

Why did *yrh* play the dog? Dogs in RS 24.258 (=KTU 1.114) and 4QMMT*

Amir Sumaka 'i Fink – University of Chicago/University of Tel Aviv

[An examination of the various aspects of the structure of RS 24.258 (=KTU 1.114) suggests that there are two key metaphors in this text: 1) the downfall of the moon-god, and 2) the dog who eats from the god's food. The paper proposes that the moon-god metaphor is possibly related to the Hattic-Hittite mythological text "The Moon that fell from Heaven." The metaphor of a dog that eats from the god's food is attested in contemporary and later sources, among them the Hittite "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials," two letters from Sidon to Ugarit and 4QMMT. It appears that dogs were the subject of three related religious polemics, in Ugarit itself, between Judeans and Phoenicians, and between the authors of 4QMMT and 11QTORAH and the Pharisees.]

Introduction

In this paper I explore some structural aspects of RS 24.258, a tablet found in Ras Shamra at the so-called *maison du prêtre aux modèles de poumon et de foies*.¹ Although various scholars have analyzed this text, and it seems that its general flow is well understood and agreed upon, it still contains some unresolved questions.² I divide the text into sections, following its poetic configuration, and offer a

* This paper is dedicated to my sister Anat, and in memory of Sherinka, our bitch, who never visited Jerusalem. I would like to express my gratitude to Dennis Pardee, Diana Edelman and Robert Hawley who made many valuable suggestions in various stages of writings. My thanks also go to Yossi Maurey for his keen editorial eye.

1. Its editio princeps is published by Charles Vroilleaud, *Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra (24^e campagne, 1961)* (Ugaritica 5), Paris 1968, pp. 545-548. Dennis Pardee published a comprehensive re-edition of the text, including photos, copy, transliteration, vocalization, translation and commentary: *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961), avec une notice archéologique de J.-C. Courtois* (Ras Shamra-Ugarit IV), Paris 1988), pp. 13-74.

2. Recent translations, commentaries and studies are available in several languages. In English: Th. J. Lewis, "El's Divine Feast," trans., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. S. B. Parker, Scholars Press 1997, pp. 193-196; D. Pardee, "'Ilu on a Toot (1.97)," *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, ed. W. W. Hallo, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997, pp. 302-305; N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and his Colleagues*, Sheffield 1998, pp. 404-413. In German: M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "'Siehe, da war er (wieder) munter!' Die mythologische Begründung für eine medikamentöse Behandlung in KTU 1.114 (RS 24.258)," *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World, A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon*, eds. Meir Lubetski, Claire Gottlieb, and Sharon Keller (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 273), Sheffield 1998, pp. 174-198; G. Theuer, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 173), Freiburg Schweiz 2000, pp. 102-110. In Spanish: G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos, leyendas y rituales de los semitas occidentales*, ed. and trans., Madrid-Barcelona 1998, pp. 158-161; José-Ángel Zamora, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit* (Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales 6), Madrid 2000, *passim*.

reconstruction of its missing content on the basis of existing repetitions, motifs and order-change. I also discuss the two major metaphors utilized in RS 24.258, namely, the downfall of the moon-god, symbolizing, in my view, the breakdown of the order of humanity, and the dog who eats from the gods' food, symbolizing a destruction of the rules, orders and the status of the gods. Finally, I bring to the fore some common aspects of RS 24.258 and 4QMMT, from which ensues an examination of the prohibitions of rearing dogs and chickens in Jerusalem attested during the roman period.

Text and subdivisions

In this section I examine the structure of RS 24.258.³ While Dennis Pardee's division of the text nicely articulates the main parts of the plot, I believe that it is nevertheless possible to add further nuances to his sketch. I propose the following subdivision:

- I) Lines 1-13 – *yrh* plays the dog
 - a. Lines 1-4 – *'il* throws a banquet for the gods (an introduction)
 - b. Lines 4-8 – the downfall of *yrh*
 - c. Lines 9-14 – the dog eats the *nšb*-cut and the shoulder-cut
- II) Lines 14-? – *'il* plays dead
 - a'. Lines 14-16 – *'l* moves on to the *mrzh* (the second introduction)
 - b'. Lines 17-22 – the downfall of *'il*
 - c'. Lines 22-? – catching the dog. (Or maybe: who will die first – *'il*? The dog?)
- III) Lines 25'-31' – the happy end and the recipe
 - d. Lines 25'-28' – *'ttrt w^cnt* bring back and apply the remedy
 - e. Lines 29'-31' – the recipe

Taking Pardee as a point of departure, I propose the following articulation of the text into lines and sections (a, b, c, a', b', c', d, and e), and units (I, II and III).

3. My investigation is based mainly on Pardee's collation, transliteration, vocalization and translation of this text. I consider here only those issues where my interpretation differs from his'. Pardee ("Ilu on a Toot (1.97)," pp. 302-305) divides RS 24.258 into several parts:

- Lines 1-13 – *'il* throws a banquet for the gods
- Lines 4-13 – *yrh* plays the dog
- Lines 14-16 – *'il* moves on to the *mrzh*
- Lines 17-22 – *'il* goes home
- Lines 22-? – *'nt w^cttrt* seek a remedy
- Lines 26'-28' – *'ttrt w^cnt* bring back and apply the remedy
- Lines 29'-31' – the recipe

Unit I

a)

(1) 'il dbh . b bth . mšd .
 šd . b qrb (2) hklh .
 šh . l qš . 'ilm .
 tlhmn (3) 'ilm . w tštn .
 tštn y^cd šb^c
 (4) trt . ^cd ṛškr^ṛ

b)

y^cdb . yrh (5) gbh .
 km . ṛk^ṛ [l] ṛb^ṛ . yqqt .
 tht (6) tlhnt .
 'il . d yd^cnn
 (7) y^cdb . lhm . lh .
 w d l yd^cnn
 (8) ylmn htm .
 tht . tlhn

c)

(9) ^cttrt . w^cnt . ymgy
 (10) ^cttrt . fdb . nšb lh
 (11) w^cnt . ktp .
 -bhm . yg^cr . tgr (12) bt . š'il .
 pn . lm . rlb . fdbn (13) nšb .
 l'inr . fdbn . ktp
 (14) b'il . 'abh . g^cr

Unit II

a')

y^ctb . 'il . k^ṛr^ṛ (15) 'a^ṛškr^ṛ [--] .
 'il . y^ctb . b mrzhh
 (16) yš^ṛt^ṛ . [y] ṛn^ṛ . ^cd šb^c .
 trt . ^cd škr

b')

(17) 'il . h^ṛṛk . lbth .
 yštql . (18) l hzrh .
 y^cmsn . nn .
 tkmn (19) w šnm .
 w ngšnn . hby .
 (20) b^cl . q^ṛnm . w dnb .
 ylšn (21) b hr'ih . w^cnth .
 ql . 'il . km mt
 (22) 'il . k yrdm . 'arš

c')

^cnt (23) w ^cttrt . tšdn .
 ṛš^ṛ ṛ^ṛ [...] (24) q^ṛd^ṛ š . b^c ṛ^ṛ [...]

Unit III

d)

(25') [] ṛn^ṛ . d[...]
 (26') [^ct] ṛt^ṛ . w ^cn ṛt^ṛ [...]
 (27') ṛw^ṛ bhm . tttb . ṛ^ṛ ṛm^ṛ dh[...]
 (28') km . trp'a . hn n^cr

e) (29') d yšt . l šbh . š^cr klb

(30') ṛw^ṛ r'iš . pqq . w šrh

(31') yšt 'ahdh . dm zt . hr ṛp^ṛ 'at

The Characters

This text concerns with excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages.⁴ It serves a clear practical purpose: supplying a recipe for the curing of physical side effects of excess drinking, and possibly also of hangover. The main character in the mythological part of the text is 'il, the chief of the gods. 'il is mentioned eight times in the text. The goddesses ^cttrt and ^cnt are mentioned four times: twice as ^cttrt w^cnt, once as ^cnt w^cttrt, and once separately.

Most of the other characters appear in the preserved text only once, a phenomenon that can be explained in various ways. There is no doubt that ^tgr bt 'il, ^tkmn w šnm and hby are mentioned only once. The first three seem to be the members of 'il's household,⁵ and naturally, we find them in 'il's home: they are an obvious choice of characters to play a secondary role in this story. The fourth character, hby, also mentioned a single time, is so unknown and his appearance so unexpected that the text provides a description of him (line 20): b^cl . qnm . w dnb⁶. The least significant characters, playing the collective role of guests at 'il's feast, providing auxiliary voices as part of the artistic setting, are described twice under the common noun 'ilm in plural, and once under 'il in singular.

More problematic is the nature of two other characters, yrh and the dog –do they constitute a single character that undergoes a transformation, or is there a single character disguised as the other? yrh is mentioned in the text only once. He is described (line 5) “like a dog” –km . ṛk¹ [l] ṛb¹ – and from this point on, his name is no longer mentioned. The dog or a dog, while not mentioned before yrh reportedly becomes “like a dog,” is mentioned several times afterwards. None of the references to a dog seem to allude to one particular dog. This is emphasized in lines 12-13 by the use of two synonyms for the word dog: k(!)lb and 'inr. The appended recipe in line 29' features dog hair, and although it does not seem to refer to any specific dog, I believe that we should reconstruct the plot as including a dog character from the point where yrh plays the dog to the end of the script. Reconstructing a yrh/dog character leaves us with three to five characters who play an essential role in this story: 'il, ^cttrt w^cnt and yrh/dog.

The later lie at the foundation of the structure of this dramatic-comic script. First comes 'il (line 1) who has the principal part in this story; 'il's appearance in line 1 informs us that he is the main character, and although we are not going to hear about him for the next twelve lines, this is his story. The next character to be introduced is yrh/dog, and lines 4-13 present the behavior of this character as yrh and as dog. In the midst of this presentation (line 9) yet another main character is introduced: ^cttrt w^cnt. 'il is mentioned once again in line 14, framing the presentation of yrh/dog and ^cttrt w^cnt. The next part is solely dedicated to the decline and fall of 'il (lines 15-22). ^cttrt w^cnt come back in line 22. Together with 'il, ^cttrt w^cnt accompany this story to its end. The last lines of the plot are missing, and there is no way to establish

4. Many works have dealt with the cultural and literary aspects of banquets and drinking in general, and in the ancient Near East in particular. See, for example: Mac Marshal (ed.), *Beliefs, Behaviors, & Alcoholic Beverages: A Cross-Cultural Survey*, Ann Arbor 1979; Lucio Milano, ed., *Drinking in Ancient Societies*, Padova 1994; Oswyn Murray and Manuela Tecusan, eds., *In Vino Veritas*, Roma 1995; Zamora, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit*.

5. As for ^tgr bt 'il, it is written in line 14 that 'il is his father (or perhaps his master). This character seems to be of secondary importance: we do not know his name, and he is defined in relation to the name of another character, 'il. With regards to ^tkmn w šnm, see Pardee, “Ilu on a Toot (1.97),” p. 304, n.13; John F. Healey, “The Pietas of an Ideal Son in Ugarit,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11 (1979) 353-356; David P. Wright, *Ritual in Narrative: The Dynamics of Feasting, Mourning, and Retaliation Rites in the Ugaritic Tale of Aqhat*, Winona Lake, Indiana 2000, pp. 62-65.

6. “He who has two horns and a tail.” Most of the English translations are quoted from Pardee, “Ilu on a Toot (1.97),” p. 304. For an identification of hby as a scorpion, see: Kevin Cathcart, “Ilu, Yarihu and the One with the Two Horns and a Tail,” in N. Wyatt, W. G. E. Watson and J. B. Lloyd, eds., *Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 12: Ugarit, Religion and Culture*, Münster 1996, pp. 1-9. The presence of a scorpion in this scene would not be surprising since it is a crawler (continues the general direction towards the ground – see “vectors” below), and could be very poisonous.

whether the third main character, *yrḫ*/dog appears in this part. It seems that on the one hand *ṯtrt w^cnt* are looking for a remedy to save 'il's life, and on the other hand the recipe, which is most probably the remedy brought by *ṯtrt w^cnt*, also includes dog-hair (line 29).⁷ I believe that these missing lines had featured a dog. It is difficult to ascertain whether the dog-hair is brought by *ṯtrt w^cnt* from afar, or is voluntarily donated by *yrḫ*/dog who has never left 'il's house. Nonetheless, to use an analogy from modern drama, a gun which is shown to the audience at a beginning of a play, is likely to be used during the course of the play. This is especially true when we all know that someone is in fact shot. The dog was introduced at the beginning of the story, dog-hair is part of the recipe –where could the hair come from?⁸

Hence, I believe we should consider *yrḫ*/dog as one of the three/five characters that play the main role in this plot, and only a deeper understanding of the structural relationship between these characters will enable us to better understand the structure of this text.

The Plot

Pardee re-published the text in question as the first in a group he titled “Para-mythological texts.” He explains that any member of this group is “one with mythological form or overtones but with a practical function . . . The functional value of this text is evident not only from content, that is, the passage from story to recipe, but also from its literary form, the myth being in poetic form while the recipe is in prose.”⁹

This story follows a circular path: with the exception of the recipe the text starts and ends in the same place, with everybody sober. The story unfolds unevenly: there are two waves of decline (units I and II), each of which is further divided into three stages. The decline in the second wave begins at the low point reached during the first-wave decline. Each wave is introduced with the same reasoning: the drinking of alcohol (a and a').¹⁰ The second wave clearly intensifies the scenario presented in the first one. During the first wave the banquet in 'il's palace is introduced, where heavy intoxication of the gods is taking place (a). This results in two harsh events: 1) the moon-god falls to the ground (b) –a symbol of chaos and turmoil on earth, and 2) a dog eats of the gods' food, that is, of sacrificial offerings– a symbol of disorder

7. For the supposed connection between the recipe and the remedy in the mythological part of the text, and a comparison to other texts, see G. del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*, Bethesda, Maryland 1999, p. 387.

8. W.G.E. Watson suggested three renderings of the recipe (A, B and C), two of which (A and C) make a case for an actual slaughtering of a dog and the use of its body-organs. See his “Comments on KTU 1.114:29'-31',” *Aula Orientalis* 8 (1990) 266. Watson's option A is:

What one should place on his (= the patient's) forehead:
the hair of a dog as well as (its) head, mouth, throat(?) and its *šr*,
and he will drink at the same time fresh olive juice.

His option C is:

What one should place on his forehead:
the hair of a dog and (its) head, mouth, throat;
and on his (= patient's) navel(?) place simultaneously fresh olive juice.

In the third option (B) a dog is not slaughtered:

What one should place on his forehead: the hair of a dog;
also (on) the (patient's) head, mouth, throat and navel(?);
and let him simultaneously drink fresh olive oil.

But see del Olmo Lete, *Mitos, leyendas y rituales de los semitas occidentales*, 161, n. 13, and Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, pp. 412-3, n. 48, for minimalist views suggesting that “dog-hair” is a name of a plant.

9. Pardee, “‘Ilu on a Toot (1.97)”, p. 302; idem, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 265-266.

10. Indeed, the text of line 16 is almost identical to that of lines 3/4; in both instances, the text articulates the beginning of a new wave.

in the houses of the gods. The literary tool used to relate the two metaphors is letting *yrh* play the dog. By playing the dog, *yrh* “must” fall to the ground, an action necessary to create the image of chaos and one characteristic of dogs. He introduces the dog into the story –an essential ingredient for the remedy as well as for the recipe. This creates a continuity between sections a and b of the plot, and what is more, it lays the basis for the main source of tension in this text (see below).

The second wave of deterioration begins in the middle of line 14, where the spotlight is now directed on *ʾil* himself, and where each stage is related to events happening in the first wave. The cause of the dreadful situation is clear: drunkenness.¹¹ When *ʾil* himself is sitting to drink again (a’), one expects the worst. *ʾil* is not sitting alone in the *mrzh*,¹² but unlike in lines 3/4, this time he is the only god who drinks.¹³

After the introduction, *ʾil*’s downfall begins (b’). Contrary to *yrh*, who finds himself on the floor immediately, *ʾil*’s collapse is gradual. First, he arrives home supported by his two sons (lines 17-19) –he would have otherwise fallen to the ground;¹⁴ he meets *hby*, who is possibly the psychopomp– ready to guide his soul to the lower world;¹⁵ then, terrorized by fear, he bowls over in his feces and his urine (lines 19-21); finally he drops like a corpse (lines 21-22) –the collapse is now complete. The description of *ʾil* falling as if dead is repeated twice: once using *km mt* (line 21), the second using *k yrđm . ʾarš* (line 22). Since the author employs the prepositions which express comparison *km* and *k*, it is clear that in both cases *ʾil* is not dead. Nonetheless, let us remember what happened to the last figure who was described as being “like” something: *yrh* is like a dog (*km . ʾk ʾl ʾb*) in line 5 (section b), and is mentioned twice as a dog in lines 12-13 (section c), but not any more as “*yrh*”. Will *ʾil*, who was described as “like a corpse” in section b’, be truly dead in section c’?

The transition from sections b to c, and from b’ to c’ is clearly marked by the repeated appearances of *ʿttrt wʿnt* and *ʿnt wʿttrt*. In section b these two goddesses take on an important role in the creation of the disaster: they feed the dog with the gods’ food. Being introduced again in the beginning of section c’, one must wonder: what trouble will these two goddesses bring this time? Yet there is still hope that something will be different. In the beginning of section c’ they are introduced in reversed order as *ʿnt wʿttrt*, a possible hint that on this occasion things are going to be different.

Most of section c’ is not extant. All we know is that *ʿnt wʿttrt* are going to hunt, or doing something that has to do with game or food, either in a sanctuary or in a place named *qʾdʾš*.¹⁷ Taking into

11. Dietrich and Loretz reconstruct the end of line 14 and the beginning of 15 as follows: *yḫ . ʾil . w l / ʾa šk[r]* which they translate as follows: “El sitzt da, und zwar wahrlich volltrunken!” If this suggestion is correct, this is another emphasis found in this text for *ʾil*’s excess drinking. See their “Siehe, da war er (wieder) munter!”, p. 178, 184-185.

12. Concerning the different opinions with regards to the *mrzh* in this text, see John L. McLaughlin, “The *marzeaḥ* at Ugarit: A Textual and Contextual Study,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 23 (1991) 270-274.

13. Nevertheless, it is possible that this is a passive form or a G plural masculine *yqtl* form. I thank Robert Hawley for drawing my attention to these options.

14. Cristiano Grottanelli indicates how the participation of the good sons in this scene can be also understood as another indication for *ʾil*’s dying: “. . . the comparison between being drunk and being dead is also indicated, indirectly but clearly, by the fact that the ideal son . . . is the one who takes care of his father when he is drunk and after he is dead, by protecting him, dead or alive, from dirt.” See his “Wine and Death - East and West,” in *In Vino Veritas*, eds. Oswyn Murray and Manuela Tecusan, Roma 1995, p. 84.

15. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, p. 40.

16. See Shalom M. Paul, “‘Emigration’ from the Netherworld in the Ancient Near East,” *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65: *Immigration and emigration within the Ancient Near East (Festschrift E. Lipiński)*, K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors, eds., Leuven 1995, pp. 221-227; Marjo Christina Annette Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine*, Münster 1990, pp. 336-363.

17. A visual relation between banquets and hunting is well attested in the Neo-Assyrian iconography. See Frances Pinnock, “Considerations on the ‘Banquet Theme’ in the Figurative Art of Mesopotamia and Syria,” *Drinking in Ancient Societies*, ed. Lucio Milano, Padova 1994, pp. 20-21.

consideration that the happy end is marked by their return with the remedy (which includes dog-hair), it is possible they kill the dog, or at least catch it during their “hunt” (line 23). On the grounds of sections a, b, and c described above, it seems that section c’ holds to its very end the tension of a race against time: catching the dog or leaving ’il to weaken and deteriorate. The only way to stop the decline is by catching the dog. By stopping the dog, *’nt w’trrt* not only bring cure to ’il, but also undo all the damage caused by the drunkenness and by their own deeds. The dog that ate from the gods’ food is punished, and the moon-god, who is imprisoned in the dog’s body, is, perhaps, released to find his way back to the sky, and thus order returns to the world. It is hard to say what an ongoing deterioration of ’il’s condition could mean to the audience; nevertheless, it seems to be the most traumatic event in a chain of disasters.

The hunting journey can also be interpreted as an ironic or humorous episode. The dog in this story appears during the beginning of the banquet and is present, or at least was present, at it. Why should two goddesses join forces in order to find it? It is reasonable to assume that most of the audience at the time knew that the remedy for this drunkenness-related illness derived, or had something to do with dogs. If so, this is the type of comical and dramatic motif, where one sees the remedy/salvation standing on the stage, but the characters who desperately need it, do not. The blindness of *’nt w’trrt*, who are not able to make the connection between the dog on the one hand, and the suffering ’il on the other, introduces a considerable amount of tension into the story.

Repetition, Motifs, and Order-Change

The author of RS 24.258 uses repetitions of various kinds:

1) Repetition of proper names, briefly discussed in the previous paragraphs, is a very common procedure in most narrations: it is used in our text for the following purposes:

a. Focusing on a certain character. Since this is a story about ’il, his name opens the first line of the text. The focus of the story up to line 14 is *yrh/dog*. Switching the focus back to ’il is accomplished by mentioning his name twice in lines 14 and 15.¹⁹

b. Names sometimes mark the beginning of new sections and create a link between them. The names *’trrt w’nt* and *’nt w’trrt* open section c (line 9) and its corresponding section c’ (lines 22-23), respectively. In section c *’trrt w’nt* feed the dog: *’trrt* with the *nšb*-cut and *’nt* with the shoulder-cut. This is an improper thing to do, as can be inferred from the fact that both ’il and they are reproved for this deed. Although section c’ is fragmentary, it seems that there *’nt w’trrt* take a journey in order to find a remedy for ’il, or simply seek a remedy for him. As previously discussed, this remedy probably contained dog-hair, or even dog-organs. In sum, whereas their action with words to the dog in section c is reportedly improper, in section c’ *’nt w’trrt* are on their way to perform a worthy act dealing with a dog, or dog hair. The nature of

18. Two biblical narratives, which deal with mass destruction, are associated with drunkenness: the stories of Noah (Gen. 9, 20-27) and Lot (Gen. 19, 30-38). In these two cases the intoxication is not the cause of the disaster but rather happens to the survivors once the disaster is over. For the comparison to Noah see also Grottanelli, “Wine and Death - East and West,” p. 85. Banquets also take place in the Mesopotamian flood myth. *Atra-Ḥasīs* / Ut-Napistim is setting a banquet for the poor workers who built his ark in order to make them drunk, and make them oblivious to the imminent flood (*Atra-Ḥasīs* tab. 3, lines 94-102; *Gilgamesh* tab. 11, lines 69-73). The situation of a banquet, held while a disaster is being prepared and left unnoticed by its participants, is somewhat similar to the situation in RS 24.258. According to a reconstruction of the *Atra-Ḥasīs* text by Lambert and Millard, the banquet begins with the moon being covered (*...ib-ba-bji-il ar-hu*) – a comparable image to the moon falling down in the beginning of the gods’ banquet in Ugarit. See Maureen Gallery Kovacs (trans.), *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Stanford CA 1989), p. 99; W. G. Lambert, and A. R. Millard, *Atra-Ḥasīs: the Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford 1969, p. 92.

19. ’il’s name is mentioned in line 12 as part of the name/title *’gr bt ’il*. This can be interpreted as another sign of the anticipated change of focus.

one act is clear from the text (c), the other is reconstructed (c'). The first one is negative (c), and the second is positive (c'). The latter can be interpreted as an attempt to restore the order, which was destroyed during the former.

Although the names of ^c*ttrt w^cnt* are repeated in section c', the order of the two names or conversely, the internal order of the double name, is changed: the names of the goddesses in section c' are ^c*nt w^cttrt*. The technique of order-change matches the literary relationship between sections c and c'. Both ^c*nt* and ^c*ttrt* have an independent existence in this text, since each one of them feeds the dog separately (lines 10-11). ^c*nt* is the last to feed it, so she should be the first to look for a remedy. It is possible that for this reason the author changes the name order to ^c*nt w^cttrt*. Similar to section c, where the combined name ^c*ttrt w^cnt* is transformed into two separate entities, ^c*ttrt* and ^c*nt*, I assume that this process also occurred in the missing part of section c', with the exception that in c' the introduction of the separate entities began with ^c*nt* and was followed by ^c*ttrt*. It is also possible that the developed forms preceded the combined name. This could be the case with the lost opening of section d.²⁰

2) The other major type of repetition is that of similar words, phrases or sentences. In some cases such repetition occurs within a single section, in addition to the frequent use of parallelism,²¹ in others, the repetition is across units, underlining the link between a and a', b and b.'

a. Repetition within a section. Verbal forms of the root ^c*db* appear five times in sections b and c. Four of them seemingly mean "to feed / prepare food" or simply "to give (food)" (lines 7, 10, 12, 13). The clearest repetition is in lines 10-11 and 12-13, where ^c*ttrt w^cnt* feed (^c*db*) the dog with the *nšb*- and shoulder-cuts, and where they are reproved for that, respectively. The repetition intensifies the sense of significance and guilt associated in the text with this type of feeding.²² In line 7 the verb ^c*ydb* also means "give food," but unlike in lines 10-14 where the/a dog is fed, here the identity of the one being fed is vague: *yrh* or possibly a dog. I am inclined to believe that the one being fed at this stage is *yrh* rather than the dog.²³ Adding to the problematic nature of this passage is the unique form *gbh* (line 5).²⁴ Reading section b "backwards," I suggest that ^c*db* is used in line 4 to confer unity on the section and to lead the audience to understand that although the section seemingly deals with two different figures (*yrh*/dog), they are in fact one.²⁵ Although the root ^c*db* does not occur in any other extant part of this text, it makes five

20. For further discussion of ^c*ttrt w^cnt* see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne* (1961), pp. 48-50.

21. For an exploration of the parallelism in this text see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne* (1961), pp. 20-23; Dietrich and Loretz, "'Siehe, da war er (wieder) munter!'" pp. 179-192, and in particular pp. 192-195.

22. In his vocalization, Pardee even suggested a textual addition in line 11, of the verb ^c*db* following the noun *ktp* in order to create a better similarity between lines 10-11 and 12-13. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

23. There are three reasons for that:

1. *tgr bt 'il* does not reprove the feeding gods in line 7. If the one being fed is a dog, what makes ^c*ttrt w^cnt* more sinful than these gods? Unless these specific cuts were reserved for gods' stomachs only.
2. The decision of the god(s) to feed the creature under the table or to strike it with a stick was based on "knowing," or, as I prefer, "recognizing" or even "identifying" it. See "*yd^c*" in G. del Olmo Lete, and J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica*, vol. II. (Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 2000), pp. 521-522. Whether or not the gods were able to identify the dog, they were capable of doing so with regards to their fellow god *yrh* in his new doggyish guise. Moreover, if one believes that in this stage the creature was a new dog transformed from *yrh*, it is impossible that any of the gods could actually recognize him. To suggest that there is no connection between *yrh* who plays the dog and the dog which is fed by the gods seems to contradict the flow of the text and the above-mentioned similarity between lines 6-8 and 9-14.
3. The process whereby *yrh* becomes a dog is framed by the introduction of *yrh* in line 4, and by the existence of the dog in lines 12-13. Lines 4-13 underline a gradual process, during which we learn that this creature is "like a dog" (line 5), and so, the character in line 7 is more likely to be *yrh* than the dog.

24. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne* (1961), pp. 35-43.

25. The first time that a verbal form of ^c*db* appears in this text, it describes an action directly related to *yrh* (lines 4-5).

appearances in this section alone. In a process during which the main figure is transformed from moon-god to dog, there is a common verb which, by its inclusion in the three stages of the transfiguration (lines 4-6, 6-8, 9-13), unites the entire passage.²⁶

The endings of the first two stages of this transfiguration are marked by the repetition of the phrase *tĥt tĥn/t: yrĥ* is located under the table/s when he plays the dog. This phrase ends two sets of parallelisms, and can be understood either as part of the previous sentences or as an independent phrase describing the condition of *yrĥ* in the end of the previous sentence: he is still underneath the table. Only once the process of becoming a dog is finalized and it is clear that the creature fed by *ᶜttrt wᶜnt* is a dog, is it no longer necessary to mention that the dog is under the table. Undoubtedly, this is the proper place for a dog under these circumstances.

b. Repetitions between sections. These repetitions create structural, lexical, and thematic relations between sections. They prompt the audience to recall the events evoked in the section to which the repetitions allude, and to project them onto the developments of the current section. In light of the narrative relations between the sections, the presence of two sets of sections where the repetitions occur in the same order, and a correlation between the ‘vectors’ (see below) of each parallel section, I divide the extant text of the recto of the tablet into two units: I (a, b, c) and II (a’, b’, c’).

The longest repetition between sections is between a and a’. The similarity can be seen clearly in the following comparison between lines 3-4 and 16:

tštn yᶜd šbᶜ / trĥ . ᶜd ᶜškr
yšᶜᶜ . [y]ᶜn . ᶜd šbᶜ . trĥ . ᶜd škr

These two similar sentences conclude two sections (a and a’). Both sentences follow sections that share a similar content: in section a *’il* summons the gods for a banquet and then “they drink wine to satiety / new wine to drunkenness,” And in a’ *’il* calls together his drinking group, and then “he drinks wine to satiety, new wine to drunkenness.” Section a is the opening section of RS 24.258, and also serves as a general introduction to the entire text (mainly line 1 and the first word of line 2), and as an introduction to the first unit of the text (I = abc). The latter deals with the appalling events at the gods’ banquet –the moon-god is under the table, two goddesses feed the dog with gods’ food. Section a’ functions as an introduction only to the second unit (II = a’b’c’). The latter deals exclusively with *’il* and his intoxication.

I suggest that the similarity between a and a’ has to do with the two related cases of drunkenness and their consequences in this text. Although relatively succinct, the “real time” duration of sections a and a’ is the longest in this story. By the end of section a the gods are drunk, and by the end of a’ *’il* is drunk. Following Pardee’s translation of the word *gbh* in line 5 as “his cup,” it is possible to understand that *yrĥ* drags his cup under the table. This can be understood as the behavior of a drunken person (or god), which also explains why he plays a dog. If “his cup” is the correct translation, the author then makes a symbolic connection between the drink (*gbh*) and the disaster (the moon-god is on the ground –see below). The drink accompanies its victim, so to speak, until it ensures that its mission is completed. The effects of the gods’ drunkenness were already mentioned above. While there is no reason to suspect that *’il* was not drinking at all at his party, he was not completely drunk. We know that he was not fully alert because he was present when *ᶜttrt wᶜnt* fed the dog with the choice-cuts, and he did not stop them. For that reason his son, the doorkeeper, who is probably the only sober person present at the banquet, reproaches him. *’il* survives the first wave of intoxication –he is the head of gods after all– and is ready for a second round. He gathers the drinking assembly, and this time (section a’) there is no doubt: *’il* himself is drunk. When

26. The verb *ᶜdb* is a verb of “transformation,” meaning, “to prepare, to get something ready.”

'il's drunkenness is presented exactly in the same way, the audience, cognizant of the effects of the previous drunkenness (that of the gods), now anticipates even worse disasters.

The same type of linkage is created between sections b and b'. This time, the repetition is not literal, yet still meaningful. In line 5 *yrh* is described by using the simile: *km . 'k' [l] 'b' . yqtqt . tht / tlhnt* – “like a dog he does the action *qtqt* under the tables.” In lines 21-22 'il is described twice using the simile: *ql . 'il . km mt / 'il . k yrdm . 'arš* – “'il falls like a corpse/ 'il himself (falls) like those who descend into the earth.” Both *yrh* and 'il are described “like” (*km*) something. 'il's description is more extensive than *yrh*'s –two simile forms are used, the second of which is *k*. The repeated use of simile is significant because *yrh* ultimately turns this figure of speech into reality and becomes a dog. Using the simile in the description of 'il, while he is experiencing a drunkenness similar to that of *yrh*, signals that whatever appears in this figure of speech (*km mt / 'il . k yrdm . 'arš*) might soon become a reality. Since 'il is compared twice to the dead, the probability that this comparison actually becomes true creates considerable tension.²⁷

“Vectors”

Borrowed from the field of Physics, a vector is “quantity having both magnitude and direction. Many physical quantities are vectors, e.g., force, velocity and momentum.”²⁸ I would like to propose that in this piece there is something akin to literary vectors –forces of directional movement that pervade the entire-text, as revealed by significant patterns of particular instances of directional movement. Just as the movement of foliating leaves can render the path of the wind visible, so do these movements reveal the presence of larger vectors. The latter serve to confer unity, both on the “micro” level of a section and on the “macro” level of the narrative whole. Most of the vectors in RS 24.258 denote motion and movement of characters as well as of related objects:

Unit I

Section a

→ A horizontal, inward vector: 'il invites the gods to partake in his banquet held in his palace; they arrive.

↓ A vertical downward vector: The gods drink wine.

Section b

↓ A vertical, downward vector:

1. *yrh* goes down under the table.
2. *yrh* digs in the ground like a dog (*yqtqt*).
3. Any god who recognizes him gives him food.
4. *yrh* probably eats the food.
5. Someone who does not know him strikes him with a stick.

Section c

→ A horizontal, inward vector:

1. *ttrt w'nt* arrive (line 9).
2. The doorman yells at them (from the door inward).
3. The doorman yells at 'il, his father.

↓ A vertical, downward vector:

1. *ttrt* gives him a *nšb*-cut (repeated twice).

27. See Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, p. 412, n. 43.

28. “Vector,” in *The Penguin Columbia Encyclopedia*, New York 1987, p. 888.

2. *ᶜnt* gives him a shoulder-cut (repeated twice).

Unit II

Section a'

→ A horizontal, inward vector: *'il* calls together his drinking group.

↓ A vertical, downward vector:

1. *'il* takes his seat in the *mrzḫ*.
2. *'il* drinks wine.

Section b'

→ A horizontal, inward vector:

1. *'il* heads home and arrives at his court.
2. *ṭkmn w šnm* bear him along.
3. Another step forward: *ḫby* meets him.

↓ A vertical, downward vector:

1. *ṭkmn w šnm* bear *'il* along (*'i*'s vector is vertical and downward).
2. He bowls over in his feces and his urine.
3. *'il* falls as though dead.
4. *'il* himself like those who descend into the earth.

Section c'

← A horizontal, outward vector: *ᶜnt w ᶜttrt* go off on the hunt.

Unit III

Section d

→ A horizontal, inward vector: “She” brings back.

↑ A vertical, upward vector: *'il* awakes.

The direction of the vectors of sections a, b, c, a' and b' (lines 1-22) is either downward or inward. The further *'il* enters into his palace, the closer he is to a death-resembling condition. I believe that the use of these vectors in essentially two main directions mirrors a vertical downfall related to drunkenness and a horizontal inward continuity of the text, a leitmotif that connects the different units. The horizontal vectors function similarly to the repetitions between sections discussed above. They associate the different, seemingly unrelated metaphors and combine the various narratives of the characters into a structured, unified composition.

The downfall of the moon

In many ancient Near Eastern cultures the moon plays an essential role in reckoning the time and date. In general, these cultures hold that the moon-god shares responsibility with the sun-god for organizing the calendar and for maintaining world order. In most Semitic languages, expressions denoting “month” are related to those designating “moon;” indeed, most cuneiform scripts express the name of the moon-god as ^dxxx,²⁹ and the words for “month” and for “moon” in Ugaritic are both spelled the same: *yrḫ*. The moon was a marker of stability and order in the North-West Semitic culture, as well as in Ugarit.³⁰

29. The maximum number of days between two new moons –a month. On the moon-god in literature and iconography see Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*, New Haven and London 1976.

30. Although lunar omens are not significant only to Ugarit, their existence testifies to the importance of the moon in these senses. See D. Pardee, “Ugaritic Lunar Omens (1.91),” in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. I, Leiden 1997, p. 302; idem, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 290-291. The other important Ugaritic text which deals

None of the known ancient Near-Eastern moon-god attributes has anything to do with the moon-god's image as a dog.³¹ In addition to several appearances of the moon-god in relation to dogs in Greek mythology,³² it is possible to point to another such appearance in the context of a bilingual Hattic-Hittite mythological text. The moon-god, or perhaps the rock in which he is trapped, is described as if it has the ability to bark.³³ However, the text does not indicate unequivocally that the moon-god is a dog.

I believe that the key to understanding this para-mythological text is separating the literary frame, mechanism and tools from the mythological elements evident in the text. I assume that each figure participating in this text brings with it its customary mythological associations. In this text, however, which is not one of the pillars of Ugaritic myth, the plot advances from one point to the other by creating new relations between old myths, social rules and conventions. I call these new relations "literary," for they are a built-up well beyond the expected common conventions of the audience. Having *yrḥ* play the dog is the brilliant invention of the author, enabling him to connect a well-known myth to well-known religious rules, both bearing the influence of Hittite culture (see below).³⁴ As I demonstrated before, the idea of the downfall of *yrḥ* is essential for creating the tension in the following downfall – that of *'il*.³⁵ If so, what mythological text lies in the background of this idea? Let us discuss the above-mentioned bilingual Hattic-Hittite mythological text, known as "The Moon that fell from Heaven."³⁶

In this text the moon-god is reportedly falling from the sky on the gate complex (seemingly trapped in a rock), but no one is able to see him. Therefore, the storm-god sends forces of nature and gods after him: the rain, the god *Hapantali* and the goddess *Kamrusepa*. The downfall of the moon-god makes the

with the moon-god is the one that describes the wedding of Yarih and Nikkal. See Theuer, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas*; G. del Olmo Lete, "Yarḥu y Nikkalu: La mitología lunar sumeria en Ugarit," *Aula Orientalis* 9 (1991) 67-75; Wolfram Herrmann, *Yarih und Nikkal und der Preis der Kutarat-Göttinnen: Ein kultisch-magischer Text aus Ras Schamra*, Berlin 1968. See also Daniel E. Fleming, "New Moon Celebration Once a Year: Emar's *Hidašu* of Dagan," in *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East* (Festschrift E. Lipiński. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65), K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors, eds., (Leuven, 1995), pp. 57-64, and see bibliography there.

31. For a detailed discussion of this topic see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 39-46; Theuer, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas*, pp. 108-110. Moreover, it seems that there is no way to connect one of the images of the moon-god, when he is described as a shepherd, to shepherd's dogs, since these very descriptions strongly indicate that the moon-god is either a bull or a calf. See "Sin and the Cow" in Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses*, Vol II, Bethesda MD 1993, pp. 891-892; A. Sjöberg, *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der sumerischen Überlieferung*, Stockholm 1960, pp. 13-34; Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near East Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, p. 385. See also this representation in art works in Tallay Ornan, "The Bull and its Two Masters: Moon and Storm Deities in Relation to the Bull in Ancient Near Eastern Art." *IEJ* 51/1 (2001) 1-26.

32. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 39-46.

33. Hoffner translates *[w]a-ap-pi-ya-ad-du-ma* as "let it/him bark." See Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths*, second edition, Atlanta, GA 1998, p. 36, §12. See also Emmanuel Laroche, *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription*, Paris 1965, p. 76, and Albrecht Goetze, "Madduwattas," in Ferdinand Sommer, ed., *Hethitische Texte in Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, book 3, Leipzig 1928, Rs 92, pp. 144-145. See also below. I would like to thank Alice Mouton for discussing this text with me.

34. The idea of "playing the dog," i.e., a personification of a dog figure, is familiar to Hittite rituals, where "dog-men" bark (the same Hittite verb as the one appears in the text in question) and sing. See Billie Jean Collins, "Animals in Hittite Literature," *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, ed. B. J. Collins, Leiden, Boston, and Köln 2002, pp. 249-250, and idem, "Animals in the Religions of Ancient Anatolia," *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, pp. 328-329. The term 'dog-man' is also the Hittite term for 'hunter.'

35. For this reason I tend not to accept the idea that this text brings to the fore the polemic against the moon-god, advanced by the believers of the sun-god. See more about the idea and its Hurrian origin in Theuer, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas*, p. 110.

36. Also known as "When the Storm God Thunders Frightfully." See Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, pp. 34-36; Kammenhuber, "Die protohattisch-hethitische Bilinguis vom Mond, der vom Himmel gefallen ist," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 51 (1955) 104-123.

storm-god anxious and fearful. It is only during their second mission that one of the storm-god's delegates is able to release the moon-god from the rock. This release involves a journey of the magic-goddess *Kamrusepa* to an unknown mountain. Before his ultimate liberation, the moon-god (or someone else?) barks. Consequently, the anxiety and fear remain inside the rock (?), the sky opens "and he made it" (returned to the sky?).

In another Hittite mythological text, entitled "The disappearance of the sun god," the moon-god is described in quite a similar situation.³⁷ This text has to do with the disappearance of the sun, which results in nature being gripped by the paralyzing force of *hahhimas* (frost). The moon-god is reportedly one of the casualties: "And he shot (?) the moon-god. [...] he threw [...] in the city gate."³⁸

In both texts the downfall of the moon-god creates havoc and is the source of global disorder.³⁹ Moreover, "The Moon that fell from Heaven" has additional elements comparable to the text under discussion: is the relationship between the storm-god and the moon-god similar to the relationship between 'il and *yrḫ*? For instance, both the storm-god and 'il become increasingly sick as long as the moon-god is not released from the rock/(from being a dog?). Do the goddesses *Kamrusepa* and *ᶜnt wᶜttrt* play the same role in both texts, helping the senior and minor gods as well as preserving godly order? Are *Kamrusepa* and *ᶜnt wᶜttrt* making a journey in order to find the rock/dog? Once it is found, is the transferal of the storm-god's fears and anxieties into the rock comparable to the curing of 'il using the dog's hair? And finally, is the general structure of the texts identical: a circular plot, which begins with two waves of decline and ends with a swift, happy end? I believe that "The Moon that fell from Heaven," or a possible Ugaritic parallel to it, might have served as a background for our text.

The precise description of the downfall of *yrḫ* is very problematic. It seems that no explanation of the words *yᶜdb* . *yrḫ* / *gbh* in lines 4-5 gives a satisfactory answer to the many grammatical, etymological and semantic questions that are raised as a consequence.⁴⁰ Pardee's translation of *gbh* as "his cup" finds support in the interpretation of the word *gbh* in RIH 77/18:13 (KTU² 1.175). This translation may be further substantiated by the Hebrew כּוּב and the Biblical Aramaic כּוּב – a hole in the ground in general, and a small natural seasonal water reservoir in particular.⁴¹ A Ugaritic word spelled *gb* is also attested at RS 1.005:1.⁴² There, Pardee translates it as "tertre," which in French means a knoll, or hillock, located in a room in the royal palace. RS 24.258 takes place in the royal palace of 'il, where one finds a *gb* underneath the table. Let us examine the parallelism in this part of the text:

yᶜdb . *yrḫ* (5) *gbh* .
km . ᶜkᶜ [l] ᶜbᶜ . *yqtqt*.
tḫt (6) *tllḫnt* .

The verbs *yᶜdb* (prepare) and *yqtqt* (dig) may well have a parallel function here. Is it possible that *gbh* is in fact a concave hole in the ground that the dog digs? Is it possible that the *gb* of a royal palace is a concave feature and not a "tertre"?

37. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, pp. 27-28.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 28, §9.

39. Compare to Lambert and Millard, *Atra-Ḫasis: the Babylonian Story of the Flood*, p. 92; see note 18 above.

40. For a comprehensive discussion see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 35-44.

41. Jer 14, 3; Dan 6, 8. The semantic relation between the Hebrew "water reservoir" and the possible Ugaritic "cup" is similar to the semantic relation that currently exists in Hebrew between כּוּב (cup) and סּפּוּל (an ancient human-made hole in the rock, used as a wine press or as a cistern).

42. Dennis Pardee, *Les textes rituels; fascicule 1: chapitres 1-53 (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XII)*, Paris 2000, pp. 214, 218, 227-230.

Another possible interpretation of *gbh* is suggested by the Hebrew word גובה “height.”⁴³ Although this translation nicely fits into my “downfall” reading, it creates two problems: 1) its correspondence to the verb *y^cdb*,⁴⁴ and 2) the possessive form should probably be *gbhh*.

Whatever might be the correct meaning of this phrase, it is clear from the context that *yrh*, formerly ruling the sky, is now under the table. This table functions as a visual partition between the ground and *yrh*'s natural habitat –heaven. He is imprisoned in the body of one of the most earthly creatures, a dog, and as such, he is digging for food.⁴⁵ Not only does the moon-god descend to the ground under the table, but he also tries to dig in the earth. But it is not he who makes the way to the underworld, for this is merely a “preview” for the forthcoming downfall, the one of 'il. In this transitional phase of transformation from a moon-god into a dog, he is treated as a moon-god by someone who can still recognize him (lines 6-7), and as a dog (lines 7-8) by someone who cannot. This final scene of humiliation formally ends the process of becoming a dog. The repetition of the words *tht . ilhn* (“under the table”) marks the finite nature of this situation: *yrh* is now a dog.

Dogs' food, gods' food. Are dogs allowed?

Are dogs allowed in 'il's banquet? Seemingly they are. Marvin Pope shows that the presence of a dog under the table in iconographical descriptions of banquets is common in the classical world.⁴⁶ A more relevant Near-Eastern example can be added to Pope's somewhat problematic ED III example: a neo-Hittite (eighth century BCE?) relief from Karatepe, in which a dog (?) is situated under the banquet table.⁴⁷ Although dogs are said to be present in the gods' houses (in mythological contexts), we should still admit the possibility that having dogs in a temple in Ugarit was unacceptable. As in many mythological texts of the ancient Near East, the plot refers to the two levels of existence of the gods: the heavenly and earthly ones. The gods are acting like human beings in their heavenly capacity, but at the same time there are some religious restrictions regarding the gods' houses on earth. Religious and ritual laws outline the proper treatment of gods by humans. Each narrative in this banquet-story could have a different meaning in each of the parallel levels. For example, in this case, even if a dog were the most natural and welcomed guest at any human banquet of the time, it could be a terrible act to let a dog in the house of a god, a temple.

43. Ez 40, 42; Amos 2, 9. According to the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, v. G 1956, pp. 6-7, this word has a plausible etymology in the Akkadian *gab'u* (attested only in the plural form *gab'āni*). Nonetheless, Wolfram von Soden translates this word as “Gipfel,” showing an attested singular form. See Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* v. I, Wiesbaden 1965, p. 272.

44. For discussion of this verb see Fred Renfroe, *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 5), Münster 1992, pp. 20-21.

45. For further discussion on *yqtqt* see note 86 below.

46. Marvin H. Pope, “A Divine Banquet at Ugarit,” in *The Use of the Old Testament in the new and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, James M. Efrid, ed., Durham NC 1972, pp. 182-190. For a description of dogs in Greek sanctuaries see F. T. Van Starten, *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Leiden, New York and Köln 1995, p. 71, 100. A Parthian ritual banquet is described as follows: “the man who enjoys the title of friend of the king does not share his table, but sits on the floor while the king is above him, lying on high divan. The man eats like a dog whatever the king throws him.” See Cristiano Grottanelli, “The Roles of the Guest in the Epic-Banquet,” in *Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East*, Carlo Zaccagnini ed., Budapest 1989, p. 301. In some ways, this ceremony seems similar to the Hasidic “Tisch.”

47. Henri Frankfurt, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, Middlesex 1969, p. 165, fig. B; Irine J. Winter, “On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and their Context,” *Anatolian Studies* 29 (1979) 118-121. Winter shows that many of the motifs in this scene are originally Greek.

As mentioned in the verso of RS 24.258, the recipe includes dog's hair: *š^cr klb*. Dog's hair was used in Ugarit for medical purposes, a fact that could relate this text to the Mesopotamian belief in the connection between dogs and healing in general, and the cult of Gula, the goddess of healing, in particular.⁴⁸ The dog in our story is used for healing only at the very end. In section c the dog and its feeders are evidently erring by feeding and eating the choice cuts. Do any contemporaneous sources that deal with feeding dogs the gods' food exist?

In the important and widely disseminated Hittite text, "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials,"⁴⁹ of which at least eight copies are extant, the dog and the pig are mentioned twice in connection to defiling and profaning the shrine and the offerings, the gods' food.

The first reference is in the paragraph dealing with the baking of the daily sacrificial bread.⁵⁰ Pigs and dogs are not allowed in this bakery:⁵¹

"Further, neither pig nor dog may come through the doors into the place where the bread is broken. (Are) the mind of man and god somehow different? No! In this which (is concerned)? No! The mind (is) one and the same. When the servant stands before his master, he (is) washed. He has clothed (himself) in clean (clothes). He gives him (his master) either to eat or to drink. Since the master eats and drinks, (in) his spirit he (is) relaxed".

The second reference is likewise taken from the context of food-preparation for the gods:⁵²

"Maintain great respect for the sacrificial loaves (and) libation vessel(s) of the gods. The place for breaking bread must be swept and sprinkled by you. Neither pig nor dog is ever to cross the threshold. You yourselves are to be bathed. Wear clean clothes. In addition, your hair and fingernails are to be trimmed. Let the will of the gods not find fault with you. If a pig or dog does somehow force its way to the utensils of wood or clay that you have, and the kitchen worker does not throw it out, but gives to the gods to eat from an unclean (vessel), to that one will the gods give excrement and urine to eat and drink."⁵³

48. See a general survey in Pierre Villard, "Le chien dans la documentation néo-assyrienne," *Topoi*, Suppl. 2 (2000) 235-249; William W. Hallo, "Ibbi-Sin (2.142)," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, William W. Hallo, ed., Leiden, New York and Köln 2000, pp. 395-396; Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia*, London 1992, p. 70; David R. West, "Hekate, Lamashtu and *klbt 'ilm*," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24 (1992) 374-376; Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 69-71. See detailed bibliographies there.

49. Gregory McMahon, "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials (1.83)," in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. I, William W. Hallo, ed., Leiden 1997, pp. 217-221.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 217.

51. The dog (?) in the Karatepe scene is hidden under a table on which bread (?) loafs are placed. See Frankfurt, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, p. 165, fig. B. Does the Karatepe scene have anything to do with this Hittite temple instructions?

52. Gregory McMahon, "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials (1.83)," p. 220.

53. Two elements are common to this text and ours: a dog that eats the gods' food in the 'cause' part of the narrative and the presence of excrement and urine in the 'effect' part of the narrative. In several ancient Near Eastern texts, excrement and urine are introduced in the context of punishment. This is the context in this Hittite text as well as in the Biblical context (the speech of Rabshakeh) in 2Kings 18: 27 and Isa. 36: 12. The use of excrement and urine for punishment is also attested in Neo-Assyrian sources, for example in the description of the battle of *Halule* (Sennacherib's 8th campaign). There (Daniel D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib*, Oriental Institute Publications, vol. II, Chicago 1924, pp. 30-32) the enemy warriors are said to be urinating and voiding their excrement in the midst of their chariots: *ši-na-te-šú-nu ú-šar-ra-pu qé-reb* ^{GIS} *GIGIR.MEŠ-šú-nu ú-maš-še-ru-ni zu-ú-šú-un*. In Rabshakeh's speech, excrement and urine are reportedly what the people of the besieged Jerusalem eat and drink; this is in contrast to what they may enjoy in the future, once they surrender to Sennacherib: vine, fig and cisterns' water. In the Hittite "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials," eating excrement and urine is the punishment for an official who fed the gods something which is equivalent to excrement and urine: food, which was touched by a pig or a dog.

In this text the dog and the pig are considered unclean, and moreover, they are defiling and profaning.⁵⁴ Were dogs considered unclean in Ugarit as well? I believe so. In a cluster of letters, written by the king of Sidon and found in Ugarit, members of a group of citizens from Ugarit are referred to as ‘dogs’ in two different letters.⁵⁵ They were ‘honored’ with this title because of the “great/sever sin” of which they were accused: the profanation of the holy of holies of the temple of the storm-god.⁵⁶ It is not clear what was the precise act these “dogs” were charged with. Nevertheless, they either just penetrated the forbidden place of the temple (the holy of holies?), or made some sort of activity inside this chamber. They are said to be plotting this evil *i-na qa-qa-de₄ ša* dIškur – “to the head of” – in front of the storm-god.⁵⁷ As a punishment, they could choose either to be stoned and crucified or to pay their way to freedom. Although it could be that the term “dogs” is simply a derogatory one, it is possible that the reason it was used so consistently is that these people defiled the temple just like dogs would (as described in the Hittite “Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials” above): they entered an area which was restricted to them, and possibly acted there illegitimately. The fine included supplying offerings twice a day during four days to all the temples under the jurisdiction of Sidon. Does this punishment imply that they were expected to compensate the gods for eating from the offerings at the temple of the storm-god, a wrongdoing typically attributed to dogs? If dogs were allowed to the holy of holies, wouldn’t the king of Sidon probably use another derogatory form?⁵⁸

Dogs (and in some cases, also pigs), or dog organs are used in rituals in the Mesopotamian, Hittite and ancient Greek cultures.⁵⁹ These rituals often featuring black dogs,⁶⁰ included a ceremony in which

54. But why only pigs and dogs? James Moyer explains that both these two animals are very common in the Hittite household. See his “Hittite and Israelite Cultic Practices: A Selected Comparison,” in *Scripture in Context*, Vol. II, William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Purdue, eds., Winona Lake IN 1983, p. 30. For the popularity of dogs and pigs in the Hittite Empire, see E. Neufeld, *The Hittite Laws*, London 1951, pp. 26-28; Albrecht Goetze, “The Hittite Laws,” in *Ancient Near East Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. J. Pritchard, Princeton 1969, p. 193; Collins, “Animals in Hittite Literature,” pp. 242-243. It seems that in many cases pigs and dogs were not tied or locked up; they could therefore reach unexpected locations such as the temple’s bakery.

55. RS 86.2221+: 66; RS 18.054: 12’. See Daniel Arnaud, “Les ports de la ‘Phénicie’ à la fin de l’âge du bronze récent (xiv-xiii siècles) d’après les textes cunéiformes de Syrie,” *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30 (1992) 189-192; Itamar Singer, “A Political History of Ugarit,” in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Wilfred G. E. Watson, and Nicolas Wyatt, eds., Leiden, Boston, and Köln 1999, p. 670; Arnaud, “Lettres,” in *Études Ougaritiques I, Travaux 1985-1995, sous la direction de Marguerite Yon et Daniel Arnaud* (Ras Shamra-Ugarit XIV), Paris 2001, pp. 266-277.

56. [*i-na q*]a-ab-le pe-[r]ek-te (RS 86.2221+: 22). Arnaud suggests that this place is “l’adyton” (“Lettres,” p. 269). The crime is described as a horrible one: [*ur*]u-ia mé-e-et (RS 86.2221+: 67) “my city is dead,” writes the king of Sidon.

57. RS 86.2221+: 22.

58. There is no doubt that from the biblical priestly and deuteronomistic points of view, the pig is unclean. See Lev. 11, 7-8 and Deut. 14, 8. The dog, obviously an impure animal, was not specifically defined as unclean, but it is hard to imagine otherwise, especially because of the frequent comments on their contact with corpses. See Ex. 11: 7; Ex. 22: 30; 1Sam. 17: 43-44; 1Kings 21: 19, 23-24; 1Kings 22: 38; 2Kings 9: 10, 36; Jer. 15: 3; Moyer, “Hittite and Israelite Cultic Practices: A Selected Comparison,” p. 30. In addition, but somehow in a more general way, the dog represents the enemy and the wicked. See 1Sam. 17: 43-44; 1Sam. 24: 15; 2Sam. 3:8; 2Sam. 9:8; 2Sam. 16:9; 2Kings 8:13; Ps. 22:21; Ps. 59: 7, 15; Eccl. 9: 4. See also the usage of כלב in the Lachish ostraka in comparison to some of the biblical references in Dirk Schwiderski “‘Wer ist dein Knecht? Ein Hund!’ Zu Aufmerksamkeitssergen und Überleitungsformeln in hebräischen Briefen,” in *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, Andreas Wagner, ed., (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 156), Freiburg, Schweiz 1997, pp. 135-141. The term כלב מחר in Deut. 23: 19 is undoubtedly a negative one, mentioned in the context of abomination. If this verse is written in parallelism with the previous one, and אהנן זונה is the price for the sexual access to the קדשה, then the כלב מחר is the price for the sexual access to the male prostitute, the קדש. In this case כלב (dog) is synonymous with קדש, the temple’s male prostitute (and not “homosexual” as suggested by Hoffner in “Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East,” in *Orient and Occident: Essays presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. ed., AOAT Bd.22 1973, p. 81, and probably a notoriety name imbedded in the context of prostitution.

59. For Mesopotamian sources see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne* (1961), pp. 68-71; for Hittite sources see Albrecht Goetze, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (American Oriental Series 14), New Haven 1938, pp. 5-25; J. M.

evil, uncleanness or illness were transferred to the animals and disappeared by burning them or by letting the animals flee. If the no-longer extant part of RS 24.258 featured the catching (or even slaughtering) of the dog, then with its death, this dog took 'il's illness with it. Although this text is not a ritualistic one, it could nonetheless be inspired by this kind of text.

These types of rituals persisted for a very long period in history, and as demonstrated by Sasson, a similar ritual, dated to the seventh century BCE at the earliest, is described by Deutero-Isaiah.⁶¹ The text in Isaiah 66 is related to the Hittite and Mesopotamian ritual texts, and not to the Hittite "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials."⁶² These could be two sides of the same coin: although the unclean pig and dog are not allowed to be in contact with any of the "mainstream" rituals of the main gods, they are nevertheless utilized under special circumstance, and only after the "mainstream" rituals have proven ineffective.

Could the enigmatic phenomenon of mass dog-cemeteries in fifth- and fourth-century east-Mediterranean cities (in Beirut, Akko, Dor, Ashdod and above all in Ashkelon) be explained in light of these rituals?⁶³ Probably not. These dogs were not slaughtered or killed. Michael Heltzer suggests that dog-cemeteries from the Persian period were the consequence of the cult of Astarte-Atargatis in Ashkelon and in other sites, and points out to additional evidence emanating from Phoenician and Punic culture.⁶⁴ One of Heltzer's indications is the Phoenician plaque from Kition, where dogs (and possibly puppies) are mentioned as "maître de temple" of *ṯrt* and *mkl*. These dogs receive offerings as if they were part of the temple's officers.⁶⁵ Could this indicate the existence of a different tradition where dogs are welcomed to

Sasson, "Isaiah LXVI 3-4a," *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (1976) 199-207; Moyer, "Hittite and Israelite Cultic Practices: A Selected Comparison," pp. 31-33; Billie Jean Collins, "The Puppy in Hittite Military Rituals," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42 (1990) 211-226; idem, "Animals in the religions of Anatolia," pp. 322-323; Richard H. Beal, "Hittite Military Rituals," in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki, eds., Leiden, New York and Köln 1995, pp. 71-75. For Classical sources see West, "Hekate, Lamashtu and *klbt 'ilm*," pp. 374-376.

60. Moyer, "Hittite and Israelite Cultic Practices: A Selected Comparison," p. 31; Klaas R. Veenhof, "An Old Assyrian Incantation Against a Black Dog (kt a/k 611)," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 86 (1996) 425-433. For the role of white dogs in this type of rituals, see West, "Hekate, Lamashtu and *klbt 'ilm*," pp. 374-376.

61. Isa. 66: 3-4; Sasson, "Isaiah LXVI 3-4a," pp. 199-207.

62. For more traces of Hittite cult, ritual and cultural parallels see Hoffner, "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels," *The Context of Scripture*, vol. III, William W. Hallo, ed., Leiden, Boston, and Köln, pp. xxix-xxxiv; Moshe Weinfeld, "Traces of Hittite Cult in Shiloh, Bethel and in Jerusalem," *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, and Gernot Wilhelm, eds., (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 129), Freiburg, Schweiz 1993, pp. 455-472.

63. See Paula Wapnish, and Brian Hesse, "Pampered Pooches or Plain Pariahs? The Ashkelon Dog Burials," *Biblical Archaeologist* 56 (1993) 55-80; Lawrence Stager, "Why were Hundreds of Dogs buried at Ashkelon?," in *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems*, Washington DC 1991, pp. 34-36; idem, "Ashkelon," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, vol. 1, Jerusalem 1993, pp. 107-110; Michael Heltzer, "On the Vth Century B.C.E. Dogs from Ashkelon," *Transeuphratène* 15 (1998) 149-152. There are many examples of dog burials from all over the ancient Near East, but most of them are not mass burials. See Wapnish and Hesse, "Pampered Pooches or Plain Pariahs?," pp. 67-73; Uwe Finkbeiner, and Hélène Sader, "Bey 020 Preliminary Report of the Excavations 1995," *Bulletin d'Archéologie et d'Architecture Libanaises* 2 (1997) 130-132.

64. Heltzer, "On the Vth Century B.C.E. Dogs from Ashkelon," pp. 149-152. This topic is also covered in Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 49-51.

65. Brian Peckman, "Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)," *Orientalia* 37 (1968) 305-306. On the basis of this inscription, Stager interprets the term מִחֵיר כֶּלֶב in Deut. 23:19 as the wages of the temple's dogs; he writes that "there were probably healing cults involving sacred dogs operating in the vicinity of Jerusalem's Temple." See his "Why were Hundreds of Dogs buried in Ashkelon?," p. 36. Although this interpretation is consistent with the Kition plaque and with the actual feeding of the dog by *ṯrt w' ṯrt* in our text, it is not appropriate to the biblical context. The biblical prohibition is on the use of a אֲתֵן זֶבֶד וְזֶבֶד לְכֶלֶב for any vow. How to explain that one could use something, which had been given to a dog

the sanctuary, and even serve in it? Does *ṯtrt* of the fifth century BCE preserve the older cult of *ṯtrt w^cnt* or *ṯnt w^cṯtrt*?⁶⁶ In RS 24.258 *ṯtrt w^cnt* are not the only gods to feed the dog. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, they are the only feeders in the time when it is clear that the one being fed is not *yrḥ* any more, but a dog. In doing so, they open a religious debate in the court of 'il, concerning the validity and appropriateness of feeding the dog with the gods' food, and of paying respect to it as if it were one of the gods; the answer to both issues is in the negative, as the feeding causes a chain of misfortunes.⁶⁷ The existence of two contradictory religious attitudes regarding dogs in the temple in Ugarit can be plausibly concluded from RS 24.258: the one of *ṯtrt ṯnt*, which sanctifies the dog (it is to be fed), and the one of Hittite origins, which posits the dog as an impure animal (in the voice of the door-keeper). These sets of beliefs may well have continued to coexist long after the destruction of Ugarit. While the later Phoenician religion could consider the dog to be sacred, the Jewish (and previously the Judean) religion never tolerated the presence of dogs in any sanctuary.⁶⁸

4QMMT, 11QTORAH and the Mishnah: Dogs and Chickens in Jerusalem

An echo of the religious intolerance towards dogs in Ugaritian temples such as I propose above, is possibly found in Matthew 7: 6 and in Revelations 22: 16.⁶⁹ Although one may expect to find an influence from Trito-Isaiah on the New Testament, it seems that the prohibition on “giving to dogs what belongs to God” is not biblical, but rather a variation of the Hittite rules and Ugaritian practice. Were there more stages in the evolution from the Hittite Empire to the Gospel of Matthew?⁷⁰

A missing link can be found in the scroll from Qumran, now widely called *Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah* (hereafter 4QMMT).⁷¹ Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell have reconstructed the text of this scroll from six main fragments. One of the passages which was preserved in relatively good condition is particularly relevant to our discussion:

ואין להבי למחנה הק[ו]דש כלבים,
שהם אוכלים מקצת [ע]צמות המ[ו]דש[ו] הבשר עליהם.

(food, most probably) for a vow, unless this is a vow taken by a dog? Prostitutes or anyone profiting from their work can theoretically use this “bad” money for this unacceptable vow.

66. On the later attestation of *ṯtrt w^cnt* or *ṯnt w^cṯtrt*, see Anthony J. Frendo, "A New Punic Inscription from Zejtun (Malta) and the Goddess Anat-Astarte," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 131 (1999) 24-35, and bibliography there.

67. One could read RS 24.258 as a polemic text against *ṯtrt w^cnt*: the latter's hospitality toward the dog almost brings a disaster upon 'il.

68. To the very least, dogs and pigs were not allowed into some sections of the Hittite temple. Seemingly in RS 24.258 no one is surprised to see a dog in 'il's house. Nevertheless, the god who raises the question and who “yells” at 'il and on *ṯtrt w^cnt* is no other than the doorman of 'il's house, the guard of the temple. If dogs are not allowed there, it is up to him to stop them upon entrance. Of course he could not stop the dog at the gate, since when the latter arrived to the party, he was still the moon-god. That the doorkeeper is the one who is angry to see a dog in the house could be interpreted therefore as yet another hint that dogs were not allowed. Were the Ugaritic rules regarding dogs in temples similar to the Hittite unqualified refutation of either “pig or dog”? I believe that RS 24.258, together with the above mentioned documents from Sidon demonstrate it.

69. Marc Philonenko, “‘Dehors les chiens’ (Apocalypse 22.16 et 4QMMT B 58-62),” *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997) 445-450.

70. I do not see a reason to look for any religious rationale in the writings of a Greek comic poet who describes on one occasion how inedible are the offerings to the gods; not only do human beings not find them tasty, even hungry dogs would not have them. For the text and discussion, see F. T. van Straten, *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, p. 126.

71. For a comprehensive publication of 4QMMT see Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*, vol. 5: *Miqṣat /Ma'asê ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judean Desert X), Oxford 1994.

כי ירושלים היא מחנה הקדש והיא המקום שבחר בו מכול שבטי ישראל,
לי ירושלים היא ראש מחנות ישראל⁷²

“And one must not let dogs enter the holy camp, since they may eat some of the bones of the sanctuary while the flesh is (still) on them. For Jerusalem is the camp of holiness, and is the place which He has chosen from among all the tribes of Israel. For Jerusalem is the capital of the camp of Israel.”⁷³

Qimron and Strugnell connect the above citation with a passage from Mishnah Bava Kama 7: 7:

אין מגדלים תרנגולים בירושלם, מפני הקדשים;
ולא כהנים בארץ ישראל, מפני הטהרות
אין מגדלים חזירים בכל מקום.
לא יגדל אדם את הכלב, אלא אם כן היה קשור בשלשלת.⁷⁴

“They do not rear chickens in Jerusalem, on account of the Holy Things, nor do priests [rear chickens] anywhere in the Land of Israel, because of the [necessity to preserve] the cleanness [of heave offering and certain other foods which are handed over to the priests]”.

They do not rear pigs anywhere. A person should not rear a dog, unless it is kept tied up by a chain.”⁷⁵

Furthermore, Qimron shows that a fragment, which he claims to be part of 11QTORAH (“the temple scroll”) “contains an ordinance prohibiting the raising of chickens in Jerusalem.”⁷⁶

1 [] ה
2 לבוא אל עירי]
3 תרנגול לא תגד] לו
4 בכל המקדש]
5 המקדש]

These are the three central Jewish sources of the time dealing with the question at hand.⁷⁷ Most scholars agree that 4QMMT is a sectarian text, underscoring the major disagreements between the authors

72. The punctuation and format follow David Henshke, “Qedushat yerushalayim: bein hazal la-halakha ha-/kitatit” (The Sanctity of Jerusalem: The Sages and Sectarian *Halakha*), *Tarbiz* 66/1 (October-December 1997): 22. See also Qimron and Strugnell, *ibid.*, 19, 52.

73. The translation is taken from Qimron and Strugnell, *ibid.*, p. 53.

74. The punctuation follows Hanoch Albek and Hanoch Yalon, *Shisha Sidre Mishna: Seder Neziqin* (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1959), 39.

75. Translation by Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, New Haven and London 1988, p. 519. See also b.Bava Kama 82b, where the rearing of chicken is mentioned among other things prohibited in Jerusalem “ואין מגדלים בה תרנגולין”, and see “ואין מגדלין בה תרנגולין משום קדשים” at the same page.

76. Qimron, “Ha-tarnegol ve-ha-kelev u-megilat ha-miqdash – 11QT^c” (Chickens in the Temple Scroll {11QT^c}), *Tarbiz* 64/4 (1995) 473. For other points of similarity between 4QMMT and the temple scroll, and for the claim for their temporality see Barbara Thiering, “The Date and Order of Scrolls, 40 BCE to 70 CE,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds. Jerusalem 2000, pp. 194-196.

77. For a survey of additional sources for this discussion see Qimron, *ibid.*, pp. 473-474, notes 4-5.

and the Pharisees at that time.⁷⁸ According to this argument, these disagreements brought the people of the sect to seclude themselves from the general public. Why is the issue of raising dogs in Jerusalem so offensive to their beliefs?

The second citation is from the Mishnah, reflecting Pharisaic Halakha and dated to circa 200 CE. Can we find there an answer to the sect's grievances and demands? Let us first address the question of rearing chickens, for it seems that there was general agreement that one was not allowed to rear chickens in Jerusalem. Both the Mishnah and 11QTORAH testify to it, and what is more, it is not mentioned as a matter under debate in 4QMMT.⁷⁹ The chicken is considered a pure animal, and the prohibition to rear it most probably has to do with its behavior rather than with the question of its purity for consumption purposes. The traditional commentary on the Mishnah's explanation for this prohibition, מפני הקדשים and מפני הטהרות, is that chickens, wandering around freely, may contaminate the קדשים and טהרות with impure worms or insects.⁸⁰

I would like to propose a different explanation for this prohibition: the improper act might be that animals, pure or impure, chicken or dog, eat from the קדשים and טהרות in general, or in particular, their leftovers.⁸¹ This was not a matter of dispute between the author of 4QMMT and the Pharisees. As David Henshke has demonstrated, at stake here is whether standard slaughtering is allowed in Jerusalem (the Pharisees' point of view), or that all slaughtering must take place in the temple, and so everything slaughtered in Jerusalem is קדשים (4QMMT's point of view)⁸². The general status quo against rearing chickens in Jerusalem is derived from the method of their breeding in that period: chickens were not locked inside their coops, but were free to collect their food all around, especially in the garbage.⁸³ Since it was impossible to lock them up permanently and at the same time rear them healthily, it was agreed by

78. See Devorah Dimant, "The Library of Qumran: Its Contents and Character," *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, pp. 173-174. Dimant emphasizes that "some of these controversies are identical to those between Pharisees and Sadducees recorded by the Mishna. But unlike the Mishna, our Qumranic text adopts the Sadducean position and contests the Pharisaic one; in the Mishnah the situation is the reverse." Nevertheless, Dimant holds the opinion that in this text we see some points of agreement between the Qumran community and the Sadducees. Others, such as Lawrence Schiffman, for instance, believe that this text is Sadducee. See his "Sacral and Non-Sacral Slaughter according to the *Temple Scroll*," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Devorah Dimant, eds., Leiden 1995, pp. 82-84. See also Thiering's suggestion ("The Date and Order of Scrolls, 40 BCE to 70 CE," p. 195) that 4QMMT "have been written by Menahem the Essene to the Pharisee leader, possibly Hillel himself." Thiering dates of the 4QMMT composition to the 30s BCE. (ibid., p. 194).

79. It is questionable how thoroughly this rule was observed. See *Mishnah 'edyot* 6:1; Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Halakha: Its Sources and Development*, translated by Raphael Posner, *Yad la-Talmud* 1986, pp. 82-83; Qimron, "ha-tarnegol ve-ha-kelev u-megilat ha-miqdash – 11QT^c," p. 474, note 8. See also Matthew 26, 74-75; Mark 14, 72; Luke 22, 60-61; John 18, 27.

80. Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Halakha: Its Sources and Development*, p. 27; Henshke, "qedushat yerushalayim: bein hazal la-halakha ha-kitatit," p. 27.

81. קדשים [עצמות המקדש] הבשר עליהם is one of the possible forms of the קדשים. Thus the prohibition on rearing chickens and dogs in Jerusalem is formulated due to exactly the same reasons. A description of when and how dogs and chickens might eat from the קדשים can be found in Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids MI and Cambridge U.K., 2002, pp. 120-121.

82. Ibid. See also Henshke, "qedushat yerushalayim be-Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah: iyun hozer" (The Sanctity of Jerusalem in *Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah: A Reconsideration [notes and comments]*," *Tarbiz* 69/1 (1999) 145-150; Menahem Kister, "iyunim bimgilat *Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah*: halakha, teologia, lashon ve-luah (Studies in 4Q *Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah* and related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar)," *Tarbiz* 68/3 (1999) 335-339; Hanna K. Harrington, "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues, Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, eds., Leiden, New York, and Köln 1997, pp. 109-117.

83. See Joshua Schwartz, "Cats in Ancient Jewish Society," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52/2 (2001) 215-220, and in particular p. 217, notes 36-38; Ze'ev Safrai, *The Economy of Roman Palestine*, London and New York 1994, pp. 179-181.

both sides that in Jerusalem, where a lot (according to Pharisees) or all (4QMMT) of the slaughtering took place in the temple, the likelihood that a chicken would eat from the קדשים was very high for chickens are carnivores.⁸⁴ Chickens were not a matter for dispute, but dogs were – why? Clearly not on the grounds that chickens are pure and dogs are not, but rather because contrary to the chickens, the Mishnah provides a solution to the problem of dogs:

לא יגדל אדם את הכלב, אלא אם כן היה קשור בשלשלת.⁸⁵

“A person should not rear a dog, unless it is kept tied up by a chain.”

When only some of the slaughterings in Jerusalem are קדשים, and dogs are kept tied up by a chain, there is no risk that they would eat from the קדשים, unless they are fed with them on purpose.⁸⁶ This is not the case when all the slaughterings are קדשים. In that case, what else could one feed the dogs with? For that reason 4QMMT wishes to prohibit any rearing of dogs in Jerusalem.⁸⁷

The rule, interdicting animals to eat from the קדשים, should not be confused with another prohibition on bringing to Jerusalem meat or skin of any impure animal, or rearing these animals in the city. This rule

84. 4QMMT helps us understand the *Mishnah*, explaining that also considered as קדשים are any remnants of the temple's slaughterings: מקצת [ע] צמות המק[דש] הבשר עליהם.

85. Henshke ignores this passage of the *Mishnah* writing that: “בהאכלת הכלבים יקפידו הכול ליתן להם מן החולין, המצויים בירושלים, ולא יבואו להאכיל כלבים בקודשים.” (ibid., 27). I believe that the requirement to tie dogs is the response of the Pharisees, preserved in the *Mishnah*, to the claims of 4QMMT. It is possible that this rule applied at first only to Jerusalem, and later on became a general rule. Qimron points out (“Ha-tarnegol ve-ha-kelev u-megilat ha-miqdash – 11QT^c,” p. 473, n. 4) that “המשנה משמרת חוק שענינו טהרת ירושלים, אך הוא מובא בדיני נויקין ולא במסכתות שענינן קודשים וטהרות, כנראה אנב גרר לאיסור גידול עזים בארץ-ישראל המובא בראש המשנה.” Similar to Qimron, I believe that considerable portions of mishnah Bava Kama 7:7 have קדשים and טהרות, not Nezikin, as a subject matter. While this brings Qimron to rationalize the presence of the ruling about chickens in this section of the mishnah, I believe the same reasoning should also be applied to the ruling about dogs. Although keeping the dogs tied by a chain is exactly what one would expect to find in mishnah Nezikin, the origin of this ruling probably has to do with the prohibition of dogs from eating עליהם [ע] צמות המק[דש] הבשר עליהם. The juxtaposition of this rule with the one utterly prohibiting rearing pigs, seems to be related also to the Hittite “pig or dog” rules and to Matthew 7:6. For more cases exhibiting similar juxtapositions see Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4*, vol. 5: *Miqsat Ma'asê Ha-Torah*, p. 163, n. 145.

86. In their commentary, Qimron and Strugnell write: “. . . it seems that dogs (rather than other animals) are involved not because they are impure, but because it is their habit to dig up bones; thus they eat the flesh that remains on the bones of the sacrificial animals (*Qumran Cave 4*, vol. 5, p. 163, and n. 145 on the same page). This assumption, as well as the text of 4QMMT, can be related to one of the translations of *yqtqt* in line 5 of RS 24.258. The Judeo-Aramaic meaning of the verb קשקש, which appears in Mishnaic Hebrew as well, is “to dig” or “to hoe.” See Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e campagne (1961)*, pp. 42-43; Kevin Cathcart, “Ilu, Yarihu and the One with the Two Horns and a Tail,” p. 4; Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, p. 407, n. 13. From the literary-structural points of view, this interpretation seems to me better for two reasons: 1) it emphasizes the motion of *yrḥ*'s downfall –not only the fact that he falls down to the ground under the table, but also that he takes this downfall to an extreme, starting to dig into the ground, and 2) this is the first hint to us about the next disaster: this “like a dog” creature, *yrḥ*, begins to look for food by digging in the ground like a dog. We know that the only food he/it might find in the house of 'il is gods' food, the eating of which may bring a disaster.

87. Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The ‘Halakha in *Miqsat Ma'asê ha-Torah* (MMT),” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116.3 (1996) 514, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*, Philadelphia and Jerusalem 1994, pp. 337-338, have both tried to draw a connection between the bone-deposits unearthed in Qumran and the prohibition of dogs from entering Jerusalem or the Camp of holiness. I agree with Magness (*The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 120), who refutes this idea. If indeed 4QMMT applied to Qumran, as Baumgarten and Schiffman suggest, then dogs were not allowed there, and there was no need to deposit the bones, allegedly to protect them from dogs. Moreover, not only can dogs dig rather deep in order to find bones, sometimes they even dig a hole and deposit the bones in it in order to return to them sometimes later to dig them out. Likewise, although fleshless bones are certainly less tasty for dogs, dogs are still attracted to them, and would sometimes dig them out of the ground anyway.

is found (with variations) in the Temple Scroll, 4QMMT⁸⁸ and in an edict of Antiochus III, quoted by Josephus in his *Antiquities* 12, 146:

“Nor shall anyone bring into the city the flesh of horses or of mules or of wild or tame asses, or leopards, foxes or hares or, in general, of any animals forbidden to the Jews. Nor it is lawful to bring in their skins or even to breed any of these animals in the city. But only the sacrificial animals known to their ancestors and necessary for the propitiation of God shall they be permitted to use.”⁸⁹

This rule, although not explicitly dealing with pigs or dogs, could be related to the Hittite instructions prohibiting the entrance of non-sacrificial animals (pigs and dogs) to the temple. The identification of Antiochus III of the temple with “all of Jerusalem” is similar to the one of 4QMMT and the Temple Scroll, both applying the sacred rules to the city in its entirety.

Furthermore, this might be the reason that both 4QMMT and the Temple Scroll prohibit the bringing to Jerusalem of skins of pure animals, fearing that they could be used at the temple or be confused with skins of impure animals, which were slaughtered at the temple. According to these scrolls, all products emanating from pure animals in Jerusalem should have their origin in the temple slaughtering.

I believe that the comprehensive view of the people of these scrolls in regards to animals in Jerusalem is as follows: dogs and chickens should not be allowed into Jerusalem for the same reason –they are carnivores; impure animals or products made of them should not be allowed to the city– they are impure;⁹⁰ skins of pure animals should not be allowed –they would be probably confused with skins of animals slaughtered at the temple.⁹¹

4QMMT alludes to the fear that dogs eat from God’s food, *מקצת [ע] צמות המ[דש] הבשר עליהם*, as one of the main reasons for the separation of its authors from the rest of the public. This anxiety is common to both 4QMMT, the Mishnah, the Hittite “Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials” and to RS 24.258.⁹² In all of these texts, feeding an animal, and especially a dog, with god’s food is considered to be a severe sin; indeed, in RS 24.258 it almost brought a disaster upon the father of the gods.

Conclusions

Two events described in RS 24.258 are crucial for deciphering the mythological conventions of this text, namely, the descent of the moon god *yrh* under the table, and the dog eating from the gods’ food. Parallels to the former exist in a Hattic-Hittite mythological text. The latter conceivably exposes a Ugaritian religious polemic, whether dogs are allowed into temples, and whether they are permitted to eat from the offerings. It is precisely this polemic which is presented in RS 24.258 in a form of a rebuke

88. Qimron, “ha-tarnegol ve-ha-kelev u-megilat ha-miqdash -- 11QT^c,” pp. 474-475; Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4, vol. 5: Miqsat Ma’asê ha-Torah*, pp. 154-156, and its review in Baumgarten, “The halakha in *Miqsat Ma’asê ha-Torah (MMT)*,” pp. 513-514; Schiffman, “The Prohibition of the Skins of Animals in the *Temple Scroll and Miqsat Ma’asê ha-Torah*,” in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: the Bible and its World*, Jerusalem 1990, pp. 191-198.

89. Translation is taken from the Loeb edition: Josephus Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, 9 vols, translated by Ralph Marcus (Cambridge MA 1943).

90. Dogs are included in this second argument as well. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that among Jews, dogs outnumbered any other impure domesticated animal. Another reason to place this emphasis on dogs is that unlike most domesticated animals, dogs are carnivores, and therefore the prohibition has to do not only with their impurity, but also with the certainty that they would eat the temple’s slaughtering.

91. Pure animals (and their by-products) are prohibited from reaching Jerusalem on two grounds: behavior (chickens), and place of slaughtering (out of Jerusalem).

92. Where we are informed in lines 1-2 that *’il* himself slaughtered and butchered the meat for his feast. This makes the cuts eaten in this event into a convincing equivalent to *מקצת [ע] צמות המק[דש] הבשר עליהם*.

directed to ^c*ttrt* and ^c*nt* for feeding the dog, and to [']*il* for not preventing it. It is certainly possible that this is the only extant text that brings this debate to the fore; indeed, it may have been one of its *raison d'être*. The approach approving of dogs is apparent in the cult of ^c*ttrt* and attested in a Phoenician plaque from Kition as well as in the Persian period dog cemeteries all along the east Mediterranean shore. The opposite approach, firmly grounded in the Hittite temple instructions, is adopted by all the religious groups of Second Temple period Judah, and can be traced to as late as the Gospel of Mathew and Revelations.

The central place given to this question in the Halakhic dispute, reflected in 4QMMT, is probably due to an earlier tradition, keeping away dogs from the temple and the sacrifices. The position of 4QMMT is based on the authors' opinion that since all slaughtering in Jerusalem must take place at the temple, it is impossible, therefore, to feed dogs from anything else but the temple's slaughtering. 4QMMT concludes that dogs should be banned from entering the city. On the other hand, the Mishnah permits to rear dogs everywhere, as long as they are tied up with a chain. This is a consequence of the Pharisaic ruling that only some of the slaughtering in Jerusalem should take place at the temple. This would enable the dog owners to make sure they do not eat any of the temple slaughtering.

Cited Works

- Arnaud, Daniel, "Lettres," in *Études Ougaritiques I, Travaux 1985-1995, sous la direction de Marguerite Yon et Daniel Arnaud*, (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XIV), Paris 2001, pp. 257-290
- "Les ports de la 'Phénicie' à la fin de l'âge du bronze récent (xiv-xiii siècles) d'après les textes cunéiformes de Syrie," *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30 (1992) 179-194.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., "The 'Halakha in *Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah* (MMT)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116.3 (1996) 512-516.
- Beal, Richard H., "Hittite Military Rituals," in Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki, eds., *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Leiden, New York and Köln, 1995, pp. 63-76.
- Black, Jeremy, and Anthony Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*, London 1992.
- Cathcart, Kevin, "Ilu, Yarihu and the One with the Two Horns and a Tail," in N. Wyatt, W. G. E. Watson and J. B. Lloyd, eds., *Ugarit, Religion and Culture* (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur 12), Münster 1996, pp. 1-8.
- Collins, Billie Jean, "Animals in Hittite Literature," in B. J. Collins, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, Leiden, Boston, and Köln, 2002, pp. 237-250.
- "Animals in the Religions of Ancient Anatolia," in B. J. Collins, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, Leiden, Boston, and Köln 2002, pp. 309-334.
- "The Puppy in Hittite Ritual," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42/2 (1990) 211-226.
- Dietrich, Manfred, and Oswald Loretz, "'Siehe, da war er (wieder) munter!' Die mythologische Begründung für eine medikamentöse Behandlung in KTU 1.114 (RS 24.258)," in Meir Lubetski, Claire Gottlieb, and Sharon Keller, eds., *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World, A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 273), Sheffield 1998, pp. 174-198.
- Dimant, Devorah, "The Library of Qumran: Its Contents and Character," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, Jerusalem 2000, pp. 170-176.
- Finkbeiner, Uwe and Hélène Sader, "Bey 020 Preliminary Report of the Excavations 1995," *Bulletin d'Archéologie et d'Architecture Libanaises* 2 (1997) 114-166.

- Fleming, Daniel E., "New Moon Celebration Once a Year: Emar's *Ḫidašu* of Dagan," in K. van Lerberghe, and A. Schoors, eds., *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East* (Festschrift E. Lipiński; *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65), Leuven 1995, pp. 57-64.
- Foster, Benjamin R., "Sin and the Cow," in *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, 2 vols., Bethesda MD 1993, pp. 876-877.
- Frankfort, Henri, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, Middlesex 1969.
- Frendo, Anthony J., "A New Punic Inscription from Zejtun (Malta) and the Goddess Anat-Astarte," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 131 (1999) 24-35.
- Goetze, Albrecht, "*Madduwattaš*," in Ferdinand Sommer, ed., *Hethitische Texte in Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, book 3. Leipzig 1928.
- *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (American Oriental Series 14), New Haven 1938.
- "The Hittite Laws," in J. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near East Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton 1969, pp. 188-197.
- Grottanelli, Cristiano, "Wine and Death -- East and West," in Oswyn Murray, and Manuela Tecusan, eds., *In Vino Veritas*, Rome 1995, pp. 62-92.
- "The Roles of the Guest in the Epic-Banquet," in Carlo Zaccagnini, ed., *Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East*, Budapest 1989, pp. 272-332.
- Hallo, William W., "Ibbi-Sin (2.142)," in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, Leiden, New York and Köln 2000, pp. 395-396.
- Harrington, Hanna K., "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT," in Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues, Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, Leiden, New York, and Köln 1997, pp. 109-128.
- Healey, John F., "The Pietas of an Ideal Son in Ugarit," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11 (1979) 353-356.
- Heltzer, Michael, "On the Vth Century B.C.E. Dogs from Ashkelon." *Transeuphratène* 15 (1998) 149-152.
- Henshke, David, "qedushat yerushalayim be-Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah: iyun hozer (The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Miqṣat Ma'asê Ha-Torah: A Reconsideration [notes and comments])," *Tarbiz* 69/1 (1999) 145-150.
- "qedushat yerushalayim: ben hazal la-halakha ha-kitatit (The Sanctity of Jerusalem: The Sages and Sectarian Halakhah)," *Tarbiz* 66/1 (1997) 17-28.
- Herrmann, Wolfram, *Yariḥ und Nikkal und der Preis der Kuṭarat-Göttinnen: Ein kultisch-magischer Text aus Ras Shamra*, Berlin 1968.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr., "Hittite-Israelite Cultural Parallels," in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 3, Leiden, Boston, and Köln 2002, pp. XXIX-XXXIV.
- *Hittite Myths*, 2nd ed. Atlanta GA 1998.
- "Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East," In Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., ed., *Orient and Occident: Essays presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (AOAT 22), Münster 1973, pp. 81-90.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*, New Haven and London 1976.
- Josephus Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, 9 vols, Translated by Ralph Marcus, Cambridge MA 1943.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies, "Die protohattisch-hethitische Bilinguis vom Mond, der vom Himmel gefallen ist," in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 51 (1955) 102-123.
- Kister, Menahem, "iyunim bimgilat Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah: halakha, teologia, lashon ve-lu'ah (Studies in 4Q Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah and related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar)," *Tarbiz* 68/3 (1999) 317-371.

- Korpel, Marjo Christina Annette, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine*, Münster 1990.
- Kovacs, Maureen Gallery, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Stanford CA 1989.
- Lambert, Wilfred G., and Alan R. Millard, *Atra-Ḫašis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford 1969.
- Laroche, Emmanuel, *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription*, Paris 1965.
- Lewis, Theodore J., translator, "El's Divine Feast," in Simon B. Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Society of Biblical Literature 1997. pp. 193-196.
- Luckenbill, Daniel D., *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Oriental Institute Publications II), Chicago IL 1924.
- Magness, Jodi, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids MI and Cambridge U.K. 2002.
- Marshall, Mac, ed., *Beliefs, Behaviors, & Alcoholic Beverages: A Cross-Cultural Survey*, Ann Arbor MI 1979.
- McLaughlin, John L., "The *marzeaḥ* at Ugarit: A Textual and Contextual Study." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 23 (1991) 265-281.
- McMahon, Gregory, "Instructions to Priests and Temple Officials (1.83)," in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997, pp. 217-221.
- Milano, Lucio, ed., *Drinking in Ancient Societies*, Padova 1994.
- Moyer, James C., "Hittite and Israelite Cultic Practices: A Selected Comparison," in William W. Hallo, James C. Moyer, and Leo G. Purdue, eds., *Scripture in Context*, vol. II, Winona Lake, Indiana 1983, pp. 19-38.
- Neufeld, Ephraim, *The Hittite Laws*, London 1951.
- Neusner, Jacob, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, New Haven and London 1988.
- Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, *Canaanite Religion Ac. to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*, Bethesda MD 1999.
- Editor and translator, *Mitos, leyendas y rituales de los semitas occidentales*, Madrid-Barcelona 1998.
- "Yarḫu y Nikkalu: La mitología lunar sumeria en Ugarit," *Aula Orientalis* 9 (1991) 67-75.
- and J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica*, vol. II, Barcelona 2000.
- Ornan, Tallay, "The Bull and its Two Masters: Moon and Storm Deities in Relation to the Bull in Ancient Near Eastern Art," *IEJ* 51/1 (2001) 1-26.
- Pardee, Dennis, *Les Textes Rituels; Fascicule I-II: Chapitres 1-53* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XII), Paris 2000.
- "Ilu on a Toot (1.97)," in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997, pp. 302-305.
- "Ugaritic Lunar Omens (1.91)," in William W. Hallo, ed., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln 1997, pp. 290-291.
- *Les Textes para-mythologiques de la 24^e Campagne (1961), avec une notice archéologique de J.-C. Courtois* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit IV), Paris 1988.
- Paul, Shalom M., "'Emigration' from the Netherworld in the Ancient Near East," in K. van Lerberghe, and A. Schoors, eds., *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 65: Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East (Festschrift E. Lipiński)*, Leuven 1995, pp. 221-227.
- Peckham, Brian, "Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)," *Orientalia* 37 (1968) 304-324.
- Philonenko, Marc. "'Dehors les chiens' (Apocalypse 22.16 et 4QMMT B 58-62)," *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997) 445-450.
- Pinnock, Frances, "Considerations on the 'Banquet Theme' in the Figurative Art of Mesopotamia and Syria," in Lucio Milano, ed., *Drinking in Ancient Societies*, Padova 1994, pp. 15-26.

- Pope, Marvin H., "A Divine Banquet at Ugarit," in James M. Efron, ed., *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, 170-203. Durham NC 1972, pp. 170-203.
- Pritchard, John B., ed., *Ancient Near East Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton 1969.
- Qimron, Elisha, "ha-tarnegol ve-ha-kelev u-megilat ha-miqdash -- 11QT^c (Chickens in the Temple Scroll - 11QT^c)," *Tarbiz* 64/4 (1995) 473-476.
- Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4, vol. 5: Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judean Desert X), Oxford 1994.
- Renfroe, Fred, *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas 5), Münster 1992.
- Safrai, Ze'ev, *The Economy of Roman Palestine*, London and New York 1994.
- Sasson, Jack M., "Isaiah LXVI 3-4a," *Vetus Testamentum* XXVI/2 (1976) 199-207.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., "Sacral and Non-Sacral Slaughter according to the *Temple Scroll*," in Lawrence H. Schiffman and Devorah Dimant, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*, 69-84, Leiden 1995, pp. 69-84.
- *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*, Philadelphia and Jerusalem 1994.
- "The Prohibition of the Skins of Animals," in the *Temple Scroll and Miqṣat Ma'asê ha-Torah. Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: the Bible and its World*, Jerusalem 1990, pp. 191-198.
- Schwartz, Joshua, "Cats in Ancient Jewish Society." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52/2 (2001) 211-234.
- Schwiderski Dirk, "'Wer ist dein Knecht? Ein Hund!' Zu Aufmerksamkeitsregern und Überleitungsformeln in hebräischen Briefen," in Andreas Wagner, ed., *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 156), Freiburg, Schweiz 1997.
- Singer, Itamar, "A Political History of Ugarit," in Wilfred G. E. Watson, and Nicolas Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden, Boston, and Köln 1999, pp. 603-733.
- Sjöberg, Åke, *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der sumerischen Überlieferung*, Stockholm 1960.
- Stager, Lawrence E., "Why were Hundreds of Dogs buried at Ashkelon?," in Lawrence E. Stager, *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems*, Washington DC 1991, pp. 20-37.
- "Ashkelon," in Ephraim Stern, *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Jerusalem 1993, vol. I, pp. 107-110.
- Theuer, Gabriele, *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU I.24* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 173), Freiburg Schweiz 2000.
- Thiering, Barbara, "The Date and Order of Scrolls, 40 BCE to 70 CE," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, Jerusalem 2000, pp. 191-198.
- Urbach, Ephraim E., *The Halakha: Its Sources and Development*, translated by Raphael Posner, New York and Jerusalem 1986.
- Van Starten, F. T., *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Leiden, New York and Köln 1995.
- Veenhof, Klaas R., "An Old Assyrian Incantation Against a Black Dog (kt a/k 611)," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 86 (1996) 425-433.
- Villard, Pierre, "Le chien dans la documentation néo-assyrienne," *Topoi*, Suppl. 2 (2000) 235-249.

- Virolleaud, Charles, “*Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra (24^e Campagne, 1961)*”, in *Ugaritica* 5, Paris 1968, pp. 545-595.
- Wapnish, Paula, and Brian Hesse, “Pampered Pooches or Plain Pariahs? The Ashkelon Dog Burials,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 56/2 (1993) 55-80.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E., “Comments on KTU 1.114:29’-31’,” *Aula Orientalis* 8 (1990) 265-267.
- Weinfeld, Moshe, “Traces of Hittite Cult in Shiloh, Bethel and in Jerusalem,” in Bernd Janowski, Klaus Koch, Gernot Wilhelm, eds., *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 129), Freiburg, Schweiz 1993, pp. 455-472.
- West, David R., “Hekate, Lamashtu and *klbt ’ilm*,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 24 (1992) 369-384.
- Winter, Irene J., “On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and their Context,” *Anatolian Studies* XXIX (1979) 115-151.
- Wright, David P., *Ritual in Narrative: The Dynamics of Feasting, Mourning, and Retaliation Rites in the Ugaritic Tale of Aqhat*, Winona Lake IN 2000.
- Wyatt, Nicolas, *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimliku and his Colleagues*, Sheffield 1998.
- Zamora, José-Ángel, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit* (Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales 6), Madrid 2000.