

⁸ A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques* (Paris, 1963) = CTA 5 [67] V: 19-21. P. J. van Zijl, *Baal. A Study of Texts in Connection with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics* (Neukirchen, 1972), p. 300, in his paragraph on "Terminology of Sexual Intercourse" does not mention 𐎧𐎠𐎫; but, then, Baal is not the subject here.

⁹ After concluding this note, I discovered that both U. Cassuto, *Biblical and Canaanite Literatures* (Jerusalem, 1972), p. 239 (Heb.), and J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Patterns in the Ugaritic Myth of Baʿlu* (Neukirchen, 1971), p. 187, independently make passing reference to the linguistic relationship between the verse in Genesis and the Ugaritic passage. (The latter also refers to CAD for the Akkadian). Neither, however, noted that in all three languages the idiomatic usage is restricted to the animal world.

¹⁰ See the standard commentaries on Amos.

¹¹ *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* 5 (Leipzig, 1912), p. 232.

¹² Though the standard editions of this Midrash have the reading 𐤊𐤋 and not 𐤊, the interpretation remains the same.

¹³ See CAD, A, I, p. 321, 7', for the present citations as well as for additional examples.

¹⁴ V. Scheil, *MDP*, p. 14, 55 iii 9 (= *Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Susiane* [Paris, 1913]).

¹⁵ For discussion, see CAD, B, p. 174, 𐎧, p. 185, and B. Landsberger, *ZA* 30 (1929-30), pp. 290-1.

A TIQQUN SOPHERIM IN GENESIS XVI 13B?

In *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 1-7, Th. Booij has published a stimulating article, "Hagar's words in Genesis xvi 13b", in which he suggests translating the MT of that verse as follows: "Would I have gone here indeed searching for him that watches me?" He endeavours to give a meaning to the MT without any emendation, in opposition to his predecessors, who accept one or two emendations, usually without any foundation in textual tradition. The most important of these former emendations have been summarized by H. Seebass, "Zum Text von Gen. xvi 13b", *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 254-6, who, himself, reads *hāgam l'ḥayyīm rā'itī ʾaḥārē rō'ī*. I should like to suggest another solution to the problems posed by this difficult verse. H. Seebass has already mentioned the possibility that ʾaḥārē is "eine recht alte Korrektur einer ursprünglich heidnischen Aussage" (p. 256). Following this line of thinking, it strikes me that ʾaḥārē could be the opposite of *p'ne*, the former meaning "hinder part, back, Rückseite, pars postica",¹ the latter "face". E.g. in 2 Sam. ii 23, we find this meaning of ʾaḥārē twice: "Abner smote him in the belly with the butt of his spear, so that the spear came out *at his back*" (*RSV*). We thus can translate the MT of Gen. xvi 13b as follows: "Did I really see here the back of the one who sees me?"² I think

this is an emendation of a sentence which originally said: "Did I really see here the face (*p'ne*) of the one who sees me?" The expression has been changed for theological reasons, because nobody can see the face of Yahweh and live (cf. Ex. xxxiii 18-23). We find the original sentence reflected in the LXX: καὶ γὰρ ἐνώπιον εἶδον ὀφθέντα μοι. But Pesh. *dhâ ʾāp hezwâ hzēt men bātar dḥzāny* and Vg. *profecto hic vidi posteriora videntis me*, render the MT. We perhaps have here a *tiqqun sopherim*, which has not been recorded in the tradition. The distinction between *rōʾi* in 13a and *rōʾi* in 13b is meaningful. The former is the abstract noun "seeing, vision", whereas the latter is the participle with a first person singular suffix. Hagar calls Yahweh "a God of vision", i.e. a God who can be seen, who shows himself. She is astonished that God allowed himself to be seen and this she expresses in her question.

Of course, in this explanation, the problem of the meaning of *hālōm* remains. Can it mean "here" instead of "hither"? The dictionaries accept this possibility, and, as it seems, rightly so.³ We know that the distinction between *šām* "there" and *šāmmā* "thither" is not always observed either. *hālōm* meaning "here" occurs in Judg. xx 7. Also in Ugaritic, the adverb *hlm* seems to mean "here", since it takes the preposition *b* when it is used with the verb *bwʾ*: so in *KTU* 1. 19. IV, 52 (= *CTA* 19, 214): *bat bhlml* "she has entered this place".⁴ The same meaning is also attested in Phoenician.⁵ On the other hand, the interpretation here suggested renders superfluous the rather speculative meaning "search for", which Th. Booij ascribes to *rʾh ʾahāre* (pp. 5-7).

In sum, the original *v.* 13 can be translated as follows: "She called the name of Yahweh who spoke to her: 'Thou art a God of vision'; for she said: 'Have I here really seen the face of him who sees me?' "

Leuven

A. Schoors

¹ BDB, p. 30; *HAL*, p. 34; Zorell, p. 35.

² Cf. also J. Lindblom, "Theophanies in Holy Places in Hebrew Religion", *HUCA* 32 (1961), p. 102, n. 21.

³ Zorell, p. 193; *HAL*, p. 239; GB, p. 183.

⁴ Cf. C. H. Gordon, *UT* § 19.771; J. Aistleitner, *WUS*, n° 834. Cf. also *KTU* 1.100, 6, according to E. Lipiński, *UF* 6 (1974), p. 172.

⁵ Cf. W. Leslau, "Observations on Semitic Cognates in Ugaritic", *Or*, N.S. 37 (1968), p. 353.