

layered fabric, sack, sheepfold

שַׁפְּתִים / מִשְׁפְּתִים

1. Statistics

מִשְׁפְּתִים

Torah: 1. Nebiim: 1. Ketubim: 0. Total: 2.

שַׁפְּתִים

Torah: 0. Nebiim: 1. Ketubim: 1. Total: 2.

2a. Literal Use

The word מִשְׁפְּתִים occurs only twice. In Gen. 49:14-15 Issachar is compared to a strong ass (הַחֹר גָּרָם) resting (רָבִץ) between הַמִּשְׁפְּתִים. The direct context provides not much of a clue for a specific identification although the article suggests that the connection between הַמִּשְׁפְּתִים and an ass was not uncommon. Moreover, the dual would seem to indicate that the ass was resting between two more or less identical objects called מִשְׁפָּת. And finally, the relation with v. 15b is not without relevance (see below). However, neither the material applied nor the shape of the מִשְׁפְּתִים is indicated.

In recent research three solutions have been suggested most frequently:

1) מִשְׁפְּתִים as ‘campfires, fire-places, ash-heaps, hearths’. This interpretation rests on a derivation from the verb שָׁפַת which in texts like 2 Kgs 4:38 and Ezek. 24:3 is thought to mean ‘to put a cooking pot on the fire’ (so e.g. *BDB*, 1046; Albright 1950; E.E. Carpenter, in: *NIDOT*, vol. 2, 1144). However, שָׁפַת does not have this specific meaning and although ‘fireplace’ might be fitting in Judg. 5:16, it is certainly out of place in Gen. 49:14.

2) מִשְׁפְּתִים as ‘sheepfolds’, ‘pastureland’ or ‘pens’. So many older dictionaries which were apparently inspired by the use of the term in Judg. 5:16 (cf. Ps. 68:16) where this meaning is indeed fitting because there is also talk of listening to the flute-playing (of shepherds) with the flocks (see for adherents to this opinion De Hoop 1998, 153, n. 449). In this connection O. Eissfeldt has pointed to the prong-shaped sheepfolds in East-Jordan (Eissfeldt 1949; 1954).

3) The third, most plausible, rendering of מִשְׁפְּתִים is ‘saddlebags, donkey-packs’. This has been defended in the past (Hogg 1927; Saarisalo 1927; Skinner 1930; see further below) and was

corroborated by new comparative linguistic evidence (De Moor 1981; 1985; 1993; 1997). The noun should be derived from \sqrt{tpd} (so still in Ugaritic) which became $\sqrt{שפה}$ in Hebrew. The basic meaning of the verb is ‘to put one thing on another’ (see section 4). The noun is more or less an equivalent of \rightarrow אֶמְתַּחַת – the Ugaritic cognates of the two words are used in synonymous parallelism. The dual form of the noun points to the fact that a sack is made of fabric folded in two and stitched around the edges. As a donkey-pack, several such sacks were interconnected in the middle and hung down the sides of the animal (cf. Avitzur, 189-91; Dercksen 2009, 92).

This background explains the imagery of Gen. 49:14-15. When the ass lies down (רַבִּיץ) with his heavy load, the bags on both sides rise up over him. This evokes Issachar’s residential area: the plain of Jizreel, on both sides bordered by mountains. The ass is willing to do heavy work, provided it feels good. That this is indeed the case shows the sequel in v. 15: his resting place is good, and the land is pleasant; so he bows his shoulder (וַיִּט שְׂכָמוֹ) to bear (כָּבַל) his burden (the מְשַׁפְתִּים). In other words, Issachar (‘man of wages’) is willing to take upon himself the unpleasant chores of a corvée worker (thus e.g. De Hoop 1999, 160-1; Macchi 1999, 152-5, both with nuances approaching the ‘labouring worker’ others prefer, e.g. Hamilton 1995, 668). Exactly the relationship between vv. 14 and 15 renders it plausible that the term מְשַׁפְתִּים refers to a real utensil, the equipment with which the pack animal hauls on his heavy load.

However, the interpretation of מְשַׁפְתִּים as ‘donkey packs, donkey bags’ in Gen. 49:14 encounters a problem in Judg. 5:16, the only other place where the word is used. The meaning proposed does not seem to fit the context there. In the middle of the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5:1-31), which sings the praise of the vigour and fighting spirit of Israel’s tribes with captivating dynamics, the tribes of Reuben, Gilead, Dan and Asher are criticised because of their inertion (vv. 15b-17). Reuben is asked why he remained sitting (יָשָׁב) among the מְשַׁפְתִּים without taking part in the action. The singer gives the answer himself: because Reuben preferred ‘to listen to the piping for the flocks’ (לְשִׁמֹּעַ שְׂרָקוֹת עֲדָרִים). The

herds are gathered by the piping of the shepherds, Reuben simply continues the daily routine of going out and coming in. Reuben hears the shepherd's flute, but not the trumpet of war. It seems likely that מִשְׁפְּתַיִם must be rendered 'sheepfolds' here, not 'donkey packs' or the like. Yet a relation between the two may be suspected in two different ways. One might assume that the poet wants to evoke the everyday scene of a mule lying down between his double burden – the very picture of peaceful rest in general. Or, one might assume that the V-shape of the sheepfold in ancient Israel resembled the shape of a donkey pack with its multiple layers of bags (thus De Moor 1993, 491, n. 33; 1997, 121, n. 80). The proposal of Crown 1967 to render 'to squat on one's haunches' failed to convince.

In view of the analogous wording and function in the context, most scholars (see section 10 below) assume that שֵׁפְתַיִם in Ps. 68:14 is a variant spelling of the term מִשְׁפְּתַיִם in Judg. 5:16 – without preformative מ and with geminated ה. Moreover, some of the ancient versions translate the two terms identically. Ps. 68:14 is a *crux interpretum*; both the position of v. 14a and the meaning of v. 14b are a riddle to many. Often it is stated that v. 14a is a stray gloss from Judg. 5:16 (e.g. Isserlin 1971; cf. Kraus 1989). Indeed the similarity between Judg. 5:16 and Ps. 68:14 is striking, but there are more parallels between Ps. 68 and the Song of Deborah. The circumstance that in Ps. 68:14 the verb שָׁכַב is used instead of יָשַׁב (so Judg. 5:14) does change nothing in the meaning of the phrase – the lying down or sitting בֵּין שֵׁפְתַיִם points to an undisturbed, acquiescent, passive attitude. Commentators disagree, however, on the meaning of the clause: are we dealing with a reproof, an adhortation, a promise, a wish, or an observation? An exegetical decision on this matter is possible only if the function of the 'dove' in v. 14b is clarified (for various proposals see e.g. Begg 1987; Hossfeldt 2000; De Moor 1997, 174, who believes that in Ps. 68:14 too the rendering 'sheepfolds' is appropriate).

The meaning of the technical term שֵׁפְתַיִם in Ezek. 40:43 is as uncertain as it is controversial. This verse too has been a *crux interpretum* from antiquity (see section 5) to the present day. The

context is a description of a room in the neighbourhood of the north gate of the temple in Ezekiel's temple vision where sacrificial animals are slaughtered and washed (40:38-43). The vast majority of commentators agrees that the present sequence of cola in vv. 42-43 is illogical. It is thought that on the tables (שְׁלֶחָנוֹת) not both the slaughtering instruments (הַכְּלִיִּים) and the flesh of victims (43b) can have been laid. Moreover, the function of the שְׁפָתַיִם in v. 43a is missing in \mathfrak{M} and v. 43a breaks off rather abruptly at אֶלְיָהֶם. It seems most natural to relate v. 43b and v. 42a, and to reverse the order so that on both sides of the building concerned (בַּבַּיִת קְרִיב קְרִיב) the שְׁפָתַיִם are attached (מוֹקְנִים, Ho. part, v. 43a). They are assumed to serve for storing the slaughtering instruments (v. 42b, cf. Gese 1957; Zimmerli 1969; Block 1998). Following various ancient versions (cf. section 5), scholars render שְׁפָתַיִם as 'hooks, pegs' or 'ledges, shelves'.

However, no lucid explanation for the text in its present form has been given. Is it necessary to emend it so drastically as has been proposed? First of all, it should be observed that the emendation into a plural, proposed by *BHS* and others, does not recommend itself. Since adjectives do not have a dual, it is normal in Hebrew that מוֹקְנִים is in the plural (cf. Waltke & O'Connor 1990; Gibson 1994). Furthermore it is illuminating to study the evidence from Egypt with regard to the tools and furniture used by butchers in antiquity (cf. Ikram 1995; Curtis, *AFT*, 165-73), because this seems to prove that the text of Ezek. 40:42-43 is perfectly acceptable as it stands. In view of their small dimensions, the 'tables' of Ezek. 40:41-43 are rather the slaughtering blocks which in Egypt too could be of both wood and hewn stone, often used simultaneously in the same chamber. The problematic אֶלְיָהֶם simply means that the stone slabs which were only one cubit high (v. 42b) were on four of the tables mentioned in v. 41 (cf. v. 41b אֶלְיָהֶם; such a stone slab is lying on the slaughtering block in a miniature model of an ancient Egyptian butcher's shop, *LÄ*, Bd. 1, 1081-2). Since the slaughtering instruments, mostly knives and scrapers, were used on these blocks, there is no valid reason to assume that they could not be lying on these 'tables' when not in use (v. 42b). The שְׁפָתַיִם which were fastened all around in

the building (v. 43) can only be the sacks in which the butchers used to suspend joints of meat for drying (Darby *et al.* 1977, 153, Fig. 3.41; Ikram 1994: 77, Fig. 16; 82-83, with Fig. 17; 85, Fig. 18; Curtis, *textitAFT*, 170-2). Apparently the fabric served to keep away flies. The circumstance that they were only one hand-breadth (טַפַּח אֶקֶד) wide in the case of Ezekiel's temple (v. 43a) can be explained on the basis of the Egyptian practice to hang out long, narrow strips of meat for drying, somewhat resembling the South African 'biltong' (cf. Ikram 1995). The sacks sometimes had a tapering shape to accommodate the shape of the cut, not unlike the European custom to sell hams in a tapering sack or net.

2b. Figurative Use

Not attested.

3. Epigraphic Hebrew

Not attested.

4. Cognates

On the basis of Ugaritic and Arabic the Semitic root can be determined as *tpd* 'to put one thing on another'. This root may have developed into שַׁפַּת in biblical Hebrew under the influence of nouns like אֲשַׁפְּתוֹת (Lam. 4:5) and שַׁפְּתִים (Ezek. 40:43; Ps. 68:13) which suggest the development **ašpadtu* > **ašpatt* > **ašpat* and **šapadtu* > **šapatt* > **šapat* (cf. *SLOCG*, § 27.3; Joüon & Muraoka, *GBH*, §§ 100b and 181).

Klein, *CEDHL*, 394, 677, hesitates between 'dual ash heaps', 'sheepfolds', and 'hook-shaped pegs', but accepts the derivation from שַׁפַּת.

UGARITIC: The word occurs as *mtpdm*, a metaphor for 'folded layers' of rock (Del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín, *DLU*, 605-6). Also the verb *tpd* G 'to place one thing on another' is attested (cf. Del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín, *DLU*, 925).

POSTBIBLICAL HEBREW: As the context betrays, שַׁפְּתִים 'border-mounds' (?) and שַׁפַּת 'to place, pile' (Jastrow, *DTT*, 1620) have apparently been borrowed from Biblical Hebrew.

CLASSICAL ARABIC: Kazimirski, *DAF*, t. 1, 226: *taffada* ...

‘Doubler, garnir en dedans une cuirasse de drap’; *tafāfid* ‘1. Nua-ges blancs qui s’amoncèlent et chevauchent les uns sur les autres. 2. Doublure, pièces de drap dont on garnit en dedans. 3. Choses cachées sous d’autres’; *matāfidu Voy. le précéd.* 2.’ Similarly Freytag, *LAL*, t. 1, 220. So the basic meaning in Arabic seems to be ‘to fold one side over the other, make double, provide with a lining’, from which developed ‘to pile, pack (said of cumulus)’, ‘to hide one thing under another’.

5. Ancient Versions

⊖ and other Greek versions:

⊖:

Gen. 49:14 ⊖ and α’: ἀνά μέσον τῶν κλήρων, ‘in the middle of the inheritances’ (*GELS-L*, 258). ἄλλος: λιβάδων, ‘streams, pools’ (*LSJ*, 1047); σ’ ἀνά μέσον τῶν γειτόνων, ‘in the middle of the neighbours’ (*LSJ*, 341). Graeco-Venetus: ἀνά τὰ ἡμιφόρτια ‘to the half-packs’.

Judg. 5:16 ⊖^A simply transcribes the Hebrew: μσοφαθαιμ. ⊖^B has ἀνά μέσον τῆς διγομίας, ‘in the middle of the double burden’ (*GELS-L*, 258; *LSJ*, 960). α’ ἀνά μέσον τῶν κλήρων. σ’ ἀνά μέσον τῶν μεταιχιμίων, ‘in the middle of the frontiers’. ἄλλος: ἐν μέσῳ χειλέων, ‘in the middle of ‘lips’ (rims)’ (*GELS-L*, 1982).

⊖:

Ps. 68 [67]:14 ⊖ ἀνά μέσον τῶν κλήρων, as in Gen. 49:14.

Ezek. 40:43 ⊖ γεῖσος ‘cornice, coping’ (*GELS-L*, 87; *LSJ*, 341. α’ ἐπιστάσεις ‘stoppers (?)’.

ω^T: The basic text J has בין כרניה ‘among the nations’ (Tal, *DSA*, 411). Some other manuscripts have לשונאיה or לשונאיה, apparently etymologizing with Hebrew שֶׁפֶּט ‘tongue’, also ‘language’. Manuscript A has בספיואיה, probably with the same meaning (Tal, *DSA*, 445, 693).

⊖:

Gen. 49:14: ⊖^O has a double translation: אחסנתיה בין תחומיא ‘his inheritance between the borders’. ⊖^N ביני תרין תחומיא ‘between two borders’ (so also some other Palestinian targums). ⊖^{PsJ} ביני תחומי אחוי ‘between the borders of his brothers’.

Judg. 5:16 בין תחומיא ‘between the borders’. A variant reading has

אורחא בפרשת אורחא ‘at a cross-road’, cf. Smelik 1995.

שַׁפְתָּיִם:

Ezek. 40:43 עונקלין, a Greek loanword (ὄγκινος or ἀγκάλη), not ‘eine mit Widerhaken versehene Stange’ (so Levy, *CWT*, Bd. 2, 230), but rather ‘hook, rack’ (Jastrow, *DTT*, 30). No doubt this was based on the iron ‘hooks’ of m. Midd. 3:5, a passage, however, which bears a hypothetical character itself.

Ps. 68:14 קילקלהא ביני ‘between dunghills’ (Jastrow, *DTT*, 1368; Dalman, *ANHT*, 377).

s: מִשְׁפָּתָיִם:

Gen. 49:14 *bêt šbîlê* ‘between roads’.

Judg. 5:16 *baynat šbūlayyā* ‘between the roads’.

שַׁפְתָּיִם:

Ezek. 40:43 *šēṗwāthōn* ‘and their rims, ledges’, cf. Payne Smith (Margoliouth), *CSD*, 385.

Ps. 68:14 *bêt špāyê* ‘between the clearings’, cf. Payne Smith (Margoliouth), *CSD*, 590; Brockelmann, *LS*, 794 ‘offensa’; Costaz, *DSF*, 376 ‘pierre d’achoppement, stumbling-block’.

ט: מִשְׁפָּתָיִם:

Gen. 49:14; Judg. 5:16 *terminus* ‘border, boundary’ (*LD*, 1859).

שַׁפְתָּיִם:

Ezek. 40:43 *et labia earum* ‘and their rims’.

Ps. 68:14 *in medios clerios*, after 6.

6. Judaic Sources

The words do not occur in Qumran, Ben Sira or rabbinic sources (see section 4 on the rare occurrence in Postbiblical Hebrew). Apparently these words became obsolete in later Hebrew.

7. Illustrations

A good drawing of the type of sack described above is found in Wilson, *PPSE*, vol. 2, 24, lower right corner (→ אֲמִתָּהָה). See also the photographs Avitzur, 189-91 and Bolen, *PLBL*, tb060503203.

8. Archaeological Remarks

[Will be added later on.]

9. Conclusion

The ancient versions are clearly at a loss how to interpret מִשְׁפָּתִים and שְׁפָתִים, words that apparently had become obsolete by the time the translators started their work. On the basis of context, etymology and iconography it may be assumed that מִשְׁפָּתִים and שְׁפָתִים designated objects made of fabric folded in two and stitched together at the edges to form a sack (→ אֲמִתָּה). As such it could designate a sack to dry freshly slaughtered and washed meat (Ezek. 40:43). Two or more such folded sacks could be connected and hung over the back of a donkey as a ‘donkey-pack’ (Gen. 49:14). Very few versions seem to have preserved a vague notion of this meaning, viz. Ⓞ^B , which translates ‘in the middle of the double burden’ in Judg. 5:16, and the Graeco-Venetus rendering ‘to the half-packs’ in Gen. 49:14. In a metaphorical sense both words could designate a sheep-fold (Judg. 5:16; Ps. 68:14) whereas the equivalent in Ugaritic (*mtpdm*) became a metaphor for multiple layers of rock and the Arabic cognate could designate cloud-packs, cumulus.

Actually the English ‘fold’ underwent a similar semantic development. The verb denotes bending a thing over itself, or ‘double’. Then also ‘to undergo bending or curvature’, said of rock strata, and ‘to enclose, envelop’. As a noun, it may denote ‘a part doubled or laid over another part’, but also curved or undulating layers of rock (Merriam-Webster), and of course also the ‘(sheep)fold’ has survived, the enclosure in which sheep are driven from the grazing land via its wide V-shaped entrance.

10. Bibliography

Curtis, *AFT*, 165-73 – Albright 1950: W.F. Albright, ‘A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 68)’, *HUCA* 23 (1950-51), 22 – Dalman, *AuS*, Bd. 6, 283 – Avitzur, 189-91 – *BDB*, 1046: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘prob. fire-places or ash-heaps (viz. of the villages or encampments of the tribes)’; 1052: שְׁפָתִים ‘doubtful word: usu. hook-shaped pegs, hooks’ – Begg 1987: C. Begg, ‘The Messenger Dove in Ps 68,12-14’, *ETHL* 63 (1987), 117-8 – Block 1998: D.I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48* (NICOT), Grand Rapids 1998, 534 – *BRL*², 317 (hesitates to accept Eissfeldt’s

hypothesis) – *CEDHL*, 394, 677 – *CHALOT*, 221: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘the two saddle-bags (of pack-animal)’; 382: שְׁפָתִים ‘(rim) of slab? Ez. 40,43; (panniers or) saddle-bags Ps 68,14 (oth.: sheepfolds)’ – Crown 1967: A.D. Crown, ‘Judges V 15b-16’, *VT* 17 (1967), 240-2 – Darby *et al.* 1977: W.J. Darby *et al.*, *Food: The Gift of Osiris*, vol. 1, London 1977, 147, 152-3 – Alonso Schökel, *DBHE*, 443: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘Alforjas Gn 49,14; aprisco?’; 761: שְׁפָתִים ‘apricos ... repisas – *DCH*, vol. 5, 564-5: leaves all options open – De Hoop 1999: R. de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (OTS, 39), Leiden 1999 – De Moor 1981: J.C. de Moor, ‘Donkey-packs and Geology’, *UF* 13 (1981), 303-4 – De Moor 1985: J.C. de Moor, ‘Ugaritic Smalltalk’, *UF* 17 (1985), 221 – De Moor 1993: J.C. de Moor, ‘The Twelve Tribes in the Song of Deborah’, *VT* 43 (1993), 491, n. 33 – De Moor 1997: J.C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism* (BEthL, 91A), Leuven ²1997, 121, – Dercksen 2009: J.G. Dercksen, ‘Sattel’, *RLA*, Bd. 12, Lief. 1/2, Berlin 2009, 90-93 – Eissfeldt 1949: O. Eissfeldt, ‘Gabelhürden im Ostjordanland’, *FuF* 25 (1949), 8-10 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Bd. 3, Tübingen 1966, 61-6) – Eissfeldt 1954: O. Eissfeldt, ‘Noch einmal: Gabelhürden im Ostjordanland’, *FuF* 28 (1954), 54-6 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Bd. 3, Tübingen 1966, 67-70) – *FHAWAT*, 167: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘Sattelkörbe’; 293 שְׁפָתִים ‘Ez 40₄₃ Gabelhaken?; Abstellplatten?; Ps 68₁₄ Hürden?; Packsattel?’ – Flashar 1912: M. Flashar, ‘Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter’, *ZAW* 32 (1912), 183 – *GB*, 473: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘wahrsch. Viehhürden’; 859: שְׁפָתִים ‘Ps. 68,14: Hürden; Ez. 40,23 erklärt man gew.: gabelförmige Pflöcke’ – Gese 1957: H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40–48) traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BHTh, 25), Tübingen 1957, 158-60 – Gibson 1994: J.C.L. Gibson, *Davidson’s Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax*, Edinburgh 1994, § 42 – *HAHAT*, 761: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘Gabelhürde(n)’ – *HALAT*, 616: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘Sattelkörbe d. Packesels’; 151 שְׁפָתִים ‘Trotz des ug. bleibt das Wort mit seinen zwei verschiedenartigen Belegen unsicher: Rand, Abstellplatte, Gabelförmige Pflöcke, hürdenartige Pflöckreihen (am Tische), Gabelhaken’ – *HAWAT*, 255: מִשְׁפָּתִים ‘Hürden, wahrscheinlich wegen der zwei Hauptseiten in Dualform, durch die der betreffende Weideplatz von den beiden Nachbargrundstücken abgegrenzt wur-

de'; 524: שַׁפְתִּים 'Doppelgestelle, Hürden (Ps. 68, 14); Hürdenartige Pflöckreihen (um Tische), Hes. 40,43' – *HCHAT*, Bd. 1, 802: 'Hürde, d.h. offener Sommerstall'; Bd. 2, 492: 'Haken, in den Wänden, um geschlachtete Thiere daran zu hängen Ez. 40,43 ... Hürde Ps. 68,14' – Heck 1986: J.D. Heck, 'Issachar: Slave or Freeman?', *JETS* 29 (1986), 390-1 – Hogg 1927: J.E. Hogg, 'The Meaning of מִשְׁפָּתִים in Gen 49,14 and Judg 5,16', *AJSL* 43 (1926-27), 299-301 – Hossfeldt 2000: F.-L. Hossfeldt & E. Zenger, *Psalmen 51–100* (HThK.AT), Freiburg i.B. 2000, 253 – Ikram 1994: S. Ikram, *Choice Cuts: Meat Production in Ancient Egypt* (OLA, 69), Leuven 1994, 41-108 – Ikram 1995: S. Ikram, 'Did the Ancient Egyptians Eat Biltong?', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 5 (1995), 283-9 – *ISBE*, vol. 2, 326 – Isserlin 1971: B.S.J. Isserlin, 'Psalm 68, Verse 14: An Archaeological Gloss', *PEQ* 103 (1971), 5-8 – *KBL*, 580: מִשְׁפָּתִים 'die beiden Sattelkörbe ... both saddle-bags'; 1006: 'Abstellplatten (aus Stein? slabs? places where to set down things Hs. 40,43; Packsättel, pack-saddles Ps. 68,14' – Kraus 1989: H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen* (BK, 15/1). Neukirchen ⁶1989, 627 – *LHA*, 486: מִשְׁפָּתִים 'saeptum duplex, i.e. locus (caulae, castra, urbs) duplici saepto cinctus ideoque tutus, quietus'; 877: שַׁפְתִּים Winer, *LMHC*, 1019: מִשְׁפָּתִים 'stabula vel crates, caulae, quibus pecus noctu includitur'; שַׁפְתִּים: 'vulgo canales, stabula' – Macchi 1999: J.-D. Macchi, *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49* (OBO, 171), Fribourg 1999 – *MHH*, 680: מִשְׁפָּתִים, מִכְלֵאוֹת צֹאן, 1137: מִקוֹם הָאֵשׁ הַבוֹעֶרֶת – *NIDOT*, vol. 2, 1144 – Pehlke 1985: H. Pehlke, *An Exegetical and Theological Study of Genesis 49:1-28*, Ann Arbor 1985, 191-6 – Saarisalo 1927: A. Saarisalo, *The Boundary between Issachar and Naphtali: An Archaeological and Literary Study of Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, Helsinki 1927, 92 – Skinner 1930: J. Skinner, *Genesis* (ICC), Edinburgh 1930, 526 – Smelik 1995: W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OTS, 36), Leiden 1995, 459 – Gesenius & Roediger, *TPC*, 1472: מִשְׁפָּתִים: 'caulae pecorum palis septae'; שַׁפְתִּים 'paxillus bifidus' (Ezek. 40:43); caulae pecorum palis (et cratibus) constructae (Ps. 68:14) – Vlaardingerbroek 1973: J. Vlaardingerbroek, *Psalm 68*, Amsterdam 1973, 59-67 – Waltke & O'Connor 1990: B.K. Waltke & M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona

Lake 1990, § 14.2b – Zimmerli 1969: W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* (BK, 13/2), Neukirchen 1969, 1022 – Zobel 1965: H.J. Zobel, *Stammespruch und Geschichte* (BZAW, 95), Berlin 1965, 16.

Last update: 11-05-2011

H.G.L. PEELS