C. L. CROUCH
JEREMY M. HUTTON

Translating Empire

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
135

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Herausgegeben von

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

135

C. L. Crouch
Jeremy M. Hutton

Translating Empire

Tell Fekheriyeh, Deuteronomy, and the Akkadian Treaty Tradition

Mohr Siebeck

C. L. Crouch, born 1982; 2004 BA in Religious Studies, Scripps College, CA; 2005 PGDip in Theology, University of Oxford; 2007 MPhil in Theology (Old Testament), University of Oxford; 2008 DPhil in Theology (Old Testament), University of Oxford; since 2018 David Allan Hubbard Professor of Old Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary, CA.
orcid.org/0000-0002-9569-5727

Jeremy M. Hutton, born 1976; 1998 BA in Theology and Philosophy, University of Notre Dame; 2002 AM in Hebrew Bible, Harvard University; 2005 PhD in Hebrew Bible and Northwest Semitics, Harvard University; since 2018 Professor of Classical Hebrew Language and Biblical Literature at University of Wisconsin-Madison, and since 2016 a Research Fellow at the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
orcid.org/0000-0002-9495-9022

ISBN 978-3-16-159026-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-159027-6
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159027-6

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

for our teachers
with gratitude

Preface

This monograph was unexpected. Though in its production we have treated it with as much deliberation as we would have given any other piece, we hardly intended to write a full study of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription when we began. The project began when C. L. Crouch was finishing up *Israel and the Assyrians* in spring 2013. She sent the manuscript to Jeremy Hutton, who had begun reading in Descriptive Translation Studies and was teaching a graduate seminar in the subject that semester at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Hutton had also begun reading in Optimality Theory, a theoretical linguistic approach to phonology that achieved a huge following among phonologists in the 1990s. Although its use for explaining phonological developments is now widely critiqued, its teleological element has enabled its effective use in translation studies.

The opportunity for collaboration came with an invitation to edit a special volume for *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*. Hutton chose the theme "Epigraphy and the Bible" and invited Crouch to co-author an article on the translation technique of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. The article, we thought, might be a bit long – 15,000 words or so – with a deadline of December 2016. By November 2017, we had written nearly 40,000 words on just the first half of the inscription (Fekh. A) and found ourselves apologizing to the editors for the delay. Konrad Schmid kindly proposed that we produce an abbreviated version of the article for the journal, then develop a slightly longer version for the FAT series. A year later, we were still wrestling with how to defend dealing with Fekh. B as an instance of *translation* (as opposed to *bilingual composition*). More work on bilingualism and cognitive theory – along with several video conference-style writing sessions – brought us to the solution proposed in Chapter 4. The overall result is less the "short monograph" that Konrad Schmid commissioned than it is a full-size monograph, and we are grateful to the other editors of the series (Mark S. Smith, Hermann Spieckermann, and Andrew Teeter) for their amenability to this much larger volume.

As is typical for study of the inscription, work continues apace. An article by Jana Mynářová and Jan Dušek ("Tell Fekheriyeh Inscription and the Western Assyrian Border in the Late Ninth Century B.C.E.," in *Aramaean Borders: Defining Aramaean Territories in the 10th–8th Centuries B.C.E.* [ed. J. Dušek

and J. Mynářová; CHANE 101; Leiden: Brill, 2019]) appeared after our work on this manuscript had been completed and the manuscript had been submitted.

Several institutions and organizations have supported our work. Much of Hutton's reading and preliminary research was supported by summer funding from the University of Wisconsin-Madison's WARF fund. Particular gratitude is due for funding provided by the Vilas Associates Fellowship, which Hutton held during the academic years 2015–2017. This support allowed Hutton to float ideas on optimality in translation at the SBL Annual Meeting in Atlanta, Ga. (2015), the triennial meeting of the International Organization for Targum Studies in Stellenbosch, South Africa (2016), the SBL Annual Meeting in Boston, Mass. (2017), and in several classes at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Much of Hutton's work on Chapter 5 was completed during a teaching sabbatical in spring 2018, while hiding out in a "secret office" graciously provided by the Center for Religious Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In particular, Jordan Rosenblum is to be thanked for the Center's hospitality and protection from the encroachment of extracurricular administrative duties.

Much of Crouch's direct work on the project was undertaken during a year's residence in Cambridge as the S. A. Cook Bye-Fellow at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge (2018), whose generous support enabled access to key collections at the Cambridge University Library. Initial research in this area was early supported by a Research Fellowship at Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge (2009–2011). Research leave from the University of Nottingham (2018) and support for ongoing research at Fuller Theological Seminary (2019) have also been critical to the completion of the project.

We are also beholden to a number of individuals for their engagement with the project at a number of stages: Yitzhaq Feder, James Aitken, David Shepherd, Eric Raimy, and Joe Salmons have asked insightful questions during presentations and conversations. Bernard Levinson has commented generously; although our thesis has moved in a somewhat different direction than his own arguments, we are grateful for the engagement and trust that his influence is apparent. Lawson Younger provided bibliography and guidance at several points, as did Alice Mandell. Wayne Pitard graciously offered photographs of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription in order to check readings occasionally. Chip Dobbs-Allsopp and Christopher B. Hays made thoughtful and valuable responses to our earliest written drafts, encouraging us especially in our exploration of the implications of our work for the interpretation of the Sefire inscriptions. We have benefitted greatly from the editorial attentions of Makenzi Crouch, who undertook the copy-editing, and the research assistance of Amy Pahlen, at Fuller Seminary, who assisted in compiling the indices. The staff at Mohr Siebeck have shown an exacting attention to detail and limitless patience: Tobias Stäbler for catching several copy-editing problems, and – especially – Ilse König for her assistance with the layout and production.

We dedicate this book to our teachers in Akkadian and the many expressions of Northwest Semitic, especially Hebrew and Aramaic, which we have employed so frequently and so fruitfully in this volume. Crouch's Hebrew training at the University of Oxford began under the tutelage of Madhavi Nevader, followed by Akkadian with Stephanie Dalley, Frances Reynolds, and Marc Van De Mieroop and Syriac with David Taylor. Kevin Cathcart, in particular, has been linguist, mentor, examiner, and friend; Crouch dedicates the work to him on his eightieth birthday. Hutton's Hebrew career began at the University of Notre Dame under Monica Brady and was picked up at Harvard University under Jo Ann Hackett, John Huehnergard, Paul-Alain Beaulieu, and Peter Machinist. We have benefitted immeasurably from the wisdom of these scholars and hope that our use of these languages is up to the high standards with which they blessed (and sometimes afflicted) us.

Jeremy M. Hutton
Madison, WI

C. L. Crouch
Pasadena, CA

Contents

Abbreviations

The work employs the standard abbreviations listed in the *SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd edn), in addition to the following:

BTL	Benjamins Translation Library
CDA	*A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. Edited by J. Black, A. George, and N. Postgate. 2nd (corrected) printing. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000
HBS	Herders Biblische Studien
IPT	*Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania*
IRT	*Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
KA	S. Aḥituv, E. Eshel, and Z. Meshel, "The Inscriptions," in *Kuntillet ʿAjrud (Ḥorvat Teman)* (ed. Z. Meshel; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2012), 73–142
KUSATU	*Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*
PLAL	Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages
RUCCS-TR	Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science Technical Report
SANER	Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records
TAD	*Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Edited by B. Porten and A. Yardeni. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1986–1999
TWPL	*Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*
VOK	Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Translating Empire

In 2 Kgs 18, the officials of Judah plead with the representatives of the Neo-Assyrian Empire to speak with them in Aramaic, so that the population of the city of Jerusalem will not understand the threats they are making against the king. The officials refuse, declaring their challenge to Hezekiah in the local language of Judah in order to ensure that the whole population is able to hear and understand the dominating claims of Assyrian imperial power.

The episode is telling: the power of the empire is conveyed not merely by the presence of its representatives, but by the very act of translation. The necessity of translating Akkadian into Aramaic and other more widely understood languages, as part of the *modus operandi* of the Neo-Assyrian imperial machine, is further attested within the empire itself. The dual depiction of Akkadian and Aramaic scribes on the Assyrian royal reliefs signals an acknowledgment of the practical use of Aramaic alongside Akkadian in the imperial bureaucracy, while a handful of surviving bilingual inscriptions indicate the use of translation for monumental purposes, at least occasionally.[1]

Our object in this study is to clarify how this process of translation actually worked in the Iron Age, especially with regard to translation of an officially produced text from Akkadian into one of the Northwest Semitic languages. Our primary text for comparison will be the Akkadian-Aramaic bilingual inscription from Tell Fekheriyeh. This text is one of very few preserved instances of

[1] H. Tadmor, "On the Role of Aramaic in the Assyrian Empire," in *Near Eastern Studies Dedicated to H. I. H. Prince Takahito Mikasa on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. Mori, H. Ogawa, and M. Yoshikawa; Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Centre in Japan 5; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 419–426; P. Garelli, "Importance et rôle des Araméens dans l'administration de l'empire assyrien," in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ed. H. J. Nissen and U. Renger; BBVO 1; Berlin: Reimer, 1982), 437–447; Z. Stefanovic, "Why the Aramaic Script Was Called 'Assyrian' in Hebrew, Greek, and Demotic," *Or* 62 (1993): 80–82; P. A. Beaulieu, "Official and Vernacular Languages: The Shifting Sands of Imperial and Cultural Identities in First Millennium B.C. Mesopotamia," in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures: New Approaches to Writing and Reading in the Ancient Near East* (ed. S. L. Sanders; Chicago, Ill.: Oriental Institute, 2006), 187–216; cf. SAA XVI 63 12–20; 99 8–11; SAA XVII 2 13-21. On the trilingual inscriptions, see note 2.

Akkadian-Aramaic bilingualism and translation from the Iron Age II: only a few other monumental inscriptions display paired (i.e., spatially proximate and semantically similar) Akkadian-Aramaic texts, namely, the Arslan Tash trilingual and the Incirli trilingual.[2] Unfortunately, both these inscriptions are fragmentary and currently remain too insufficiently understood to serve as useful source material for the study at hand. The following discussion therefore relies on the text(s) of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription as evidence for Iron Age translation practices.

[2] For the Arslan Tash trilingual, see W. Röllig, "Aramäer und Assyrer: Die Schriftzeugnisse bis zum Ende des Assyrerreiches," in *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age* (ed. G. Bunnens; ANESSup 7; Louvain: Peeters, 2000), 177–186, esp. 182–183; idem, "Die Inschriften des Ninurta-bēlu-uṣur, Statthalters von Kār-Salmānu-ašarēd. Teil I," in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola* (ed. M. Luukko, S. Svärd, and R. Mattila; StOr 106; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2009), 265–278; H. D. Galter, "Militärgrenze und Euphrathandel: Der sozio-ökonomische Hintergrund der Trilinguen von Arslan Tash," in *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction* (ed. R. Rollinger and C. Ulf; Melammu Symposia 5; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004), 444–460; idem, "Der Himmel über Hadattu: Das religiöse Umfeld der Inschriften von Arslan Tash," in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums "Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr." (Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003)* (ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar; AOAT 318; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), 173–188; idem, "Die Torlöwen von Arslan Tash," in *Festschrift für Hermann Hunger zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (ed. M. Köhbach et al.; WZKM 97; Wien: Selbstverlag des Instituts für Orientalistik, 2007), 193–211; K. L. Younger, "Some of What's New in Old Aramaic Epigraphy," *NEA* 70 (2007): 139–149, here 142; H. Tadmor and S. Yamada, *The Royal Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BC) and Shalmaneser V (726–722 BC), Kings of Assyria* (RINAP 1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 161–163, no. 2001. The hieroglyphic Luwian inscription is published in J. D. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions* (vol. 1 of *The Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions of the Iron Age*; Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 8.1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), no. III.10: pt. 1:246–248; pt. 3:pls., 103–105. For the Incirli inscription, see S. A. Kaufman, "The Phoenician Inscription of the Incirli Trilingual: A Tentative Reconstructive and Translation," *Maarav* 14 (2007): 7–26. Kaufman is reportedly working on an official *editio princeps* of the Incirli trilingual with B. Zuckerman, but he provides a somewhat disheartening description of the state of the Akkadian text, for which he will offer "a very hypothetical suggested reading …" Moreover, "the Luwian hieroglyphs and the [Assyrian] cuneiform on the right hand side appear to be beyond salvage with current imaging techniques" (ibid., p. 8 n. 3). We thank here Younger, who kindly pointed these instances out to us and provided advanced views of the forthcoming *COS* entry for the Arslan Tash trilingual, including prior bibliography (personal communication).

1.2. Discovery and Historical Context of the Tell Fekheriyeh Inscription

The Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (*KAI* §309) was discovered on February 22, 1979, on the southwestern flank of that archaeological *tell*. The site had for some time been identified as ancient Sikan, and the discovery of the monument sealed that identification, with multiple mentions of Sikan in both a cuneiform (Assyrian Akkadian) and an Aramaic text.[3] Tell Fekheriyeh lies not far (ca. 2 km) east of Tell Ḫalaf, flanking the Ḫabūr River on its west bank. This latter site is also known from antiquity, both from cuneiform sources (where it is called Gūzāna[4]) and from the Hebrew Bible (Gôzān; 2 Kgs 17:6, 18:11, 19:12; Isa 37:12; 1 Chr 5:26).[5] It is also mentioned prominently in the inscription at hand. As will be seen below (section 1.3.2), the inscription evinces a composition history that seems to be bound up with the cultic apparatuses of both Guzan and Sikan.[6] The object was published in short order, first in a series of preemptive announcements,[7] and shortly thereafter in a monograph-length volume that is commonly considered the *editio princeps*.[8] Several publications followed in quick succession,[9] often working independently and therefore unaware of the

[3] We offer no argument here as to whether Sikan should be identified with the city Waššukani, the former capital of the Mitannian state. For further discussion and much relevant bibliography, see K. L. Younger, *A Political History of the Arameans: From Their Origins to the End of Their Polities* (ABS 13; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 148, 243–244. Younger also provides an overview of the site's archaeology (p. 242).

[4] See the many Assyrian sources cited by S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms* (AOAT 6; Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), 138–139.

[5] For detailed attestations of this identification, see, e.g., A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, and A. R. Millard, *La statue de Tell Fekherye et son inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne* (Études Assyriologiques 7; Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1982), 67; and E. Lipiński, "The Bilingual Inscription from Tell Fekherye," in *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics II* (ed. E. Lipiński; OLA 57; Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 19–81, esp. 20, 23–26.

[6] As noted by Younger (*Political History*, 244, 259), Sikan's role as a cultic center for the worship of Hadad and Šala extends back to the Ur III period.

[7] A. Abou-Assaf, "Die Statue des HDYSʿY, König von Guzana," *MDOG* 113 (1981): 3–22; Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 640–655; A. R. Millard and P. Bordreuil, "A Statue from Syria With Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions," *BA* 45 (1982): 135–141. For accounts of the inscription's discovery, see Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 3–4; Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 1–4, unnumbered pages (area map and site plan); Millard and Bordreuil, "Statue from Syria," 137; and Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 19–21.

[8] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*.

[9] J. C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, "Notes on the Bilingual Inscription from Tell-Fekherye," *Shnaton* 5–6 (1982): 119–129 [Hebrew]; idem, "Notes on the Curse Formulae of the Tell Fekherye Inscription," *RB* 92 (1985): 47–59; and idem, "Notes on the Akkadian-

results of contemporaneous studies. Although the pace of studies dedicated specifically to this inscription quickly abated, the furious pace of early publication occasioned a great deal of redundancy in the early literature on the inscription.

The monument most likely dates to the third quarter of the ninth century (ca. 850–825 BCE). This determination of a ninth-century date for the epigraph was made already by A. Abou-Assaf on the basis of iconographic parallels and historical data,[10] but subsequent studies have confirmed this date with few exceptions. Often these studies simply replicate the original argument, relying on the same types of data, but occasionally new arguments have been put forward, citing the style and diction of the formulaic content of the inscriptions[11] and the paleography of the Assyrian text.[12] One of the most commonly cited historical data in support of the ninth-century context is the fact that the eponym of the seventeenth year of Aššurnaṣirpal II (i.e., 866 BCE) was Šamaš-nūrī.[13] Although the title of Šamaš-nūrī has not been preserved in the pertinent lists, "the eponym of 867 B.C. was almost certainly the governor of Tušhan,"[14] the city whose governor regularly preceded that of Guzan in these lists (e.g., for 794–793, 764–763, 728–727, and 707–706 BCE).[15] E. Lipiński has added to this

Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye," *Iraq* 45 (1983): 109–116; R. Zadok, "Remarks on the Inscription of *hdysʿy* from Tell Fakhariya," *TA* 9 (1982): 117–129; F. M. Fales, "Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye," *Syria* 60 (1983): 233–250; T. Muraoka, "The Tell-Fekherye Bilingual Inscription and Early Aramaic," *AbrN* 22 (1983–1984): 79–117; P.-E. Dion, "La bilingue de Tell Fekherye: Le roi de Gozan et son dieu; La phraséologie," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (ed. A. Caquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu; AOAT 215; Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 139–147; D. M. Gropp and T. J. Lewis, "Notes on Some Problems in the Aramaic Text of the Hadd-Yithʿi Bilingual," *BASOR* 259 (1985): 45–61; V. Sasson, "The Aramaic Text of the Tell Fakhariyah Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual Inscription," *ZAW* 97 (1985): 86–103; and F. Vattioni, "La bilingue assiro-aramaica di Tell Fekherye," *AION* 46 (1986): 349–365. An early bibliography was compiled by W. E. Aufrecht and G. J. Hamilton, "The Tell Fakhariyah Bilingual Inscription: A Bibliography," *Newsletter for Targumic & Cognate Studies. Suppl.* 4 (1988): 1–7.

[10] Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," esp. 9, 12–13. See also Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 9–12, 22, 87–102; as well as A. R. Millard, "Assyrians and Arameans," *Iraq* 45 (1983): 104–105.

[11] Greenfield and Shaffer point to the origin of the curses in the first millennium rather than the second ("Notes on the Curse Formulae," 49).

[12] S. A. Kaufman, "Reflections on the Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual from Tell Fakhariyeh," *Maarav* 3 (1982): 137–175, esp. 139–140.

[13] E.g., Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 103–113.

[14] Millard, "Assyrians and Arameans," 105.

[15] See A. R. Millard, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire, 910–612 BC* (SAA 2; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1994), 56–60; and, more recently, J. Dušek and J. Mynářová, "Tell Fekheriye Inscription: A Process of Authority on the Edge of the Assyrian

datum the observation that the eponym of the eighteenth year of Shalmaneser III (i.e., 841 BCE) was Adad-rēmanni (^{d}IM-ARḪUŠ-*ni*). Lipiński considers the meaning of this name ("Adad, show pity on me!") sufficiently similar to the meaning of that of the author of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (Haddu-yiθʿî "Hadad is my deliverance") as to possibly warrant consideration as the same individual.[16] Although this suggestion warrants further investigation, it is far from certain. Speaking against this identification is the fact that the eponym of the preceding year is given the title "governor of Nemed-Ishtar" rather than what would be the expected "governor of Tušhan."[17] Moreover, K. L. Younger has recently put forward a thorough and convincing challenge to the identification of Haddu-yiθʿî with Adad-rēmanni, based in large part on the different syntactic patterns of the two names.[18] Nonetheless, aside from a few epigraphers, who have suggested that the Aramaic paleography suggests an earlier date (i.e., in the late eleventh century BCE),[19] and a few art historians, who have adduced iconographic parallels in the eighth century BCE,[20] the date ca. 850–825 BCE has gone largely unchallenged and currently maintains a large consensus. This ninth-century date continues to receive support from most critics.[21]

Empire," in *The Process of Authority: The Dynamics in Transmission and Reception of Canonical Texts* (ed. J. Dušek and J. Roskovec; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 27; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 9–39. Younger (*Political History*, 525–526) also includes a section of eponymic data relevant to the years 794–793.

[16] Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 23–24.

[17] See Millard, *Eponyms*, 56.

[18] See Younger, *Political History*, 264–266, and bibliography cited there; also, ibid., 255.

[19] J. Naveh, "The Date of the Inscription from Tell Fekheriyah: A Palaeographic Analysis of the Aramaic Version," *Shnaton* 5–6 (1982): 131–140 [Hebrew], esp. 134–135; and F. M. Cross, "Paleography and the Date of the Tell Faḫariyeh Bilingual Inscription," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 393–409. Both studies recognize the difficulty of this proposal, even though Cross seems more willing to engage later dating than does J. Naveh. For a reasoned response to Naveh's study, see Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 26–30.

[20] H. S. Sader, *Les états araméens de Syrie depuis leur fondation jusqu'à leur transformation en provinces assyriennes* (Beiruter Texte und Studien 36; Beirut: Steiner Verlag, 1987), 26–27; A. Spycket, "La statue bilingue de Tell Fekheriyé," *RA* 79 (1985): 67–68. But these arguments have been effectively dispatched by A. R. Millard, "The Tell Fekheriyeh Inscriptions," in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June–July 1990* (ed. A. Biran and J. Aviram; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1993), 518–524, esp. 518–519; and Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 22.

[21] See most recently the studies by Dušek and Mynářová, "Tell Fekheriye Inscription," 33–36; and L. Quick, "'To Hear and to Accept': A Word-Pair in the Tell Fakhariyah Bilingual Inscription," *JSS* 61 (2016): 413–429. Although Dušek and Mynářová adduce a possible date between 763 and 727 BCE, their preferred date is during the Assyrian civil war (827–820 BCE).

1.3. The Object and Its Inscription

The object on which the inscription appears is a large, anthropomorphic statue carved in basalt. The male figure is standing in a neutral, frontal pose, with his hands clasped across his midriff. His hairstyle, facial features, and clothing are consistent with exemplars from the mid-ninth century BCE. For the most part, these elements are unremarkable for our purposes, and more detailed discussions can be found in previous publications.[22] More important for our study is the spatial arrangement of the figure's skirt, where the epigraph has been inscribed in the space approximately between the individual's upper thighs and his mid-shins. The Akkadian text is found on the front side of the skirt, the lines of text separated by thin vertical lines, inscribed as pleats or a design on the skirt. The Aramaic text occupies the back of the skirt, except for the two lines that did not fit and had to be inscribed on the lower hem of the front. The left ends of these final two lines reach around to the front of the skirt, and are inscribed below the Akkadian.[23] As observed already by the editors, this disposition signals the relative importance of the Akkadian text over the Aramaic.[24] This bilingual pair of texts has been preserved nearly completely, with only a few signs or graphemes in each language missing.

1.3.1. The Text of the Inscription(s)

For navigational purposes, we present the text(s) of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription in Appendices 1 and 2 in an eclectic edition, assembled from several prior treatments. We have been unable to consult the inscription itself.[25] The only photographs to which we have had access were those kindly provided by Wayne Pitard, which are unfortunately not of paleographic quality. We have therefore compiled the following eclectic text by working from the base text provided in both the *editio princeps* and in *KAI*, and using emendations and suggestions for re-readings made by various interpreters. This goes especially for the Akkadian text, which for ease of reference we render here only in normalized Akkadian. Although most interpreters have reached some degree of unanimity in their understanding of the logographic values of the Akkadian texts, we have at times had to favor one interpretation over another. Our notes

[22] E.g., Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 5–11; Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 5–7, 9–12.

[23] See Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 3; Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 8–9, and unnumbered page (autograph of Aramaic inscription).

[24] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 9.

[25] The Tell Fekheriyeh inscription is currently held in the National Museum of Syria, Damascus. Given the current state of conflict in Syria, we have not attempted a visit to the museum.

justifying various readings or translations have been incorporated into the discussion below, where they directly impinge on the interpretation, rather than left to congest the schematic presentation of the text.

It remains conventional to cite the inscription's physical lineation in modern discussions of the inscription, and we follow that principle in the discussion immediately following. However, in order to focus on the tightly corresponding translational segments in the co-texts, we have also divided the text into grammatical units – usually phrases or what we consider to be realistic translation segments. We call these unit "stichs," with each stich reference containing a letter that designates the part of the inscription, A or B, and a number indicating the stich number of the individual part. For the most part we use this numeration as the primary form of citation in the translation-theoretic discussion below, instead of the more common line numbers. For coordination of these two systems, we present the texts in our own synoptic lineation in Appendices 1 and 2 (see pp. 305–308). Superscript numerals indicate the conventional line numbers.

1.3.2. The Physical History of the Statue and Its Inscription

In light of the statue's discovery at Sikan, the conflicting – and sometimes only implied – references in the text to the location of the statue's original disposition have elicited spirited discourse. In the Aramaic Introduction, unparalleled in the Akkadian text, the statue was commissioned by the Aramean king Haddu-yiθʿî to be dedicated to Hadad-of-Sikan (Aram. line 1 = stich Intro-RelVP). The testimony of this introduction is sustained throughout the Aramaic text (Aram. lines 5–6, 16 = stichs A:7; B:7), where the statue is consistently situated before the divine manifestation of Hadad in Sikan (יסב סכן "dweller of Sikan").[26] In contrast, in the corresponding portions of text, the Assyrian version at first locates Hadad's residence in Guzan (i.e., the nearby Tell Ḫalaf[27]) (*āšib* ^{uru}*guzani* "dweller of Guzan"; Akk. line 7 = stich A:7), but later in Sikan (*āšib* ^{uru}*sikani* ~ יסב סכן; Akk. line 25 = stich B:7). To complicate matters, the royal titles of the statue's commissioner, Haddu-yiθʿî, fluctuate as well. Originally, Haddu-yiθʿî seems to have positioned himself (as heir to his father's position) as the ruler of Guzan in both the Assyrian and the Aramaic texts (Akk. lines 8–9; Aram. lines 6–7 = stich A:9). But Haddu-yiθʿî then arrogates to himself an expanded set of titles, claiming to control Guzan, Sikan,

[26] Contrast Lipiński ("Bilingual Inscription," 31), who argues that "both qualifications … refer to the same deity."

[27] See n. 5.

and Azran (*šakin māti* ^{uru}*guzani* ^{uru}*sikani u* ^{uru}*zarani* ~ מלך גוזן וזי סכן וזי אזרן; Akk. lines 19–20; Aram. line 13 = stich B:1).[28]

The contradiction in divine locale is not troublesome from the perspective of the history of ancient Near Eastern religion, since the phenomenon of local manifestations of deities is well known and admits a certain "fluidity" of divine identification.[29] The problem is rather one of physical *realia*: what is the composition history of this inscription and of the statue itself? Where was the votive offering initially deposited? Was the statue moved, and/or does this object comprise a *second* votive offering? The contradictions among the geographic references, in combination with structural repetitions, made clear early on that both the Assyrian and the Aramaic texts were composed of two units, traditionally called an A text (= Akk. lines 1–18; Aram. lines 1–12) and a B text (= Akk. lines 19–38; Aram. lines 12–23). Our division of the text into stichoi marked as A and B recognizes and follows this convention. In particular, the divergence of geographical markers in the A portion – the location in Guzan in the Assyrian text, compared to Sikan in the Aramaic text – has led to various proposals regarding the inscription's history of composition and its relation to the statue's manufacture.

In the *editio princeps*, the editors recognized that the second text (B) contains a new introduction (Akk. lines 19–20; Aram. lines 12–13 = stich B:1). Moreover, an indication of the statue's improvement (or surpassing?) in the second text (Akk. lines 23–24, Aram. line 15 = stich B:5) "allows us to deduce the existence of an earlier monument which was replaced by the monument at hand."[30] Thus, they argued that the differences between the two inscriptions allow us to hypothesize multiple stages of revision, culminating in the inscription of the statue now under discussion.[31] Because the Aramaic Introduction text makes it clear that the statue is dedicated to Hadad-of-Sikan (Aram. line 1 = Intro-RelVP; see also Aram. lines 5–6 = stich A:7), and because only the Akk. A text locates Hadad in Guzan (Akk. line 7 = stich A:7), A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, and A. R. Millard envision a scenario in which the A text was inscribed on an original monument that remains undiscovered.[32] This original

---

[28] As Younger points out (*Political History*, 256), although no conclusive identification of Azran can be made yet, it seems to have been of a stature similar to that of Guzan, and Sikan.

[29] For the "fluidity" of divine manifestations, see recently B. D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); J. M. Hutton, "Local Manifestations of Yahweh and Worship in the Interstices: A Note on Kuntillet ʿAjrud," *JANER* 10 (2010): 177–210; and S. L. Allen, *The Splintered Divine: A Study of Ištar, Baal, and Yahweh: Divine Names and Divine Multiplicity in the Ancient Near East* (SANER 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).

[30] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 67; our translation.

[31] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 67.

[32] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 67–68.

monument was dedicated to Hadad-of-Guzan. Later, when the second monument (i.e., the one under consideration) was erected in Sikan, the Akkadian text (Akk. A) was replicated exactly, preserving the identification of Hadad as *āšib* ^{uru}*guzani* (Akk. line 7 = stich A:7), before the addition of the Akk. B text – which updated the author's titles to reflect that he was now *šakin māti* ^{uru}*guzani* ^{uru}*sikani u* ^{uru}*zarani* (Akk. lines 19–20 = stich B:1b). At the same time, the Aramaic text (including the Introduction, which is unparalleled in the Akk. A text) must have been adjusted to account for the fact that this new statue was dedicated to the manifestation of Hadad resident in Sikan rather than the manifestation of the same deity resident in Guzan.[33]

This geographic and chronological reconstruction makes generally good sense of the various geographical cues presented in the text and is the foundational argument challenged or tacitly accepted by subsequent interpreters. Yet, this solution poses a problem as well: why would the Aramaic text have been adjusted to recognize the new site of deposition while the Akkadian text was left undisturbed (and thus outdated)? As part of their solution, Abou-Assaf et al. hedged: "One can also suppose that Hadad of Guzana was identified with that of Sikan, but for whatever political, theological, or traditional reasons, the title carried by this god in the capital [= Guzan] was preferable for the cuneiform text."[34] This is possible, but not entirely satisfying, as demonstrated by the fact that the editors themselves posed an alternative suggestion: they supposed it was possible that two statues had initially been erected, "one at Guzan bearing the Assyrian text of A, the other at Sikan bearing the Aramean text of A."[35] Although they do not follow this solution to its logical conclusion, the implications are clear: with the establishment of the new (now, *third*) statue in Sikan, the first two texts (Akk. A and Aram. A) were combined, each in its original form, and Text B was added to each.

---

[33] See similarly C. Dohmen, "Die Statue von Tell Fecherīje und die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen: Ein Beitrag zur Bilderterminologie," *BN* 22 (1983): 91–106, esp. 94–95. However, Dohmen argued that all of the Aramaic text (Aram. A + B) had been translated from the Akkadian at a single time (95–96). He based this assessment of two points of data: the location of the inscription in Sikan, and the lexical and syntactic correspondence of the Aramaic Introduction with the second portion of the inscription. However, Dohmen's conclusions are not entirely necessary – he assumes, for example, that the Aramaic has been translated specifically for the second statue, and his analysis of the "correspondence" between the Aramaic Introduction and Akk. lines 23–26 is not spelled out.

[34] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 67 ("On peut aussi supposer que Adad de Gouzana était identifié à celui de Sikan, mais que pour des raisons politiques, théologiques, ou traditionnelles le titre porté par ce dieu dans la capitale a été préféré par le texte cunéiforme.").

[35] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 68 ("l'une à Gouzana portant le texte assyrien de A, l'autre à Sikan portant le texte araméen de A").

In the initial presentations of the inscription, preceding publication of the *editio princeps*, the editors posited a more complex reconstruction than was eventually represented in the *editio*. In those preliminary offerings, they suggested that the original statue – dedicated to Hadad-in-Guzan and bearing only the Akk. A text – had been *transported* to Sikan. To this statue was then added the Aramaic translation of the original text (Akk. A), augmented by the novel formulation of a more typically West Semitic introduction. In a third stage, both the Akk. B and Aram. B texts were added.[36] Without making explicit reference to this effect, Bordreuil et al. seem here to be positing the gradual accumulation of separate (but related) epigraphs on a single object. Naturally, this hypothesis presents a difficulty, since, as was described above, all evidence points to a single moment of inscription for both the Assyrian and the Aramaic texts on the statue at hand. This difficulty was accounted for in the subsequent *editio*, in which the editors recognized that neither the spatial arrangement nor the style of the inscription provided evidence of successive acts of engraving.[37]

Although this particular proposal is not the formulation that eventually emerged in the *editio*, it has recently been picked up and modified by J. Dušek and J. Mynářová.[38] They hypothesize a three-stage development of the text: like Bordreuil et al., they assume an object dedicated to the deity Hadad-in-Guzan and bearing only the Akk. A text. Yet, unlike the earlier editors, Dušek and Mynářová recognize that this object may not have been a statue at all: Akk. A nowhere claims that it appears on an (anthropoid) image (although compare the Aramaic Introduction in which the lexeme דמותא "likeness" is used; Aram. line 1 = stich Intro-NP), whereas both versions of Text B explicitly use terms indicating a human form (stich B:1: *ṣalam* $^{\text{l}}$*adad*(U)-*it*-ʾ*i* [Akk. line 19] ~ צלם הדיסעי [Aram. line 12]; stich B:5: *ṣalma šuāte*[39] [Akk. line 23] ~ דמותא זאת [Aram. line 15]). This possibility had been raised by D. M. Gropp and T. J.

[36] P. Bordreuil, A. R. Millard, and A. Abou-Assaf, "La statue de Tell Fekheryé: La première inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne," *CRAI* 125 (1981): 640–655, here 646–647.

[37] Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 68; Dohmen, "Statue von Tell Fecherīje," 95.

[38] Dušek and Mynářová ("Tell Fekheriye Inscription," 20–29) provide a very helpful review of the previous literature, but their analysis is not without errors. For example, they mistakenly assign this third reconstruction to the *editio* as well (p. 20 n. 21). While the eventual form of the *editio* may not stand in direct opposition to the hypothesis of the first statue's physical removal to Sikan, neither does it explicitly articulate that proposal.

[39] We have normalized NU here as the accusative *ṣalma* rather than the nominative *ṣalmu* (with, e.g., Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 21; Abu Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *Statue de Tell Fekherye*, 16; and *KAI*) since it is the direct object of the verb *ušātir*. The lack of a phonetic complement here requires interpretation. Fales ("Double bilinguisme," 239) adduces the spelling *šu-a-te* as a marker of Assyrian scribal habit, since it is "practically absent" ("pratiquement absent") in Standard Babylonian.

Ancient Texts Index

Biblical Texts

Other Ancient Texts

Modern Authors Index

Subject Index

Constraint Index