JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

EDITORS:

J COOK   I CORNELIUS   G R KOTZÉ
C H J VAN DER MERWE

VOLUME EDITOR:

C H J VAN DER MERWE

at Stellenbosch University
South Africa

CONTENTS

Noga Ayali-Darshan (Bar-Ilan University)

THE ELEMENTS שו(ו)ע/שבע/תע IN BIBLICAL PROPER NAMES: A RE-EVALUATION

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with the meaning and significance of the element שוע in biblical personal names in the light of Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Akkadian findings. The conclusion suggests new and revised interpretations of the elements תע and שבע in proper names.[*]

Idan Breier (Bar-Ilan University)

"THESE ARE YOUR WORDS" (EA 1:42-43): DIRECT CITATION AND COMMUNICATION IN THE EL-AMARNA INTERNATIONAL LETTERS[*]

ABSTRACT

How did ancient writers use direct speech or quote others in international and diplomatic correspondence? This article explores this phenomenon, taking the El-Amarna archive as a test case. Framing it within the modern rubric of linguistic studies, it adduces examples of authoritative quotes, third-party quotes, confirmative citations, and fabricated/imaginary speech in these fourteenth-century cuneiform writings, together with dialogical and recursive quotes. The analysis is undertaken in light of the international relations between the great empires of the day.

Jeremy M Hutton (University of Wisconsin-Madison & University of the Free State) & Konstantin M Klein (Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg)

TWO PALMYRENE FUNERARY STELAE IN THE COLLECTION OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

ABSTRACT

There are two Palmyrene funerary stelae in the archaeological study collection of the American Academy in Rome (nos. H28, H29); neither has seen previous publication. The present study offers an art historical and epigraphic description of these objects, discussing the Palmyrene names found in the inscriptions. Together, they provide some new access points into the onomasticon of Palmyra and its environs.

Adina Moshavi (Bar-Ilan University)

ON THE POSSIBLE GRAMMATICALIZATION OF דָּבָר AS AN INDEFINITE PRONOUN IN BIBLICAL HEBREW[1]

ABSTRACT

Modern Hebrew features two indefinite pronouns formed from nouns denoting basic ontological categories: iš *'anyone', from the noun meaning 'man', and* davar *'anything', from the noun meaning 'thing'. The purpose of this paper is to determine whether the biblical ancestor of* davar *had already been grammaticalized as an indefinite pronoun in the classical BH prose corpus (Gen-2 Kgs). The results establish that biblical* דָּבָר *had a semantically-bleached usage with the same distribution, semantic interpretation and rhetorical effects as the indefinite pronoun* מְאוּמָה*. In this usage* דָּבָר *functioned, like* מְאוּמָה*, as a negative polarity item (NPI) with minimizing meaning. The development of the NPI usage of* דָּבָר *in the biblical period was the first stage in a grammaticalization path ultimately leading to the formation of the indefinite pronoun.*

Renate M van Dijk-Coombes, Stellenbosch University

"HE ROSE AND ENTERED BEFORE THE GODDESS": GILGAMESH'S INTERACTIONS WITH THE GODDESSES IN THE *EPIC OF GILGAMESH*[1]

ABSTRACT

In the Epic of Gilgamesh*, Gilgamesh interacts with three goddesses: Ninsun, his mother and a goddess renowned for her wisdom, Ishtar, the goddess of love and sexuality, and Siduri, a minor goddess of wisdom. This article will investigate Gilgamesh's interactions and relations with these goddesses. How do these goddesses reveal or present themselves to Gilgamesh? How do the goddesses communicate with Gilgamesh, and how does he interact with them? The manner in which these interactions take place in the Standard Version of the* Epic *will be compared to the same episodes in the earlier Old Babylonian Version of the* Epic *and the Sumerian narratives in order to identify changes across time. Finally, how do these interactions differ from the way in which Gilgamesh interacts with male gods in the* Epic of Gilgamesh*? These various interactions will be compared and analysed to reveal not only similarities and differences in the way Gilgamesh communicates with the goddesses in the* Epic of Gilgamesh*, but also crucial differences in the manner in which male and female deities reveal themselves and communicate with Gilgamesh.*

BOOK REVIEWS

Bray S L & Hobbins, J F 2017. *Genesis 1-11: A New Old Translation for Readers, Scholars, and Translators*. Wilmore, KY: GlossaHouse. x + 316 pages. ISBN 978-1-94-269737-4. $14.99.

The present review summarises and evaluates a new (2017) English translation of Genesis 1-11, which is accompanied by extensive scholarly notes that document and defend the crucial and at times controversial choices that have been made in the innovative translation. This interesting and informative work, which is of special interest to those engaged in the fields of Old Testament and Translation Studies, has already attracted significant academic attention in the United States.

The first important thing to note about this book is that it is much more than a translation, as will be pointed out below. Second, the rather strange description "New Old Translation" is in fact very appropriate, for this translation is obviously "new" since it has been just recently produced; however, it is at the same time "old" in the sense that it seeks to preserve traditional wordings (i.e., along the lexical lineage of the KJV) to the degree possible in English while retaining adequate contemporary comprehension. "The Translation" itself, covering just twenty pages, is preceded by a section "Before The Translation", and it is followed by the largest portion of the book, "After The Translation". The former leads off with an introduction, "To the Reader", which requires a closer look.

Scholar-translators Bray and Hobbins[1] begin by asserting that "the Tyndale Bible and the King James Version", along with "other early modern Bibles", such as the Revised Version (4), were ideal in that they "held together three virtues that have since been pulled apart" in/by contemporary English translations (3; all page references are to the book under review). In the first place, these older versions "tried to reproduce not only the conceptual content of the original, but also its form and content" (3). "Second, they had a strong preference for traditional [lexical] renderings", namely, those "of the existing English translations and of the Vulgate" (3). And finally, "their translations were meant not only to be

---

1 Samuel L Bray is a professor of law at the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA), and John F Hobbins is a parish pastor and biblical Hebrew scholar who has taught at the Waldensian Theological Seminary in Rome and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Both men are widely published academic authors.

read, but also to be heard"; that was because in those days, "the one universal experience of the Bible was an aural one" (3).

The authors admit that these three "virtues of close translation, traditional renderings, and aural quality … are ambiguous" in that they result in renditions which manifest "losses" in terms of fluency, freshness, and naturalness (4). They argue, however, that their chosen formal correspondence method produces a more "unified" biblical text tradition that is better suited "for reading in public or private worship" (5). Thus, careful attention in particular to the diverse lexical and grammatical repetitions found in the Hebrew text, which "tie together the stories of Genesis" (7), is what distinguishes this "new old" translation, and the authors proceed to make a number of significant, some perhaps debatable, claims in favor of such a formally concordant version.

For example, "[c]onsistent renderings … keep the reader from wondering what a difference means" (8), and a translation that "sounds like a translation" is "better able to challenge the reader's own way of organizing reality" (8). Traditional usages "often lead to better rhythm" (9) and more faithfully correspond to the "physicality" of the original text (10, 13). By generally exchanging ease of "comprehension" for substantive "correspondence (12), this translation distances itself from "English idioms of the moment" and is therefore "better able to hold together a community of readers over time" – though, admittedly, those readers need to be "diligent and determined" (13). The readers of the present review might begin to evaluate the validity of these claims for themselves when sampling a familiar passage from Genesis 1 that is shown below. Preceding the actual translation then is a brief explanatory section "On the Presentation", which lists its principal typographical distinctions, such as the use of italics, chapter and paragraph breaks, and the use of sectional titles (14-15).

The first section "After the Translation" is addressed "To the Persistent Reader" (41ff.), apparently someone who has managed to read through the entire text of the translation – although I suspect that this important explicatory discussion would be more effectively positioned beforehand, that is, combined along with the initial material found in "To the Reader". The "persistent reader" section considers a number of critical topics that pertain to the distinctive character of this "new old" translation. These headings are merely listed below along with a brief quote or comment:

- "The Text" indicates that "the [consistent] basis for this translation is the Masoretic Text (MT)" since "[t]he coherence of a textual

tradition can be marred when emended with readings from another textual tradition" (41-42).

- "Conjectural Emendations" are not allowed, and "where MT is obscure to the point of unintelligibility", the obscurity is carried over in translation along with a textual note (42).

- The translation is intended to evoke a "Classical Feel" (*better, "Sound"?*) that corresponds to the "prose and poetic styles contained in Genesis 1-11" (43). Thus, "just as the biblical text stands distant in terms of its language and culture, so within this translation an impression of distance is achieved using resources of English", namely, its "diction and syntax, even spelling (e.g. *AEthiopia*)" (44).

- As claimed to be the case in the KJV and related versions, this translation aims for "Terrible Simplicity" in respect of diction and syntax, thereby "following its original" (44).

- It is also described as being "earthy", thus exhibiting "Physicality", for example, "'green shoots' instead of 'vegetation' (1:11), 'cleaves to' instead of 'is united to' (2:24)" (45).

- It replicates "Fronting", where "a subject or object is placed in an unusually early position in a clause", which "can be a way of introducing a new topic, selecting from existing topics the one being carried forward, directing the reader's attention, or indicating a relationship" (46), e.g., "*And flying things* – let them fly" (1:20, original italics). Such formal correspondence "slows the pace of a translation", and "[s]ometimes it improves the rhythm and makes a translation memorable" (47).

- A duplicating effort in the cause of equivalence is also applied to "Syntactic Operators", such as the feature where "clause after clause begins with a certain conjunction … 'and'" (incorrectly referred to as "the *waw* consecutive" construction) (47). Included here are the pragmatic markers "'lo' (*hen*) and 'behold' (*hinneh*)" (48; e.g., "*See*, the man has become like one of us …" in 3:22), as well as the conjunction *ki*, which is rendered "according to context" but "concordantly where its repetition seems to have significance", e.g., "*Because* you …" in 3:14 and 3:17 (49).

- As far as "Gender" is concerned, "An honest translation should leave gender-specificity where it is, e.g., "'man' in the sense of humanity" (49), including certain "gendered pronouns" with reference to personifications, e.g., the "ground" (F) or "Sin" (M) (50).

- In the case of "Grammatical Subjects", "this translation avoids" making "what is implicit in the Hebrew text more explicit, such as the decision to specify which character is speaking when the Hebrew does not" (50).

- The practice of "Double Translation" applies to instances where it is deemed necessary "to translate a single term that has strong denotative and connotative functions with a pair of terms", like "smooth and shrewd" with reference to the "serpent" in Gen. 3:1 (51).

- Considerable attention is given to the description of "Sections" in the manuscript that forms the basis for this translation, "Codex L", which includes long and short blanks in the text to mark divisions (52). Respectively then, "[o]pen sections are generally thought to mark larger breaks, and closed sections, smaller breaks" (52). The authors cite evidence from the Qumran manuscripts to support their procedure (53) and the general principle that "a new section may begin with the onset of divine speech" (54).

- The preceding discussion is continued in the "Significance of Sections", since "[a]s recognized since antiquity, where the breaks fall in a text will shape the experience of the reader" (55). For example, "[i]n Codex L", the fact that "there is no break after Genesis 2" encourages readers to proceed with the narrative "that continues on to the man and woman's disobedience" (55).

- With regard to "Pericopes & Verses" (*sedarim* and *pesuqim*), the former are "not reproduced in the layout of the translation" because there is "almost complete overlap with the more ancient division into sections" (56). On the other hand, "[t]he verse division of the Hebrew text is indicated in the margin" (57).

- Concerning the "Presentation as Verse", the reader is somewhat surprised to learn that "[o]nly one passage is formatted as poetry in this translation, Genesis 4:23-24" (57). On the contrary, 1:27, for example (cf. also 3:15), would arguably seem to be another likely candidate – that is, according to the "hallmarks of ancient Hebrew verse" summarized on page 57, including (not mentioned) the absence of an initial *waw* in the 2nd and 3rd lines:

וַיִּבְרָ֨א אֱלֹהִ֤ים ׀ אֶת־הָֽאָדָם֙ בְּצַלְמ֔וֹ

and-he-created <u>God</u> *the-man* **in-his-image**

בְּצֶ֥לֶם אֱלֹהִ֖ים בָּרָ֣א אֹת֑וֹ

in-[the]-image-of <u>God</u> he-created *him*

זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:

male and-female he-created *them*

- "English Accents": "In order to aid public reading, a few words are given accents to show the stressed syllable" (57), for example, "Ráamah".
- "The Toledot Formula", "These are the generations of *x*", serves importantly to give "the book a 'reproductive' framework" (57), and furthermore, "it connects Genesis to the rest of the Pentateuch" (58).
- "The First Book of Moses", a traditional title attribution for Genesis, is rejected on the grounds that "Genesis was not in antiquity called one of the books of Moses, but rather was considered to be part of 'the book of Moses'" (58). Thus, "what the premodern readers demonstrably did was to proceed to interpret the Pentateuch as a single coherent whole" (59).
- The "Inclusion of Genesis 12:1-9" in a translation of Genesis 1-11 is justified as follows: "In the manuscript [that] this translation follows (Codex L), Genesis 11:32 is not separated from chapter 12 by the marker of a large textual division, an 'open section.' The next open section in Codex L falls after 12:9" (61).
- Regarding the diagnostic terms "'Traditional' & 'Literal'", the former has reference to "a rendering characteristic of the Tyndale-KJV tradition", while Nabokov's definition for "literal" is adopted, where the "aim is to render, 'as closely as the associative and syntactical capacities of another language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original'" (62).[2]

---

2   It is interesting to compare this definition with a version having similar goals, namely, the "essentially literal" translation of the *English Standard Version*. "It means that a translation strives to find the English word or combination of words that most accurately corresponds to the words of the original text. It does not mean translating the original in a way that makes no sense in English" (Grudem, *et al.* 2005:58). "An essentially literal … translation conveys as much as possible of what was said, and how it was said, in as near word-for-word form as the target language allows, though inevitably with some difference and imperfectly" (ibid 82). Similar too is the perspective of translator Everett Fox in his Schocken Bible (1995:ix): "The purpose of this work is to draw the reader into the world of the Hebrew Bible through the power of its language. … I have sought here primarily to echo the style of the original, believing that the Bible is best approached … on its own terms. So I have presented the text in English dress

- With respect to "Other Translations": "Because translators work from different premises, they reach different conclusions. Many of the divergences pointed out in the notes can be fully explained on these grounds" (62-63).

The preceding explanation "to the persistent reader" is then followed by an extensive section of "Notes" (135 pages worth), which "are meant to explain and justify choices made by the translators … for many kinds of readers" in order to offer a scholarly "glimpse behind the translation" (65). These informative and insightful expositions are clearly keyed to individual verses or short sections of text and include many references to modern translators and commentators, as well as to well-known ancient Jewish commentators, such as Rashi.

After the Notes section, the authors introduce us to the "Dramatis Personae" of Genesis, offering a succinct description of each one - from "God" (201) to "Sarai" (206). This is followed by a helpful "Glossary" that is subdivided according to the following subjects: "Hebrew Texts" (207), "Translations" (208), "Interpreters" (215), and "Other Terms", namely, "*Ketiv* and *Qere*" (222). In a short section "On the Making of Books," a few recommendations are made concerning what Bray and Hobbins consider to be exceptional "Introductions & Commentaries" (223), "Readings" (224), and "Translations" (225). The book's concluding indices cover various "Abbreviations" used within the text (226), a rather extensive listing of "Works Cited" (235), a useful categorized "Index of Subjects" (268), an "Index of Ancient Sources" (287), "Index of Translations" cited (297), "Index of Authors" (303), and a short, concluding "Index of Stories & Genealogies" (313).

Thus far we have considered what Bray and Hobbins aim to do in their new-old translation and how they propose doing it; it is time to review an actual sample, though due to the limitations of space, this can only be a small portion. However, it is a most memorable one: the first paragraph of Genesis, vv. 1-5, is reproduced below as nearly as possible to how it appears in the translated text (p. 19; the proportional spacing between words could not be duplicated):

---

but with a Hebraic voice". The respective responses of reviewers (on the back cover) are equally enthusiastic: "Reinvigorates some of the most important verses of Scripture for a new generation of readers" (Bray & Hobbins); "A powerful new translation that will … reward any reader with new appreciation, insights, and comprehension of the original" (Fox).

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.	**1**
Now the earth was void and desolate, and darkness was	2
over the face of the Deep, and the spirit of God hovered	
over the face of the waters, and God said, "Let there be	3
light." And there was light. And God saw the light, that	4
it was good, and God divided the light from the darkness. And	5
God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And	
there was evening and there was morning, a first day.	

The first thing that meets the discerning eye is the format of this text (cf. Wendland & Louw 1993): The solid block paragraph with justified lines resembles that which is found in other translations. In its favor are these features – a single column of print (instead of the usual two) without any disruptive line-end hyphenation. On the other hand, much more could be done to format this text in a manner that would accomplish its major objective of paying "close attention to how it fares when read aloud" such that it fully realizes its "pervasive concern for rhythm, order, and pacing" (11-12). Justified lines do not contribute towards such a goal, nor does the lack of consideration given to normal utterance units, where each line (ideally) ends at a natural "pause point", whether long or short.

Another problem that relates to a natural reading of this text (resulting in a more ready hearing of it) is the multiplication of "ands" (12 of them in 8 lines). The authors, as already noted, feel that "in Hebrew narrative prose, the repeated conjunction appears to be a literary usage" (48), but that position is questionable and depends on what one means by "literary". In any case, the repetition does not generate a functional equivalent in English; rather, it produces a somewhat awkward, sometimes confusing style – as when "and/*waw*"-s that appear at a lower (e.g., phrasal) as distinct from a major (e.g., verse-initial) syntactic level are not distinguished, for example in v. 3: "… and [> And] God said, 'Let there be light.' And [>, and] there was light. …" (cf. v. 4: "… and [>And] God saw the light …"). While the authors pay close attention to word order and parallelism within the verse (e.g., "fronting", 46-47) as well as Codex L-determined "open" and "closed" sections (52), the larger arrangements of literary parallelism (or chiasmus) are not distinguished, for example, the seven-fold pattern of slightly variable utterance sequence that runs throughout Genesis one (Wendland 2011:73-76): (a) "And God said …" – (b) "Let there be …" – (c) "And it was so." – (d) Action Report [fulfillment of b] – (e) "God saw … good" – (f) "And God called/ blessed …" – (g) "And there was evening/ morning …"

The preceding evaluation would lead to a structural and minor translational revision of the text of Genesis 1:1-5 that may be displayed as follows:

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.   **1**

Now the earth was void and desolate,   2
   and darkness was over the face of the Deep,
     and the Spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters.

So God said,   3
   "Let there be light,"
    and there was light.

     God saw the light, that it was good,   4
      and God divided the light from the darkness.

     God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night.   5
    There was evening and there was morning, a first day.

Such a format would of course be more costly in terms of space and expense, but it would seem to accomplish the translators' objectives more completely with regard to the oral-aural character of the English text in relation to the Hebrew original.

In conclusion, while I am unconvinced that this "new-old" translation produced by Bray and Hobbins is quite meant for all "Readers" (as suggested in the book's title), certainly not those who are articulating the text aloud, it is undoubtedly a most valuable resource for "Scholars and Translators". The complementary "Notes" offer a precise, learned commentary on the Hebrew original and its proposed English rendering – a version that readers may not always agree with, but one by which they will be variously instructed as they follow the accompanying perceptive argumentation provided by the translators. In view of its scrupulous attention to the form of the Hebrew text, this version might have exemplified one type of "direct translation" as defined by Van der Merwe – with one crucial exception: "an attempt to 'interpretively resemble' in good idiomatic [English] all the communicative clues of the source text in the contexts construed for the *source text* audience. This foreignising translation tries to let the Bible speak idiomatic [English] in the time of the Bible" (van der Merwe 2016). The exception of course concerns the requirement of an idiomatic style in the target (host) language. The degree to which the two translators have succeeded with regard to other aspects of their innovative interlingual enterprise may be determined only by a repeated oral performance of the venerable Genesis passage that they have regenerated in a language that echoes loudly with a multitude of predecessors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fox, E 1995. *The Five Books of Moses*. New York: Schocken Books

Grudem, W, Ryken, L, Collins, C J, Poythress, V S & Winter, B 2005. *Translating Truth: The Case for an Essentially Literal Bible Translation*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.

Van der Merwe, C H J 2016. How 'Direct' Can a Direct Translation Be? Some Perspectives from the Realities of a New Type of Church Bible. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72/3, a3233. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/-hts.v72i3.3233.

Wendland E R 2011. *LiFE-Style Translating*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International.

Wendland E R & Louw, J P 1993. *Graphic Design and Bible Reading*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Ernst R Wendland
Stellenbosch University

Burton, M E 2017. *The Semantics of Glory: A Cognitive, Corpus-Based Approach to Hebrew Word Meaning* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 68). Leiden / Boston: Brill. 349 pages. ISBN 978-9-00-433961-3 (Hardback), ISBN 978-9-00-434217-0 (E-book). $121.00 (Hardback), $110.00 (E-book).

In this publication, based on her PhD research, Burton investigates the semantics of the concept GLORY in Classical Hebrew. She focuses on the interrelations of and differences between the group of lexemes that could be associated with this concept – in particular "the group of Hebrew lexemes surrounding this concept" that "is yet untouched by any comprehensive semantic study" (p. 2).

  She commences in chapter one (called "Cognitive Semantics") with a brief overview of the realities facing scholars of Classical Hebrew as far as models of language (and in particular, semantics) are concerned. Classical Hebrew is a non-spoken language of which we have a limited corpus available. Furthermore, the bulk of the available data, i.e. the Hebrew Bible has a long and complex history of transmission. Since no living speakers are available to consult, scholars in recent times preferred to use models that allow them to make most of the available linguistic evidence.

Structuralist and neo-structuralist models were often embraced because they have provided theoretical frameworks in terms of which discreet categories of language use could be postulated and inter-subjectively tested (in a scientific manner). However, at the turn of the 21st century some of the basic premises of the structuralist approaches to language study have been called into question, and some even shown to be untenable. This happened in particular in what could be called cognitive approaches to language. Structuralist and neo-structuralist (e.g. componential analysis of meaning) try to limit linguistics to what could be described in terms of discrete and neat categories, and relegate the complexities of language as a means of human communication – the 'messy' side of language – to the field of pragmatics. Burton correctly points out (p. 10) that the cognitive approach "makes no such distinction, embracing a maximalist understanding of lexical semantics in which semantics and pragmatics, conceptual and perceptual knowledge merge together". She also aptly points to a crucial observation by Geeraerts (2010:132), namely, while neo-structuralists try to pinpoint what are the invariable concepts behind the lexical variety of human language, cognitive semanticists rather try to understand the structure of the variety and under which conditions the different types of variety are produced (p. 10).

According to Burton "Probably the three most significant developments within the cognitive school are *prototype theory*, *frame theory*, and *conceptual theory* and *conceptual blending*". (p. 11). She discusses each of these developments in more detail (pp. 11-17) and then turns to a brief overview of applications of insights from Cognitive Linguistics for understanding Classical Hebrew (pp. 17-23). She does not claim that her overview is exhaustive, but intends to point her readers to biblical scholars "for whom cognitive semantics is a primary research focus" (p. 23). Since the major challenge facing these scholars are that the cognitive approaches – like most modern linguistic models – assume the availability of living speakers, her primary concern is "how cognitive methods can be adapted in the context of ancient languages, and how cognitive data is drawn from the text themselves". For these purposes she critically assesses the work of three scholars that in her opinion made a contribution in this regard, viz. Van Steenbergen (pp. 24-26); De Blois (pp. 26-27) and Aaron (pp. 27-30). Of the three scholars, De Blois appears to be the one that meets most of what she regards as crucial criteria. What is not clear is why she interacts so little with De Blois when she formulates her own working-hypothesis (pp. 30-34).

The key features of the methodological principles that characterise her study, Burton describes as follows: Firstly, they are cognitive since it is acknowledged that "conceptual categories are culture- and language specific" (p. 30). The scholar must not rely on his/her own intuitions, but "an objective semantic study must pay close attention to textual evidence, and all clues available therein" (p. 31). Secondly, they are relational, since lexemes should be studied in semantically related groups. Although she concedes that an exhaustive analysis should include all the word classes of the lexemes in the domain, as a means "to limit and focus" her study, she included only nouns in her study. Thirdly, they are decompositional. She fully acknowledges the shortcomings of the classical componential analysis. Nevertheless, she follows a relatively widely accepted position that it is nearly impossible to conduct a semantic analysis without some type of componential analysis. She also explicitly states that the semantic features that she distinguishes are non-critical, not binary, but graded, not equally weighed and neither basic or universal (pp. 32-33). Fourthly, they are exhaustive. In this regard, she remarks that "For a thorough comparison between members of the same semantic domain, each must be matched against each of a previously-identified set of semantic features". The big question in this regard, however, is how does one determine that the features considered are adequate, the most relevant ones and/or exhaustive enough? In this regard, she later acknowledges that this is a subjective choice of the researcher (pp. 113-114). However, the best way to address this challenge is "To present the available data and the reasoning process as thoroughly as possible, such that my own reasons for certain decisions may be evident, but such that others may still make use of the data to draw their own conclusions". In this regard, it is not clear why she does not interact critically with the pioneering work that De Blois has done in his Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew project. Fifthly, they are corpus-based. In order to be as inclusive as possible as far as Classical Hebrew is concerned, she includes the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira in her corpus (pp. 33-34).

In chapter two, "Defining the Domain: Parallelism and Patterns of Language Association" Burton describes in detail how she has identified the lexemes of the domain 'glory', viz. תְּהִלָּה, עֹז, הוֹד, הָדָר, תִּפְאֶרֶת, כָּבוֹד, גֵּאוּת and גַּאֲוָה, גָּאוֹן, צְבִי, נֵצַח.

In chapter three she is systematically "Exploring the Domain" by conducting a "frame analysis" of each lexeme in the domain in terms of the following "semantic features": identity, ascription, giving and taking,

verbs, causal relations, reaction, association, metaphor, antonyms, idioms and distribution.

In chapter four, the "Interrelations" of the lexemes in the domain are discussed in terms of the semantic features postulated in chapter three. At the end of this chapter, she summarizes her findings with the help of a number of graphs, brief overviews of the uses of each of the lexemes. In these overviews special reference is made of the way(s) a particular lexeme differs from others in the domain. Before concluding with how her findings relate to that of traditional scholarship, she provides definitions and translation equivalents of each of the lexemes.

Cognitive semantics without doubt has opened new horizons for the better understanding of the "mechanics" of linguistic meaning (and language as a complex and dynamic system). Burton is "spot-on" in her assessment of some of the challenges that faces scholars when they want to apply the insights of cognitive semantics to the better understanding of Ancient Hebrew with its relative small (and complicated) corpus of texts to work with. She has to be lauded for her empirical rigor and commitment to let the data speak for themselves. She makes a valuable contribution towards establishing some inter-subjectively testable criteria for establishing members of a semantic domain. One of the benefits of her model Burton illustrates by identifying that the lexeme עֹז belongs to the domain of GLORY.

Burton's range of (although admittedly subjective) parameters to consider when a "frame analysis" of the lexemes of a specific domain is conducted, is in line with what is called a *Behavior Profile Analysis* by Gries (2010:323-346). As far as the lexemes of the domain that she has investigated are concerned, Burton illustrates the benefits of her model for better understanding their use, relationships and the differences between their uses.

Burton acknowledges that כָּבוֹד has more than one sense. This second sense is typically associated with the idiomatic expression כְּבוֹד יְהוָה (pp. 175). However, if one considers her definitions, and her maps illustrating the relationships between the lexical items, it is hard not to conclude that she still operates with the notion that each of the lexemes in her domain has some fixed invariable sense. Little room appears to be left for the possibility of polysemy of the more frequent occurring lexemes in the domain. Furthermore, if one accepts the cognitive semantic maxim that the sense (or senses) of a lexeme provides a window onto the conceptualization(s) in the conceptual world of a language community, the question is: What exactly

are the conceptualizations of each of the lexemes in the domain GLORY? Is it possible to describe the uses of lexemes and their relationship with other lexemes (and senses) in a domain without including encyclopaedic information about the conceptual world of that speech community? Lastly, I wonder why Burton did not interact critically with De Blois's work or insights of scholars working in the field of corpus cognitive linguistics (like Gries referred to above)?

A technical aspect of Burton's book that I have found strange, is that only the chapters are numbered. This makes it very hard to navigate between the subsections.

Despite these few critical questions, I think Burton makes a contribution towards the better understanding of the concept GLORY in Classical Hebrew. She also provides some parameters to consider when trying to describe a semantic domain of the ancient language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Geeraerts, D 2010. *Theories of Lexical Semantics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gries, S T 2010. Behavior Profiles: A Fine-grained and Quantative Approach to Corpus-based Lexical Semantics. *The Mental Lexicon* 5/3, 323-346.

Christo H J van der Merwe
Stellenbosch University

Keel, O 2017. *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-ʿIdham bis Tel Kitan* (OBO 35). Fribourg / Göttingen: Academic Press / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. XVIII + 672 pages. ISBN 978-3-52-554412-9. €200.00.

The volume is the **fifth** of the *Corpus of Seal-Amulets from Palestine/Israel*; it consists of an 18-page Introduction and a Catalogue of 672 pages.[1] It covers 29 sites from Tel el-Idham to Tel Kitan and 1,340 objects.[2] This brings the total of seal-amulets published so far to a total of

---

1   The material is also available online via www.bible-orient-museum.ch/bodo.

2   The *Summary* mentions 1,340 objects but on p. VIII the figure is 1,430. A count of the objects listed in the Contents gave a total of 1,340.

7,041 from 131 sites, if the objects published in Corpus I-IV (for references see Cornelius 2013) are included: *Band* I includes 2,139 objects from 22 sites; II 1,224 from 45 sites; III 1,009 from 4 sites; IV 1,329 from 31 sites. If the Jordan material is added, the total is 7,760 objects from 223 sites.

As is typical of the Corpus, each site is introduced with the names in Arabic, Hebrew and English, the location, and a description of the history of the excavations (this is much longer for Jerusalem on p. 277, also including the Temple Mount Sifting Project on pp. 510-511), followed by the catalogue entry with regard to the object, the base, date, collection, find's context and bibliography. Every item has a detailed technical description on the left-hand page with photographs and line-drawings on the right-hand page. Some of the line-drawings are not of the same high quality as others (e.g. Jerusalem No. 496ff.); this is explained as being due to the lack of funding (p. VIII).

There are maps of the sites on the inner front and inner back covers of the volume. Objects come from the following sites (more common English name and number of objects added in brackets): Idham (1), Ira (2), Izbet Ṣarṭah (2), Ishaqi (1), Jabne (Yavneh) (6), Jabne-Jam (Yavneh-Yam) (7), Jafit (2), Jafo (Jaffa) (17), Jarmut (1), Jattir (1), Jericho (597), Jerusalem (521), Jesreël (Jizreel) (4), Jiftach-El (16), Jinam (2), Jokneam (8), Kabbar (1), Kabri (37), Kabul (1), Kafernaum (1), Karkara (1), Kefar Ara (33), Kefar Ruppin (8), Kefar Szold (1), Keïla (1), Keisan (35), Kinneret (29), Kirjat Jearim (3), Kitan (1). Some of the sites have yielded only one object, other more (e.g. Kabri, Keisan, Kefar Ara, Kinneret).

Very important as part of this volume is the material from Jericho and Jerusalem, with respectively 597 and 521 objects coming from mostly the Middle Bronze Age and the late Middle Kingdom to the Persian period. Whereas the material from Jericho goes back to older excavations (e.g. Sellin), the objects from Jerusalem mostly come from newer discoveries (e.g. Reich *et al.*). Currently Jerusalem is in the news with the discovery of a seal impression with an inscription which has been linked to the biblical prophet Isaiah.[3] The Jerusalem material should be read with the impressive two-volume monograph by Keel on Jerusalem (2007, cf. also Keel 2012) at hand. What is special about the Jerusalem material is the large number of clay bullae (cf. Keel 1995:116ff.), which were missed in earlier excavations, but found thanks to the so-called wet-sieving method. These contain names, e.g. No. 53ff. No. 495 has the name of king Hezekiah of Judah with winged sundisk and flanked by Egyptian life symbols.

---

3   But see the critical assessment by Rollston (Romey 2018).

The text is in German, but some of the newer material has been published in English (pp. 340ff.)

Some objects do not contain much (e.g. Jerusalem No. 312), but some have very important imagery (numbers indicated the catalogue entries):

Jericho

60: shows an image of a horned winged(?) being, possibly the god Seth-Baal standing on the back of a bull

565: Persian-period "master of animals" (for images of "Heroic Encounter" and "Heroic Control" see Garrison & Root 2001)

Jerusalem

1: men supporting a winged sundisk

43: a "prancing horse," (see Barkay 1992)

100: shows a moon crescent as the symbol of the moongod Sin of Harran (see Keel 1994) as also found at Zincirli from where it spread to the far south (Seidl 2000:Fig. 1 and Staubli 2003:65ff.)

133: a Persian-period smiting figure

159: a winged Seth flanked by sun disks and uraei (see Keel 2012:333, Fig. 99)

286: is a much discussed image of a winged sundisk on a throne (see Keel 2007:304, Abb. 191; 2012:Fig. 95*, also Hartenstein & Moxter 2016:61-62, Bild 8). This is not an "empty throne" or aniconic (Berlejung 2017:85 note 40)

341: The lion is linked to YHWH roaring from Zion (Amos 1:2), following Ornan

344: The 4-winged winged uraeus is a protective being, a member of the entourage of Yahweh as described in Isaiah 6:2 (Ornan 2012:*18)

355: winged Seth-Baal on a lion (see Keel 2012:333, Fig. 100)

371: is this the sign of the Phoenician-Punic goddess Tanit? For the earliest sign of Tanit from Megiddo (11th cent. BCE) see Arie 2017[4]

387: another moon crescent like 100 with tassels

450: a figure drinking with a straw/tube goes back to early Sumerian seals, appears on a stela from Amarna and on later seals.

This is a very important publication: it includes material from the important site of Jerusalem and some objects are published for the first time here (p. VIII). It is unfortunate that funding for this most important project, which started more than twenty years ago, was stopped at the end of 2013 (cf. pp.

4   I thank Adriano Orsingher for a discussion of this object.

VIII-IX). One really hopes that the project will be completed in one way or the other to cover all material from all sites. An English translation of this most important source is another desideratum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arie, E 2017. The Earliest Known 'Sign of Tanit' Revealed in 11th Century BCE Building at Megiddo. *Tel Aviv* 44/1, 61-71.

Barkay, G 1992. "The Prancing Horse" – An Official Seal Impression from Judah of the 8th Century B.C.E. *Tel Aviv* 19, 124-129.

Berlejung, A 2017. The Origins and Beginnings of the Worship of Yhwh: The Iconographic Evidence, in: Witte, M & van Oorschot, J (eds). *The Origins of Yahwism*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 67-92.

Cornelius, I 2013. Review of Keel, O. 2013. Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel IV. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 39/2, 129-130.

Garrison, M B & Root, M C 2001. *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. Vol. 1. Images of Heroic Encounter*. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Hartenstein, F & Moxter, M 2016. *Hermeneutik des Bilderverbots. Exegetische und systematisch-theologische Annäherungen*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Keel, O 1994. Das Mondemblem von Harran auf Stelen und Siegelamuletten und der Kult der nächtlichen Gestirne bei den Aramäern, in: Keel, O. *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel IV*. Fribourg: University Press, 135-202.

Keel, O 1995. *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Einleitung*. Fribourg: University Press.

Keel, O 2007. *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Keel, O 2012. Paraphernalia of Jerusalem Sanctuaries and their Relation to Deities Worshipped therein during the Iron Age IIA, in: Kamlah, J (ed.). *Temple Building and Temple Cult*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 317-338.

Ornan, T 2012. Member in the Entourage of Yahweh: A Uraeus Seal from the Eastern Plaza Excavations, Jerusalem. *Atiqot* 72, 15*-20*.

Romey, K 2018. Has the 'Signature' of Biblical Prophet Isaiah Been Discovered? *National Geographic Magazine* 21 Feb. 2018 (https://news.national-geographic.com/2018/02/prophet-isaiah-jerusalem-seal-archaeology-bible/).

Seidl, U 2000. Babylonische und assyrische Kultbilder in den Massenmedien des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr., in: Uehlinger, C (ed.). *Images as Media: Sources for the*

Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st Millennium BCE). Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 89-114.

Staubli, T 2003. *Werbung für die Götter. Heilsbringer aus 4000 Jahren.* Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.

Izak Cornelius
Stellenbosch University

Steinkeller, P 2017. *History, Texts and Art in Early Babylonia: Three Essays* (Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records 15). Boston / Berlin: De Gruyter. 261 pages + 48 figures. ISBN 978-1-50-151330-5. €89.95.

Steinkeller draws on his four decades of experience to produce this book which explores the relationship between Mesopotamian historical texts, art and political history from the Late Uruk to Old Babylonian Period, as well as the scholarly tradition which examines these. It contains three essays and two appendices. The essays are expanded versions of papers presented between 2001 and 2015. All five papers deal with similar, inter-related topics, and as such there is much cross-referencing between the papers, and a cogent argument runs through the entire book. The layout is unusual in that the two appendices are located between the essays, with Appendix 1 between Essay 1 and Essay 2, and Appendix 2 between Essay 2 and Essay 3. In this way Appendix 1 follows Essay 1, forming and appendix to this paper, while Appendix 2 similarly is related to Essay 2, and could function as an appendix to this essay, rather than the two appendices serving as appendices to the collection of essays. The book is relatively well illustrated with 48 figures provided on plates at the end of the book.

The first essay, *Writing, Kingship and Political Discourse in Early Babylonia: Reflections on the Nature and Function of Third Millennium Historical Sources* (7-81), examines the nature of third millennium historical sources and can be broadly divided into two sections. The first deals with ideas of kingship and how these influence the concept of history and historical writing, and the second deals with Babylonian scribal lore and its relevance in the historical tradition. Steinkeller uses a wide variety of sources from the Uruk to Old Babylonian periods, and does a good job of explaining why he doesn't consider certain texts to be truly historical. He argues that the "lack of elite display sources and chronographic records

in Early Dynastic times was largely due to the absence of a developed dynastic tradition" (39) and that "true historical sources and monumental art that glorified the ruler and his political achievements" appeared during the Akkadian Period when the concept of kingship changed (40). In the second section Steinkeller argues for the existence of a "Managerial Class" (56) which stood as a separate kind of political power. This group marked their legitimacy through the use of texts such as the lexical lists, like the Lu A and Ad-gi$_4$, and the Antediluvian King List. They had their own political and social agenda which was independent to the royal and official canon. Steinkeller argues this well, but it is a pity that he does not integrate his argument in the second half of the paper for the Managerial Class more explicitly with the concepts of kingship discussed in the first half.

Appendix 1, *The Priest-King of Uruk Times* (82-104) discusses the ruler of the Uruk Period by focusing on both iconographic (82-94) and textual (94-104) sources. These two types of sources though are dealt with quite separately, with relatively little integration. Steinkeller handles the textual evidence – the appearance of the title en in Uruk III tables and the title of nam$_2$-šita$_2$ (96-100) and texts from later periods (100-102) – much better than the visual sources. Steinkeller points out that a basalt stele from Uruk with the Priest-King holding a spear is usually overlooked in literature on priest-king iconography (83 n. 225), but he himself seems unaware of a cylinder seal which depicts the Priest-King and an attendant hunting bulls, with Inanna's ring-post with streamer directly behind the Priest-King (BM 131440). This cylinder seal contradicts Steinkeller's contention that there are no images of the priest-king as a warrior or hunter in which either Inanna or her symbols are depicted (83). Furthermore, Steinkeller states that "[t]he present study considers exclusively the images illustrating the Priest-King's ritual aspect" (83), but the inclusion of the ring-post with streamer suggests that this hunt is a ritual act (see e.g. Van Dijk 2011). This exclusion becomes problematic when Steinkeller later argues "[t]hat the Priest-King is not a god is shown conclusively by the images depicting him, in the contexts entirely devoid of any religious character, as a warrior and hunter" (90) without providing further argument. Another problem is Steinkeller's identification of Inanna's MUŠ$_3$ emblem as a "large, totem pole-like object made of reeds, to whose top there was attached a scarf or streamer made of textile" (84 n. 230), a hypothesis first put forward in his 1998 paper. He bases this interpretation on an Early Dynastic III text which identifies Inanna's emblem as a lapis lazuli scarf which she wears around the neck. The contemporary Uruk Period iconographic evidence though points to this

symbol representing a reed standard (Van Dijk 2016a:27, 31-46, 71, 234). Steinkeller further identifies Inanna as wearing this proposed scarf on two of the cylinder seals he discusses (88), but when compared to the Warka Vase and other seals it is evident that this is the Inanna figure's hair.

The second essay, *The Divine Rulers of Akkade and Ur: Toward a Definition of the Deification of Kings in Babylonia* (107-157) discusses the phenomenon of the deification of living kings in Mesopotamia during the Akkadian and Ur III dynasties. Steinkeller argues that the fundamental differences in concepts of kingship and history, as discussed in the first essay, were linked to the ideology of divine kingship, which was first conceived of during the Akkadian Period. He does this by examining the alleged divinity of Early Dynastic rulers and the historical context of the divination of Akkadian and Ur II rulers, including the differences in the socio-political contexts of Southern and Northern Babylonia and how these influenced the development of divine kingship. He also investigates the evidence for divine kingship. The essay concludes with a short investigation into whether Naram-Sin's deification may have been inspired by the Egyptian concept of kingship. There are problems with some arguments in this chapter. For example, Steinkeller uses Gudea's inscriptions to illustrate that the Early Dynastic "statements about divine parenthood of rulers are but poetic metaphors" (112), but also states that the evidence for Gudea's posthumous deification "cannot be projected back to Pre-Sargonic times" (116). That the evidence from Gudea's reign can support one argument but is dismissed from another seems inconsistent and illogical. There are numerous problems with the logic of Steinkeller's hypothesis regarding Naram-Sin's proposed deification being inspired by Egyptian rock reliefs. He argues that rock reliefs are unknown from Greater Mesopotamia before the Ur III Period (155). While this may be the case, one would not expect to find rock reliefs in Greater Mesopotamia dating from the Early Dynastic Period if the conflicts of these rulers were limited to Babylonia and they did not campaign further afield. Furthermore, the rocks in Babylonia itself would also not be suitable for such reliefs. Steinkeller also suggests that there may have been Egyptian reliefs in Lebanon which may have been seen by and inspired the Mesopotamian rulers, although "[i]f such rock reliefs existed, none of them have come down to us" (156). This highlights the possibility that there may similarly have been Mesopotamian reliefs which have not survived. Despite the problems, this chapter is generally well argued, and provides great insight

into the historical and socio-political contexts which gave rise to the ideology of divine kingship.

The second appendix, *The Roundlet of Naram-Suen* (158-164), provides a description of the limestone mould of a roundlet and a tight, compact argument that this roundlet, or, more accurately, the object produced by it, is described in an inscription on the obverse of AO 5474. Steinkeller's suggestion that the object produced would have been a divine standard (or more accurately an emblem which would have surmounted a standard) which was set up in Ištar-Annunitum's sanctuary (158-159) is problematic. There is no iconographic evidence from the third millennium for such as standard. Ištar may have been associated with the rod with balls standard on Naram-Sin's Victory Stele (Van Dijk 2016b:41-45), but no other standard for this goddess is known from the Akkadian Period. In the succeeding Neo-Sumerian Period Ištar's aš-me standard is represented with the emblem of a lion with a disc on its back (Van Dijk 2016a:205-206), but this emblem is smaller than the object produced by the mould would have been. The object may still have been a divine emblem, but from the iconographic evidence it appears unlikely that this emblem would have formed part of a standard.

In the third and final essay, *Mythical Realities of the Early Babylonian History (or the Modern Historian and the Native Uses of History Past)* (167-197), Steinkeller argues that various so-called historical sources should not be taken as historically factual or reliable, but rather that they can give much insight into what the Mesopotamians believed their history to be. This is described as "mythical history" (176), where events described can only have taken place in a mythical reality. While these sources may still be historically informative, in that they may name historical figures or organize events in a chronological order, they essentially do not differ from completely non-historical sources (177). Steinkeller uses the Sumerian King List (192-196) and the various sources on Ur-Zababa and Sargon (181-186) to illustrate his argument. Steinkeller's contention that this mythical history should be treated seriously "as true reflections of the social matrix" (197), and that, if done systematically, could provide us with a wealth of information and understanding, is one that should be stressed.

In general, Steinkeller handles the textual sources better than he does the visual. In both Essay 1 (28) and Essay 2 (116, 120) he argues that in Early Dynastic art rulers are not differentiated from other members of society by special posture or the wearing of any royal insignia or special attire. Furthermore, Steinkeller contends that there is no expression of their

special "institutional connection with the divine realm" (116), and that the ruler is never shown "officiating over ritual activities" (120). However, the ruler on the Standard of Ur (BM 121201) is represented as larger than the other figures on the standard, clearly differentiating him from them. Ur-Nanše is similarly depicted as larger than his family members on his relief plaques (AO 2344 and AO 2345). In one of these (AO 2344) Ur-Nanše is carrying a brick basket to lay the foundations of a temple, an activity which was of ritual significance and "seems to be more indicative of royal rank" (Marchesi & Marchetti 2011:201). In fact, Marchesi & Marchetti (2011:196-207, 211-218) further suggest a number of symbols which may identify figures as royal, including branches held by figures in banquet scenes (2011:201-202), a kind of curved scimitar which is held by the royal figure on the circular base from Lagaš (AO 2350, 3288) as well as Eannatum on his Stele of the Vultures (AO 16109, 50, 2346, 2348) (2011:196), and a mace, which, importantly in light of Steinkeller's arguments, was also considered a divine weapon (2011:201). He also repeatedly tries to explain visual material by using textual sources. While this can potentially provide great insight, as for example with the Naram-Sin roundlet, it can also be problematic when contemporary iconographic evidence suggests a different reading, as for example on his identification of the MUŠ$_3$ symbol. Visual and textual sources may provide information which can be either complementary or different from each other. As Suter (2000:8) argues, a "mental background" should be sought for the two types of sources, rather than looking for direct or perfect matches. Steinkeller does this well. In all, the book is well conceived, generally well argued, and is thought-provoking. It is a valuable addition to the field of early Mesopotamian studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Braun, J, Łyczkowsak, K, Popko, M & Steinkeller, P 1998. *Written on Clay and Stone: Ancient Near Eastern Studies presented to Krystyna Szarzyńska on the Occasion of her 80th Birthday*. Warsaw: Agade.

Editorial Científica Universitaria-Fac. Hum., Universidad de Catamarca. 2011. *Actas de las XIII Jornadas Interescuelas/Departamentos de Historia, 10, 11, 12 y 13 de Agosto de 2011*. San Fernando del Valle de Catamarca: Publicación en CD-ROM. ISBN 978-987-661-141-1.

Marchesi, G & Marchetti, N 2011. *Royal Statuary of Early Dynastic Mesopotamia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Steinkeller, P 1998. Inanna's Archaic Symbol, in: Braun, J, Łyczkowsak, K, Popko, M & Steinkeller, P 1998, 87-100.

Suter, C E 2000. *Gudea's Temple Building: The Representation of an Early Mesopotamian Ruler in Text and Image* (CM 17). Groningen: Styx Publications.

Van Dijk, R M 2011. La cacería real Mesopotámica, in: Editorial Científica Universitaria-Fac. Hum., Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, 2011.

Van Dijk, R M 2016a. The Form, Function and Symbolism of Standards in Ancient Mesopotamia during the Third and Fourth Millennia BCE: An Iconographical Study. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Stellenbosch University.

Van Dijk, R M 2016b. The standards on the Victory Stele of Naram-Sin. *Journal for Semitics* 25/1, 33-50.

Renate M van Dijk-Coombes
Stellenbosch University