. whose languages were non-Semitic were the Egyptians, the Hurrians, and the Hittites. We may be permitted therefore to investigate their languages (so far as they are known) for a term which might have passed into early South Canaanite as *terāphīm*. Yet the search for a candidate must be rigorously controlled by the following criteria: (1) the phonetic similarity must either be complete or the divergences must be readily explicable in terms of historical linguistics, (2) the word must bear a signification in texts of its own language which is appropriate as a designation for deities, cult images, or mantic devices, (3) the word must be attested from a period contemporary with the formative stages of Hebrew religion and statehood, and (4) the word must belong to the language of a people who exercised a cultural influence upon Syria and/or Palestine during the period in question.

In the spring of 1965 at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in Chicago, Professor Benno Landsberger noted in the course of an address concerned with the present status of Assyriology that recent epigraphical evidence from Boğazköy suggested to him a connection between the Hebrew noun *terāphīm* and the "Hittite"

¹⁷ H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, p. 93; J. G. Hava, *Arabic-English Dictionary* pp. 58-59.

¹⁸ A. Jamme, *Sabaean Inscriptions from Maḥram Bilqīs*, pp. 449-50.

¹⁹ No root TRP exists in Akkadian according to F. Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 714, and

Bezold-Götze, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, p. 295, although Delitzsch lists a tree named *tarpi'u*.

²⁰ W. F. Albright, *BASOR*, No. 83 (1941), p. 40.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 40, n. 8; see also C. H. Gordon, *UT*, p. 499, Entry No. 2610.

²² Aistleitner-Eissfeldt, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*, p. 296, Entry No. 2531.

noun *tarpi*-.²³ Professor Landsberger was not able at that time to detail the nature of this new evidence, but the mere suggestion itself was provocative. And, although the writer's own particular field of interest was Hittitology, he did not pursue the matter further on his own at that time. In the fall of 1966, however, with the appearance of the third supplementary fascicle of J. Friedrich's *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, there was made available to the scholarly world at least one tantalizing bit of this evidence. Professor Heinrich Otten of Marburg announced that he had succeeded in joining several new fragments (to be published in hand copies in the forthcoming volume *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Heft 13, [Berlin: Gebr. Mann], Text No. 1) to the existing columns of *KBo* I 44, and that the new join restored the full Akkadian and Hittite readings for an important section of the Boğazköy version of the lexical series *erim.ḫuš* = *anantu*.²⁴ Otten further noted that among the new equations thus revealed was that of the Akkadian terms *lamassu* and *šēdu* with Hittite *annariš* and *tarpiš* respectively. Equally opportune was the appearance of an article by Wolfram von Soden of Münster in which he discussed the meanings of these two Akkadian terms on the basis of all their known occurrences in Assyro-Babylonian literature.²⁵ Von Soden concluded from his study that, although both terms were originally abstract nouns denoting some aspect of the life force, in second and first millennium texts *lamassu* and *šēdu* came to signify deities or spirits which might be either protective or harmful. And although there exist rare instances of both evil *lamassu*'s and good *šēdu*'s, the normal pattern was for the two as a pair to denote benevolent spirits, while *šēdu* alone (usually in incantations) represents an evil demon.²⁶ Hence, according to the equation yielded by the newly restored lexical text, Hittite *tarpiš* (nom. sing. of the stem *tarpi*-.²⁷) denotes an evil demon.

But if this newest bit of evidence is the most conclusive with regard to determining the meaning of *tarpiš*, it is by no means the only occurrence of that term. In three other texts from the Hittite capital *tarpiš* appears in immediate juxtaposition with *annariš* in a manner reminiscent of the Akkadian combination *lamassu* and *šēdu*, expressing two aspects of a single protective genius.²⁸ Illustrating the other connotation of *tarpiš* (when

²³ I should like to express my thanks to Professor Landsberger for granting me permission to cite him in this context for his public remarks on *terāphim*.

²⁴ J. Friedrich, *HWb*, Erg. 3 (1966), p. 32 sub *tarpi*..

²⁵ "Die Schutzgenien Lamassu und Schedu in der babylonisch-assyrischen Literatur," *Baghdader Mitteilungen*, Heft 3, pp. 148-56.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

²⁷ J. Friedrich, *Heth. Elem.*², p. 47 for paradigm.

²⁸ KUB XXXII 87 rev 10-17; KUB II 8 obv i 25-28, ii 11-14, 43-46. In XXXII 87 (annual festival celebrated by the queen) we are reading a description of a festival rite in which the celebrant drinks in a seated position eight times to eight different deities (l. 10). Although there is a break on the right side of the tablet, there are at least parts of eight different divine names in the following four lines—but only if *annarin tarpin* is counted as one deity! This is significant, since it indicates that *annariš tarpiš* as a combination was conceived as one *daimōn*, not two. In KUB II 8 (Antahšum festival for the tutelary deity of Tauriša) the *annariš tarpiš* occurs in a sequence of ostensibly benevolent forces: EME-aš *hantanza* ("the true tongue"), ZI-BU (= *zibu* "food-offering,"

CAD, Z, p. 105?), *šarrumar* ("allotment"?), and ^DUD.SIG₅ (= ^DIzzištanu). The *:tarpīuš* of *KBo* XII 70, line 13b, which is parallel to *ga₁₄-ni-ni* (= *ganīni* "magazines") in the Akkadian version, is more problematic. Von Schuler has suggested orally to Friedrich (*HWb*, Erg. 3, p. 33) the translation "Vorratsraum(?)." This much is probable not only on the basis of the Akkadian but even from the Hittite context (what there remains of it): *ḫa-ri-iš-ta-ni-uš :tar-pi-i-uš-ša ku-i-e-eš ḫal-ki-i šu-un-né-eš-šir* GIM-an-ma-ta ^DGul-ša-aš UD.KAM-uš *ti-an-zi nu 9-an a-ra-li-i en kap-pu-u-wa-a-an-zi na-an-ta ki-i-kar-za zi-ik-kán-zi*, "they who have filled with barley the *ḫarištaniuš* and the *:tarpīuš*, when the days of the ^DGulšeš arrive for you, they will count nine *aralin* and lay them at your head." Thus the two objects referred to by *ḫarištani*- and *:tarpī*- can be filled with grain. Yet how do we reconcile the meaning "Vorratsraum(?)" with "evil demon"? That there is some connection is hinted by the word *ḫarištani*-, which—although it denotes something which can contain grain here—is apparently based upon the same stem as the divine name ^DḪarištaššiš occurring alongside of *annarin tarpin* in KUB XXXII 87 rev 13-14. The common stem is **ḫarišta*-, which has been expanded

it occurs without *annariš*) is the incantation text KUB XXXIII 66 obv ii 9 ff. in which the following passage occurs: *a-ru-ni-ma URUDU-aš pal-ḥa-eš ki-an-da-[ri] iš-tap-pu-ul-li-iš-mi-it A.GAR₅-aš nu-kán [i-da-a-lu²⁹] an-da da-iš ta-ar-pi-in da-iš pár?-[]da-iš e-eš-ḥar da-iš ḥa-pa-an-zi d[a-iš] DIRIG³⁰ da-iš iš-ḥa-aḥ-ru da-iš [. . .] da-iš lúm?-pa-an³¹ da-iš kam-ma-ra-[an da-iš] ḥur-di³² da-iš i-na-an d[a-iš], “in the sea copper (= bronze?) cauldrons are set. Their lids (are of) lead. And [evil(?)] he put therein, the evil demon (*tarpin*) he put, [. . .] he put, bloodshed he put, *ḥapanzi* he p[ut], sorrow he put, tears he put, [. . .] he put, grief he put, fog(?) [he put], cursing(?) he put, disease he p[ut].” The significance of this passage becomes clear when it is viewed against the background afforded by other incantation passages of a similar type. Bronze cauldrons with lids of lead also figure in the incantation of the wrath of the vanishing god Telepinu,³³ as well as in that of the deity designated by the Sumerogram ^dMAḤ.³⁴ In these*

with the diminutive *-(a)nni-* to form the container name *ḥarištani-* (“the little **ḥarišta-*”?) but with *-(a)šši-* (HE², par. 51b) to form the divine name ^dḤarištaššiš (“he of the **ḥarišta-*”). Is it too much to suggest that the *ḥarištaniuš* and *tarpīuš* here are containers perhaps in the shapes of the deities to guard and care for the deceased? It is interesting also to note in passing that the Akkadian (originally Sumerian) word *ganūnu/ganūnu* has (by coincidence?) the same consonantal skeleton as the later Arabic term for the protective genii (*jinnu*).

²⁹ I restore *i-da-a-lu* conjecturally on analogy with other similar incantation rituals.

³⁰ The sign is that which occurs in Forrer’s and Friedrich’s sign lists as SA₅ (= SI + A). A reading SA₅, “red,” is impossible here. This context requires a synonym of “sorrow, grief.” Deimel, ŠL, II 123:8 lists a DIRIG.GA = *ašūtu* (“grief”) for which see also Von Soden, *AHW*, p. 86a. The reading DIRIG is, however, complicated by the vocabulary entry ^{sa} - aSA₅ = *ašūu* of CT XII 9 iv 9 (cited in *AHW*, p. 79b sub *ašūu* III).

³¹ The signs are *ši-pa-an*. No word *šipa-* with single writing of the *p* is known elsewhere in Hittite. The *-an* is clearly the Hittite accus. sg. case ending. The interpretation of the two preceding signs is problematic. ŠI.PA is hardly an ideogram here. Nor, since the Hittite word for “eye” is *šakui-*, does a reading IGI.*pa-an* satisfy. A value of *li* for IGI is known from the divination text AT 454 found at Alalakh (Gurney apud D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*, p. 117, n. 6). It may also be found in a rare instance at Boğazköy [*ḥu-tal-ḥi-ya-a[š]*] in *KBo* I 51 rev 14). On the Alalakh occurrence, but not noting the Boğazköy example, see H. Kronasser, *Etym. der hethitischen Sprache*, I, p. 492, n. 2. Yet even employing *li* we obtain nothing convincing: *li-pa-an*. In Old Akkadian and Old Assyrian texts, however, one finds also the value *lúm* (Von Soden, *Akkad. Syllabar*, p. 77 sub #261). Its distribution is quite restricted, being found only in word-final positions, where the *m* represents the mimation. Yet a reading *lúm* in KUB XXXIII 66 has great plausibility, especially since an expanded form *lumpašti-lupašti-* “sorrow, grief” is already known from other texts (*HWB*, p. 131a; see also KUB XXXVI 97 rev iv 1-2: *idalun lupaštin zi-ni piran arha uiyaddu*, “let him banish baleful grief from the mind!”). A reading of *lúm-pa-an* here would provide us with the simplex

of *lumpašti-* (HE², § 44d; *EHS*, §§ 33, 115). There is also made possible an etymological connection with Greek *λύπη* “sorrow, grief,” which according to Frisk (*GEW*, II, 145-46) is cognate to forms such as *rump-* in Latin and *lup-/rup-* in Sanskrit.

³² The signs in the copy are clearly ḤAR/ḤUR and DI. The form *ḥurdi* cannot easily be connected with *ḥurtai-* “curse,” since the latter is of common gender, requiring an accus. sg. *ḥurtain* and an accus. pl. *ḥurtauš*. If the second sign is read as *ki* (!), a reading *ḥarki* (nom.-accus. neut. sg.-pl. of *ḥarki-* “white”) is possible. But “the white thing(s)” is awkward. It is tempting on grounds which I cannot elaborate here (see my “English-Hittite glossary” [*RHA* f. 80 (1967)], 80-81, n. 154) to take *ḥarki* as the Nesite reading of *KU.BABBAR* and translate “silver he put,” for we know that both raw silver and silver objects were often dropped into sacrificial pits (*a-a-pi*) as gifts to chthonic spirits, and the cult image of ^dSulikatte (= Nergal) is trimmed (as well as his weapons) with silver. Yet in a context with evils (bloodshed, tears, grief, etc.) even this reading is unsatisfactory. It is perhaps best just to read the signs *ḥur-di* and leave them untranslated for the present.

³³ Cat. 258, 1st version of Telepinu Myth, A iv 15-19 (latest transliteration by E. Laroche, *RHA* f. 77, pp. 96 ff.): *kal-ta-an da-an-ku-i ták-ni-i ZABAR pal-ḥi ar-ta iš-tap-pu-ul-li-iš-me-et A.GAR₅-aš za-ak-ki-iš-me-iš AN.BAR-aš ku-it an-da-an pa-iz-zi na-aš-ta nam-ma ša-ra-a ū-UL ū-iz-zi an-da-(da-jaḥ) ḥar-ak-zi*, “down in the dark netherworld a bronze cauldron stands. Their (sic!) lids (are of) lead; their (sic!) latch (is of) iron. That which goes therein will not again come up out; it will perish therein. (So) also let it hold in the wrath, anger, sin, and fury of Telepinu, and let it not come back!”

³⁴ Cat. 265^b, the disappearance of ^dMAḤ, KUB XXXIII 54 + 47 obv A ii 5-9 (latest transliteration by E. Laroche, *RHA* f. 77, pp. 138 ff.): [*da-an-ku-wa-i ták-ni-i ZABAR pal-ḥi-i-e-eš ki-ya-an-ta-ri [iš-tap-pu-ul-li-iš-me-et A.GAR₅-aš] ku-it-kán an-da pa-iz-zi n[a-aš-ta nam-ma ša-ra-a ū-UL ū-iz-zi an-da-at-kán ḥar-[ak-zi]*] ^dMAḤ[*aš-ša kar-pi-iš ka[r]-tim-mi-ya-az wa-aš-túl ša-a-u-wa-a[r an-da pa-id-du]*] *na-at-kán an-da ḥar-ak-du*, “in the dark netherworld bronze cauldrons are set. Their lids (are of) lead. That which goes therein will not again come up out; it will perish therein. (So) also let the wrath, anger, sin, and fury of ^dMAḤ go in, and let it perish therein!”

passages the cauldrons are not in the depths of the sea, but in the netherworld.³⁵ And in them it is specifically stated that whatever is put into those cauldrons and covered with the lead lids cannot under any circumstances ever come up out again.³⁶ The imagery employed recalls not only the notorious "Pandora's box" of Greek legend, but also the brief episode in Zechariah, chap. 5, where a female figure symbolizing evil witchcraft is placed inside an ephah with a lead lid (כֶּכֶר עִפְרָת) and carried off to Babylon.³⁷ In this passage too the lead lid serves to insure that the spirit or demon cannot escape. In the Hittite incantation text the absence of *annariš* is both striking and significant. For there would be no need to confine *annariš*, since she is a beneficial and protective force rather than an evil one.

In summary, the Hittite evidence is conclusive that *tarpi-* denotes a spirit which can on some occasions be regarded as protective and on others as malevolent. It is possible in view of its connections with the netherworld in incantations that the spirit was a chthonic one, though this cannot be proved. Certainly this meaning would not be at odds with the various uses of Hebrew *terāphîm*. For just as Akkadian *lamassu* and *šēdu* primarily denote the spirits but in later periods are employed to refer to the images, so also the same development may have occurred within Hittite. The *terāphîm* are never directly referred to as objects of worship, though this is often assumed. They are mantic devices employed for cultic inquiry. Furthermore, we know that such inquiries which were not conducted along "orthodox" lines in ancient Israel were usually directed toward the netherworld.³⁸ Thus, although the *terāphîm* are never specifically grouped with the *yidd^onîm* or the *’ōbhôt*, as objects of cultic inquiry, they may well have belonged to this same general category. Hence I believe that we can legitimately claim that the terms of criterion number two (allied meaning) have been met.

Criterion number one (phonetic identity) can be satisfied as well, if we observe that Hittite proper names³⁹ and common nouns⁴⁰ regularly lose their consonantal case endings when they are borrowed into Ugaritic.⁴¹ This means that *tarpiš* (stem *tarpi-*) would have been taken over into a West Semitic language as **tarpi*, and the final short *i* of the stem would have been altered in accordance with the early West Semitic case endings (*u* for nom., *i* for gen., *a* for accus.). If *tarpi-* was borrowed during the late

³⁵ Texts: (*kattan*) *dankui takni*.

³⁶ Texts: *n-ašta namma šara natta uizzi*.

³⁷ Zech. 5:5-11.

³⁸ I Sam., chap. 28; Isa., 8:19; etc.

³⁹ Note in the alphabetic texts from Ugarit the personal names Šuppiluliumaš (*tpilm*, UT 118:16) and Tudhaliyaš (*tdgl*, UT 1034:9; 1039:21), in both instances without the consonantal case endings.

⁴⁰ Neuter nouns such as *zapzagai-* (= Ugar. *spsg*) prove nothing, since even in Hittite they have (at least in the nom. and accus.) no consonantal case endings. If T. H. Gaster (and the writer independently, cf. *JNES*, 23 [1964] 67) is correct in proposing Hittite *kubašiš* (pronounced **kubašiš?*) as the origin of Hebrew כִּבְיַע "helmet," then this would provide one instance of the loss of the case ending in transfer. The writer's theory on Ugaritic *dgt* and its Anatolian origins (*JNES*, 23 [1964], 66-68) need not be rejected because of the final *l*, since an equally good case can be made for a pronounced **duḡḡušša* for Hittite *tuhhuesšar*, "resin (for incense)" (see now H. G. Güterbock, *RHA*, f. 74 [1964], pp. 106 f.). The final *r*

of abstracts in *-eššar* and *-atar* is often omitted in the orthography, as doubtless also in speech (*HE*², p. 33, par. 30b). It is not likely (so De Moor in *JNES*, 24 [1965], 355-56) that *dgt* is a denominative verb "to incense for purification." Ch. Rabin's theory that Hebrew *lappid* preserves an instance of the Hittite instrumental case ending (i.e., **lappit* from *lappiya-*, "kindling wood[?]",) is without precedent (*Or*, NS, 32 [1963], 129, n. 1). Rabin should also have indicated that **lappid/t* is totally hypothetical as the instrumental of the noun *lappiya-*, which is not at present attested in that case. Furthermore, it is not clear that nouns of the common gender in *-iya-* form their instrumentals by a monophthongization of the *-iya-* to *-i-*. Of the only two other Hittite nouns in *-iya-*, *memiya-* forms its instrumental by the addition of an *n* as hiatus (*meminit*), while there is no attested instrumental for *taparriya-*.

⁴¹ I am indebted to Dr. Manfred Weippert of Tübingen, who by letter pointed out to me this characteristic of early loans from Hittite into Semitic languages.

Bronze Age, the vocalization of its nominative singular form would presumably have been **tarpu*. According to the established rules of phonetic development for Hebrew such a form would have become **tereḫ* in the (hypothetical) singular and *terāphīm* in the plural of massoretic Hebrew. Thus I believe that the phonetic identification of the two terms is convincing.

As to criterion number three (chronology), the Hittite texts from Boğazköy belong to a period roughly contemporaneous with the Hebrew patriarchs, Moses, and Joshua (ca. 1650–1200 B.C.E.). But although the earliest Hittite documents (e.g. the Anitta text: *KBo* III 22+) date from as early as the age of the later patriarchs, it should be pointed out that the most likely period for the transfer would have been during the thirteenth century.⁴²

The final criterion concerns the sphere of Hittite cultural influence. Now it cannot be questioned that Palestine (and particularly southern Palestine) lay within the cultural and political sphere of Egypt rather than that of the Hittites in the north or the cultures of Mesopotamia to the east. Yet OT scholars have long recognized that no one foreign power held a monopoly on the influencing of Palestinian life. The evidence of both literary and non-literary remains on Palestinian soil suggests that the early inhabitants thereof benefited (or suffered) from cultural influences proceeding from Egypt, the Aegean, Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia.⁴³ The influence of Asia Minor in particular is perhaps slight in comparison with that from areas nearer at hand, yet it is clearly present. On the basis of evidence from the biblical text itself Hittite cultural influence has been detected which is linguistic,⁴⁴ juristic,⁴⁵ and historiographic.⁴⁶ This influence may have been mediated by the migration of Anatolian peoples (either the *ḫḫḫ* themselves, as defended by E. Forrer,⁴⁷ or perhaps the *ḫḫ*, as recently proposed by G. E. Mendenhall⁴⁸) or indirectly through north Syrian peoples who enjoyed the cultural

⁴² Hittite political and cultural influence on North Syria during the period of the Old Kingdom (ca. 1650–1400 B.C.E.) was negligible. It is true that both Ḫattušili I and Muršili I campaigned in Syria, but no system of alliances or vassal relationships were instituted until the time of Šuppiluliuma I (ca. 1380 B.C.E.). It is from this latter period that we must trace the greatest political and cultural influences from Anatolia through Syria into Palestine. For the history see now O. R. Gurney, "Anatolia c. 1750–1600 B.C." and "Anatolia c. 1600–1380 B.C." (*New Camb. Anc. Hist.*, Vol. 2, chaps 6 and 15), and A. Goetze, "The Struggle for the Domination of Syria," "Anatolia from Shuppiluliumash to the Egyptian War of Muwatallish," and "The Hittites and Syria" (*New Camb. Anc. Hist.*, Vol. 2, chaps 17, 21, and 24).

⁴³ It is impossible to detail all of the archeological evidence here. Some of the more recent evidence is to be found in R. Hestrin and M. Tadmor, *IEJ*, 13 (1963), 283, n. 52, 287, and C. A. Key, *IEJ*, 13 (1963), 289–90.

⁴⁴ Two articles summarize the present status fairly well: P. Fronzaroli, "Rapporti lessicali dell'ittita con le lingue semitiche," *Archivo Glottologico Italiano* 41 (1956), 32–45, and Ch. Rabin, "Hittite Words in Hebrew," *Or.*, NS, 32 (1963), 113–39. Of the twenty-two examples cited by Rabin, only about seven are very plausible. Yet even these reveal an appreciable cultural influence albeit indirect.

⁴⁵ The two best-known examples being the

influence of the literary form of the Hittite suzerainty treaties upon early Hebrew covenant formulation (G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*; M. G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*; D. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*), and the possible explanation of the issue at stake in the bargaining between Abraham and Ephron "the Hittite" in Genesis, chap. 23 (M. R. Lehmann, *BASOR*, no. 129 [1953], pp. 15–18, challenged recently by G. Tucker, *JBL*, 85 [1966], 77–84).

⁴⁶ The matter of Hittite and biblical historiography was investigated by A. Malamat in *VT*, 5 (1955), 1–12. This area deserves more study. There is a good possibility that Hittite literary forms underlie some of the earliest pieces of Hebrew historical writing, such as the celebrated "court history of David." My student, Dr. Herbert M. Wolf, has explored the relationships between the Apology of Ḫattušiliš and I Sam., chaps. 16–31, and II Sam., chaps. 1–8, in his Brandeis University doctoral dissertation published in Xerography by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1967. Much of the present writer's thinking on the matter is contained therein.

⁴⁷ "The Hittites in Palestine," *PEQ*, 68, 190–209, and 69, 100–115.

⁴⁸ G. E. Mendenhall, "Who Were the Hivites?"—oral presentation at 102d Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December, 1966, in New York City.

heritage of the "neo-Hittite" kingdoms of Aleppo, Ya³udiya, and Arpad. It is perhaps possible only to suggest a partial satisfaction of criterion number four. Yet even so, the accordance of this theory with the first three criteria and the likely fulfilment of number four render it far more plausible than any of its earlier rival hypotheses. The name *terāphîm* is then, I suggest, a cultic term brought into Syria and Palestine by migrant cultic personnel⁴⁹ formerly resident in Anatolia. It was adopted by the south Canaanites at the end of the Amarna Age (thirteenth century) and preserved for us only (to date) in the pages of the OT as a designation for a type of idol or mantic device.

A Hurro-Hittite source for Hebrew *terāphîm* would accord well with the apparent Hurro-Hittite origin of the Hebrew term ³*ôbh* "ritual pit; (spirit from the) ritual pit," which M. Vieyra (*RHA* f. 69 [1961], 47-55) first identified with Hittite *a-a-bi*. To this question the writer has recently devoted an entire article, "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew ³*ôb*," which is scheduled to appear in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (hopefully Vol. 86 [1967], Part IV). It is possible that both Hebrew ³*ôbh* and *terāphîm* are based upon old substratum words rather than upon loanwords from Hurrian or Hittite. Thus Professor Landsberger considers them to be "ursprachliches Residuum." This interpretation carries more conviction in the case of *a-a-bi*, since it has no cognates in Hittite. In the case of *tarpiš*, however, one feels from the many cognate forms (*tarpalış*, *tarpalaš*, *tarpanallašša-*, *tarpatarpa-*, and divine name ^DTarpatassis) that the word must be native to the language. Both words, however viewed as to source, have in both their Hebrew and Hittite manifestations a pronounced chthonic orientation. As seen above the Hittite *tarpiš* could be confined in the netherworld, and the *a-a-bi* pit was intended as a means of gaining access to deities or departed spirits presently residing in the infernal regions. The Hebrew ³*ôbh* likewise was a pit used by a practitioner to communicate with departed spirits (I Sam., Chap. 28). The *terāphîm* were not employed to communicate with the nether regions, but they were a mantic device.

⁴⁹ Those whom Homer calls the *δημιοεργοί* (*Odyssey* XVII 382-86); see C. H. Gordon, "Ugaritic Guilds and Homeric ΔΗΜΙΟΕΡΓΟΙ," *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman*, pp. 136-43.