JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

EDITORS:

J COOK   I CORNELIUS

P A KRUGER   C H J VAN DER MERWE

VOLUME EDITOR:

J COOK

at the University of Stellenbosch
South Africa

Contributions and books for review should be sent to
The Editor: *JNSL*
Department of Ancient Studies
University of Stellenbosch
Private Bag X1, Matieland, ZA-7602
SOUTH AFRICA
Fax +27 (0) 21 808 3480
e-mail: cyster@sun.ac.za

Subscriptions should be sent to the same address but marked as
Subscription: *JNSL*

House rules
Articles submitted for publication must be according to the house rules on the homepage
JNSL homepage (house rules, contents, subscription)
http://www.sun.ac.za/as/journals/jnsl/

ORDER FORM: Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
  Enter me as a subscriber to the JNSL
  I enclose the correct amount due

Per Invoice	$ 65.00
	€ 50.00
Booksellers	- 30 %

  Name
Address... ....
....Postal code ....
For further subscription information: **e-mail to cyster@sun.ac.za or write to**
The Editor, JNSL, Department of Ancient Studies, University of Stellenbosch,
Private Bag X1, Matieland, South Africa, 7602 or fax to +27 (0)21 8083480.

CONTENTS

John Van Seters (Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada)

IS THERE ANY HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE HEBREW BIBLE? A HEBREW – GREEK COMPARISON

ABSTRACT

E W Nicholson has challenged the view that there is any historiography in the Hebrew Bible and disputed the published comparisons of the author between the Hebrew "histories" of Genesis to 2 Kings and the histories of Herodotus and other early Greek historians. In particular, he understands Greek historiography to be a form of narrative about the recent past that is based only on direct observation and the critical appraisal of historical evidence and rational causes without any consideration of divine causation of historical events. By contrast the biblical writings are only "story". The following essay attempts to show that this understanding of Greek historiography is quite misleading and that there is indeed much that is similar in the Hebrew Bible and the Greek histories such that the biblical writings deserve to be called histories every bit as much as those of ancient Greece.

Natalio Fernández Marcos (Madrid)

THE OTHER SEPTUAGINT: FROM THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS TO THE LETTER OF JEREMIAH

"Despite the efforts of a few Hebrew scholars down the ages and their claims to be concerned, like St Jerome, with the original Hebrew, it was the Greek Bible that has been most influencial in the history of Christianity and indirectly in the history of western culture", John F A Sawyer (1999:94).

Josef Lössl (KULeuven)

AMOS 6:1. NOTES ON ITS TEXT AND ANCIENT TRANSLATIONS

ABSTRACT

This article discusses briefly the text of Amos 6:1 and compares it with a group of ancient translations. It looks at how these translations tried to make sense of the original and how they interacted with each other in the process. It comes to the conclusion that both aspects are present in each of the translations reviewed. None of them can claim to have a special relationship to the Hebrew over against any other, yet each of them represents a valuable contribution to a better understanding of the original, and all of them do so precisely by interacting with each other.

Moshe A Zipor (Bar-Ilan)

TOWARDS AN ANNOTATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE *PESHITTA*

ABSTRACT

The Syriac Peshitta version of the OT is a translation of the Hebrew Bible. However, the Peshitta has its own value both as an ancient interpretation of the Hebrew text and as a version that reflects sometimes a Hebrew Vorlage different from the MT. Making an English translation of the Peshitta can be justified only if it reflects clearly these two aspects of relationship between the Peshitta and the MT. To achieve this goal the English translation must stick as much as possible to the Syriac wording, in order to warn the reader whenever the Syriac says something different from the MT. The translation must be appended in footnotes or even in a commentary, which has to illuminate the following issues: any significant interpretation used by the Syriac translator; cases of similarity to other ancient versions or traditions and the possibility of a different Hebrew Vorlage. Thus the Syriac expression dšml' 'ydh lmlbš m'n' is the literal rendition of וּמִלֵּא אֶת־יָדוֹ לִלְבֹּשׁ אֶת־הַבְּגָדִים *both, lit.: "and had filled-in his hands to wear the garments"; Lev 21:10), but would certainly appear in any English translation as "and that had been appointed to wear the (sacerdotal) garments", and the issue has to be clarified in the footnotes.*

As a sample, Lev 19 is attached. The sample includes an alignment of MT and Peshitta in Hebrew characters (with varia lectiones*), an English translation and a commentary.*

Michal Ephratt (University of Haifa)

Hebrew morphology by itself

ABSTRACT

*Regarding the choice of which model most adequately represents Hebrew morphology, it is argued that such a model must arise from Hebrew facts, that is Hebrew morphology by itself. Specifically, this necessitates theoretical and empirical understanding of the essence of the Hebrew root. Three models are considered: Word-based (**WB**), Root-based (**RB**) and Root-pattern based (**RPB**). We show that the nature of Semitic/Hebrew morphology is such that new lexemes (as well as nonsense or potential words) were and still are generated directly from roots and patterns without any need and any factual support for an intermediate word stage. The WB model (Aronoff 1976) we conclude is inadequate for mainstream Hebrew morphology. Root-based (**RB**). We then show that a Hebrew root morpheme is not a stem undergoing vowel modification. Nor can it merge with vowels, or with concatenative affixes (derivational or inflectional). It can only merge with a pattern morpheme: one root morpheme with one pattern morpheme at a time. This maxim is lost in a RB model. We propose an alternative, namely, root-pattern-based model. We show that such a model succeeds in representing the equal, necessary, exclusive bond that holds between the root morpheme and the pattern morpheme. Such a model is supported by empirical data. We conclude with a brief glance at what we consider the phonological and semantic nature of the root-pattern model.*

Albert Pietersma (Toronto)

Ἐπίχειρον IN GREEK JEREMIAH

ABSTRACT

It is argued here that a reputedly unique Greek word with an allegedly unique meaning in Greek Jeremiah is neither unique in attestation nor unique semantically and furthermore ought not be cited in support of any theory of bi-sectioning the book.

Gerrit van Steenbergen (University of Stellenbosch)

Componential analysis of meaning and cognitive linguistics: Some prospects for biblical hebrew lexicology

ABSTRACT

In this article the author develops a theoretical framework for the application of componential analysis of meaning (CA). After a brief overview of the "classic" version of CA, a broader theoretical approach based on cognitive linguistics is proposed in which CA functions as a heuristic tool for the lexicographic description of specific Hebrew lexical items that belong to the domain of negative moral behaviour. The tool of CA can play a crucial role in cross-cultural communication, describing and analyzing the features that have a bearing on our understanding of reality. It can serve for both linguistic as well as psychological and anthropological input. This makes CA relevant beyond its traditional structuralist linguistic constraints. The paper provides the theoretical background to underpin this last statement and draws mainly on insights from cognitive linguistics in this discussion, particularly in the fields of categorization and the concepts of "schema" and "frame".

Harry F van Rooy (Potchefstroom)

THE HEADINGS OF THE PSALMS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

ABSTRACT

This article studies the headings of the Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially in relationship to the headings in the Masoretic Text and in the Septuagint. Special attention is given to those manuscripts that contain a substantial number of headings, such as 4QPs^a, 4QPs^b, 4QPs^c, 4QPs^e, 11QPs^a, 11QPs^c, 11QPs^d, He/Se4 and MasPs^a. Special attention is also given to those Psalms where important variants occur in the headings, such as Psalms 33, 71, 91, 100, 104, 105, 123, 126, 130, 135, 144, 148 and 150. The results tend to demonstrate affinity with the Septuagint in only a limited number of instances, such as Psalm 33, 104 and perhaps 91. It does not seem as if the headings at Qumran have any special significance for the headings in the Septuagint. The results also indicate stability in the Hebrew headings (Masoretic text and Qumran) in the first three books of the Psalter. It is also clear that the situation with regard to 11QPs^a is not different from the other headings from the corresponding sections of the Psalter.

Paul A Kruger (Stellenbosch)

JOB 18:11B: A CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE EMOTION OF FEAR?

ABSTRACT

Job 18:11b has always been a crux interpretum*, especially the meaning assigned to the difficult Hiphil of the root* פוץ *which is conventionally translated as "pursue, disperse". Proposals to solve the obscure passage are reviewed and in the light of parallels gathered with regard to the experiencing of the emotion of fear, the suggestion is made that* פוץ *should rather be related to the basic meaning of* פוץ *"overflow". Hence the phrase is to be translated: "and compel him to overflow (*פוץ *= to make water) over his feet". This suggestion was already made one hundred years ago by Ehrlich, but it has not yet been accepted by scholars.*

BOOK REVIEWS

Adair, James R 2000. *An Inductive Method for Reconstructing the Biblical Text, Illustrated by an Analysis of I Samuel 3* (JNSL Monograph Series 2). Print24.com: Cape Town. pp. vii+380. ISBN 0-7972-0785-6. Price $ 50.

Adair proposes a systematic method of reconstructing the biblical text. After a thorough criticism of current methods in biblical textual criticism, he devises a particular amalgam of some of the canonical and genealogical methods. From canonical criticism he adopts the vision of the Hebrew underlying the MT, and the various ancient translations, LXX, Vulgate, Peshitta, Targum (and in addition to that the Hebrew texts from Qumran and a few interesting medieval Hebrew manuscripts according to Goshen-Gottstein's analysis) as independent text forms, each cultivated by its own community (the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions of the LXX and the 'Three' are presented as partial witnesses). By virtue of their independence these text-forms also are viewed as 'archetypal' witnesses to an underlying Hebrew source text. In Adair's view reconstruction of these source texts provides the basis for an eclectic approximation of the Hebrew parent text (the 'original' text).

Reconstruction of the Hebrew source text of each version proceeds in stages. First Adair establishes a working text of the translation by elimination of secondary variants within its textual tradition. Then he proceeds to identify all *prima facie* deviations of the version at hand from the MT. In the third stage he specifies all obvious matters of translation technique. This 'partial', *prima facie* identification is subsequently refined by means of the elimination of all obvious graphic errors of the Hebrew source text. This operation sequence enables Adair to present a quantified, statistical evaluation of various parameters of the translation technique, resulting in a characteristic profile of each version. Once this profile is given, Adair uses 'complete induction' in order to establish the source text of each version. This way he succeeds in establishing a series of independent witnesses to the Hebrew parent text (the 'original Hebrew') which thus is reconstructed from all preferable variants, including those found in the Qumran scrolls and the MT. Adair illustrates the advantages of this procedure by means of the text of 1 Samuel 3.

In the view of the present reviewer the determination of the various steps necessary for systematic reconstruction is admirable and definitely constitutes progress. The interaction between translation technique and textual evidence is, of course, well known in our discipline. Nevertheless, a difference exists between piecemeal examination and overall analysis. One of the important points is that the evidence of the LXX is now identified as a relatively literal and that of the Peshitta as a quite literal witness. Still some questions impose themselves. Does a given version serve as a witness to an independent textual tradition, as the author suggests? The present reviewer tends to doubt this. The community that cherishes the tradition of a certain version cultivates the text of that version itself, rather than the underlying Hebrew source text. Thus the independence of the witnesses seems canonical rather

than archetypal. In fact, Adair's investigation confirms again that Peshitta, Targum and Vulgata all represent a Hebrew text that is close to the rabbinic forerunner of MT.

A second question relates to the reliability of the reconstruction. The problem is that any reconstruction along these lines needs unequivocal choices, wherever a dilemma presents itself. Actually, then, many steps on this ladder are entirely dependent on textual decisions taken. Are we always able to determine whether a given reading in a given version relates to internal variance or to the Hebrew source text? And in how many cases are we allowed to suspect that other factors are involved? For instance, at 1 Sam 3:2, (MT ועלי שכב במקמו) most manuscripts of the LXX read ἐκάθευδεν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ αὐτοῦ but for ἐκάθευδεν B* has ἐκάθητο. Adair views the latter variant as secondary *vis-à-vis* ἐκάθευδεν, which fits the lexeme שכב of MT. Although his suggestion seems sound, it should be pointed out that at 1 Sam 1:9 MT has ועלי הכהן ישב על הכסא, perfectly matched by LXX καὶ Ηλι ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκάθητο ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου. Thus the B* reading agrees with this verse, an agreement which could have arisen in the Hebrew as well as in the Greek tradition. After all, the similarity of ἐκάθητο to ἐκάθευδεν is hardly more striking than the likeness of ישב to שכב. In the present case, it is easy to decide that 'lying down' suits the context better than 'being seated,' but one may doubt whether it is possible to point to a decision method that would turn this intuitive judgment into a systematic procedure. In general, more attention could have been given to passages in the wider context.

This kind of indeterminacy is also found on higher level. For instance, in the end one has to choose between two versions of Samuel's call and the subsequent dialogue of priest and future prophet: the MT version and that reflected by the LXX (and partly backed up by 4QSam[a]). According to the methods of literary oriented canonical criticism (Walters), one would have to view each version in its own right. Adair prefers to reconstruct a presumed 'original' text, and adopts the version reflected by the LXX. Is this a purely textual decision? The present reviewer would answer this question in the negative. A decision of this kind involves questions of pattern (we are dealing with a three stages structure with a climax in the fourth stage), scheme (a dream scheme for a non-dreaming state), inner life (the innocent boy facing the divine call), and narrator's attitude. Adair is right in taking these issues into account. The problem, however, is of a more general nature. When the disposition of the text is involved, there is no way of knowing how many aspects are to be reckoned with. One can try to touch upon as many issues as possible, but one never knows if the discussion was exhaustive, nor whether the points touched upon are decisive. That is the logic behind the proposal to restrict oneself to the indication of two different pictures. If the textual critic feels that it is necessary to go beyond that line, he has to be aware that at this point textual analysis turns into literary scrutiny.

In the present case the author shows awareness of a measure of schematization in the LXX, since in the Greek Eli's instructions to Samuel always include the two imperatives ἀνάστρεφε κάθευδε (3.6, 7, 9), whereas in the MT the instructions include two sets of imperatives: שוב שכב (vv. 5,6) and לך שכב (v. 9). At this

juncture analysis of these differences seems imperative to the present reviewer. In the latter case, which belongs to the preparation for the climax, the use of לך seems most significant, since the lad is not merely to return to his place, but is preparing to respond to the divine call. By the same token, in the LXX the first description of Samuel returning to his place (3.5) uses the same two verbs καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν καὶ ἐκάθευδεν, whereas the MT reads וילך וישכב. The latter form highlights the contrast with his response to what he viewed as Eli's call, וירץ אל עלי, whereas the former emphasizes obedience. In the Greek version the final order to Samuel is simply introduced by καὶ εἶπεν, while the MT has a solemn introduction of the two parties, ויאמר עלי לשמואל (v. 9). The fuller introduction seems more appropriate to the decisive instruction than the laconic clauselet of the Greek, all the more so as all participants are already known, so that the specification of speaker and addressee is particularly stately. In the Greek the interaction ritual probably has been ironed out.

These circumstances contribute to our understanding of the structure of the divine call. In the Greek the distinctive call Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ occurs in the opening stage (v. 4), is repeated in the next phase (v. 6), but does not occur in the climax (v. 10). In the MT the high point includes this call: ויבא יהוה ויתיצב ויקרא כפעם בפעם שמואל שמואל (similarly 4QSam^a). The fact that this stage also indicates the divine apparition (analogous to the dream pattern, Gen 20.3; 28.13) *prima facie* favours the MT rather than the Greek in which καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ὡς ἅπαξ καὶ ἅπαξ could seem rather weak after the solemn opening of the verse (καὶ ἦλθεν κύριος καὶ κατέστη). Thus one may get the impression that the Greek in this case represents an abridgment of the fuller picture found in the MT.

Adair rejects this impression since in his view the LXX reveals quite the opposite tendency in the two opening stages which both include the double call Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ (vv. 4, 6). In the present reviewer's opinion this point is well taken. The absence of a full call correlates with the lack of the divine name in Samuel's response דבר כי שמע עבדך (v. 10b): the narrator does not expose the frightened lad to the theophany in all its power. Only when he is not aware of the identity of his summoner, can the call be represented in full, as it is in the LXX, in the opening scene, responded to by a formulaic הנני (v. 4; cf. Gen 22:1, 11; 46:2; Exod. 3:4). It is the equilibrium between the opening call and the final theophany which highlights Samuel's development most clearly. Adair's systematic treatment of this pericope contributes much toward the literary and psychological picture.

Nevertheless some detail problems present themselves. In his scrutiny of the use of the tenses of the LXX the author points to the fact that in this chapter the participle active of the Qal is not rendered by corresponding participle constructions in the Greek, but rather by indicative forms in the imperfect (v. 3 שֹׁכֵב / ἐκάθευδεν), the perfect (v. 8, קֹרֵא / κέκληκεν), the present (vv. 9, 10, שֹׁמֵעַ / ἀκούει; v.11 אנכי עשֶׂה / ἐγὼ ποιῶ; v. 13 שֹׁפֵט אני / ἐκδικῶ ἐγώ). On the basis of these data Adair (p. 89) concludes that all participles that in an unvocalized text could be read as

finite verbs, actually were not read as participles. Although the interchange of *qatal* and participle is possible in the Hebrew (1 Chron 21:15 עומד as against 2 Sam 24:16 היה), this inference is hardly warranted. First, in this discussion the author applies a merely morphological analysis in which participle should correspond to participle. However, from a functional point of view the Hebrew participle is only partially comparable to the Greek morpheme. Moreover, a present tense, such as found in vv. 9, 10, 11, 13, is just a good rendering of the participle, in particular in view of Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew. The rendering as perfect or imperfect is impeccable, as long as these forms are taken as process (continuing in the present, v. 8) or situation (in the past, v. 3). In fact, both participle and finite verb are used at 1 Sam 26:7 (καὶ ἰδοὺ Σαουλ καθεύδων ὕπνῳ ἐν λαμπήνῃ / והנה שאול שכב ישן במעגל; /והעם שכבים סביבתו). If such problems as the reflection of the tenses and interchanges of singular and plural should be taken into account for an analysis of translation technique, they should be assigned to special categories so as not to skew the results for semantic consistency.

Retroversion also remains a problematic issue. The author pays attention to the lack of equivalence between החלו כהות [qerê ועיניו] ועינו and Greek καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοι αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο βαρύνεσθαι, and reaches the conclusion that the Greek reflects a Hebrew source text that read ועינו החלו כבוד. However, this kind of literalism is only possible if the relationship between Greek and Hebrew enables unequivocal identification of the equivalents. In the present case the Hebrew side of the variation unit contains a rare lexeme, that is variously treated in the different books of the Bible. Moreover, the dictionary teaches us that βαρύς means not only 'heavy', but also, e.g., 'burdensome, grievous'. Since the author himself refers to a verse in which כבד is used for diminished eyesight (Gen 48:10: ועיני ישראל כבדו מזקן / οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοι Ισραηλ ἐβαρυώπησαν), the more plausible solution seems to be that the translator thought of this verse, all the more so as the scene of Eli's death describes the priest as כי זקן האיש וכבד / ὅτι πρεσβύτης ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ βαρύς (1 Sam 4:18), combining the lexemes also found in Gen 48.10. Hence it seems more probable that the translator plays a contextual game with reminiscences from Genesis and the anticipation of Eli's death.

However, the merit of Adair's approach is not impaired by criticism of detail. Its value lies in the systematicness of the approach. Obviously, many points need correction and refinement. Some of the first steps in this direction should be the application to a number of samples in addition to this analysis of 1 Sam 3, and in particular testing on a number of samples for which an alternative Hebrew text-form exists, such as 4QSam[a,b,c], the Samaritan Pentateuch, or some other of the larger manuscripts from Qumran. Also, the wider context and contextually derived renderings merit far more consideration. However, Adair's inductive method no doubt has much to contribute toward the increasing exactitude in textual criticism.

Frank Polak
Tel Aviv University
Ramath Aviv, Israel