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A number of recently published inscriptions and studies of the ancient Near Eastern context enlighten our understanding of the Book of Ruth. This study will investigate two such items: daily food ration data and the new “Widow’s Plea” inscription.

1. Ration Texts—Ruth 2:17

In Ruth 2:17 the text stresses the large quantity of grain that Ruth threshed from the first day of her gleaning in the field of Boaz—an ephah of barley (κηφηναὶ σεκορίμοι). Commentators, with the exception of J. Sasson, usually give some kind of conversion figure for an ephah and end at that. K. Nielsen in her commentary concludes: “Of course, the important thing is not to find out exactly the actual weight but to be overwhelmed by Boaz’s generosity to Ruth.” While the text is obviously giving this data in order to demonstrate Boaz’s hesed towards the two widows, Ruth and Naomi, what would be the practical, real-life implications of the particulars? Certainly this data about the significant amount of grain gleaned by Ruth is not given to the reader in order “to add to her list of virtues that she was as strong as an ox.” It must have had some tangible, utilitarian value.

1. Talmon’s suggestion that the preposition κηφηναὶ before σεκορίμοι may be an example of kaph veritatis indicating exactitude is based on a supposed usage in the phrase κύμμι in the Mesad Hashavyahu (Yavneh Yam) ostraca (IK 200, line 5); see S. Talmon, “The New Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C. in Historical Perspective,” BASOR 176 (1964), 29–38, esp. 33. But its use in that inscription is not certain; see J. Renz, Handbuch der Althebräischen Epigraphik (Darmstadt), 1:325, n. 3.

2. In a one-sentence comment, Sasson links the interpretation of the verse to the data from Mari, but not to all the Ration Lists evidence. He states: “Given the fact that at Mari of the Old Babylonian period, the ration of a male worker rarely exceeded one to two pounds per day, we are impressed by Ruth’s ability to gather enough to last her and her mother-in-law a few weeks”; J. M. Sasson, Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation, 2nd ed. (Sheffield, 1989), 57. Hubbard follows Sasson; R. L. Hubbard, Jr., The Book of Ruth, NICOT (Grand Rapids, 1988) 79. On the Mari data, especially the “king’s meal,” see L. Milano, “Food and Diet in Pre-Classical Syria,” in C. Zaccagnini, ed., Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East (Budapest, 1989) 213–29; and J.-J. Glassner, “Mahlzeit,” in RLA 7/3–4.259–67.


4. E. F. Campbell, Jr., Ruth, AB 7 (Garden City, NY, 1975), 104.

5. This is not a statement on the genre of the Book of Ruth (for which see Sasson, Ruth, 197–221; Hubbard, Ruth, 42; and F. Bush, Ruth, Esther, WBC 9 [Dallas, TX, 1996], 52). Rather, this detail is important and relevant for the “story” of Ruth to work; A. Berlin, “Poetics in the Book of Ruth,” Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative (Sheffield, 1983), 83–110.
One of the positive contributions of the French *Annales* school has been its emphases on “history from below” and “total history.” Hence, whether that historiographic movement has been acknowledged or not, this has led to a renewed interest in the ration texts found throughout the various periods of Mesopotamian history.

The best evidence for the diet of ordinary people in Mesopotamia comes from the Ration Lists. These lists are found throughout Mesopotamian history from the Early Dynastic period to the Neo-Babylonian period. They record allocations of barley (*hordeum vulgare*) and other cereals by religious and secular employers to their employees. The lists include an extensive range of professions from shepherds to weavers, from agricultural workers to brewers, even slaves. They include men, women, and children. The rations are recorded either as monthly or daily issues, although they can also be provided for a particular job (e.g., harvesting). There are always variations according to age and status.

These Ration Lists give the portions in the Sumerian capacity measure of the *sīla* or the Akkadian *qū*.

While the measure varied somewhat during different periods and locations, the variance for these Mesopotamian measures seems to lie between 0.83 and 1.02 liters. As M. Powell has recently noted, the ancient norm for a daily food ration throughout the entire history of Mesopotamia seems to have been widely regarded as approximately 1 *sīla* or *qū* (= 1 liter), usually of barley.

Moreover, R. Ellison points out in her study of Mesopotamian alimentation (see the table of *Recommended Daily Nutritional Intakes* below), any adult male receiving more than 1.33 liters per day, and any adult female with more than 1 liter per day, had an energy intake as high or higher than that recommended by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) (3,000 calories for males and 2,200 calories for females). In fact, men with 1 liter (2,700 calories) and women with 0.83 liters (2,160 calories) probably have a sufficient energy intake, especially if allowances are made for smaller size and hotter climate. Hence, as F. M. Fales notes, the 1 *sīla*/liter allocation can be considered the minimum-survival daily nutritional dosage.

Such a diet that is based solely on barley rations would guarantee a relative wealth of energy (accompanied naturally by a marked nutritional imbalance over an extended period of time).

Of the essential nutrients, the barley rations would supply adequate intakes of thiamin and niacin. The iron content could perhaps be low for girls and women, but adequate for men. The most serious deficiencies are vitamins A and C, and these

---


must be made up elsewhere. Insufficient vitamin C can cause scurvy.\(^{13}\) The lack of vitamin A can produce blindness.\(^{14}\) This may have been a significant factor in a number of the cases of blindness in the ancient Near East.\(^{15}\)

The wheat rations would have been emmer wheat (\textit{triticum dicocum}) which is low in gluten making it best suited for the basic flat loaves resembling pita bread.\(^{16}\) Wheat rations would compare with barley rations in general nutritional value. Since vegetables were often grown in small personal gardens, rather than in the fields, and received special attention and irrigation,\(^{17}\) it can be reasonably assumed that these were a major supply of vitamins A and C to supplement the barley and wheat rations.

Therefore, as M. Stol has recently observed, the ration recipients had a diet that contained adequate energy intake.\(^{18}\) Moreover, this ancient Near Eastern data is reinforced by numerous studies in medieval and modern European history. These have demonstrated that rarely did the diet of an adult male doing heavy work—from whom there is a desire to ensure sufficient output—come down below 3,000 daily calories.\(^{19}\)

In the Judahite context, this data is informative in understanding the import of the rations given to the \textit{Kittîm} mercenaries of the Arad letters. J. Renz has recently been able to determine that this group—whether Greeks or Phoenicians\(^{20}\)—numbered about 38 individuals.\(^{21}\)

In the biblical text, the capacity measure of an \textit{ephah} (\textit{êpâh}) was one-tenth of a homer (\textit{hômêr}). This systemic feature is deducible from evidence in the Hebrew Bible (Exod. 16:36; Ezek. 45:11). Very likely the \textit{imēru/hômêr} system was introduced in Mesopotamia by the Amorites in the late third millennium BCE.\(^{22}\) Because the Mesopotamian \textit{imēru} was clearly a West Semitic import, it is likely that the

---

13. Ellison notes that scurvy which developed during the winter months might be cleared up when the green vegetables appeared; “Diet in Mesopotamia,” 39.
14. Technically, the deficiency of vitamin A is the main cause of xerophthalmia and keratomalacia—conditions which, if not halted, produce permanent blindness.
15. It is possible that the frequent use of the phrase \textit{IGI.NU.DU₈} “blind,” usually taken to refer to prisoners of war who had been deliberately blinded, may refer to people who have been blinded or partially blinded by vitamin A deficiency (Ellison, “Diet in Mesopotamia,” 39–42; and “Some Thoughts on the Diet of Mesopotamia from c. 3000–600 BC,” \textit{Iraq} 45 [1983], 146–50, esp. 149).
17. Ibid., 193.
norms of the Hebrew system, also deriving out of the common West Semitic context, was similar to this imēru/ḥōmer system. Thus early Hebrew norms for the ḥōmer may not have been very different from the contemporary Mesopotamian capacity measures: Mesopotamian qû → sūtu → imēru = Hebrew ʿōmer → ʾēpāh → ḥōmer respectively.

The ḥōmer was derived from the “assload”—the weight that one ass can carry. This “assload,” Powell notes, “lies somewhere in the 90 kg range, fixing the assload of barley at = 150 liters or the assload of wheat at = 120 liters. Furthermore, even allowing for uncertainties and upward adjustment by redefinition of norms, the “natural” assload can hardly have exceeded 200 liters. Corresponding to their Mesopotamian counterparts, the probable parameters of the pre-exilic Hebrew Bible dry measures from smallest to greatest were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesopotamian</th>
<th>qû (šīla)</th>
<th>sūtu</th>
<th>imēru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>ʿōmer</td>
<td>ʾēpāh</td>
<td>ḥōmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1–2 liters</td>
<td>10–20 liters</td>
<td>100–200 liters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of this capacity measure data to the Book of Ruth is complicated by the uncertainty concerning the book’s date of composition. Unfortunately, there is no consensus concerning the book’s date, with some scholars preferring a pre-exilic date and others a postexilic date.

Problems of actual capacities arise due to differences between pre- and post-exilic sources. Many of these are due to the postexilic identification of the ḥōmer with the kōr and the inability of ancient authors to see that different structures and norms distinguished pre-exilic metrology (primarily decimal structures) from postexilic metrology (strongly influenced by sexagesimal patterns and Babylonian norms). Consequently, the larger capacity measure for an ephah that is sometimes listed in commentaries (i.e., 36.4 liters) is a measure based upon postexilic and later sources. This obviously would produce a ḥōmer (364 liters) that no single donkey could carry! But then, the ancient links to the original imēru/ḥōmer system at this point were being lost. Often the equation of an ephah with a 36.4 liter capacity is based on a derivation from the Persian maris. While this accords well with Josephus’ measures for the bat (Antiquities 3.8.3; 8.2.9), it produces an ephah of unrealistic weight for Ruth to carry, unless she made more than one trip from the threshing to Naomi’s house. If a post-exilic ephah is in view, then the actual amount gleaned is a significantly greater amount than the pre-exilic amount.

24. Ibid., 903–5. Because of diachronic and political circumstances, it seems likely that there were a number of ēomer norms in the pre-exilic period, although these probably remained within the general range described here.
25. Ibid., 903. The difference in capacity measures is due to the difference in grain weights.
27. Loc. cit.
29. Such a scenario, however, seems to be diminished as a possibility in light of the story’s description of Naomi’s spontaneous reaction at Ruth’s arrival back home.
Whatever the case, the ancient norm for a daily food ration seems to have been widely regarded as \(= 1\) liter, usually of barley.\(^{30}\) It should be remembered that 0.83 liters can be sufficient for women (see above discussion). Therefore, using the pre-exilic capacity measure, Ruth’s \(ephah\) equated about 10–20 liters of barley which was enough for the two women to eat for a little more than a week.\(^{31}\) Using the post-exilic capacity standard, Ruth’s gleanings were enough for the two women to subsist for two and a half weeks.

But according to Ruth 2:23, Ruth continued to glean in Boaz’s fields “until the barley and wheat harvests were finished.” According to Deut. 16:9–12 and the Gezer Calendar,\(^{32}\) the time period from the beginning of the barley harvest to the end of the wheat harvest was normally two months, concluding at Pentecost. If Ruth averaged roughly the same total each day (i.e., one \(ephah\)), and worked the entire two months, she would have gleaned a considerable amount of barley and wheat that would have fed the two women, at the minimum pre-exilic rate, approximately two-thirds of a year, or at the maximum pre-exilic rate, more than an entire year. With a post-exilic extension of the capacity measure data, the two women would have had enough from Ruth’s gleanings over the two month period to eat for two years.\(^{33}\)

In any case, regardless of the date of composition for the book, the ancient hearers of the story of Ruth were certainly well versed in the agricultural world of the Levant and no doubt sensitive to food rationing issues. Thus it is most likely that the ancient hearers would have perceived the import of this gleaning detail in Ruth 2:17 as heightening the generosity of Boaz towards the two widows on a scale greater than modern readers of the story have even begun to perceive.

2. Ruth and “the Widow’s Plea”

The recently published “Widow’s Plea”\(^{34}\) evokes comparison and contrast to the Book of Ruth. To facilitate discussion the inscription, in transliteration and translation, are given:\(^{35}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
& (1) \ yb®rk k \ yhwh \ b®l®m. \\
& (2) \ wÇt \ ysm c. \ dny \ \ h®sr \ rmt k 3 \\
& (3) \ y˜ky.
\end{align*}
\]

30. In other words, one \(sÌL\)A or \(qû\) throughout the entire history of Mesopotamia (Powell, “Weights and Measures,” 904). For a full discussion, see Milano, “Food and Diet in Pre-Classical Syria,” 201–71; and Fales, “Grain Reserves,” 23–34.

31. An observation first made by Sasson, Ruth (see n. 2 above).

32. According to this extrabiblical Hebrew inscription (lines 4–5), a month was devoted to harvesting barley and a month was devoted to harvesting wheat. This inscription is clearly a twelve month calendar of the agricultural year, in spite of some persistent disclaimers’ comments. See the discussion and bibliography in D. Sivan, “The Gezer Calendar and Northwest Semitic Linguistics.” \(IEJ\ 48\) (1998), 101–5; and O. Borowski, \(Agriculture in Iron Age Israel\) (Winona Lake, IN, 1987), 31–44.

33. Storage for this amount of grain, however, may have presented a problem.


35. Recently the ostraca’s authenticity has been questioned. See I. Eph'al and J. Naveh, “Remarks on the Recently Published Moussaïeff Ostraca,” \(IEJ\ 48\) (1998), 269–73. See also A. Berejund and A. Schüle, “Erwägungen zu den neuen Ostraka aus der Sammlung Moussaïeff,” \(Zeitschrift für Althebräistik\ 11\)
May Yahweh bless you in peace.

And now, may my lord, the commander, hear your maidservant:

My husband is dead; (and there are) no sons.

And let your hand be with me; and may you give into the hand of your maidservant the ancestral estate that you promised to Amasyah.

And now, the wheat field which is in Naamah, you have given (or: may you give) it to his brother.

Besides the obvious parallel with the story of Naomi (lines 1–4), there are a number of instances of similar vocabulary to Ruth 4 (lines 4–8). In addition, the use of the term āmāh in the inscription (lines 2, 4) seems to illuminate Ruth’s usage of the term in her nocturnal approach to Boaz (Ruth 3:9).

The editors of the “Widow’s Plea” rightly point out the fact that an āmāh is the feminine parallel to the masculine term ēbed as confirmed by the marvelous parallel in the Meṣad Ḩashavyahu inscription (KAI 200). There have been, however, a number of scholars who have argued that there was no significant difference between an āmāh and a šiphāḥ. 37

Obviously there was semantic overlap between the two terms. 38 Both terms can be used interchangeably in certain contexts as a term for “female slave (i.e., any female who is not ‘free’).” 39 Both can also be used figuratively as a term for self-abasement. But such near synonymity does not rule out the possibility that there are contexts in which some nuance of difference may be present. 40

(1998), 58–73. While the arguments of Eph’al and Naveh may raise questions concerning the inscription’s authenticity, they do not—as they admit—prove that it is a forgery. In fact, these same arguments—in particular the biblical and epigraphic parallels—in many ways could be used to argue—and often are used as arguments for authenticity in the cases of other inscriptions—for the genuineness of this ostracan. The abruptness and enigma caused by the last sentence (lines 6–8) may indicate genuineness. Would a forger think to insert this statement?

36. It is possible that nth in line 7 has the same volitional nuance of wntth in line 4 (as observed by Eph’al and Naveh, “Remarks,” 269).


38. See, e.g., 2 Sam. 14:6–19 where šiphāḥ’kā appears to be parallel to šōmātō. It is noteworthy, however, that the only two occurrences of šōmātō are found in the more formal indirect speech/thought of the widow (vv. 15–16). Thus the wise woman of Tekoa refers to herself as “your šiphāḥ” when describing her plight but as “your āmāh when presenting her request.


"'āmāh seems to be used to emphasize a slave’s feminine qualities (need for protection, weakness, sexual attractiveness, etc.), while 'sipḥāh seems to be used when the female is viewed as a possession and a laborer. Both terms can be used as self-designations. When it is used this way, 'āmāh appears to suggest a female petitioner’s weakness and need for help or protection when presenting a request before a more powerful male, never before another female. When 'sipḥāh is used as a self-designation of obeisance, it seems to signify the woman’s subservience and readiness to serve or obey instructions.

It appears that the term 'āmāh may have also been used at times figuratively to describe women of higher social status. This seems to be the case particularly in a number of extra-biblical uses. Thus it is used to describe a woman who was the wife of a high government official (the 'ṣr 'l hbyt) in the inscription of the “Royal Steward.” It is also used in a seal of a woman named Shelomith who is the wife of Elnatan, the governor of Judah. Both the 'āmāh of the 'ṣr 'l hbyt and Shelomith, the 'āmāh of the governor, are very likely women of higher social status. In these contexts, 'āmāh may be used as a metonymy for wife or an honorific title. Finally, 'āmāh appears in our “Widow’s Plea” inscription, being used twice as the appropriate, polite designation for a woman presenting a discretionary petition to a higher official or judge.

In 1 Sam. 25:41, according to Berlin, Abigail is an 'āmāh but wants to further reduce herself to a 'sipḥāh vis-à-vis David. It appears that 'sipḥāh, when used distinctively, is the more deferential term since it refers to women belonging to the lowest rung of the social ladder.

In Ruth 2:13, Ruth initially refers to herself as Boaz’s 'sipḥāh, although she does not really have even this status (she is officially a nokriyāh, “foreign woman”). She refers to herself in this way to emphasize her complete unworthiness and her role...
and intent as laborer, since she does not know what the response of Boaz will be to
this new Moabitess in his field. She is not yet even remotely established within her
new social context.

But later in her nocturnal visit (Ruth 3:9), Ruth refers to herself as an ̄āmāḥ. She
uses the term that is appropriate in the context of a request of marriage 48 to a
gibbōr ḥayil like Boaz. The use of this self-designation may indicate the woman’s utter
dependence on the addressee’s favor to grant her request. 49

This new ostracon also raises a question concerning the levirate marriage in an-
cient Israel. H. Shanks puts it this way:

The inscription is puzzling. According to the law of levirate marriage, a man must marry his
brother’s widow if his brother died childless (see Deuteronomy 25:5–6). Why wasn’t the hus-
band’s brother, who had already received the wheat field in Na‘amah, required to do his duty
by marrying his brother’s widow? Alas, the ostracon does not tell us. 50

There are at least seven possible reasons that the levirate is not mentioned in the
ostracon:

1. The widow is beyond child-bearing age and thus the levirate is impossible to
implement. Unfortunately we have no way of knowing if this were the case
or not for the inscription’s widow.

2. While on the basis of the biblical Book of Ruth many scholars have assumed
that the laws pertaining to marriage and redemption of land were necessarily
intertwined, it may be, as H. Avalos has observed, that the author of Ruth
has intentionally distorted these two institutions primarily to advance and
strengthen a plot that focused on the fortunes of widowed women. 51 Thus
there would be no reason for the levirate to apply in this case. If, however,
R. Westbrook is correct in his analysis of the levirate—namely, that the levi-
rate was indelibly linked to the nahālāh as is evident from the exegesis of the
relevant passages, 52 then there are good reasons to see the two institutions as
linked together.

3. The levirate was not practiced any longer in Judahite society at the time of
the ostracon’s writing (i.e., the time of Josiah, according to its editors). Cer-
tainly, at some point the levirate ceased to be practiced. And if the state were
breaking down the old traditional kinship groups, 53 then it is possible that by
the end of the monarchic period the levirate was disappearing. However, it is

---

51. Avalos, “Legal and Social Institutions,” 616. In fairness to Avalos, he is not necessarily advocating
this interpretation, but citing it as a caution in the interpretation of the levirate.
52. R. Westbrook, Property and the Family in Biblical Law, JSOT Supp. 113 (Sheffield, 1991), 69–89;
of Individual Moral Liability,” in B. Halpern & D. W. Hobson, eds., Law and Ideology in Monarchic Is-
very difficult, if not impossible under present circumstances, to prove that the levirate was no longer being practiced.

4. It may be that widows could, in fact, inherit land in ancient Israel and that the biblical text simply does not adequately note this. T. Thompson and D. Thompson register this possibility when they argue that normally no provisions were made for widows, yet “they do not say the wife cannot inherit if the husband, before he dies, chooses to make her his heir.” Consequently, if this is the case, the ostracon evinces a situation in which arrangements have been made beforehand for the nahvelah to pass to the widow, but the šar has not executed the estate properly as yet, although he has, in the case of the wheat field of Na‘amah, executed part of the inheritance to the deceased’s brother.55 The widow’s petition would be more like the worker’s plea in the Mešad Ḥashavyahu letter, an appeal for justice in the fulfillment of what had been promised.

However, in the biblical texts, the widow, along with the fatherless and the gēr (“foreign sojourner”) typified the powerless in ancient Israel (Exod. 22:21–24; Deut. 10:18, etc.). The prophets describe their abuse by those in power (Jer. 7:6; Isa. 1:17; 10:2; Mal. 3:5). It seems that a woman’s economic well-being was directly related to her link with some male.56 Moreover, as Lewis has pointed out, the story of the Tekoite widow in 2 Samuel 14 “works” only if women do not inherit. If women inherit, the story loses much of its force.57

5. The widow’s brother-in-law has refused to perform the levirate for some reason.58 According to Deut. 25:7–10, this was a possibility, although if this were the case here, one would have expected the widow to bring this to the šar’s attention. The passage in Deuteronomy details the process of shaming the brother-in-law who “has no desire (ḥāpēš) to marry his brother’s widow.” But the passage is silent on what happens to the widow and the nahvelah.59 Presumably, she is free to remarry someone else within the mispāelah and the

---


55. Unless the verbal form in the last sentence is understood volitionally “may you give.” See n. 36 above.


58. Perhaps like the prōnōi ʿalmōnī of Ruth 4:1–6, he is worried about endangering his own nahvelah.

land remains in a temporary, transitional state until this remarriage. The Hebrew Bible is silent on what happened to the \( naḥəlāh \) during the interim between the death of the husband and the ceremony in Deut. 25:7–10, as well as the interim between the ceremony and the time of remarriage.

6. Some type of special arrangement has been made in this case by Amasyahu—the widow’s deceased husband as the ostracon’s editors have suggested.\(^{60}\) Hence the widow was requesting the \( šar \) for a temporary usufruct of the \( naḥəlāh \). They state:

The wife of the deceased is requesting a temporary suspension of legal transfer of her husband’s property to those who were legally entitled to receive it; her request is based on the claim that the husband’s brother has taken possession of one part of the property and that he cannot therefore claim a state of need similar to her own.\(^{61}\)

In such a case, this special arrangement may have superceded the levirate.

However, this interpretation is problematic since it is not clear on what ground such a special arrangement has been based. While Moses modifies the law concerning inheritance in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad, he does so, according to the tradition in Numbers, on the basis of Yahweh’s command (Num. 27:7–10). Does the \( šar \) have this kind of authority? Ideally in the ancient Near East, the king was the protector of the widow, the orphan, and the poor—that is, the powerless in society. And it was the \( šar \), who by extension of the royal authority, was responsible for this as well.

7. The levirate would not apply in this case since the \( naḥəlāh \) of her husband’s and brother-in-law’s father had already been divided between the two brothers. The levirate would apply only up to the point of the division of the father’s \( naḥəlāh \).

If one understands the levirate as Westbrook has described it in his *Property and the Family in Biblical Law*, then the levirate would not apply in this case. If the land has already been divided, then the brothers were no longer “living together” (cf. Deut. 25:5). If one of them dies without issue, then the surviving brother inherits as heir of the deceased brother, not as heir of the deceased father. Since the land was divided and the deceased brother would be listed as an owner having title (\( šēm \)), there would be no reason to implement the levirate. It would be unnecessary to generate the legal fiction of title through the birth of a levirate son since the deceased brother had realized title to the land before his death.

This solution, however, is not free of problems. If Amasyahu died without issue, then why hasn’t the surviving brother as heir of the deceased brother already inherited the estate of the deceased? On what grounds has Amasyahu arranged commitments from this \( šar \) concerning the \( naḥəlāh \)? And why has

---

61. Ibid., p. 11. In regard to special arrangements for a widow made by the husband in anticipation of his death, and for the occasional need for judicial intervention to obtain the widow’s settlement in such cases, see M. T. Roth, “The Neo-Babylonian Widow,” *JCS* 43–45 (1991–93), 1–26, esp. 7–14.
the šar given the wheat field in Naḥamah to Amasyahu’s brother (if there were a commitment to a special arrangement)?

Finally, the ostraca raise another question: “Did Naomi have a legal option that she chooses not to exercise? And if she had one, why wouldn’t she use it? A comparison with the widow of Tekoa and the widow of this ostraca could appeal to a higher authority, why can’t Naomi? Is it because the former instances (the widow of Tekoa and the widow of the ostraca) live during the monarchy when such appeals were more possible? If this is the case, wouldn’t this have raised a question in the minds of hearers/readers of the Book of Ruth (i.e., would they have not wondered too why Naomi does not make appeal to a clan chieftain, elder, or šar). Of course, Naomi’s case may have been different to the point that an appeal was not possible (i.e., maybe the šādēh, “field,” of Elimelech having been sold previously before the departure from Bethlehem to Moab effectively eliminated the grounds for appeal since only in the context of a gōʾēl’s action could there be remedy for her situation).

Conclusion

To what extent can one expect a short story that has something of a folkloristic air to it to convey social, legal, and economic institutions in an accurate, realistic manner? Frequently, biblical and ancient Near Eastern materials have been used to attempt to argue for a particular date of composition for the Book of Ruth or its historicity. This article has not attempted to do this. Rather the two comparative points discussed in it have assumed that the ancient Near Eastern materials can be helpful in the elucidation of the biblical text because they are data—in an important sense—from the “real world” out of which the story of Ruth arose. Even in the most folkloristic of tales, there are elements of the story that “work” in the real world of the original audience. The accurate/inaccurate, realistic/unrealistic qualities of an ancient story are sometimes best judged by documents from a historically literary context close to that story’s.

While the two notes discussed here do not solve the interpretive problems in the Book of Ruth, they do help us re-address some of the issues. And this very process is helpful because it enhances our ability to discern some of the intricate nuances that

---

62. Or why is the widow requesting that the wheat field in Naḥamah be given to Amasyahu’s brother (if wntth is volitional; see n. 36 above)?
64. See the fine discussion in S. Niditch, “Legends of Wise Heroes and Heroines,” in D. A. Knight & G. M. Tucker, eds., The Hebrew Bible and its Modern Interpreters (Minneapolis and Atlanta, 1985), 445–63, esp. 451–56. She rightly points out that such items as genre, legal information, and theology cannot be used definitely to date Ruth.
may have been active in the legal systems and cultural mores in ancient Israelite society in so far as a story like Ruth may relay them.

---

**Recommended Daily Nutritional Intakes**

(Food and Agricultural Organisation, FAO, 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calories</th>
<th>Protein (g)</th>
<th>Calcium (mg)</th>
<th>Iron (mg)</th>
<th>Thiamin (mg)</th>
<th>Riboflavin (mg)</th>
<th>Niacin (mg)</th>
<th>Vit. A (iu)</th>
<th>Vit. C (mg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Male</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>400–500</td>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Female</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>400–500</td>
<td>14–28</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nutritional Value of Selected Barley Rations**

(assuming 1 šaluqi = 1 liter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>šaluqi per day</th>
<th>Calories</th>
<th>Protein (g)</th>
<th>Calcium (mg)</th>
<th>Iron (mg)</th>
<th>Thiamin (mg)</th>
<th>Riboflavin (mg)</th>
<th>Niacin (mg)</th>
<th>Vit. A (iu)</th>
<th>Vit. C (mg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>145.50</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>72.75</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65. Both tables are adapted from Ellison, “Diet in Mesopotamia,” 40–41 with additional update.
Well, right in that book, while that condition in general existed, you set this contrast. This beautiful picture is given to us in the book of Ruth. And so we are brought to see God acting, with the long view, in the midst of such conditions, and at such a time. Look at the last words of the book of Judges: “In those days, there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” Note: “And a certain man of Bethlehemjudah went to sojourn in the country of Moab; he and his wife and his two sons.” Now Elimelech, his wife and two sons were very decent people, very nice people, were very good people. We haven’t anything at all that’s said against them, in their moral life, in their respectability. Perhaps in their God-fearingness, in heart. Part 2. The Book of Ruth Michał Németh Jagiellonian University in Krakow Abstract he present article is a continuation of a description of manuscript III-73, which contains the earliest known Western Karaim Torah translation (from 1720) along with the North-Western Karaim translation of four books of Ketuvim more precisely, the translation of the Book of Ruth, the Book of Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Esther. he linguistic peculiarities of the Torah were presented in Where reasonable, in order to present the text in a bit larger comparative perspective I will The Book of Ruth is short. Really, really short. It only has 4 chapters, which means that it fits on two pages in a full-sized Bible. It reads like a short story, and therefore carries a lot less of the “preachy” stuff common to many parts of the Bible. Ruth tells the story of (surprise!) a lady named Ruth. Ruth gets married to Boaz, who begat Obed, who begat Jesse, who begat David, who was the ancestor of Joseph, who “begat” (gasp) No! he didn’t Jesus! The book of Ruth summary. A man from Bethlehem named Elimelech was forced out of his home by famine and went to live in the land of Moab with his wife, Naomi, and two sons. He died and subsequently his sons married women from Moab, Orpah and Ruth. After 10 years the two sons also died, leaving Naomi and her two daughters-in-law as widows. Naomi heard that the famine was over in Judea and decided to return to Bethlehem. She urged her daughters-in-law to remain in Moab and find husbands from among their own people. Orpah finally decided to stay, but Ruth was determined to go with Naomi. Again, N