JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

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 Cook (Asbury Theological Seminary)

THE HEBREW PARTICIPLE AND STATIVE IN TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

ABSTRACT

The Biblical Hebrew participle and stative forms have long been recognized as "double-natured" or "intermediate" forms between the nominal and verbal systems (Andersen & Forbes 2007; Dyk 1994; Gordon 1982; Kahan 1889; Sellin 1889). Attention has been drawn to the relationship between these forms and the Hebrew verbal system by scholars who see the participle and the stative as integral parts of the finite tense-aspect-mood system in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., Hoftijzer 1991; Joosten 1989, 2002). I examine these forms in light of typological data on intransitive predication and adjectives and conclude that, while they have both nominal and verbal characteristics, they should be classified as adjectives. I conclude with implications for understanding the Biblical Hebrew verbal system.

Matthias Köckert (Humboldt University Berlin)

SUFFERING FROM FORMLESSNESS – THE PROHIBITION OF IMAGES IN EXILIC TIMES

For Othmar Keel (6th December 2007)

Throughout the Ancient Near East the cultic statue was regarded as the "body of the deity" and represented its presence in the temple. Formlessness (Gestaltlosigkeit), therefore, was not a happy experience, but rather an expression of divine anger. It signifies that the deity has left his or her earthly body. He or she has retreated to the heavenly sphere and in doing so exposed the city to the mercy of its enemies. When the earthly body of the deity was destroyed or taken away to a foreign land, a period of misery began. The country suffered from mourning and affliction. The Bible, however, seems to depart from this common pattern in Ancient Near Eastern cultures, and formlessness seems to be the trademark of the God of Israel. How did that happen? We will start our investigation with a brief look at current scholarly trends.

Tania Notarius (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

PROSPECTIVE *WEQATAL* IN BIBLICAL HEBREW: DUBIOUS CASES OR UNIDENTIFIED CATEGORY?

ABSTRACT

The author claims that in classical Biblical prose the form וקטל *may function as a prospective future, namely denote posteriority in reference to the past time event and possible event within the past-time framework. The analysis of the temporal and modal semantics of the category is carried out in terms of the Reichenbachian theory of temporality and the modal theory of possible worlds; some element of Discourse Representation Theory are also involved. The hypothesis contributes to the general theory of BH* וקטל *and is placed in the context of typological and historical investigation of the category. The hypothesis of the prospective* וקטל *provides strong support for the so-called modal theory of the BH "imperfective" use of* וקטל *in past-time reference. The prospective* וקטל *can be seen as a transitional stage in the process of the development of the imperfective past-tensed* וקטל *from the conditional future Old Canaanite* u-qatala.

Ephraim Nissan (University of Manchester)

ETYMOTHESIS AND FALLACY: ON CARROTS AND THE LIVER

ABSTRACT

Recently, folk-etymology received renewed scholarly attention. The general thread in this article is to enucleate one possible etymothetical pattern (out of many) – fallacious on the strength of the discussion of specific examples. Semitic lexical derivatives for 'liver' are from the root כבד*, whose central sememe is 'heavy', i.e., the protosememe of Hebrew* יקר *(for 'dear', 'costly'), whose Semitic root has no known derivative for 'liver.' One does find* iecur *'liver' in Latin, unlikely to have come from Semitic: it is well established among Indo-European cognates, and their peculiar genitive forms are not amenable to* יקר*. An example similar to fallaciously relating* iecur *to* יקר *by analogy to the polysemy of the Hebrew root that yields the noun* כָּבֵד *for 'liver', is from names for 'carrot'. For Semitic roots* כרת *and* גזר *the*

central sememe is 'to cut'. Semitic names for 'carrot' outwardly have a root גזר *(a semantic shift to 'wedged taproot' from 'cut' is tempting), yet it has been cogently shown they are a loan from outside Semitic, namely, Middle Persian, the historical stratum relevant for the appearance of the terms in Semitic. Neither the Persian, nor the Greek and European names for 'carrot' came from Semitic* כרת*.*

Lénart de Regt (United Bible Societies, Crawley, West Sussex)

HEBREW VERB FORMS IN PROSE AND IN SOME POETIC AND PROPHETIC PASSAGES: ASPECT, SEQUENTIALITY, MOOD AND COGNITIVE PROXIMITY

ABSTRACT

After a synchronic overview of the verb system in Biblical Hebrew prose, this description of the verb system is applied to various poetic and prophetic passages, especially Hab 3, Deut 32, Jonah 2 and Jer 51. Not only are aspect, (non-)sequentiality and mood categories inherent to the verb, but cognitive (non-)proximity – a new feature – is indicated by the verb as well. (Tense is only indicated by wayyiqtols *predominant in narrative text and by* yiqtols *predominant in discursive text.) On the basis of these four categories functional oppositions are described between* yiqtol, qatal, wayyiqtol, weqatal *and predicative* qotel. *Occasionally this position has implications for translation, not least in target languages that are tense-based.*

BOOK REVIEWS

Wagner, A (Hrsg.) 2007. *Parallelismus Membrorum* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 224). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Academic Press. pp. viii + 300. ISBN 978-3-7278-1575-1. Price: SF 89.

The 29th German Orientalist convention on the theme "Barriers – Passages," held in Halle an der Saale on September 20-24, 2004 had a panel on *parallelismus membrorum* (henceforth PM). The papers presented there, supplemented with a few additional ones, are now available to the wider academic world in this excellent publication. According to the editor (p. vii), the idea was that a variety of disciplines would be represented to discuss PM, taking into account the latest research, interdisciplinary questions, and anthropological, metrical, iconographical, contrastive and other perspectives, as well as to make available the literature in an extensive bibliography. While the present reviewer cannot pretend to assess the variety of contributions in the book, it is my distinct impression that this goal has been attained. The select bibliography (pp. 273-295) in itself is of great value, although unfortunately it ends halfway through the information on Zakovitch's article, p. 296 being blank, in my copy at least.

Wagner very ably introduces the broader theme with his essay, arguing that assigning PM to the field of the poetic entails the danger of an insufficient awareness of the cognitive-noetic dimension of PM. This is fine, but with it the problem of definition surfaces. What is meant by PM and what is the role of the word "*membrorum*" in this expression? For a definition, or a description approaching a definition, Wagner (p. 3) quotes from Seybold (*Poetik der Psalmen*, 2003: 89), who at first uses PM to refer to the parallelistic arrangement in Hebrew poetry of various elements, ranging from strophes to vowels, and then limits parallelism (but not PM, unless I misunderstand) to verses, parts of verses and words. Wagner accepts Seybold's description without engaging with it critically.

Wagner's use of PM is symptomatic of a larger problem with the book. Should the book have been called *Parallelismus Membrorum*, or would *Parallelismus* have been a better title? One could, of course, argue that without "*membrorum*" the title may have become extremely vague. But if the ways in which the individual authors use these terms and the variety of parallelistic phenomena which they discuss are taken into account, then it becomes difficult to defend the use of "*membrorum*" in the title. The title then indicates not so much an overall theme, but a nucleus around which the various studies have been attached. The vagueness lies in the variety of the content, and that resulted from the loose use of the term PM within the field of Old Testament studies. In Seybold's own

contribution to the current volume, he inter alia makes a plea (p. 108) for Lowth's term PM to be reserved for the versified (German *versgebundene*) parallel structure. Seybold thus improves on his wording quoted by Wagner (see above).

Martin Mark's lengthy contribution does not deal with PM or with parallelism at all, but with the text-semiotic significance of Hebrew metrics, as his subtitle clearly indicates. Certainly PM is there, but in the background of his essay, never as the main point of focus. That does not mean that his is a weak contribution. After thorough attention to the history of the field and clarification of concepts, he turns to Psalm 116:19bβ, 117 and 118, with reference to the colographically written form of Psalm 118 in Codex Aleppo and Codex Petropolitanus.

The much shorter, but tightly argued, contribution of Walter Groß assumes the sharp definition of PM. Focusing on syntactical matters in versified texts, he uses three examples – Isa 5:24, Amos 5:11 and Job 29:7-8 – to argue that the syntactical functions of poetic form elements such as PM and colon boundaries can and should be more thoroughly researched.

Eberhard Bons discusses parallelism in the Septuagint Psalter and finds enough cases where the translators either strengthened or created parallel structures to warrant further research. Holger Gzella, in his contribution on parallelism and asymmetry in Ugaritic texts, is aware that PM normally refers to correspondences within a small group of cola, but then points out that parallelistic phenomena occur over longer stretches of verse, in which case he would speak of *parallelismus versuum* (p. 137). This term is, of course, not new and his use of it seems too vague.

Other contributions are by Gerald Moers (Egyptology, not limited to texts), Michael Streck (Old Babylonian hymns), Astrid Nunn (PM in ANE pictures), and Joachim Gentz (Parallelism in Chinese literature, with a separate bibliography). In reading the various contributions on parallelism and PM outside of the Old Testament, one is struck by the very strong and even currently continuing impact of the study of parallelism and PM in Old Testament studies on the study outside of Old Testament studies. It is very unfortunate that the loose use of the term PM has been transferred as part of this impact.

In spite of the various points of criticism, this book, reflecting as it does the current state of research in an interdisciplinary way, is certainly essential reading for anyone interested in parallelism, *parallelismus membrorum*, Ancient Near Eastern poetry and more especially Hebrew poetry.

                    W T Woldemar Cloete, University of the Western Cape, Bellville