

TIGAY

Tigay, EJ 2 (1971)

origin, since ad
West-Semitic
ed theophorical

18-1942), 148-1
18-1942), dem. int
[H.W.S.]

Zedek is lord"
Jerusalem at the
(Josh. 10:1-5).
n together with
Ebron, Jarmuth,
ed as a reaction
ne Israelites and
t of "Al by the
e sovereignty of
of the coalition
er, solicited the
st the Amorites
ated at Gibeon.
ne, retreated to
em with the help
d in a cave at
mg is said about
had lost his life:
ever, did result

ortant city-state
biblical passage
s (14th century
g of Jerusalem
t warrant the
ntrolled the hill
ver "the land of
Adoni-Zedek is
il into the above
entify him with
eptuagint reads
i-Zedek.

[Ed.]

of the World").
Ashkenazi rite)
and expressing
ne Sephardi rite
ugh it has been
entury). It may,
Babylonia. The
nce the 14th cen-
tmost every rite
be initial section
uggested on the
ally formed the
so still appears.
the Sabbath and
even on the Day
nce. Adon Olam
o it serves as a
ase present at a
veral times into
Borrow in his
(5) and by Israel
other European
[Ed.]

Andante

'A- don to - lam a - ser ma - lak bé -
 te - rem kól
 'A - don to - lam a - ser ma - lak bé - tar - rem kól yá -
 - gur niv - ra lé - et na - 'a - sa bé - nef - go kól
 'a - zay me - lak sé - mo niq - ra
 'a - ná - re kúx - lot hak - kól lé - vad - do yim
 - lox no - ra wé - hu ha - ya wé - hu ho - we
 wé - hu yih - ye bé - t'á - ra
 - hu e - had wé - ten sé - nu lé - ham - sí - lo lé -
 - han - bi - ra wé - hu ri - son wé - hu ah - ron lé -
 - kól ho - mer ú - kól zu - ra etc
 'A - don to - lam a - ser ma - lak bé -
 - te - rem kól yé - gur niv - ra lé -
 - et na - 'a - sa ké - si - ci - het - go kól 'a -
 - zay me - lak sé - mo niq - ra

Music. Adon Olam is generally sung by the congregation. In the Ashkenazi tradition it is also sometimes rendered by the cantor on certain festive occasions, and then the melody is adapted to the *nosah* of the section of the prayer into which it is incorporated. The great number of melodies for Adon Olam includes both individual settings, and borrowings from Jewish and Gentile sources. Ex. 3, from Dieroa, is a North African "general" melody for *piyyutin*. Two versions from Germany in Ideisonn (Melodien, (1932), nos. 59 and 330) both borrow the western Ashkenazi melody of *Omnam Ken*, while no. 346a is a German folk tune. A melody from Tangiers (I. Levy, Antologia, I (1965), no. 96) is the tune of the Romance *Esta Rahel la estimosa*. The composed or adapted tunes are mostly based upon a strict measure of four or three beats, both equally suitable for conforming to the *hataf*-meter of the text—one short and three longs (see ex. 3 as against exs. 1 and 2). The melody is sung in many schools in Israel at the end of the pupils' morning prayer (in 4/4 measure; cf. the same, in 3/4 measure, YE vol. 1, p. 514). Solomon de' Rossi included an eight-voice composition of Adon Olam in his *Ha-Shirim Asher li-Sheimo* (Venice, 1622/23). [Av.He.]

Bibliography: Eibogen, Gottesdienst, 88; Abrahams, Companion, vii-ix; Davidson, Ozar, I (1924), 29 no. 575; C. Roth, Essays and Portraits (1962), 295ff.; Baer S., Seder, 35; idem, Tazetot Hayyim (1871), 57. Music: Sendrey, Music indexes.

ADOPTION, taking another's child as one's own. Alleged Cases of Adoption in the Bible. The evidence for adoption in the Bible is so equivocal that some have denied it was practiced in the biblical period.

(A) GENESIS 15:2-3. Being childless, Abram complains that Eliezer, his servant, will be his heir. Since in the ancient Near East only relatives, normally sons, could inherit, Abram had probably adopted, or contemplated adopting, Eliezer. This passage is illuminated by the ancient Near Eastern practice of childless couples adopting a son, sometimes a slave, to serve them in their lifetime and bury and mourn them when they die, in return for which the adopted son is designated their heir. If a natural child should subsequently be born to the couple, he would be chief heir and the adopted son would be second to him.

(B) GENESIS 16:2 AND 30:3. Because of their barrenness, Sarai and Rachel give their servant girls to Abram and Jacob as concubines, hoping to "have children" (lit. "be built up") through the concubines. These words are taken as an expression of intention to adopt the children born of the husbands and concubines. Rachel's subsequent statement, "God . . . has given me a son" (30:6) seems to favor this view. A marriage contract from Nuzi stipulates that in a similar case the mistress "shall have authority over the offspring." That the sons of Jacob's concubines share in his estate is said to presuppose their adoption. Bilhah's giving birth on (or perhaps "onto") Rachel's knees (30:3; cf. 50:23) is believed to be an adoption ceremony similar to one practiced by ancient European and Asiatic peoples among whom placing a child on a man's knees signified variously acknowledgment, legitimation, and adoption. Such an adoption by a mistress of the offspring of her husband and her slave-girl would not be unparalleled in the ancient Near East (see J. van Seters, JBL 87 (1968), 404-7), but other considerations argue that this did not, in fact, take place in the episodes under consideration. Elsewhere in the Bible the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah are viewed only as the sons of these concubines, never of the mistresses (e.g., 21:10, 13; 33:2, 6-7; 35:23-26). Rachel's statement "God . . . has given me a son" reflects not necessarily adoption but Rachel's ownership of the child's mother, Bilhah (cf. Ex. 21:4, and especially the later Aramaic usage in Pritchard, Texts, 548a plus n. 5). The concubines' sons sharing in Jacob's estate does not presuppose adoption by Rachel and Leah because the sons are Jacob's by blood and require only his recognition to inherit (cf. The Code of Hammurabi, 170-1). Finally the alleged adoption ceremony must be interpreted otherwise. Placing a child on the knees is known

Tigay

from elsewhere in the ancient Near East (see I. J. Gelb et al., *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 2 (1965), 256 s.v. *birku*; H. Hoffner, *JNES* 27 (1968), 199-201). Outside of cases which signify divine protection and/or nursing, but not adoption (cf. T. Jacobsen, *JNES* 2 (1943), 119-211), the knees upon which the child is placed are almost always those of its natural parent or grandparent. It seems to signify nothing more than affectionate play or welcoming into the family, sometimes combined with naming. (Only once, in the Hurrian Tale of the Cow and the Fisherman (J. Friedrich, *Zeitschrift fuer Assyriologie* 49 (1950), 232-3 ll. 38ff.), does placing on the lap occur in an apparently adoptive context, but even there it is not clear that the ceremony is part of the adoption.) Some construe the ceremony as an act of legitimation, but no legal significance of any sort is immediately apparent. Significantly, the one unequivocal adoption ceremony in the Bible (Gen. 48:5-6) does not involve placing the child on the knees (Gen. 48:12 is from a different document and simply reflects the children's position during Jacob's embrace, between, not on, his knees). Furthermore, Genesis 30:3 speaks not of placing but of giving birth on Rachel's knees. This more likely reflects the position taken in antiquity by a woman during childbirth, straddling the knees of an attendant (another woman or at times her own husband) upon whose knees the emerging child was received (cf. perhaps Job 3:12). Perhaps Rachel attended Bilhah herself in order to cure, in a sympathetic-magical way, her own infertility (cf. 30:18, which may imply that Rachel, too, had been aiming ultimately at her own fertility), much like the practice of barren Arab women in modern times of being present at other women's deliveries. Genesis 50:23 (see below) must imply Joseph's assistance at his great-grandchildren's birth: or, if taken to mean simply that the children were placed upon his knees immediately after birth, it would imply a sort of welcoming or naming ceremony.

(C) GENESIS 29-31. It is widely held that Jacob was adopted by the originally sonless Laban, on the analogy of a Nuzi contract in which a sonless man adopts a son, makes him his heir, and gives him his daughter as a wife. This in itself is not compelling, but the document adds that, unless sons are later born to the adopter, the adopted son will also inherit his household gods. This passage, it is argued, illuminates Rachel's theft of Laban's household gods (31:19), and herein lies the strength of the adoption theory. But M. Greenberg (*JBL*, 81 (1962), 239-48) casts doubt upon the supposed explanation of Rachel's theft, thus depriving the adoption theory of its most convincing feature. In addition, the Bible itself not only fails to speak of adoption but pictures Jacob as Laban's employee.

(D) GENESIS 48:5-6. Near the end of his life Jacob, recalling God's promise of Canaan for his descendants, announces to Joseph: "Your two sons who were born to you . . . before I came to you in Egypt, shall be mine; Ephraim and Manasseh shall be mine, as Reuben and Simeon are"; subsequent sons of Joseph will (according to the most common interpretation of the difficult v. 6), for the purposes of inheritance, be reckoned as sons of Ephraim and Manasseh. In view of the context—note particularly that grandsons, not outsiders, are involved—many believe that this adoption involves inheritance alone, and is not an adoption in the full sense. (M. David compares the classical *adoptio mortis causa*. This belief is strengthened by the almost unanimous view that this episode is intended etiological to explain why the descendants of Joseph held, in historical times, two tribal allotments, the territories of Ephraim and Manasseh.

(E) GENESIS 50:23. "The children of Machir son of Manasseh were likewise born on Joseph's knees" is said to reflect an adoption ceremony. To the objections listed above (b), it may be added that unlike (d), Joseph's adoption of Machir's children would explain nothing in Israel's later history and would be etiological pointless.

(F) EXODUS 2:10. "Moses became her [= Pharaoh's daughter's] son." Some, however, interpret this as fosterage.

(G) LEVITICUS 18:19. A "sister . . . born outside the household" could mean an adopted sister, but most commentators interpret it as an illegitimate sister or one born of another marriage of the mother.

(H) JUDGES 11:1ff. S. Feigin argued that Gilead must have adopted Jephthah or else the question of his inheriting could never have arisen. But since Jephthah was already Gilead's son, the passage implies, at most, legitimation, not adoption.

(I) RUTH 4:16-17. Naomi's placing of the child of Ruth and Boaz in her bosom and the neighbors' declaration "a son is born to Naomi" are said to imply adoption by Naomi. But the very purpose of Ruth's marriage to Boaz was, from the legal viewpoint, to engender a son who would be accounted to Ruth's dead husband (see Deut. 25:6 and Gen. 38:8-9) and bear his name (Ruth 4:10). Adoption by Naomi, even though she was the deceased's mother, would frustrate that purpose. The text says that Naomi became the child's nurse, not his mother. The child is legally Naomi's grandson and the neighbors' words are best taken as referring to this.

(J) ESTHER 2:7. 15. Mordecai adopted his orphaned cousin Hadassah. (This case, too, is taken by some as rather one of fosterage.) This possible case of adoption among Jews living under Persian rule is paralleled by a case among the Jews living in the Persian military garrison at Elephantine, Egypt, in the fifth century B.C.E. (E. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (1953), no. 8).

(K) EZRA 2:61 (= NEHEMIAH 7:63). One or more priests married descendants of Barzillai the Gileadite and "were called by their name." This may imply adoption into the family of Barzillai.

(L) EZRA 10:44. Several Israelites married foreign women. The second half of the verse, unintelligible as it stands, ends with "and they placed established children." S. Feigin, on the basis of similar Greek expressions and textual emendation, viewed this as a case of adoption. Since the passage is obviously corrupt (the Greek text of Esdras reads differently), no conclusions can be drawn from it, though Feigin's interpretation is not necessarily ruled out.

(M) I CHRONICLES 2:35-41. Since the slave Jarha (approximately a contemporary of David according to the genealogy) married his master's daughter, he was certainly manumitted and, quite likely, was adopted by his master; otherwise, his descendants would not have been listed in the Judahite genealogy.

(N) In addition to the above possible cases, one might see a sort of posthumous adoption in the ascription of the first son born of the levirate marriage (Gen. 38:8-9; Deut. 25:6; Ruth 4) to the dead brother. The child is possibly to be called "A son of B [the deceased]"—in this way he preserves the deceased's name (Deut. 25:6-7; Ruth 4:5) and presumably inherits his property.

SUMMARY. Of the most plausible cases above, two (A, D) are from the Patriarchal period, one reflects Egyptian practice (F), and another the practice of Persian Jews of the Exilic or post-Exilic period (J). From the pre-Exilic period there is a possible case alleged by the Chronicler to have taken place in the time of David (M), one or two other remotely possible cases (G) and (K), the latter from the late pre-Exilic or Exilic period; and the "posthumous adoption" involved in levirate marriage (N). The evidence for adoption in the pre-Exilic period is thus meager. The possibility that adoption was practiced in this period cannot be excluded, especially since contemporary legal documents are lacking. Nevertheless, it seems that if adoption played any role at all in Israelite family institutions, it was an insignificant one. It may be that the tribal consciousness of the Israelites did not favor the creation of artificial family ties and that the practice of polygamy obviated some of the need for adoption. For the post-Exilic period in Palestine there is no reliable evidence for adoption at all.

Adoption as a Metaphor. (A) GOD AND ISRAEL. The relationship between God and Israel is often likened to that of father and son (Ex. 4:22; Deut. 5:5; 14:1). Usually there is no indication that this is meant in an adoptive sense, but this may be the sense of Jeremiah 3:19; 31:9; and Hosea 11:1.

(B) IN KINGSHIP. The idea that the king is the son of a god occurs in Canaanite (Pritchard, *Texts*, 147-8) and other ancient Near Eastern sources. In Israel—which borrowed the very institution of kingship from its neighbors (I Sam. 8:5, 20)—this idea could not be accepted literally; biblical references to the king as God's son therefore seem intended in an adoptive sense. Several are reminiscent of ancient Near Eastern adoption contracts. Thus, Psalms 2:7-5 contains a declaration, "You are my son," a typical date formula "this day" (the next phrase, "I have born you," may reflect the conception of adoption as a new birth), and a promise of inheritance (an empire; II Samuel 7:17) contains a promise of inheritance (an enduring dynasty), a declaration of adoption, and a statement of the father's right to discipline the adoptive son (cf. Ps. 89:27ff.; I Chron. 17:13; 22:10; 28:6).

Since the divine adoption of kings was not known in the ancient Near East, and the very institution of adoption was rare—if at all

existent—in Israel, these metaphors was (1970) the answer. David and Israel. The form which is wide these a donor adopt inheritance. Thus David serves as the empire, and God's (Jer. 3:19; also no pattern of the cover adoption was used, adoption was used, redeemed from spir. Gal. 4:5), and to the (Rom. 8:21-23). W or post-biblical, and debated.

Later Jewish I institution in Je personal status of family relationships creating this stat However, Jewish essentially similar by legal means.

These consequ person to assume and mental wellfa matters of inheri achieving this re adopter as a "guar exclusive authorit including his up his place of abode of the child's undertaking to be expense and with all such financial natural parents v all practical purp his adoptors as h parents, since u upbringing, and (Ket. 101b; Main 114 and Tur *ibid.* 3 (n.d.), 109-125 would be obliged child out of the f created a legal o Ar., HM 60:4.

Indeed, in prin his natural paren any way affected above; but in fac what is generally the word. The p the extent to wh of, and the adop obligations to h accordance with concerning a o overriding consi (Responsa Kasn sa Radbaz, 1:12 Sh. Ar., EH 82, A

Even without of all orphans."

child of Ruth and
 on "a son is born to
 omi. But the very
 the legal viewpoint,
 uth's dead husband
 name (Ruth 4:10),
 deceased's mother,
 Naomi became the
 Naomi's grandson
 ing to this.
 orphaned cousin
 as rather one of
 g Jews living under
 Jews living in the
 in the fifth century
naic Papyri (1953).

ore priests married
 ere called by their
 of Barzillai.
 reign women. The
 ds. ends with "and
 the basis of similar
 ved this as a case of
 t (the Greek text of
 be drawn from it,
 ruled out.
 rha (approximately
 ealogy) married his
 d. and, quite likely,
 endants would not

one might see a sort
 ne first son born of
 (6: Ruth 4) to the
 d "A son of B [the
 ased's name (Deut.
 property.

two (A, D) are from
 tian practice (F).
 of the Exilic or
 period there is a
 taken place in the
 ssible cases ((G) and
 lic period) and the
 marriage (S). The
 is thus meager. The
 s period cannot be
 tal documents are
 played any role at
 nificant one. It may
 s did not favor the
 ctice of polygamy
 for the post-Exilic
 for adoption at all.

t. The relationship
 t of father and son
 ndication that this
 e sense of Jeremiah

son of a god occurs
 other ancient Near
 e very institution of
 his idea could not be
 king as God's son
 sence. Several are
 n contracts. Thus,
 e my son," a typical
 ave born you," may
 h), and a promise of
 tains a promise of
 n of adoption, and a
 adoptive son (cf. Ps.

nown in the ancient
 n was rare—if at all

existent—in Israel, the question arises as to where the model for these metaphors was found. According to M. Weinfeld (JAOS 90 (1970)) the answer is found in the covenants made by God with David and Israel. These are essentially covenants of grant, a legal form which is widespread in the ancient Near East. In some of these a donor adopts the donee and the grant takes the form of an inheritance. Thus in the biblical metaphor God's adoption of David serves as the legal basis for the grant of the dynasty and empire, and God's adoption of Israel underlies the grant of a land (Jer. 3:19; also noted by S. Paul). According to Y. Mušš, the pattern of the covenant in the Priestly Document (P) is modeled on adoption by redemption from slavery (cf. Ex. 6:6-8). In later times adoption was used metaphorically in the Pauline epistles to refer variously to Israel's election (Rom. 9:4), to the believers who were redeemed from spiritual bondage by Jesus (Rom. 8:15; Eph. 1:5; Gal. 4:5), and to the final eschatological redemption from bondage (Rom. 8:21-23). Whether Paul modeled the metaphor on biblical or post-biblical, ancient Near Eastern or Roman legal sources is debated.

[J.H.T.]

Later Jewish Law. Adoption is not known as a legal institution in Jewish law. According to *halakha* the personal status of parent and child is based on the natural family relationship only and there is no recognized way of creating this status artificially by a legal act or fiction. However, Jewish law does provide for consequences essentially similar to those caused by adoption to be created by legal means.

These consequences are the right and obligation of a person to assume responsibility for (a) a child's physical and mental welfare and (b) his financial position, including matters of inheritance and maintenance. The legal means of achieving this result are: (1) by the appointment of the adopter as a "guardian" (see *Apotropos) of the child, with exclusive authority to care for the latter's personal welfare, including his upbringing, education and determination of his place of abode; and (2) by entrusting the administration of the child's property to the adopter. The latter undertaking to be accountable to the child and, at his own expense and without any right of recourse, would assume all such financial obligations as are imposed by law on natural parents vis-a-vis their children. Thus, the child is for all practical purposes placed in the same position toward his adopters as he would otherwise be toward his natural parents, since all matters of education, maintenance, upbringing, and financial administration are taken care of (Ket. 101b; Maim., Yad, Ishut, 23:17-18; and Sh. Ar., EH 114 and Tur *ibid.*, Sh. Ar., HM 60:2-5; 207:20-21; PDR, 3 (n.d.), 109-125). On the death of the adopter, his heirs would be obliged to continue to maintain the "adopted" child out of the former's estate the said undertaking having created a legal debt to be satisfied as any other debt (Sh. Ar., HM 60:4).

Indeed, in principle neither the rights of the child toward his natural parents, nor their obligations toward him are in any way affected by the method of "adoption" described above; but in fact, the result approximated very closely to what is generally understood as adoption in the full sense of the word. The primary question in matters of adoption is the extent to which the natural parents are to be deprived of, and the adoptive parents vested with, the rights and obligations to look after the child's welfare. This is in accordance with the rule that determined that in all matters concerning a child, his welfare and interests are the overriding considerations always to be regarded as decisive (Responsa Rashba, attributed to Nahmanides, 38; Responsa Radbaz, 1:123; Responsa Samuel di Modena, EH 123; Sh. Ar., EH 82, *Pithei Teshuvah* 7).

Even without private adoption, the court, as the "father of all orphans," has the power to order the removal of a

child from his parents' custody, if this is considered necessary for his welfare (see Apotropos). So far as his pecuniary rights are concerned, the child, by virtue of his adopters' legal undertakings toward him, acquires an additional debtor, since his natural parents are not released from their own obligations imposed on them by law, i.e. until the age of six. Furthermore, the natural parents continue to be liable for the basic needs of their child from the age of six, to the extent that such needs are not or cannot be satisfied by the adopter; the continuation of this liability is based on *Dinei Zedakah*—the duty to give charity (see *Parent & Child; PDR, 3 (n.d.), 170-6; 4 (n.d.), 3-8).

With regard to right of inheritance, which according to *halakha* is recognized as existing between a child and his natural parents only, the matter can be dealt with by means of testamentary disposition, whereby the adopter makes provision in his will for such portion of his estate to devolve on the child as the latter would have got by law had the former been his natural parent (see Civil Case 85/49, in: *Pesakim shei Beit ha-Mishpat ha-Elyon u-Vaitei ha-Mishpat ha-Mehozivim be-Yisrael*, 1 (1948/49), 343-8. In accordance with the rule that "Scripture looks upon one who brings up an orphan as if he had begotten him" (Sanh. 19b; Meg. 13a), there is no halakhic objection to the adopter calling the "adopted" child his son and the latter calling the former his father (Sanh. *ibid.*, based on II Sam. 21:8). Hence, provisions in documents in which these appellations are used by either party, where the adopter has no natural children and/or the child has no natural parent, may be taken as intended by the one to favor the other, according to the general tenor of the document (Sh. Ar., EH 19; Pithei Teshuvah, 3; HM 42:15; Responsa Hatam Sofer, EH 76). Since the legal acts mentioned above bring about no actual change in personal status, they do not affect the laws of marriage and divorce, so far as they might concern any of the parties involved.

In the State of Israel adoption is governed by the Adoption of Children Law, 5720/1960, which empowers the district court and, with the consent of all the parties concerned, the rabbinical court, to grant an adoption order in respect of any person under the age of 18 years, provided that the prospective adopter is at least 18 years older than the prospective adoptee and the court is satisfied that the matter is in the best interests of the adoptee. Such an order has the effect of severing all family ties between the child and his natural parents. On the other hand, such a court order creates new family ties between the adopter and the child to the same extent as are legally recognized as existing between natural parents and their child—unless the order is restricted or conditional in some respect. Thus, an adoption order would generally confer rights of intestate succession on the adoptee, who would henceforth also bear his adopter's name. However, the order does not affect the consequences of the blood relationship between the adoptee and his natural parents, so that the prohibitions and permissions of marriage and divorce continue to apply. On the other hand, adoption as such does not create new such prohibitions or permissions between the adopted and the adoptive family. There is no legal adoption of persons over the age of 18 years.

[B-Z.Sch.]

Bibliography: BIBLE COMMENTARIES: J. Skinner, *The Book of Genesis* (ICC, 1930); E. Speiser, *Genesis* (1964); N. M. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis* (1966); W. Rudolph, *Ruth* (1962); M. J. Dahood, *Psalms*, vol. 1 (1966). GENERAL: T. H. Gaster, *Myth . . . in the Old Testament* (1969) 448-9, 741-2; de Vaux, *Anc. Isr.*, 51-54, 111-3 (bibl. 523); S. Feigin, in: *JBL*, 50 (1931), 186-200; idem, *Mi-Sitrei he-Avar* (1943), 15-24, 50-53; H. Granqvist, *Birth and Childhood Among the Arabs* (1947), 60, 114, 252-9; M. David, *Adoption in het Oude Israel* (Dutch, 1955); Z. Falk, *Hebrew Law in*

Biblical Times (1964), 162-4; F. Lyall, in *JBL*, 88 (1969), 458-66; H. Donner, in: *Oriens Antiquus*, 8 (1969), 87-119; H. E. Baker, *Legal System of Israel* (1968), index. SPECIAL STUDIES: B. Stade, in: *ZAW*, 6 (1886), 143-56; G. Cooke, *ibid.*, 73 (1961), 202-25; C. Gordon, in: *BA*, 3 (1940), 2-7; H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), 163-86 (= *HTR*, 40 (1947), 77-99); I. Mendelsohn, in: *IEJ*, 9 (1959), 180-3; R. Patai, *Sex and Family in the Bible and the Middle East* (1959), 42, 78-79, 92-98, 205, 224; W. F. Albright, in: *BASOR*, 163 (1961), 47; H. Hoffner, in: *JNES*, 27 (1968), 198-203; J. Preuss, *Biblich-Talmudische Medizin* (1923), 460-1; S. Kardinon, in: *JSS*, 3 (1958), 123-6; J. van Seiers, in: *JBL*, 87 (1968), 401-8; Z. Falk, in: *Lura*, 17 (1966), 170-1. JEWISH LAW: J. Kister, *Sekirah al Immuz Yetadim* (1953); G. Felder, Hakohen, in: *Sinai*, 48 (1961), 204ff.; Findling, in: *Vo'am*, 4 (1961), 65ff.; Ezrahi, *ibid.*, 94ff.; Rudner, *ibid.*, 61ff.; B. Schereschewsky, *Dinei Mishpahah* (1967), 395ff.



ADORAIM (אָדוֹרַיִם), ancient city of Judah, southwest of Hebron. It appears in the Bible only in the list of cities fortified by Solomon's son, *Rehoboam (II Chron. 11:9). Adoraim (Adoram) is also mentioned in the Book of Jubilees 38:8-9. In the Hellenistic period, when it was known as Adora, it was one of the chief cities of Idumea; the Ptolemaic official Zeno visited it in 259 B.C.E. (Zeno papyri, 76). The city is also mentioned in I Maccabees 13:20 in connection with

the campaigns of the Hasmonean *Jonathan and his adversary Tryphon in 143 B.C.E. It was later captured by John Hyrcanus together with Marisa and the whole of Idumea (Jos., Wars, 1:63; Ant., 13:257). The Roman proconsul Gabinius (d. 48/7 B.C.E.) chose it as the seat of one of his *synhedria* ("councils"; Jos., Ant., 14:91) and it retained its Jewish character until the end of the Bar Kokhba War (135 C.E.). The site is occupied by the twin villages of Dūrā al-'Arajān, 5 mi. (8 km.) southwest of Hebron, situated on a plateau overlooking the coastal plain, with a population of 10,000. [M.A.-Y.]

Modern Period. The name Adoraim also describes a ridge of the Hebron Hills. Most of the ridge, including the site of ancient Adoraim, remained until 1967 on the Jordanian side of the 1949 armistice lines. However, the name Adoraim was given in the middle 1950s to a specially planned region in the Judean Foothills under Israel control between the Bet Guvrin-Hebron road and Kibbutz Lahav. [E.O.]

Bibliography: EM 1 (1965), 103-4; Abel, in: *RB*, 35 (1926), 531; 36 (1927), 145; Abel, *Geog.*, 2 (1938), 239; W. F. Albright, in: *BASOR*, 89 (1943), 14 no. 37; Albright, Stone, 347; D. Kallner (Amiram), in: *BJPES*, 14 (1948-49), 30-37; Kanael, in: *IEJ*, 7 (1957), 98-106.

ADORNO, THEODOR W. (1903-1969), German sociologist. Adorno was born in Frankfurt, and studied philosophy, psychology, sociology, and musicology. He began teaching at the University of Frankfurt in 1931, but in 1933 was deprived of his chair. In 1934 he emigrated to England and in 1938 to the United States. He was musical director of the Princeton Radio Research Projects (1938-41) and then codirector of the Research Project on Social Discrimination at the University of California at Berkeley (1941-48). Together with Max Horkheimer he published *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (1947) and with the American social psychologist Nevitt R. Sanford wrote *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950). This work, which attempts an empirically ascertainable characterological analysis of fascism and

similar movements, has exerted considerable influence on modern psychology and sociology. In 1956 Adorno returned to Frankfurt as professor of sociology.

Adorno was influenced by Hegel, Freud, and George Lukács and studied music under Alban Berg in Vienna. His work represents a combination of influences of aesthetics, philosophy, and sociology. He published *Kierkegaard: Konstruktion des Aesthetischen* (1933); *Philosophie der neuen Musik* (1949); and *Versuch ueber Wagner* (1952). Adorno's work in philosophy is devoted to social-critical analysis of intellectual trends, and his major publications in this field are *Prismen: Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft* (1955), *Dissonanzen* (1956), *Zur Metakritik der Erkenntnistheorie* (1956), and *Aspekte der Hegelschen Philosophie* (1957). As director of the Institut fuer Sozialforschung in Frankfurt from 1953 Adorno published and influenced numerous analytical papers and sociological studies. Together with Walter Dirks he edited the *Frankfurter Beitrage zur Soziologie*, the second volume of which illustrates his special interest in the group discussion method. Adorno was a major intellectual force among the left-wing academic youth of the Federal Republic of Germany, but was later opposed by Maoist youth.

Bibliography: *Zeugnisse: Theodor W. Adorno* (1963); M. Jay, in: *Midstream* (Dec. 1969), 62-69.

[W.J.C.]

ADRAMMELECH (Heb. אֲדַרְמֶלֶךְ).

(1) A deity. Adrammelech was worshiped, together with *Anammelech, by the people of *Sefarvaim (II Kings 17:31), who settled in Samaria after its destruction in 722 B.C.E. No Assyrian or Babylonian deity is known by the name Adrammelech; moreover, according to the narrative, the cult of Adrammelech was accompanied by human sacrifice, but no reference to this is found in Mesopotamian documents. The inscriptions of Kapara, the Aramean king of Gozan (Tell Halaf on the Khabur, beginning of the ninth century B.C.E.), refer to the name Adad-milki-ilaia ("Adad-Milki is my god"), and also to the human sacrifice practiced in Gozan. Thus, it has been suggested that the name should read Adadmelech (cf. Gen. 36:39 with I Chron. 1:50). On the other hand, it is surprising that the Bible should employ the Assyrian form *Adad* for the Hebrew (and Aramaic) *Hadad*, although in I Kings 11:17 the (Assyrian) form *Adad* is used. The element *melech* in the name can be the Hebrew word for king, or it may hint at *molekh* (*molech), connected with human sacrifice that was offered to Adrammelech. It may also be identical with the name of the deity *Molech*.

(2) Adrammelech was the son of *Sennacherib, king of Assyria (II Kings 19:37; Isa. 37:38). Adrammelech, together with his brother *Sharezer, murdered his father in the temple of Nisroch and escaped to the land of *Ararat (cf. II Chron. 32:21). Abydenus (Eusebius, *Armenia Chronicle*, ed. Schoene, 1:35) gives the name of the murderer as Adramelus; *Alexander Polyhistor as Ardumusanus (427), and *Josephus (Ant., 10:23), Andromachos, but these forms may have been based on the Bible. Adrammelech has no Assyrian etymology, and is unknown as an Assyrian personal name, and no son of Sennacherib with a similar name is known from Assyrian sources. The incident itself is related in a Babylonian chronicle as a revolt against Sennacherib, by one of his sons, where the name is not given; it is also related thus by Berosus (43, ed. Schnabel). The only source that mentions more than one murderer is an inscription of Ashurbani-pal, the grandson of Sennacherib. There too, the murderers' names are not given, nor is it stated that they were sons of Sennacherib. A passage in the annals of Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib who