You Can't Offer Your Sacrifice and Eat It Too: A Polemical Poem from the Aramaic Text in Demotic Script
Author(s): Richard C. Steiner and Charles F. Nims
Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Vol. 43, No. 2 (Apr., 1984), pp. 89-114
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/545086
Accessed: 30-01-2019 22:51 UTC

YOU CAN'T OFFER YOUR SACRIFICE AND EAT IT TOO:
A POLEMICAL POEM FROM THE ARAMAIC TEXT IN DEMOTIC SCRIPT*

RICHARD C. STEINER,
Yeshiva University

CHARLES F. NIMS,
University of Chicago

INTRODUCTION

THIS is the second of a projected series of articles carrying on the pioneering work of R. A. Bowman on the Aramaic Text in Demotic Script.[1] Our first article[2] dealt with a seven-line passage from col. XI,[3] chosen for its relative clarity and unusual interest. In this article we present a passage which is no less interesting but quite a bit more difficult: the seventeen and one-half lines of col. VI.

Perhaps the main source of the difficulty is the poor condition of lines 1 and 12–18; in some places only minute traces remain. We have spared no effort to salvage what we could from these ruins. Fortunately, we have at our disposal resources which

[Richard Steiner was Visiting Associate Professor of Hebrew Linguistics in 1981; Charles Nims is Professor Emeritus of Egyptology.]

enable us to view the papyrus at several different stages: the original photographs,[4] made around the turn of the century, the hand-copy and transliteration made by Herbert Thompson in 1921, a photostat supplied by the Pierpont Morgan Library in the late 1940s, the microfilm made at that institution in 1976, and, finally, the papyrus itself.

There is no need to repeat here all of the general information about the papyrus which we and Bowman have already published.[5] Only information directly relevant to the text, commentary, and discussion published here is included in the notes which follow.

NOTES ON OUR TRANSLITERATION OF THE DEMOTIC SCRIPT

Non-alphabetic signs. With the exception of determinatives, all signs which are not used alphabetically in normal demotic texts are marked here by an overline, two overlines, or a superior point. The ones in this article are:

$\bar{\imath}$ = ⟩	$\bar{\bar{\imath}}$ = ‖⟨	$\dot{\imath}$ = ⨍
$\bar{w}$ = ⟨	$\dot{w}$ = ⎰ and ⎰ [6]	$\bar{p}$ = ⴘ
$\bar{b}$ = ⎰ⱽ	$\bar{r}$ = ⨍⫽⟨	$\bar{r}$ = ⎰
$\overline{mn}$ = ⎰	$\overline{\overline{mn}}$ = ⎰	$\overline{Mn}$ = ⎰⩵
$\bar{h}$ = ⲣ [7]	$\overline{h\imath}$ = ⴘ	$\overline{Hr}$ = ⎰⸗
$\overline{p\dot{h}}$ = ⲩ	$\overline{{}^ch}$ = ⎰ [8]	$\overline{t\dot{y}}$ = ⎰ [9]
$\overline{mw\dot{t}}$ = ⟨⨍	$\overline{nb}$ = ⟨	

---

[4] These photographs are our point of departure, since they show many signs and fragments of papyrus which have since disappeared. But, in the course of our work, we learned that each of the above-mentioned sources has preserved something which the others have not. Thus, we were astonished to find that a crucial fragment of papyrus which is now lost and does not appear in the original photographs *does* appear in the microfilm of 1976! The explanation turned out to be simple: the fragment was folded over at the time when the original photographs were made. Before the microfilm was made, the piece was unfolded, as a result of which it broke off and later (before the papyrus was mounted under glass) disappeared.

[5] See nn. 1 and 2 above.

[6] In normal demotic texts ⎰ is *ẁ* (the plural ending of nouns) and ⫽ is *g* (the god determinative). In this text, the two signs appear to be completely interchangeable. Thus, the divine name read in our first article (p. 268) as *yh*[*g*] can also be read as *yhẁ* and probably should be, since an Egyptian scribe

who failed to write the god determinative after *mr* (the chief deity of the authors of the papyrus) and *ʾdny* (a divine name in cols. XI–XII, no matter how it is to be vocalized; cf. n. 36 below) would be unlikely to put one after the hapax *YH*. The *ẁ* of *yhẁ* may render either Sem. *u* or Sem. *w*. Either way it strengthens the case for the Jewish origin of the passage in which it is found, since most of the alleged occurrences of the tetragram in pagan texts are of the form *yh* or *yw*. That case is further strengthened by the demonstration (in the appendix) that *yhẁ* corresponds to the occurrence of the tetragram in Ps. 20:8—a correspondence which can hardly be a coincidence.

[7] In normal demotic texts, this sign has the value of *hn*. For evidence that the latter is not the value in our text, see below.

[8] We are indebted to Robert Ritner for this reading.

[9] We are indebted to Richard Jasnow for this reading. It agrees precisely with the reading proposed independently by RCS based on the context.

Determinatives. Demotic determinatives are transliterated by small raised letters. With few exceptions, they follow every sequence which the scribe believed to be a word. The ones in this article are:

m   "man with his hand to his mouth," used in Middle Egyptian after words indicating speech (as well as thought, emotion, silence, eating, etc.) but in our papyrus after almost *any* word, apparently because the word is the basic unit of speech.[10]

g   "god"[11]

w   "seated woman, goddess," a determinative whose use in the papyrus is not yet understood.

w/g   "walking legs," used after ⁵*r* = Aram. ⁵*l* "on, to," because that sequence reminded the scribe of the dem. word for "go up."

w/r   "water," used after *mr* = Aram. *mr(h)* "Mar(ah)"[12] because that sequence reminded the scribe of the dem. word for "riverbank" (cf. Coptic MHP).

e   "evil," used after *bn* in a few instances where that sequence reminded the scribe of the dem. word for "evil."

sp   "remainder," used to indicate the end of a section. Alternatively, this may be a rendering of Aram. *sôp* "end,"[12a] if there was contraction of *aw* (cf. Syr. *sawpā* and Arabic *sawfa*) to *ô* in this word. However, all of the evidence known to us at present points to the preservation of diphthongs in all environments (including closed and unstressed syllables) in the papyrus.

Problematic signs. Dem. *aleph* is the most common sign in the papyrus and, at the same time, one of the least understood. The scribe may have intended it to indicate the presence of a vowel. If so, we must conclude either that the scribe's ear was not attuned to Aramaic vowels or that our ideas about Egyptian Aramaic vocalization are very far from the mark. Only in initial position, i.e., immediately following a word-divider (determinative), does dem. *aleph* appear to be a reliable indicator of the presence of a vowel;[13] and the *absence* of dem. *aleph* has no meaning in *any* position. In view of the ubiquitousness and relative lack of importance of this sign, we transliterate it with a period (.) instead of the overly prominent and distracting ꜣ.

The dem. signs conventionally transliterated *y* and *e*, respectively, were transliterated *y* and *e* in our first article, but the basis for that transliteration has since become eroded,[14] and so we have decided to revert to the conventional transliteration.

The dem. sign conventionally transliterated *hn* is transliterated $\bar{h}$ for two reasons: (1) a sequence of $\overline{hn}$ plus *n* is usually written $\overline{hn}.n$ with an *aleph* in the middle (line 9 below, XI/17,[15] XII/2, XIV/2), which indicates that *n* is *not* a phonetic complement, since true phonetic complements in this text normally come immediately after the sign they complement (e.g., $\overline{mn}n$, $\overline{sn}n$); (2) a full third of the occurrences of $\bar{h}$ in the

[10] Bowman, "Aramaic Religious Text," p. 220.

[11] See n. 6, above.

[12] For the Aramaic value of *mr^w/r*, see Commentary to that word in line 13, below.

[12a] S. P. Vleeming and J. W. Wesselius, "An Aramaic Hymn from the Fourth Century B.C.," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 39 (1982) (actual date of appearance: spring 1983): 509.

[13] This fact is evidence against our interpretation (p. 268) of XI/16 *.rh.kšt^m .rh.h.nt.^m* as *lhkšt lh-hhnt*

"the request of heart(s) which you have tested." A more likely interpretation is discussed in the Appendix.

[14] We are no longer convinced that dem. *y* renders Aram. ꜣ in the papyrus; see Commentary to *ymh.^m* in line 14, below. The switch from *y* to *y* eliminates much of the rationale for using *e* rather than *e*.

[15] See our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2-6," p. 268. The overline of the $\bar{h}$ was inadvertently omitted there.

papyrus are in the phrase, $r\bar{h}(.)r(.)\check{s}.^{w}$ which can only mean "god of ꜣRŠ"—not "our god, ꜣRŠ" (since ꜣRŠ is definitely a toponym) nor "our god of ꜣRŠ" and certainly not "our god, chief one"[16] (since the determinative ^{w} occurs regularly with the toponym). The fact that this phrase is sometimes written with a plain h but never with an added n (as a phonetic complement) clinches the argument.

The sign - has been left untransliterated because its value in our papyrus is not entirely clear. It looks like the dem. preposition n "of, to, for," and its distribution (around 90 percent word-initial in terms of the scribe's word boundaries) might seem to support that identification, but the value [n] is excluded in a number of clear contexts. In fact, many of the more than 50 contexts (which include passages with parallels in which the counterpart of - is ø) appear to exclude the possibility of any consonantal value for -. Presumably, then, the sign - has some non-phonetic meaning, but what that meaning is (and whether it has any relation to the meaning of the dem. preposition n) remains a mystery. (For a solution to the problem, see Addendum.)

Superlinear and sublinear signs. We have attempted to give a general idea of the position of signs inserted above the line (lines 9 and 10) and below (lines 12 and 15). Unfortunately, in the case of super- and sublinear *aleph*, the dot which transliterates it may be taken to be a diacritic. (We have tried our best to prevent this confusion by not putting this dot too close to any letter.)

Spaces. Spaces the width of one sign do not, in general, appear in the papyrus, but we have inserted them (1) after determinatives; (2) after signs which when word-final obviate the need for determinatives (either because they have their own internal deter-minatives, e.g., $\bar{r}$ and $\overline{Mn}$, or because they come *after* the determinative in normal demotic writing, e.g., $\dot{w}$). In environment (1), spaces have been left whether our interpre-tation calls for them or not; in environment (2), they have been left only when our interpretation calls for them, since the signs in question are not restricted to word-final position. We have not inserted spaces in any other environments. (In the Semitic interpretation, however, we have inserted a hyphen between words whenever the above rules do not permit the insertion of a space.)

Brackets. ⌐ ¬ indicate a reading less than certain because of the damaged condition of the papyrus or the ambiguity of the writing;
[ ] indicates a restoration in a place where no traces remain;
[1] indicates a gap the width of one sign;
[2] indicates a gap the width of two signs, etc.

NOTES ON OUR SEMITIC INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION

In general, our transliteration of the underlying Aramaic text follows normal Aramaic scribal practice of the period of our text, except where this would lead to loss of information.

The following deviations from normal scribal practice should be noted:

ḫ   Like the scribe, we distinguish velar $ḫ$ from pharyngeal $ḥ$.[17]

---

[16] Pace Vleeming and Wesselius, "Aramaic Hymn," p. 501.

[17] See again our article "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," p. 263.

ġ   Like the scribe, we distinguish velar $ġ$ from pharyngeal ^{c}. It should be borne in mind that Aram. $ġ$ in this period is the reflex both of PS $ġ$ and of PS $ṣ́$ (*ḍād*).

ś   We distinguish Sem. $ś$ (i.e., the Aram. reflex of PS $ś$) from Sem. s (i.e., the Aram. reflex of PS s), even though it is not yet clear whether the two were still distinct in the Aram. dialect of the papyrus. At first glance, the fact that around 10 percent of the instances of Sem. $ś$ are rendered by dem. $ś$ rather than dem. s[18] would seem to show that the distinction was in fact still maintained; but this proof depends upon the assumption that Sem. s is never rendered by dem. $ś$—an assumption which may not be true.

y, w   Whenever the scribe uses these to indicate vowels, we do so as well, even if the environment is one in which a contemporary Aramaic scribe would not have used a *mater lectionis*.

Alternative Semitic interpretations and English translations are indicated by the symbols /, { } and ( )—singly or in combination. The meaning of these symbols should be clear from the following illustrations, in which each letter represents a word:

ab(cd)ef is an abbreviation of: "*abcdef* or *abef.*"

a{b/c/de}f is an abbreviation of: "*abf* or *acf* or *adef.*"

abc/def = ab{c/d}ef and is an abbreviation of: "*abcef* or *abdef.*"

An additional use of ( ) in the translation is to supply words required by English usage. Dubious interpretations other than those involving restorations and questionable readings are indicated through the use of italics in the English translation.

<p style="text-align:center">P. Amherst Egyptian 63, Col. VI</p>

Transliteration of Demotic Script

1. $\bar{t}$b.why^m ṫ.[6–8].w.^{m} ⌜s⌝.m.ky^m [6–8]⌜n^m⌝

2.   mr^m .r$\bar{h}$.^{w} ṫ.b.^{m} .r$\bar{h}$.[^{w} m].^{c}.bt^m e.t.^{cm} ⌜e⌝.myty^m .r$\bar{h}^w$

3.   r.b.š.^{w} b.k.py^m .r$\bar{h}^w$ r.t.$\bar{r}$.^{m} tyn.^{m} b.$\bar{p}$ym.^{m}

4.   s.m^m ṫ.ny^m e.m.$\bar{r}$.^{m} b.ḫ.nh.n.^{w} eyb.r^m b$\overline{h}$te$\bar{r}^m$

5.   ṫ.h.n^m ḳr^m s$\overline{Mn}$ y.k.šš.š.n.ny^m -.m.ty^m w.n.šm.n^m

6.   w.n.ḳ.s.^{m} n.ḳr^m b.s.$\bar{r}$.^{m} w.n.š.m.n^m n$\overline{n}$byḫ^m ṫ.m.^{m}

7.   w.n$\bar{r}$w.^{m} r.b.^{m} .r$\bar{h}$.$\bar{r}$š.^{w} mr^m s.m.kẇ s.k.$\bar{r}$.t^m b.$\bar{p}$mh.n^m

8. $\overline{mn}$nr.r.^{m} y.^{m} $\overline{mn}$nt.ḫt^m r.šnh.n^m mr^m .r$\bar{h}$.^{w} ṫ.b.^{m} .r$\bar{h}$.^{w} m.^{m}

9. ^{c}.bt^m e.t.^{m} -myty^m .r$\bar{h}$.^{w} r.b.š.^{w} b.k.py^m .r$\bar{h}$.n^w r.$\overset{\bar{p}ym.^m}{t\bar{r}^m}$ tyn^m b.^{m}

10.   s.mt.n^m ṫ.m.$\bar{r}$.^{m} b.$\overset{\bar{p}m}{nh}$.n^m $\overline{mn}$nḫ.rẇy.^{m} $\overline{mn}$mt.ḫ.t^m r.š.n^m h.n.^{m}

11.   r.b.^{m} .r$\bar{h}$rš.^{w} mr^m s.mkẇ ḥ.m.^{m} b.$\bar{p}$.mh.n.^{m} $\overline{mn}$rry.^{m} $\overline{mn}$nt.ḫ.t^m r.šn^m

---

[18] In two instances, Sem. $ś$ is rendered with dem. $ś$ in a word which has appeared with dem. s earlier in the sentence or paragraph.

Fig. 1.—P. Amherst Egyptian 63, col. VI, width ca. 27 cm. Photograph courtesy Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

12.   h.n^m mr^m ^{c}.ny.^{m} wr.e.m$\bar{r}$.^{m} [b]⸢št⸣[2]⸢.⸣r^m ⸢p̄⸣b$\bar{n}$.r^m t.t.ḫr[k]⸢^{m}⸣   [e.]⸢n⸣^{m}

13.   ⸢tys.krb⸣[n]k.^{m} .r^m mr^{wtr} e.n^m t[2–3]⸢.t⸣[2]⸢^{m}⸣   .r^m mr^m $\overline{mn}$nt$\bar{r}$k.^{m} wrš.^{w}

14.   [e.h.wb.t.^{m} b]⸢.⸣y.myk.^{m} ⸢s⸣[nyk]⸢.⸣^{m} $\bar{w}$.^{c}.š.n⸢t⸣.k.^{m} ymḫ.^{m} ey.^{m}

15.   [b.yk.^{m} ḫ.$\bar{r}$yk.]^m e.n.e.ḳr.^{m} ḳ⸢t⸣myk.^{m} r.k$\bar{r}$k.^{m} ^{c}r^{wlgwlg} ḥe$\bar{r}$t.hn^w

16.   [10–11]   [e.tm.]⸢ky⸣.myn.⸢k^m e.b⸣r⸢ḳ.k⸣^{m} b.š.rm.^{m} by.t.k.^{m}

17.   [13–15]k.^{m} $\bar{t}$[3]⸢.⸣^{m} ⸢^{c}⸣.r.⸢w⸣yk.^{m} k.s.k.^{m} [1–2]⸢.⸣b.wn^m

18.   [13–15]⸢t⸣.nt[2–3]^{sp}

SEMITIC INTERPRETATION	TRANSLATION

Stanza 1

(1)...	...
(2)mr ᵓlhᵓ ṭbᵓ	Mar, good god—
ᵓlhy [mh-]ᵓᶜbd	My god, what should I do?
ᵓdᶜ mh-ᵓyty ᵓlhy	Let me know *what I should bring*, my god.
(3)lᵓ-byš bkpy, ᵓlhy	No evil is in my hands, my god;
lᵓ-trtyn bpymy	No duplicity/slander in my mouth.
(4)śm ᵓdny ᵓmr bġnhn	My lord put a lamb in their flocks;
ᵓybl/ybl bḥtr(5)thn	{He brought (it) into/A ram in} their folds.
krsmn ygššw/ykssw-šnyn	"*Let our teeth feel/chew tidbits*;
ᵓmṭy wnšmn (6)wnkśh	Bring (them) that we may become fat and corpulent.
nᵓkl bśr wnšmn	Let us eat meat and become fat;
nnbyġ dm (7)wnrwh	Let us cause blood to flow and drink to saturation."
lb ᵓlh-ᵓrš mr smkw	Did they support the life of the god of ᵓRŠ, Mar?
sklwt bpmhn	*Foolishness* is in their mouth;
(8)m(n)rryᵓ mn-ṭḥt lšnhn	Bitters under their tongue!

Stanza 2

mr ᵓlhᵓ ṭbᵓ	Mar, good god—
ᵓlhy mh (9)ᵓᶜbd	My god, what should I do?
ᵓdᶜ mh-ᵓyty ᵓlhy	Let me know *what I should bring*, my god.
lᵓ-byš bkpy, ᵓlhn	No evil is in my hands, our [*sic*] god;
lᵓ-trtyn bpymy	No duplicity/slander in my mouth.
(10)śm-ᵓdny tmr bpmhn	My lord put a date in their mouth;
mn-ḥlwyᵓ/mḥlwyᵓ mn-ṭḥt lšnhn	Sweets under their tongue.
(11)lb ᵓlh-ᵓrš mr smkw	Did they support the life of the god of ᵓRŠ, Mar?
ḥmh bpmhn	Venom is in their mouth;
mrrh mn-ṭḥt lšn(12)hn	Poison under their tongue!

Stanza 3

mr ᶜny	Mar speaks up,
wᵓl-ᵓmr	And *El* says,
[b]ᵓᵓštᵓ ...r	[In] ᵓfireᵓ ...
ᵓpᵓbnwr {dy-/t-/ᵓth-}tḥr[k]	ᵓAndᵓ in flames {which/let it/you shall make (it)} bur[n]:/.
[ᵓ]ᵓnᵓ (13)(ᵓᵓt-)tsyk̲-k̲rbᵓ[n]k ᵓl mr(h)	[I]ᵓf you causeᵓ your ᵓsacrifiᵓ[ce] ᵓto ascendᵓ to Mar(ah),

ʾn t . . . ʾl mr mn-ʾtrk wʾrš	If you . . . (it) to Mar from your place and ʾRŠ,
⁽¹⁴⁾[ʾhwbd b]ymyk ⌐šⁿ[nʾyk]	[I will destroy your enemies in] your days,
wᶜšnⁿtⁿk ʾymḥh ʾy⁽¹⁵⁾[byk]	And during your year⌐sⁿ I will smite [your] ad[versaries].
[ġryk] ʾnh-ʾklh ḳⁿdⁿmyk	[Your foes] I shall cause to perish be⌐fⁿore you;
lgrk ᶜl ʾḥrthn	Your foot (will be) on their back(s).
⁽¹⁶⁾ . . .	. . .
[ʾtm]ⁿk-yⁿmynⁿkⁿ	[I will suppor]ⁿt your rⁿight (hand).
⌐ʾbⁿrⁿkkⁿ bšlm	⌐I will bⁿⁿess youⁿ with peace/well-being;
bytk ⁽¹⁷⁾ . . .	Your house . . .
. . . ⌐ⁿⁿⁿwⁿyk . . .	. . . ⌐uⁿpⁿoⁿn you . . .
⁽¹⁸⁾ . . .	. . .

PHILOLOGICAL COMMENTARY

(1) ⌐sⁿ.m.kyᵐ. The first sign is actually a b plus an additional stroke which looks like the third stroke of the s sign. For want of any better interpretation, we have followed Thompson's suggestion[19] that the additional stroke was intended as a correction of the b to s.

(2) mrᵐ = Mr "Mar, Lord," the chief deity of the authors of the papyrus.[20] The name is always written without alephs and (oddly enough) without the god determinative. The consistent absence of dem. aleph after the r shows that there was probably no vowel there; cf. mr < mrʾ[21] in Late Aramaic, Palmyrene, and Nabatean[22] (but not Old Aramaic),[23] and perhaps NT Μάρθα[24] = Aram. mrtʾ/h.[25] This is one of four instances in which the name occurs immediately before .rh̄ = ʾlh, the others being VIII/20, IX/17, and XI/17. For further discussion, see Addendum.

mrᵐ .rh̄.ʷ i.b.ᵐ = mr ʾlhʾ ṭbʾ "Mar, good god," a vocative noun phrase. Theoretically, it would be possible to construe these words as a sentence (mr ʾlhy ṭb "Mar

[19] Unpublished transliteration of papyrus, 1921.

[20] For Semitic divine names containing the element mr, see J. Naveh, "Phlṣ beʾostrakon ʾarami hadaš," Lešonenu 37 (1972–73): 273–74.

[21] Mār is not derived directly from māre(ʾ) but rather indirectly, via mārî (itself derived from mārʾî), by means of a back-formation, according to E. Y. Kutscher, Toledot ha-ʾaramit (Jerusalem, 1972–73), p. 140. (We are indebted to M. Bar-Asher for this reference.) In Eastern Aramaic, mārî >mār may have a different explanation, namely the loss of final vowels there; cf. Syr. māry with a linea occultans over the y.

[22] H. H. Rowley, The Aramaic of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1929), pp. 111–15; G. Widengren, "Aramaica et Syriaca" in Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer" (Paris, 1971), pp. 228–31. (We are indebted to J. Naveh for the latter reference.) Both of these works cite forms like mrn and mryhm to prove that mr existed already in the Persian period, but the creation of mr was a two-step process

(see the preceding footnote), and such forms prove only that the first step had occurred.

[23] The alleged occurrence of mr in Old Aramaic (mr srsy srgn "Sargon's chief eunuch") is based on an incorrect reading, according to S. A. Kaufman, "The History of Aramaic Vowel Reduction" in M. Sokoloff, ed., Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition (Ramat-Gan, 1983), pp. 53–54. (We are indebted to J. C. Greenfield for this reference.)

[24] The name also occurs in Greek inscriptions beginning with the end of the second century; see O. Masson, "Quelques noms sémitiques en transcription grecque à Délos et à Rhénée" in Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer (Paris, 1971), pp. 66–67.

[25] The Aramaic form is attested in a number of ossuary inscriptions; see J.-B. Frey, Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum, vol. 2 (Rome, 1952), pp. 264–65, and Naveh, "The Ossuary Inscriptions from Givᶜat ha-Mivtar," IEJ 20 (1970): 35.

my god is good" or *mr ʾlh ṭb* "Mar is a good god") or, together with the following *.rḥ.*["], as two sentences (*mr ʾlhy // ṭb ʾlhy* "Mar is my god//Good is my god"), but the fact that the question which follows is addressed to Mar (see immediately below) favors a vocative interpretation.

[*m*].ᶜ.*bt*ᵐ = *mh-ʾᶜbd* "what should I do?" That this question is addressed to Mar is shown by the fact that Mar answers it in lines 12 ff. For the proclitic character of *m(h)* in Aramaic, cf. Nerab ii 5 *mḥzh ʾnh* "what do I see," unless *mḥzh* is a *pa*ᶜ*el* participle; for Hebrew, cf. Exod. 4:2, Isa. 3:15, Ezek. 8:6. According to the Massoretic accentuation of BH, *mh* is *always* proclitic before words beginning with consonants other than *h, ḥ, ᶜ, r*; and the Massoretic *vocalization* of the BH form with *pattaḥ* (a vowel which rarely occurs as the reflex of **ā* and never occurs as the final phoneme of a stressed word in BH) shows that this accentual phenomenon is ancient.

⌜*e*⌝.*myty*ᵐ = *mh-ʾyty* "*what I should bring*," i.e., what type of offering I should bring; cf. Cowley 27:14 *lhytyh mn[ḥḥ]* "to bring an offering." Our interpretation assumes that ⌜*e*⌝ and *m* have been metathesized; cf. the metathesis of ⌜*e*⌝ and *ḥ* in *r.ḥ.*⌜*e*⌝.*k.* = *lʾḥk* "to your brother" (XIX/15) and *ḥer̄.thn*ʷ = *ʾḥrthn* "their back(s)" (line 15, below).

*.rh̄*ʷ = *ʾlhy* "my god" (or *ʾlhʾ* "god").[26] That this word is vocative rather than "accusative" (indirect object of *ʾyty* "bring") follows not only from the considerations discussed in connection with the first phrase in this line but also from the fact that Aram. *ʾty*, unlike Arabic *ʾty*, governs the "accusative" only with nouns of place.[27] In the *af*ᶜ*el*, too, the preposition meaning "to" cannot be dispensed with before an animate noun.

(3) *r.b.š.*ʷ = *lʾ-byš* "no evil." One's initial impulse to interpret this form as a rendering of *lbš* "garment" must yield to the realization that the inital *r.* of *r.b.š.* is parallel to the initial *r.* of *r.t.r̄.*ᵐ *tyn.*ᵐ (just as the initial *b.* of *b.k.py*ᵐ is parallel to the initial *b.* of *b.p̄ym.*ᵐ). Proclitic negative *l* is normal in the papyrus, as it is in early inscriptions[28] (cf. also proclitic *lʾ* in the Massoretic accentuation and BT Ned. 11a *mʾy lḥwlyn? lʾ ḥwlyn. . . .* "What is (the meaning of) *lḥwlyn* (in the Mishnah)? Not *ḥwlyn. . . .*").[29]

*t.r̄.*ᵐ *tyn.*ᵐ = *trtyn* "two"—wrongly divided, like many other words in the papyrus. The word is obviously used here in some figurative sense, which, judging from the context, must be a negative one. The possibility which comes to mind first is "duplicity," but we have not succeeded in finding any better evidence for this meaning than Ps. 12:3 *blb wlb ydbrw* "they speak with two hearts (lit., a heart and a heart)"[30] and BT Pes. 113b, BM 49a *hmdbr/ydbr ʾḥd bph wʾḥd blb* "he (who) speaks one thing with the mouth and another in the heart." A meaning which is easier to document is "defamatory gossip, slander"; cf. Ben Sira 4:28, 5:14 (bis), 6:1, 21:28, 28:13 *bᶜl štym* "scandalmonger."[31] That this is, in fact, the meaning of *bᶜl štym* is shown both by the parallelism between it and *lšwn šlyšyt* "defamatory gossip" in Ben Sira 28: 13–14[32] and

[26] The latter is a possible alternative of *ʾlhy* throughout lines 2, 3, 8, and 9.

[27] E. Vogt, *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1971), p. 20.

[28] In these inscriptions negative *l* is written together with the following word. However it is also possible, as J. Blau reminds us, that this practice is purely orthographic in origin, stemming from a reluctance to leave a single letter standing by itself.

[29] We are indebted to D. Boyarin for this parallel and for the further reference to J. N. Epstein, *Mavo le-nosaḥ ha-mišnah* (Jerusalem, 1963–64), p. 622.

[30] We are indebted to M. Greenberg for this parallel.

[31] We are indebted to Y. Yahalom for this parallel.

[32] M. Z. Segal, *Sefer Ben-Sira ha-šalem* (Jerusalem, 1958), pp. 173–74.

by the fact that its Greek rendering (δίγλοσσος) is also used for *hwlk rkyl* "scandal-monger" in Prov. 11:13.[33]

b.pym.[m] = *bpymy* "in my mouth." The word for "mouth" is spelled with *y* here and in line 9 and in VIII/4 (*w.pym.k.*[m] = *wpymk* "and your mouth"). The same spelling occurs (alongside *pm*) in CPA and in reliable manuscripts of GA.[34] In the latter, one also finds vocalization with *e* (*sere-segol*).[35] Eastern Aramaic, on the other hand, knows only *pwm*, vocalized with *u*. This is one of several "isoglosses" connecting our papyrus with Western Aramaic in general and GA in particular. Cf. also Commentary to *b.pmh.n*[m] in line 7 below.

l[ɔ]-*byš bkpy . . . l*[ɔ]-*trtyn bpymy* "no evil is in my hands . . . no duplicity/slander in my mouth." This bipartite protestation of innocence in word and deed (mouth and hand) calls to mind Isa. 53:9 [ᶜ]*l l*[ɔ] *ḥms* [ᶜ]*šh wl*[ɔ] *mrmh bpyw* "although he had done no injustice and (had) no falsehood in his mouth"; Job 16:17 [ᶜ]*l l*[ɔ] *ḥms bkpy wtplty zkh* "although no injustice was in my hands and my prayer was pure" (perhaps equivalent to Ps. 17:1 *tplty bl*[ɔ] *špty mrmh* "my prayer (uttered) not by false lips"); and the "negative confession" of the devotee of Osiris in the Carpentras stele (line 2) *mnd*[ᶜ]*m b*[ɔ]*yš l*[ɔ] [ᶜ]*bdt wkrsy* [ɔ]*yš l*[ɔ] [ɔ]*mrt tmh* "Nothing evil did she/I do, nor backbiting calumnies against anyone did she/I utter there"; cf. also Isa. 59:3 and Ps. 15:3. A prose version of the first hemistich is 1 Sam. 24:11 [ɔ]*yn bydy r*[ᶜ]*h wpš*[ᶜ] "there is no evil or sin in my hand"; cf. also 1 Sam. 26:18, Ps. 7:4, Isa. 59:6, Job 11:14, and Jon. 3:8. For the second hemistich, cf. Zeph. 3:13 and Ps. 10:7.

(4) *t.ny*[m] = [ɔ]*dny* "my lord" (with "my" matching the preceding pronouns)[36] rather than "Adoni" or "Adonay." The corresponding form in Stanza 2 (line 10, below) is *t.n*[m], which cannot be "Adonay" but can be "Adoni" or "my lord" (cf. XX/2 *š.m*[ᶜ]*ny*[m] *mr*[m] *šm*[ᶜ]*n*[m] = *šm*[ᶜ]*ny mr šm*[ᶜ]*ny* "hear me, lord, hear me," with final *ī* represented first by *y*, then by ø). The problem with "Adoni" is that no such divine name is attested in Semitic texts. The second component of the Phoenician name [ᶜ]*bd*[ɔ]*dny*, like the second component of Sabean [ᶜ]*bdmr*[ɔ]*hw*, is merely an epithet standing in for a divine name.[37] And the Greek divine name Αδωνις is generally derived from Phoenician [ɔ]*adon* rather than [ɔ]*adoni*—possibly because of the by-form Αδων.

e.m.r̄.[m] *b.ḥ.nh.n.*[w] = [ɔ]*mr bgnhn* "a lamb in their flocks"; cf. Targ. to Ezek. 45:15 *w*[ɔ]*ymr ḥd mn* [ᶜ]*n*[ɔ] "one lamb from the flocks," Sam. Targ. to Gen. 21:28 [ɔ]*mrn* [ᶜ]*n* "lambs of the flocks," and Pesh. to Ps. 114:4, 6 [ɔ]*mr*[ɔ] *d*[ᶜ]*n*[ɔ], with the same meaning.

---

[33] S. Lieberman, *Yewanit we-yawnut be-*[ɔ]*eres Yiśrael* (Jerusalem, 1962), pp. 292–93, esp. n. 101. (We are indebted to Y. Yahalom for this reference.) Of course it is not impossible that the translaters took *hwlk rkyl* to mean "deceiver" (as do the Syro-Hexapla and the Peshitta in some places), but both Lieberman and J. F. Schleusner (*Novus Thesaurus Philologico-criticus*, vol. 1 [Glasgow, 1822], p. 598) agree that δίγλοσσος means "slanderer" rather than "deceiver." The image evoked by this word, according to Lieberman, is not that of a two-tongued person saying different things with each tongue, but rather of a person whose whispering about others is reminiscent of the hissing sound supposedly produced by the forked tip of the snake's tongue. The same is true of Syriac *trynwt* (*lšn* [ɔ]): pace Payne-Smith and Brockelmann, it is by no means clear that the

meaning of this expression is "duplicity (of tongue)." The expression almost certainly derives from *ghr*[ɔ] *tryny lšn*[ɔ]—the Syro-Hexapla's rather slavish rendering of δίγλοσσος in the LXX and Hexapla to Prov. 11:33; see *Codex Syriaco-Hexaplaris*, pt. 1, ed. H. Middeldorpf (Berlin, 1835), ad loc. It is thus, in all likelihood, a calque on δίγλοσσος "slanderer." That is the reason we have not adduced this expression as evidence that *trtyn* means "duplicity."

[34] Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan, 1976), pp. 20–21. (We are indebted to M. Bar-Asher for this reference.)

[35] Ibid.

[36] Contrast XI/12, 16 [ɔ]*dny* "Adonay," where the interpretation "my lord" is impossible because the surrounding suffixed pronouns are 1st person pl.

[37] Naveh, "Phls," p. 273.

eyb.r^m = *ʾybl* "he brought (it)" or *ybl* "a ram." The first interpretation connects our form with GA, SA, CPA *ʾybl* and BA *hybl*.[38] Outside of these dialects there is no exact parallel, since Eastern Aramaic treats *ybl* as *primae waw* in the *af^cel* stem, and Samalian and Imperial Aramaic use *ybl* in the *kal* rather than the *haf^cel*. Thus, this interpretation creates an "isogloss" connecting our papyrus with Western Aramaic—one of several discussed in this article. The second interpretation connects our form with "Arabian" Aram. (= Jewish Nabatean?) *ywbl^ʾ* "ram,"[39] Punic *ybl*, and BH *ywbl*. The advantage of this interpretation is that it takes our form as a noun (in parallelism with the object of *śm* "put") rather than a verb (in parallelism with *śm* itself), thereby preserving the syntactic congruence of our bicolon with the corresponding bicolon of Stanza 2 (line 10, below).[40] The disadvantage of this interpretation is that it fails to account for the initial dem. *e*, but since the latter is relatively unsubstantial both from the graphic and from the phonetic point of view and seems to be intrusive in other places in the papyrus, we should perhaps not attach too much weight to it here.

ʾmr "lamb" // *ybl* "ram"; cf. JT Ber. 13c top *b^crbyʾ kwryn lʾymrʾ ywblʾ* "in Arabia they call an *ʾymr* a *ywbl*."[41] Cf. also the Marseilles Tariff in which *ʾlp* "bull": *^cgl* "calf": *ybl* "ram": *ʾmr* "lamb": *^cz* "goat": *gd* "kid" and perhaps Panamuwa 21—an unintelligible line in which *ʾmr* occurs once and *ybl* twice.

bh̄ter^m (5) *t.h.n^m* = *bhṭrṯhn* "in their folds";[42] cf. JA (Onk., Targ. Proph., BT) *h(w)ṭr* "fold," Arabic *ḥaẓīrah* "pen, fold," Ug. *ḥẓr/ḥṭr* "court." The proto-form contains a pharyngeal *ḥ* (cf. the Arabic and Ugaritic cognates just mentioned) and so does the demotic rendering. The *e* is problematic but hardly fatal (cf. Commentary to *eyb.l^m* immediately above). Is it possible that the sequence *te*, like modern *t^ʾ*, is a rendering of glottalic *ṭ*? The fem. marker *t* is unexpected, since it is absent from both the singular and the plural of JA *h(w)ṭr*; but the assumption of fluctuation in gender is less radical than the positing of an interchange between *d-* (the allomorph of the genitive marker used before nouns) and *dl-* (the allomorph of the genitive marker used before pronouns) necessitated by the alternative interpretation of *t.h.n^m* as *dhn* "of them." Even the determinative separating *bh̄ter* from *t.h.n^m* is, in the present state of our knowledge, not enough to tip the scales in favor of *t.h.n^m* = *dhn*. The final problem presented by our form concerns the referent of its suffixed pronoun. Who are the people being spoken about here? Structural analysis of the poem provides the answer. First of all, it is obvious that all of the 3d person pl. pronouns in lines 10–12 (*pmhn* "THEIR mouth," *lšnhn* "THEIR tongue," *smkw* "THEY sustained," *pmhn*, *lšnhn*) have the same referent. Now each of these pronouns corresponds to a 3d person pl. pronoun in

[38] See the standard dictionaries and Sam. Targ. to Lev. 26:13, Deut. 28:36, and Deut. 29:4 (one MS). M. Sokoloff calls our attention to the discussion of *ybl; ʾwbl* in T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1910), p. 198. He also calls our attention to the fact that GA has several other verbs which are (due to analogy with the *kal*) *primae yod* in *af^cel* instead of original *primae waw*: *ʾytr*, *ʾytb*, and *ʾykl*; cf. G. Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1905), p. 307. The same phenomenon is discussed by Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "^cIyyunim ba-ʾaramit šel ʾereṣ-yiśraʾel u-ve-fiyyuṭ ha-šomeronim" in

S. Abramson, ed., *Sefer Ḥayyim Schirmann* (Jerusalem, 1970), p. 48.

[39] BT RH 26a and JT Ber 13c top, discussed by A. Cohen, "Arabisms in Rabbinic Literature," *JQR*, n.s. 3 (1912–13): 225.

[40] This was pointed out to us by J. Blau and M. Greenberg.

[41] It is true that the BT version of the baraita (RH 26a) has *dkr^ʾ* "ram" instead of *ʾymr^ʾ* "lamb," even if the JT text is secondary, it is still a valuable witness to the associations of native speakers of GA.

[42] We are indebted to M. Greenberg and S. Shaked for this interpretation.

lines 4–8 (*bgn*hn "in THEIR flocks," *bḥṭr*hn "in THEIR folds," *smk*w, *pm*hn, *lšn*hn).
That correspondence shows that the latter set of pronouns is also co-referential, despite
the fact that the first two of them are separated from the last three by a passage
containing 1st person pl. pronouns (*šny*n "OUR teeth," *nšmn* "WE shall grow fat," *nkšh*,
nnbyg, *nrwh*). Moreover, it is difficult to avoid the impression that these 1st person pl.
pronouns have the same referent as the 3d person pl. pronouns which they are sand-
wiched between. If so, the poet has switched without warning from a 3d person
narrative *about* X to a first person utterance *by* X and back again. The transition may
strike us as overly abrupt, but abrupt transitions are common in ancient Semitic
poetry. In Ps. 2:1–5, for example, we find almost exactly the same set of abrupt
transitions that we find in lines 4–8 of our poem.[43]

    *bgn*hn "in their flocks" // *bḥṭr*hn "in their folds"; cf. Targ. to 1 Sam. 24:3, Mic.
2:12, Zeph. 2:6 *ḥṭry(n d)ᶜn* "sheepfolds." This may be an example of the breakup of a
fixed phrase for use in parallel cola.[44]

    krᵐ s$\overline{Mn}$ = **krsmn* "*morsels, tidbits.*" This interpretation assumes the existence of a
noun *krsm* related to GA *krsm* "bite, nibble," MH *krsm* and BH *krsm* with the same
meaning. It is very dubious.

    y.k.šš. = *ygššw* "*let them touch, feel*" or *ykssw* "*let them chew,*" both well attested in
late Aramaic dialects. The latter interpretation fits the context perfectly, but is prob-
lematic from the phonetic point of view. The problem cannot be solved by assuming
that the proto-root is **kšš*, since the latter does not account for Akkadian *kasāsu*
"chew."

    š.n.nyᵐ = *šnyn* "*our teeth*" (or *šny* "*my teeth*"). Our interpretation assumes that the
scribe has inverted the order of the last two signs. The interpretation in parentheses
also assumes a scribal error (dittography) and does not fit the context as well.

    -.m.tyᵐ = *ᵓmṭy* "bring (them)," the *afᶜel* of *mṭy* "reach" (<*mṭᵓ*) attested in Onk.,
BJA, Mand., and SA.[45] (For a revised reading of this form as *ṅ.m.tyᵐ* = *nmṭy* "let us
bring," see Addendum.)

    wnšmn "and we will become fat" // *wnrwh* "and we will drink to saturation." The
expected parallel to *rwy* "drink to saturation" is not *šmn* "become fat" but *šbᶜ* "eat to
satiety"; cf. Lam. 3:15, Jer. 46:10 (flesh and blood), the Mandaic incantation text cited
in the commentary to *bśr* // *dm* in line 6 below, and even our papyrus XIII/8–9 *p̄.s.bᶜ*
$\overline{Mn}$tyy.k.ᵐ // *e.rw.ᵐ rye.ḥyᵐ $\overline{mn}$.bnẅn.t.k.ᵐ b.ym.ᵐ* = *pᵓsbᶜ-mn-dyk* // *ᵓrwh ᵓly-ᵓḥy*
mn- ... k bymᵓ "and let me eat to satiety from your abundance // let me drink to
saturation, my god, my brother, from your . . . in the sea." The substitution of *šmn* for
šbᶜ and the repetition of the former serve to highlight the main point: that people are
fattening themselves on (portions of) sacrifices which are supposed to be for Mar's
benefit (see discussion section, below).

---

[43] Cf. also the shift from 3d person sing. to 2d
person sing. and back to 3d person sing. in Deut.
32:15 and the shift from 2d person pl. to 1st person
pl. and back to 2d person pl. in Esarhaddon's vassal
treaties (*ANET*, p. 539, cf. §57 with the preceding
and following paragraphs; we are indebted to
M. Greenberg for this parallel).

[44] Cf. E. Z. Melamed, "Break-up of Stereotype
Phrases as an Artistic Device in Biblical Poetry,"
Scripta Hierosolymitana 8 (1961): 115–53.

[45] We are indebted to Z. Ben-Hayyim for relaying
to us the results of his investigation into the usage
of this verb in SA.

(6) $w.n.k.s.^m$ = $wnkšh$ "and we shall become corpulent."[46] This interpretation connects our word with Deut. 32:15 $kšyt$—a hapax whose relationship to the verbs preceding it has long been a subject of debate, some seeing it as an appositive of $šmnt$ ^cbyt "you became fat, you became stout" and hence synonymous with those verbs, and others taking it to be parallel to wyb^ct "and he kicked" and hence only a result of $šmnt$ ^cbyt (just as wyb^ct is a result of $wyšmn$). Now, normally one would reject as methodologically unsound any attempt to identify a word in our papyrus with a Hebrew hapax of uncertain meaning—or even an *Aramaic* hapax of uncertain meaning, for that matter. In this case, however, the context of the Aramaic form ($w.n.šm.n^m$ $w.n.k.s.^m$) is so similar to the context of the Hebrew form ($šmnt$ ^cbyt $kšyt$) that we need have no methodological reservations about identifying these two unknowns and allowing them to elucidate each other. The Hebrew form reveals that the root of the Aramaic form is $kšy$. And the Aramaic form settles the debate about the relationship between the Hebrew form and its context: $kšyt$ must be a synonym—rather than an undesirable result—of $šmnt$ ^cbyt, just as $w.n.k.s.^m$ is a synonym of $w.n.šm.n^m$ and not an undesirable result of it.

$n.kr^m$ $b.s.\bar{r}.^m$ = n^akl $bśr$ "let us eat meat!" This cry of self-indulgence reminds one of the cry of the merry-makers in Targ. to Isa. 22:13 $nykwl$ bsr ($wnšty$ $ḥmr$) "let us eat meat (and drink wine)!"

$n\overline{nby}ḥ^m$ = $nnbyġ$ "let us cause to flow"; cf. XII/7 $\overline{nby}ḥ$ = $^anbyġ$ "cause (it) to flow" coordinated with ($y.yn.^m$) $m.s.k\dot{w}$ = (yyn) $mzgw$ "mix/pour a drink (of wine)" and with $\bar{r}wy^m$ = rwy "drink to saturation" (paralleling the coordination of $nnbyġ$ with $wnrwh$ "and let us drink to saturation" in our passage). The velar $ḥ$ of the demotic form agrees with the third radical of Arabic $nabaġa$ "gush forth (water)"[47] rather than $naba^ca$. It should also be noted that the Akkadian cognates of Aram. nb^c "flow" and mbw^c "spring" are $nabā^au$ "rise (flood water)" and $namba^au$ "seep, water hole"—rather than *$nebē^au$ and *$nembe^au$—pointing to an original $ġ$.[48] Finally, it may be pointed out that the Syriac doublets $mbw^{c_a}/mbwg^a$ "spring" and the Mandaic form $mambuga$ are most easily explained on the assumption that nb^c is a reflex of *$nbġ$.

n^akl "let us eat" // $nnbyġ$ "let us cause to flow." The normal parallel to ^akl "eat" is $šty$ "drink," as in Targ. to Isa. 22:13 $nykwl$ bsr $wnšty$ $ḥmr$ "let us eat meat and drink wine." That is no doubt the reason Vleeming and Wesselius wish to read $nšth$ here.[49]

$bśr$ "flesh" // dm "blood." A common pair.[50] Examples in the context of a sacrificial meal are Ezek. 39:17, Ps. 50:13; cf. also Deut. 12:27 and Mandaic $^akly^a$ $bsrywn$ d bny^a

[46] Cf. Vleeming and Wesselius, "Aramaic Hymn," p. 501, $wnks^a$ "[and we shall] become thick," although their transcription with s, rather than $ś$, leaves room for doubt about the congruence of their interpretation and ours.

[47] We are indebted to J. Blau for calling this doublet to our attention and for the following references: J. G. Hava, *Al-Faraid: Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut, 1964), s.v., and *Lisān al-^cArab*, vol. 8, p. 453, col. 1, line 1: wa-$nabaġa$ l-$mā^au$ wa-$naba^ca$ bi-$ma^cnā$ $wāḥid$ "and (there is also) $nabaġa$ l-$mā^au$ (the water) and $naba^ca$ with one and the same meaning."

[48] Akkadian e < *a is found in the vicinity of ^{a} < *^{c} but not in the vicinity of ^{a} < *$ġ$; see O. Rössler,

"Zur Frage der Vertretung der gemeinsemitischen Laryngale im Akkadischen," *Akten des XXIV. internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München 1957* (Wiesbaden, 1959), pp. 129–32.

[49] Vleeming and Wesselius, "Aramaic Hymn," p. 501. We know of no way that the demotic signs in question can be read so as to yield Aram. $nšt$ [*sic*]. Even if it were possible to read the group preceding y (here, in XII/7, and in IVa/7) as $\overline{šty}$ (Copt. ⲩⲓⲧⲉ) instead of $\overline{nb}$, the final $ḥ$ would still have to be explained away.

[50] Cf. M. Dahood, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs" in L. Fisher, ed., *Ras Shamra Parallels*, vol. I (Rome, 1972), p. 151.

ʾnʾšʾ lsybʾ wšʾtyn dmʾy[wn] lrwyʾ "they eat the flesh of humans to satiety and drink their blood to saturation."[50a]

(7) .rh̄.r̄š.ʷ = ʾlh-ʾrš "god of Arashi," see Commentary to wrš.ʷ in line 13 below and our discussion of the sign h̄ = h̄n in the introduction above.

s.m.kẅ = smkw "did they support?" Note that words ending in ẅ (the dem. plural ending for nouns) do not require a determinative in our papyrus, probably because in normal demotic writing this sign comes after the determinative. We have refrained from incorporating this verb into the quotation by interpreting it as an imperative, because if it were part of the quotation, it ought to be in the first person (nsmk).

r.b.ᵐ .rh̄.r̄š.ʷ mrᵐ s.m.kẅ = lb ʾlh-ʾrš smkw "did they support the life (lit., heart) of the god of Arashi, Mar?"; cf. Pesh. to Gen. 18:5, Judg. 19:5, 8; Ps. 104:15 smk lb- "support the life (lit., heart) of," rendering BH sᶜd lb(b)- with the same meaning. In all of these places, the reference is to sustaining life with food (cf. Heb. smk in Gen. 27:37, Song Sol. 2:5), which is why Heb. sᶜd lb(b), after being abridged to sᶜd (cf. already 1 Kings 13:7), came to mean "dine," with sᶜwdh meaning "meal." The phrase smk lb is attested in Hebrew (Ps. 112:8)[51] and Mandaic as well, but there it is passive and refers to a psychological (rather than a physical) state, as expected with lb.

s.k.r̄.tᵐ b.p̄mh.nᵐ = sklwt bpmhn "foolishness is in their mouth"; cf. Eccles. 10:13 thlt dbry pyhw sklwt "the first words (out) of his mouth are foolishness." This r̄ is one of a small number in the text which seem to render Aram. l rather than Aram. r.[52]

b.p̄mh.nᵐ = bpmhn "in their mouth." All three occurrences of pmhn (here and in lines 10 and 11) are transcribed without y, whereas the occurrences of pymy (lines 3 and 9) and pymk (VIII/4) have a y in dem. transcription. Could this difference reflect an alternation conditioned by syllable structure? M. Sokoloff informs us that, in reliable manuscripts of GA, the word for "mouth" is written pym before suffixes beginning with a vowel and pm elsewhere.

(8) m̄nnr.r.ᵐ y.ᵐ = m(n)rryʾ "bitters." The n in this form shows that the following r was originally geminated, and hence that this is probably the adjective *marrīr- used as a noun, rather than the noun *murār-. Another unexpected case of nasalization < gemination (involving the same dem. consonants!) is XX/15 w̄y.m˹n˺rr.ᵐ < *way(y)i-mallil "and he spoke," XIX/7 m̄nnr.r.ᵐ < *mallilī "speak."

m̄nnt.h̄tᵐ = mn-tht "underneath." The proto-form contains a pharyngeal h (cf. Ug. tht "under," Arabic taḥta, ESA tht) and so do the demotic renderings in this column (here and in lines 10 and 11), XI and XII/13, 14.

sklt bpmhn mrryʾ mn-tht lšnhn "foolishness is in their mouth, bitters under their tongue"; cf. Ps. 10:7 ʾlh pyhw mlʾ wmrmwt wtk, tht lšwnw ᶜml wʾwn "his mouth is full of oaths, deceit, and fraud; mischief and evil are under his tongue."

bpmhn "in their mouth" // mn-tht lšnhn "underneath their tongue"; cf. Uruk incantation 21, 24–25 ba-ʾ pu-um(?)-mi-e "in his mouth" // ti-ḫu-ú-tú liš-šá-ni-e "under his tongue." In biblical poetry tht lšn- "under the tongue of" means "in the mouth of," but somehow never quite manages to appear parallel to bpy- (even when bpy- occurs in

[50a] J. Naveh, "Another Mandaic Lead-Roll," Israel Oriental Studies 5 (1975): 48, 51, and cf. the parallel cited there. We are indebted to J. Naveh for this reference.

[51] We are indebted to M. Greenberg for this reference.

[52] Cf. our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," p. 262.

the parallel colon, as in Job 20:12). Nevertheless, the biblical parallels of *tḥt lšn-* (in Ps. 10:7, 66:17, Song Sol. 4:11, and Job 20:12) are variations on the theme of *ḥpy-*, and seem to presuppose knowledge of the standard pair exemplified in our text.

(9) *e.t.ᵐ* = *ʾdᶜ* "let me know"; cf. *e.t.ᶜᵐ* with final ᶜ in the corresponding stich of Stanza 1 (line 2, above). Two other cases of omitted ᶜ rendered certain by the existence of parallels are X/13 *ys.t.nyᵐ* = *ysᶜdny* "will sustain me" and XVII/14 *nwymrᵐ* = ᶜ*nh w ʾymr* "spoke up and said."

(10) $\overline{mn}$*nḥ.rẃy.ᵐ* = *mn-ḥlwy* "some sweets" (with "partitive" *mn*) or *mḥlwy* "sweets" (with "preformative" *m*). The latter interpretation is suggested by the writing of preformative *m* in VIII/13 *.lp* $\overline{Mn}$*t.bḥ.ᵐ* = *ʾlp-mdbḥ* "a thousand altars," XIX/8 $\overline{mn}$*rk.btᵐ* = *mrkbt* "the chariot," XXI/12 $\overline{mn}$*rk.b.[t].ᵐ*, XVIII/10 *bytᵐ* $\overline{mn}$*ns.ḥyᵐ* *t.ᵐ* = *byt mšḥyt* "the bath house," XVIII/13 *bytᵐ* $\overline{mn}$*ns.[ḥ]yt.ᵐ*. The last two examples show that even the presence of the phonetic complement *n* after $\overline{mn}$ is not an insuperable obstacle to this interpretation. It is true that the form *mḥlwy* is unattested elsewhere, but Heb. *mmtḳym* "sweets"[53] makes up, in part, for this lack. Even according to the former interpretation, the root-final *w* probably shows that this is a noun like Arabic *ḥalwayāt* "sweets" (cf. also Syr. *ḥlwy*) in contradistinction to the *tertiae yod* forms found in XII/10 (*wḥry.yn.ᵐ* = *wḥlyyn*), Ahikar 131 (*ḥlyn*), and the Late Aramaic dialects, which are (deponent) passive participles. The protoform contains a pharyngeal *ḥ* (cf. Arabic *ḥaluwa/ḥaliya* "be sweet") and so do the demotic renderings, here and in XII/10.

$\overline{mn}$*mt.ḥ.tᵐ* = *mn-tḥt* "underneath." The use of *m* here, rather than *n*, as the phonetic complement of *mn* was discussed in our first article.[54]

b. $\overset{\overline{pm}}{nh}$*.nᵐ* = *bpmhn* "in their mouth." The first *aleph* is written over what appears to be a *ḥ*. This correction complements the insertion of $\overline{pm}$ above the word. The net result is a correction from *bḥnh.nᵐ* = *bġnhn* "in their flocks"—transferred here by mistake from the corresponding hemistich in Stanza 1 (line 4)—to *b.* $\overline{pm}$*h.nᵐ*. The confusion is quite natural in view of the fact that Stanzas 1 and 2 are identical up until the word before this one.

tmr "a date" // (*m*)*ḥlwy* "sweets." Not attested elsewhere, as far as we know, but a perfect pair nonetheless, since the date was the sweet fruit *par excellence* by virtue of its being the source of a very popular type of honey.[55]

šm-ʾdny . . . m(*n-*)*ḥlwy mn-tḥt lšnhn* "my lord put . . . sweets under their tongue." Contrast line 8 *m*(*n*)*rry mn-tḥt lšnhn* "bitters are under their tongue." The irony is unmistakable: the sweet things which Mar puts under their tongue cannot neutralize the bitter things which they themselves put there. For the antonymy of *mrr* and *ḥlw y*, cf. *Ahikar* 188 *kpn yḥḥlh mrrwt* "hunger sweetens bitterness," Pesh. and Targ. to Prov. 27:7, Pesh. to Isa. 5:20, and *Ginza iamina* 126 *ia ḏ-apkia halia ᶜl marira umarira ᶜl halia* "O you who turn sweetness into bitterness and bitterness into sweetness."[56]

[53] We are indebted to M. Greenberg for this parallel.

[54] See "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," p. 266, s.v. *y.m.t.n.*

[55] Cf. I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1924), p. 348.

[56] E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963), p. 254, s.v. *marir(a)*.

(11) *h.m.*^m = *ḥmh* "venom," cf. XV/14 ⌈*ḥ*⌉.⌈*mt*⌉^m *k.k.*⌈*t*⌉*n.n.n*^m = *ḥmtk ktnnn* "your venom is like (that of) serpents," itself reminiscent of Pesh. to Ps. 58:5 *ḥmthwn* ^ɔ*yk dḥwy*^ɔ "their venom is like that of snakes," Neof. and Frag. to Deut. 32:33 *ḥmthwn mdmy(y)*^ɔ *lḥmthwn dtnyny*^ɔ/*h* "their venom resembles the venom of serpents," Pesh. ad loc. *ḥmt*^ɔ *dtnyn*^ɔ *ḥmthwn*⁵⁷ "the venom of serpents is their venom," and Onkelos, Neof., Frag. (Vat.) to Deut. 32:24 *ḥmt(hwn d)tnyny*^ɔ "the venom of serpents." The proto-form contains a pharyngeal *ḥ* (cf. Ug. *ḥmt* "venom," Arabic *ḥumatun* "scorpion venom," and Akkadian *imtu* "venom") and so do the demotic renderings, here and in XV/14.

‾*mnrry.*^m = *mrry*^ɔ "bitters," but read probably ‾*mnrr.* = *mrrh* "gall, poison." The word *mrrh* has cognates with the basic meaning "gall" and the derivative meaning "poison" and in many Aramaic dialects and Semitic languages,⁵⁸ and is a perfect parallel to *h.m.*^m = *ḥmh* "venom" (see below). In most Aramaic dialects it is feminine and singular (although Mandaic has a masc. form *mrara* and a plural form *mririata* with the meaning "poison(s)").⁵⁹ Thus, the final *y.* of our form, implying a masc. plur. form, is probably due to a contamination with ‾*mnnr.r.*^m *y.*^m in line 8 (cf. the confusion between *b.ḥ.nh.n.*^w and *b.pmh.n*^m in line 10).

ḥmh "venom" // *mrrh* "poison," cf. the rendering of Deut. 32:33 *ḥmt tnynm* "serpent's venom" with Aram. *mrt tnyny*^ɔ (Onk.), *mryrthwn dtnyny*^ɔ (Jon.), alongside Aram. *ḥmt*^ɔ *dtnyn*^ɔ (Pesh.), *ḥmthwn dtnyn*^ɔ (Frag.). Cf. also the close association of *imtu* with *martu* in Akkadian and the possible association of *šmrr* with *ḥmt* in the Ugaritic serpent incantation.⁶⁰

ḥmh bpmhn mrrh mn-tḥt lšnhn "venom is in their mouth, poison under their tongue"; cf. Ps. 140:4 *ḥmt* ^ʕ*kšwb tḥt śptymw* "spider poison is under their lips" (where the usual expression—"under their tongue"—is replaced by "under their lips" because *lšn* "tongue" has been preempted for use in the preceding parallel colon). An even closer parallel, if Dupont-Sommer's interpretation of it is correct, is Uruk incantation 21, 24–25 *iš-ša-*^ɔ *ba-*^ɔ *pu-um(?)-mi-e (u-ma-*^ɔ) *ḫa-la-ṭi-in-ni ti-ḫú-tú liš-šá-ni-e* "fire is in his mouth, (and) mixtures under his tongue." According to Dupont-Sommer, both the word for "fire" and the word for "mixtures" refer to poison.⁶¹

(12) ^ʕ*.ny.*^m = ^ʕ*ny* "speaks up." The last stroke of the *y* (the stroke whose curvature distinguishes *y* from *s*) is on a tiny piece of papyrus which was folded over (onto the recto) at the time when the first photographs were made (around the turn of the century) and is now (1983) missing. As a result, we were initially tempted to read ^ʕ*.ns.*^m (*wr.e.mr̄.*^m) = ^ʕ*nz*^ɔ (*wl*^ɔ*mr*^ɔ) "the goat (and the sheep [accus.])." But the final stroke of the *y* is clearly visible in the microfilm made at the Pierpont Morgan Library in 1976, at which time the crucial piece of papyrus was already unfolded but not yet lost.

wr.e.mr̄.^m = *w*^ɔ*l-*^ɔ*mr* "and El says." Coming after ^ʕ*.ny.*^m = ^ʕ*ny* "speaks up," *e.mr* can only be ^ɔ*mr* "says,"⁶² but the *r* preceding it is difficult. The interpretation suggested

---

⁵⁷ Corrupted from an original *ḥmrhwn* "their wine"?

⁵⁸ Cf. D. Pardee, "*m*^ɔ*rôrät-p*^ɔ*tanîm* >Venom< in Job 20:14," *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 91 (1979): 401–16.

⁵⁹ Drower and Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary*, p. 278, s.v. *mrara* and *mrirta.*

⁶⁰ Pardee, "*m*^ɔ*rôrät-p*^ɔ*tanîm*," pp. 403, 404, 408–9;

N. Waldman, "The Sprinkling of Venom," *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982): 201 (note).

⁶¹ A. Dupont-Sommer, "La tablette cunéiforme araméenne de Warka," *RA* 39 (1942–44): 50.

⁶² The formula consisting of these two verbs (frequently followed by *wymll* "and he spoke") occurs at least a dozen times in the story (cols. XVII–XXI). It is also very common in Daniel and *Aḥiḳar.*

above assumes that the phrase *ʿny wʾmr* has been broken up into parallel cola,[63] thereby allowing for the insertion of El (// Mar) before *wʾmr* (// *ʿny*). Alternatively, the *r* could simply be deleted.

[*b*]⌈*št*⌉ = *bʾšt*(ʾ) "in fire." The identity of the last two signs cannot be established from our photographs or from the microfilm, but the papyrus itself retains enough of their contours to make the above reading[64] plausible, even without the help of synonymous parallelism. The word for fire may be in any state: construct (*bʾšt* "in fire of"), determined (*bʾštʾ* "in fire"; cf. Cowley 31:11), or absolute (*bʾšh* "in fire"; cf. Cowley 30:12). (The last possibility presupposes that the word ends with *š* and that the following sign, *t*, is the beginning of the next word.) It is not clear whether "in fire" is the beginning of Mar's response or a modifier of *ʿny wʾmr* "spoke up and said." The latter alternative is presupposed by the first interpretation of *t.t.ḥr*[*k*]⌈*ᵐ*⌉ below; the former alternative is assumed by the second and third interpretations.

⌈*p*⌉*bn̄.rᵐ* = *pbnwr* "and in flames," cf. *p̄* = *p* "and" in XIII/9, quoted above (Commentary to *wnšmn*//*wnrwh*). However, the reading of the first sign is problematic. Today it looks like *ʿ*, but that is apparently due to the fact that the strip of papyrus containing the bottom of the sign is folded over. In the original photographs, it has a horizontal base which makes it look something like *p̄*.— Just below the first sign, there is a dem. *aleph* which is probably to be read with it rather than with the *rᵐ* below it, since the latter sequence already has an aleph preceding it.

t.t.ḥr[*k*]⌈*ᵐ*⌉ = *dy-tḥrk* "which burn" or *tṭhrk* "let it (fem.) be burned" or *ʾth-tḥrk* "you shall burn (it)." The initial dem. *t* is problematic in all three interpretations—in the first because the transformation *dy* + *finite verb* → *participle* ought to be triggered here (cf. Dan. 3:6 ff. *nwrʾ ykdtʾ* "burning fire," 7:9 *nwr dlk*); in the second because there is no obvious feminine subject; and in the third because the independent pronoun *ʾth* "you" is superfluous here (although cf. *e.n.e.kr.ᵐ* = *ʾnh-ʾklh* "I will cause to perish" in line 15, below). Is this another instance of dittography?

[*e.*]⌈*n*⌉*ᵐ* = *ʾn* "if." We have placed the *n* in half-brackets only because it is a bit larger than usual. The restoration of the first two signs rests on the assumption that this form is parallel to *e.nᵐ* in line 13.

(13) .⌈*tys.krb*⌉[*n*]*k.ᵐ* = (*ʾt-*)*tsyḳ-ḳrbnk* "you will cause your sacrifice to ascend." Almost all of these signs are gone now. In the original photographs, the traces of ⌈*tys.*⌉ are reasonably unambiguous, the traces read here (by RCS) as ⌈*kr*⌉ are slightly ambiguous, and the traces read (by RCS) as ⌈*b*⌉ are highly ambiguous. Our interpretation assumes that the scribe has reversed the order of *s* and *y*—a mistake which the similarity of these two signs could have helped to bring about. The *k* serves both as the last letter of *tsyḳ* and the first letter of *ḳrbnk*; cf. *m.še.r.b.n.ᵐ* = *mšʾl-lbn* in X1/16[65] among other clear parallels. It is possible that the *t* of our form also does double duty.[66] The *aleph* at the beginning of our form may indicate the presence of a vowel there, in which case it is probably to be interpreted as *ʾt-tsyḳ-ḳrbnk*. For the use of the independent pronoun with the imperfect, cf. *e.n.e.kr.ᵐ* = *ʾnh-ʾklh* (line 15) and possibly

63 Melamed, "Break-up of Stereotype Phrases."
64 By RCS.
65 See our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," p. 268.

66 This term is accurate from the morphophonemic point of view, but not from the phonetic point of view, since there was probably only one segment in such cases, albeit a long one.

t.t.ḥr[*k*]$^{'m'}$ = $^{?}$*t-tḥrk* (?) (line 12). Some of the instances here may express the kind of emphasis which English expresses with contrastive stress: if *you* (do good things), then *I* (will do good things). The *ḳal* of *slḳ* is used of burnt offerings several times in the column following ours, in a passage which may well be a sequel to ours.[67] The word *ḳrbn* occurs in Late and Middle Aramaic and perhaps also in Imperial and Old Aramaic.[68] For a probable occurrence in the papyrus itself, see Addendum.

mr$^{w'r}$ = *mr(h)* "Mar(ah)." The deity's name is written here with a group of signs which in demotic means "river-bank" (Coptic MHP). This group of signs occurs fourteen times in the papyrus. In at least three—and possibly as many as seven—of these occurrences, the context shows that the reference is to a goddess. The occurrence in VII/2[69] shows that this female goddess is the consort of Mar. There, as here, the name occurs in parallelism with that of Mar.

$\overline{mnn}\overline{tr}k.$$^{'m'}$ = *mn-$^{?}$trk* "from your place," i.e., your place of exile in Egypt, in contrast to your homeland, mentioned next.

wrš.^{w} = *w$^{?}$rš* "and (from) $^{?}$RŠ." The importance of this toponym to the community which produced this text is obvious from its frequency of occurrence; its two dozen occurrences make it by far the most common toponym in the text. The fact that it is virtually always written with the goddess determinative points, perhaps, in the same direction. It is the place where Mar's temple is located (cf. X/8–9 $\overline{mwt}.b.n^e$ $k\overline{ry}.$$^{'m'}$ *b.r̄.š.*^{w} = *mwtbn $^{?}$gry b$^{?}$rš* "the seat of my temple is in $^{?}$RŠ" and VII/2 *y.b̄r̄^{r}k.k̄*[.]$^{'m'}$ *mr* $\overline{mnrš.}$^{w} = *ybrkk Mr mn $^{?}$rš* "bless you will Mar from $^{?}$RŠ"), and hence it is also (1) the place from which Mar sends his emissary in time of trouble (cf. XI/13);[70] (2) the place from which Mar himself goes out or from which he went out when his worshipers emigrated to Egypt (cf. X/16 *mr*^{m} *n.p.k.*$^{'m'}$ $\overline{mnn}r.š.$^{w} = *Mr npk mn-$^{?}$rš* "Mar who goes/went out of $^{?}$RŠ"); and (3) the place from which burnt offerings ascend to Mar (cf. our passage).

In our first article, we vocalized $^{?}$*rš* as Arash, but we were unable to identify this crucial toponym.[71] It has since occurred to us that $^{?}$*rš* (usually shortened to *rš* in the papyrus) may be cuneiform Araši (usually called Raši, Rašu). Arashi appears in Neo-Assyrian documents as "a land located near the Elamite-Babylonian border and much involved in Elamite affairs."[72] The Elamite connection led ultimately, it seems, to Arashi's undoing. It was captured by Ashurbanipal at the beginning of his eighth campaign[73]—a campaign designed to punish Elam for having supported Shamash-shum-ukin's revolt against him. Ashurbanipal does not tell us what punishment he meted out to Arashi, but it seems likely that he treated it the way he treated Elam proper, ravaging the land,[74] destroying its temples,[75] and deporting its people to the far

---

[67] The passage is translated in the Discussion, below.

[68] Cf. Maurice Sznycer, "Trois fragments de papyri araméens d'Égypte d'époque perse" in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), pp. 169–71.

[69] The passage of which this is a part is translated in the Discussion, below.

[70] See again our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," pp. 263–64.

[71] Ibid., p. 266.

[72] J. A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*, AnOr 43 (Rome, 1968), p. 282, n. 1830.

[73] D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. 2 (New York, 1927), § 805.

[74] Ibid., § 811.

[75] Ibid., § 810.

southwest.[76] If those were, in fact, the consequences of Shamash-shum-ukin's revolt for the people of Arashi, it is easy to understand why they preserved a story about that revolt[77] for half a millennium and incorporated it into a *religious* document like our papyrus, of which it constitutes a full 20 percent. This reconstruction may also explain why the year of Shamash-shum-ukin's birth is described in the papyrus (XVII/10–11) as a year stricken by the curse of Deut. 28:23: *šnt.^{m} ʾyyrt^m m.r.n.^{m} e.ḥ.n.^{m} sr.^{m} m̄n̄ky^m .rk^m h.w^m n.ḥ.š.n^m šm.y.^{m} iprs.rn^m ʿ.pr̄.^{m}* = *šnt^ʾ dy-yld mrʾn ʾhn srmky ʾlk hw‹w› nhšn šmyʾ dy-przln ʿprʾ* "the year in which our lord, our brother, Sarmuge (Shamash-shum-ukin) was born to/for you the heavens were (pieces of) bronze, the ground was of (pieces of) iron" (cf. Esarhaddon's vassal treaties, *ANET*, p. 539, §§ 63–64).

Another possibility is that *ʾrš* is modern El-Arish (al-ʿArīš). The substitution of ʿ for ʾ is not as much of a problem as it appears to be at first glance. The same substitution is attested in many other Palestinian toponyms.[78] Moreover, in this case, the resulting toponym is identical to a common noun (with the meaning "bower, shack, trellis"), so that we can also posit a folk etymology to explain the change.[79] The main evidence for this identification comes from VII/2 where *rš.^{w}* and *š.w̄r* form a parallel pair, followed by VII/3, where *t̄s.p.n.^{m}* and *rp̄ḥ.h^m* are in parallelism.[80] Now, *rp̄ḥ.h^{m81}* is almost certainly Raphia, on the northern coast of Sinai, which means that the *t̄s.p.n.^{m}* = Zephon referred to in the parallel hemistich is the one on the northern coast of Sinai (or Egypt) rather than the one in Syria.[82] This suggests that *š.w̄r* in the preceding line is biblical Shur—also in northern Sinai. El-Arish fits perfectly into this pattern. Additional evidence for this identification is the fact that the chief god of Gaza, according to Byzantine writers, was called *Marna(s)*—a name which Naveh has connected with the name *ʿbdmrʾn* on a fourth–third century B.C.E. ostracon believed to have been found in the area of Raphia.[83] The divine name *Mrʾn-Marna(s)* (lit., "our lord") is the closest parallel we have found to the divine name Mar (lit., "lord") found throughout the papyrus. As such, it provides another link between our papyrus and the northern coast of Sinai.

(14) [*e.h.wb.t.^{m}*] = *ʾhwbd* "I will destroy." Like all restorations in full brackets, this one is only a conjecture; but it is worth noting that in the original photos, a small fragment with the sign *w* on it is shown lying upside-down on some shreds of papyrus not far from the spot where the above restoration assumes that a *w* once stood.

[*b*]^r.ʾy.myk.^{m} = *bymyk* "in your days." Despite the fact that diphthongs are normally uncontracted in this text, the plural of *ywm* "day" occurs several times without *waw*, e.g., XVII/13–14 *y.M̄n t̄rhw.w.n^m š.n..n^m t̄rp.kw̄* = *ymyn dy-lʾ-hwwn šnyn dy-lʾ-ʾpkw*

---

[76] Elamites from Susa were settled in Samaria and Elamites from Kirbit in Egypt; see B. Oded, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden, 1979), p. 28. The Arashians may have accompanied the former and migrated later to Egypt, or they may have gone directly to Egypt with the latter.

[77] We owe the identification of the historical background of this story to J. C. Greenfield. The same identification appeared subsequently in Vleeming and Wesselius, "Aramaic Hymn," p. 501.

[78] Kutscher, *Studies*, pp. 87–88.

[79] For the effect of folk-etymology on Palestinian toponyms, see A. F. Rainey, "The Toponymics of Eretz-Israel," *BASOR* 231 (1978): 8.

[80] The passage is translated in the Discussion, below.

[81] The sign *ḥ* is a phonetic complement of the sign *ph*, despite the *aleph* which separates them.

[82] See again our joint article, p. 266.

[83] Naveh, "Phls," p. 273.

"days which never were, years which *were* not *spent*" (alongside XVII/9 $y.\dot{w}\overline{Mn}$[83a] and XVIII/1 $y\dot{w}.\overline{Mn}$ in the same refrain). This form, like Heb. *yāmim* and, according to some,[84] Samalian *wbymy* "and in my days" (Hadad 9, 10), is apparently a survival of an original biliteral form.

$\overline{w}.{}^{c}.\check{s}.n^{\ulcorner}t^{\urcorner}.k.^{m} = w^{c}\check{s}ntk$ "and during your years."[85] This ^{c} is in all likelihood ${}^{c}l$[86] with its final consonant assimilated to the *š* of *šntk*; cf. Cowley 45:3 ${}^{c}dbr<{}^{c}l\ dbr$ "concerning" and BJA prefixed ${}^{\flat}-<{}^{c}l$ "on, ..."[87] For the assimilation of word-final *l* to word-initial *š*, cf. XVI/17 $b^{c}\check{s}myn^{g} =$ Hat.[88] and Nab.[89] $b^{c}\check{s}myn$ "Baal of Heaven" (Punic $b^{c}\check{s}mm$)[90] and XII/9 $\check{s}.\overline{r}.n.b.^{m}\ \check{s}rk.n\overline{r}.^{m} = \check{s}r\text{-}nb(l)\ \check{s}r\text{-}knr$ "harp music, lyre music." For ${}^{c}l$ meaning "during" cf. Nab. ${}^{c}l\ \check{s}ny\ \underline{h}rtt\ mlk\ nb\underline{t}w$ "during the years of Haretat, king of Nabatea," ${}^{c}l\ \underline{h}yy$ "during the lifetime of," etc.[91] Less likely, but still possible, is ${}^{c}<{}^{c}d$; cf. Cowley 30:20 $w^{c}znh\ ywm^{\flat}$ corrected to $w^{c}d\ znh\ ywm^{\flat}$ "and until this day" (although the *z* of *znh* is probably a historical spelling for *d* and hence not strictly comparable to the *š* of *šntk*). For ${}^{c}d$ meaning "during"—not in the sense of "*before* the end of" (i.e., "at some point during") but rather in the sense of "*until* the end of"— cf. Syr. ${}^{c}d\ zbn\ (\underline{k}lyl)$ "for a (little) while," ${}^{c}d\ ywmt$ "for a few days," BH (Job!) ${}^{c}dy\ rg^{c}$ "for a moment" (where "for" = "until the end of"). In the last analysis, it may not even be necessary for us to choose between ${}^{c}l$ and ${}^{c}d$, since there is a surprising amount of interchange between them in Aramaic (and Hebrew).[92] Indeed, the assimilation of final *l/d* attested in our papyrus may well be the cause of this interchange.

ymyk "your days" // *šntk* "your years"; cf. XVII/9–10, XVIII/13–14, XVII/1 $y(w)mn\ dy\text{-}l^{\flat}\text{-}hww(n)$ // $\check{s}nyn\ dy\text{-}l^{\flat}\text{-}{}^{\flat}pkw$ "days which never were // years which *were* not *spent*." The pair is a common one.[93]

$ym\underline{h}.^{m} = {}^{\flat}ym\underline{h}^{\flat}$ "I shall smite"; cf. V/7 (bis), X/11 $y.m\underline{h}. = ym\underline{h}^{\flat}$ "he shall smite." In our first article, we took it for granted that in $y.r\overline{h}.n^{w} = {}^{\flat}lhn$ "our god," the *y* of the former renders the ${}^{\flat}$ of the latter.[94] We now realize that it is possible that the *y* (or rather *y.*) of $y.r\overline{h}.n^{w}$ represents the *e* of *ʾelāhanā*, and that the initial glottal stop of the latter is, as usual, not represented in the demotic transcription at all.[95] The same possibility exists for the *y* of XVII/15 $ysr^{m}\ r.k^{g} = {}^{\flat}yzyl\ lk$ "go, get thee" (cf. Onk. to

---

[83a] The $\dot{w}$ in this form is crowded between—and noticeably fainter than—the signs before and after it. Could it be a later addition?

[84] H. L. Ginsberg, "The Northwest Semitic Languages" in B. Mazar, ed., *The World History of the Jewish People*, vol. 2 (Patriarchs) (New Brunswick, 1970), p. 270, n. 10, and S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), §3.8.5.2.4; but cf. P. E. Dion, *La Langue de Yaʾudi* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1974), pp. 72–73.

[85] We are indebted to J. Blau for the insight that $\check{s}.n^{\ulcorner}t^{\urcorner}.k.^{m}$ is a separate word, parallel to $y.myk.^{m}$.

[86] We had rejected this interpretation in favor of ${}^{c}d$ until S. Shaked called our attention to the temporal usage of ${}^{c}l$ in Nabatean discussed below.

[87] Cf. J. N. Epstein, *Dikduk ʾaramit bavlit* (Jerusalem, 1960), pp. 132–36.

[88] H. Donner and W. Röllig, *KAI* 244:1, 3; 245:1; 246:2; 247:3. (We are indebted to J. Naveh for this reference.)

[89] *CIS* ii 163:c.

[90] Donner and Röllig, 64:1.

[91] Cf. Y. Yadin, "Expedition D—The Cave of the Letters," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 240. (We are indebted to J. Naveh for this reference.)

[92] Cf. Greenfield, "The Prepositions ${}^{c}ad/{}^{c}al$ in Aramaic and Hebrew," *BSOAS* 40 (1977): 371–72.

[93] Cf. Dahood, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs," p. 205, and Y. Avishur, *Ketovot finikiyyot we-ha-mikra* (Jerusalem, 1979), pp. 68–70, 146; and add now Tell Siran 7 (H. O. Thompson and F. Zayadine, "The Tell Siran Inscription," *BASOR* 212 [1973]: 9) and Tell Fekherye 7–8 (A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bondreuil, and A. R. Millard, *La Statue de Tell Fekherye* [Paris, 1982], p. 23).

[94] See our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6." p. 268. The overline of the $\overline{h}$ was inadvertently omitted there.

[95] Ibid., p. 263.

Gen. 12:1, 22:2 ꜣyzyl lk), XIII/6 y.nt.t.ky^m = ꜣynttky "your (fem.!) wife," XVI/8 ykrky^m = ꜣygrky "your (fem.) temple" and the y of our form. Indeed, the entire assumption that dem. y can render Aram. ꜣ needs to be reexamined. The proto-form of Aram. mḫꜣ contains a velar ḫ (cf. Ug. mḫṣ "smite," ESA mhḍ, MSA mḫẓ) and so do the demotic renderings.

⌐š꜀[nꜣyk] "your enemies" // ꜣy[byk] "your adversaries" // [ḡryk] "your foes"; cf. Dan. 4:16 lśnꜣyk "for your enemies" // l꜀ryk "for your foes" and Ps. 139:20–22 ꜀ryk "your foes" ... mśnꜣyk "your enemies" ... ꜣwybym "adversaries."[96]

(15) e.n.e.ḳr.^{m} = ꜣnh-ꜣklh "I shall cause to perish." The fact that medial ꜣ is normally elided in this text[97] makes it likely that e.ḳr.^{m} is a separate word, despite the absence of a determinative before it. A ḳal form of kly with the meaning "perish" occurs in Enoch 107:1 wḥmsꜣ yklꜣ mn ꜣr꜀ꜣ "and violence shall perish from the earth."[98]

ḳ⌐t⌐myk.^{m} = ḳdmyk "before you." Two different nuances are possible: (1) "before you in battle, before your onslaught"; cf. Onk. to Deut. 28:7 ytyn YWY yt b꜀ly dbbk dkymyn ꜀lk tbyryn ḳdmk "may the Lord cause your enemies who rise up against you to be broken before you," and (2) "before your eyes"; cf. Jer. 29:21 whkm l꜀ynykm "and he shall smite them before your eyes." Nuance (2) is suggested by the apparent vertical parallelism between ḳdmyk and bymyk "in your days"; cf. Jer. 16:9 hnny mšbyt mn hmkwm hzh l꜀ynykm wbymykm ... "I am going to cut off from this place, in front of your eyes and in your days, ..." Each of the two initial consonants (viz., ḳ and ⌐t⌐) is written above an aleph.

r.ḳrk.^{m} = lgrk "your foot"; cf. XXI/4 r.ḳryk.^{m} M̄nk.b.r.n^m = lgryk mn-kh-bln "carry your feet from here"[99] and IVa/13 b.r̄[.]š.^{w} ⌐ḳ⌐.bš.r.ḳr̄[.hy^m] = bꜣrš kbš-lgr[hy] "in Arashi is his footstool." The use of r̄ (which renders Aram. l only rarely) to write the second liquid of the word in three places in the papyrus suggests that we are dealing here with the metathesized form of Sem. rgl "foot," known hitherto only from Old Aramaic (Panamuwa 16 blgry "at the feet of") and Late Aramaic (Mand. lygrꜣ "foot" > BJA nygrꜣ "(foot)step," nygry dprzlꜣ "iron feet/shoes").[100]

꜀r$^{w/g w/g}$ = ꜀l "on." The sign following the first walking-legs determinative (always used with this word in the papyrus) looks more like a second walking-legs determinative than like a t. Four or five other clear examples of dittography have been identified in the papyrus thus far.

ḥer̄t.hn^w = ꜣhrthn "their back(s)"; cf. BH ꜣhry "back of" (vocalized ꜣāḥōrê and ꜣaḥărê), Arabic muꜣaḫḫaru r-raꜣs "back of the head," and Aram. ꜣhr(y) "after, behind." Our interpretation assumes that the scribe has reversed the order of ḥ and e. The proto-form has a velar ḫ (cf. Arabic muꜣaḫḫaru r-raꜣs "back of the head, ESA ꜣḫrn "latter," Ug. aḫr "after") and so does the demotic rendering. The feminine marker t is unexpected, but, as mentioned in the Commentary to bh̄ter^m t.h.n^m (lines 4–5, above),

[96] We are indebted to J. C. Greenfield for the latter parallel. For additional parallels, see Dahood, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs," pp. 97–99.

[97] See our "Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2–6," p. 263.

[98] J. T. Milik, The Books of Enoch (Oxford, 1976), p. 210.

[99] Cf. Gen. 29:1 wyśꜣ y꜀kb rglyw "Jacob picked up/carried his feet."

[100] Cf. Dion, Yaꜣudi, p. 117; S. Krauss, Tosefot he-꜀arux ha-šalem (Vienna, 1926), p. 276; and Epstein, Dikduk ꜣaramit bavlit, p. 19. (We are indebted to S. Morag for the last reference.)

the assumption of fluctuation in gender is less radical than the assumption of inter-
change between *d-* (the allomorph of the genitive marker used before nouns) and *dl-*
(the allomorph of the genitive marker used before pronouns) necessitated by the
alternative interpretation of *t.hn*ʷ as *dhn* "of them."

lgrk ⁽l ⁾hrthn "your foot (will be) on your back(s)"; cf. Deut. 33:29 *wᵒth ⁽l bmwtymw*
tdrk "and you shall tread on their backs,"[101] Josh. 10:24 *śymw ᵒt rglykm ⁽l śwᵒry*
hmlkym h⁾lh "put your feet on the necks of these kings," and Akkadian (*kišād*) X
(*ana/ina šēpē*) *kabāsu/kubbusu* "step on (the neck of) X (with one's feet), vanquish
X." (Cf. also the West Semitic expressions meaning "to place X under one's foot,
vanquish X" which Greenfield has interpreted in the light of representations of Egypt's
enemies lying under the Egyptian king's feet.)[102]

(16) [*e.tm.*]⌐*ky*⌐*myn.*⌐*k*⌐ = *ᵒtmk-ymynk* "I will support your hand"; cf. XV/3–4 *b⁽rᵍ*
š.mynᵍ t.mkᵐ ḥ.s.n.kyᵐ .r͞pp.ᵐ nbwyᵈᵉᵗ n.t.r.kyᵐ = *b⁽l šmyn tmkky ḥsnky ᵒlpᵒ nbw*
ntrky "Baal of Heaven is your support, your strength is *the Bull*, Nabû is your
guardian." Isa. 41:13 *ᵒny YYY ᵒlhyk mḥzyk ymynk* "I am the Lord your God who
strengthens/grasps your right hand," Isa. 41:10 *tmktyk bymyn ṣdky* "I support you
with my faithful/victorious right hand," Exod. 17:12 *wᵒhrn wḥwr tmkw bydyw* "and
Aaron and Hur supported his hands."

⌐*e.b*⌐*r*⌐*k.k*⌐ᵐ = *ᵒbrkk* "I will bless you." Only traces of the word remain, and they are
clearest on the papyrus itself. It was only at the end of an entire afternoon at the
Pierpont Morgan Library that RCS was able to make sense of these traces. The dem.
aleph which follows *e* is written above the line.

⌐ᵒ*b*⌐*r*⌐*kk*⌐ *bšlm* "I will bless you with peace/well-being"; cf. Ps. 29:11 *YYY ybrk ᵒt*
⁽*mw bšlwm* "the Lord will bless his people with peace/well-being."

*by.t.k.*ᵐ = *bytk* "your house." The suffixed pronoun *-k* probably precludes any
syntactic connection with the preceding word (*bšlm*), despite Job 21:9 *btyhm šlwm*
"their houses are secure" and Cowley 34:7 *šlm bytk* "greetings to your house" (neither
of which is a perfect parallel to **šlm byt* "well-being of house" in any case).

(17) ⌐⁽⌐*r.*⌐*w*⌐*yk.*ᵐ = ⁽*lwyk* "on you"; cf. Cowley 5:6, 9 ⁽*lwy* "on," Cowley 5:11
⁽*lwyh* "on it" and ⁽*lwy* in the Late Aramaic dialects. Everywhere else in the papyrus
we find ⁽*lyk*, etc. We have reluctantly rejected the possibility that this form means
"your holocausts" since the latter is fem. plur. (⁽*lwn*, ⁽*lwt*, ⁽*lwt-*) in all dialects that we
know of.

DISCUSSION

That our poem is a polemic of some kind is clear from the concluding stich of
Stanza 1, where the poet denounces a certain belief as "foolishness" and "bitters," and
from the concluding stich of Stanza 2, where the poet, escalating the stridency of his
rhetoric, condemns that same belief as "venom" and "poison." What is this belief that

---

[101] Cf. Ug. *bmt* "back." The ancient versions,
perhaps influenced by Josh. 10:24, take *bmwt* in this
verse to mean "necks."

[102] Greenfield, "Heᶜarot li-xtovet Azitawada (Kara-
tepe)." *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978): 74. To the Egyptian

material collected by Ruehlmann (ibid., n. 1), add
that collected by D. Wildung, "Der König Ägyptens
als Herr der Welt?" *AfO* 24 (1973). (We are indebted
to J. C. Greenfield for the latter reference.)

the poet repudiates so vehemently, in stichs occupying two of the three most prominent positions in the poem? From the rhetorical question which immediately precedes each of these stichs—"Did they support the life of the god of ʾRŠ, Mar?"—we may deduce that the object of the poet's wrath is the belief that Mar is nourished—indeed, kept alive—by the food and drink (specifically the flesh and blood) served at the sacrificial banquets of his worshipers. At first glance, this looks like a rejection of the entire pagan conception of sacrifice[103] comparable to Ps. 50:13 "Do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of he-goats?" However, further reflection reveals a second interpretation, in which the poet accepts (indeed, takes for granted) the pagan view that the gods need sacrificial animals to survive, rejecting only the idea that this need can be satisfied at a sacrificial banquet attended by gluttonous humans who have no qualms about fattening themselves at the expense of others. In this interpretation, it is, of course, not merely a belief which the poet is rejecting; it is either the entire institution of the sacrificial meal or else a widespread attitude[104] or practice (possibly the practice of eating portions traditionally designated for Mar's consumption) subversive of the intent of that institution.

Whether the first interpretation given above is capable of explaining the connection between the various parts of the poem remains to be seen. The second interpretation, however, provides a simple explanation for several (although not all) of the key relationships in the piece. The questions "What should I do?" and "What should I bring?" are easy to understand if the lines which follow deny—at least conditionally— the efficacy of the most common and basic rite of the sacrificial cults in the ancient world.[105] Similarly, the expressions "in flames {let it/you shall make (it)} bur[n]" and "ʿyou shall cause to ascend⟩" in Mar's answer to the above questions are easy to explain if the poet has repudiated the sacrificial meal or some perversion of it, since the only alternative to eating sacrifices (in the Semitic world, at least) is burning them[106]—a practice for which verbs meaning "cause to ascend" are frequently employed. It should also be noted that these references to burning—somewhat uncertain because of the damaged condition of lines 12–13—are corroborated by similar references in col. VII,[107] which appears to be intimately connected to our column.

Before turning our attention to col. VII, it may be advisable to present, in outline form, a summary of our interpretation of col. VI (with line numbers in parentheses):

I. First Priest's Prayer
   A. Request for divine guidance: what is the preferred method of presenting offerings? (2)
   B. Confession of innocence (3)

[103] Cf. Y. Kaufmann, *Toledot ha-ʾemunah ha-yiśra ʾelit* (Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv, 1960), vol. 1, pp. 399–401.

[104] We are indebted to S. Shaked for suggesting this less radical aternative.

[105] Cf. R. K. Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (London, 1953), pp. 20 ff., 68 ff.; W. R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, 3d ed. (London, 1927), p. 255.

[106] For the notion that men would rather eat sacrificial meat than burn it, cf. Jer. 7:21.

[107] These references would seem to show that the Arameans (if this label can be applied to the authors of our papyrus) did belong to that group of Semites which practiced the burning of sacrifices - a proposition labeled "questionable" by L. Rost, "Erwägungen zum israelitischen Brandopfer" in J. Hempel and L. Rost, eds., *Von Ugarit nach Qumran* (Berlin, 1961), p. 179.

    C. Polemic against eating (Mar's portion of) offerings (4–8)
      1. Mar gives people a lamb (4–5)
      2. They gorge themselves on its flesh and blood (5–7)
      3. They claim that they have thereby supported Mar's life (7)
      4. But they are speaking nonsense (7–8)
  II. Second Priest's Prayer
    A. Request for divine guidance: what is the preferred method of presenting
      offerings? (8–9)
    B. Confession of innocence (9)
    C. Polemic against eating (Mar's portion of) offerings (10–12)
      1. Mar gives people sweets (10)
      2. They claim that by eating them they are supporting Mar's life (11)
      3. But they are speaking vile lies (11–12)
 III. Mar's response
    A. Food for me should be burned in fire (12)
    B. If you make (my portion of) your offering ascend to me (instead of eating it
      yourself) (12–13)
    C. I will shower blessings upon you (14–18)

Turning now to col. VII, we find that it begins with a series of blessings[108] which, despite the appearance of Mar in the third person instead of the first, must be seen as a continuation of the blessings at the end of our poem:

. . . {I have blessed you/your blessings} . . . will bless you. Bless you will Mar from ʾRŠ; Mar(ah) from Shur/Ashur will bless you. Bless you will Baal from Zephon; Padri from Raphia (rph.hᵐ) will bless you. Bless you will Bel from Babylon; Belit from Esangila will bless you. Bless you will Nebo from Borsippa; Nanai from Ayakku will bless you. Bless you will the Throne of Horus and Sar from . . . (krs. H̄r w.s.r̄.ᵐ m̄nnk.bᵐ).

    Immediately following these blessings, there is suddenly talk of fire, of lambs and goats ascending, of the aroma of burning fat:[109]

I shall set fire (e.šyt.nᵐ) and I shall offer (it) up as an ᶜolah in fire (w̄. ᶜryb.š.ᵐ).[110] Ascend to ʾRŠ, O lamb (s.k.r̄š.ᵐ eymrᵐ), ascend to ʾRŠ. Ascend, O holocaust-aroma (s.w̄t),[111] to Mar; he will bless you. Ascend . . . to Anat (ᶜnntᵐ) and . . . to Nebo . . . Let sixty . . . ascend to Mar's memory, and let Mar remember them. Mar will bless you. Let sixty . . . ascend to Mar's memory. His handfuls of myrrh and frankincense (ᶜ.p.nwhyᵍ m.r.ᵐ r.bwn.ᵐ) to the nostrils (m̄nnh̄r.[y]ʳ.ᵛᵐ) of Bethel. Let sixty lambs ascend to Mar's memory . . . a shining-white lamb to you, Mar of Heaven. The smoke of goats comes nigh unto you (t.ntᵐ t̄s. ᶜr̄.ʳnᵛᵐ k̄r.bᵐ ᶜryk.ᵐ).

    The transition between these two parts of col. VII is extremely abrupt, unless of course the subject of burnt offerings was introduced already in lines 12–13 of col. VI.

---

[108] Published in part by Bowman, "Aramaic Religious Text," pp. 227 ff.

[109] The following translation is a preliminary one, offered only for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of col. VI.

[110] Our interpretation takes ʾᶜly here to be a technical term derived from ᶜl(w)h "holocaust" or a borrowing from Canaanite.

[111] Cf. J. Payne Smith, A Compendious Syriac Dictionary (Oxford, 1903), p. 371, s.v. swtʾ.

We believe that this is in fact the case, and that cols. VI and VII together make up a liturgical composition recited by Arashian/Arishan priests when offering up holocausts to Mar and the rest of their pantheon.

APPENDIX

As pointed out in n. 13, above, the fact that dem. *aleph* in initial position appears to be a reliable indicator of the presence of a vowel is evidence against our earlier interpretation (p. 268) of XI/16 .*rb.kšt^m.rb.ḥnt.^{m}* as *lbkšt lb-bḥnt* "the request of heart(s) which you have tested." Accordingly, we should probably follow Vleeming and Wesselius (p. 508) in interpreting it as *ʾlh bkšt ʾlh bḥnt* "some with the bow, some with the spear" (corresponding to Ps. 20:8 *ʾlh brkb wʾlh bswsym* "some with chariots, some with horses") followed by *ʾry/w ʾnḥn* "behold we" (corresponding to Ps. 20:8 *wʾnḥnw* "and we"). It is true that in Hebrew, the usual correlate of *ḥnyt* "spear" is *ḥrb* "sword," but cf. Ps. 46:10 *kšt yšbr wkṣṣ ḥnyt* "He shatters the bow and chops up the spear." This interpretation allows us to replace our reading *ʿyp̱.n.^{m}* in line 17 with the paleographically superior reading *ʿy$\overline{\overline{mn}}$.n.^{m}* = *ʿymn* "(is) with us" (not *ʿy$\overline{mw}$.n.^{m}* attached to the following clause, as Vleeming and Wesselius would have it), yielding *ʾry/w ʾnḥn Mr ʾlhn H̄r YH(W)(H) ʾln ʿymn* "As for us—Mar our god, Horus, YH(W)(H), our god, is with us." This hemistich corresponds nicely with Ps. 20:8b, but also bears a strong similarity to Ps. 46:12a *YYY Ṣbʾwt ʿmnw* (as well as Judg. 6:13, 1 Kings 8:57, Isa. 8:10). We have already noted the similarity between the preceding hemistich and Ps. 46:10b. These similarities may be combined with others noted in our first article to produce the following chart:

Ps. 46	pAmh 63, col. XI	Ps. 20
$^{(10b)}$kšt yšbr wkṣṣ ḥnyt,	$^{(16)}$ʾlh bkšt ʾlh bḥnt	$^{(8)}$ʾlh brkb wʾlh bswsym,
ʿglwt yśrp bʾš.		
$^{(12)}$YYY Ṣbʾwt ʿmnw, mśgb	$^{(17)}$ʾry/w ʾnḥn Mr ʾlhn Hr	wʾnḥnw bšm YYY ʾlhynw
lnw ʾlhy Yʿkb slh.	YH(W)(H) ʾln ʿymn.	nzkyr.
		$^{(9)}$hmh krʿw wnplw,
		wʾnḥnw kmnw wntʿwdd.
		$^{(10)}$YYY hwsyʿh, hmlk
	yʿnn$^{(18)}$mhr ʾl-Byt-ʾl, Bʿl	yʿnnw bywm krʾnw.
	šmyn Mr ybrk. lḥsydyk	
	brktk.	

The correspondence of XI/17 with Ps. 20:8b greatly increases the number of 1st person pl. pronouns in the second half of Ps. 20 which have parallels in the paganized version, thereby corroborating H. L. Ginsberg's suggestion (apud Nims and Steiner, p. 220, n. 17) that the nearly consistent use of 1st person pl. pronouns throughout the paganized version (even in places where Ps. 20 has 2d person masc. sing. pronouns) is due to harmonization. The only 2d person masc. sing. pronoun to escape this leveling process was the one at the end of *syrk* "your emissary"—a fine example of an exception proving (i.e., testing and, in the end, confirming) the rule. This particular 2d person masc. sing. pronoun could not be altered because of a syntactico-semantic constraint:

the possessive pronoun attached to *syr* refers to the sender of the latter (rather than the addressee) and therefore must agree with the subject of *šlḥ* "send" as in Isa. 57:9 *wtšlḥy syryk* "you sent your emissaries" and Gen. 24:7 *hwʾ yšlḥ mlʾkw lpnyk* "He will send His emissary before you." (We are indebted to A. Dotan for the latter example.) Once jussive *yšlḥ* was altered to imperative *šlḥ* to agree with the possessive pronoun of *syrk* (a change which became necessary when *syrk* replaced ʿ*zrk* "someone to help you," in which the pronoun had been objective rather than possessive), that pronoun had to remain as it was in order to preserve the requisite agreement. This reconstruction—in which the psalm's pattern of pronouns is assumed to be original—would seem to be the only possible explanation for the appearance of *šlḥ syrk* in the paganized version instead of something like **yšlḥ ln syr* "may he send us an emissary," with jussive verb and 1st person pl. pronoun as in the lines preceding and following.

<p style="text-align:center">ADDENDUM</p>

P. 91—further work on the papyrus has revealed a possible instance of the contraction of *aw* in a closed syllable.

Pp. 92, 93, 95 and 100—our most recent work on the problem of dem. - makes it likely that that sign is used in our papyrus to render Aram. *n*, except for a few instances in which the scribe intended to write the very similar dem. *e*. (The impression that - had some non-phonetic meaning was due mainly to the cases in which it is made redundant by a following *n* serving as a phonetic complement; cf. the use of *p* as a phonetic complement of *p̄*.) If so, the next-to-last word in line 5 is to be read *ṅ.m.ty*ᵐ = *nmṭy* "let us bring" (a reading which fits the context better), and the third word in line 9 is to be read *ṅmyty*ᵐ and emended to *emyty*ᵐ so that it matches the corresponding form in stanza 1 (line 2).

P. 96—our derivation of the divine name *mr*ᵐ from Aram. *mrʾ* "lord" is confirmed by XX/2 (cited in the Commentary to *t.ny*ᵐ in line 4) and the parallel in XXI/2, where *mr*ᵐ is used in addressing a *human* lord.

P. 106 top—the word *krbn* occurs, in all likelihood, in a Hebraizing section of the papyrus: XII/2 *n.s.b.ḥ*ᵐ *r.k.*ᵐ *b..rḥ̄ʿ.n*ⁱʷ *kr[b].n*ᵐ = *nzbḥ lk b<l>-ʾlhn kr[b]n* "we shall sacrifice to you, Bel, our god, a sacrifice.

P. 106 bottom—the destruction of Arashi is, in fact, mentioned by Ashurbanipal; see M. Streck, *Assurbanipal*, vol. 1, pp. cccxxxiv, cccxxxvii, cccxliii.

P. 107—H. Tadmor raises the possibility that ʾRŠ is Esarhaddon's Arza, a place on the Egyptian border which may or may not be identical with El-Arish; see idem, "Philistia under Assyrian Rule," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 29 (1966): 97.

P. 109—for an example of metathesis involving precisely the same consonants, see p. 97, above.