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Abstract

The cardinal study on the topic of pig eating in the Ancient Near East, is the work of Billie Jean Collins (2006). She focused basically on the issue as it relates to the Hittite cuneiform texts but did also probe sideways to other nations and the Bible, albeit minor comments. This study wishes to stand on the shoulders of Collins, adjusting some statements, adding other aspects from Archaeological sites and Gerhard Hasel’s explanation of Clean and Unclean in Leviticus 11. What was found in this presentation, is that chronology as backbone in the Scriptures, if taken seriously, could explain the presence or absence of pig eating practices also among the Hittites and Egyptians (the New Kingdom). This research has investigated Collins’ contribution of Hittite and Pig Consumption, Pigs in Hittite archaeology, Pigs in Egypt, Pigs in Mesopotamia, Pigs in Zoo-archaeology at Hesban in Transjordan, Pigs at Sites in Canaan, Pigs as Offerings in Hittite Rituals, Pig Taboo Rules in the Ancient Near East, Pigs as Medical Use in Mesopotamia, Pig Taboo in the Old Testament by Ackerman (1992) and Collins (2006), Pig Taboo among Later Greeks, Pig Taboo in the Old Testament by Gerhard Hasel (1991, 1994). Whereas the other Nations around Israel display an S-curve or down-trend and up-trend in the appearance and disappearance of evidence for the taboo against pig-eating, among the Israelites it was a straight line unchanged. For that matter, the sojourn in Egypt, the Exodus from Egypt, the presence in Assyria, the presence in Babylonia or Egypt later during the exiles and Persian periods, should be taken into consideration for observations from cuneiform texts, from papyri or pyramid texts or from the travel descriptions of Herodotus. The biblical reality of Israelites living in these domains under consideration and the evidence or absence of taboos against pig-eating from the same areas and times, necessitate re-evaluations of the data.

Introduction

Mary Parsons in her notes on pig-eating in Ancient Egypt made the comment that she is not aware that the Ancient Egyptians knew about *trichinelllosis*.1

1 *Trichinella* is a disease that is connected to eating raw or undercooked pork or pig. Although frozen pork reduces the danger of this disease, there is no guarantee that smoking, freezing, microwaving, or cooking pork or pig will effectively prevent...
Porphyry in 245 CE gave examples of vegetarian nations and he included the Egyptians, Jews, Syrians, Persians, and Indians. However, if one looks at the statements of Herodotus in 480 BCE about the Egyptians, we get a totally different picture. An ugly ditch exists between Herodotus and Porphyry and Porphyry’s perceptions are colored by sources and Stoic biases and ideals of his time. Archaeology can reveal valuable aspects to the diet and the eating of pig among nations of the Ancient East. Among the nations, it appears that vegetarianism was regarded as an idyllic diet and one can see also in Genesis 1 and 2 that the original diet was vegetarian. Although there were the broad classifications of flesh as opposed to non-flesh diets, it is especially the pig-diet that deserves our attention here, since Leviticus 11 and throughout scripture, pig eating was divinely prohibited. Archaeology and cuneiform tablets have brought us more data to consider regarding this topic. We wish to look at pig-eating in Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Canaan, Transjordan, Egypt, among the Greeks and finally also in the Old Testament.

**Hittites and Pig Consumption**

Pig consumption among the Hittites was governed by a complex set of principles and the determiners were factors like status, gender, and the level of cultic influence from the religious sanctuaries. (Billie Jean Collins, “Pigs at the Gate: Hittite Sacrifice in its Eastern Mediterranean context” JANER 6 [Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2006]: 155-187; also available online—www.brill.nl). For anyone working with the concepts of pigs in the Ancient Near East, this scholar’s work is mandatory.

Whenever a few texts are making reference to the eating of pork, in Hittite texts, they are in a ritualized context, suggesting that special religious significance was sometimes attached to the eating of pork (Collins 2006: 155). That is one reason why she concluded in one of her articles, that the consumption of pork in Hittite Anatolia “is unlikely to have been a simple matter of geography or ethnicity, but was governed by a complex set of principles involving determiners like status, gender, and the level of cultic influence from religious sanctuaries.”

Looking at other text in cultures surrounding the Hittites, Collins concluded that the sacrifice of pigs in the Hittite culture was a private matter. She found that they were killed to ensure the wellbeing of the Hittite community and the fertility of humans and crops. There was a festival performed in Istanuwa and there may be a correlation, she thinks, between the practice to sacrifice a pig at the ratification of treaties. The pig was used as a substitute for human sacrifice (Collins 2006: 155).

There is a wide range of textual evidence for the use of pigs, and the Hittite attitude was seemingly ambivalent towards pigs.

In his Geography by Strabo (64/3 BCE-25 AD), he mentioned the story of Cleon, a thief who transgressed the sanctity of the sacred area in Comana in the Pontus in northern Anatolia by “consuming pig flesh on the premises” (Collins 2006: 156). Strabo then writes that the area “is most conspicuously free from the impurity of the eating of swine’s flesh; in fact, the city as a whole is free from it; and swine cannot even be brought into the city” (12.8.9) (Collins 2006: 156).

---

1. This observation will come up again later and we must repeat that Israel’s taboo against pig consumption was absolute and strictly connected to every Israeliite. Deviation from this taboo was not considered ever to be appropriate. The taboo is revelation connected and happens to be sensible science in modern times. Scavengers are not considered food.
What Collins must take into account utilizing Strabo, is that Jews were by this time all over Anatolia as well. That is a factor that constrains “Greek” attitudes towards pigs in later times. We are all aware of the role of Philo and Alexandrian Jews and Josephus during the same time as Strabo. Hellenism is not Classical Greek but Greek amalgamated and transformed by outside influences of which Jewish traditions are one, especially when it comes to pig taboos.

Collins states that the “pig enjoyed a relatively low status in Hittite society. It was considered unclean for all the same reasons that it was unclean elsewhere in the Near East, and the temple administrators were amply warned, “Neither pig nor dog is ever to cross the threshold (of the temple) . . . If a pig or dog does somehow force its way to the utensils of wood or clay that you have, and the kitchen worker does not throw it out, but gives to the gods to eat from an unclean vessel, to that one will the gods give excrement and urine to eat and drink” (CoS 1.83, §14). The complaint of the text is that the sound of pig is unpleasant² and that it lives in a sty.⁴

Mursili II (1345-1315 BCE) was troubled by Kaska tribesmen and in his prayer he refers to them as “swineherds and weavers of linen” (KUR URUG Ga-aš-ga na-at)²⁵. Collins thinks that they were women since Hittite culture was concerned to preserved masculinity (Collins 2006: 157). The period under consideration here coincide with the time of Ehud (1346-1266 BCE, Judges 3:30; 4:1).⁶ According to Beckman, it is not a reference to an occupational option within Hittite society and culture (Beckman 1988: 38).⁷

Urhi-Tesub (Mursili III), was imprisoned by his usurper, Hattusili III, “like a pig in a sty” (Apology §11; CoS 1.77).

Urhi-Tesub was the nephew of Hattusili III and he was taken from the throne and driven to Egypt. The period of Hattusili III (1289-1246 BCE) coincide with the time of Jabin’s Oppression (1266-1246 BCE) in Judges 4:3 and the beginning of the time of Deborah and Barak (1246-1206 BCE).⁵ Collins concluded that “pigs were best known to the inhabitants of the Hittite heartland as urban-dwellers, living among humans in villages and towns” (Collins 2006: 157).

**Infractions by Pigs on Holy Areas**

Pigs also came accidentally on the holy areas. In one example, Zullanni, the GUDUš-priest, failed to report a pig mounting an ass.⁹

In another case, the Temple brewer said: “My son died and I did not perform the rituals. I announced (my son’s death) solemnly in the temple. (Also:) A pig trespassed (lit. committed a sin), but I did not perform the ritual”¹⁰

---

¹Collins (2006: 157) listed KBo 12.96 i 12’ (CTH 433); KUB 14.1 rev. 92-94 (CTH 147). These are Hittite cuneiform texts.
⁶Van Wyk (2008): 262. One needs to keep in mind that the end of Egyptian colonialism in Canaan and adjacent areas almost to the Euphrates by the Habiru and religious Hebrews under Joshua between 1410-1405 BCE, was snowballing the takeover of the Minoans by the Mycenean culture at Crete and those areas, and also the takeover of the Hurrians by the Hittites. The cities like Ugarit, should be understood as commercial centers for refugees and migrants, some from Canaan, that found a new horizon staged in pluralism and syncretism after the long dominant Egyptian period. The Late Bronze cuneiform texts from Palestine also indicate a multi-national presence. Mosaic theology, including taboos against pig eating (Leviticus 11) was a source that was transformed into a product by mixing the cultures. Pure Hebrew theology was paganized at Ugarit as I suggest we have evidence of in the Baal cycle and other myths (Van Wyk 2008: 243). Correlations between phrases of the Pentateuch, Job (Mosaic), and some early hymns of the Psalms, with later Ugarit literature, should not surprise us. Israelites also secularized and migrated for business and other purposes in the days of the Judges. The surprising correlations between Hittite historiography and Israelite historiography that captivated my professor, Charles Fensham, should also be seen in this light.
⁷KUB 18.9 iii 7-9 (CTH 580; Beal 2002:21). Cf. ii 22’-23’ (see Collins 2006: 157).
Infractions on Gardens

The laws indicate that pigs were also a problem on gardens, field or grain-heap (§86; Hoffner 1997: 88, op. cit. Collins 2006: 157). Collins indicated that the environment in Anatolia is favorable for raising pigs, so that there would be no serious competition between man and animal here.

Value of Pigs Higher than Sheep and Lower than Cows

“The Hittite Laws set a replacement value of twelve shekels on an adult grain-fed pig (§81; Hoffner 1997:85), making it more valuable than sheep, although not as valuable as cattle” (Collins 2006: 157).

Value of Cereal Raised Pigs Were Half-price of Grain Fed Pigs

They were called “pigs of the courtyard” and were half-priced.

Value of Pig-fat was Extremely High in Anatolia

Hoffner indicated that pig-fat was extremely expensive in Anatolia (Hoffner 1995: 109). The reason is that the fat was used to make perfume and used for medical treatments.

“...with only a handful of sites reporting faunal remains over a significant period of time” (Collins 2006: 158).

Pigs, like dogs and other animals are scavengers that fulfill an essential role in the sanitation service of man (Collins 2006: 158).

Pigs Not Part of the Local Regulated Economy

De Martino found that pigs were not part of the laws that establish prices for commodities and Collins thinks that the likelihood is that pigs were not part of the integrated regional economy (De Martino 2004: 53; Collins 2006: 158).14

Pigs and Hittite Archaeology

Collins thinks that the picture presented by archaeology for evidence of pig exploitation in the Hittite period, is incomplete “with only a handful of sites reporting faunal remains over a significant period of time”.

a. Butchering marks on pig bones not evidence that they were eaten

Faunal analysts claim that the marks on the bones were evidence that they were eaten. Von den Driesch and Boessneck (1981: 12-13) claim that they are primarily leftovers from butchering and kitchen refuse based on the patterns of the cut marks on the bones. Collins argued that “the presence of cut marks on the bones only indicates that the animal was butchered; it is not evidence that lion or leopards—or pigs or that matter—were eaten”15 This is a very good point, since the meat from one animal can be used to feed scavengers whose existence in the area is useful and necessary.

b. A finding pig report is given by Collins:


“The findings of Zeder (1998:118) for third-millennium Tell Leilan indicated a dramatic difference in the quantity of pigs between the citadel and the lower city, where pigs constitute fifty percent of the faunal remains. Faunal evidence from the Hittite capital at Boghazköy suggests that, at least in the Late Bronze Age, the pig maintained its level of importance (von den Driesch and Boessneck 1981:48), which was, however, minor compared with sheep, goat, and cattle.

In the Empire period, domestic pig remains represent only 7 percent of the total faunal remains in the Lower City, while cattle are 36.6 percent and ovicaprids 50.6 percent (von den Driesch and Boessneck 1981:20).

Most of the published animal bones come from the quadrant J-K/20 in the residential section of the lower city, north of the Great Temple. In comparison, faunal remains recovered from the citadel were sparse, and were concentrated along its southern wall. Of the 190 animal bones recovered on the citadel, eleven were from domestic pigs (von den Driesch and Boessneck 1981:18).

On Büyükkaya, used primarily as a granary in the thirteenth century, but also possibly the site of some cultic activity, 16 pigs represent only 2.4 percent of the faunal remains compared with 5.4 percent in the Iron Age (von den Driesch and Pöllath 2003:295). The remains of three pigs were also found in the nearby cemetery at Osmankayaşı (Herre and Röhrs 1958:63, 70-71); the only other animals found at the cemetery were equids (13), dogs (6), sheep (3), and cattle (1). Unfortunately, we can only speculate as to why pigs were placed in the cemetery.

In the Hittite-period city of Kuşisakhi-Sarissa, pig bones were less frequent than at Boghazköy relative to other animals (von den Driesch and Vagedes 1997:125-26) and faunal specialists have identified subtle differences in the consumption patterns between elites and lower town occupants: In the residential area, pigs comprise 4.7 percent of remains compared with 3.5 percent on the Temple terrace (1997:130)” (Collins 2006: 158-159).

There is also the case of a “pig fetus found buried in a pit within the Hittite rock sanctuary at Yazılıkaya adjacent to Chamber B [Hauptman 1975:65-67], the funerary chamber for Tudhaliya IV, with its image of the Death-god carved in relief in the form of a dagger” (Collins 2006: 166).

c. Redding and Rosenberg thought that pigs are kept as subsistence insurance.16 (Also Collins 2006: 158 footnote 13).

d. Boessneck and Von den Driesch suggested that pigs were killed at Korucutepe in eastern Anatolia in the LB period in such a large number because of their “refined taste” (contra Collins 2006: 158 footnote 13).

Pigs in Egypt

It is said that Herodotus provides some misleading statements regarding food-practices among the ancient Egyptians. He said they did not eat beans but beans were found in tombs (Alcock 2006). He said that pig eating was taboo among the Egyptians. The priests were forbidden to eat pork (Alcock 2006) but pigs were kept on the farms in the New Kingdom according to tomb paintings. At Tell el-Amarna a large pig farm, pig bones cut with knives were found. Then again the Pharaoh of the time, Ikhnaton, was skew with his traditional Egyptian religion. At other villages in Egypt archaeologists have also found pig bones. Scholars are speculating that the unclean habits of pigs and that pig spoiled faster than other beets, may be the reason for the taboo (Alcock 2006). It is indicated that wild pigs (sus scrofa) were known in Egypt and Marie Parson indicated from her sources that they were known in the Nile Valley, in the Delta, the Fairyum and the Wadi Natrun. Some scholars think that pigs were rarely offered to gods. Archaeologically, pigs were abundant in areas associated with the working class or peasant-related activities, especially in the New Kingdom (Hecker 1982:62; 1984; Brewer 2002:440-42; Collins 2006: 161).

Brewer is of the opinion that pig avoidance in Egypt is based upon definitions according to social classes and particular times of the year (Brewer 2002: 443).

---

In the time of Nefertiti it is said: “Look, maidservants [. . . ] are offering pigs”. In the Book of the Dead, pigs were offered. Scholars think that the god Ammut was sometimes depicted as a pig personifying Nut. There were pig sacrifices to Osiris. Also Seth was in the shape of a pig. Herodotus (370 BCE) said that when they touched a pig they washed their clothes. By the time Herodotus visited Egypt, a large number of Jews were colonized in that area and even had a temple at Elephantine. The point is that the customs attached to Egyptians by Herodotus may have been by Egyptian speaking Jews. In the Middle Kingdom there was the tale of Horus and the Pig. The sungod Re said in the tale that “the pig is an abomination to Horus” (de Buck 1918: 326). Marie Parsons concluded that scholars are divided on the existence and usage of pigs in ancient Egypt. She indicated that “The oldest domestic pig remains presently known in Egypt come from the large Predynastic settlement site of Merimda Beni Salama in the western Delta . . . Pig remains have been found throughout Egypt at sites such as Hierakonpolis, Maadi, Abydos, and Armant, near graves belonging to the poorer classes, indicating that pork was an element in their diet, at least at the Predynastic period.” She continued to say “In the early Fourth Dynasty tomb-chapel of Metjen at Saqqara, the deceased states that he received a bequest from his father that included ‘people, small livestock and pigs.’ The Eleventh Dynasty tomb of the monarch Khety at Beni Hasan depicts a herd of pigs, the first in Egyptian art since the First Dynasty.” In the Old and Middle Kingdoms pigs were scares in daily life scenes and not in the offering lists. Parsons indicated that in the New Kingdom “Pig-farming expanded during the New Kingdom. Inscriptions indicate that temples and wealthy citizens maintained large numbers of them on their country estates, and tomb-chapels of several nobles from the early 18th dynasty illustrate swine as well as other farmyard animals. The mayor of el-Kab relates that he owned a herd of fifteen hundred pigs. A temple of Amenhotep III [1405-1374 BCE] at Memphis was endowed with some 1,000 pigs and 1,000 piglets, and the mortuary temple of Seti I [1340 – 1258 BCE] at Abydos held large herds of swine on its domains.” Amenhotep III offered one hundred adults and one thousand piglets to the temple of Ptah at Memphis, while Seti I [1340-1258 BCE] allowed pigs to be raised inside the temple consecrated to Osiris at Abydos (Brewer 2002:442; see Collins 2006: 160 footnote 19). When Amenhotep III took control of Egypt, Joshua has stripped him from any power in Canaan between 1410-1405 BCE. He had no military interest in Canaan during his reign. Amenhotep III instituted a strict migrant control on the borders, a natural action with Canaan in turmoil with the entry of Israelites under Joshua casting off the Egyptian colonialism. Pro-Egypt nations would have felt to flee to Egypt. As such, the Israelite presence and influence in Egypt during the days of Amenhotep III would be so minimal, that the resort to pigs as ritual objects at that time can be expected. Canaan is no longer an option for obtaining livestock, like sheep and cows, for the temples, and this may have led to his resorting to pigs as substitute. Seti I became ruler of Egypt during a period that is known in the book of Judges as a “rest period” for Israel and that was during the time of Ehud (1346-1266 BCE; Judges 3:30-4:1). Pigs in Mesopotamia

There were numerous words for pigs of different varieties in Akkadian (Salonen 1974: 8). Postgate indicated that they were important for their fat and for their meat (Postgate 1992: 166). Despite this use of pigs, Collins pointed out that pigs were unclean animals and were not welcome in a temple, similar to dogs (Scurlock 2002: 393; op. cit. Collins 2006: 160). Several scholars think that the taboos placed on pork consumption were to be the result of taboos in connection with particular cults (Houston 1993:155-56; Scurlock 2002:392-93). They are arguing that pork consumption was not basically a taboo, only particular cults did not tolerate it.

18Neither in Israelite historiography nor in Egyptian records is there any mention that he entered Israelite territory. When he passed by to the Phoenician coastlands, it is over the desert to Edom and then from there, to the east Jordan and then all the way up and over to the Lebanon. Megiddo was also an enemy of Seti I, as one can see in one of his inscriptions. The sudden appearance of pigs in the foreground in the New Kingdom seems to support the biblical chronology that Israelites left Egypt and with them, taboos as well. Biblical chronology calculates the Exodus in 1450 BCE and the entry into Canaan in 1410 and the five year period of conflict in the Amarna Tablets crisis corpus may have been in the last days of Thutmosis IV so that by 1405 BCE, Amenhotep III took over from his father. One of the first things Amenhotep III did was to set up migrant control to keep Canaanites out of Egypt since the Habiru arrived in Canaan and Canaanites had to flee to Ugarit and other islands (Koot van Wyk, “Appendix: Guide to the Method of Writing a Dissertation on Judges” in A commentary on Archaeological Elements in the Book of Judges (ThD dissertation, Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan, 2008)).
Postgate goes further and believes that he can place a chronology on the taboos, by saying that widespread prohibitions against pork consumption were a late invention and introduction (Postgate 1992: 166). One has to place limits on the veracity of Postgate’s observation, since one may question as to how widespread data he collected on this conclusion.

**Pigs in Zoo-archaeology at Hesban in Transjordan**

The work of Øystein Labianca at tell Hesban in Transjordan under supervision of Andrews University and their consortium, is valid here. In 1973 Labianca published his results of a systematic collection of bones at the tell during the Summer of 1971. More than 22,000 faunal remains were recovered of which 5,867 were bones. The tell had four fields A-D and 19 strata were identified from modern to Iron 1 (1200-925 BCE). Bedrock was reached in Field C and some squares in D during that time. Most of the bones were in squares B.1 (16.33%); B.4 (11.47%); C.4 (13.53%); C.5 (11.74%); and D.6 (16.02%). Field C ended in bedrock but in the Iron Age. Field D hit bedrock in the Roman period in some squares (Geraty 1973: 109). Field B had a cistern of the Iron Age. A reservoir that is older than 525 BCE, contributed to many bones in Field B. Labianca was able to compare the bones from this reservoir of the Iron Age and that of Field D ending in the Roman period, and as far as pigs are concerned, no pig bones were found in the reservoir of the Iron Age in Field B.1 but in Field D.6 of the Roman times (bones were from the Ayyubid/Mamluk periods, see Labianca 1973: 141), 1 pig was found. Absolute dating was established for Area D in Cistern D.6:33 where it was excavated in the stratified contexts created by the gradual filling of the cistern in the Ayyubid, Early and Late Mamluk periods. Numismatic evidence supports this dating (Geraty 1973: 101-104; Sauer 1973c: 56-63; Herr 1978a: 126, 127).

Pig remains were found in the following loci at Tell Hesban: A.1:28, 43, 58; A.2:25, 28, 35, 79; A.4:27; B.2:22; B.3:27; B.4:1, 6, 15, 16, 50, 55, 57; C.1:15, 38; C.2:14; C.4:19; C.5:1, 2; D.1:43, 44; D.6:35, 36, 45. Most of the bones were of young animals. One of them was charred and that is at C.1:38 which happened probably in the Iron Age. See below where Sauer indicated that the pottery from this area was mostly Iron Age or earlier, namely, Late Bronze. This would make it concurrent with the discussion on pigs in Hittite texts.

Then there is the *Madaba Plains Project* by Andrews University and their Consortium. It was undertaken within a radius of 5-km of Tell el-ʿUmeiri.

Faunal readings were published and we list the pig examples: Square 7K41: U84 A.7K41:9 (5/28 [count or weight]); U84 A. 7K41:9 (1/9); Square 7K50: U84 A.7K50:3 (3/35); Square 7J87: U84 A.7J87:4 (2/27); U84 B.7J87:5 (1/12); Square 7K90: U84 B.7K90:2 (1/6); U84 B.7K90:2 (1/22); U84 B.7K90:9 (1/1); U84 B.7K90:15 (7/59); Square C.8L62: U84 C.8L62:1 (2/10); Square C.8L63: U84 C.8L63:1; Square D.5K76: U84 D.5K76:7 (3/42); Square D.5K76: U84 D.5K76:15 (1/2); Square D.5K77: U84 D.5K77:2 (1/4).

James Sauer noted that Iron IA pottery is normally a continuation of LB Age pottery and it is difficult to say whether potteries are in Iron IA or LB (which is a change in his position initially, in his early years, as opposed in his more advanced and professional age). His conclusions sound very stable in the 1994 article. He pointed out that if it is Iron IA-B pottery that is showing up it would be the period of the Judges (James Sauer, "An Interim Hesban Pottery Report, 1993" Hesban After 25 Years, eds. David Merling and Lawrence T. Geraty [Berrien Springs, Michigan: Institute of Archaeology, Siegfried Horn Museum, Andrews University, 1994]: 225-281. He mentioned that one should not compare Megiddo ceramics with Hesban but Bethel ceramics with Hesban since it is more hilly (Sauer 1994: 237). What is clear, is that there are methodological problems with the earliest pottery identification at Hesban. Sauer is in process of a major shift to push the earliest pottery earlier. There is a large quantity of pig bones in the Iron IA-B times at Hesban and this indicates for Sauer that Ammonites or Moabites or even Amorites or Canaanites may have lived here (Sauer 1994: 237).

---

22 Øystein Labianca, "The Zoo-archaeological Remains from Tell Hesban" AUSS XI: 1 (January 1973): 133-144.
There are more than 100,000 sherds from excavations at Hesban (Sauer 1994: 225). Iron Age IA, IB, IC, IIA-B potteries from Area C were noted in bypassing by Boraas and Geraty in 1976 and 1978 descriptions of the stratigraphic reports, but they were not yet published in 1994 (Sauer 1994: 226-227). Late Bronze sherds from Hesban are shown in a photo (Sauer 1994: 234).

**Pigs at Sites in Canaan**

In Canaan at Early Bronze Arad, pig bones were found at all strata of the Early Bronze (2400-2000 BCE) (Amiran, 1978: 116). At Tell Qasile bones of four pigs were found (Mazar, 1985). The city is not completely Philistine since in strata X there is a reappearance of Egyptian, Cypriot and Phoenician ware. It seems that the city was cosmopolitan after 1,100 BCE. Philistine ceramic wares suddenly diminished with only pockets in areas like Area C. An article that appeared in 2013 highlights the role of pig husbandry in Iron Age Israel and Judah. It seems that the evidence from Transjordan and that of Israel and Judah displays similar results if compared for the Iron Age IIA period. As it is with any archaeological report relying on statistics for their conclusions, the major deficit in the evidence or data from the tells, is that archaeologists do not mention the quantity of exposure on each tell because each datum will have its own “weight of probability” which will affect the postulated percentage but also future and further excavations on the seventh eighths of the tell that was not excavated yet, would change the percentages presented. The statistical picture can be misleading and slightly distant from reality.

---

25 Thanks go to prof. dr. Akio Tsukimoto from Tokyo, who has pointed out this article to me Lidar Sapir-Hen, Guy Bar-Oz, Yuval Gadot, and Israel Finkelstein, "Pig Husbandry in Iron Age Israel and Judah" ZDPV 129 (2013):1-20. The article focuses mainly on Iron Age IIB (older 800-721 BCE/ current 780-680 BCE dating) but it does expand into LB III (older 1175-1125 BCE/ current 1200-1130 BCE dating), Iron Age I (older Iron Age IB 1125-1100 BCE/ current 'early Iron I' 1130-1050 BCE dating) and Iron Age II A (older 925-800 BCE/ current 950-870 BCE dating) and later Iron Age IIC (older 721-856 BCE/ current 680-586 BCE dating). Thirty five Israelite sites were investigated (2013: 3) and a "pig bone" count were made and the quantities were further quantified and played around with to come up with observations and suggestions. Earlier theories and observations by Finkelstein in the late 1980’s on settlement patterns in Israel during the Late Bronze and Iron Ages served as net for the ideas to be packed out on. There are lowlands and highlands; north and south; Late Bronze and Iron Ages; Canaanite and Israelite dichotomies. The conclusions are based upon pig frequencies that are calculated by computer from faunal assemblages from various sites in different periods. Tables can be found on pages 4-7 and a graphic map displays the synthesis of these percentages for the Iron Age IIB (2013: 8). Climate in Iron I indicated a high rainfall and in Iron II a lower rainfall. Forest sizes were bigger in Iron I and smaller in Iron II. Population growth was higher in Iron II than in Iron I. Pig appearances in Iron II at certain regions like Israel as opposed to Judah were higher in the Iron II than in Iron I. The article has to be looked at in the light of the broader textual history of Israel. Some notes: (1) Israel left Egypt in 1450 BCE under Thutmosis III and entered Canaan in 1410 after the death of Moses. This is the Late Bronze Period and for the next 300 years at least, great and sizeable urban centers dominated the scenes in Israel (about 25-30 of them). The towns were bigger in this period (Hamilton 1934: 1). In the Iron Age I from the time of Samuel and David smaller towns originated and 57 ha became 72 ha but also an increase of number from 80 in Iron Age I to 240 in Samaria and an increase from 46 in Iron Age I to 66 in the western Jezreel valley for the Iron Age II period or the Divided Kingdom Period. (2) Demography cannot be calculated unless the whole site and all sites are totally exposed by archaeology, otherwise it is mere projections. (3) One cannot expose an eighth of a site and superimpose that data over seven eighths that are not excavated. This brings Finkelstein's settlement theories into question and also in this case the pig conclusions based on these projections of unexcavated areas. The study is still important but the caution he expressed in 1988 is still valid today: “At the same time we cannot brush aside the possibility that certain groups who settled in the hill country in Iron I originated directly from the Canaanite urban society of the lowlands, it is just that the archaeological evidence to support the view is vague, if it exists at all” (Finkelstein 1988: 45). Continuity of Late Bronze and Iron Age I is no problem since Israel was already nearly 300 years in the country by that time. (4) The Divided Monarchy Period was known for intermarriage and acculturations with Aramaeans and Phoenicians and thus their habits were tolerated and endorsed. If they worshiped Baal they would have seen no problem to eat pig. (5) Notice that in the Late Bronze urban centers no pig evidence can be seen, at least not in the same percentages as in the later periods. This is the time when the Israelites settled in Palestine and the whole period between 1410 to the time of David is the period of the Judges. The period of the Judges would not be a pig-eating problem period for the Israelites. It is only in the period after the Divided Kingdoms that intermarriage brought with it also pig-eating habits. (6) The theories of Julius Wellhausen are not conducive for proper reconstruction of the reality of the past based on the text. The archaeology presented by these Israeli scholars aligns better with taking the text for what it is than to superimpose, with artificial Hegelianism, late datings from Wellhausen to the sources. The text (biblical) claims Israel was in Canaan in the Late Bronze since 1410 BCE and the tells (archaeology data) are evidence that in Late Bronze no pig evidence is dominant (“At the same time, pigs do not appear at the ‘proto-Israelite’ sites in the highlands” [Late Bronze II] Sapir-Hen et al 2013: 10). There is no settlement origin of Israel in the Iron Age II period since textually it is the period of the divided Monarchies.
The statistical analysis is not fruitless since it can provide indications of preference or taboo, but it is better to use the methodological descriptive jargon “thus far our investigations show that” thus putting data into a probability zone guarding against jumping to absolute and canonized conclusions. This dynamic will have both tell scholars and text scholars on their knees presenting their conclusions. The Settlement investigations of Finkelstein and now these pig results for Israel stand under this umbrella of suggestions here.\(^{26}\)

Let us highlight the relevant results from the Sapir-Hen et al. presentation in ZDPV 2013:

**Multi-cultural Canaan with Egyptian imperial domination (van Wyk)**

Middle Bronze Age II: Northern Israel highland (Shiloh). Pigs are in high percentage of 3.5 percent (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9-10).

**Israel in Canaan since 1410 BCE (van Wyk)**

Late Bronze Age II-III: Northern Israel lowland (Megiddo, Lachish, Ekron). Pigs were raised (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9). Egyptian administration and military presence sites: Aphek (2.4 percent) and Beth-Shean (11.75 percent). Beth-Shean is the highest in the Late Bronze Age (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Late Bronze Age II-III: Northern Israel highland (Shiloh and Tell Dōthan). Pigs are absent (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9-10).

Late Bronze Age II-III: Neighboring sites (Near Megiddo and Beth-Shemesh and Ekron). No interest in pig husbandry (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9-10).

Late Bronze Age II-III: Judean sites. Nearly absent (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).

Late Bronze Age II-III: Shephelah and Beer-Sheba Valley. Low frequency of pigs (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).

Late Bronze Age II-III: Aroer is an exception because it is a trading highway site (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).

Late Bronze Age II: Pre-Philistine site. Ekron (2.7%) (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

**Samuel, Davidic and Solomonic Times (van Wyk)**

Iron Age I: Northern Israel lowland (Dan, shore of Sea of Galilee [1%]). Small or no pig presence (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).

Late Iron Age I: Northern Israel lowland (Megiddo VI 1.5%; Tēl Yoqnašām/Tell Qēmūn 1.5%. Low frequencies of pig bones (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Northern Israel highland. “Pigs do not appear” (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Shephelah site of Beth-Shemesh and Khirbet Qēyafa. No pigs (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Coastal site. Dor (no pigs for the entire Iron Age [see footnote 33]) (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Coastal Philistine urban sites (Ashdod 10.8%). Pig presence high (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Early Iron Age I: Coastal Philistine urban sites. Ekron (19.5%). Pig presence high (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Late Iron Age I: Coastal Philistine urban sites. Ekron (6.8%). Pig presence high (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Coastal central Philistine sites but smaller rural sites almost absent. Aphek (0.4%)(Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Coastal northern Philistine sites but smaller rural sites almost absent. Tell Qaqish (1.2%) (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age I: Coastal southern Philistine sites but smaller rural sites almost absent. Near Gaza (no pigs) at Qubūr el-Walāyide (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

**Post-Solomonic Divided Kingdom Period (Phoenician, Aramean, Assyrian influences) (van Wyk)**

Iron Age IIA: Northern Israel lowland (Hazor, Tēl Yoqnašām/Tell Qēmūn, Tēl Rehov/Tell es-Sārem). Higher values (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Early Iron Age IIA: Northern Israel lowland (Tēl Yoqnašām/Tell Qēmūn). Higher values (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Late Iron Age IIA: Northern Israel lowland (Hazor). Higher values (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age IIA: Philistine urban site (Tell es-Sāfī 13.5%). Pig presence high (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

Iron Age IIA: Judean site (Lachish IV). Very little pig bones (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10).

**Period of Isaiah (van Wyk)**

---

\(^{26}\)Let me give one example. If I want to study the importance of the word ‘anoint’ at Qumran but I only look at Cave One, then my percentages of using the word anoint cannot use the umbrella thought of “Qumran scribes had a 45% interest into the word anoint”. I need to mention my limitation that I did not look at the other caves as well.
Iron Age IIB: Northern Israel lowland (Hazor, Megiddo, Beth-Shean). High values of 3.2-7.8% (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).
Iron Age IIB: Northern Israel highland. Data not available (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).
Iron Age IIB: Neighboring sites (pro-Phoenician and pro-Aramean sites). No interest in pig husbandry.
Iron Age IIB: Shephelah and Beer-Sheba Valley. Low frequency of pigs (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).
Iron Age IIB: Aroer is an exception because it is a trading highway site (Sapir-Hen 2013: 9).

Judean Period until the Exile (van Wyk)

Iron Age IIC: Judean sites. Very little pig bone evidence (Sapir-Hen 2013: 11).

Despite the statistical handicap that one can see in the article, the tell evidence in the article supports the textual evidence from Scripture.

**Pig Bones at Tel Rekhesh**

A separate treatment of the pig-bones from Tel Rekhesh is necessary since they were not part of the discussion in ZDPV 2013 mentioned supra. The Japanese contribution to the archaeology of Israel at various excavation sites and also at Tel Rekhesh cannot be overlooked. The Faunal collections from this site were done from the years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010. Carole Cope identified faunal findings from key loci at Tel Rekhesh in 2010. The following table was supplied by Mr. Onozuka regarding the overview of Faunal remains at Tel Rekhesh and of course I am focusing in this article on pig-bones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LB (Number = 116)</th>
<th>Iron I (Number = 150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIBPS (MNI)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep/goat</td>
<td>51 (19)</td>
<td>44% (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>27 (5)</td>
<td>23% (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>16 (9)</td>
<td>14% (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
<td>8% (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gazelle/deer</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>5% (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NIBPS = Number of Identified Bones per Species

27 A special word of thanks goes to prof. dr. Akio Tsukimoto affiliated with Rikkyo University in Tokyo and Sophia University in Tokyo who has been directing Japanese teams of excavators for decades. In fact, the first time we met was after a Japanese participation in an excavation in El-Al on our way to the United Kingdom in the early 90's. A young Japanese archaeologist Mr. Takuzo Onozuka who is an Associate Fellow in Near Eastern Archaeology in the Tokyo National Museum kindly provided me with the bone data of the LB and Iron Age I periods at Tel Rekhesh in Northern Galilee.

There are certain restrictions to these data that Mr. Onozuka pointed out: the Late Bronze data is mostly from one square and thus presents a fragmented view that may be augmented in future excavations. Another valid point he mentioned is that most of the Iron I bones come from the Late Iron I phase. A tentative conclusion that Mr. Onozuka makes is that pig was not popular in the Late Iron I phase but that Late Bronze people here had a different view of animal husbandry.

**Comparison of Tel Rekhesh and other sites in Israel during the Late Bronze and Late Iron I Age**

If one compares the presence of pigs at Tel Rekhesh and at Beth-Shean (11.75%) which is the highest in the Late Bronze Age (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10), then one can say this report from Tel Rekhesh with the 19% presence in one square is quite high. Tel Rekhesh will lie in the highway to the North, so that Egyptians and other nations which wanted to avoid the Central Highlands, would move either from Tel Rekhesh to Beth-Shean and then down the east Jordan to the South following the Kings Highway, or they would go up the opposite direction. Biblically, Israel was already in the Highlands of Israel but cities like Megiddo and Beth-Shean, and one can include Tel Rekhesh, would have a high presence of multi-cultures and a liberal view of pig-taboos.

The Late Iron Age I at Tel Rekhesh (5%) compares also very well with the finds from Megiddo VI (1.5%). Also at Tell Yoqneam/Tell Qēmūn (1.5%) and it was concluded that at these other sites low frequencies of pig bones were encountered (Sapir-Hen 2013: 10). It is very likely that Tel Rekhesh is situated in the highway to the North and South empires and that military invasions and movements in Israel as a whole may account for the higher presence at Tel Rekhesh of pig bones for the Late Iron Age.

**Iconographical Representations of Pigs**

At Kuntillet ʿAjrud a representation of a wild pig can be seen on Pithos A. This Pithos originated near Jerusalem in the Motza formation as petrographic and NAA tests revealed. The result of the analysis of all the pottery from Kuntillet ʿAjrud led the researchers to believe that the late eight century (ca. 722 BCE) could be an appropriate date for the site.

A wild pig terracotta clay model is also from the Persian Period dating to the time of Artaxerxes I (464-424 BCE) near Nippur. Although the texts are in cuneiform script, many Aramaic script phrases and words can be found also on them. One should not haste to conclude that the presence of these examples means that the pig was eaten there. The function of the pigs at these places is not clear and one can also assume that they used them to consume the meal residue of the town without intention to eat them.

**Pigs as Offerings in Hittite Rituals**

Pigs as offerings are limited (Collins 1996; and also De Martino 2004: 50). When pigs are found in Hittite offerings, it was not the normal process of events (Collins 2006: 161). Collins suggested that the frequent appearance in the Hittite texts of pigs, are related to magic rituals.

There is a complex set of guidelines for pork consumption in Anatolia generally (Collins 2006: 160).

a. **Pigs and other animals listed but not sure whether they are sacrificed**

---

29 Lily Singer-Avitz, “The Date of Kuntillet ʿAjrud” Tel Aviv 33 (2006): 196-228, especially page 202. The analysts in this article moved away from any cultic consideration of the site or any theology construction for Israel and attributed the site to Assyrian military outpost presence (ibid., page 213). Much more can be said about this site so that a revision of conclusions of the iconography is imperative: cow and calf motif with a human hanging on the tail of the cow; the large beslike figure crudely drawn in a secondary action over the text and cow and the other beslike figure; the ibex flanking the metallic tree compared to tridacna art from Shechem; revision of the syntax and translation of the inscriptions on the Pithoi with regions (town names) rather than gods as the focus; and a number of methodological inconsistencies that crept in over the decades of the start of its publication.

30 Ibid., page 213.

31 H. V. Hilprecht and A. T. Clay, Business Documents of Murashu Sons of Nippur Dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I (464-424 B.C.) in The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania Series A: Cuneiform Texts Volume IX (Philadelphia: Published by the Department of Archaeology and Paleontology of the University of Pennsylvania, 1898), plate xiii no. 28. The find of texts of the Murashu family consisted of 870 texts that were distributed to Istanbul, Philadelphia and Jena.
Collins mentioned a text and its duplicate that listed pigs, horses, mules, asses, dogs and a deer among the festival paraphernalia in Luwian-populated Istanuwa (in the Lower land) (Collins 2006: 161). It is not clear that these animals were offered.

b. Pig in a ritual listing is not necessarily for offering
In a late ritual a pig boar is included with goats, rams, a bull and a puppy but Collins maintains that puppies were not offering animals (Collins 2006: 161).

c. Pig in a distribution list is not necessarily for offering
A Middle Hittite text from the Hattian milieu, (KBo 21.82 iv 14’CTH 734), records the distribution of beer-bread, a pig, and a puppy to the storehouse-manager of Hattusa for purposes unknown (Collins 2006: 161).

d. Pig is used to cleanse a person of hurkel, a sexual offense
In Zuwi’s Ritual a pig, a dog, and a puppy were used to cleanse a person of the offense of hurkel, a sexual offense (Hutter 2000: 103). The animals are present to secure the removal of the sin, not as offerings (Collins 2006: 161 footnote 22).

e. Pig is slaughtered but in a strange ritual
At Kuliwisna in the Lower land, a Hittite queen officiates during a pig sacrifice that is directed to the Utniyantas-deities, who are local deities connected to the land (Trémouille 2002:361 nr. 38; Collins 2006: 161).

The text reads:
“This they drive out a pig and they kill it. They hold a thin loaf of bread under the blood and place it back before the deity. But the pig they prepare? They gut it and inflate its entrails. They butcher [it]. The pig’s head they [. . .]. In/on it the entrails (acc.) they [. . .].”

f. Cooking a piglet for the goddess of childbirth Hannahanna
In another ritual where the Queen is present a piglet was given to Hannahanna (NIN.TU) goddess of childbirth and motherhood:
“[They dedicate?] one piglet to Hannahanna [and] they cook that same [pig]let in a pot.”
The piglet is cut into pieces since its head and entrails appear on the reverse side of the text (Trémouille, 2002:361 in Reverse lines 3’-4’).

g. The fate goddesses, Gulses, receive regularly pork
“One cooked piglet and one pitcher of ordinary beer and wine[. . .] they place these before Hannahanna”.

“One pig, one ram and one plow ox in good condition, (and) a fat cake: Let these be (given) to the Gulses.”

h. The pig is only made of dough but used in a ritual for Anzili

32 KUB35.142 obv.3’-7’ [Starke 1985:323; Collins 1989:142] and its duplicate KUB 55.38[Starke 1990:600-602].
33 KBo 22.125 i 3’-7’ [CTH456] (see Collins 2006).
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“She takes a little from each stew and takes it there (to) the wood that is sitting before the pig of dough, but the remainder of the stews they set before Anzili.”

i. A pig festival (nuntarriyasha) is celebrated by the Queen

A tablet is outlining the events of the nuntarriyasha-festival, which indicates that on the 35th day, the queen celebrates the festival (EZEN) of the pig (Collins 2006: 162).

j. The pig in these rituals probably connected to fertility rites

A number of scholars are pointing to the association of the pig with fertility rites.

k. The pig as a metaphor for agrarian magic

In the Benedictions of Labarna, an appeal is made to a pig saying: “Just as a single pig gives birth to may piglets, let every single branch of this vineyard, like the pig, bear many grape clusters.” It is only the Sun-goddess that receives a pig: “for the Sun-goddess of the Earth, one piglet to the fertile(?) earth.”

l. A pig must be supplied when the villagers kill their pig

There are probably superstitious reasons or agrarian fertility superstition involved here for the whole village to kill one pig. Then they had to give also one pig to the hamina-men.

“When the people of Ulusna kill their pig(s), they give one pig to the hamina-men”.

m. A pig must be presented in the festival for Tettiwati by Wolfmen

“When the wolfman hulhuliya-s the pork, he gives it to the priest of Tetewatti and the priest of Tetewatti sets it on the offering table in front of the deity. Then two wolfmen dance before the deity. The cultic prostitutes dance opposite.” These are exceptional cases within the restrictions in general of pig meat in Hittite society.

n. Setting a piglet on fire at the ritual for Tunnawiyas’s ritual

“[They place] a foot and a hand, one each, [in] the pit. The jester [holds] a piglet [over] the hearth and they set [. . . ] on fire” (CTH 670). Tunnawiyas’s ritual (CTH 408). The ritual texts are between CTH 390-500.

o. Standing stones at the Spring and Autumn Festivals received piglets

Tudhaliya IV (1250-1220 BCE during the time of Deborah and Barak [1246-1206 BCE] according to Judges 5:31), ordered the restoration of the Spring and Autumn festivals in the villages (KUB 12.2) and it lists sheep and piglets to the huwasi-s (standing stones) (Collins 2006: 164).

p. Certain deities received only piglets as offerings

“The Sun-goddess of the Earth, the divine spring Kuwannaniya, the zawalli-deities, Pentaruhsi, three lesser storm gods and an assortment of “male deities” attached to the cults of other, more senior, male deities all receive piglets rather than sheep” (Collins 2006: 164). Collins has argued that all these gods are of a chthonic nature, which is a Greek word for “beneath the earth”.

q. Pig holocausts were rare in Hittite texts

Collins is comparing Mycenaean practices and wonders if the participants thought they will have access to cosmological powers in such rites.

41 KUB 51.15 rev. 6’ (CTH 626; Nakamura 2002: 70-71; de Martino 2004: 52). M. Nakamura, Das hethitische nuntarriyaš-Fest in PHANS vol. 94 (2002); see Collins 2006: 162.
44 Popko (1994): 102 l. 12’ (see Collins 2006: 163). The conclusion of Collins that villagers were “tithed” a pig for the festival is not correct. Tihe is 10% and there is no indication that 10% of pigs had to be given for the festival (Collins 2006: 165 at footnote 33).
For example KUB 12.2. “They were not state sanctioned festivals, but rituals performed for private individuals or groups in which feeding large numbers of people was not the goal, that is, they were socially restricted (see Hamilakis and Konsolaki2004:146-47; op. cit. Collins 2006: 164).

**Pigs for Human Consumption in Hittite Culture Rare**

“Occasions when humans are described eating pork is even more rare and certainly as unusual as those involving the gods” (Collins 2006: 164).

a. Female attendants eat burned pig in a detailed ritual

In a very detailed description of Hittite ritual, a bad omen of the Moon is cancelled during the birth of a boy or girl by hitting seven bronze or iron nails in a piglet and seven nails elsewhere as well. The importance of the number seven for the Ancient Near East as a whole, as subject, is also curious here.66 Collins indicates that the eating of a pig here is extremely rare.

b. Female attendants swallow a piglet at the ritual for Teteshapi

“[S/he] tak[es] up [. . .]. For the priestess/he takes a cup [. . .] and they swallow down the piglet. [. . .] they hit. The side x [. . .] § The priestess [. . .] Teteshapi. . . .” (Collins 2006: 166).

c. Clearest example (very rare) of pig consumption at a Hittite ritual

It is a Hittite meal involving a pig in Ashella’s ritual at Hapalla where a goat, ram and pig were offered to the god who has caused a plague in the army: “At daybreak on the third day, they bring one goat, one ram, and one pig. After they prepare three thick loaves and one pitcher of beer, they drive them to an uninhabited region in the countryside. They spread out branches, place the three thick loaves again, and dedicate the goat, ram and pig to that god who made this plague in the army (saying): ‘Let that deity eat. Let that deity drink. And in the land of Hatti and in regard to the army of the land of Hattilet there be peace. Let him (the deity) be turned in favor to the army.’ They eat and drink. Then they come away” (Collins 2006: 166).

d. Pig meat was used to trick cannibal enemies to think it is human meat

In one Hittite text, the Hittite soldiers moved out to meet the enemies who were cannibals. In the text KBo 3.60 = BoTU 21, the allied forces met the enemies and Kaniu puts the enemies to test to determine whether they are mortal or divine: “Kaniu took cooked pork and set it before DUMU.MA›.LÍL (saying): ‘If he hazziya-s this then (he is) a god, but if he does not ha[zziiya-] it then (he is) a man, and [a mortal] we can fight.’ DUMU.MA›.LÍL [took] the pork and ate it. [He gave] them (i.e., his comrades) to eat. [He] gave them to drink.”47 The meaning of Gütterbock is making the pig a substitute for human flesh. The text is dating probably to the time of Hattushilish I which is ca. 1600-1580 BCE. This falls within the enslavement period of Israel in Egypt according to Masoretic Text Chronology (1850-1450 BCE).

e. The ritual of Walkui indicates pork avoidance for human consumption

The priest of the Deity of the Night, Walkui, recommended that “a man eats anurura-herb or pork in a dream, or if by divine chance he comes across an urura-herb among the herbs in the temple, or if by divine chance he comes into contact with a pig carcass.” The ritual is in Kizzuwatna the region rich with Hurrian traditions. Scholars like Mouton (2004) and De Martino (2004) argue that the text is proof of Hurrian avoidance of eating pork. The argument of the text is that the individual is contaminated by the sin and then needs an extensive cleansing ritual. This may help the problem eventually, they thought. One should pay attention to this particular instruction by Walkui. When Moses wrote Leviticus 11 sometime between 1448-1410 BCE, long before this Hittite text, he also indicated that touching a live pig per se cannot make a person unclean. Touching a carcass of a pig makes a person unclean.48

---

66The text is KUB 17.28 i 1-24 = CTH 730.1 and its full reading is found at Collins 2006: 164 at footnote 37.

47Gütterbock understands the term abstractly to mean “to recognize,” (as in “hit [the mark]). Collins thinks that this is the best explanation.

48See the article by G. Hasel, “Is the distinction of clean and unclean animals made in Lev 11:2-23, 41-45 (and in Deut 14:3-20) still relevant today?” http://www.biblicalperspectives.com “Evidently this is true only of the carcass of an unclean animal, but not of a live unclean animal.” (Hasel 1991 : 32 footnote 13). The Bible and Hittite practice coincide here but 200 years apart, Moses in 15th century BCE and Hittite texts in the 13th -12th and later centuries BCE. For updates on chronology of the Bible and Hittites, see Koot van Wyk, *Archaeological Elements in Judges in the Appendix: Guide to the method of writing a dissertation on*
Pigs Are Assumed to Be the Domain of Woman

Melinda Zeder noted that the issue is complex but that woman may be closer associated to the raising or presence of pigs.

a. Pigs were involved in rituals related to the fertility of women
A number of Hittite texts dealt with this issue.

b. Pigs were invoked to secure the wellbeing of the community and models were placed on foundations of buildings.
Collins is very clear that no actual pig was placed in the foundations but only models of pigs, for example copper models.

c. The goddesses to whom the rituals of pigs apply were fertility goddesses
It is only the god Utuniyantes that is connected to the land. All the other goddesses, says Collins, is connected to fertility (Collins 2006: 170).

d. The Queen’s role with pigs were probably also related to fertility and prosperity
Collins indicated that the Queen text mentioned supra, is probably also connected to her role as royal patron although as elite she would avoid pigs (Collins 2006: 170).

Pig Taboo Rules in the Ancient near East

Theories regarding the avoidance of pigs in the Ancient Near East in general and Leviticus 11 particularly fall into various groups:

a. Pigs are disgusting to farm with
This theory holds that Israelites and Arab ancestors found the pigs disgusting since they are focused on sheep and goats (Firmage 1992:1134; Hesse 1995:215; cf. Hyams 1972:70-71; Collins 2006: 170).

b. Pigs are not ecologically practical (wet vs. dry) or economical (rural vs. urban) or social (ritual vs. secular)
This theory holds that these three factors made it difficult to consider pigraising as an option (Hesse and Wapnish 1997:240-53; Collins 2006: 170).

c. Pig consumption fluctuated depending on the level of political centralization
According to this theory, it depends who was in control of the political domain of the country, that will affect the quantity of pig consumption. (Zeder 1996:307; 1998:119-20; Collins 2006: 170).

d. Pigs are scavengers and it is natural for health reasons not to eat scavengers
This theory will hold that one should not underestimate the ability of the Ancients to know what a scavenger is and what risks people take upon themselves by eating it. It is noteworthy that nearly all animals listed as not fit for eating in Leviticus 11 are scavengers.

e. Pig taboo is not connected with ethnicity or geography
Collins holds this view but this is not exactly correct. One cannot limit it only to one ethnos but the Israelites were not known throughout their history to have consumed any pig. Nowhere in the history from Adam until modern days is there any reference that permits them to eat pig.

Judges (ThD dissertation, Rikkyo University, Tokyo, 2008). Unfortunately, Collins’ biblical view is prescribed by modern historical criticism that is based upon the findings of the Arabist Julius Wellhausen in the Victorian Age, following the trend of Rationalism with a hermeneutics of suspicion superimposing eighteenth century German Literature Criticism over the biblical text. Chronology of the Bible thus cannot function properly for Collins et al with this modern existential, rationalistic superimposition. Instead of making the text speak for itself, Collins makes existentialism a program for observations. Collins does let the Hittite texts speak for themselves in relation to the biblical text, an unfair state of affairs.

See, e.g., KUB 36.83 i 3-7; iv 5-9; Bo 3617 i 4-17; KUB 12.44 iii 16-19(Collins 2002b; see Collins 2006: 170).

KUB 59.44 obv.7-13’ with duplicates KUB 40.23 i 6-12’ and KBo 23.90 i 2-7’ (CTH 470; Kühne1972:251-52; cf. Ünal 1999:220; de Martino 2004:51; see Collins 2006: 170).

KBo 4.1 rev. 27-28 (CTH 413), Collins 2006: 170.
This taboo is definitely linked to Israel without a shadow of doubt. They were scattered over the Ancient World so that it is not easy to investigate pig taboos in other nations. They also received sometimes nicknames, so that the identification of a Hittite as pure Hittite is not ipso facto established without a shadow of doubt. It may be 99% correct but there is always a 1% left open for the opposite fact. Gideon’s Canaanite nickname was Jerubaal.

In his book *Purity and Monotheism*, Walter Houston discussed that in Syro-Palestine, people were offering the food that they themselves saw fit to eat since the food to the gods was supposed to be eaten. The pig was not in their diet (Houston 1993:157; Collins 2006: 170).

“Further, neither pig nor dog may come through the doors into the place where the bread is broken. (Are) the mind of man and god somehow different? No! In this which (is concerned)? No! The mind (is) one and the same” (CoS 1.83, §2; op. cit. Collins 2006: 170).

Houston pointed out that table to altar taboos of pigs is related to the fact that the options were confined to that what is considered clean; that people were too poor to eat meat; Collins et al indicated that pigs were a low-class meal not fit for the elite (Collins 1989:284-86; 2002a:249; cf. von den Driesch and Boessneck1981:61-62; Ünal 1985:422; Collins 2006: 171).

Hesse argued that pork consumption was a low-level food in Egypt and Syro-Palestine (Hesse1995:213).

Whereas in Anatolia, Egypt, and Syro-Palestine pig consumption was considered a low-class meal, in Israel it was absolutely forbidden. In Anatolia it was soldiers and female attendants to the ritual that ate the piglets exceptionally (Collins 2006: 171).

**Pigs as Medical Use in Mesopotamia**

In Mesopotamia, the asakku-demon was expelled with the use of a piglet substitute: “[Take] a piglet; [put it] at the head of the afflicted person. Remove its heart (and) [put it] on the man’s epigastrium.[Sprinkle] its blood on the sides of the bed. Disarticulate the piglet and spread (the pieces) out over the sick man, then purify and cleanse that person with pure sweet water from the holy waterbasin and pass the censer and reed torch by him and scatter seven and seven cakes baked in ashes at the outer gate and give the piglet as his substitute and give (its) flesh instead of his flesh, (its)blood instead of his blood so that they may take (it instead of him).Give the heart which you put on his epigastrium instead of his heart so that they may take (in instead of him)” (Scurlock 2002:386; Collins 2006: 171).

There is further evidence of a pig taboo, at least for certain days during the time of Ashur-naṣir-apli (883-859 BCE). At Nimrud in room NT 12 the text ND 5545 was found. It was a hemerological text and the first seven days of Tishri is provided with a list of prohibitions in the diet and what will happen if these prohibitions are ignored.53

The king should not eat garlic on the second day, nor cooked flesh, flesh of an ox, goat or pig. On the fifth day, the king shall again not eat pig. On the eighth day the king was to cleanse himself and at this point of cleansing as a result of abstinance of items listed, he was to “fill his house with fruit from (his) garden”.54

What makes this text relevant is the concept in the time of Mesha and Omri of the Bible, that a person attain ritual cleansing through abstinance of products from beef eating and that a vegetarian diet is considered suitable for such a sanctified and clean person. What we do not know is whether this abstinance was only effective for these seven or eight days of Tishri. Pigs were eaten seemingly before and after this period but as food to approach the god, it was considered a taboo, of course also garlic, fish and onions.

**Pig Taboo in the Old Testament**

“Outside of the Pentateuch, the Hebrew Bible refers, rather obliquely, to the prohibition against pork only three times, each in Isaiah(65:2-5; 66:3; 66:17; Ackerman 1992:203)” (Collins 2006: 182).

---

52 One cannot miss the importance of seven again in this ritual also. Mesopotamia is controlled in all aspects of society with the seximal alternating decimal system so that the hepta (seven) system is foreign to Mesopotamia.


54 ND 5545: Line 54.
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“Finally, the offering of pig’s blood in Isa 66:3 probably has less to do with breaking the Levitical prohibition per se (contra Ackerman 1992:205), than with the use of pigs as sacrifices in substitution rituals or rituals of reconciliation or, most likely, in sacrifices having to do with fertility, since the offering of pig’s blood is contrasted with cereal offerings. Fertility rites are also among the activities condemned in Isa 65:2-5 and Isa 66:17, along with necromancy, incubation and eating swine’s flesh (Ackerman 1992:208-10). Not at all a part of secret, mystery religions, as argued by de Vaux (1958) and refuted by Ackerman (1992), pig sacrifice was about beginnings. Pigs were killed in private or group ceremonies to mark transitions like birth and marriage and, as substitutes, provided some measure of assurance that death could be held at bay” (Collins 2006: 182).

It is in the context of condemnation by Isaiah in line with Moses. Thus, any act with pig blood will be foreign influence in ritual of Israel and will thus be condemned.

Pig Taboo among Later Greeks
There is evidence of pig taboos in ca. 150 CE in a sanctuary where it is said by Xanthos that they should not eat pig and garlic (Haussleiter, 1935: 16 footnote 4).

Certain papyri indicated that they were sometimes expected not to eat pig (probably under Jewish influence) (Haussleiter, 1935: 20 footnote 7). It is also found in Byzantine recipes for magicians. The reason for abstinence was given, according to Haussleiter, that they feared that with the eating of meat and pig, certain demonic powers enter the human body and those powers would disturb the magician.

Medicine and magic was connected so that Hippocrates suggested that Epilepsy is a “holy sickness” and that suffering is controlled by cleanliness from demon-possession by a strict diet. The sick person was to abstain from pig (Haussleiter 1935: 21). Pigs were considered a favorite of demons.

Pig Taboo in the Old Testament by Gerhard Hasel
Gerhard Hasel did a research on the role of clean and unclean animals in Leviticus 11 which included the pig. His results are noteworthy:

1. Two Types of Clean/Unclean Distinctions in Israeliite Law

Foundational to any discussion of the clean/unclean distinction is the fact that the Old Testament refers to two clearly defined types of uncleanness.

1.1. One type of uncleanness is permanent, non-ritual, non-cultic, and non-ceremonial in nature and purpose.
1.2. The other type is distinctly ritual, cultic, and ceremonial in nature and design.
1.3. The first type of uncleanness, the one that is non-ceremonial, is permanent in nature and, therefore, no action, ritual, or activity can remove it.
1.4. The other type of uncleanness, the one that is ceremonial in nature, is clearly ritual and ceremonial in nature and a cultic action is prescribed, because it is in need of removal.
1.5. "vital distinction between permanent, non-cultic, non-ritual, non-ceremonial uncleanness, on the one hand, and temporary, cultic, ritual, ceremonial uncleanness, on the other hand."
1.6. It must be noted that there are parts in the book of Leviticus that are outside the framework of ritual/cultic instruction such as most of Leviticus 17, 18 and 26, 27.
1.7. The book of Leviticus contains both ceremonial-ritual and moral-universal laws. The assumption that all material in the book of Leviticus is ceremonial in nature can hardly be sustained.
1.8. Under certain circumstances that which is inherently clean can acquire uncleanness—it can become unclean. The acquired uncleanness comes through contact with a carcass (Lev. 11:29-40; Num. 19:11-17), bodily emissions (Lev. 15:2-28) and human skin disease, usually designated leprosy (Lev. 13, 14), and so on.
1.9. The uncleanness thus acquired calls for a removal by means of some ritual prescription that has been provided. In the case of leprosy there was an elaborate cleansing ritual which included washing and/or bathing and sacrifices (Lev. 14:1-32).
1.10. "the type of uncleanness which is not acquired, and thus non-ritualistic and non-ceremonial. This uncleanness can be said to be innate or inherent in certain animals alone."
1.11. The unclean animals of Leviticus 11:2-23 are not unclean because of an acquired/attached uncleanness. They have not become unclean from contact with anything that was unclean as is typical in acquired uncleanness. They are unclean in themselves. They are declared by God to be "unclean" (tame’םָּ֧) and/or "detestable" (sheqets שֶּׁקֶּץ). In this sense we may speak of a designated uncleanness.
1.12. The innate, inherent, or designated uncleanness is an uncleanness which can never be removed by any ritual or cultic activity specified in ceremonial law. It is never removed by time, or a combination of cultic activity and time as in the case of the ritual/cultic uncleanness that has become attached to something that was originally clean.

1.13. In other words, there is no possibility to remove innate and non-acquired uncleanness by cooking, boiling, washing, sacrifice, lapse of time, or by anything else.

2. The uncleanness of animals designated unclean/detestable is of a different origin and has a different purpose than cultic or ritual uncleanness.

2.1. The ritual and cultic uncleanness is acquired by someone or something which was not previously unclean. Thus there is need, by means of some appropriate ritualistic/cultic action, to restore such to the former clean status.

2.2. The innate or inherent uncleanness, to the contrary, is permanent and irremovable.

2.3. It is not in need of a ceremonial cleansing.

2.4. It is divinely designated unclean for food purposes.

2.5. The uncleanness inherent in live animals cannot be transferred to those who come into contact with unclean animals.

2.6. The non-transferability of the inherent uncleanness indicates that it is of a different nature than ceremonial, ritual, cultic uncleanness.

3. Israel compared to ANE

3.1. Only in Israel, the carcass of dead animals, regardless whether clean or unclean, brought about uncleanness by contact.

3.2. No live animal by itself whether clean or unclean brings impurity to humans.

3.3. If the uncleanness of live animals was cultic or ritual in nature, there would be a cultic, ritual transference of uncleanness to persons or things that come into contact with such animals.

3.4. In short, the non-transferability of uncleanness from live unclean animals seems to reveal that the uncleanness of animals is of a different kind than ritual, ceremonial uncleanness, i.e. it is non-cultic and non-ritual.

3.5. The non-ritual, non-cultic uncleanness of a live animal does not pollute or cause impurity or uncleanness whether cultic or other.

3.6. We may suggest on the basis of this evidence that the innate, inherent, or designated uncleanness has a different origin and purpose than the acquired, ritual uncleanness. Both are radically separate from each other in origin, purpose and design. They cannot be equated. Each has its own meaning and relevance. Each one functions differently.

3.7. Leviticus 11 "reveals that a clean animal killed for food does not bring about uncleanness to the person who eats it or has contact with it. It affirms, however, that a person or utensil that has come into contact with a carcass of a creature that died of natural causes, whether inherently unclean or not, becomes unclean. It prescribes regulations on how such acquired uncleanness is disposed of in the Hebrew ceremonial system.

3.8. Two Hebrew words are used in Leviticus 11 for unclean: tame טמא = unclean and sheqets שקץ = detestable. In parallel references in Deuteronomy, like the winged creatures of Leviticus 11:20, 23 which is "detestable" is in Deuteronomy 14:19 “unclean”. "This suggests that both terms cover nearly the same meanings, but "detestable" seems to contain broader connotations." "To be 'detestable' means to be in a state too serious to be handled by ritual, ceremonial cleansing."

3.9. The law is universal since it applies to both Israelite or foreigner/ger גר living with Israelites (Leviticus 17:13).

3.10. In other words, certain laws have a universal application; they are outside of the limited focus of ceremonial, ritual, cultic law.
Conclusions

It is concluded that the issue of presence or absence of pig-eating taboos in various Ancient Near Eastern cultures, if connected strongly with the perception of the investigating scholar regarding the role of Old Testament History, can have some answers to questions. If the biblical chronology is taken seriously as a historical and as a past reality given, the end of Egyptian colonialism in Canaan and adjacent areas almost to the Euphrates by Habiru and religious Hebrews under Joshua between 1410-1405 BCE, could have snowballed the takeover of the Minoans by the Mycenean culture at Crete and those areas, and also the takeover of the Hurrians by the Hittites. Ugarit should be understood as a commercial center for refugees and migrants, some from Canaan, who found a new horizon staged in pluralism and syncretism after the long dominant Egyptian period. The sudden disappearance of taboos against pig-eating in Egypt in the New Kingdom will then coincide with the absence of Israelites from Egypt and Canaanites barred to enter Egypt due to strict immigration laws under Amenhotep III. The Israelites and Hittites had many things in common; especially legal aspects and historiography and thus biblical chronology, if taken seriously, would argue that Israelite and Hittite interactivity, following the entry into Canaan in 1410 BCE until 1200 BCE, could account for an S-curve presence and absence of the pig-eating taboo with the Hittites. Hybridization took place among the cultures assimilating and transforming in the process of inculturation and thus these nations could imitate the taboo from Israelites present in their societies since the taboo, different from the other nations, had no S-curve of presence and absence with the Israelites, but with them it was a strong unchanged straight line taboo. That scavengers cannot be food, remained unchanged as principle of taboo among Israelites and the Old Testament and New Testament texts, testifies of that phenomenon.
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