



On the Meaning of #(W)#PT

Jeffrey H. Tigay

Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 101, No. 3. (Sep., 1982), pp. 321-331.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-9231%28198209%29101%3A3%3C321%3AOTMOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

Journal of Biblical Literature is currently published by The Society of Biblical Literature.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sbl.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE MEANING OF $\dot{T}(W) \dot{T}PT$ *

JEFFREY H. TIGAY

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104

I. Orthography and Form

THE word $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ appears three times in the Torah, in passages enjoining that certain phenomena are to be, or be bound, as a sign on the hand and to be as $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ “between your eyes” (Exod 13:16; Deut 6:8; 11:18). The orthography of both syllables of this word has been a matter of discussion since Talmudic times.¹ In the current critical editions of the MT (*BH*³ and *BHS*) the orthography varies between $\dot{t}w\dot{t}pt$ in Exod 13:16 and Deut 11:18 and $\dot{t}tpt$ in Deut 6:8.² The consistent spelling of the second syllable as pt , despite the masoretic vocalization as a plural ($p\delta t$), has suggested that the noun was originally intended as a singular, a view supported by the singular $zkrwn$ in the corresponding slot in the parallel passage Exod 13:19. The antiquity of the orthography pt is shown by its appearance in the many *tēfillin* texts from the wilderness of Judea.³ These texts, which contain the passages in question, are all but unanimous in this orthography (the only exception, to the best of my knowledge, is 4Qphy1H, where Exod 13:16 has $wl\dot{t}w\dot{t}pwt$). There are even manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch which

* This study was completed at The Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. I wish to express my gratitude to the Director and staff of the Institute for their many efforts in support of my research in 1978–79. Thanks also to Profs. M. Goshen-Gottstein, J. Greenfield, and E. Tov for their counsel on a number of items discussed here. They are naturally not accountable for the final outcome.

¹ See the *baraita* cited in *b. Sanh* 4b, *Zebah* 37b, and *Menah* 34b, the *Tōsāfōt* at all three passages, and further: *Minḥat Shai* to Deut 11:18; S. B. Rosenfeld, *spr mšpht suprym* (Wilna: Romm, 1883) 24, 48–49, 80, 132–33; S. Loewinger, “Prolegomenon” to V. Aptowitz, *Das Schriftwort in der Rabbinischen Literatur* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: KTAV, 1970) XXXIX–XL.

² 4Q130 has $\dot{t}w\dot{t}$ [] in Deut 6:8 (DJD 6, 55 line 18).

³ See most recently Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and The Shrine of the Book, 1969) and R. de Vaux and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Grotte 4*, II (DJD 6; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) part II. For further bibliography see Yadin, 7 n. 1. See also the *mēzūzā* text 8Q4 published in DJD 3 (1962) 158–61.

⁴ The transcription in DJD 6.62 omits the second *wāw*, but it is visible in the photograph on Pl. XVI and was noted earlier by K. G. Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften [Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1]; Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1957) 19, where the text is cited as 4Qphy1^d Rs.

preserve the defective orthography,⁵ despite the Samaritan preference for full orthography and the interpretation reflected in the Samaritan targum's translation of the word as a plural (see appendix). The antiquity and consistency of this picture strengthen the view that we are dealing with a noun originally intended as a singular. The vocalization as a plural in 4Qphy1H and the MT must be due to contamination by the vocalization and orthography of 'wt in the previous clause or by the plural phrases "these words," etc. which appear as antecedents to *t(w)tpt* in Deut 6:8 and 11:18.

II. Current Interpretations

Although recent discoveries have rendered the form of *t(w)tpt* clearer, no similar progress has yet been registered in the matter of its meaning. This word has called forth over the centuries as great a variety of interpretations as any word in the Hebrew lexicon.⁶ A sampling of recent literature indicates that there is still no consensus on its meaning nor very much confidence in the interpretations adopted. Renderings in recent English translations include the traditional "frontlets" (RSV) as well as "phylactery" (NEB), "circlet" (JB), "pendant" (NAB) and "symbol" (NJV). In his explanation of the NJV's "symbol," H. M. Orlinsky describes it as "approximately the meaning of obscure" *twtpt*, citing the parallel 'wt, "sign" and *zkrwn*, "memorial" used in the place of *twtpt* in the related passage Exod 13:9.⁷ The article "Frontlets"⁸ in the IDB refers to the *t(w)tpt* simply as "objects worn on the forehead" and cites with a question mark the oft-suggested etymology from *nṭp* "to drop, drip," while the article "Phylacteries"⁹ in the same dictionary speaks of the word's uncertain etymology but suggests that the word should perhaps be read as a singular noun *tṭpt* "meaning a 'round jewel.'" The *Encyclopedia Miqrait* mentions the post-biblical usage of *twtpt* (singular) for a "woman's ornament" and considers it "possible" that in the Bible it refers similarly to "an ornament a man binds to his head"; derivation from *nṭp* is also mentioned as a possibility, to which the ornaments called *nṭypwt* (Judg 8:26; Isa 3:19) would then be comparable.¹⁰ HALAT mentions

⁵ Those followed in the edition of A. and R. Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 1961–1965) rather than those followed by A. von Gall, *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1914–1918).

⁶ For the versions, see appendix.

⁷ H. M. Orlinsky, *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1970) 168.

⁸ J. M. Myers, in IDB 2. 326.

⁹ G. H. Davies, in IDB 3. 809.

¹⁰ E. S. Hartum, in *Enc. Miqr.* 3. col. 376. Wellhausen compared Arabic *naṭafatu*ⁿ (*Reste Arabische Heidentums* [Berlin: Reimer, 1887] 165). *nṭypwt* are taken to be droplet-shaped ornaments (A. R. S. Kennedy, "Phylacteries," HDB 3. 872); cf. the Samaritan targum's *tṭyn* (see appendix) and cf. M. M. Kasher, *Ḥumash, Torah Shelemah* (New York: American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, 1949–) 12.279 §8.

post-biblical usage but defines $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ in the Bible as “Merkzeichen an d. Stirn” and mentions the competing etymologies from *n\dot{t}p/\dot{t}pp* and Arabic *\dot{t}\dot{a}fa* (see below),¹¹ neither of which yields precisely this meaning. The most recent study, in *TWAT*, concludes that the biblical evidence permits no precise definition and simply defines the object as a forehead ornament (“Stirnschmuck”).¹²

Modern attempts to find the etymology of $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ sometimes range as far afield as Rabbi Akiba’s ancient explanation on the basis of “Coptic” (?) and “African” words (*b. Menah.* 34b). H. Grimme invoked Egyptian *\dot{d}d\dot{f}.t* which means “snake,” including the uraeus snake often worn on the headdress.¹³ E. A. Speiser posited a hypothetical Akkadian **\dot{t}aptappu*, referring to an apotropaic figurine.¹⁴ *HALAT* mentions an Arabic *\dot{t}a\dot{f}\dot{t}\dot{a}\dot{f}*, which is said to mean the hem or trimming of a dress, and “Mand[aiic] *\dot{t}u\dot{t}i\dot{p}\dot{t}\dot{a}*.”¹⁵

While one would naturally prefer to adopt the approach of the *NJV* and be guided by parallelism and a related passage, the connection of $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ with *\dot{w}t* and *zkrwn* finds no plausible etymology or related usages to support it. The view which seems most defensible on the basis of related usage and etymology is that which understands $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ in the Bible as a headband. This interpretation was proposed by medieval grammarians and is still reflected in some translations (“frontlet,” “circlet”), but it has been largely neglected in recent scholarly discussions of the word. The purpose of the present study is to redirect attention to the arguments in favor of this view and to supplement these with another based on artistic evidence.

¹¹ *HALAT* 357.

¹² J. Gamberoni, *\dot{t}o\dot{t}a\dot{p}o\dot{t}*, *TWAT* 3, 341–43.

¹³ “Hebr. **תפפ** und **תב**, zwei Lehnwörter aus dem Ägyptischen,” *OLZ* 41(1938) 148–52; M. Görg, “ $\dot{T}(w)\dot{t}pt$ —eine fast vergessene Deutung,” *Biblische Notizen* 8 (1979) 11–13. The suggestion is dismissed as “untenable” by T. O. Lambdin, “Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament,” *JAOS* 73 (1953) 145 n.3. Earlier Egyptian etymologies are listed by W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1829) 548, and Kasher (above, n. 10) 279 §6.7. Naturally, the word is listed as Egyptian—but without explanation—by A. S. Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1933) 99.

¹⁴ “ $\dot{T}W\dot{T}P\dot{T}$,” *JQR* 48 (1957–58) 208–17 (note Speiser’s reservations in “PÄLIL and Congeners,” *AS* 16 [1965] 392 n. 22). On p. 215 n. 17 Speiser also suggested a connection with Sumerian *kušTAB*, a leather bag or container.

¹⁵ *HALAT* 357. In the Mandaic text cited *\dot{t}u\dot{t}i\dot{p}\dot{t}\dot{a}*’ appears in a context referring to Jews and is therefore probably a loan word from Hebrew or Aramaic (so Th. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* [Halle: Waisenhaus, 1875] xxix) rather than independent evidence for the word. The text tells of an apostate Jewess who rejected Judaism, the synagogue, the *\dot{t}u\dot{t}i\dot{p}\dot{t}\dot{a}*’, the Sabbath, and the Torah in favor of symbols of the Mandaic religion; in place of the *\dot{t}u\dot{t}i\dot{p}\dot{t}\dot{a}*’ she chose a wreath of fresh greens (M. Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* [Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1915] 124:10). One might interpret the word as a reference to *\dot{t}\dot{e}\dot{f}\dot{i}\dot{l}\dot{l}\dot{i}\dot{n}* or to a headdress (as in Talmudic literature) which was characteristic of Jewesses (note that apart from this passage the word appears only in Jewish literature).

III. $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ = *Headband—Previous Arguments*

The medieval grammarians understood $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ in the light of its later usage¹⁶ for bands, including headbands, in the targums and for full or half headbands (i.e., frontlets) in rabbinic Hebrew.¹⁷ In the targums twtpt renders 'š'dh , “bracelet, armband” (*Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 1:10) and p'r , “turban” (*Tg. Neb.* Ezek 24:17, 23), which have in common the fact that they encompass the part of the body on which they are worn.¹⁸ A woman’s headdress called twtpt (singular) is mentioned in Tannaitic texts (*m. Šabb* 6:1, 5; *t. Šabb* 4:6). By Amoraic times the meaning of this word was debated. In *b. Šabb* 57b it is explained by R. Judah in the name of Abbaye as 'pwzyynw , which Rashi glosses with Old French *prwntl* (frontal),¹⁹ “frontlet,” and by Abbahu as something “which encompasses her (head) from ear to ear” (*hmwqpt lh m'zn l'zn*).²⁰ These explanations contemplate a band which encompasses at least the forehead if not the entire head. The targums show

¹⁶ ttpt is often restored in the Hebrew text of Ben Sira 36(33):3(2): $\text{'yš nbwn ybyn dbr wturtw tt[pt] q . . .}$ (*The Book of Ben Sira* [Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language and The Shrine of the Book, 1973] 33). The Greek text reads otherwise.

¹⁷ On this basis the medieval lexicographers reached the meaning frontlet or headwrapping (Judaeo-Arabic 'š'bh , “turban, fillet”). See Saadia’s treatise on hapax legomena, *ptrwn tš'ym mlwt bwddwt lr' s'dy' g'wn z' 'l*, edited by A. Jellinek in Y. BenJacob, *Debarim Attikim* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1844), no. 46; in the *Tafsir* Saadia renders the word with mš'wr , which J. Derenbourg understands as mtpš't and connects with R. Abbahu’s explanation (i.e., spread out on the forehead; see below); see Derenbourg, *Oeuvres Complètes de R. Saadia ben Iosef al-Fayyûmî*, I (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1893), at Exod 13:16. See also W. Bacher, *Sepher Haschoraschim . . . von Abulwalid Merwan Ibn Ganah* (Berlin: Itzkowski; repr. Jerusalem, 1966) 179 s.v. tpt and cf. 428 s.v. šyš ; Ibn Quraish in M. Katz *'grt R. Yhwdh bn Qwryš* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1950) 68. The Karaite Yefet ben Ali rendered mswbbwt not on the basis of rabbinic usage but on the basis of an interpretation of h'p in Ezek 21:2 (quoted by Jellinek from J. C. Wolf, *Bibliothecae Hebraeae* [Hamburg: Liebezeit, 1715–33] 4.1095).

¹⁸ While the renderings in *Tg. Neb.* to Ezekiel might conceivably reflect a midrashic attempt to portray biblical characters as wearing tēfillin (as in *Tg. Esth* 8:15; see the two versions printed in A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* [Leiden: Brill, 1968] 4A. 201–2 and in the aggadic passages cited in Str-B, 4/1. 252, 253), this possibility is rendered unlikely by *Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 1:10, for there twtpt would have to refer to the arm tēfillin , which it never does.

¹⁹ See A. Darmesteter and D. S. Blondheim, *Les Gloses Françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi* (Bibliothèque de l’Ecole Des Hautes Etudes. Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, 254; Paris: Ancienne Honore Champion, 1929) 1. 74, no. 528. “Frontlet” has been a standard rendering of $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ in English Bible translations at least since the Geneva Bible of 1560. Its cognate *frontal* is used in the fourteenth-century Spanish translation published by P. Jose Llamas, O.S.A., *Biblias Medievales Romanceadas. Biblia Medieval Romanceada Judio-Cristiana* (Madrid: Instituto “Francisco Suarez,” 1950) 1.102, 259, at Exod 13:16 and Deut 6:8.

²⁰ Other talmudic explanations of the Tannaitic $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ are those of R. Joseph (hwmrt' dqtpt , “a charm [made] of balsam,” *b. Šabb.* 57b, where it is rejected) and R. Bon bar Hiyya (qwbyrh , *dbr šhw' nwn bmqum hwtpt, “ qwbyrh [a word of uncertain reading and meaning], something which is placed where the tōtepet goes,” *y. Šabb.* 4.1, 7d).*

the use of the word for something which completely encircles the part of the body on which it is worn.²¹

For the notion of encircling, an etymology based on Arabic *tāfa* (ṭʿf/ṭwf) “go around, encircle, encompass” is current.²² Assuming that the biblical orthography ṭṭpt is indeed defective for ṭwṭpt (like *kbb*, which sometimes appears for *kwb*),²³ the noun is generally explained as a quadriliteral with an original form ^oṭṭp(t), with the first labial softening to *w*, on the analogy of *kwb*<*kabkab*- (the latter form attested in Amorite and Ugaritic).²⁴ An etymology from ṭ-*p* would comport with Barth’s statement that in early Semitic most quadrilaterals developed by the reduplication of biliteral, i.e., middle-weak, stems.²⁵ Apart from *kwb* and ṭwṭp(t) the phenomenon of *qalqal* nouns in which the second consonant is reduced is attested in such forms as Heb. *šāšar* (with compensatory lengthening of the first vowel) < ^ošršr (as in Akkadian *šaršerru*/*šaršarru*/*šeršerru*, with the Neo-Assyrian form *šaššeru*)²⁶ and Akkadian *qaqqadu* < ^oqadqadu (as in Ugaritic and Hebrew *qdqd*). The case for this derivation would be stronger were it not for the fact that apart from *kwb* and ṭwṭpt no further examples in which the second consonant is a labial softened to *w* are known from biblical times. However, the development is known in postbiblical Hebrew and elsewhere. Examples are *lwb*<*lbb* (as in targumic *lbb* and related

²¹ Cf. Ibn Janāḥ and Yefet quoted in n. 17; Radaq, in J. H. Biesenthal and F. Lebrecht, *Rabbi Davidis Kimchi Radicum Liber* (Berlin: Bethge, 1847) 127 s.v. ṭṭp; R. Asher b. Yeḥiel, *hlkwṭ gḏwlwt.hlkwṭ ṭpylyn*, §2, printed in back of *b. Menahot* in the Romm-Vilna edition of the Talmud.

²² E.g. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, 548 (rendering ṭwṭpwt as *ligamenta, fasciae*, i.e., “bands, fillets”); Luzzatto in P. Schlesinger, *S. D. Luzzatto’s Commentary to the Pentateuch* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1965) 266; BDB, 377; A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*³ (ed. V. Ryssel; KHAT; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897) 143; S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896) 92; D. Z. Hoffman, *spr dbrym* (Tel Aviv: Nezach, 1959) 99. For the Arabic word see E. Lane, *Lexicon*, 1892–94; G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (Halis Saxonum, 1830–37) 3.79–80. Note the Targum’s rendering of ṭṭp in Isa 3:16 as *wbṭhṭn mḳpn*; and note M. Jastrow’s rendering of the problematic ṭṭpwt as “circumvallation,” *A Dictionary of the Targumim* (New York: Pardes, 1950) 1.547.

²³ Also in Ugaritic: *UT* §8.43.

²⁴ Ibn Janāḥ, *spr hrqmḥ* (ed. M. Wilensky; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1964) 162; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, 548; GKC §19^o, 84^{bo}; H. Bauer-P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des ATs* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1962) 484; BDB, 377; Speiser, *JQR* 48 (1957–58) 211; R. Ružička, “Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen,” *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 6/4 (1909) 129. For the Amorite and Ugaritic forms see H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1965) 220; C. Gordon, *UT* §19.1189; Bauer-Leander, 482 also mention Mehri *kebkib*.

²⁵ J. Barth, *Nominalbildung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894) 203.

²⁶ *AHw*, 1191c.

forms and Akkadian *liblibbu*²⁷) and Syriac *rurb*<*rbrb*.²⁸ In light of *kukb*<*kbkb* there is no reason to consider this a late phenomenon.

The advantage of “headband” over other interpretations is thus twofold: it is consistent with later usage of the same word in the same as well as a closely related language, and it can be supported by a plausible etymology following a known pattern of development.

Scholars who have been reluctant to adopt the meaning “headband” for biblical occurrences of *ṭ(w)ṭpt* have given two reasons for their reluctance. The objections are, according to A. R. S. Kennedy, that this “suits neither the descriptive expression ‘between thine eyes’ nor the circle of ideas from which, we are convinced, the figure in the text is borrowed.”²⁹ These objections are fallacious. The first assumes that “between the eyes” refers to a single spot on the forehead, but Hebrew and Ugaritic evidence shows the meaning to be simply “on the head” or “on the forehead,”³⁰ where the headband is most noticeable. As for the second objection, it is explicitly based on the presupposition that the term in question must refer to some sort of amulet. Even if this were a necessary presupposition it would not rule out a headband since some scholars hold that headbands (and perhaps all forms of headdress) originally served magical or apotropaic purposes.³¹ But the presupposition is itself arbitrary. While it is true that marks or objects worn on the forehead are frequently apotropaic,³² this is not demonstrably always so. In fact, the expression *whyw ṭ(w)ṭpt byn ’ynyk* is similar to a series of metaphoric expressions in which the objects mentioned are common items of jewelry and clothing. While some may have served an apotropaic

²⁷ Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 2.689; A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum* (Vienna, 1889)5.26; CAD L, 179–81; cf. B. Landsberger, *The Date Palm and its By-products* (*AfO* Beiheft, 17; Graz, 1967) 1 n. 1; 19 n. 59; 28–30; F. Perles, “Babylonisch-talmudische Glossen,” *OLZ* 8 (1905) 381–82.

²⁸ Cf. Ružička (above, n. 24) 107–8. In Mishnaic Hebrew a number of nouns are presumed to have been formed by reduplication of the second and third radicals of a trilateral stem (*qataltal*, etc.) with a similar softening, as in *gnwgnt*<*°gnngnt*; *grwgrt* < *°grrgrt*; *ḥtwṭrt* < *°ḥṭrṭrt*; *špwprt* < *°šprprt*; see M. H. Segal, *dqdq ḥšwn ḥmšnh* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1936) 39 §55; 78 §119. The noun *ḥšwšrh* in Biblical Hebrew is thought to be derived from *°ḥšrṣrt* (BDB, 348; GKC, 156 §55e; 245 §84n; Bauer-Leander, 483).

²⁹ A. R. S. Kennedy, “Phylacteries” *HDB* 3.872. The first objection was also voiced by Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40, 723; Baentsch, *Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903) 113–14; E. König, *Das Deuteronomium* (KAT; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1917) 99. Kennedy, while not overlooking the Talmudic evidence, misinterpreted it as referring to a jewel; note the refutation of S. R. Driver, *Exodus* (Cambridge Bible; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1953) 110, n. 1.

³⁰ See *b. Menah* 37b; *Mek.*, *Bō*’ to Exod 13:16 [ed. Horovitz-Rabin, p. 67]; H. L. Ginsberg, *The Ugarit Texts* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1936) 73; *ANET*, 131 n. 10; C. H. Gordon, *UT*, §19.1846; Y. Avishur, “Expressions Such as *’byn ydyym*’ and Their Parallels in Semitic Languages,” *Beth Mikra* 69/2 (1977) 200–203 (Hebrew); S. Loewenstamm in *UF* 3 (1971) 96. The phrase *byn ’ynym* appears in parallelism with *r’š* and *qdqd*.

³¹ Cf. *ERE* 4. 336–45, art. “Crown.”

³² Cf. Ezek 9:4; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 4:15; A. L. Oppenheim, “The Golden Garments of the Gods,” *JNES* 8 (1949) 173 n. 4.

purpose, others did not. The universality of these metaphors is indicated by the fact that they appear in several different literary genres and stem from different lands and periods.

- (1) **כי לויֹת חן הם לראשך וענקים לגרנרתֶיךָ**
 “For a graceful garland will they (viz. your parents’ instructions) be for your head, and a chain for your neck” (Prov 1:9; cf. 3:3; 4:9; 6:21; 7:3).
- (2) **והיִית עטרת תפארת ביד ה' וצניף מלוכה בכף אלהיך**
 “And you shall be a glorious crown in the hand of the Lord, a royal diadem in the hand of your God” (Isa 62:3).
- (3) **התשכח בתולה עדיה כלה קשריה**
 “Can a maid forget her ornaments, a bride her adornments?” (Jer 2:32).
- (4) **כי כאשר ידבק האזור אל מתני איש כן הדבקתי אלי את כל בית ישראל ואת כל בית יהודה**
 “For, as a waistcloth clings to the loins of a man, so did I make the whole house of Israel and the whole house of Judah cling to me” (Jer 13:11).
- (5) **כי אם יהיה כניהו . . . חותם על יד ימיני כי משם אתקנך**
 “Though Coniah were . . . the seal on my right hand, I would pluck him off even from there” (Jer 22:24).
- (6) **אקחך ורובבל . . . ושמתֶיך כחותם כי בך בחרתי**
 “I shall take you, O Zerubbabel . . . and I will make you like a seal, for I have chosen you” (Hag 2:23).
- (7) **שימיני כחותם על לבך כחותם על זרועך**
 “Place me like a seal upon your heart, like a seal upon your arm” (Cant 8:6).
- (8) **צדק לבשתי וילבשני כמעיל וצניף משפטי**
 “I put on righteousness and it clothed me, like a robe and turban was my justice” (Job 29:14).
- (9) **והיה צדק אזור מתניו והאמונה אזור חלציו**
 “Justice will be the girdle round his loins, and faithfulness a girdle round his waist” (Isa 11:5).
- (10) *lu uqni kišādija aj amši ūmē annūti lu aḥsusamma ana dāriš aj amši*, “As surely as I shall not forget the lapis on my neck, I shall be mindful of these days, forgetting them never” (Gilgamesh Epic XI, 164–165 [ANET, 95]; cf. Atrahasis Epic, Old Babylonian Version, III, vi, 2–4).
- (11) “As you wear a dress, so shall you carry with you these oaths” (KUB XXVI, 25, 6ff.).³³
- (12) “Thou art the pectoral of the Storm-god and of the Storm-goddess of Arinna; they continually look at thee” (KUB XXI, 27, iii, 44f.–45 [ANET, 394]).
- (13) “Would you know what mode of apparel the Lord requires? Have prudence, justice, temperance, fortitude” (Jerome, Letter LII, §13, cited in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Vol. 6, ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace, p. 95).

In these passages, garments and ornaments are mentioned as things which are kept constantly in mind or close to the wearer or held dearly by

³³ Cited by M. Weinfeld in connection with the $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ passages, in *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 302 from H. Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 4. On p. 300 n. 2, Weinfeld also cites Jer 13:11 and A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1968) 4. 47, on Isa 11:5. For other possible examples, see Weinfeld, “The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon—an Annotated Translation,” in *Shnaton. An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 1 (1975) 105, 1. 384 and n. 70.

him or typify him.³⁴ That some of these items may have had an apotropaic function is in most cases³⁵ immaterial in this connection. Passages such as these are often cited in support of the interpretation according to which the ornaments named in Exod 13:9,16 and Deut 6:8; 11:18 are alluded to for the same purpose: the ceremonies and teachings mentioned in these contexts are to be as dear to the Israelite and close to him or on his mind as these ornaments are.³⁶

If the passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy mentioning *t(w)tpt* were indeed meant metaphorically, they rely for their effectiveness upon the assumption that the Israelite audience will recognize in *t(w)tpt* something dear or familiar. P. Heinisch stated that these passages presuppose that Israelites wore headbands.³⁷ While this inference may go too far, these passages certainly imply familiarity with the *t(w)tpt*. If it could be shown that the headband was indeed a common item of dress in or around ancient Israel, at least in the period when the *t(w)tpt* passages were first formulated, this would add further support to the identification of the *t(w)tpt* as a headband.

IV. *t(w)tpt* = *Headband—Artistic Evidence*

Numerous illustrations in Egyptian and Assyrian art depict inhabitants of the Syro-Palestinian region, often explicitly identifying them as such.³⁸

³⁴ Cf. Weinfeld (above, n. 33), p. 300 ("permanent attachment"). Ehrlich (above, n. 33) describes the items of clothing mentioned in Isa 11:5 and Jer 13:11 as things which the wearer never sets aside. Conceivably referring to clothing is EA 147:39–40 *ana muhhi gabitija muhhi šu'rija ubbal amātu šarri bēlija*, "on my belly and my back I carry the words of the king my lord."

³⁵ On Prov 6:20–22 see P. D. Miller, *JNES* 29 (1970) 129–30. Cf. also the continuation of the passage from Jerome's letter LII cited here as no. 13.

³⁶ The grammatical subject of "shall be a sign on your hand and *tw)tpt* between your eyes" in Exod 13:16 (similarly "shall be a sign to you," etc. in v 9) cannot be the biblical passage itself, which is not mentioned as such in the text, but rather (1) the fact "that" the Lord brought the Israelites out of Egypt etc. (vv 9b, 16b), in which case the verses mean that the Lord's mighty deeds must be remembered well (like a sign, a memorial, a *t(w)tpt*) so that his teaching will be remembered well (v 9aβ), or (2) the grammatical antecedents of "shall be" namely, "this day" or "this practice" or the festival of unleavened bread in Exod 13:1–10 and the sacrifice/redemption of the first-born in vv 11–16, in which case the verses mean that these things must be remembered well (like a sign, a memorial, a *t(w)tpt*), so that the Lord's teaching will be remembered well. In neither case does "it shall be a sign," etc. represent an additional observance beyond those mentioned in vv 2–8 and 12–15. This is also implied by v 10 which refers to an annual observance, not a daily one like *tēfillin*. Only for Deut 6:8; 11:18 is there some evidence for a literal interpretation, but it is far from certain. See Driver, *Exodus* (above, n. 29) 107, 111; *Deuteronomy* (above, n. 22) 92–93; Kennedy, "Phylacteries" (above, n. 29) 870–72; and, at greater length (including ancient and medieval antecedents of this interpretation), J. Tigay, "*tpylyn*," *Enc. Miqr.* 8 (forthcoming).

³⁷ *Das Buch Exodus* (HSAT 1/2; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1934) 107–9. Heinisch mentions rings as well as headbands, but he presents no evidence that the general term 'ōt is ever used for "ring." What concrete object, if any, is alluded to by 'ōt in our passages remains problematic.

³⁸ For the precise terminology used in the captions see Pritchard, cited in note 41.

Unfortunately, only a few (all Assyrian) explicitly name Israelites or Israelite cities,³⁹ and these do not show headbands. However, none of these few antedates the eighth century B.C.E., whereas most scholars regard Exod 13 as considerably earlier. More important, the number of illustrations explicitly depicting Israelites is too small to be considered representative. Some of the figures categorized as "Syrian" in Egyptian art are presumably also Israelite and present a fuller range of possibilities for identifying items of Israelite dress.

Figures in Egyptian art categorized as "Syrian" offer abundant evidence on Syro-Palestinian headdress. At least two score illustrations in *ANEP*, spanning the twenty-fifth through the eighth centuries B.C.E., show "Syrian" figures wearing headbands and head fillets.⁴⁰ In a study of "Syrians as Pictured in the Paintings of the Theban Tombs" of the New Kingdom, J. B. Pritchard described four types of dress worn by over two hundred male figures appearing in paintings from twenty-one tombs of this period who are "either labeled as Syrians or . . . obviously intended to represent people from the northeast of Egypt."⁴¹ Headbands and head fillets are the only type of headdress mentioned. They appear in varying frequency with all four types of costume, especially with hair that is worn long. In the case of Pritchard's dress type A, twenty-five of twenty-six figures wear headbands or fillets; the only exception has a shaved head. In *ANEP* 52 even the bald or shaven men wear head fillets. On the whole, no other type of headdress so typifies "Syrian" figures shown in Egyptian art as do headbands and head fillets.

It goes without saying that such evidence must be used with reserve.⁴² Even where the subjects of an illustration are labeled precisely the accuracy of the artist cannot be taken for granted. Further caution is demanded where we seek to infer Israelite practice from illustrations whose labels are less precise. However, the illustrations of Syro-Palestinians with headbands are by many different artists and span more than a millennium and a half. In group portraits, Syro-Palestinian costumes are often distinguished clearly

³⁹ (1) *ANEP* 351–55, row II (see *ANET*, 281); (2) 366; (3) 369; and (4) 371–73, more fully reproduced in Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963) 2. Cf. also R. D. Barnett, "The Siege of Lachish," *IEJ* 8 (1958) 163–64; Yadin, *Warfare*, 2. 410. On the question of the faithfulness of such illustrations, cf. also Alfred Rubens, *A History of Jewish Costume* (London/Jerusalem: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1973) 3.

⁴⁰ The bulk of the illustrations is from the fifteenth–twelfth centuries: *ANEP* 2, 4–9, 43, 45–55, 157, 314–16, 324–26, 329–31, 334, 344, 346, 473. Earlier are *ANEP* 41–42 (Fifth Dynasty), 311 (late Fifth or early Sixth Dynasty), and 3 (Beni-Hasan, ca. 1890). Later and not Egyptian are *ANEP* 455 and 530 (Zinjirli, ninth century) and 64 (Amman, ca. eighth century; four views of this figure are shown in R. D. Barnett, "Four Sculptures from Amman," *ADAJ* 1 [1951] pl. 11). See also *ANEP* 817 from Ras Shamra.

⁴¹ *BASOR* 122 (1951) 36–41.

⁴² See Pritchard, "Syrians," 41, and *ANEP*, p. 255, description of fig. 45.

from those of individuals from elsewhere.⁴³ It is not likely that a type of costume would have been so consistently used for inhabitants of a particular region if it did not have a basis in reality. A few native representations from Syria-Palestine (Amman, Ras Shamra, Zinjirli; see n. 40) offer local confirmation that headbands were worn there. We thus have every reason to assume that headbands were commonly worn all over Syria-Palestine and no reason to exclude early Israelites from this picture, even if Israelite head-dress may have changed by the eighth century.⁴⁴

The artistic evidence from the region thus complements nicely the arguments from later Hebrew and Aramaic usage and from etymology that the $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ was a headband. The artistic evidence also offers one additional factor in favor of this definition. In later times $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ was understood as referring to the head $\text{t}\check{\text{e}}\text{f}\check{\text{i}}\text{l}\check{\text{l}}\check{\text{i}}\text{n}$ (*Tg. Onq. Exod 13:16; Mek to Exod 13:16; etc.*). Many of the headbands visible in paintings and statues are identical to the headband by which the $\text{t}\check{\text{e}}\text{f}\check{\text{i}}\text{l}\check{\text{l}}\check{\text{i}}\text{n}$ capsule was attached to the head: they are knotted in back, with the ends hanging down,⁴⁵ sometimes as long streamers (see *ANEP* 53, 54, 455). If headband is indeed the correct interpretation this means that, apart from the capsule with its texts, the form of the head $\text{t}\check{\text{e}}\text{f}\check{\text{i}}\text{l}\check{\text{l}}\check{\text{i}}\text{n}$ was based on the form of the real $\text{t}(w)\text{tpt}$ of biblical times. This definition thus permits a simpler explanation of the form of the head $\text{t}\check{\text{e}}\text{f}\check{\text{i}}\text{l}\check{\text{l}}\check{\text{i}}\text{n}$ than assuming that it deviates completely from the earlier meaning of the word.

APPENDIX: RENDERINGS OF $\text{T}(W)\text{TPT}$ IN THE VERSIONS

A. The Greek versions and some of their derivatives play with the theme of motion, shaking. A reading *saleutón*, "moving, shaking," appears in a couple of LXX MSS and citations and is reflected in OL *mobilia* (Deut 6:8; 11:18; also in a Latin work of Origen cited by Brook-McLean at Deut 6:8) and Vg *movebuntur* (Deut 6:8). Philo paraphrases Deut 6:8 and 11:18 as "have them shaking (*seiómena*) before the eyes," and refers to "vibration and movement" (*sálon d'echétō*), an interpretation thought to reflect the reading *saleutón* (Philo, *The Special Laws*, IV, §137, 139; see Colson's comments in the LCL edition, vol. VIII, 92–93 note b; 435). Perhaps these renderings envision an ornament suspended before the eyes and shaking (such as that appearing in W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Amulets* [Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1975], no. 130). On the other hand, LXX (and Theodotion at Deut 6:8) *asáleuton*, "unmoved, unshaken" and the reading *atínakta*, "unshaken, immovable" attributed to Aquila apply the same meaning but antithetically, perhaps reckoning that God's teachings should be immovable (cf. the use of

⁴³ See *ANEP*, 2, 4–9, and 45.

⁴⁴ After this article was completed, *Archaeology* 33/6 (November-December, 1980) appeared, with an article by Y. Shiloh, "Excavating Jerusalem: The City of David." On p. 17 there appears a picture with the following caption: "Fragment of a tenth-century B.C. pottery cultic stand decorated in relief. A bearded human head is portrayed with long hair arranged by a headband or a feathered headdress."

⁴⁵ See *ANEP* 8, 9, 53, 54, 330, 346, 355, 473.

asáleutos with laws and ordinances in Philo, *Life of Moses* II, §14 and in a papyrus cited in LSJ, 254 s.v. *asáleutos*. (Z. Frankel, on the other hand, suggested that LXX and Aquila had *tēfillin* in mind; see *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinische exegesis auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* [Leipzig: Barth, 1851] 89–90.)

Although “moving” and “unmoved” are opposite interpretations, their shared theme of motion suggests that they did not develop independently of each other but have a common basis. The idea of motion, shaking may derive from an etymological interpretation based on (1) *tpp* in Isa 3:16, which is usually taken to refer to a mincing or swinging gait (cf. already Saadia and Ibn Janāh quoted in E. Ben Yehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* [New York: Yoseloff, 1959] 4.1915 n. 3) and/or (2) on the use of *tptp* for intermittent actions such as dripping, glittering, and flickering (see Ben Yehuda, 4.1907; Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1.548; cf. Syriac *tptp*, which has the additional sense of bubbling); for the semantic connection of dripping (*nṭp*/**tpp*>*tph*) and intermittent motion (*tpp*/*tptp*) in the same root, cf. *dlp* (see E. A. Speiser, “The Semantic Range of *dalāpu*,” *JCS* 5 [1951] 64–66). If we are right in supposing that the idea of motion lies at the base of the Greek and derivative renderings, the antithetic reflexes of this idea in LXX and Aquila could be cases of “converse translation,” for which see M. L. Klein, “Converse Translation: A Targumic Technique,” *Biblica* 57 (1976) 515–37.

What interpretation Symmachus’s *diestalmena/oi* was intended to convey is uncertain.

B. Another etymological interpretation, based on *tph*, “drop,” is reflected in the rendering found in most MSS of the Samaritan targum, *ṭpym/ṭpyn*, “drops”; cf. the entry in the Hebrew-Arabic-Aramaic Dictionary of the Samaritans: *ṭṭpwt = nqt = ṭpyn* (Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957] 2. 477:75 [cf. 74–76]). The Arabic *nuqat* (plural of *nuqtā*) means “point,” “drop.” Some have taken this interpretation to refer to tattooing (i.e., ink drops or drop-like puncture marks) in a metaphorical sense; cf. A. Habermann, ed., *ktby ’brhm ’pštyyn* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1950) 175–81; H. Y. Abramowitz, *dwrwn lbr mšwh* (Tel Aviv: Nešah, n.d.) 156 (reference courtesy of Prof. Abraham Goldberg). Prof. Ben-Ḥayyim, however, writes that Arabic *nuqtā* also means “sign,” and it seems to me that the Samaritans exploited this *double-entendre* in translating $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$, for their interpretation of the verse which speaks of the commandment of $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ is that the $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ is a symbol, a sign for remembering, as emerges from a comparison of Exod 13:9 with 16” (letter of 4 June, 1979).

C. Similar to the latter suggestion are versions which explicitly render $\dot{t}(w)\dot{t}pt$ as a synonym of *zkrwn* in the parallel passage Exod 13:9: *Tg. Neof.* Exod 13:16 *dwkrn ṭb*, exactly as it renders in v 9 (but a marginal gloss in v 16 reads *tplym*); *Peshitta* Exod 13:16 *dwkrn*; *Vg.* Exod 13:16 *quasi appensum quid, ob recordationem . . .* “as if hanging for a memorial . . .”

D. In Deuteronomy the *Peshitta* renders with *rwšmh*, “mark,” presumably interpreting in light of the parallel *wt*, “sign” (though A. Epstein, cited in §B above, takes this to refer to tattooing).

E. *Tgs. Onqelos* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* (and *Neofiti I* marg. as cited above) render in accordance with the *halakhah*: *tplyn*. Prof. Ben-Ḥayyim informs me that this rendering appears in two MSS of the Samaritan targum (once spelled with *tet!*), although the Samaritans do not understand the word *tplyn* in the same way Jews do. Note also Frankel’s suggestion, mentioned above, that LXX and Aquila have *tēfillin* in mind.

For Saadia’s rendering see above, n. 17. For a collection of eleven interpretations see M. M. Kasher, *Ḥumash. Torah Shelemaḥ* (New York: American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, 1949–) 12.277–80 (reference courtesy of my colleague, Prof. Judah Goldin); twenty-one interpretations are collected by H. Y. Abramowitz (cited above, §B), 155–58.

On “phylacteries,” see Tigay, “On the Term Phylacteries (Matt 23:5),” *HTR* 72 (1979) 45–52.