

of clouds and livers, the flight of birds, and numerous other phenomena (Seow and Ritner 2003; Nissinen 2004; Beerden 2013).⁴³

SOCIAL MONITORING AND PUNISHMENT. Patronage and full access to strategic information also would have cued a hearer/reader to the SOCIAL MONITORING domain (one of the fundamental prosocial functions of deity), which would also be construed according to common conceptual frameworks. “Judge” was a common profile associated with deity in the Hebrew Bible, which was activated most clearly when the root *špt* (“to judge”) occurred in some way in reference to a deity’s activities (e.g., Gen 18:25; Isa 2:4; 11:4; Ezek 7:8). This could represent a range of ideas about judgment and the conventions associated with them that frequently bled into other notions of authority and governance. For instance, *špt* is used in some texts to refer to the activity of kings, prophets, and even high priests (1 Sam 4:18; 7:16–17), suggesting it was associated somewhat generically with authority, as in 1 Sam 8:5: “give us a king to judge us [*lāšāptēnū*] like all the nations.” The deity could even be cast as prosecutor or plaintiff, and particularly in the *rīb* (roughly, “lawsuit”) type-scene (Nielsen 1978, de Roche 1983).

Related to social monitoring is punishment, which was most commonly reflected in the judgments against Israel and the nations for their disobedience and iniquity. Because of the Yahwistic orientation of the vast majority of the biblical literature, punishment is generally exercised *on* the deities of the nations, rather than exercised *by* them. A non-Yahwistic example from the cognate literature, however, is found in the Mesha Stele, which asserts in lines 5–6 that the king of Israel was able to oppress Moab because “Chemosh was angry with his land” (*y’np kṁš b’rṣh*).⁴⁴ The Hebrew Bible reflects the same perspective in several locations where YHWH allows foreign powers to oppress Israel because of their iniquity or cultic infidelity. In fact, 2 Kgs 17:18 insists that the fall of the Northern Kingdom was the work of YHWH: “YHWH was very angry [*wayyit’anap YHWH mē’ōd*] with Israel and removed them [*waysirēm*] from his sight.” This reflectively employs the SOCIAL MONITORING and PUNISHMENT domains to rationalize another nation’s victory over Israel without acknowledging the failure of YHWH

⁴³ Necromancy may have been the most accessible, natural, and ubiquitous form of divination available to Israelites and Judahites. Threats to YHWH’s monopoly on the “full-access strategic agent” profile, however, were a concern for later cultic authorities (cf. Deut 18:13). As a result, many of these channels and means for divination were portrayed in later periods as outlawed in monarchic Israel and Judah, with access to this divine agency rhetorically restricted to an authorized school of Yahwistic prophets (Schmitt 2008; Huffmon 2012). Although these prophets still utilized some of the tools mentioned above, unauthorized, foreign, and non-Yahwistic forms of divination were literarily condemned, particularly if involving the deceased (Exod 22:17; Lev 19:26; 20:6, 27; Deut 18:9–14; 1 Sam 28:3–25; cf. Num 23:23; cf. Stökl and Carvalho 2013; Hamori 2015).

⁴⁴ For the text of the Mesha inscription, see Jackson and Dearman 1989.