Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel

2
Volume 7
2018

Epigraphy, Theory, and the Hebrew Bible

Mohr Siebeck

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel

Herausgegeben von Gary N. Knoppers (Notre Dame IN), Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv), Carol A. Newsom (Atlanta GA) und Konrad Schmid (Zürich)
Redaktion: Phillip Michael Lasater (Zürich)

Redaktionsadresse
Professor Dr. Konrad Schmid
Theologische Fakultät der Universität Zürich
Kirchgasse 9
CH-8001 Zürich
Switzerland
E-mail: hebai@theol.uzh.ch

Online-Volltext
Im Abonnement für Institutionen und Privatpersonen ist der freie Zugang zum Online-Volltext enthalten. Institutionen mit mehr als 20.000 Nutzern bitten wir um Einholung eines Preisangebots direkt beim Verlag. Kontakt: brixner@mohrsiebeck.com. Um den Online-Zugang für Institutionen/Bibliotheken einzurichten, gehen Sie bitte zur Seite: www.ingentaconnect.com/register/institutional. Um den Online-Zugang für Privatpersonen einzurichten, gehen Sie bitte zur Seite: www.ingenta connect.com/register/personal

Verlag: Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Postfach 2040, 72010 Tübingen
Vertrieb erfolgt über den Buchhandel.

Satz: Martin Fischer, Tübingen.
Druck: Gulde-Druck, Tübingen.

ISSN 2192-2276 (Gedruckte Ausgabe)
ISSN 2192-2284 (Online-Ausgabe)

Jeremy M. Hutton and C. L. Crouch

Deuteronomy as a Translation of Assyrian Treaties

An "Optimal Translation" Approach[1]

This article evaluates claims that the relationship between the Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon (VTE) and the book of Deuteronomy (especially chapter 28) can properly be called one of translation. We conduct this study by analyzing the translation style of the bilingual (Akkadian-Aramaic) Tell Fekheriyeh inscription using the theoretical paradigm of Optimal Translation. We argue that the relevant passages of Deuteronomy 28 – those that have been judged as most likely representing direct translation from Akkadian or indirect translation through Aramaic – do not, in fact, show any procedural similarities to the one extensive and definitive exemplar of Akkadian-to-Northwest Semitic translation from antiquity, namely, the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. Although this conclusion does not rule out more refractory uses of Akkadian treaty texts, it suggests that Deuteronomy's reliance on prior texts was unlikely to have been limited to a single exemplar, and more likely to have been based on a variety of texts within the Akkadian and Northwest Semitic treaty traditions.

Keywords: Deuteronomy 28, Vassal Treaty of Esarhaddon, Tell Fekheriyeh, translation, optimality

1. Introduction

1.1. Deuteronomy and the Principles of Translation

Numerous scholars have argued that the book of Deuteronomy originated as an adaptation of an Assyrian treaty document.[2] The so-called Vassal Treaty

1 The following summarizes several arguments from Jeremy M. Hutton and C. L. Crouch, *Translating Empire: Tell Fekheriyeh, Deuteronomy, and the Assyrian Treaty Tradition* (forthcoming). The authors thank the editors for their suggestion of concurrent publication. We are also grateful to Alice Mandell, who offered useful critique of section 5, to Lawson Younger, who suggested useful bibliography, and to Chip Dobbs-Allsopp and Christopher B. Hays, both of whom read and commented on the full draft. Any remaining infelicities are, of course, our own.

2 For a full *Forschungsgeschichte*, see C. L. Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion* (ANEM 8; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 1–11.

HeBAI 7 (2018), 201–252 DOI 10.1628/hebai-2018-0014
ISSN 2192-2276

of Esarhaddon (VTE) has been perceived as having particular affinities to Deuteronomy 13 and 28, addressing the Israelites' exclusive loyalty to YHWH (Deuteronomy 13) and recounting in curse form the manifold disasters which will befall them should they fail to observe this loyalty and its attendant obligations (Deuteronomy 28).

The suggestion of a very close relationship between these passages of Deuteronomy and VTE appeared almost as soon as the Akkadian text was made public. Articles by R. Frankena and M. Weinfeld quickly turned discussion away from any relationship between Deuteronomy and second millennium Hittite treaties and towards a relationship between Deuteronomy and first millennium Assyrian treaties. In his initial analysis, Frankena declared that "the phrasing of some curses of Deut. xxviii may be supposed to be an elaboration of an Assyrian 'Vorlage'."[3] Frankena posited a situation in which the author of Deuteronomy had first-hand access to his Assyrian source material and was able to refer to it as he wrote his own text.[4] Weinfeld's analysis likewise concluded that parts of Deuteronomy had been "literally transcribed from a Mesopotamian treaty copy to the book of Deuteronomy."[5] While Weinfeld was hesitant to insist that the Mesopotamian treaty was VTE, he was clear that the Judahite scribe possessed Assyrian treaty documents from which he "transposed an entire and consecutive series of maledictions."[6]

Although both expressed reservations about these texts' exact relationship, the thrust of their conclusions diffused rapidly across the discipline. Notably influential was the model by which they perceived their similarities to have come about: the idea that the author of Deuteronomy undertook the direct transmission of an Akkadian source text into Hebrew. Following in their footsteps, scholars such as P.-E. Dion, H. U. Steymans, E. Otto, and B. M. Levinson have offered further arguments in favor of the adaptation of material from VTE by Deuteronomy.[7]

---

3 R. Frankena, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy," *OTS* 14 (1965): 122–154, here 145.

4 Frankena, "Vassal-Treaties," 150–151.

5 M. Weinfeld, "Traces of Assyrian Treaty Formulae in Deuteronomy," *Bib* 46 (1965): 417–427, here 422–423.

6 Weinfeld, "Traces of Assyrian Treaty Formulae," 422–423.

7 P.-E. Dion, "Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchical Era," in *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel* (ed. B. Halpern and D. W. Hobson; JSOTSup 124; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 147–216; H. U. Steymans, *Deuteronomium 28 und die Adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel* (OBO 145; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); idem, "Eine assyrische Vorlage für Deuteronomium 28:20–44," in *Bundesdokument und Gesetz: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; HBS 4; Freiburg: Herder, 1995), 119–141, followed by E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechts-*

Though there have been some attempts at nuance, the fundamental model of Deuteronomy as a close adaptation – possibly even a direct translation – of VTE has persisted, largely unscathed, for five decades. Dion, for example, allowed that Deuteronomy 13 was not a mechanical calque of VTE, but nevertheless contended that it has "precise contacts with the vassal treaties of Esarhaddon"; Levinson has proposed a process of "selective adaptation and creative transformation."[8] Both envision Deuteronomy's author as making deliberate and direct reference to an Assyrian treaty text; thus Levinson describes Deuteronomy's use of VTE as "citation," albeit creative.[9] In lieu of authorial creativity, Steymans and Otto explain the texts' differences in terms of extensive redactional alteration.[10] Steymans argues that Deuteronomy 28 exhibits sufficient affinities to VTE to call it a translation, although this is only imprecisely defined: he speaks of an *Übersetzer* ("translator") at some points, but at others of *freie Übertragung* ("free transmission") or *Übernahme* ("adaptation").[11]

Crucially, Steymans points to other ancient Near Eastern bilingual texts, including the Tell Fekheriyeh and Behistun inscriptions, to justify his claim that the *Umstellungen* ("rearrangements") in Deuteronomy's transmission of VTE are in line with other ancient translations.[12] We address this claim in section 5. Here it is necessary to observe that much of Steymans's and Otto's

---

reform in Juda und Assyrien (BZAW 284; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999); idem, "Treueid und Gesetz: Die Ursprünge des Deuteronomiums im Horizont neuassyrischen Vertragsrechts," *ZABR* 2 (1996): 1–52; B. M. Levinson, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty as the Source for the Canon Formula in Deuteronomy 13:1," *JAOS* 130 (2010): 25–45; idem, "'But You Shall Surely Kill Him!' The Text-Critical and Neo-Assyrian Evidence for MT Deuteronomy 13:10," in *Bundesdokument und Gesetz: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; HBS 4; Freiburg: Herder, 1995), 37–63; idem, "Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test Case in Method," *JBL* 120 (2001): 211–243.

8 Dion, "Deuteronomy 13," 196, 205; Levinson, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty," 341.

9 Levinson, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty," 343; cf. idem, "'But You Shall Surely Kill Him!'," 60–61.

10 E. g., Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 119–141; Otto, "Treueid und Gesetz," 32–47. Dion ("Deuteronomy 13," 147–216) undertakes some redactional analysis, but not to the same degree.

11 For terminology of an *Übersetzer*, see Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 134, and esp. 141 (where he describes Deut 28 as "eine Übersetzung aus der Übersetzung" – "a translation of the [Aramaic] translation"); for *Übertragung*, see ibid., 128 (in direct contrast to "wörtliche Übertragung"); for *Übernahme*, see ibid., 140. Otto is more equivocal, and tends to refrain from using the terminology *Übersetzung*, preferring instead *Übertragung* (e. g., "Treueid und Gesetz," 33, 36, 40, 42, 44, 45, 52). The question that continues to present itself vis-à-vis Otto's formulation is how "direct" his *direkte Übertragung* (ibid., 52) is understood to be.

12 Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 129, 131–132, 133, 136.

proposed redactional activity is motivated by the desire to achieve a text closely resembling VTE. Using the results obtained from the reconstruction of a putatively pre-Deuteronomic document – performed in part through comparison to VTE – in order to understand the relationship between Deuteronomy and VTE in terms of translational technique is impossible; the redactional analysis already assumes a mode of adaptation that may not withstand scrutiny.

Insofar as the Deuteronomy-VTE relationship has been questioned, it has been a result of the small number of surviving ancient Near Eastern treaties. K. Radner observes that most examples have been poorly preserved and are likely only a few of those originally extant. She concludes, therefore, that she "would certainly be very cautious about regarding a specific oath – or even only its curse section – as the prototype for passages in the book of Deuteronomy."[13]

These scholarly camps reflect two ways of dealing with acknowledged dissimilarities between Deuteronomy and VTE: recourse to creative and expansive adaptation *versus* recourse to an alternate source text. To the latter we will return in our conclusions. First we will address the specific questions about the nature and practice of translation in the ancient Near East which are raised by the explanation of divergences between Deuteronomy and VTE in terms of creative translation.

1.2. Purpose and Subject of this Study

In a recent monograph, Crouch has argued that neither Deuteronomy 28 nor Deuteronomy 13 contains specific enough allusions to VTE to sustain an argument for Deuteronomy's sole, direct dependence on VTE.[14] Translational issues complicate matters, insofar as modern discussions of translation recognize the possibility of pervasive and significant transformations

---

13 K. Radner, "Assyrische *ṭuppi adê* als Vorbild für Deuteronomium 28,20–44?" in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte *et al.*; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 351–378, here 375; cf. J. Pakkala, "Der literar- und religionsgeschichtliche Ort von Deuteronomium 13," in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte *et al.*; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 125–137; C. Koch, *Vertrag, Treueid und Bund: Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im alten Testament* (BZAW 383; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 106–247, 284–286.

14 Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians*.

as a source text is moved into a new linguistic system. Because VTE was composed in Akkadian and Deuteronomy in Hebrew, it is necessary to gauge the degree to which normal translational transformations may have distorted an underlying source text.

This study seeks to determine if Deuteronomy's use of motifs found in the Akkadian treaty tradition, as represented in VTE, falls within accepted parameters of translation in the Iron Age II. We seek to clarify how the process of translation actually worked in the Iron Age, especially translation of an officially-produced text from Akkadian into one of the Northwest Semitic languages. Our primary text for comparison is the Akkadian-Aramaic bilingual inscription from Tell Fekheriyeh. This is one of very few preserved instances of Akkadian-Aramaic bilingualism and translation from the Iron Age II; only a few other monumental inscriptions display paired (i. e., spatially proximate) Akkadian-Aramaic texts, namely, the Arslan Tash Trilingual and the Incirli Trilingual. Unfortunately, both are fragmentary and remain insufficiently understood to serve as source material for this study.

To compare the translation technique of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription with Deuteronomy's putative reliance on VTE, we employ the theoretical framework of "optimal translation" recently described by Hutton.[15] A brief theoretical section lays out the theory's basic principles (section 3). We then review evidence for the source-target relationships evinced in the Tell Fekheriyeh Inscription (section 4) and in the VTE-Deuteronomy relationship (section 5). We show that there is little evidence that a scribe translating from an Akkadian source text into a Northwest Semitic language (in this case, Hebrew) would have done so in a way that would result in the differences between Deuteronomy and VTE, and argue that these transformations move beyond what can reasonably be called *translation*, even under the most liberal of construals. At most, they might be qualified as literary *refraction*.[16] First, however, we must briefly review the material disposition and compositional history of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (section 2).

---

15 J. M. Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations," *JHebS* 15 (2015): art. 7; a brief analysis of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription was presented at the SBL Annual Meeting as idem, "Tracking Optimality in Translation at Tell Fekheriyeh" (21 November 2015).

16 See A. Lefevere, "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature," in *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed.; ed. L. Venuti; London: Routledge, 2012), 203–219.

2. The Object and Its Inscription

2.1. The Object's Discovery and Its Historical Context

The Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (*KAI* § 309) was discovered at Sikan, not far (ca. 2 km) east of Guzan (Tell Ḫalaf). The site is mentioned prominently in the inscription, which evinces a composition history that is bound up with the cultic apparatuses of both Guzan and Sikan. The object was first published in a series of preemptive announcements,[17] then in a monograph-length volume commonly considered the *editio princeps*.[18]

The monument most likely dates to the third quarter of the 9th century (ca. 850–825 B.C.E.). This determination was made already by A. Abou-Assaf on the basis of iconographic parallels and historical data.[19] The date ca. 850–825 B.C.E. has gone largely unchallenged and currently maintains a large consensus.[20]

2.2. The Object and Its Inscription

The object itself is a large, anthropomorphic statue carved in basalt. The male figure is standing in a neutral, frontal pose, hands clasped across his midriff. Important for our study is the spatial arrangement of the figure's skirt, where the epigraph has been inscribed in the space approximately

17 A. Abou-Assaf, "Die Statue des HDYSʿY, König von Guzana," *MDOG* 113 (1981): 3–22; P. Bordreuil, A. R. Millard, and A. Abou-Assaf, "La statue de Tell Fekheryé: La première inscription bilingue assyro-araméenne," *Comptes rendus, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 125 (1981): 640–655; A. R. Millard and P. Bordreuil, "A Statue from Syria with Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions," *BA* 45 (1982): 135–141.

18 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). For accounts of the inscription's discovery, see Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 3–4; Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 1–4, unnumbered pages (area map and site plan); Millard and Bordreuil, "Statue from Syria," 137; and E. Lipiński, "The Bilingual Inscription from Tell Fekherye," in idem, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics II* (OLA 57; Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 19–81, esp. 19–21.

19 Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," esp. 9, 12–13. See also Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 9–12, 22, 87–102; as well as A. R. Millard, "Assyrians and Arameans," *Iraq* 45 (1983): 104–105.

20 See most recently the studies by J. Dušek and J. Mynářová, "Tell Fekheriye Inscription: A Process of Authority on the Edge of the Assyrian 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, esp. 33–36; and L. Quick, "'To Hear and to Accept': A Word-Pair in the Tell Fakhariyah Bilingual Inscription," *JSS* 61 (2016): 413–429.

between the individual's upper thighs and his mid-shins. The Akkadian text is on the front side of the skirt, while the Aramaic text occupies the back, except for two lines that did not fit; these are inscribed on the lower hem and reach around to the front, where they are inscribed below the Akkadian.[21] The disposition signals the relative importance of the Akkadian text.[22] The texts have been preserved nearly completely.

In light of the statue's discovery at Sikan, the conflicting (and sometimes only implied) references 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 Aramaean king Haddu-yiθʿî to be dedicated to Hadad-of-Sikan (Aram. line 1 = stich Intro-RelVP [see Appendices A and B for the text of the inscription][23]). This is sustained throughout the Aramaic text (Aram. lines 5–6, 16 = stichs A:7; B:7). The Akkadian version, by contrast, first locates Hadad's residence in Guzan (Akk. line 7 = stich A:7), but later in Sikan (Akk. line 25 = stich B:7). To complicate matters, the royal titles of the statue's commissioner, Haddu-yiθʿî, also fluctuate. Originally, Haddu-yiθʿî seems to have positioned himself in both texts as ruler of Guzan (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, and Azran (Akk. lines 19–20; Aram. line 13; = stich B:1). The contradictions in locale, combined with structural repetitions, make clear that both the Akkadian and Aramaic versions are composed of two units, 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 this. The divergence of geographical markers in the A 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 B text contains a new introduction. Moreover, reference to the statue's improvement (or surpassing?) indicates the existence of an earlier monument.[24] They argued that the

21 See Abou-Assaf, "Statue des HDYSʿY," 3; Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 8–9, and unnumbered page (autograph of Aramaic inscription).

22 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 9.

23 It remains conventional to cite the inscription's physical lineation, and we follow that principle here. However, in order to focus on the tightly-corresponding translational segments in the co-texts, we have also divided the text into grammatical units. We call these unit "stichs" and use this numeration in the translation-theoretic discussion below. For coordination of these two systems, see the Appendices.

24 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 67.

differences between the A and B texts allow us to hypothesize multiple stages of revision. They envision a scenario in which the A text was originally inscribed on a monument to Hadad-of-Guzan.[25] Later, when the present monument was erected in Sikan, the Akk. A text was replicated exactly, preserving the identification of Hadad as *āšib* ^{uru}*guzani* (Akk. line 7 = stich A:7). The Aramaic text (including the Introduction unparalleled in the Akk. A text), however, was adjusted to account for the fact that the new statue was dedicated to Hadad-of-Sikan, rather than Hadad-of-Guzan.[26]

This reconstruction makes generally good sense of the text's geographical cues. Yet it poses a problem: why would the Aramaic text have been adjusted but the Akkadian left undisturbed? A. Abou-Assaf, P. Bordreuil, and A. R. Millard hedged: "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."[27] This is possible, but not entirely satisfying, and the editors themselves offered an alternative: Perhaps two statues were erected initially, "one at Guzan bearing the Assyrian text of A, the other at Sikan bearing the Aramean text of A."[28] Although they do not follow this to its logical conclusion, this implies that Akk. A and Aram. A were combined as part of the establishment of a new (now, *third*) statue in Sikan, when Text B was also added.

In their earlier discussions the editors had suggested that an original statue dedicated to Hadad-in-Guzan, bearing only the Akk. A text, had been *transported* to Sikan. The Aramaic translation of A was added in Sikan, augmented by the novel formulation of a more typically West Semitic introduction. The B texts were added at a third stage.[29] This hypothesis presents a difficulty, since all evidence points to a single moment of inscription for both the Assyrian and the Aramaic texts on the extant statue. In the *editio* the editors abandoned the proposal,[30] but it has been picked up and modified by J. Dušek and J. Mynářová.[31] They assume an object dedicated to the deity Hadad-in-Guzan, bearing only Akk. A. This object was then moved to Sikan, where Aram. A was added; in the process, some of the Akkadian

25 Ibid., 67–68.

26 See similarly C. Dohmen, "Die Statue von Tell Fecherīje und die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen: Ein Beitrag zur Bildenterminologie," *BN* 22 (1983): 91–106, esp. 94–95.

27 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 67.

28 Ibid., 68.

29 Bordreuil *et al*., "Statue de Tell Fekheryé," 646–647.

30 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 68; Dohmen, "Statue von Tell Fecherīje," 95.

31 Dušek and Mynářová ("Tell Fekheriye Inscription," 20–29) provide a helpful though not impeccable review of previous literature.

phrases were deliberately re- (or mis-?) construed to be more meaningful in the new setting.[32] In a third stage, Akk. and Aram. B and the Aramaic Introduction were added to the A text, and all inscribed on an entirely new object (i. e., the statue at hand).[33]

Several questions remain. As nearly universally recognized, the Aramaic text's mention of Sikan indicates that it was adjusted to acknowledge the present statue's location. But perhaps Akk. and Aram. A were inscribed simultaneously; only the more vernacular Aramaic text was revised to reflect the new locale in Sikan, because the more formal Akkadian text was less amenable to revision.[34] Alternatively, the Aramaic was translated only on the occasion of the installation of a new object in Sikan; the preservation of the old locale in the Akkadian served as a nod to the dedicator, rather than as an indicator of the object's material and geographic history. Dušek and Mynářová's reading of the Aramaic of lines 10–11 (= stich A:18) is also problematic. Only the hypothesis that the statue under investigation is at least the second dedicated object can explain the thematic disjunctures between the A and B texts while accounting for their attested material continuity.

Finally, commentators are nearly universally agreed that the Aramaic text of lines 2–12 (= stichs A:1–19) were translated directly from the already-extant Akk. A text (lines 1–18). Similar consensus has not been achieved concerning the B text. For example, certain rearrangements in the curses of the B text (B:15–19) have been treated mostly independently in recent studies by Ramos and Quick. These researchers have plausibly argued that the frequent employment of this style of futility curse in ritual settings suggests that the Aramaic literary tradition had its own distinctive conventions; these conventions were recruited for use in Fekh. B, in contrast to the differently-structured Akkadian curses that stood in parallel.[35] Yet, without a much more detailed analysis than can be undertaken here, it would be difficult to express confidence in any reconstruction that utilized the relationship between Akk. B and Aram. B in its data set. Thus we use a minimal corpus of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription, comprising only that portion of the inscription for which nearly all parties are agreed that the evidence points to an act

32 Ibid., 27–28.

33 Ibid., 28.

34 See Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 67, quoted above.

35 M. Ramos, "A Northwest Semitic Curse Formula: The Sefire Treaty and Deuteronomy 28," *ZAW* 128 (2016): 205–220; L. Quick, *Deuteronomy 28 and the Aramaic Curse Tradition* (Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), esp. 68–106. Quick's very detailed analysis of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (ibid., 137–151) appeared after the bulk of this essay was completed, and will be dealt with in greater depth in Hutton and Crouch, *Translating Empire*.

of translation from the underlying Akkadian source into Aramaic (i. e., Text A, without the introduction peculiar to the Aramaic).

3. 'Optimal Translation': A Theoretical Précis

3.1. Optimality Derives from Norms

We adopt in this paper two theoretical stances that are readily combined. The first is Descriptive Translation Studies, which has been increasingly employed to analyze the major biblical translations. The second is Optimality Theory, developed by formal linguists in order to describe phonological developments.[36] Hutton has recently sketched an optimality-theoretic approach to translation, inspired by translation theorist G. Toury's description of translators as seeking to produce the *optimal* translation.[37] A. Chesterman and C. Nord have made similar statements about translated texts exhibiting the *optimal* representation of their sources.[38] This mode of translation takes divergent forms in translation manuals, which assume that translations can be (and are) optimal in some way. But how does the translator decide what constitutes an optimal translation?

Once the initial norm governing the translation has been established or selected, the translator works under the influence of a set of socially-negotiated *operational norms*. These hold the status of "'instructions' [that] specify what is prescribed and forbidden, as well as what is tolerated and permitted in a certain behavioral dimension …."[39] Furthermore, they are vested with implications for the translator's status. Status enhancement derives from the translator's adherence to socially-negotiated norms constraining translational behavior; diminution ("sanctioning"[40]) when the translator has

36 A. Prince and P. Smolensky, *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar* (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 234–238; published online as Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science Technical Report, 2 (Aug., 2002 version; originally published 1993); online: http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/537-0802/537-0802-PRINCE-0-0.PDF (accessed March 22, 2013).

37 Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations," 6–9; see also G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond* (rev. ed.; Benjamins Translation Library 100; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012), 32 and below.

38 A. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation* (Benjamins Translation Library 22; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997; repr. 2000), 69, 80, *et passim*; C. Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997), 63, 116.

39 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 63. For norms as constraints, see also Chesterman, *Memes of Translation*, 78–81.

40 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 64.

not.[41] Some norms are more stringently adhered to than others. Some may be violable, especially when the translator seeks to adhere to other norms in the target culture. Some can be subverted entirely. The existence of such norms necessarily confronts the translator with an array of translational decisions. As a result, "the selection [of translation replacements]," says Toury, becomes "*non-random*."[42]

Hutton has offered a provisional definition of "norm": "*a social, political, literary, or other type of constraint underlying and motivating an established pattern of translation. Norms can, but do not necessarily, motivate any specific degree of [formal] equivalence.*"[43] From this it is possible to hypothesize that translational decisions, made in the context of and under the linguistic and social constraints imposed by norms, necessarily comprise the translator's attempt to satisfy all the constraints felt to be operative for the commission at hand in the best – i. e., *optimal* – manner available. We thus take for granted the *optimality* of any given translation, but recognize that optimality is contingent upon the social and functional setting in which the translation has been performed. An optimal translation designed with a specific function in one setting will hardly qualify as optimal in another, or when analyzed as fulfilling a different function, because the set of constraints imposed as norms in one setting diverges from the set of norms imposed in another setting. The goal, then, in analyzing translation technique, is not simply to provide an account of how linguistic segments match up to one another, or how a translation was used (or meant to be used). Rather, the goal is to identify "the relevant conventions [i. e., norms] that were operative in that culture when the text was produced."[44]

3.2. Descriptive Translation Studies and Optimality Theory: A Comparison

In the preceding section, we saw that translation optimality is subject to culturally-negotiated norms. We will now briefly summarize the theoretical and methodological considerations uniting Descriptive Translation Studies and Optimality Theory.[45]

---

41 See I. Even-Zohar, "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem," in *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed.; ed. L. Venuti; London: Routledge, 2012), 162–167.

42 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 64.

43 Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations," 8 (emphasis original).

44 C. Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (BTS 8; Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 60.

45 The following expands on J. M. Hutton, "Optimal Translation in LXX and Tg. Jon. of 1 Sam 1:1–5: Outline of a Comparative Theory of Translation Technique," in *IOTS*

3.2.1. Range of Possible Alternatives

In both theoretical frameworks, *speakers (or translators) select from a range of possible alternatives, some of which are more well-formed than others*. Language speakers and translators naturally conceive of multiple possible replacements of words, phrases, and so on. In ideal circumstances, they instinctively select the structure that best fits their intentions – in linguistic terms, the most well-formed candidate.[46]

This is not to say that speakers or translators always select the appropriate word. Speakers sometimes come up with "the wrong word"; translators make mistakes. But judgments concerning well-formedness are made on the basis of *constraints* imposed by speaker communities. As a linguistic example: Speakers of English may pronounce /dog/ as [dag], [dɔg], or [dawg]. All three fall within a range of acceptable alternatives. One may be more preferable to the others, depending on geographical and social context, but all will be understandable to most native speakers, and a native speaker might accept an even more strongly-divergent pronunciation if she recognizes that her interlocutor's native language is not English. But [dɪg] is not a well-formed, or optimal, output of /dog/, and speakers who made the mistake of pronouncing the word this way would be "sanctioned" (in Toury's terminology). That is to say, their conversation partners would have a hard time understanding the intended denotation. In extreme circumstances, the interlocutor is likely to give up on the conversation and go talk with someone else.

Similarly, translators have a range of options for rendering source text into a target language. For example, the biblical translator has the option to translate Hebrew *dāḇār* as "word," "matter," or "thing." But as with the linguistic example, choosing to translate *dāḇār* with a replacement that does not fit the context or does not satisfy the audience's sense of appropriate syntactic and semantic value would potentially place the translator under suspicion. Further, rendering *dāḇār* with a word whose semantic value does not overlap significantly (e. g., English "fire") would likely jeopardize one's job as a translator. In short, there are linguistically-mandated and socially-negotiated normative constraints placed on speakers and on translators. Some can be violated with minimal social repercussions, but others cannot.

Conference Publication (ed. M. N. van der Meer and D. Shepherd; JSJSupp; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming) and is further elaborated in Hutton and Crouch, *Translating Empire*.

46 See Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 2, 6, etc.

3.2.2. Assumption of Optimality (~Equivalence)

Descriptive Translation theorists *assume the equivalence of a translation with its source text*. The two texts need not necessarily express a relationship of either *formal* or *semantic* equivalence, but descriptivists assume that a translation is the translator's best-formed target text, with all relevant constraints balanced optimally.[47] Similarly, Optimality theorists posit that the grammatical output of any given input is the *optimal* output. In linguistics, this optimality is defined by the operation of phonological, morphological, or syntactic constraints. These constraints are not inviolable, but some rank more highly than others – that is, some constraints force adherence to themselves universally while others merely motivate certain outcomes, all other things being equal.[48] It is the researcher's task to discover the principles whereby this *optimality* obtained – and, in the case of translation, to develop a profile of what choices the translator made so as to achieve this equivalence.[49]

3.2.3. Assumption of Universal Constraints

Each field *assumes the existence of some universal constraints*.[50] Optimality theorists propose a group of *faithfulness* constraints that require sufficient similarity of the output to its input so as to be recognizable. Descriptive translation theorists assume that the translator has attempted to render the source text in such a way that the locution and the concepts of the translation – the target text – are sufficiently similar so as to qualify as a "translation" in some way. This principle is known as "adequacy."

Each field also employs a set of *markedness* constraints. In Optimality Theory, these introduce difference into the grammar.[51] In translation theory, this is known as the drive towards "acceptability" – that is, the goal of a translator is to make the translation *acceptable* to the intended audience, within the constraints imposed by the assignment.

---

47 See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 17–34.

48 Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 3; J. J. McCarthy and A. Prince, *Prosodic Morphology: Constraint Interaction and Satisfaction* (Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science Technical Report, 3 [Nov., 2001 version; originally published 1993]); online: http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/482-1201/482-1201-MCCARTHY-0-0.PDF (accessed March 22, 2013); and R. Kager, *Optimality Theory* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

49 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 31–34.

50 Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 4; Kager, *Optimality Theory*, 1–2, 10–11, 18.

51 Kager, *Optimality Theory*, 2–3, 6–8.

3.2.4. Limited and Hierarchical Constraint Sets

In both systems *the constraints on speakers and on translators are finite in number and hierarchical in arrangement*.[52] Optimality Theory seeks to capture deep-seated linguistic principles underlying more epiphenomenal "rules" discovered via traditional generative and historical analyses.[53] The hierarchical arrangement of constraints describes how the principles (constraints) imposed on a given language's grammar *interact*. It is their interaction that determines the precise realization of any given language's surface-expression.

Principles governing language frequently conflict with one another. Consider, for example, Biblical Hebrew's preference for single consonants at the end of words (thus **ʿamm* > *ʿam*, "people"; **malk* > *mɛlɛ̀k*, "king"; **piry* > *pərî*, "fruit"). Although each originated with a structure of *CVCC, different sets of constraints have operated differently on each. In the case of *ʿam*, a constraint disfavoring word-final consonant clusters has motivated the simplification of a homorganic cluster. With **malk*, where the word-final consonant cluster is heterorganic, a different surface-level sound rule applies (here, anaptyxis of /ɛ/), though the phenomenon can still be traced back to the same underlying principle discouraging word-final consonant clusters. The same applies to *pərî*, in which additional, prosodic constraints have reconfigured the underlying **y* as the nucleus of the second syllable (thus, **y* > *î*). The surface realizations of these lexemes diverge, despite the fact that they all bear a common underlying structure. Optimality Theory seeks to understand these as the results of diverse interactions on the part of relatively few constraints.

These interactions are coordinated by a *constraint hierarchy*. As noted above, every constraint is potentially violable, but some violations incur minimal penalty, while others might be "fatal." (Any output candidate violating a constraint ranked more highly in the hierarchy than the constraints violated by other contenders is necessarily eliminated from further consideration. Such a violation is termed "fatal.") Optimality Theory assumes that constraints are ranked in hierarchies exhibiting "strict domination": the violation of a highly-ranked constraint cannot be redeemed by the satisfaction of lower-ranked constraints, unless all other plausible contenders violate the highly-ranked constraint to the same degree. The dominance of one constraint may produce the surface-level appearance that the lower-ranked constraint has somehow "failed" to achieve its goals, but in the paradigm

52 Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 232–234.
53 See, e. g., ibid., 5.

of Optimality Theory the constraint has not "stopped working" or "failed." Instead, it has been overruled by the higher-ranked constraint. The mechanisms of this apparatus will become clear in the discussions below.

3.2.5. Universal vs. Language- and Culture-Specific Constraints

Because of the cross-disciplinary scope of the present project, we anticipate various types of constraints, including linguistic constraints, general translational constraints, and more specific socio-cultural constraints. Each imposes its own sub-set of constraints: the target language will impose constraints relating to grammatical well-formedness and lexical familiarity; the central project of translation involves constraints aiming at semantic correspondence; and the socio-cultural milieu will impose its own peculiar set of constraints.

Translation theorists advocating a functionalist approach refer to the "commission" or "brief" (sometimes "*Skopos*") as "the prime principle determining any translation process."[54] This will impose a particular structure upon the constraint hierarchy and may introduce some text-peculiar constraints: translations commissioned to be more strictly representative of the underlying text's grammatical and lexical structures will demonstrate hierarchies in which constraints mandating faithfulness in linear order and strict morphological correspondence (i. e., "isomorphism") are privileged over constraints emphasizing adherence to the target culture's literary conventions. Alternatively, translations may seek to adhere to the literary conventions of the target culture (in which case constraints on literary well-formedness may be ranked more highly than those stressing a rigid morphological correspondence), or of defamiliarizing the text through the use of unfamiliar linguistic structures (in which case the linguistic constraints of the target language will be ranked lower than constraints proceeding from the literary sensibilities of the translator). As Hutton summarizes:

> It is the task of the Optimality Theorist … to discover and arrange the constraints in the proper hierarchy such that the greatest levels of adherence to the most highly-ranked constraints produces the translation under scrutiny. In the words of Prince and Smolesky, we have access to "empirically correct output, which must be optimal under the constraint hierarchy, if the grammar is to be successful." Our "empirically correct output" is given in the text produced by the translator …. it falls to the researcher, then, to reconstruct the "grammar" – alternately stated, the *constraint hierarchy* – in an Optimal Translation model.[55]

54 Nord, *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*, 27–38, quote from 27.

55 Hutton, "Optimal Translation in LXX and Tg. Jon"; Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 129.

3.3. Optimality-Theoretic Constraints on Translation

Our study is predicated on the results of Hutton's two earlier studies[56] and assumes several translation-universal norms identified therein (Table 1). For the most part, the *identity* constraints characteristic of translation are in this category – identity constraints are what motivate similarity between source and target texts (i. e., *adequacy*; Table 1a). Translators fulfil their roles *qua* translators only inasmuch as they produce translations that are faithful in some way to their source texts – formally, semantically, stylistically, or in some other criterion of sameness.

We further identify a number of language- and culture-specific constraints that make the translation more *acceptable* to the target audience. Insofar as these constraints motivate semantic and formal departures from the source text, they comprise *markedness* constraints (Table 1b). This comprises aspects both of linguistic *grammaticality* (i. e., the intuition of native speakers that the grammar is somehow "correct" or "proper") and of social propriety (i. e., that the literary stylistics, mannerisms, and other intangible aspects adhere to normal social conventions).

The simplest way to approach the interaction of constraints is through the identification of "pairwise" conflicts – that is, direct conflict between two constraints.[57] Eventually, with the establishment of pairwise *domination relationships* (in which one constraint "dominates" or takes precedence over another), interactions can be analyzed in larger sets, using a formal tool called a *tableau*.[58] Tableaux are also used to verify or validate the hierarchy constructed through pairwise comparisons. If a tableau predicts an empirically incorrect output, then the constraint hierarchy has been incorrectly reconstructed or the reconstruction has failed to account for a constraint. Because our introductory discussion is able to operate in a pairwise manner, tableaux will be reserved for later, when the comparison of larger sets of constraints will require that we employ a more comprehensive model.

---

56 Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations"; idem, "Optimal Translation in LXX and Tg. Jon."

57 E. g., Prince and Smolensky, *Optimality Theory*, 5, 139.

58 For a basic introduction to Optimality Theory "tableaux," see Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations," 9–17.

Translation Universals: *Identity, Maximality,* and *Dependency* Constraints

Morphological Identity (siglum: Ident:morph)
Each morpheme of the Source Text (M_1) must be reproduced by a corresponding morpheme in the Target Text (M_2).
Morphological Maximality (siglum: Max:morph)
For each morpheme of the Source Text (M_1) there must be a morpheme in the Target Text (M_2).
Morphological Dependency (siglum: Dep:morph)
For each morpheme of the Target Text (M_2) there must be a morpheme in the Source Text (M_1).
Morphological Linearity (siglum: Linear:morph)
The order of morphemes in the Target Text must be consistent with the order of morphemes in the Source Text.
Lexical Identity (siglum: IO-Ident:lex)
Each lexeme of the Source Text (L_1) must be reproduced by a cognate lexeme in the target language (L_2), if one exists.
Lexical Maximality (siglum: Max:lex)
For each word of the Source Text (L_1) there must be a word in the Target Text (L_2).
Lexical Dependency (siglum: Dep:morph)
For each word of the Target Text (L_2) there must be a word in the Source Text (L_1).
Lexical Linearity (siglum: Linear:morph)
The order of words in the Target Text must be consistent with the order of words in the Source Text.
Semantic Identity (siglum: Ident:sem)
Each semantic value of the Source Text's morphemes and lexemes ($|M/L|_1$) must be reproduced by a corresponding semantic value in the Target Text ($|M/L|_2$).

Table 1a: Translation Universal Faithfulness Constraints

Translation Universals: Markedness Constraints

Change Linguistic System (siglum: ChLingSys)
The original message of the source text must be transferred from one linguistic system to another.
Transliterate Proper Nouns (siglum: TrPropNs)
Whenever a proper noun is recognized, replace it with a corresponding phonological string that is similar, if not identical, to the replaced string. This replacement should adhere to the phonotactic repertoire of the target language as much as possible.

Table 1b: Translation Universal Markedness Constraints
Adapted from Hutton, "Optimality in the 'Grammars' of Ancient Translations"; idem, "Optimal Translation in LXX and Tg. Jon"

4. Building the Optimal Grammar of Translation in Fekheriyeh Text A

In section 3, we outlined the principles guiding our analysis of the translational norms (constraints) governing the Aramaic translator's approach to the Assyrian source text in Fekh. A. Here we offer the analysis itself. This depends on technical procedures and linguistic formalisms and will likely overshoot the typical biblical scholar's tolerance for technical data and formal representation. The casual reader may prefer to skim this somewhat superficially, reading only the summary section (4.4). We have compiled the source text and its translation in Appendix A, developing an eclectic reading of the text as agreed by the majority of commentators.[59]

4.1. Pairwise Comparison of Selected IDENTITY Constraints

4.1.1. TRPROPNS ≫ CHLINGSYS

Definitions of "translation" normally include replacement of one language system with another. This is *nearly universally* the case, suggesting that the constraint CHANGE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM is among the highest in nearly every translation. In Fekh. A, the translator subordinated CHANGE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM to another constraint in only a few circumstances. First and foremost is the translator's decision to *transliterate* a name rather than *translating* its semantic value.[60]

Septuagint renderings of the Hebrew toponym *maḥănayim* serve as a comparative example. Translators could transliterate, Μααναιμ (LXX^{OG} Josh 13:30), or translate using its (putative) semantic equivalent, παρεμβολας, 'camps' (LXX^{OG} Gen 32:3). In the former, the constraint TRANSLITERATE PROPER NOUNS dominates CHANGE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM; this relationship is given formal representation as (1) (the relationship of domination is indicated in Optimality Theory by a double arrow pointing toward the dominated constraint):

(1) TRPROPNS ≫ CHLINGSYS

That is, the translator of LXX^{OG} Josh 13:30 chose to satisfy TRANSLITERATE PROPER NOUNS while violating CHANGE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM because the latter could be violated with fewer negative repercussions. Conversely,

59 For the sake of space, detailed text-critical discussions are omitted; these may be found in Hutton and Crouch, *Translating Empire*.

60 For further discussion see Hutton, "Optimal Translation in LXX and Tg. Jon."

LXX^{OG} Gen 32:3, which renders παρεμβολας, adopts the other possible ranking of these two constraints, as in (2):

(2) ChLingSys ≫ TrPropNs

Because this text plays on the semantic value of the name, it was more important that the translation satisfy Change Linguistic System.

In Fekh. A, we may discern several replaced-replacement segments that testify to a constraint hierarchy favoring transliteration of names over translation, as in (3):

(3) TrPropNs ≫ ChLingSys in *Akk. A* ⇒ *Aram. A*
Stich 9a: ^{I}*adad*(u)-*it'i* (PN) ⇔ הדיסעי (PN)
Stich 9b: ^{Id}*šamaš-nūrī* (PN) ⇔ ססנורי (PN)
Stich 19c: *adad*(u) (DN) ⇔ הדד (DN)

In all three examples, the names demonstrate close phonological correspondence, adapting the pronunciation of each to Aramaic's phonotactics. In the case of ^{I}*adad*(u)-*it'i* ~ הדיסעי, this may be because the Akkadian source text is already using an Aramaic form of the name.[61] This bidirectionality, represented with the double-arrow (⇔), may testify to the privileging of TrPropNs ≫ ChLingSys in Aramaic-into-Akkadian translational contexts as well.

The single piece of evidence contradicting the proposed hierarchy TrPropNs ≫ ChLingSys appears in stich A:7, where the Assyrian text reads ^{uru}*guzani* while the Aramaic reads סכן. As we saw above, this is most economically understood not as a translational issue but as a textual one, connected to the historical context of the inscription's production. We therefore eliminate this datum from consideration as a marker of Aram. A's translation technique.

4.1.2. Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex

Another pairwise comparison may be made between two constraints that frequently interact. Semantic Identity recognizes that translational adequacy depends upon the close correspondence of the translation's semantic value to that of its source. Lexical Identity recognizes that one of the most common translational tactics is to render a source-language lexeme with a cognate target lexeme, because this involves a lower cognitive load for the translator.[62] The interaction between these two constraints poses a special

61 Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 23–24.

62 See M. Sherkina, "The Cognate Facilitation Effect in Bilingual Speech Processing," *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 21 (2003): 135–151.

problem, such that special tactics are taught in modern translation classes to account for the conflicts that inevitably arise between Semantic Identity and Lexical Identity.[63]

Cognate languages (or those that share a long history of language contact) will frequently share a set of "false friends." These are cognate words whose semantic values have diverged over time. Compare, for example, Aram. טור and Heb. צור. Were one to translate the Aramaic phrase in Dan 2:35 (הות לטור רב, "it became a great mountain") into Hebrew, it would be incorrect in most circumstances to translate היתה לצור רב, because Hebrew צור would constitute a semantic departure from the Aramaic source text. More favorable would be היתה להר רב (or, perhaps even better, היתה להר גדול). This example allows us to posit a naturally-preferred hierarchy to these two constraints. Semantic Identity ranks higher than Lexical Identity:

(4) Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex

In Fekh. A, several Aramaic replacements satisfy both constraints. For example, Akkadian *nādin rîti u mašqīte*, "who gives pasturage and watering," is rendered in Aramaic as נתן רעי ומשקי, i. e., *nātin rVʿê wa-mašqê* (A:2). This correspondence is notable because it satisfies most of the identity constraints listed above as well: It satisfies Morphological Identity because for each participle (*nādin*), noun (*rîti*, *mašqīte*), or conjunction (*u*) in the Assyrian text, there is a formally correspondent participle (נתן), noun (רעי, משקי), or conjunction (ו) in the Aramaic text. Indeed, the correspondence of the two texts is so tight as to make the theoretical framework appear vacuous. But the precise delineations permitted in our system allow more precise formulations of the constraint hierarchy, even in this otherwise mundane translation segment.

Lexical Maximality and Lexical Dependency are both satisfied, since every word in the source text has a corresponding replacement word. Lexical Identity is satisfied, since each of the words in the output is cognate to its corresponding word in the input, and Semantic Identity is satisfied (as far as we can tell) by virtue of the fact that each lexemic replacement in the Aramaic denotes the same basic referent as the corresponding segment in the source text. Lexical Linearity is satisfied as well, since the syntactic order of the target text mirrors that of its source. Only the Morphological Identity constraint has been compromised: the feminine

63 See M. Terceder, "Cognates as Lexical Choices in Translation," *Target* 22 (2010): 177–193.

singular nouns of the Akkadian source (*rîti*, *mašqīte*) have undergone an apparently obligatory shift to masculine singular in the Aramaic target (רעי, משקי). This indicates that Lexical Identity and Semantic Identity dominate Morphological Identity, as in (5):

(5) Ident:lex, Ident:sem ≫ Ident:morph

Lexical Identity and Semantic Identity are separated by a comma to indicate that, at this point, we have no evidence to force a hierarchical relationship between the two. This privileging of Lexical Identity and Semantic Identity over Morphological Identity can be found in the further examples in (6):

(6) Ident:lex, Ident:sem ≫ Ident:morph in *Akk. A* ⇒ *Aram. A*
Stich A:1: *šamê u erṣeti* ⇒ שמין וארק ("heavens and earth")
Stich A:4: *nārātī* ⇒ נהר ("rivers")
Stich A:6a: *ša sīpūšu ṭābu* ⇒ זי תצלותה טבה ("whose prayer is good")
Stich A:10: *napšātīšu* ⇒ נבשה ("his life")
Stich A:11: *arāk ūmēšu* ⇒ מארך יומוה ("the being-long of his days")
Stich A:12: *šanātīšu* ⇒ שנוה ("his years")

In other instances, however, the translator has chosen an Aramaic phrase that corresponds to the semantic value of the Akkadian but is not cognate to it. For example, Akk. *šumī-ma liškun* "let him place my name" (Akk. line 16 = stich A:18) is not rendered with Aram. שכן, because that root exhibits a different semantic value. Instead, the Aramaic is שמים לשם (/*šumī-m laśim*/, 'let him place my name'; Aram. line 11). We can thus say that, for Fekh. A, Semantic Identity dominates Lexical Identity. We can incorporate the domination pattern from (5) into the more specific statement (7). Examples are presented in (8):

(7) Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex ≫ Ident:morph

(8) Examples of hierarchy (7) in *Akk. A* ⇒ *Aram. A*
Stich A:8: *bēli rabî* ⇒ מרא רב ("great lord," similarly stich A:9a)
Stich A:10: *ana bulluṭ napšātīšu* ⇒ לחיי נבשה ("to sustain his life")
Stich A:19a: *šumī unakkaru* ⇒ ילד שמי ("[whoever] would efface my name")
Stich A:19b: *šumšu išakkanu* ⇒ ישים שמה ("[whoever] would place his name")

A number of further replacements correspond semantically but not lexically to their source-segments, but do so because Aramaic does not seem to have a lexical equivalent. While these examples are not proof of hierarchy (7), therefore, they do attest to the high rank of Semantic Identity, not to mention the various Linearity constraints motivating isomorphism (see below, section 4.3.2):

(9) Examples of the dominance of IDENT:SEM where no cognate existed in Aramaic
Stich A:5: *muṭaḫḫidu kibrāti* ("[who] makes the lands luxuriant") ⇒ מעדן מת ("[who] makes [the] land[s] delightful")
Stich A:6a, 15: *sīpūšu*, *ikribīya*[64] ⇒ תצלותה ("his prayer")
Stich A:9b: *mār* ⇒ בר ("son [of]")
Stich A:12: *šumʾud šanātīšu* ⇒ כבר שנוה ("[to] increase his years")
Stich A:14: *nasāḫ murṣi* ⇒ מלד מרק ("[to] remove sickness")
Stich A:16: *magāri* ⇒ מלקח ("[to] receive [the words of my/his mouth]")
Stich A:16: *qibīt pīya* ⇒ אמרת פמה ("the utterance of my/his mouth")
Stich A:17: *iqēš* ⇒ יהב ("he gave")
Stich A:18a: *mannu arkû* ⇒ מן אחר ("whoever [is] later")
Stich A:19c: *adad*(U) *qardu* ⇒ הדד גבר ("Hadad the hero")

A questionable example might also be included. In stich A:2, Akkadian *mušaznin* ("who causes to rain") was rendered with Aramaic מהנחת ("who sends down"). At first, the two appear to violate our highly-ranked constraint SEMANTIC IDENTITY: the former specifically denotes precipitation, whereas the latter is simply directional.[65] Accordingly, some semantic bleaching seems to have occurred in the Aramaic translation. However, Dion has argued that the correspondence is conventional: in the Targumim, the C-stem (*aphel*) of נחת is used to render Hebrew המטיר ("to cause to rain").[66] If the shift is obligatory because the semantic value of Aram. הנחת (C-stem) had already come at this point to approximate closely Akk. *šazninu* (C[Š]-stem), then SEMANTIC IDENTITY would not be violated. However, there does seem to be a Targumic alternative to הנחת, namely the C-stem of √מטר. However one decides to handle this particular situation, it is clear that our constraint of SEMANTIC IDENTITY must be sensitive to numerous problems associated with the amount of overlap and coextension of semantic fields.

4.1.3. IDENT:PRAG.LEX ≫ IDENT:SEM

In a number of instances, individual Akkadian words have been replaced by semantically divergent but functionally equivalent Aramaic words. This implies that there is an even more highly ranked constraint, thus far unnoticed because the above examples do not violate it:

---

64 We disregard for the moment the change between Akk. 1.sg. *-ya* and Aram. 3.m.sg. ה-.

65 E. g., Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 55.

66 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; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 139–147, here 143.

(10) Pragmatic Lexical Correspondence (siglum: Ident:prag.lex)
When no semantically or lexically-equivalent translation replacement suffices, replace with a term that captures the pragmatic implicature of the lexeme to be replaced; often this will entail *abstraction*.[67]

As articulated in (10), Pragmatic Lexical Correspondence has a precondition: namely, there must be no appropriate semantic or lexical equivalent available in the target language, *or* the semantic or lexical equivalent must be somehow inappropriate. The precise nature of this "inappropriateness" would require much further study. Nevertheless, it is possible to point to a few of the unexpected lexical replacements that are likely to be attributed to the broad scope of this high-ranking constraint:

(11) Examples of Ident:prag.lex ≫ Ident:sem in *Akk. A* ⇒ *Aram. A*
Stich A:1: *mušaznin nuḫše* "who causes fruitfulness to rain"
⇒ מהנחת עסר "who causes wealth to descend"
Stich A:2b: *ana nišē* "to the inhabitants (lit.: people)"
⇒ למת "to the (inhabitants of the) land(s)"
Stich A:3a: *išqu u nindabê* ("share[s?] and food offering")
⇒ שלה ואדקור ("sprinkling and food offering")
Stich A:17: *ikrum-ma* ("he dedicated [it] and")
⇒ -כנן ו ("he erected [it] and")

4.1.4. Summary

This discussion of Identity constraints has shown that the translator of Fekh. A:
(a) uniformly transliterated names rather than translating their meanings (TrPropNs ≫ ChLingSys; section 4.1.1);
(b) used semantically- and lexically-correspondent replacements where available, even if that required some disregard for strict morphological identity, privileging semantic correspondence over lexical correspondence (Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex ≫ Ident:morph; section 4.1.2); and
(c) resorted to *generalizing* or *abstracting* only in certain circumstances, when the semantically-correspondent word or phrase did not match the intended text-linguistic function (Ident:prag.lex ≫ Ident:sem; section 4.1.3).

67 See, e.g., A. Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (London: Routledge, 2010), 14–15; also J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of English and French* (Benjamins Translation Library 11; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 343.

4.2. Comparison of Multiple Constraints

We will now discuss certain additions, subtractions, and rearrangements made by the translator to make the text more acceptable and explicit to an Aramaic audience.

4.2.1. Favor-loc.ttl ≫ Ident:sem

One example forces the addition of a culture-specific constraint, Favor Local Status Titles. This is one of the most salient discrepancies between the Akkadian source text and its Aramaic translation: namely, the unexpected rendering of the official position held by Haddu-yiθʿî and his father. Akkadian *šakin* (*māti*) ("governer [of the land]") is rendered with Aramaic מלך ("king") in stichs A:9a, 9b. Recognizing that the semantic denotations of these words are contradictory, most interpreters understand this as an indication that the two texts were targeted at different audiences. The Akkadian text spoke to those under Assyrian hegemony, and correlated Haddu-yiθʿî's status with that of an Assyrian provincial official. The Aramaic text allowed Haddu-yiθʿî to retain his native title, since it was directed to a different, local audience. Alternative readings minimize a major divergence in semantic value and we prefer this traditional interpretation.

Šaknu is the typical Akkadian term for a regional governor. More logical translations than מלך are easily intuited. For example, the cognate root **sakn* ("governor, major-domo") – an Akkadian loanword – would adhere to the constraints Lexical Identity and Semantic Identity. We could also propose **pīḥāt* ("governor"), perhaps also a loan from Akkadian. This would satisfy Semantic Identity, but not Lexical Identity. Finally, we must confront what would seem to be the highly unlikely rendering, Aram. **malk* ("king"). Applying A. Prince and P. Smolensky's dictum that our evidence constitutes the "empirically correct output," we must add מלך to our candidate list.

A confluence of multiple constraints allows us to demonstrate the utility of Optimality Theory's most iconic formalism: the *tableau*. The goal is to demonstrate that successive applications of progressively lower-ranked constraints gradually weed out non-optimal output candidates, yielding a single candidate that best satisfies all of the constraints used in the evaluative process. We work from left-to-right, in an order of descending constraint hierarchy.[68] We begin with **sakn*. This satisfies both Lexical Identity

68 Although tableaux necessarily process judgments of optimality *serially*, according to Optimality Theory the actual operations are performed *simultaneously* across a much

and Semantic Identity: its meaning corresponds closely to that of Akkadian *šaknu*, and its lexical identity in the mind of the translator is almost assured by its phonetic similarity to its Akkadian counterpart. The word **sakn* therefore receives no disqualifying marks on the tableau. Our second possibility is **pīḥāt*, which satisfies Semantic Identity. However, it is not related etymologically to Akkadian *šaknu*, and therefore violates Lexical Identity. That violation is marked with an asterisk and, since **sakn* has incurred no such violations, this violation is "fatal." We mark fatality with an exclamation point and by shading further cells. Finally, we deal with **malk*. In our current tableau, **malk* violates both Semantic Identity and Lexical Identity. The first violation is fatal, because neither of the other possible renderings has violated such a highly-ranked constraint; the second violation is thus superfluous. Our model, in which Semantic Identity and Lexical Identity are presumed to be the most salient, predicts that the Aramaic translator would have favored **sakn* as his replacement for Akkadian *šaknu*. This would be marked in Optimality Theory with a pointing hand.

(12) Tableau 1: Preliminary Evaluation using only Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex

Akk. *šakin*	Ident:sem	Ident:lex
☞ **sakn*		
**pīḥāt*		*!
**malk*	*!	*

When confronted by the "empirically correct output" of Fekh. A, however, Tableau 1's prediction is revealed to be mistaken. We must identify a constraint that is *both* more highly-ranked than either of our two present constraints *and* sufficiently specific so as to capture all pertinent data without interfering with the regular operation of lower-ranked constraints. The editors of the *editio princeps* suggest that the Aramaic text has used **malk* as a reflex of its localizing tendencies – Hadad-yiθʿî was governor in the Assyrian context, but a "king" in the Aramaean context. We therefore posit a markedness constraint that takes into account local social status in the Aramaean setting:

(13) Favor Local Status Titles (siglum: Favor-loc.ttl)
Use local titles rather than those imposed by external superordinate powers when designating a native political leader's position.

broader spectrum of constraints. We simply schematize the process, stripping it down to the highest relevant constraints, evaluating the most probable replacement candidates.

This constraint may be culture-specific. In Fekh. A, it outranks even the more universal faithfulness constraints addressed so far. It is also tightly-constrained, limited to a single nominal category (political titles). If we rearrange the hierarchy in our tableau, with Favor Local Status Titles dominating, our tableau correctly predicts the use of Aramaic **malk*:

(14) Tableau 2: Evaluation using Favor-loc.ttl ≫ Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex

Akk. *šakin*	Favor-loc.ttl	Ident:sem	Ident:lex
**sakn*	*!		
**pīḫāt*	*!		*
☞ **malk*		*	*

Both **sakn* and **pīḫāt* fatally violate Favor Local Status Titles, removing them from contention. By the time their satisfaction of Ident:sem is considered, the damage has been done. Thus, **malk* emerges as the optimal candidate. This highly-ranked constraint is specific enough that it does not pose problems for any of the remaining replacements in the Aramaic text, but is broad enough to be potentially applicable in other settings, should the need arise.

4.3. Comparison of Selected Max, Dep, and Linear Constraints

Aside from the Identity constraints profiled above, three other types of constraints are directly involved in determining the mode and degree of isomorphism in any given translation. Maximality constraints require that every morpheme (or word, or structure, or …) in the source text have a replacement in the target text. Max constraints therefore prohibit *omissions* from the message of the source text. Conversely, Dependency constraints require that every morpheme (or word, or structure, or …) in the target text have a warrant in the source text. Dep constraints therefore prohibit *additions*. Linearity constraints enforce the order of morphemes, words, or sentence-level constituents. In some modes of translation, grammatical necessity forces regular violation of Morphological Linearity. This is the case, for example, in Hebrew-Aramaic translation, where the definite article necessarily shifts from pre-clitic (Heb. המלך "the king") to post-clitic (Aram. מלכא). As we will see, Aramaic SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) and Akkadian SOV syntax will occasionally demand that we use a different rank of constraint, namely, a Constituent Linearity constraint.

Generally speaking, isomorphism increases as the Maximality, Dependency, and Linearity constraints at lower ranks (i. e., morpheme, word) are privileged above those at higher ranks (i. e., syntactic constituent, liter-

ary trope); rote word-for-word replacement overrides concern for literary stylistics. If the MAXIMALITY, DEPENDENCY, and LINEARITY constraints at the higher ranks are privileged, translation typically becomes more "literary," since higher-level tropes such as rhyme, metaphor, and culture-specific imagery are favored over specific word-for-word correspondences. In this section, we analyze interactions between MAXIMALITY, DEPENDENCY, and LINEARITY constraints and the language- and culture-specific constraints that must have out-ranked them in the hierarchy obeyed by the translation of the Fekh. A inscription.

4.3.1. EXPLIC-COORD, EXPLIC-PREP, EXPLIC-VERB ≫ DEP:MORPH

At several points the Aramaic translator added a coordinating conjunction (-ו) or infinitive-introducing preposition (-ל) where the Assyrian source text did not exhibit one, at the clausal (15a) or phrasal level (15b):

(15) Paratactic use of coordinating conjunction (-ו) or infinitive-introducing preposition (-ל) to render Akk. Ø

(a) Clause-level:
- i. Stich A:2b: *nādin rîti u mašqīte* ⇒ וְנתן רעי ומשקי[69]
  "and (who) gives pasturage and watering (place)"
- ii. Stich A:3a: *nādin išqu u nindabê* ⇒ וְנתן שלה ואדקור
  "and (who) gives sprinkling and food offering"
- iii. Stich A:11: *arāk ūmēšu* ⇒ וְלמארך יומוה
  "and to prolong his days"
- iv. Stich A:12: *šumʾud šanātīšu* ⇒ וְלכבר שנוה
  "and to increase his years"
- v. Stich A:13a: *šullum bītīšu* ⇒ וְלשלם ביתה
  "and to make sound his house"
- vi. Stich A:14a: *ana nasāḫ murṣi ša zumrīšú* ⇒ וְלמלד מרק מנה
  "and to remove sickness from his body/from him"
- vii. Stich A:15: *ikribīya ana šemê* ⇒ וְלמשמע תצלותה
  "and to hear my/his prayer(s)"
- viii. Stich A:16: *qibīt pīya ana magāri* ⇒ וְלמלקח אמרת פמה
  "and to receive the utterance of my/his mouth"
- ix. Stich A:18c: *šumī-ma liškun* ⇒ וְשמים לשם בה
  "and let him place my name (on it)"
- x. Stich A:19a: *mannu ša šumī unakkaru* ⇒ וְזי ילד שמי מנה
  "But (as for) (anyone) who would efface my name (from it)"

(b) Phrase-level (note restatement of verb as well):
- i. Stich A:13b: *zērēšu* ⇒ ולשלם זרעה

69 We use underlining to contrast morphemes that have been *added* by the translator from those that merely replicate the morphology of the source text (as in *u mašqīte* ~ ומשקי).

"and to make sound his progeny"

ii. Stich A:13c: *u nišēšu* ⇒ ולשלם אנשוה

"and to make sound his men"

These data attest to an Aramaic cultural constraint dominating Morphological Dependency. We may call this Coordination Explicitation and provisionally state its range of application as in (16):

(16) Coordination Explicitation (siglum: Explic-coord)
Coordinate phrases and clauses paratactically rather than hypotactically.

It should be noted, however, that this constraint did not operate everywhere we might have expected. The translator did not add a conjunction in stichs A:4, 5, 6a, 7, 8, and 9a, all of which continue the list of Hadad's descriptions, begun in stich A:1 (and maintained by A:2b and 3a). We are faced with a choice: Do we attribute this to a shift in the hierarchy at the transition from stich A:3 to stich A:4, wherein Morphological Dependency was re-ranked above Coordination Explicitation? Or do we attribute it to specific text-environmental factors conditioning the operating environment of Coordination Explicitation?

That the constraint operates regularly from stich A:11 onwards suggests that the former option is not ideal: we would have to assume that the translator began with a ranking Explic-coord ≫ Dep:morph, switched to Dep:morph ≫ Explic-coord at stich A:4, and then switched back at stich A:10–11. Although possible, it seems odd that a translator would reverse the decision within only a few lines. It is preferable to search for specific text-environmental factors that prevented the addition of a coordinating conjunction in stichs A:4–9. In fact, the morphosyntax of stichs A:2–11 provides an easily-discerned determining factor. The Assyrian source text began with a series of participles, but then interrupted this with a nominal, before continuing with another participle, followed again by another series of interspersed nominals and participles. After stich A:3a, no more than two stichs in a row begin with the same morphological form. The Aramaic reflects this patterning by coordinating the three stichs in which participles feature as the first constituent, but not the remaining stichs where alternation occurs rapidly.

The same pattern emerges in the list of motivation clauses, where, in addition to the coordinating conjunction, the Aramaic also adds the preposition -ל. This suggests a constraint Preposition Explicitation, in which infinitives are marked explicitly with the preposition ל. Furthermore, in A:13 the Aramaic translation not only adds the conjunction but also restates the verb לשלם for each member of the compound object. This suggests a

third Explicitation constraint, namely Verbal Explicitation, in cases where multiple objects of a single verb require restatement of the verb. It is very likely that these three Explicitation constraints should be articulated as in (17). All three outrank Morphological Dependency, but because we do not have any examples where they come into conflict with one another we are unable to propose a more finely-grained hierarchy than (18):

(17) Coordination Explicitation (siglum: Explic-coord)
Coordinate phrases and clauses paratactically rather than hypotactically when three or more parallel items in a row participate in the same morphological category.

Preposition Explicitation (siglum: Explic-prep)
Insert preposition ל before verbal infinitives in lists of verbal infinitives.

Verbal Explicitation (siglum: Explic-verb)
If a motivational verbal phrase consists of a verbal infinitive governing a compound object, restate the verbal infinitive before each member of the compound object.

(18) Explic-coord, Explic-prep, Explic-verb ≫ Dep:morph

4.3.2. Favor-NWS_conv ≫ Max:morph

Pronouns in the Aramaic text mostly closely follow the source text. The chart in (19a) lists the fourteen cases in which the 3.m.sg. or 1.c.sg. pronominal suffix in the Assyrian source text was replaced by the corresponding morpheme in the Aramaic. Morphological Identity, Morphological Dependency, and Morphological Maximality have been satisfied in all thirteen and require no further discussion.

In contrast, (19b) lists the six examples wherein these constraints have been violated. In some cases (b.ii–iii), this occurred when the Akkadian 1.c.sg. suffix was replaced by an Aramaic 3.m.sg. suffix (violating Morphological Identity). In other cases (b.iv–vi), a prepositional object assumed in the Assyrian text has been made explicit in the Aramaic (violating Morphological Dependency).[70] In a single exemplar (b.i), either textual or larger discourse-level considerations are involved, and Morphological Maximality is violated. Our task in this section is to identify and track the constraints motivating these six violations.

(19) Replacement of Personal Pronouns in Fekh. A

(a) 3.m.sg. ⇒ 3.m.sg., 1.c.sg. ⇒ 1.c.sg. (adherence to Morphological Identity)

70 For *explicitation*, see Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 14; Vinay and Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics*, 116, 342.

(i) Stich A:3b: *aḫ(ḫ)ēšu* ⇒ אחוה "his brothers"
(ii) Stich A:6a: *sīpūšu* ⇒ תצלותה "his prayer"
(iii) Stich A:10: *napšātīšu* ⇒ נבשה "his life"
(iv) Stich A:11: *ūmēšu* ⇒ יומוה "his days"
(v) Stich A:12: *šanātīšu* ⇒ שנוה "his years"
(vi) Stich A:13a: *bītīšu* ⇒ ביתה "his house"
(vii) Stich A:13b: *zērēšu* ⇒ זרעה "his progeny"
(viii) Stich A:13c: *nišēšu* ⇒ אנשוה "his men"
(ix) Stich A:14: *ša zumrīšú* ⇒ מנה "from his body/him"
(x) Stich A:18b: *anḫūssu luddiš* ⇒ כן יבל לכננה חדס "(when) it is dilapidated, let him renew (it)"
(xi) Stich A:18c: *šumī* ⇒ שמי "my name"
(xii) Stich A:19a: *šumī* ⇒ שמי "my name"
(xiii) Stich A:19b: *šumšu* ⇒ שמה "his name"
(xiv) Stich A:19c: *bēl dīnīšu* ⇒ קבלה "his adversary"

(b)

(i) Stich A:9a: *bēlīšu* ⇒ מרא "(his) lord"
(ii) Stich A:15: *ikribīya* ⇒ תצלותה "my/his prayer(s)"
(iii) Stich A:16: *pīya* ⇒ פמה "my/his mouth"
(iv) Stich A:17a: *Ø ikrum-ma iqēš* ⇒ כנן ויהב לה "erected (it) and gave (it) to him"
(v) Stich A:18c: *šumī-ma Ø liškun* ⇒ ושמים לשם בה "let him place my name on it"
(vi) Stich A:19a: *šumī Ø unakkaru* ⇒ ילד שמי מנה "would efface my name from it"

We begin with (b.i), where Akk. *-šu* has been replaced by Aramaic *-Ø*. The editors originally suggested adding the 3.m.sg. possessive suffix to מרא (hence, מראה) on the basis of the Akkadian parallel *bēlīšu*.[71] Similarly, Greenfield and Shaffer note the possibility of haplography.[72] According to these solutions, the cause of the discordance is a textual one. But it is methodologically unsound to assume that the translator intended maximal isomorphism. Furthermore, inspection of photographs[73] confirms that after the *aleph* of מרא there is a clear word divider, followed by הדיסעי. The syntax of the Aramaic makes clear that it intends a construct phrase. We therefore propose that the discrepancy is due to a divergence in the supra-

71 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 30–31; cf. V. Sasson, "The Aramaic Text of the Tell Fakhariyah Assyrian-Aramaic Bilingual Inscription," *ZAW* 97 (1985): 86–103, here 94.

72 J. C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye," *Iraq* 45 (1983): 109–116, here 111, 114; cf. 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, here 49.

73 We are grateful to Wayne Pitard for allowing us access to his photographs of the inscription.

linguistic discourse structure of the two versions. The Assyrian text makes a major division at this point in its rhetorical structure: until now, the text has listed the epithets and descriptions of Hadad, to whom the statue is dedicated:

For Hadad, the canal inspector (*ana* ^{d}*adad gugal*) … [*other epithets*], the great lord, his lord (*bēli rabî bēlīšu*) – Haddu-yiθʿî … (in order) to sustain his life, … [*other motivations*], dedicated (it) and gave (it).

This single opening clause of the Assyrian text sprawls from stichs A:1–17 and has two sets of prepositional adjuncts: one listing the epithets of Hadad (A:1–9a), the other comprising a list of motivations for the offering (A:10–16). The sentence has one subject (Haddu-yiθʿî, A:9a) and one compound verbal action ("dedicated [it] and gave [it]"; *ikrum-ma iqēš*, A:17). Stich A:1 thus forms the first line of an extended dedicatory formula; it is a prepositional phrase that stands as a fronted adjunct (stich A:1) of the matrix clause (subject in A:9 + verb in A:17) in which the direct object is covert (Ø) and accessible only as a result of the epigraph's inscription on the object itself (i. e., implicit deixis):

(20) Discourse Structure of Fekh. A (Assyrian):

Stich A:1	Stich A:9	Ø	Stich A:17
(indir. obj.)	(subject)	(dir. obj.)	(verb)
[$_{PP}$ To Hadad …]	[$_{S}$ [$_{NP}$ Haddu-yiθʿî …]	[$_{VP}$ [$_{NP}$ ø (this image)]	dedicated …]].

The Aramaic text has a different structure due to the addition of its Introduction. This addition posed two translational problems. First, the dedicatee of the object was listed in the second stich of the introduction (Intro-RelVP), making inclusion of the deity's name in stich A:1 redundant. The translator or tradent opted for the parsimonious solution of simply omitting it. A second, more difficult problem was posed by the grammatical difficulties associated with adding the Aramaic Introduction while at the same time attempting to replicate the typically Akkadian verb-final syntax (culminating in A:17), in an attempt to satisfy Lexical Linearity. The addition of the verb "he placed" in the Introduction's relative clause (זי שם) rendered the verbs of stich A:17 (כנן ויהב) redundant. This forced the text's division into two separate syntactic units.[74] The first unit was essentially an extended nominal phrase, in which the explicit deictic reference to the object (Intro-NP) was complemented by a relative clause (Intro-RelVP) containing the clandestine subject (Haddu-yiθʿî), the overtly denoted verbal action ("which [he] placed"), and the beginning of the prepositional

74 Cf. Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 81.

phrase indicating the recipient (here the indirect object of the verb). This constituent of the larger noun phrase coincided with the Akkadian text in stich A:1–9:

(21) Discourse Structure of Fekh. A (Aramaic, clause 1)

Intro-NP	Intro-RelVP			Stich A:1… A:9
(noun)	(rel.)	(subj. + verb)	(indir. obj. ……..)	
[$_{NP}$ The likeness	[$_{S}$ which	[$_{VP}$ (he) placed	[$_{PP}$ before [H.-of-S.,	… *(epithets)*]]]

The second syntactic unit began with the list of prepositional adjunct motive clauses in stich A:10 and ended with the verbal phrase(s) in stich A:17. The covert subject of the verb ("he," again Haddu-yiθʿî) could be obtained from the Introduction's relative clause. Similarly, the covert object of the verb was obviously to be understood as the nominal reference of the first syntactic unit (i.e., "the likeness"). Although it would have been possible to recover the dedicatee ("to him," i.e., Hadad-of- Sikan) from the Introduction as well, the Aramaic translator made this explicit:

(22) Discourse Structure of Fekh. A (Aramaic, clause 2)

Stich A:10	Ø	Stich A:17	Ø	Stich A:17	
(motive)	(subj.)	(verb)	(dir. obj.)	(ind. obj.)	
[$_{PP}$ (In order) to sustain his life …]		[$_{S}$ (he)	[$_{VP}$ erected	$_{NP}$ (it)…]	[$_{PP}$ to him]]

Thus, the Aramaic מרא (without suffix) works perfectly with the present syntax of the Aramaic inscription. The lexeme stands in a construct relationship with the PN Haddu-yiθʿî, whose title and patronymic in Stich 9 round out the list of epithets. By omitting the dedicatee's name in one place (A:1) and only one morpheme (Akk. *-šu*), the Aramaic translator was able to (a) add the expected West Semitic dedicatory introduction and (b) maintain as closely as possible the rest of the Akkadian word order, even if this solution did not maintain the syntactic relationships of the Akkadian text in any direct way. We might thus argue that Lexical Linearity takes precedence over Syntactic Identity (siglum: Ident:syn) in the present form of the Aramaic, and that a constraint, Favor Northwest Semitic Conventions, motivating adherence to Aramaic dedicatory conventions – see (23) – is even more highly-ranked (24):

(23) Favor Northwest Semitic Conventions (siglum: Favor-NWS_conv)
Adhere to the specific formulaic conventions of Northwest Semitic literary versions of the genre(s) in which the text participates.

(24) Favor-NWS_conv ≫ Linear:lex ≫ Ident:syn, Max:morph

Accordingly, example (19.b.i) should be attributed to the operation of supra-linguistic, discourse-level constraints, not the failure of Morphological

Maximality, which continued to operate at a relatively high position within the overall hierarchy.

4.3.3. Explic-pro ≫ Dep:morph

The examples in (19.b.iv–vi) may be explained more economically. In each case, a pronoun is added as part of a propositional phrase making explicit one of the participants in the verbal action. The additional indirect object ("to him") in (19.b.iv) likely relates to the division of the passage into two clauses; the second clause does not mention the recipient of the offering and it is possible that the translator felt compelled to point back to the recipient named in the Introduction. The addition of a prepositional phrase with a pronominal object in stichs A:18:c and A:19:a (19.b.v-vi) may seek to clarify the item on which the king's name would be inscribed (or from which it would be effaced). However, in stich A:17 the Aramaic does *not* add a pronoun indicating the item that Haddu-yiθʿî has dedicated to the deity Hadad. It is a well-known phenomenon for the Northwest Semitic languages to allow objects to remain covert when implied by the larger discourse situation, and this is probably the case here. Altogether, these examples point to a constraint Pronoun Explicitation, which must be qualified as pertaining only to indirect objects, as in (25):

(25) Pronoun Explicitation (siglum: Explic-pro)
Clarify any items occupying essential participant roles (other than *patients* [i.e., direct objects]) through the insertion of a pronoun indexing the item, along with any necessary prepositions governing the associated verbal action.

This constraint outranks the one that would prohibit the addition of the relevant pronouns:

(26) Explic-pro ≫ Dep:morph

4.3.4. DeixisCons ≫ Ident:morph

In certain places the Aramaic translator violated Morphological Identity by rendering Akkadian 1.c.sg. suffixes as 3.m.sg. (*ikribīya* ~ תצלותה, A:15; *pīya* ~ פמה, A:16). This is related to the fact that Haddu-yiθʿî is referred to with the 3.m.sg. pronoun in the preceding lines of both the Assyrian and Aramaic versions. If we chart the two instances of *-ya* ~ ה- mismatch (19.b.ii–iii) in this wider context, we arrive at Table 2 (27).

(27) Distribution of Suffixed Pronouns throughout Fekh. A, by Discourse Unit

	Haddu-yiθʿî		statue		vandal		Constraints Violated:	
	Akk.	Aram.	Akk.	Aram.	Akk.	Aram.	Deixis Cons	Ident: morph
(a.i) A:3b	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.ii) A:6a	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.iii) A:10	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.iv) A:11	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.v) A:12	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.vi) A:13a	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.vii) A:13b	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.viii) A:13c	*-šu*	ה-						
(a.ix) A:14	*-šu*	ה-						
(b.ii) A:15	*-ya*	ה-						*
(b.iii) A:16	*-ya*	ה-						*
(a.x) A:18b			*-šu*	ה-				
(a.xi) A:18c	*-ī*	י-						
(a.xii) A:19a	*-ī*	י-						
(a.xiii) A:19b					*-šu*	ה-		
(a.xiv) A:19c					*-šu*	ה-		

The horizontal solid line indicates the major rhetorical units of the Akkadian. Stichs A:1–17 comprise a single extended sentence giving the following information: (a) the dedicatee of the statue (Hadad) and his epithets (stichs A:1–9a); (b) the dedicator (Haddu-yiθʿî), his titles, and his patronymics (A:9); (c) the motivations for dedication (A:10–16); and (d) the verbal action (A:17). After this come two shorter clauses. The first (A:18) is an imprecation for rededication of the statue by later individuals who repair the statue. The second (A:19) invokes Hadad's wrath on anyone who would deal treacherously with the statue, failing to credit Haddu-yiθʿî properly during refurbishment. Together, this "blessing" and "curse" comprise the second major unit.

According to this division, it is the Akkadian text that confronts us with the rhetorical anomaly: in the last two stichs of the motivations, the pronominal referent inexplicably changes to 1.c.sg. This is marked in Table 2 by the horizontal dotted line and shaded cells. The Aramaic adheres to a more tightly-structured pattern: In the first unit, Haddu-yiθʿî is invariably marked with the 3.m.sg. In this section, Haddu-yiθʿî is the primary actor of the matrix clause, the subject of the verbs "he dedicated (it) and gave (it)."

In contrast, he is sidelined in the second half of the inscription, in favor of the hypothetical "later person." That person becomes the referent of the 3.m.sg. pronominal suffixes (A:19b–c) and Haddu-yiθʿî becomes the "I" concerned for the preservation of his name. This shift is natural and the Aramaic conforms to its logic assiduously. We thus propose that the translator has adhered to a highly-ranked constraint, Deixis Constancy, described as in (28):

(28) Deixis Constancy (siglum: DeixisCons)
Maintain the deictic references of pronouns consistent with that of the discourse unit of which the segment is a constituent. Allow changes to deixis only to clarify referents, and only at significant points of rhetorical disjuncture.

(29) DeixisCons ≫ Ident:morph

Assuming that Deixis Constancy outranks Morphological Identity allows us to posit a reasonable explanation for the divergence in morphological forms in stichs A:15 and A:16. The Aramaic translator maintained deictic consistency until a rhetorical disjuncture licensed a switch in pronominal reference to again match the Akkadian source text.

4.3.5. SynCons, NWS-syn ≫ Linear:lex

Beginning at stich A:15 the Assyrian text shifts the verbal infinitives of the motivation clauses to the end of the clause. The Aramaic translator, however, continues the pattern *verb* + *direct object*, suggesting a discourse-level constraint motivating Syntactic Constancy:

(30) Syntactic Constancy (siglum: SynCons)
Maintain the surface-level syntactic ordering of clausal constituents consistent with that of the discourse unit of which the clause is a constituent. Allow changes to syntactic ordering only in certain cases (which we leave undefined here), and only at significant points of rhetorical disjuncture.

Although the description of Syntactic Constancy is modeled on that of Deixis Constancy, we do not have enough examples to describe it fully. The most important feature to note is its operation at the clausal *constituent* level rather than simply at the lexical level: the reordering of entire nominal phrases is thereby accounted for, and we need not worry about the number of lexical positions across which individual words have moved.

It may be coincidental that the motivation clauses' syntactic ordering (stichs A:10–14, i. e., *verb* + *direct object*) violated standard Akkadian syntactic order ([*subject*] + *direct object* + *verb*). Whatever the reasons for the

ordering of the Akkadian, the close mirroring recommended by the translator's Lexical Linearity constraint adhered to typical Northwest Semitic syntactic ordering (*verb* [+ *subject*] + *direct object*):

(31) Northwest Semitic syntactic ordering (siglum: NWS-syn)
Maintain typical Northwest Semitic syntactic ordering (VSO) when there are no extenuating circumstances (e. g., fronting for focus or topicalization, poetic/literary reasons, etc.).

All of the motivation clauses in the Aramaic text satisfy such a constraint. We would have no empirical reason to propose it were it not for the linear adjustments of the Aramaic translation in stichs A:19a–b. Because no syntactic pattern has been established in the second rhetorical unit, Syntactic Constancy does not operate and Northwest Semitic syntactic ordering picks up the slack. Both outrank Lexical Linearity, but these constraints' relative ranking is unknown. We thus conclude with the hierarchy in (32):

(32) SynCons, NWS-syn ≫ Linear:lex

4.4. Summary of the Translation Style in Aramaic Fekh. A

This analysis is not an exhaustive description of the translation style conditioning the Aramaic version of Fekh. A. Nonetheless, we have investigated the majority of constraints and arrived at the list of pairwise hierarchies in (33):

(33) Pairwise Constraint Hierarchies in Aramaic Fekh. A
(a) TrPropNs ≫ ChLingSys
(b) Ident:prag.lex, Favor-loc.ttl, DeixisCons ≫ Ident:sem ≫ Ident:lex ≫ Ident:morph
(c) Explic-coord, Explic-prep, Explic-verb, Explic-pro ≫ Dep:morph
(d) Favor-NWS_conv, SynCons, NWS-syn ≫ Linear:lex ≫ Ident:syn, Max:morph

A brief unpacking is warranted. Domination pattern (a) states that the translator will change the linguistic system of the source text in all cases but those of names, which will be transliterated. Pattern (b) attempts to capture the fact that even though the translator frequently renders with cognate morphemes (Ident:lex, Ident:morph), certain concerns outweigh this inclination. The translator is more concerned with choosing words that *correspond semantically* (Ident:sem), and was not opposed to adjusting the text towards Aramaic conventions of consistency in how the main speaker of the text referred to himself (DeixisCons, Favor-loc.ttl) or saying things

in a slightly more general way so as to appeal to an Aramaic-speaking audience (IDENT:PRAG.LEX). Statement (c) shows that the Aramaic translator added a few kinds of words for clarity: these consisted mostly of pronouns, prepositions, and coordinating conjunctions (EXPLIC-PRO, EXPLIC-PREP, EXPLIC-COORD), but occasionally comprised repetition of a verb (EXPLIC-VERB). Finally, (d) captures the translator's stance toward word-for-word translation: It was more important to replicate linearity of individual words (LINEAR:LEX) than to maintain the precise structure of the discourse's syntax (IDENT:SYN) and replication of all source morphemes (MAX:MORPH). But even more important were those few instances in which the translator felt compelled to attend to the conventions of Aramaic dedicatory inscriptions (FAVOR-NWS_CONV), maintain the syntactic consistency of the discourse (SYNCONS), or use typical northwest Semitic sentence structure (NWS-SYN). In all four statements we see a deliberate choice to maintain close adherence to the source text (*adequacy*), but not at the cost of a slavish devotion to the source – the translation was made more *acceptable* for the audience.

In the following section, we will provide an abbreviated analysis of the putative translation hierarchy that would have had to be in place if Deuteronomy 28 were translated from the VTE. We show that this looks nothing like the empirical example provided by Fekh. A.

5. The Putative Translation Style of Deuteronomy 28

In section 4, we showed that the translation style of Fekh. A was largely isomorphic. This isomorphism broke down rarely and only for obvious, tightly constrained reasons. Additions to and departures from the source text were minimal, usually comprising small adjustments in word usage and lexical ordering. As we will show in this section, the minimal shifts in both Fekh. A and Fekh. B contrast sharply with the translation style that would have to have been employed if the assertion that the author of Deuteronomy 28 translated (an Aramaic translation of) the Assyrian VTE were correct.

We make this argument assuming, first, that the translation constraints governing Akkadian-Aramaic translation at Fekheriyeh in the 9th century B.C.E. would have been reasonably similar to the Akkadian-(Aramaic)-Hebrew mode of translation in the 7th century B.C.E. Second, we observe that the linguistic structures of Hebrew and Aramaic, two closely related Northwest Semitic languages, are generally far tighter than those obtaining between Akkadian and Aramaic. In a case of double-translation, we would expect most departures from the source text to occur in the Akkadian-

Aramaic transition, rather than in the movement from Aramaic to Hebrew.[75] It is therefore a relatively minor point whether the putative translation of Deuteronomy from VTE was made from the Assyrian text directly or from an Aramaic translation of it.

We focus on instances in Deuteronomy 28 that Steymans considers indicative of Deuteronomy's direct dependence on a form of VTE. We will show that, with reference to the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription, Steymans overstates the markedness required of the translation process. Each of his two references to Tell Fekheriyeh will be handled in its own subsection. We will also address Deut 28:23–24.

5.1. Deut 28:22 and the Multiplication of Translation Replacements

Steymans's first example comes from Deut 28:22, which he claims renders VTE § 56:479–481[76]:

(34) VTE § 56: *ʾakalaʾ* (NINDA-MEŠ) *u mê* (A-MEŠ) *lēʾzibūʾkunu sunqu ḫušaḫḫu bubūtu mūʾtāʾnu* (NAM-ʾÚŠʾ-MEŠ) *ina* (TA) *ēnēkunu* (IGI-*ku-nu*) *a*[*i*] *ippiṭir*
May ʾfoodʾ and water abaʾndonʾ you; may famine, starvation, hunger, (and) illʾneʾss not be cleared from your eye.

Deut 28: יככה י׳ בשחפת ובקדחת ובדלקת ובחרחור ובחרב ובירקון ורדפוך עד אבדך
May the Lord strike you with consumption, and with fever, and with inflammation, and with violent heat, and with the sword, and with mildew, so that they pursue you until your demise.

Steymans claims that:

> The list of the three Akkadian synonyms for "famine" (b) corresponds to the famine-causing triad "drought," "conflagration [of a crop]," and "crop-blight" (b′) in Deut 28:22. The *stichwort* "epidemic" (c) ends the Assyrian curse, while it introduces the Hebrew [curse] (c′). The Akkadian word for deadly illness, *mūtānu*, is reproduced by three Hebrew terms, corresponding to a phenomenon observable on the Assyrian-Aramaic bilingual from Tell Fekheriyeh.[77]

---

75 E. g., G. Mushayabasa, "Redefining the Consistency of Equivalencies in the Peshitta to Ezekiel: Towards a Frame Semantics Approach," *JNSL* 38 (2012): 79–91, esp. pp. 89–90.

76 Unless otherwise noted, we have used VTE as published in S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (SAA 2; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1988), no. 006 (i. e., the Nimrud version; online at http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/saao/saa02/corpus, no. 006). We have also compared the Tayinat version (ORACC no. 015), originally published as J. Lauinger, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary," *JCS* 64 (2012): 87–123. In most of the relevant passages, it is nearly identical to the Nimrud text; we have indicated where readings differ. Normalization and translation are ours.

77 Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 129 (our translation).

He cites here Fekh. B:20 (35):

(35) Akk.: *di'u šibṭu dilipte ištu mātīšu lā ipparrasū*
(May) illness, scourge of pestilence, not be cut off from his land!
Aram.: וַמותן שבט זי נירגל אל יגתזר מן מתה
And may plague, the scourge of Nergal, not be cut off from his land!

The use of זי as a genitive particle is particularly intriguing, since it potentially serves as a marker of the Fekh. B text's *free composition* rather than its *translation*.[78] It was for this and related reasons that we avoided using the Fekh. B text as evidence in the present study.

Yet even if we allow Fekh. B as evidence, it does not support Steymans's argument. His interpretation follows the editors in taking *dilipte* to mean "pestilence" and in setting it in apposition to other nouns in the line.[79] This does not take seriously the fact that *di'u* and *šibṭu* are both written with the expected nominal ending, whereas the final sign of *dilipte* (-TE) cannot reasonably be understood as anything other than a genitive case vowel. This suggests *šibṭu dilipte* is a construct phrase, "scourge of pestilence." This is paralleled by the use of זי as a genitive marker in the Aramaic. If we are correct, Fekh. B:20 satisfies MORPHOLOGICAL DEPENDENCY much more rigidly than Steymans claims.

As an ancillary point, we observe that the only constraint dominating MORPHOLOGICAL DEPENDENCY is a previously unidentified markedness constraint mandating the use of זי in genitive constructions:

(36) FAVOR GENITIVE-זי (siglum: FAVOR-GEN-זי)
Use זי as a genitive particle in certain constructions.

This constraint dominates MORPHOLOGICAL DEPENDENCY in the Introduction (Intro-NP), and in Fekh. B, where it is used twice (37.a.i–ii). Moreover, זי is used three times as a clearly genitive marker (37.b.i–iii):

(37) Genitive use of זי at Tell Fekheriyeh
(a) Used to supply a relative pronoun in **ḏV* + NP constructions:
(i–ii) Stich B:1: *šakin māti* ^{uru}*guzani* ^{uru}*sikani u* ^{uru}*zarani* ⇒ מלך גוזן וזי סכן וזי אזרן
"governor/king of Guzan, (and of) Sikan, (and of) Azran"

78 For this problem, see F. M. Fales, "Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye," *Syria* 60 (1983): 233–250; Quick, *Deuteronomy 28*, 137–151, esp. 151; and the extended discussion in Hutton and Crouch, *Translating Empire*.

79 Abou-Assaf, Bordreuil, and Millard, *La statue*, 21; similarly Greenfield and Shaffer, "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue," 110; Kaufman, "Reflections," 163.

(b) Used as a genitive particle:
(i) Stich Intro N-P: Ø ⇒ דמותא זי הדיסעי "The statue of Haddu-yiθ'î"
(ii) Stich B:10: *unūtē ša bīt* ^{d}*adad* (IŠKUR) ⇒ מאניא זַי בת הדד "the vessels of the house of Hadad"
(iii) Stich B:20: *di'u šibṭu dilipte ištu mātīšu lā ipparrasū* ⇒ וַמותן שבט זַי נירגל אל יגתזר מן מתה (i. e., the case at hand)

Regardless of our present inability to identify the precise environments in which this construction is used, its limited appearance in the Introduction and in Fekh. B may lend credence to the claim that Fekh. A and Fekh. B were translated by different individuals (if the Introduction can credibly be assigned to the translator or scribe who composed Fekh. B).

Returning to the matter at hand, we must observe that, even if Steymans's reading of Fekh. B:20 were to stand, his interpretation of its usefulness for his point is doubtful. In his rendering, the departure of the Aramaic from its putative Assyrian source text would violate Phrasal Maximality (three individual nouns/noun phrases rendered as two nominal phrases) and Morphological Dependency (a single Akkadian lexeme – either *šibṭu* or *dilipte* – rendered as a three-morpheme genitive in Aramaic [שבט זי נירגל]). These are hardly the same violations assumed in the putative shift from VTE *sunqu ḫušaḫḫu bubūtu mūtānu ina ēnīkunu ai ippiṭir* (§ 56:479–481) to Hebrew יככה י׳ בשחפת ובקדחת ובדלקת ובחרחור ובחרב ובירקון (Deut 28:22). The replacement of Akkadian *mūtānu* by three Hebrew terms would be a violation of Phrasal Dependency, and would move in the opposite direction – i. e., expansion – of the example in Fekh. B:20. Furthermore, it is not clear that the Akkadian terms in VTE § 56:479–481 are close enough semantically to their putative Hebrew correspondents to satisfy Semantic Identity, or the even higher-ranked Pragmatic Identity. The curse formula also departs in significant ways, violating both Syntactic Identity (i. e., the occurrence of the list in subject position in VTE, but as a series of adverbial prepositional phrases in Deuteronomy) and Morphological Identity (i. e., there is general non-correspondence between the Akkadian 2.m.pl. *-kunu* and the Hebrew 2.m.sg. morph, not to mention that *ina ēnēkunu ai ippiṭir* remains completely un-reproduced in the Hebrew). In short, were Deut 28:22 a translation of VTE § 56:479–481, multiple major translation constraints would be violated in patterns directly antagonistic to the patterns established by Fekh. A (and, for that matter, the system of correspondences found in Fekh. B).

5.2. Deut 28:30 and the Transformation of Futility Curses

To bolster his case, Steymans points to the end of Fekh. B, in which the Akkadian expresses a series of wishes for results that would affect the object of the curse negatively; the corresponding Aramaic text couches these in the form of a futility curse. We provide one example in (38):

(38) Akk.: 1 *mē laḫrātu lā ušabbâ ḫurāpa*
May one hundred ewes not satisfy a lamb.
Aram.: וּמאה סאון להינקן אמר ואל ירוי׃
And may one hundred ewes nurse a lamb, but (may it) not be satisfied.
(Stich B:15; Akk. lines 32–33 ~ Aram. line 20)

A single clause in the Akkadian has been expanded into two clauses in the parallel Aramaic curse. Aside from the addition of clausal linkages motivated by Coordination Explicitation, the Aramaic explicates the verbal action (i. e., nursing), and recasts the Akkadian transitive verb as an intransitive passive verb. The semantic roles of the Assyrian text are thereby represented faithfully in the Aramaic solution (preserving adherence to Semantic Identity and probably also Pragmatic Identity), but violate Syntactic Identity at the clausal and phrasal levels, not to mention Morphological Identity with respect to the verbal transformation. The same types of transformations occur in the three following curses (B:16–18). Outside of these transformations, however, our main constraints remain active. That is, although the Aramaic has clearly been crafted with a view towards retaining culturally-relevant models (satisfying Favor Northwest Semitic Conventions), it takes pains to retain the same pragmatic value as its Assyrian counterpart and, at the same time, to violate the lower-ranked constraints Morphological Dependency, Morphological Identity, and Lexical Linearity as minimally as possible. We can confirm this by setting the actual Aramaic output (γ) in competition with what would have been the closest possible word-for-word replications of the Akkadian, first with topicalizing left-movement (α) and then without (β). These three candidates are given in (39), together with details of their syntactic structure:

(39) Replacement possibilities of Akk. B:15:
Akk.: 1 *mē laḫrātu lā ušabbâ ḫurāpa*
[S [NP SUBJ] [VP NEG V [NP OBJ]]]
(α) מאה סאון אל יהשבען אמר
[S [NP SUBJ] [VP NEG V [NP OBJ]]]
(β) אל יהשבען מאה סאון אמר
[S [VP NEG V] [NP SUBJ] [NP OBJ]]
(γ) מאה סאון להינקן אמר ואל ירוה
[S [NP SUBJ] [VP V [NP OBJ]]] CONJ [S [VP NEG V]]

The competition between (α), (β), and (γ) is analyzed in Tableau 3 (40), with constraints consistent with the hierarchies identified in (33).[80] All three options satisfy PRAGMATIC IDENTITY and, so far as possible, LEXICAL IDENTITY, so we omit them from our tableau. Because options (α) and (β) satisfy SEMANTIC IDENTITY, MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTITY, MORPHOLOGICAL DEPENDENCY, and SYNTACTIC DEPENDENCY (CLAUSE) more optimally than does (γ), we must posit that the elimination of alternatives (α) and (β) occurs at a higher constraint range. As it happens, we have already identified such a highly-ranked constraint, FAVOR NORTHWEST SEMITIC CONVENTIONS. This constraint would automatically disqualify (α) and (β):

(40) Tableau 3: Evaluation of (α), (β), and (γ), including FAVOR-NWS_CONV:

Akk.	FAVOR-NWS_CONV	IDENT:SEM	IDENT:MORPH	DEP:SYN(CL)	DEP:MORPH
(α)	*!				
(β)	*!	* detopicalizes subject			
☞ (γ)		* explicitation of verbal action	* f.pl. > m.sg.	* adds clause	* להינקן

FAVOR NORTHWEST SEMITIC CONVENTIONS forced the translator (or composer) of Aram. B to come up with a translation that satisfied this highly-ranked constraint, even if it required violating certain lower-ranked constraints. Yet, although the lower-ranked constraints are violated, their violation is minimal – *they continue to remain in force*.

In confirmation, we observe two exceptions to this pattern (41):

80 We assume that the translation technique – or, more synchronically, the system of correspondences – evidenced in Fekh. B closely resembles that of Fekh. A. This is not a *necessary* prerequisite, but instead a *convenient* one. A fuller analysis would reconstruct the hierarchy for Fekh. B from scratch; see Hutton and Crouch, *Translating Empire*.

(41) Akk.: *līriš lū lā eṣṣidi*
1 līm līriš 1 sūt liṣbat[81]
May he sow, may he not harvest.
1,000 (measures of barley) may he sow, 1 *seah* may he harvest.
Aram.: וְלִזרע וְאל יחצד
וְאלף שערין לזרע ופריס לאחז מנה
And may he sow, but may he not harvest;
And may he sow 1000 (measures of) barley,
but may he seize (only) a *parīs* from it.
(Stichs B:13–14; Akk. lines 30–32 ~ Aram. lines 18–19)

In these curses, the Aramaic version satisfies all Identity, Maximality, Dependency, and Lexical Linearity constraints to the degree expected. Presumably, this was possible because the Akkadian was already articulated in a way that mirrored typical West Semitic curse formularies, rather than replicating the structure of the remaining Assyrian curses in this text. In other words, given the option of satisfying the lower-ranked constraints while still adhering to the higher-ranked constraint Favor Northwest Semitic Conventions, Aram. B does so – confirming that these constraints are indeed still active.

While Steymans is correct that "one [i. e., the translator] changes around formulae according to the fixed patterns of the target language,"[82] the translator *also* attends to many other lower-ranked constraints. The significance of this is drawn out through our analysis of Deut 28:30, which Steymans claims is derived from VTE § 42:428–430:[83]

(42) VTE § 42: ^{d}*dilibat nabaṭ kakkabī* (mul.meš) *ina niṭil ēnēkunu* (igi.2.-*ku-nu*) *ḫīratēkunu ina sūni* (úr) *nakrēkunu* (lú.kúr-*ku-nu*) *lišanīl mārēkunu* (dumu.meš-*ku-nu*) *ai ibēlū bītkunu* (é-*ku-un* [sic]) *nakru* (lú.kúr) *aḫû lizūz* (*li-za-zi-ma* [sic]) *mimmûkunu* (*mim-mu-ku-un* [sic])
May Venus, brightest of the stars cause your (pl.) wives to lie in the lap of your enemies before your very eyes; may your sons not lay claim to your house; may a foreign enemy divide all of your possessions.

---

81 Despite the normal semantic value of Akk. *ṣabātu*, "seize," the context clearly supplies the local sense of harvesting. Greenfield and Shaffer ("Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue," 115) point to a technical meaning of *liṣbat*, which they translate "get … in return": "The nuance is getting a return from the increase on an investment." They point to a similar nuance of the root אחז in Hebrew (Num 31:30); for this technical meaning, see also E. Lipiński, "Bilingual Inscription," 46.

82 Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 131.

83 The Akkadian text drawn from ORACC differs slightly from that in D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq* 20 (1958): 1–99, esp. 61. VTE § 42 does not appear in the Tayinat version.

Deut 28: אשה תארש ואיש אחר ישגלנה בית תבנה ולא־תשב בו כרם תטע ולא תחללנו

You will betroth a woman, but another man will violate her; you will build a house, but you will not dwell in it; you will plant an orchard, but you will not enjoy its fruits.

Tableau 4 evaluates the first two of these curses – concerning the woman/wife and concerning the house – which we designate here (δ) and (ε). The candidates are each evaluated for the degree to which they violate the various constraints summarized in (33). As we saw above, Fekh. B also adheres to these constraints. In Tableau 4 we especially note Morphological Maximality (Max:morph), to capture the degree to which the Hebrew text *omits* morphemes from the corresponding Akkadian. This constraint demands that every morpheme of the source text be replaced with a corresponding morpheme in the translation. We have only briefly discussed this constraint above (section 4.3.2) *because it is only violated once by the Aramaic translator of Fekh. A*. Each violation of Morphological Maximality indicates a word in Akkadian that is not replicated in the putatively-correspondent Hebrew.[84]

(43) Tableau 4: Evaluation of VTE § 42:428–430 ~ Deut 28:30 according to the expectations established by Fekh. A and B:

	Favor-NWS_conv	Ident:sem	Ident: morph	Dep:syn(cl)	Dep: morph	Max:morph
(δ)		* *ḫīrat-* ~ אשה * *nakrēkunu* ~ ואיש אחר	* *-kunu* ~ אשה * *ina sūni* ישגלנה	* (expected as part of move to futility curse)	* תארש	*** ^{d}*dilibat nabaṭ kakkabī* ** *ina ēnēkunu*
(ε)		* *ibēlū* ~ תשב	* *-kunu*	* (expected as part of move to futility curse)	* תבנה	** *mārēkunu*

84 We have counted *dilibat* as only one morpheme, so as to minimize the number of violation marks in the tableau. Strictly speaking, however, it should count as two morphemes (base + f.sg. *-at*). As this begins to suggest, a *strict* application of Morphological Maximality would produce even more violation marks than are given here. Even in this abbreviated form, the contrast of this chart with (33) is clear enough. As a simpler, non-technical mode of comparison, note how the translations of the Akkadian and Aramaic texts of Fekheriyeh can be represented in a single column of text (as in Appendices A and B): this shows clearly how minimally the Aramaic translator violated this major constraint.

In our analysis, we have marked violations conservatively. In fact, so *many* violations of the constraints established by analysis of the Tell Fekheriye Inscription occur here that it is nearly impossible to track all of them without expanding our tableau significantly. The number of violation marks in Tableau 4 serves to capture the high degree to which Deut 28:30 would violate the translation constraints identified in (33).

5.3. Deuteronomy 28:23–24 as a Translation of VTE §§ 63–64

In keeping with an interpretive tradition that goes back to Weinfeld and Frankena, Steymans identifies Deut 28:23–24 as a translation from VTE §§ 63–64:[85]

(44) VTE §§ 63–64: KI.MIN KI.MIN *ilānū* (DINGIR.MEŠ) *mala ina ṭuppi aʾdêʾ an*[*niē šumšunu* (MU-*šunu*) *zakrū*] *ammar libitti* (SIG$_4$) *kaqquru lusiqqūnikkunu kaqqarkunu kī parzilli* (AN.BAR) *lēpušū memēni ina libbi* (ŠÀ-*bi*) *lū lā iparruʾa*
kī ša ištu libbi šamê (TA ŠÀ AN-*e*) *ša siparri* (UD.KA.BAR) *zunnu* (A.AN) *lā izannununi* (Tayinat: *izannunanni*) *kī ḫannie zunnu* (A.AN) *nalšu ina eqlīkunu* (A.ŠÀ.MEŠ-*kunu*) *tamerātēkunu lū lā ʾilʾlak; kūm zunnu* (A.AN) *peʾenāti ina mātīkunu* (KUR-*kunu*) *liznun* (Tayinat: *liznuna*)
DITTO, May whichever gods [that are named in th]is treʾatyʾ tablet make the land as narrow for you as a brick; may they make your land like iron; may nothing sprout in (its) midst. Just as from the heart of heavens of bronze rain does not come down, in the same way may rain (nor) dew not come down in your fields, your meadows; but rather, may a rain of charcoal rain in your land.

Deut 28: והיו שמיך אשר על־ראשך נחשת והארץ אשר־תחתיך ברזל: יתן י׳ את־מטר ארצך אבק ועפר מן־השמים ירד עליך עד השמדך
The (*lit.*: your) heavens that are over your head will be bronze, and the earth that is beneath you (will be) iron. The Lord will make the rain of your land (into) dust and grime; it will come down upon you until you are destroyed.

These thematically comparable texts are frequently cited as exhibiting particularly close resonances. Indeed, there are several lexical terms that overlap, suggesting that the constraints LEXICAL IDENTITY and SEMANTIC IDENTITY may be satisfied in ways that other sections of Deuteronomy have not been able to demonstrate. But Crouch has shown that arguments proceeding from these terminological similarities founder when confronted with a more

85 Steymans, "Assyrische Vorlage," 123, 137–138. The translation here is based on that of ORACC, with a few emendations to reflect our own work.

exacting analysis.[86] Here we compare the two texts using the translation constraint hierarchy in Tableau 4 (43). To save space – and to keep matters from exceeding even the most dedicated typesetter's abilities – we represent only the violations occurring in VTE § 63 and Deut 28:23, while allowing that VTE § 64 holds some vocabulary in common with Deut 28:23:

(45) Tableau 5: Evaluation of VTE §§ 63(–64) ~ Deut 28:23 according to the expectations established by Fekh. A and B:

	Favor-NWS_conv	Ident:sem	Ident: morph	Dep: syn(cl), Max: syn(cl), Ident:syn	Dep: morph	Max:morph
(v.23)		* (the assymetries here are too numerous to count; we provide one mark of violation only to indicate the wholesale variation of the semantic meanings of these two texts)	* *kaqqarkunu* ~ הארץ (omission of 2.m.pl. suffix; cf. no suffix on *kaqquru*, § 63, and 2.m.sg. suffix on ארצך, v. 24)	** (the loss of a clause, combined with significant syntactic reconfigurations that go well beyond the kind of rearrangements discussed above)	* והיו *** אשר על־ ראשך ** אשר־תחתיך	********** ********* *ilānū mala ina ṭuppi adê anniē šumšunu zakrû ammar libitti kaqquru lusīqūnikkunu … kī … lēpušū memēni ina libbi lū lā iparruʾa*

The significance and magnitude of the violations that this pairing demonstrates renders it highly unlikely that the author of Deuteronomy 28 could be construed as "translating" VTE in any sense of that term.

5.4. Summary

On the basis of our analysis in section 4, we suggested that the translation of an Akkadian source text into a Northwest Semitic language ought to be characterized by principled adherence to major translation-universal constraints, in patterns roughly approximating the constraint hierarchy evident in Fekh. A. As the above begins to show, the lexical and syntactic changes between VTE and its putative "translation" in Deuteronomy diverge signifi-

86 Crouch, *Israel and the Assyrians*, 65–68.

cantly from the model established by Fekh. A (and, for that matter, Fekh. B), despite certain thematic similarities. Without further concerted reflection on the method of "counting" violations, it becomes unclear just *how* severely Deuteronomy violates this translation hierarchy, but already it is clear that it does so to a significant degree.

6. Implications of the Tell Fekheriyeh texts for Deuteronomy

We suggested above that scholarly opinion with regard to Deuteronomy's relationship to VTE reflects two ways of dealing with their acknowledged dissimilarities: explanation by recourse to creative translation and explanation by recourse to an alternate source text. The suggestion that Deuteronomy constitutes a creative translation of VTE has now been considered and dismissed: we have argued that, if Deuteronomy reflects a translation of an Akkadian treaty or loyalty oath, it ought to reflect a hierarchy of translation constraints similar to that exhibited by the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. On the basis of the very real failure of Deuteronomy 28 to satisfy these constraints, we have excluded the possibility that Deuteronomy represents a translation of VTE.

This leaves open the possiblity that these divergences might result from the author of Deuteronomy having used a source other than VTE. Our conclusions thus far are well-suited for considering this possibility. Again, if Deuteronomy reflects a translation of an Akkadian treaty or loyalty oath into Northwest Semitic, it ought to reflect a hierarchy of translation constraints similar to that exhibited by the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. Barring specific reasons for deviation (which, as described above, are usually limited), a target text produced according to those constraints should closely resemble its source, preserving elements such as vocabulary (Lexical Identity and Semantic Identity), syntax (Syntactic identity and Lexical Linearity), or concepts, as well as the overall shape of its source text (Syntactic Dependency, Morphological Dependency, Morphological Identity).

Furthermore, if Deuteronomy is such a translation, we should be able to reconstruct an approximation of its source text. Although this reconstructed text will not exactly mirror the original, the basic process is viable enough to begin and proceed with a high degree of principled certainty. Translations which exhibit fastidious satisfaction of fundamental constraints such as Morphological Dependency, Morphological Maximality, and Morphological Identity are precisely those for which the retroversion

of the source text is most viable: morpheme-for-morpheme from source to target, morpheme-for-morpheme from target back to source.

If Deuteronomy's source text came from the Assyrian treaty family, then, both this retroverted text and Deuteronomy itself ought to resemble extant exemplars closely, with occasional deviations from the Hebrew text explicable through reference to highly-ranked constraints established in our analysis of the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. As our analysis has begun to show, however, Deuteronomy contains few or no clues indicative of an Akkadian source text: one or perhaps two loan words may derive from Akkadian but have no counterpart in any known Assyrian treaty (thus incurring serious violations of Lexical Identity), while the rest of Deuteronomy's vocabulary and locution show no distinctive signs of having been influenced by Akkadian or by Assyrian treaty vocabulary and locution more particularly (thus incurring serious violations of Morphological Identity, Morphological Dependency, and a variety of other similarly fundamental constraints). By the same principles that make clear that Deuteronomy is not a translation of VTE, therefore, Deuteronomy is exceedingly unlikely to be a translation of some other Akkadian text.

We allow that our analysis has not entirely ruled out a refractory use of the VTE, or perhaps the independent reliance of each text on an extant tradition or common set of tropes. Yet such refraction can hardly be called "translation," if by that term we mean anything approximating the transformations employed by the translators who effected the Aramaic text of the Fekheriyeh inscription. But, if this is the case, then there are very few avenues by which to trace dependency between *specific* Assyrian texts and Deuteronomy. Our analysis would necessarily be reliant on a far more nebulous set of refractory and transformative procedures than we have discussed here. If dependence upon previous texts cannot be traced with the precision that we have come to expect from the project at hand, then we must question whether dependence on a *specifically Assyrian* treaty- and oath-tradition can be substantiated at all.

Appendix A: Text of the Fekheriyeh Inscription, Text A

Assyrian text (normalized)		Aramaic text	
		Intro	
		NP	[1] דמותא זי הדיסעי
		Rel-VP	זי שם קדם הדד סכן
Text A		*Text A*	
A:1:	[1] *ana* [d]*adad gugal šamê u erṣeti*	A:1:	[2] גוגל שמין וארק
A:2a:	*mušaznin* [2] *nuḫše* (HÉ-NUN)	A:2a:	מהנחת עסר
A:2b:	*nādin rîti u mašqīte* [3] *ana nišē kal dadmē*	A:2b:	ונתן רעי [3] ומשקי למת כלן
A:3a:	*nādin* [4] *išqu u nindabê*	A:3a:	ונתן שלה ואדקור
A:3b:	[5] *ana ilī aḫ(ḫ)ēšu*	A:3b:	[4] לאלהין כלם אחוה
A:4:	*gugal nārātī*	A:4:	גוגל נהר כלם
A:5:	[6] *muṭaḫḫidu kibrāti*	A:5:	מעדן [5] מת כלן
A:6:	*ilu rēmēnû* [7] *ša sīpūšu ṭābu*	A:6:	אלה רחמן זי תצלותה טבה
A:7:	*āšib* [uru]*guzani*	A:7:	יסב [6] סכן
A:8:	[8] *bēli rabî bēlīšu*	A:8:	מרא רב
A:9a:	[I]*adad*(U)*-itʾi šakin māti* [uru]*guzani*	A:9a:	מרא הדיסעי מלך גוזן
A:9b:	[9] *mār* [Id]*šamaš-nūrī šakin māti* [uru]*guzani-ma*	A:9b:	בר [7] ססנורי מלך גוזן
A:10:	[10] *ana bulluṭ napšātīšu*	A:10:	לחיי נבשה
A:11:	*arāk ūmēšu*	A:11:	ולמארך יומוה
A:12:	[11] *šumʾud šanātīšu*	A:12:	[8] ולכבר שנוה
A:13a:	*šullum bītīšu*	A:13a:	ולשלם ביתה
A:13b:	*zērēšu*	A:13b:	ולשלם זרעה
A:13c:	[12] *u nišēšu*	A:13c:	ולשלם [9] אנשוה
A:14:	*ana nasāḫ murṣi* [13] *ša zumrīšu*	A:14:	ולמלד מרק מנה
A:15:	*ikribīya ana šemê*	A:15:	ולמשמע תצלותה
A:16:	[14] *ṣibīt pīya ana magāri*	A:16:	ול [10] מלקח אמרת פמה
A:17:	*ikrum-ma* [15] *iqēš*	A:17:	כנן ויהב לה
A:18a:	*mannu arkû*	A:18a:	ומן אחר
A:18b:	*anḫūssu luddiš*	A:18b:	כן [11] יבל לכננה חדס
A:18c:	[16] *šumī-ma liškun*	A:18c:	ושמים לשם בה
A:19a:	*mannu ša šumī* [17] *unakkaru*	A:19a:	וזי ילד שמי מנה
A:19b:	*u šumšu išakkanu*	A:19b:	[12] וישים שמה
A:19c:	[18] *adad*(U) *qardu lū bēl dīnīšu*	A:19c:	הדד גבר להוי קבלה

English Translation (*italics* indicates Aramaic text):

Intro-NP: *The likeness of Haddu-yiθʿî*
Intro-RevlVP: *which he placed before Hadad-of-Sikan …*
A:1: To Hadad, (the) canal inspector (of) heaven and earth
A:2a: (the one who) causes to rain fruitfulness (of fields) (Aram.: *riches*)
A:2b: *and* gives pasture and watering place to (the) inhabitants (of) all the land (Aram.: *to* [*the inhabitants of the*] *lands, all* [*of*] *them*);
A:3a: *and* gives share(s?) (Aram.: *sprinkling*) and food offering;

A:3b: to (the) gods, *all of them*, his brothers;
A:4: (the) canal inspector (of) rivers, *all of them*;
A:5: (the one who) makes luxuriant the land / world, *all* (*of*) *it* / *them*;
A:6: compassionate god to whom it is good to pray;
A:7: resident (of) Guzan (Aram.: *Sikan*);
A:8: great lord, his lord (Aram.: Ø);
A:9a: Haddu-yiθʿî (Aram.: *the lord of Haddu-yiθʿî*), governor (of) the land (of) Guzan,
A:9b: son (of) Šamaš-nūrī, governor (of) the land Guzan (Aram.: *king of Guzan*),
A:10: (In order) to make healthy (Aram.: *sustain*) his life,
A:11: *and to* prolong his days,
A:12: *and to* increase his years,
A:13a: *and to* make sound his house,
A:13b: *and to make sound* his progeny,
A:13c: and *to make sound* his men,
A:14: *and* to remove sickness from his body / person (Aram.: *from him*)
A:15: *and* to hear my prayers (Aram.: his prayer),
A:16: *and* to accept the word of his mouth,
A:17: he dedicated (Aram.: *erected*) it and gave it *to him*.
A:18a: (As for) anyone subsequent,
A:18b: *when* it is dilapidated, let him renew (it) (Aram.: *let him establish it anew*)
A:18c: *and* let him place my name *on it*.
A:19a: *But* as for anyone who would efface my name *from it*
A:19b: and would place his own name –
A:19c: may Hadad the hero be his adversary.

Appendix B: Text of the Fekheriyeh Inscription, Text B

Assyrian text (normalized)		Aramaic text	
Text B		*Text B*	
B:1a:	[19] *ṣalam* [1]*adad*(U)-*it-ʾi*	B:1a:	צלם הדיסעי
B:1b:	*šakin māti* [20] [uru]*guzani* [uru]*sikani u* [uru]*zarani*	B:1b:	[13] מלך גוזן וזי סכן וזי אזרן
B:2:	[21] *ana tiriṣ* (?) [giš]*kussîšu*	B:2:	לארם ורדת כרסאה
B:3:	*arāk palûšu*	B:3:	[14] ולמארך חיוה
B:4a:	[22] *qibīt pīšu*	B:4a:	ולמען אמרת פמה
B:4b:	*eli ilānī u nišē* [23] *ṭubbi*	B:4b:	אל אלהן ואל אנשן [15] תיטב
B:5a:	*ṣalma šuāte*	B:5a:	דמותא זאת עבד
B:5b:	*eli maḫ*[24]*rê ušātir*	B:5b:	אל זי קדם הותר
B:6:	*ina pāni* [d]*adad* (IŠKUR)	B:6:	קדם הדד
B:7:	[25] *āšib* [uru]*sikani*	B:7:	[16] יסב סכן
B:8:	*bēl* [nār]*ḫabūr*	B:8:	מרא חבור
B:9:	[26] *ṣalamšu izqup*	B:9:	צלמה שם
B:10a:	*mannu ša šumī issu libbi* [27] *unūtē*	B:10a:	מן ילד שמי מן מאניא

Assyrian text (normalized)		Aramaic text	
B:10b:	*ša bīt* ^{d}*adad* (IŠKUR) *bēlīya* [28] *ipaššiṭuni*	B:10b:	זי בת הדד מראי [17]
B:11a:	^{d}*adad* (IŠKUR) *bēlī*	B:11a:	מראי הדד
B:11b:	*akalšu* [29] *mêšu lā imaḫḫaršu*	B:11b:	לחמה ומוה אל ילקח מן [18] ידה
B:12a:	^{d}*šala bēssī*	B:12a:	סול מראתי
B:12b:	[30] *akalšu mêšu* KI.MIN	B:12b:	לחמה ומוה אל תלקח מן ידה
B:13:	*līriš lū lā* [31] *eṣṣidi*	B:13:	ול[19]זרע ואל יחצד
B:14:	1 *līm līriš* 1 *sūt* [32] *liṣbat*	B:14:	ואלף שערין לזרע ופריס לאחז מנה
B:15:	1 *mē laḫ̣rātu lā ušabbâ* [33] *ḫ̣urāpa*	B:15:	[20] ומאה סאון להינקן אמר ואל ירוי[!]
B:16:	1 *mē lâtu lā ušabbâ mūri*	B:16:	ומאה סור להינקן [21] עגל ואל ירוי
B:17:	[34] 1 *mē ālidāte lā ušabbâ māra*	B:17:	[22] ומאה נשון להינקן עלים ואל ירוי
B:18:	[35] 1 *mē āpiāte lā umallâ tinūra*	B:18:	ומאה נשון לאפן בתנור לחם ואל ימלאנה
B:19:	*eli tubqināte lāqitū* [37] *lilqutû*[!]	B:19:	ומן קלקלתא ללקטו אנשוה שערן לאכלו
B:20a:	*di'u šibṭu* [38] *dilipte*	B:20a:	[23] ומותן שבט זי נירגל
B:20b:	*ištu mātīšu lā ipparrasū*	B:20b:	אל יגתזר מן מתה

English Translation (*italics* indicates Aramaic text)

B:1a: The image of Haddu-yiθʿî,
B:1b: governor (of) the land (Aram.: *king of*) Guzan *and of* Sikan and *of* Azran –
B:2: for the prosperity (?) (Aram.: *the exaltation and succession* [?]) of his throne,
B:3: *and to* prolong his reign (Aram.: *his life*),
B:4a: *and in order* to make the utterance of his mouth (Aramaic: *that the utterance of his mouth be*)
B:4b: good to the gods and *to* humanity,
B:5a: *he made* this likeness,
B:5b: he improved it over what was before.
B:6: Before Hadad,
B:7: resident of Sikan,
B:8: lord of the Habūr,
B:9: he placed his statue.
B:10a: As for whoever would efface my name from the objects (Aram.: *vessels*)
B:10b: of the house of Hadad my lord –
B:11a: may Hadad my lord
B:11b: not receive his food *and* his water from him (Aram.: *his hand*);
B:12a: may Šala my lady
B:12b: not receive his food *and* his water from him (Akk.: DITTO his food *and* his water; Aram: his hand);
B:13: *and* may he sow, but may he not harvest;
B:14: *and* may he sow 1,000 (measures of) *barley*, but may he seize (only) a *parīs* from it;
B:15: *and* may 100 ewes not satisfy a lamb (Aram.: *may 100 ewes nurse a lamb, but it not be satisfied*);

B:16: (may) 100 bulls (sic!) not satisfy a calf (Aram.: *and* [*may*] *100 bulls* (sic!) *nurse a calf, but it not be satisfied*);
B:17: (may) 100 mothers not satisfy a son (Aram.: *and* [*may*] *100 women nurse a baby, but it not be satisfied*);
B:18: (may) 100 bakers not fill an oven (Aram.: *and* [*may*] *100 women bake bread in an oven, but not fill it*);
B:19: and may the gleaners glean on the refuse pits (Aram.: *and from the refuse-pits may his men glean barley* [*and*] *eat*)!
B:20a: May illness, scourge of pestilence (Aram.: *And may plague, the scourge of Nergal*),
B:20b: not be cut off from his land!

Jeremy M. Hutton
University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA
Department of Classical & Ancient Near Eastern Studies
University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa
960 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Dr.
Madison, WI 53711
jmhutton@wisc.edu

C. L. Crouch
University of Nottingham, UK
Department of Theology and Religious Studies
University Park
Nottingham NG7 2RD
carly.crouch@nottingham.ac.uk

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel

Contact address:
Professor Dr. Konrad Schmid
Theologische Fakultät der Universität Zürich
Kirchgasse 9
CH-8001 Zürich
Switzerland
E-mail: hebai@theol.uzh.ch

Publisher: Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Postfach 2040, 72010 Tübingen
Can be purchased at bookstores.

Printed in Germany.
Typeset by Martin Fischer, Tübingen.
Printed by Gulde-Druck, Tübingen.

ISSN 2192-2276 (Print Edition)
ISSN 2192-2284 (Online Edition)

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel

volume 7 (2018), no. 2

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel is a peer-reviewed, quarterly journal focusing primarily on the biblical texts in their ancient historical contexts, but also on the history of Israel in its own right. Each issue has a topical focus. The primary language is English, but articles may also be published in German and French. A specific goal of the journal is to foster discussion among different academic cultures within a larger international context pertaining to the study of the Hebrew Bible and ancient Israel in the first millennium B.C.E.

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel erscheint vierteljährlich, die Beiträge werden durch einen Peer-review-Prozess evaluiert. Ihr Thema sind die Texte der hebräischen und aramäischen Bibel in ihren historischen Kontexten, aber auch die Geschichte Israels selbst. Jedes Heft wird einen thematischen Fokus haben. Die meisten Beiträge werden in Englisch verfasst sein, Artikel können aber auch auf Deutsch oder Französisch erscheinen. Ein besonderes Ziel der Zeitschrift besteht in der Vermittlung der unterschiedlichen akademischen Kulturen im globalen Kontext, die sich mit der Hebräischen Bibel und dem antiken Israel im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. beschäftigen.

Mohr Siebeck

2192–2276(201806)7:2;1–P