

THE CARTHAGINIAN *MAYUMAS*

*Robert M. Good*

A small number of Punic texts from Carthage reveal the celebration in that city of a religious festival designated *mayumas*<sup>1</sup>. The Punic texts are a welcome addition to the documentation of a festival that was widely celebrated in the ancient Mediterranean world<sup>2</sup>. They prove that the central activity in the festival was a movement of water and thereby confirm an inference drawn long ago<sup>3</sup>. The following remarks are intended to present the new documentation and to place the Carthaginian festival in its widest context.

The Punic texts are numbered according to CIS 270-275, 290, 4908, 4909. In each of these inscriptions the word *mayumas* either occurs or can be reliably restored. In all but one instance the word *mayumas* is spelled *my<sup>c</sup>ms*. In one instance, CIS 4908, the term is spelled *m<sup>c</sup>ms*. The word *mayumas* always occurs in a prepositional phrase, the fullest form of which is *lmy<sup>c</sup>ms<sup>c</sup> m qrthdšt*, "for the *mayumas* of the people of Carthage". The expression occurs at or near the end of each text. These are votive texts with the familiar introductory formulae, *lrbt ltnt pn b<sup>c</sup>l wl'dn lb<sup>c</sup>l ḥmn 'š ndr PN*, "for the Lady, for Tanit Face-of-Baal, and for the Lord, for Baal of the Amanus, that which so-and-so vowed".

None of the texts is dated. Various features of the inscriptions can be used to suggest their time of origin. The shapes of Carthaginian steles changed through time and may be used to indicate approximately the date a stele was made. The sculpted motifs associated with some of the inscriptions can also be located in a serial chronology. And changes in the forms of letters allow a

paleographically decided date. Brian Peckham has shown the sequence of letter forms<sup>4</sup>. The paucity of dated texts caused him to rely in part on stele shape and decoration in determining the paleographic series. As a result, paleographic evidence should be checked by stele shape and motif analysis. I leave to those specializing in their study the task of dating these texts in accordance with stele form and decoration. As a paleographic judgment, it can be said that CIS 270 is the oldest inscription of the series and that this text probably belongs to the last half of the fourth century B.C.E. The letter <sup>c</sup>ayin in this inscription seems from the photograph in CIS to be closed, and Peckham believes this characteristic of Carthaginian texts from the second century B.C.E.<sup>5</sup>. But this is also an archaic Punic letter shape, and other letters in CIS 270 show old features. The following should be noted. The letter bet sharply distinguishes shaft and tail. Its head is rather more triangular than rounded. Dallet has a full tail, inclining slightly to the left. The letter lamed resembles the fifth/fourth century form of the letter in CIS 5510. The letter mem seems to have a right shoulder, and this could point to the fourth century as well. The left side of the letter nun does not curve and is not of approximate size with the shaft of the letter. Again we are directed to the fourth century. For reasons which will become clear in the following discussion, it is unlikely that the text was inscribed prior to Alexander's conquests and the rise of Hellenism, and so a date in the latter part of the fourth century seems to be indicated for CIS 270. None of the remaining texts is older than CIS 270. They date to the third and second centuries, and cannot be later than the fall of Carthage in 146.

The word *mayumas* in these texts has been misinterpreted in a variety of ways. The absence of word dividers permits a reduction of the expression *lmy<sup>c</sup>ms* ("for the *mayumas*") into numerous hypothetical combinations of letters<sup>6</sup>. But letter arrangement has not been the greater source of error in interpreting the prepositional phrase. Most commonly the word *mayumas* has been analyzed as a noun with the form *miqta<sup>l</sup>*<sup>7</sup>. Analogous spellings have encouraged this, *miqdaš* spelled *myqdš* in a Neopunic text<sup>8</sup>, *mi<sup>c</sup>p<sup>c</sup>al* spelled similarly with a yod *my<sup>c</sup>p<sup>c</sup>l*

in a Punic inscription<sup>9</sup>. The supposed noun *\*mi<sup>c</sup>mas* is linked to the verb *<sup>c</sup>amas* ("to load, carry"). This results, depending on the scope allowed for semantic extension of "load", in a noun meaning "decree, command"<sup>10</sup>, "weight"<sup>11</sup>, or "election"<sup>12</sup>.

The unique spelling *m'<sup>c</sup>ms* opposes explaining the noun as a *miqṭal* formation, and so an alternative understanding of the noun must be found. Our proposal is to connect *my<sup>c</sup>ms/m'<sup>c</sup>ms* with the festival name *Mayumas*. The word *mayumas* occurs both in rabbinic and classical texts. Its etymology is unknown, and it has been suspected that the noun was Semitic in origin<sup>13</sup>. This suspicion can be confirmed by the Punic evidence. Punic *my<sup>c</sup>ms/m'<sup>c</sup>ms* appears to be a compound word. We believe its components to be the noun "water" (Punic *\*m*) and the verb "to be carried" (Punic *y<sup>c</sup>ms/'<sup>c</sup>ms*). Both components require comment in connection with the Greek form of the festival name, *μαῖουμας*.

We begin with the verb. In the noun *μαῖουμας* we can detect an element *ioumas* representing *yu<sup>c</sup>mas*, the y-passive infinitive of *<sup>c</sup>ms*. The Punic spelling *my<sup>c</sup>ms* betrays the verb in its etymologically correct form as *y<sup>c</sup>ms*. In the Punic spelling *m'<sup>c</sup>ms* we witness the transformation of the yiphil (yuphal) into an 'iphil ('uphal): *'<sup>c</sup>ms*. There are reliable analogies in Punic to this transformation<sup>14</sup>. Since the Punic yiphil corresponds to the hipil of Hebrew, we may compare the Hebrew hipil of *<sup>c</sup>amas* for the meaning of the verb *yu<sup>c</sup>mas*. Hebrew *he<sup>c</sup>mās* means "to load, carry". Accordingly, we may translate the passive verb *yu<sup>c</sup>mas* as "to be loaded, carried" or the like.

It remains to comment on the noun "water". In the spellings *my<sup>c</sup>ms/m'<sup>c</sup>ms* the noun seems to be represented by the consonant *m*. In *μαῖουμας* the term is to be identified as either *ma-* or *mai*. To my knowledge, the noun "water" is attested nowhere else in Phoenician and Punic. The parent form of the Phoenician/Punic noun can be reconstructed as *may-*. Since diphthongs ordinarily monophthongize in Phoenician and Punic, we would expect the noun "water" to have the form *mē*, and not *ma* or *mai*. Yet there is a consideration that justifies our understanding *ma* or *mai* to be the noun "water": a geminated *y* will not monophthongize, and in a compound word *may-yu<sup>c</sup>mas* (*mayyu<sup>c</sup>mas*) the consonant *y* is

doubled. We shall see momentarily that the noun *mayumas* is in fact a compound word. We may leave open the possibility that the noun  $m'^c_{ms}$  was vocalized  $m\hat{e}'u^c_{mas}$ , but the correspondence between  $my^c_{ms}$  and *maloumas* seems clear, permitting us to assign the vocalisation  $mayyu^c_{mas}$  to the former and interpret it accordingly.

The word *mayumas* is thus composed of a noun (water) governed by a following infinitive (to be carried). The word order is awkward for Punic<sup>15</sup>, but the awkwardness is easily explained. As analyzed here, *mayumas* is shown to have congruent form and meaning identical with Greek *hydrophoria* (*hydro-phoria*, "water-movement"). *Mayumas* must be a calque of the Greek term (and so a compound word). Classical sources use the noun *hydrophoria* with various related meanings. As a neuter plural noun, *hydrophoria* denotes a festival. *Hydrophoria* can also signify the ritual portage of water. Either usage may lie behind the Punic calque, but since the noun *mayumas* ordinarily refers to a festival, another meaning of *hydrophoria* ("the office of the water carrier") is to be excluded from the process of word transmission. For the same reason we may not consider related terms to be the source of the Punic borrowing: *hydrophoros* ("carrying water"; "water carrier"); *hydrophoreō* ("to carry water"; "to serve as *hydrophoros*")<sup>16</sup>. *Mayumas* is thus a Semitic *terminus technicus* for rites of water movement, and by extension the name of the festival in which such rites were performed. But its Semitic pedigree can go back no further than the time at which it was translated from Greek *hydrophoria*, probably not before the dawn of the Hellenistic era. As we have seen, paleography is compatible with this conclusion.

*Mayumas* is a Punic or Phoenician compound word. Naturally, its meaning was not transparent to speakers of Greek and Latin. When the name of the festival entered the parlance of Greek- and Latin-speakers, it lost its literal meaning. Thereafter *mayumas* was no more than the name of a religious event. By the time of the Byzantine chronicler John Malalas (sixth century) the etymology of the festival name was unknown. John Malalas explained *mayumas* as the festival of *May*<sup>17</sup>. Other Greek, Latin, and rabbinic sources give no evid-

ence of comprehending the literal sense of the name. In rabbinic Hebrew, where the transparency of the word could have been partially retained, *mayumas* is spelled *myums*, without the etymologically vital <sup>c</sup>. The name must have entered Hebrew indirectly through Greek or Latin. Under these circumstances it cannot be assumed that the association of *mayumas* and rites of water movement was everywhere preserved. A study of *mayumas* materials thus encounters a first difficulty. The celebration called *mayumas* in one city may have been rather loosely related to the *mayumas* as celebrated elsewhere. The degree of relationship between any two instances of the *mayumas* will have been determined by the principles involved in labeling a festival *mayumas*. Festivals named for the month of their celebration are not likely to have a great deal in common.

There is a second difficulty confronting the study of the *mayumas*. Festivals which ought to be compared with the *mayumas* may or may not have been called *mayumas* in antiquity. *Hydrophoria* as a ritual or a festival is attested under other names in the ancient Mediterranean world. Rabbinic sources associate water movement with the Jewish celebration of Tabernacles, giving the name *šō'ēbā* to the *hydrophoria*<sup>18</sup>. It has been argued that the Jerusalem Talmud witnesses a Tyrian *hydrophoria* and calls the event *yārtā*<sup>19</sup>. The argument is etymological. Since the verb *yrd* can be supposed to have originally meant "to descend to water", a festival called *yārtā* may have involved descent to a source of water. The Tyrian *yārtā* was, according to the Jerusalem Talmud, an event with a religious character, and so the argument that connects this celebration with other festivals of water movement has some merit. The Jerusalem Talmud assigns another *yārtā* to Botna<sup>20</sup>. Writing in Greek, Lucian speaks of Hierapolis' rites as a moving of water (*hudōr pherein*) and so uses a phrase which stands ultimately behind the nominalization *hydrophoria*<sup>21</sup>. An Athenian *hydrophoria* is known<sup>22</sup>, as also a festival called *ta hydrophoria* in Aegina<sup>23</sup>. The Madeba map brings further complexities with its entry *bētomarseas hē k(ai) maioumas*, "Marzēāh-house, which is also *Mayumas*"<sup>24</sup>. Here a comparison (and thus comparability) of the *mayumas* with that institution named *marzēāh* is implicit. Clearly, the use of different names for rituals and festivals of water movement implies

nothing about the similarity of the variously named festivals.

The preceding discussion clarifies the problem of understanding the *mayumas*. The relevant source material is diffuse, and the bearing of one datum on another is not always certain. To set the Carthaginian *mayumas* in a comparative context therefore requires caution. There is an inherent danger of error in seeking to give a general profile of the festival on the basis of the available sources. We must accordingly speak of probabilities rather than actualities.

A transport of water was probably the central act at the *mayumas*, although in at least one case (*hydrophoria* at the Athenian Anthesteria) this ritual took a secondary place among cultic events. Lucian <sup>25</sup> and ethnographic reports from the eighteenth century<sup>26</sup> lead us to believe that the movement of water was accomplished by a host of celebrants who would travel to a source of water, draw and carry the water to a temple where the liquid would be poured out<sup>27</sup>. More than one source of water is attested - the Mediterranean Sea<sup>28</sup>, a spring <sup>29</sup> - and the meaning of this difference is unclear. Texts from Carthage designate the local *mayumas* as a popular celebration (*my<sup>c</sup>ms<sup>c</sup> m qrtḥdšt*), and this justifies the assumption that the Carthaginian festival involved a numerous body of participants. The Mediterranean Sea is immediately at hand for Carthage, and perhaps it offered a source of water for the festival.

The origin of the Carthaginian festival is uncertain. Since the name *mayumas* is a calque of Greek *hydrophoria*, it may be suspected that the festival itself was introduced from a Hellenistic source. However, the first occurrence in the Punic texts of the word *mayumas* need not be taken to mark the introduction of the named festival. It may indicate nothing more than an innovation in festival nomenclature, the festival itself being indigenous in part or in all.

Comparative evidence cannot reveal the origin of the Carthaginian festival, but it is suggestive. Festivals of water movement were common to the ancient Syro-Palestinian world, and this makes it seem likely that Carthage held such a festival as part of its Phoenician heritage. At least the extent of the

celebration (or the alleged celebration) of the *mayumas* and related festivals in the Semitic world - at <sup>C</sup>Ain Baki<sup>30</sup>, Tyre, Antioch, Gerasa<sup>31</sup>, Gaza, Ashkelon<sup>32</sup>, Jerusalem, Hierapolis, perhaps Homs on the Orontes River<sup>33</sup>, perhaps Baalbek<sup>34</sup>, perhaps Botna, and perhaps even Dura Europus<sup>35</sup> - requires explanation. By contrast, *hydrophoria* is only rarely encountered among Greek cults. If we disregard celebrations termed *mayumas* rather than *hydrophoria*, then to my knowledge *hydrophoria* is found only at Athens as part of the Anthesteria and at Aegina. According to Theopompous (fourth century B.C.E.), *hydrophoria* was the ritual accompaniment of the Deucalion flood myth<sup>36</sup>. Certainly the Deucalion myth came to Greece from the Semitic east<sup>37</sup>, and perhaps also the ritual. Be that as it may, rites of water movement are more securely attested outside of Greece than within.

It is nevertheless true that our documentation of the Syro-Palestinian *mayumas*, using the term to signify broadly any festival of water movement, does not antedate the Hellenistic era. This is the case despite occasional efforts to find earlier references to rites of water movement. Such rites are alleged for Late Bronze Age Ugarit on the authority of the myth-and-ritual text CTA 23 and the mythological narrative CTA 4<sup>38</sup>. According to this view, the former refers to the ritual filling of a flagon with water. The relevant passage reads:

*yqh il mšt<sup>c</sup> ltm*  
*mšt<sup>c</sup> ltm lriš agn (CTA 23:35-36)*

and can be translated:

El takes two ladelsful,  
 two ladelsful filling a flagon<sup>39</sup>.

But there are reasons to doubt this translation, and it may be better to understand the lines to mean:

El takes two torches,  
 two torches from the top of the flame<sup>40</sup>.

Understood in this way, the text cannot be referred to rites of *hydrophoria*. The second of the two Ugaritic texts declares unequivocally that the god Baal opened windows in his palace as rain sluices (CTA 4.7.15 ff.). It can be suppo-

sed that this is the myth standing alongside a ritual of water movement, but the supposition cannot be demonstrated and in fact seems unlikely.

There is a second fact relevant to the existence of ritual water movement at ancient Ugarit, but it proves to be equivocal as well. We have seen that the Madeba Map invites a comparison of the *mayumas* and the *marzēāḥ*. Texts from Ras Shamra attest the existence of the *marzēāḥ* in the Late Bronze Age<sup>41</sup>. Unfortunately, the character of this institution is not fully understood<sup>42</sup>, and as matters stand, there is no evidence to link water rites with the Ugaritic *marzēāḥ*.

From the foregoing it appears that there is some possibility of the practice of *hydrophoria* at ancient Ugarit but no positive evidence of the ritual. The same conclusion is reached when the evidence for rites of water movement in ancient Israel is examined. The Mishnah gives the earliest positive evidence of an Israelite *hydrophoria*, but this document was redacted ca. 200 C. E. and cannot be taken to witness directly the religious life of the Second Commonwealth. Nevertheless, not a few biblical scholars have found in the reports of Mishnah a warrant for filling out details in the course of the celebration of Sukkot for the period of the second temple, and form critics have even carried parts of Mishnah's scenario back to the cult of pre-Exilic Israel. This movement backwards in time fosters efforts to find corroborating evidence from the biblical literature and biblical archeology. A few biblical texts allegedly reflect the ritual movement of water<sup>43</sup>. Some of these record no more than the pouring of libations<sup>44</sup> ordinarily in battle reports. Such texts seem to have no connection with *hydrophoria*<sup>45</sup>. Others are too vague to bear the weight of proving the existence of a ritual unattested elsewhere<sup>46</sup>. Archeology does no better in confirming the practice. Avraham Biran has suggested that a tenth century installation excavated at Tell Dan with an apparatus for collecting liquids functioned in rites like those of Mishnah's *šō'ēbā*<sup>47</sup>. But this is altogether uncertain, and in sum it appears that a clear indication of ritual water movement is lacking for ancient Israel. To say this is not to offer a judgment of probability, but simply to observe that positive evidence for *hydrophoria* does not occur in our most ancient sources.

As a result of the failure of the Ugaritic and Israelite literatures to witness unambiguously rites of *hydrophoria*, it must be admitted that ritual water movement is not securely attested in pre-Hellenistic cults of the Near East. It therefore cannot be shown that appropriate water rites were native to the Phoenician homeland of Carthage's settlers, and the belief that Carthage celebrated the *mayumas* as part of its oriental heritage must rest a judgment of probability.

Even if this judgment is correct, it must be suspected that the outward forms of the Carthaginian celebration resembled those of other Hellenistic festivals. Most descriptions of the local *mayumas* celebrations give the festival the character of a mystery cult. Ludwig Venetianer has made illuminating comparisons of Mishnah's Sukkot and the Eleusinian mysteries<sup>48</sup>. Sukkot's nocturnal, lamp-lit processions recall those of Eleusis. Both recall those implied for Antioch's *mayumas*, here mentioned and explicitly called mysteries (*mysterion*) by John Malalas:

In the same manner [Commodus] designated for the nocturnal theatrical (?) festival (*skēnikē heortē*) celebrated every three years - it is the mystery of Dionysos and Aphrodite which is also called the *Mayumas* because it is celebrated in May, the month of Artemis - enough gold funds for lamps, candles, and other things needed for the festival of thirty days' pleasures<sup>49</sup>

John Malalas characterizes the Antiochene festival as *skēnikē*. This has always been taken to mean "theatrical". In October, 399, the emperors Arcadius and Honorius condemned the *mayumas* and referred to it as a *spectaculum*<sup>50</sup>. Near Eastern archeology has furnished numerous examples of religious theaters<sup>51</sup>. Those used for mysteries had special architectural characteristics<sup>52</sup>, and on the surface it is sensible to interpret Malalas' *skēnikē* as "theatrical". But *skēnikē* means "theatrical" in connection with the players' tent (*skēnē*), and it is interesting to note that rabbinic sources connect festivities related to the *mayumas* with tents in various ways. Mishnah's Sukkot (LXX: *heortē skēnōn*) featured rites of water movement, as we have already observed. A mishraic tradition treated the sin at Shittim in an Israelite tent (*qubbā*; Nu 25: 1 ff.) as

a *marzēāh* affair<sup>53</sup>, and the Madeba Map seems to label the location of that affair a *mayumas*.

The particular sin at Shittim was sexual, and whether or not the *mayumas* was a theatrical mystery, this fact harmonizes with the generally licentious character of the event. John Malalas labelled the Antiochene festival the orgies of Dionysos and Aphrodite. A *mayumas* celebrated at Gerasa was remembered as "most enjoyable" (*chariestatos*)<sup>54</sup>. The decrees of Arcadius and Honorius know the *mayumas* as a licentious affair. The Athenian Anthesteria with its *hydrophoria* sported a *hieros gamos*<sup>55</sup>. *Mīmās*, the Arabic form of the word *mayumas*, was used for a place of pleasure and outrageous sexual behavior<sup>56</sup>. Sexual liberties can even be inferred for Sukkot. Tradition records that the separation of male and female worshippers in Judaism originated in an effort to subdue what is euphemistically called the lightheadedness (*qallūt rō'š*) of those celebrating Tabernacles<sup>57</sup>. It is noteworthy that the Carthaginian *mayumas* was a festival of the goddess Tanit and her consort Baal of the Amanus. This perhaps allows the inference of some form of sexuality for the event.

To summarize the evidence relating to the external form of the *mayumas*: The festival featured a collective transport of water from a source to a sanctuary, possibly in connection with sexual rites, and perhaps in the context of a theatrical mystery.

If we turn from the external form of the Carthaginian *mayumas* to consider its religious significance, we find ourselves on very uncertain ground. The presence of formally similar rituals in more than one setting does not imply that the same or similar meanings were ascribed to those rituals in their individual settings, and at most we may speak of recurring concerns associated with festivals of water transport. One such concern was a desire to regulate the involvement of the dead in the world of the living. At Athens, *hydrophoria* belonged to the Anthesteria. There is reason to associate this festival with a cult of the dead<sup>58</sup>, and there is every reason to associate the *marzēāh* with comparable concerns<sup>59</sup>. In Augustine's day a cult of the dead was firmly entrenched in the Carthaginian countryside<sup>60</sup>, and we may assume it to have

been in place much earlier. So it is possible that the *mayumas* at ancient Carthage held a place for the departed, but by no means certain that it did.

A second concern for water movement festivals is registered by both Lucian and Theopompous. They connect *hydrophoria* with the flood myth. But the ancient association of flood myth and *mayumas* is not altogether natural. At Carthage, Tanit and Baal of the Amanus were principals in the festival. Their conjoint significance is not easily located in the flood, and we may be on firmer ground turning to a recollected interpretation of *hydrophoria* from eighteenth century Tyre. Those participating in this version of the *mayumas* understood the festivities to celebrate the wedding of sea and land<sup>61</sup>. Rabbinic tradition gives a similar interpretation to *šō'ēbā* when it makes the transport and pouring out of water the union of supernal and infernal waters<sup>62</sup>. A sacred marriage was central to the Athenian Anthesteria. The purpose of a cosmic marriage was quite clearly the promotion of fertility on earth, and it is here in the realm of fertility cults that some of the evidence concerning the character and purpose of the *mayumas* converges. The very act of pouring out water has suggested to most interpreters a rite of sympathetic magic designed to inaugurate life-giving rains. Thus Sukkot occurs in the autumn and coincides with the critical start of winter rains. The Anthesteria was no less a fertility cult. The fragmentary documentation of the Ugaritic *marzēāḥ* compels the assumption that it, too, concerned issues of fertility. Possible mortuary associations with the *mayumas* are easily accommodated to the view that it was a fertility festival. In the history of religions the idea that the departed play a role in the fertility of the living is unexceptional. It may be, then, that the Carthaginian *mayumas* was a fertility festival.

But all this must remain uncertain, at least for the present. The evidence for describing the form and function of the Carthaginian festival is entirely comparative, and while a comparison of the diffuse data bearing on the *mayumas* brings to light recurring patterns of associated practices (water movement, sacred marriage) and beliefs about the significance of those practices (for the promotion of fertility, in solidarity with the departed), patterns

are no more than an abstraction from observed data. They are not a tool for prediction. It is perhaps not too much to hope that future epigraphic find will shed further light on the Carthaginian festival and allow a description of the event which is more positive and less probabilistic.

- 
- 1) The spelling *mayumas* is used for convenience. For the etymology of the word, see below.
  - 2) The most recent discussion of the *mayumas* are Y. Hajjar, *La triade d'Héliopolis-Baalbek*, Leiden 1977, 56-59, 437, 520; M.H. Pope, *Song of Songs*, (Anchor Bible), Garden City, New York 1977, 218; Id., *A Divine Banquet at Ugarit*, in James M. Efron (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and other Essays: Studies in Honor of William F. Stinespring*, Durham, North Carolina, 1972, 191-92; D. Bryan, *Texts Relating to the Marzeah: A Study of an Ancient Semitic Institution* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation; Johns Hopkins University), 1973, 34-67; Y. Kutscher, *Words and their History* (in Hebrew), Jerusalem 1965, 167-71. See in addition G. Hölscher, *Maiuma*: PW, XIV, 610; K. Preisendanz, F. Jacoby and G. Hölscher, *Maiumas*: PW, XIV, 610-613; G. Goossens, *Hiérapolis de Syrie*, Louvain 1943, 69 ff. The present study emerges in part from the writer's doctoral dissertation, *The Sheep of his Pasture: A Study of the Hebrew Noun <sup>C</sup>am and its Semitic Cognates* (Yale University, 1980), and in part from a communication to the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society, 1981. I am particularly grateful for helpful criticism offered by my colleague at Brown University, Professor Horst Moehring.
  - 3) G. Hoffmann, *Aramäische Inschriften aus Nêrab bei Aleppo. Neue und alte Götter*: ZA, 11 (1896), 241, 246; I. Levy, *Cultes et rites syriens dans le Talmud*: REJ, 43 (1901), 192-95 (hereafter cited as *Cultes*); R. Mousterde, *Cultes antiques de la Coelésyrie et de l'Hermon*: MUSJ, 36 (1959), 73. Hoffmann evidently first proposed seeing water rites in the *mayumas* in an article for the 1873 Kieler Festschrift for Olhausen, a work not accessible to me. The proposal has not rested on a correct understanding of the etymology of the festival name.
  - 4) B. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts*, Cambridge 1968, 191 ff.
  - 5) *Ibid.*, 214-15.
  - 6) *lm-y<sup>C</sup>ms*, "may (the people) not remove", Hoffmann apud Z. Harris, *A Grammar*

- of the Phoenician Language, New Haven 1936, 115; *lm-y<sup>c</sup>ms*, "pour qu'ils n'enlèvent pas": J. Février, *Vir sidonius: Semitica*, 4 (1951-1952), 18.
- 7) Thus CIS; Février, *Vir sidonius*, 18; M. Sznycer, L'"Assemblée du peuple" dans les cités puniques d'après les témoignages épigraphiques: *Semitica*, 25 (1975), 56-59; evidently also A. van den Branden, *Le 'š šdn*: *BiOr*, 36 (1979), 157.
  - 8) KAI, 161:1.
  - 9) CIS, 5522:2-3.
  - 10) Sznycer, L'"Assemblée", 56-59; CIS.
  - 11) Février, *Vir sidonius*, 18.
  - 12) van den Branden, 'š šdn, 157.
  - 13) Jacoby: PW, XIV, 612-613.
  - 14) S. Segert, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*, München 1976, 72.
  - 15) I am indebted to Professor Marvin Pope for this observation.
  - 16) The Greek lexical data are found in H. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1901<sup>8</sup>, 1598.
  - 17) John Malalas, *Chronographia* (ed. B. Niebuhr), Bonn 1831, 284-285 (= § 373).
  - 18) For the documentation, see R. Patai, *The "Control of Rain" in Ancient Palestine*: *HUCA*, 14 (1939), 258-59; Id., *Man and Temple*, New York 1967, 24 ff. The form šō'ēbā is not consistently attested. For variations of the name, see Y. Epstein, *On the Talmudic Lexicon* (in Hebrew): *Tarbiz*, 1/3 (1930), 135-36.
  - 19) *Aboda Zara* I, 4 (39b), and see Lévy, *Cultes*, 195.
  - 20) *Aboda Zara* I, 4 (39b), and Lévy, *Cultes*, 197-99.
  - 21) Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, 33.
  - 22) P. Stengel, *Hydrophoria*: PW, IX, 86-87.
  - 23) Scholiast to Pindar, *Nemea*, V 81; Suidas, s.v. *hydrophoria*.
  - 24) W. Bacher, *Zur Mosaikkarte von Madaba*: *JQR*, 13 (1900), 322-23; A. Büchler, *Une localité énigmatique mentionnée sur la mosaïque de Madaba*: *REJ*, 42 (1901), 125-28; O. Eissfeldt, *Etymologische und archäologische Erklärung alttestamentlicher Wörter*: *OA*, 5 (1966), 165 ff.; H. Donner, *Mitteilungen zur Topographie des Ostjordanlandes anhand der Mosaikkarte von Madaba*: *ZDPV*, 98 (1982), 181-83.
  - 25) Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, 13.
  - 26) Lévy, *Cultes*, 195.

- 27) Our ancient sources do not make a clear division of this ritual process into its significant parts: descent to water; drawing of water; transport of water; pouring of water. Etymologically, the names for the process designate a privileged part of the totality: drawing of water (*šō'ēbā*); transport of water (*hydrophoria*, *mayumas*); descent to the water (*yārtd*).
- 28) *De Dea Syria*, 13, where Lucian seems to imply sending to the sea for water. It has been debated whether the rites of Hierapolis actually entailed travel to the Mediterranean or whether some other source of water served the occasion. For pre-modern Tyre and the use of the Mediterranean Sea, Lévy, *Cultes*, 195.
- 29) Patai, *Man and Temple*, 24 ff.
- 30) *Babylonian Talmud*, *Aboda Zara* 11b; Lévy, *Cultes*, 192-94.
- 31) C. Welles, *The Inscriptions*, in K. Kraeling (ed.), *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis*, New Haven 1938, 470-71; Bryan, *The Marzeah*, 52 ff.
- 32) Gaza and Ashkelon, see Hölscher, *Maiuma*. Although *mayuma* denotes a harbor installation, the name seems to have some connection ultimately with the site of the ritual/festival.
- 33) Arabic sources locate a *mīmās* at or near Homs; for a *dayr mīmas* referring to an ale house/monastery, see P. Peeters, *La passion de S. Pierre de Capitolias: Analecta Bollandiana*, 57 (1939), 324-28. See in addition J. Wellhausen, *Die Namen des Orontes: ZDMG*, 60 (1906), 245-46.
- 34) Note Lévy's effort to equate Ein Baki and Baalbek, *Cultes*, 192-95; Mouterde, *Coelésyrie*, 73; cf. Hajjar, *Triade*, 56-59.
- 35) This has been suggested, without evidence, by du Mesnil du Buisson, *L'éten-dard d'Atargatis et Hadad à Doura-Europus ou la déesse Sēmia: Revue des Arts Asiatiques*, 11 (1937), 84.
- 36) Stengel, *Hydrophoria*; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932, 113.
- 37) G. S. Kirk, *Myth: Its Meaning and Function in Ancient and Other Cultures*, Berkeley, Univ. of California, 1970, 116.
- 38) S.H. Hooke, *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual*, London 1938, 35, 42; R. Dussaud, *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien Testament*, Paris 1941, 127; Goossens, *Hiéropolis*, 71.
- 39) For this translation, see F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, Cambridge 1973, 22. Cross does not argue for the ritual interpretation of the text.
- 40) Cf. M.H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, Leiden 1955 (= VTS, 2), 80-81.
- 41) See R. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature*, Cambridge 1972, 433, s.v. *mrzḥ*.
- 42) See Eissfeldt, *Erklärung alttestamentlicher Wörter*, 166-70; Id., *Kultvereine*

- in Ugarit: U 6, 187-95; Pope, *Divine Banquet at Ugarit*, 190-94; C. L'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods*, Missoula, Montana, 1979, 206-212; Bryan, *The Marzeah*.
- 43) Isa 12:3; I Sam 7:6; II Sam 23:16; Zech 14:7. See S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, Nashville 1962, 120-23.
- 44) I Sam 7:6; II Sam 23:16.
- 45) That is to say, the full process described above is not in evidence.
- 46) Thus Isa 12:3 and Zech 14:7. But it must be admitted that the latter connects Tabernacles and rain production, and *hydrophoria* is plausibly interpreted as a rain charm (see below).
- 47) Biran made this suggestion in a public lecture to the annual meeting of the American Schools of Oriental Research, November 7, 1980. In publication of the installation he has refrained from pressing this interpretation: Biran, *Two discoveries at Tel Dan*: IEJ, 30 (1980), 91-98; cf. O. Borowski, *A Note on the "Iron Age Cult Installation" at Tel Dan*: IEJ, 32 (1982), 58; L. Stager and S. Wolff, *Production and Commerce in Temple Courtyards: An Olive Press in the Sacred Precinct at Tel Dan*: BASOR, 243 (1981), 95-102.
- 48) L. Venetianer, *Die eleusinischen Mysterien im jerusalemischen Tempel*, in A. Brüll, *Populärwissenschaftliche Monatsblätter*, 17 (1897), 121-25, 169-181. Contrast the review by H. Hubert: REJ, 36 (1898), 317-18.
- 49) J. Malalas, *Chronologia*, 284-85.
- 50) T. Mommsen and P. Myer (eds), *Theodosiani Libri XVI*, I, 820; Bryan, *The Marzeah*, 37-38.
- 51) E. Frézouls, *Les théâtres romains de Syrie: Annales archéologiques de Syrie*, 2 (1952), 46-100.
- 52) Ch. Picard, *Le théâtre des mystères de Cybèles-Attis à Vienne (Isère), et les théâtres pour représentations sacrées à travers le monde méditerranéen*: CRAIBL, 1955, 229-48.
- 53) Sifre Num 131.
- 54) Welles, *The Inscriptions*, 470-71; Bryan, *The Marzeah*, 52.
- 55) Deubner, *Attische Feste*, 112-13.
- 56) *Kit. al-Aqhani*, XV, 146.
- 57) Patai, *Man and Temple*, 27.
- 58) Deubner, 112-13.
- 59) Pope, *Divine Banquet at Ugarit*, 172, *passim*; Id., *Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit*, in M. de J. Ellis (ed.), *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, Hamden, 1977, 164 ff.; contrast C. L'Heureux, *Rank among the Gods*, 206-212.

- 60) P. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop*, New York 1961, 517 ff.
- 61) Lévy, *Cultes*, 195.
- 62) Patai, *Control of Rain*, 258 ff.