Da es sich bei „Foes“ *nicht* um einen kollektiven Ausdruck im
üblichen Sinne handelt, scheint mir diese Deutung nicht möglich zu
sein.

Ich glaube, dass wir im Hinblick auf das Ugaritische diese Form
anders erklären können, ohne auch nur einen Konsonanten des
Textes ändern zu müssen (wohl aber die Vokale): wozu wir m.E.
umso mehr berechtigt sind, als Psalm lxviii auch sonst noch mehrfach
Anklänge an das ugaritische Sprachgut aufweist. Ich fasse *tndp*
al Niphal Impf. Pl. 3. m. auf, mit dem aus dem Ugaritischen und
aus dem Kana‘anäischen der El-Amarna-Briefe bekannten Präfix t-‘
(das auch schon an anderen Stellen des Alten Testamentes nachge-
Vershälfte auch: kehinnadep (Ni. Inf. c.) ‘asan tinnadepu (Ni. Impf.
Pl. 3. m.) „wie Rauch verweht wird,(so) sollen sie verweht werden".

Bonn

A. JIRKU

**FLESH, COVERING, AND RESPONSE, EX. xxi 10**

In the words ṣērāb kesūtāh wēnātāh lō yigrā‘, the Covenant-Code
forbids a man to diminish three rights of his ‘inferior wife’ (rather
than ‘slave-concubine’: every wife was *bought*, and the secondary
partners had a legal status no less rigidly determined than that of the
primary spouse). These three rights are universally interpreted to be
‘food, clothing, intercourse’; but commentators are embarrassed to
account for the unusual words chosen in all three cases.

Ṣērāb means ‘her flesh’. Ṣēr is used only of living flesh in the
Bible, probably even in Ps. lxxviii 20, 27, since in verse 25 ‘meat’ is
unequivocally ṣēdā. In Mi. iii 3 also, living human flesh is meant,
ṣir occurs three times in the sense of ‘flesh’ (or ‘remnant’) rather than
meat, though similarly used of cannibalism; Akkadian ṣēru in Ham-
murabi’s prologue and epilogue means ‘well-being’. Meat was a
rarity in the diet of less-privileged Israelites, and would scarcely be
singled out as one of a woman’s three fundamental rights. Just as
biblical Ṣēr means ‘blood-relation’ either abstractly or concretely,
especially in ‘flesh of his flesh’ Ṣēr bāsārō Lv. xviii 6, so bāsār means
‘living things collectively’; but bāsār means also or primarily ‘meat’,
which cannot be said of Ṣēr. BUHL claims without explanation that
3½r means ‘inner flesh’ as opposed to bâśār ‘outer flesh’; the latter is perhaps to be referred to a presumed euphemism (KÖHLER), questionable in Lv. xv 2, and quite unwarranted in Ez. xvi 26; xxiii 20. One may with as great justification suggest that in Ex. xxi 10 3½r is ‘flesh’ in the sense of ‘fleshy satisfaction’, including also conjugal pleasure in a general well-being of the flesh. This is quite suited to the Septuagint tâ déônta.

K°sit means ‘covering’, and in series with ‘food’ it would suggest ‘raiment’. But as applied to the indemnity-money of Gn. xx 6, KÖHLER quite plausibly finds the sense ‘covering of eyes = declaration of undamaged womanly reputation’; this sense is still more prominent in the undisprovable Revised Version ‘thy brother is to thee a covering of eyes’, i. e. a guardian of thy chastity. This undoubtedly metaphorical use would seem based on a literal veil or shawl rather than garment in general; in Études sur le code de l’Alliance (Paris 1946) 49, CAZELLES concludes from uses in Is. 1 3, the 400-year-stele of Tanis, and the Til-Barsib relief, to a sort of undergarment. The radical sense of the verb is of protection as well as covering, especially in Dt. xiii 9. It seems that the ‘covering’ Ex. xxi 10 may well have this sense of protection or ‘harem-seclusion’ (harem of its nature referring not to the plurality of wives but to the accommodation accorded them).

‘Ônâ occurs only here. In Modern Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic it is known with the sense of ‘fixed time’, but as relating to conjugal duty, and hence traceable directly to Ex. xxi 10 rather than to a far-fetched link with ‘êt ‘time’ from the root ‘answer’; more reasonable would be ‘answer’ in the sense of verantwortlich, ‘her responsibility’, as the Latin euphemistic debitum; or KÖHLER’s suggested derivation from ‘nh II ‘cause to submit’ or III ‘disquiet’. Others prefer to work from ‘wun ‘dwell’, yielding ‘(co-)habitation’ as Latin civis = ‘(fellow-)citizen’. The crucial Hos. x 10 ṭônâtâm (Ketib; Qere ‘eynôtâm) could be the same form as Ex. xxi 10, ‘their cohabitation’, though one wonders how this can be supported by the ‘anta of Os. ii 17 (CAZELLES), and most commentators prefer ‘their iniquities’. In any case there is unanimity as to the sense of ‘ônâ in Ex. xxi 10. And yet CAZELLES notes that it is incompatible with the verb yigra‘ ‘diminish’ (‘il parait difficile qu’on oblige le maître à ne pas reduire ses relations avec une ‘âmâh s’il en a une autre’). But instead of rendering yigra‘ as ‘suppress’, one might rather supply from the context a more suitable meaning for the uncorroborated ‘ônâ. In fact, as is well known from the stories of Rachel Gn. xxx 1, Anna 1 Sam. i 8, and