

## Article

# The Constellation of Agents: An Often Overlooked Aspect in the Comparison of Deuteronomy and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties

Joachim J. Krause 

Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät, Ruhr-University Bochum, 44801 Bochum, Germany; joachim.krause@rub.de

**Abstract:** Ever since the pioneering studies of George Mendenhall, Klaus Baltzer, Dennis McCarthy, and Moshe Weinfeld, the structural analogies between Deuteronomy and ancient Near Eastern treaties have been a key issue in the scholarly study of the book. More recently, the hypothesis that Deuteronomy 13\* and 28\* could even represent a Hebrew rendering of the Neo-Assyrian Succession Treaties of Esarhaddon has prompted a yet intensified investigation of the matter. Yielding nuanced models to account for the traditio-historical pluriformity of features in Deuteronomy vis-à-vis the various strands of tradition found in late Hittite and Neo-Assyrian, as well as Aramaic comparative evidence, this latter discussion has arguably once again broadened the horizon. In any case, it only emphasizes that reading Deuteronomy against the background of the ancient Near Eastern treaty tradition more broadly provides an indispensable perspective when it comes to the literary genesis of Deuteronomy as we have it. What is more, it also opens a window on its interpretation. At the same time, however, it can also lead to certain misconceptions, for as much as major parts of Deuteronomy are modeled on a treaty, Deuteronomy is no treaty. The comparative perspective thus requires one to heed both commonalities and differences. This article focuses on one such difference, namely the constellation of agents. It is typical of ancient Near Eastern treaties that the contracting parties agree to delegate the task of safeguarding the treaty to a third party constituted by deities. It is these gods who figure as “witnesses” of the curses that the contracting parties call upon themselves if they should act contrary to the treaty, the term “witness” also denoting, according to the semantics of ancient Near Eastern treaty discourse, “agent of the sanctions.” Hence, the agreed upon sanctions are conceived of as coming into effect without the further involvement of the contracting parties. In fact, this particular feature is the operating principle which makes an ancient Near Eastern treaty work. In Deuteronomy, however, it does not apply. While intriguingly enough there are certain entities in the close context of the curse sections which are called “witnesses,” none of them can truly figure as a witness in the sense described above, for none of them is a deity; neither is there an attempt made to charge these “witnesses” with putting into effect the curse sanctions. Often overlooked, this aspect has significant ramifications for the understanding of the curses in Deuteronomy and the treaty style structure in general.



**Citation:** Krause, Joachim J. 2023. The Constellation of Agents: An Often Overlooked Aspect in the Comparison of Deuteronomy and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties. *Religions* 14: 339. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14030339>

Academic Editors: Anja Klein and Christoph Berner

Received: 6 February 2023  
Revised: 23 February 2023  
Accepted: 26 February 2023  
Published: 3 March 2023

**Keywords:** Deuteronomy; Deut 28; ancient Near Eastern treaty tradition; semantics of cursing; divine witnesses



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Ever since the pioneering studies of George Mendenhall, Klaus Baltzer, Dennis McCarthy, and Moshe Weinfeld, the structural analogies between Deuteronomy and ancient Near Eastern treaties have been a key issue in the scholarly study of the book.<sup>1</sup> More recently, the hypothesis that Deut 13\* and 28\* could even represent a Hebrew rendering of one specific Neo-Assyrian treaty has prompted a yet intensified investigation of the matter. Yielding nuanced models to account for the traditio-historical pluriformity of features in Deuteronomy vis-à-vis the various strands of tradition found in comparative evidence,

this latter discussion has arguably once again broadened the horizon. In any case, it only emphasizes that reading Deuteronomy against the background of the ancient Near Eastern treaty tradition more broadly provides an indispensable perspective when it comes to the literary genesis of Deuteronomy as we have it. What is more, it also opens a window on its interpretation. At the same time, however, it can also lead to certain misconceptions, for as much as major parts of Deuteronomy are modeled on a treaty, Deuteronomy is no treaty.<sup>2</sup> The comparative perspective thus requires one to heed both commonalities and differences. In this paper, the focus will be on one such difference, namely the constellation of agents.

## 2. Comparing Deuteronomy and Ancient Near Eastern Treaties

The importance of comparing Deuteronomy and ancient Near Eastern treaties, or ancient legal institutions more broadly for that matter, is uncontroversial in critical scholarship.<sup>3</sup> There will be no full understanding of Deuteronomy without taking into account the unmistakable allusions to the basic structure of a political treaty. This is the lasting relevance of approximately three quarters of a century of research into the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near East, the history of which is well documented.<sup>4</sup> Only recently, two superbly edited journal issues took stock of the discussion: a 2019 volume of *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* titled “Perspectives on the Treaty Framework of Deuteronomy” (Edenburg and Müller 2019b) and a 2020 double issue of *Maarav* in memory of George Mendenhall (Levinson 2020a).<sup>5</sup> In light of this, there is no need for another full review of earlier research here. Instead, I will enter the debate with some brief remarks on the much-discussed contention that core chapters of Deuteronomy are in fact a Hebrew rendering of parts of the Neo-Assyrian Succession Treaties of Esarhaddon (EST),<sup>6</sup> and the fruitful controversy sparked by it.

Said contention builds on the observation that both Deut 13\* and 28\* feature passages which resemble paragraphs from EST in such a way that one cannot but reckon with some sort of genetic relationship; and that relationship, in turn, is assumed to be that of a literal translation (Steymans 1995; Otto 1999). The force of this hypothesis lies in the basic observation, for the parallels are in fact remarkably close. That is to say, they need to be explained. However, the explanation is not predetermined by the observation itself (for a careful methodological discussion, see Arnold and Shockey 2022). Caution is recommended already by the fact that, apart from EST, there are no fully preserved Neo-Assyrian treaties at our disposal (Radner 2006). Critically important, however, is the additional observation that next to the Neo-Assyrian there are also clear traits of various Northwest Semitic traditions to be discerned in the very same chapters of Deuteronomy (see in particular Koch 2006, 2008; see also Quick 2018). Against this background, more nuanced traditio-historically informed models of explanation have been proposed, attaching particular importance to the guild of scribes in the ancient Near East, their decidedly international outlook, and the largely standardized training they received (see again Koch 2008; cf. Ramos 2016). In this vein, the pluriformity of features in Deuteronomy has been fruitfully compared with the amalgam of genuinely Aramaic, late Hittite, and Neo-Assyrian traditions found in the Sefire inscriptions (Fitzmyer 1995; see Koch 2006; d’Alfonso 2006).<sup>7</sup>

It should be noted at this point that these more recent insights do *not* call for a flat denial of any specific relationship between Deut 13 and 28 and the Neo-Assyrian treaty tradition as represented by EST. In my view, attempts to downplay the parallels in question as “general,” “imprecise,” and “superficial” (Crouch 2014, p. 92) do justice neither to the translation hypothesis<sup>8</sup> nor to the actual features of the texts themselves.<sup>9</sup> While claims of *exclusive* dependence of Deuteronomy on EST are demonstrably unwarranted, and claims of direct *literary* dependence are uncertain at best, it is impossible to deny specific Neo-Assyrian influence in Deuteronomy; and the copy of EST recently unearthed at Tell Tayinat (Lauinger 2012) only confirms this.<sup>10</sup>

Having said this, my discussion will now focus, not on particular features relevant for the comparison of Deuteronomy with just one instance of the ancient Near Eastern treaty tradition, but on the essential elements common to any and all political treaties in

the ancient Near East and, in fact, the ancient world altogether.<sup>11</sup> Notwithstanding an almost bewildering variety of actual manifestations, which is only to be expected when one looks at the history of a tradition over the course of more than a millennium and through widely differing historical and cultural contexts, three main elements are to be discerned throughout and in fact allow one to speak of a common tradition. These elements are the actual treaty provisions, or stipulations; sanctions for non-compliance with these provisions, which come in the form of curses, optionally to be complemented by sanctions for compliance, which come as blessings; and the invocation of divine witnesses.

When searching for analogies to this basic structure in Deuteronomy, EST provides a particularly well-preserved and well-known example. A treaty of the Assyrian Great King Esarhaddon with various vassal kings stating that Esarhaddon's son, Assurbanipal, shall succeed his father as overlord, EST obliges the vassal kings to show, after Esarhaddon's death, the same obedience to Assurbanipal as they now show to Esarhaddon; hence, the usual designation "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty."<sup>12</sup> This is, in essence, the provision of the treaty. In order to enforce compliance with this provision, EST goes on to describe the consequences of non-compliance, that is, of acts of disloyalty towards Assurbanipal. As is typical of a treaty in the ancient world, the passages in question present themselves as curses, that is, as invocations for harm to come upon the perpetrator.<sup>13</sup> Opening with § 58, the pertinent passage reads: "If you should sin against this treaty which Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, [your] lord, [has concluded] with you concerning Assurbanipal, the great crown prince designate, . . . May Aššur, father of the gods, st[ri]ke [you] down with [his] fierce weapons. (59) May Palil, the fore[most] lord, let eagles and vultures [eat your f]lesh. (60) May Ea, king of the Abyss, lord of the springs, give you deadly water to drink, and fill you with dropsy." And so it continues, finally invoking "all the gods that are [mentioned by name] in th[is] treaty tablet" (63).<sup>14</sup>

Precisely this basic structure of a political treaty in the ancient world is to be discerned in the depiction, given in Deuteronomy, of the special relationship, or "covenant," of Yhwh and his people Israel.<sup>15</sup> Following the extensive body of stipulations found in Deut 12–26, Deut 28 details the sanctions for non-compliance and, notably, compliance. Verses 1–2 read as follows: "If you will only obey Yhwh your God, by diligently observing all his commandments that I am commanding you today, Yhwh your God will set you high above all the nations of the earth; (2) all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, because you obey Yhwh your God: . . ." <sup>16</sup> The chapter thus opens with the desired scenario, namely, Yhwh blessing his people elect. But if Israel will not live up to its obligations in this special relationship, here as well curse is impending. In fact, depicting the sanctions for non-compliance is the focal point of the chapter, the function of which is to safeguard the covenant.<sup>17</sup> Thus, v. 15 reads: "But if you will not obey Yhwh your God by diligently observing all his commandments and decrees, which I am commanding you today, then all these curses shall come upon you and overtake you: . . ." <sup>18</sup>

### 3. The Constellation of Agents

Thus far, our comparison has covered two of the three essential elements of a political treaty in the ancient world, namely the actual provisions and the sanctions for non-compliance, or curses. Yet the third element, the invocation of divine witnesses, has also come into view. As the above quote from a curse section of EST demonstrates, Esarhaddon calls upon gods to execute the curses he utters: "May Aššur . . . May Palil . . . May Ea . . ." In so doing, he notably includes gods, not only from his own pantheon, but also from that of the other contracting party. In this respect, the copy of EST found at Tell Tayinat is most instructive, for here we find a curse not preserved in the Nimrud fragments, § 54B, invoking the "Queen of Ekron": "May Šarrat-Ekron make a worm fall from your insides" (Lauinger 2012, p. 113). By including these and numerous other invocations, the contracting parties agree to delegate the task of safeguarding the treaty to a third party constituted by deities. It is these gods who figure as "witnesses" of the curses that the contracting parties call upon themselves if they should act contrary to the treaty, the term "witness"

also denoting, according to the semantics of ancient Near Eastern treaty discourse, “agent of the sanctions” (see [Kitz 2014](#); [Christiansen 2012](#)). Using the example of EST again, if the vassal king will, at some point in the future, refuse to show obedience to Assurbanibal as he agreed to, the invoked gods, not Assurbanibal himself, will retaliate.

To be sure, there are examples of aggrieved parties claiming to execute divine wrath when taking punitive action on their own behalf or, looking at the other side of the coin, of divine agents who employ human instruments to implement sanctions (see [Kitz 2014](#), pp. 195–96; cf. also [McCarthy 1978](#), pp. 138–39). However, by referring to the conceptual frame of divine agency, these examples actually affirm the principle. In any case, the content of most curses lies beyond human, or royal, reach. Instead, there is, in the Neo-Assyrian realm, a standard division of competencies among prominent members of the pantheon: Sin is responsible for skin diseases, Šamaš for blindness, etc. ([Weinfeld 1965; 1972](#), pp. 117–21).

All this is to say that, according to the idea of divine witnesses, the agreed upon sanctions for non-compliance with the provisions of a treaty are conceived of as coming into effect without the further involvement of the contracting parties. Because the treaty is safeguarded by the gods, there *will* follow disaster from disloyalty. One may even be tempted to speak of a “curse automatism.” This coinage, however, immediately calls for further clarification, as it tends to blur the border between divine agency and magical practice. Needless to say, the latter also features prominently in the realm of treaty-making (see [Kitz 2014](#), pp. 9–31; [Steymans 1995](#), pp. 209–20; [Aitken 2007](#), pp. 5–17), as do, in certain contexts, curses that are phrased in the passive participle, that is, without explicitly invoking an agent.<sup>19</sup> Against this backdrop, the description of an “automatism” may seem either unfit or quite instructive when referring to the conditional self-imprecations of the treaty partners under scrutiny here, depending on which aspect we wish to consider. Looking at the divine witnesses and their independent agency, the term “automatism” would in fact be misleading. But it is illuminating from the perspective of the contracting parties (according to our example, the Assyrian Great King and the respective vassal king), for the force of their conditional self-imprecations lies precisely in the fact that these sanctions will be implemented by an independent third party. Indeed, this particular feature is the operating principle which makes an ancient Near Eastern treaty work.

In fact, this also holds when we broaden the horizon to look at other legal institutions and other cultural contexts of the ancient world.<sup>20</sup> To this end, let me introduce an additional, lesser-known example, namely an oath taken by the citizens of the Cretan Itanos<sup>21</sup> from the third century BCE (*IC III iv 8*).<sup>22</sup> As this example is not cited quite as often, I will reproduce the pertinent passages of the oath and offer a translation before discussing it.<sup>23</sup> The oath commences as follows (ll. 1–9):

Θε]ῶς ἀγαθός.  
 τά]δε ὤμοσαν τοῖ Ἰτάνιοι πά[ν-  
 τε]ς] Δία Δικταῖον καὶ Ἥραν καὶ θ-  
 εο]ῦς τοὺς ἐν Δίκται καὶ Ἀθαν-  
 5 α]ίαν Πολιάδα καὶ θεοὺς ὄσσο[ι-  
 ς] ἐν Ἀθαναίαι θύεται πάντας  
 κ]αὶ Δία Ἀγοραῖον καὶ Ἀπόλλω-  
 ν]α Πύθιον καθ’ ἱερῶν νεοκαύ-  
 10 δ]ωσέω . . .

“God is beneficent. The following oath was sworn by all the Itanians, in the name of Zeus of Dicte, Hera, the gods at Dicte, Athena Polias, all the gods to whom sacrifices are offered in the sanctuary of Athena, Zeus Agoraeus and Pythian Apollo, over newly burnt offerings: I will not betray the city of Itanos. . . .”

Falling in line with the first promise just quoted, “I will not betray the city of Itanos” (ll. 9–10), there are numerous other promises, detailing the loyalty a citizen owes to the city and its environs, to other citizens, and to the form of government, including the agreed

upon laws (ll. 10–38). After this main body of the oath, we find the following conclusion (ll. 38–49):

τοῖς δ' εἰ-  
 ορκέοσι καὶ κατέχουσι τὸν [ῥο-  
 40 κο]ν τέκνων ὄνασ[ι]ν γίνεσθ[αι]  
 καὶ γᾶν ἔνκαρπο[ν] φ[έρ]ειν καὶ [πρ-  
 ό]βατα εὐθηγ[εῖ]ν κα[ὶ] ἄλλ[α] πολ[λ-  
 ᾶ καὶ ἀγαθὰ [γίνε]σθαι [κα]ὶ αὐτῶ[ι]  
 45 κ]αὶ τοῖς τέκνο[ις,] τοῖς δὲ ἐπιορκέ-  
 ο]σι μήτε γᾶν φέρειν μήτε τέκν-  
 ω]ν ὄνασιν γίνεσθαι μήτε πρό-  
 βα]τα εὐθηγεῖν, ἐξόλλυσθαι δὲ  
 κα]κῶς κακοῦς καὶ αὐτοῦς καὶ γ-  
 εν]εἶαν αὐτῶν.

“May those who honor and respect the oath be blessed with children, see their land produce crops and their flocks flourish, and may they and their children enjoy many other blessings; but for those who break the oath may their land be infertile, and may they be denied children and flourishing flocks, and may they perish miserably in their wickedness together with their descendants.”

A citizen’s oath taken by equals who pledge loyalty to their body politic and to each other, this example could hardly be farther removed from an ancient Near Eastern vassal treaty. At the same time, however, it features the three essential elements which make up the basic structure reconstructed in the latter: actual provisions; sanctions for compliance or non-compliance with these provisions, which come in the form of blessings and curses; and the invocation of divine witnesses responsible for implementing these sanctions.<sup>24</sup> Admittedly, there is no explicit reference to divine agency in the concluding section, with both blessing and curse being phrased impersonally: “may their land be infertile,” etc.<sup>25</sup> However, the assumption that one would look to the divine sphere for the origin of such calamities suggests itself, if not from the cultural context per se,<sup>26</sup> then arguably in view of the extensive introduction which mentions a whole range of gods, in the name of which the Itanians took the oath.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, the operating principle, according to which not the legal partners themselves, but an independent third party protects the treaty or oath, seems to hold here as well. In fact, it may well be characterized as *the* core feature of legally binding agreements in the ancient world.<sup>28</sup> In Deuteronomy, however, it is precisely this feature which does not apply. While intriguingly enough there are certain entities, in the close context of the curse sections, which are called “witnesses,” none of them can truly figure as a witness in the sense described above, for none of them is a deity; neither is there an attempt made to charge them with putting into effect the curse sanctions.

These surrogate witnesses are the book of the Torah written down by Moses, according to Deut 31:26; a song associated with Moses, according to Deut 31:19, 21; and, most prominently, heaven and earth, according to Deut 30:19 (see also Deut 31:28; 32:1; 4:26). These references come from various sub-units and mostly rather late literary layers. Of importance here, however, is both that “witnesses” *are* being referred to—apparently the basic structure of a treaty-like arrangement called for including this element, and the diachronic aggregation only confirms this assumption—and, for another thing, that not one of these “witnesses” is actually able to serve in the capacity of a witness in the sense of traditional treaty discourse, plainly because none of them is a deity. Notably, the latter also holds regarding heaven and earth. While the comparative evidence, especially (but not limited to) the Hittite tradition, does in fact testify to the invocation of heaven and earth, or their numina, as divine witnesses of a treaty,<sup>29</sup> it is evident that, in Deuteronomy, heaven and earth are not conceptualized as divine entities.<sup>30</sup>

In the constellation of agents which is envisioned when Deuteronomy depicts the special relationship of Yhwh and his people Israel as a “covenant”—that is, in treaty-like manner—there is only one God: Yhwh himself. Consequently, it is Yhwh and Yhwh alone who will implement the agreed upon sanctions for non-compliance on the part of Israel; it is Yhwh who will bring about the consequences detailed by the curses. Seen from this angle, we are well-advised to use the traditional term “curse” more cautiously when interpreting the pertinent sections of Deuteronomy, as has already been pointed out by Dennis McCarthy: “[C]ertain passages [ . . . ] called *curses, blessings or curse-blessing formulae* might be better characterized as *threats, promises, conditional predictions* or the like. [ . . . ] A curse is usually defined as ‘A prayer or invocation for harm or injury to come upon one.’ But Yahwe does not pray, He *says* what will happen” (McCarthy 1978, p. 11).<sup>31</sup> Following McCarthy’s lead, I will henceforth use the neologism “curse threat” for instances in Deuteronomy. For, uttered by his mouthpiece Moses, this is what the curses-style sections in Deuteronomy truly are—Yhwh’s ultimate threat for breaking his covenant.<sup>32</sup>

That Yhwh in fact serves as the agent of his own curse threat is, after all, evident from the literary accounts in Deuteronomy themselves. Deuteronomy 28 is a case in point (see McCarthy 1978, pp. 177–80). Having opened with a series of אָרָר-type curses<sup>33</sup> in vv. 16–19, from v. 20 onwards Yhwh is explicitly introduced as the subject (Nelson 2002, pp. 328–29). We also find curse contents being personified, and even “the curses” (הַקְלָלוֹת הָאֵלֶּה) being construed as the subject of actions, as in v. 45a.<sup>34</sup> They are, however, mere instruments employed by Yhwh, as v. 22 makes clear beyond doubt: “Yhwh will afflict you with consumption, fever, inflammation, with fiery heat and drought, and with blight and mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish.” Further proof is found in the moods. For curse threats, Deuteronomy 28 uses jussives next to indicatives (v. 21). This is in keeping with traditional ancient Near Eastern treaty discourse, where curses figure as appeals of the treaty partners to the divine witnesses. In Deuteronomy 28, however, they are one and the same person: the dominant partner, or “overlord,” who dictates this “treaty,” Yhwh, is at the same time the grammatical subject and the addressee of the appeal. Therefore, jussives in conjunction with Yhwh are the ultimate indicator that Yhwh himself serves the function that, in a political treaty, is served by divine witnesses. There are no such witnesses here, no external agents, and no independent third party. Instead, Yhwh, in a personal union of sorts, is both a partner to this covenant and the one who safeguards it.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4. Conclusions

Often overlooked, this rather peculiar feature marks the categorical difference between the covenant in Deuteronomy and its source of inspiration, the political treaty. The latter provides an analogy according to which, in Deuteronomy, a profoundly theological notion is introduced, namely a new conceptualization of how the human and the divine relate to each other. As per the theological notion of a covenant between Yhwh and his people Israel, their relationship has no primordial character, but is due to highly conscious decisions, to be located in time and space. This novel description, in turn, carries with it the claim of exclusive adherence to this one god, who has opted for this people, and this people for him; and precisely because of this claim, and the responsibility it implies on the part of Israel, the relationship is vulnerable and in danger of being impaired. The latter aspect may in fact explain the extraordinary career of covenant theology, especially in Deuteronomistic circles, for it affords a theological account of the historical catastrophe of 587 BCE. But this is another question. Here, the point to be made is merely that the political treaty is an *analogy* (McCarthy 1978, p. 297), operating “on the level of metaphor” (Morrow 2021, p. 21). In other words, we can not interpret, say, Deuteronomy 28 just “[l]ike other treaty texts from West Asia.”<sup>36</sup>

This is not to say that there is no use in comparing. On the contrary, I think it is a *sine qua non* for a full understanding of Deuteronomy, as I hope the above discussion has illustrated yet again. But as is often the case when taking a comparative perspective, the most instructive insights lie in the differences, as they throw the particular character of

a given subject matter into relief. Summarizing the present study, one such difference—and arguably the most important one when it comes to a theological interpretation—is to be found in the constellation of agents, according to which Yhwh is both a partner to this covenant and the agent of the sanctions. In stark contrast to the operating principle of ancient Near Eastern treaties and of legal institutions in the ancient world altogether, according to which it is not the legal partners themselves but an independent third party who act as “witness,” it is Yhwh and Yhwh alone who will bring about his own curse threat.

Looking at the other end of this constellation, the latter insight is tantamount to the conclusion: It is not Israel’s “compliance,” or “non-compliance,” with the provisions of the covenant that will unleash the calamity. To be sure, it is part and parcel of the novel concept of a covenant between Yhwh and Israel to point out that not only the former but also the latter is responsible for keeping this relationship. Unlike a treaty, however, the sanctions do not come into effect automatically once Israel violates the covenant. Instead, they come into effect when Yhwh puts them into effect.<sup>37</sup>

**Funding:** This research was funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant number 455616995.

**Data Availability Statement:** No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Further developing insights first expounded in chap. IV.2 of (Krause 2020), an earlier draft of this article was presented at the 2020 SBL Virtual Annual Meeting.
- <sup>2</sup> Unless one is willing to considerably stretch the meaning of the word, as does, e.g., (Levinson 2020b, p. 42), when describing the particular form given to the “covenantal relationship” in Deuteronomy as “a national treaty between god and people.”
- <sup>3</sup> Most recently, see the review article of (Morrow 2021).
- <sup>4</sup> To list but the four most influential contributions, see (Mendenhall 1955) and (Baltzer 1960), both building on (Korošec 1931), then (McCarthy 1978) and (Weinfeld 1972).
- <sup>5</sup> See the rich editorial introductions in both issues.
- <sup>6</sup> Standard edition in (Parpola and Watanabe 1988).
- <sup>7</sup> Such approaches have been reinforced by the recent work on translating Akkadian texts into Northwest Semitic by (Crouch and Hutton 2019), who offer a theoretical introduction as well as a thorough case study of one particularly instructive example, the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription. Using the latter as the benchmark for other purported instances of Akkadian–Northwest Semitic translations, including the alleged translation from EST in Deuteronomy 28, they arrive at a profoundly skeptical evaluation of that hypothesis.
- <sup>8</sup> See now especially (Otto 2016, pp. 1201–72) and, responding to criticism, (Otto 2016, pp. 1222–26).
- <sup>9</sup> On Deut 13, see also (Levinson and Stackert 2012), among others.
- <sup>10</sup> On the importance of this find, see (Steymans 2013), among others.
- <sup>11</sup> See (Weinfeld 1990). From the more recent discussion, see, e.g., (Weeks 2004; Beckman 2006; Koch 2006; Christiansen and Devecchi 2013), among others.
- <sup>12</sup> For the controversy over interpreting EST as either vassal treaties or loyalty oaths, see (Otto 2000, pp. 15–32; Koch 2008, pp. 78–97), each with bibliography.
- <sup>13</sup> For this definition, see (McCarthy 1978, p. 11). For the distinction between preemptive and punitive use of curse material, see (Pomponio 1990).
- <sup>14</sup> All translations of EST are taken from (Parpola and Watanabe 1988).
- <sup>15</sup> It is still useful to consult the seminal reconstructions in (McCarthy 1978; Weinfeld 1972).
- <sup>16</sup> Throughout this article, biblical translations follow the New Revised Standard Version with modifications.
- <sup>17</sup> On this point, see, e.g., (Nelson 2002, p. 327).
- <sup>18</sup> As for Deuteronomy 28, the key questions of the original unity (or diachronic profile) and provenance of the material remain far from settled. See, e.g., the discussion in (Edenburg and Müller 2019a, pp. 81–83), with further references, and the contributions by (Pakkala 2019; Morrow 2019; and Steymans 2019). These issues are particularly pressing if one wishes to clarify the precise genetic relationship of Deuteronomy and EST.

- <sup>19</sup> For an influential interpretation of such אָרָר-type curses in terms of their alleged self-efficacy, see (Hempel 1925) and especially (Gevirtz 1961) and (Schottroff 1969).
- <sup>20</sup> See again (Weinfeld 1990). Such a broad perspective, and in particular the interpretation of Deuteronomy in the light of comparative evidence from the ancient Mediterranean, remains an under-researched field of study. For important forays in this direction, see especially (Hagedorn 2004, cf. Hagedorn 2017, p. 118), with a few additional references in note 6. For a more recent discussion, see also (Oswald 2020).
- <sup>21</sup> On the polis, see (Spyridakis 1970).
- <sup>22</sup> Thanks are due to my colleague and friend, Professor Wolfgang Oswald of Tübingen, for drawing my attention to this example.
- <sup>23</sup> Text according to (Guarducci 1942, vol. 3, 89–90) (reconstructed readings are given in square brackets); cf. (Avilés 2010, p. 181), drawing on (Dittenberger 1915). The translation follows (Austin 2008, p. 207); a German translation is found in (Avilés 2010, p. 182).
- <sup>24</sup> On the interpretation of this and related citizen's oaths, see (Avilés 2010, pp. 127–31).
- <sup>25</sup> My thanks to Professor Anselm Hagedorn of Osnabrück for helpfully complicating matters in this respect (personal communication, November 2020).
- <sup>26</sup> See the influential study (Latte 1920, pp. 61–88). For a discussion and further references, see (Hagedorn 2005, p. 133).
- <sup>27</sup> See also (Oswald 2022, p. 53) (with regard to another example). It should be noted, however, that an interpretation assuming divine agency must remain tentative in view of the actual wording of the oath. In any case, it raises questions which exceed the scope of the present study. See (Williamson 2013, esp. pp. 123–26).
- <sup>28</sup> In (Avilés 2010, p. 130), it comes as “die Vorstellung der göttlichen Bestrafung des Meineidigen.”
- <sup>29</sup> See (Koch 2006, pp. 388–90), building on (Moran 1962, pp. 317–20) and (Delcor 1966).
- <sup>30</sup> With a look at the attestation in Sefire I A 11–12, (Veijola 2004, p. 103, note 531), points out: “Dort treten der Himmel und die Erde noch als echte Götter auf, während sie im Dtn entmythologisierte Naturelemente sind.”
- <sup>31</sup> Italics in the original.
- <sup>32</sup> For a fuller discussion, see (Krause 2020, pp. 124–25), engaging (Steymans 1999, p. 273) and (Steymans 1995, p. 206).
- <sup>33</sup> See above, note 19.
- <sup>34</sup> For comparative evidence, see (Kitz 2014, p. 195).
- <sup>35</sup> For similar observations, albeit with different interpretations, see (Weippert 1990, p. 168; Steymans 1995, p. 24).
- <sup>36</sup> (Olyan 2008, p. 342) with regard to Deuteronomy 28.
- <sup>37</sup> Looking again for ancient Near Eastern comparative material, the same holds for curses (or rather, according to the above neologism, curse threats) of gods themselves. While in principle they are thought to be immutable, this does not imply “that the deities ever lost the ability to *manage* their own curses. [ . . . ] The deities remained completely free to confer a blessing, dismiss the harm, or heal the afflicted individual” (Kitz 2014, p. 137; italics in the original). That is to say, a god uttering a curse threat retains “exclusive authority over the harm, that is, the effect, embedded in the curse he [the example under scrutiny features Enlil] personally utters” (Kitz 2014, p. 137).

## References

- Aitken, James K. 2007. *The Semantics of Blessing and Cursing in Ancient Hebrew*. ANESSup 23. Louvain: Peeters.
- d'Alfonso, Lorenzo. 2006. Die hethitische Vertragstradition in Syrien (14.–12. Jh. v. Chr.). In *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by Markus Witte, Konrad Schmid, Doris Prechel and Jan C. Gertz. BZAW 365. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, pp. 303–29.
- Arnold, Bill T., and Brian T. Shockey. 2022. Deuteronomy 13 and the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon: A Fresh Investigation. In “*Now These Records are Ancient*”: *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History, Language and Culture in Honor of K. Lawson Younger, Jr.* Edited by James K. Hoffmeier, Richard E. Averbeck, J. Caleb Howard and Wolfgang Zwickel. ÄAT 114. Münster: Zaphon, pp. 1–14.
- Austin, Michel. 2008. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Avilés, Domingo. 2010. *Altgriechische Gesetze: Natur und Entwicklung eines Rechtsinstituts*. Ph.D. thesis, Universität Freiburg, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany.
- Baltzer, Klaus. 1960. *Das Bundesformular*. WMANT 4. Neukirchen: Neukirchener.
- Beckman, Gary. 2006. Hittite Treaties and the Development of Cuneiform Treaty Tradition. In *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by Markus Witte, Konrad Schmid, Doris Prechel and Jan C. Gertz. BZAW 365. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, pp. 279–301.
- Christiansen, Birgit. 2012. *Schicksalsbestimmende Kommunikation: Sprachliche, gesellschaftliche und religiöse Aspekte hethitischer Fluch-, Segens- und Eidesformeln*. StBoT 53. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Christiansen, Birgit, and Elena Devecchi. 2013. Die hethitischen Vasallenverträge und die biblische Bundeskonzeption. *BN* 156: 65–87.

- Crouch, Carly L. 2014. *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon, and the Nature of Subversion*. ANEM 8. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Crouch, Carly L., and Jeremy M. Hutton. 2019. *Translating Empire: Tell Fekheriyeh, Deuteronomy, and the Akkadian Treaty Tradition*. FAT 135. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Delcor, Mathias. 1966. Les attaches littéraires, l'origine et la signification de l'expression biblique 'prendre a temoin le ciel et la terre'. *VT* 16: 8–25. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm. 1915. *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum: Vol. 1*, 3rd ed. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Edenburg, Cynthia, and Reinhard Müller. 2019a. Editorial Introduction: Perspectives on the Treaty Framework of Deuteronomy. *HBAI* 8: 73–86. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Edenburg, Cynthia, and Reinhard Müller, eds. 2019b. Perspectives on the Treaty Framework of Deuteronomy. *HBAI* 8. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1995. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, 2nd ed. BibOr 19/A. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Gevirtz, Stanley. 1961. West-Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law. *VT* 11: 137–58. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Guarducci, Margherita. 1942. *Inscriptiones Creticae opera et consilio Friderici Halbherr collectae: Vol. 3: Tituli Cretae orientalis*. Rome: La libreria dello stato.
- Hagedorn, Anselm C. 2004. *Between Moses and Plato: Individual and Society in Deuteronomy and Ancient Greek Law*. FRLANT 204. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hagedorn, Anselm C. 2005. Wie flucht man in östlichen Mittelmeer? Kulturanthropologische Einsichten in die *Dirae Teiae* und das Deuteronomium. In *Kodifizierung und Legitimierung des Rechts in der Antike und im Alten Orient*. Edited by Markus Witte and Marie T. Fögen. BZAR 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 117–50.
- Hagedorn, Anselm C. 2017. Sacred Law, Lawgivers and Codification: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible, Gortyn and Selinus. In *Writing Laws in Antiquity—L'écriture du droit dans l'Antiquité*. Edited by Dominique Jaillard and Christophe Nihan. BZAR 19. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 117–40.
- Hempel, Johannes. 1925. Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen. *ZDMG* 79: 20–110.
- Kitz, Anne Marie. 2014. *Cursed are You! The Phenomenology of Cursing in Cuneiform and Hebrew Texts*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Koch, Christoph. 2006. Zwischen Hatti und Assur: Traditionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den aramäischen Inschriften von Sfire. In *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by Markus Witte, Konrad Schmid, Doris Prechel and Jan C. Gertz. BZAW 365. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, pp. 379–406.
- Koch, Christoph. 2008. *Vertrag, Treueid und Bund: Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. BZAW 383. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Korošec, Viktor. 1931. *Hethitische Staatsverträge: Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung*. LRWS 60. Leipzig: Weicher.
- Krause, Joachim J. 2020. *Die Bedingungen des Bundes: Studien zur konditionalen Struktur alttestamentlicher Bundeskonzeptionen*. FAT 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Latte, Kurt. 1920. *Heiliges Recht: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der sakralen Rechtsformen in Griechenland*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lauinger, Jacob. 2012. Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary. *JCS* 64: 87–123.
- Levinson, Bernard M., ed. 2020a. Law, Society, and Religion: Essays in Memory of George E. Mendenhall. *Maarav* 24: 1–2.
- Levinson, Bernard M. 2020b. Revisiting the 'And' in Law and Covenant in the Hebrew Bible: What the Evidence from Tell Tayinat Suggests about the Relationship between Law and Religion in the Ancient Near East. *Maarav* 24: 27–43.
- Levinson, Bernard M., and Jeffrey Stackert. 2012. Between the Covenant Code and Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty: Deuteronomy 13 and the Composition of Deuteronomy. *JAJ* 3: 123–40.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. 1978. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. AnBib 21A. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Mendenhall, George E. 1955. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburgh: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Moran, William L. 1962. Some Remarks on the Song of Moses. *Bib* 43: 317–27.
- Morrow, William. 2019. Have Attempts to Establish the Dependency of Deuteronomy on the Esarhaddon Succession Treaty (EST) Failed? *HBAI* 8: 122–58. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Morrow, William. 2021. Ancient Near Eastern Treaty Traditions and Biblical Covenants: Recent Surveys. *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 21: 1–12. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Nelson, Richard D. 2002. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Olyan, Saul M. 2008. The Status of Covenant During the Exile. In *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt, Festschrift für Rainer Albertz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Ingo Kottsieper, Rüdiger Schmitt and Jakob Wöhrle. AOAT 350. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, pp. 333–44.
- Oswald, Wolfgang. 2020. Die politischen Konzeptionen des Deuteronomiums als Teil des politischen Denkens der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. In *Der Alte Orient und die Entstehung der Athenischen Demokratie*. Edited by Claudia Horst. *Classica et Orientalia* 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 55–68.
- Oswald, Wolfgang. 2022. Das Gesetz als Vertrag: Zum archaisch-griechischen Hintergrund der Gesetzeskonzeptionen im Exodusbuch und im Deuteronomium. In *Menschsein in Weisheit und Freiheit: Festschrift für Thomas Krüger*. Edited by Veronika Bachmann, Anette Schellenberg and Frank Ueberschaer. OBO 296. Leuven, Paris and Bristol: Peeters, pp. 47–57.

- Otto, Eckart. 1999. *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien*. BZAW 284. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Otto, Eckart. 2000. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*. FAT 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Otto, Eckart. 2016. *Deuteronomium 12–34: Vol. 1: 12,1–23,15*. HThKAT. Freiburg, Basel and Vienna: Herder.
- Pakkala, Juha. 2019. The Influence of Treaties on Deuteronomy, Exclusive Monolatry, and Covenant Theology. *HBAI* 8: 159–83.
- Parpola, Simo, and Kazuko Watanabe. 1988. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. SAA 2. Helsinki: University Press.
- Pomponio, Francesco. 1990. *Formule di maledizione della Mesopotamia preclassica*. TVOA.M 1. Brescia: Paideia.
- Quick, Laura. 2018. *Deuteronomy 28 and the Aramaic Curse Tradition*. OTRM. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Radner, Karen. 2006. Assyrische *ṭuppi adē* als Vorbild für Deuteronomium 28, 20–44? In *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur 'Deuteronomismus'-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*. Edited by Markus Witte, Konrad Schmid, Doris Prechel and Jan C. Gertz. BZAW 365. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, pp. 351–78.
- Ramos, Melissa. 2016. A Northwest Semitic Curse Formula: The Sefire Treaty and Deuteronomy 28. *ZAW* 128: 205–20. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Schottroff, Willy. 1969. *Der altisraelitische Fluchspruch*. WMANT 30. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Spyridakis, Stylianos. 1970. *Ptolemaic Itanos and Hellenistic Crete*. University of California Publications in History 82. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Steymans, Hans Ulrich. 1995. *Deuteronomium 28 und die adē zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*. OBO 145. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Steymans, Hans Ulrich. 1999. Verheißung und Drohung: Lev 26. In *Levitikus als Buch*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Hans-Winfried Jüngling. BBB 119. Berlin: Philo, pp. 263–307.
- Steymans, Hans Ulrich. 2013. Deuteronomy 28 and Tell Tayinat. *Verbum et ecclesia* 34: 870. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Steymans, Hans Ulrich. 2019. Deuteronomy 13 in Comparison with Hittite, Aramaic and Assyrian Treaties. *HBAI* 8: 101–32. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Veijola, Timo. 2004. *Das fünfte Buch Mose—Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17*. ATD 8/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weeks, Noel K. 2004. *Admonition and Curse: The Ancient Near Eastern Treaty/Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relationships*. JSOTSup 407. London and New York: T & T Clark.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1965. Traces of Assyrian Treaty Formulae in Deuteronomy. *Biblica* 46: 417–27.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1972. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1990. The Common Heritage of Covenantal Traditions in the Ancient World. In *I trattati nel mondo antico: Forma, Ideologia, Funzione*. Edited by Luciano Canfora, Mario Liverani and Carlo Zaccagnini. Saggi di Storia Antica 2. Rome: L'Erma' di Bretschneider, pp. 175–91.
- Weippert, Manfred. 1990. Synkretismus und Monotheismus: Religionsinterne Konfliktbewältigung im alten Israel. In *Kultur und Konflikt*. Edited by Jan Assmann and Dietrich Harth. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 143–79.
- Williamson, Christina G. 2013. As God is My Witness: Civic Oath in Ritual Space as a Means towards Rational Cooperation in the Hellenistic Polis. In *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Edited by Richard Alston, Onno M. van Nijf and Christina G. Williamson. Leuven, Paris and Walpole: Peeters, pp. 119–74.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.