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ABSTRACT

In Official Aramaic, the preposition "ל" was reanalyzed as a direct object marker. This lamed object occurs sporadically in Biblical Hebrew, but it is difficult to differentiate from the ordinary use of "ל" as a dative marker. The diagnosis is often based on distribution – if there are arguments realized elsewhere as direct objects, then an equivalent term marked by "ל" is also considered a direct object – but this does not account for the possibility that some verbs may behave irregularly with respect to transitivity. Nevertheless, semantic clues can help differentiate the set of lamed-verbs that may occur in both transitive and intransitive syntactic structures from examples of lamed object proper.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Biblical Hebrew, the specialized preposition "את" is used to mark the direct object of a transitive verb in a Differential Object Marking (DOM) system. Cognates are used similarly in the other Northwest Semitic

* A previous draft of this paper was read in the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew section of the 2015 SBL Annual Meeting in Atlanta, GA. I thank the participants for their helpful feedback as well as the comments of an anonymous reviewer, which prompted me to refine the argument in several places.

1 In a DOM system only one set of objects are explicitly marked for case while another subset remains unmarked. This variation is attributed to semantic and pragmatic factors, typically definiteness and animacy. Bossong (1991) presents an overview of DOM, including examples from Hebrew and Aramaic, and see Bekins (2014:50-57) for Biblical Hebrew "את" in the context of DOM. Case has traditionally been associated with inflectional systems, which has led some scholars to avoid the terminology of case when discussing Biblical Hebrew (e.g., Hofstijzer 1965:7-8). The syntactic and semantic relationships indicated by case are relatively abstract, however, and Haspelmath observes that it is “completely unproblematic” (2009:509-510) to transfer the traditional case labels, such as accusative and dative, to prepositions that serve a similar dependent-marking function. Indeed, "את" has traditionally been termed the nota accusativi (GKC §117) since its core function aligns with the accusative. The
CONCEPTUAL BLENDING AS AN INTEGRATIVE APPROACH TO METAPHOR AND ICONOGRAPHY: THE COMPLEX DIVINE WARRIOR IMAGERY IN JOSH 10:10-11 AS CASE STUDY

ABSTRACT

An exciting development in Biblical Studies is the rise of iconographic exegesis, an approach that sheds a new light on biblical figurative language by relating ANE iconography to literary tropes in biblical texts. As a number of exemplary studies illustrate (e.g., Klingbeil 1999; Strawn 2005; De Hulster 2009; LeMon 2010), a careful comparison, in which both media are related to one another on the conceptual / cognitive level, shows how biblical textual imagery and ANE iconographic art may express congruent conceptual models. Drawing on recent developments in Cognitive Linguistics, this study explores how the iconographic-biblical approach can be applied to complex conceptual structures that derive from multiple conceptual metaphors.

1. INTRODUCTION

With the increased attention for ANE iconography in biblical studies, the question arises how ANE iconography is related conceptually to figurative language in the Hebrew Bible. This methodological crux is especially addressed by the iconographic-biblical approach, a methodology in which biblical literary imagery is interpreted “with the help of ancient Near Eastern visual remains” (De Hulster, Strawn & Bonfiglio 2015:20). A seminal study in this regard is Izaak De Hulster’s ‘Iconographic Exegesis’. By adopting the ‘Cognitive Theory of Metaphor’ (hereafter CTM), De Hulster relates “material images” (such as sculptures, reliefs etc.) and “literal or textual images” to each other via “conceptual metaphor”: whereas metaphors are determined by “a ‘level of iconicity’ in that they picture one entity as another”, material images or icons also “picture metaphors” (De Hulster 2009:115). In perfect agreement with the view that metaphor is a cognitive phenomenon (Lakoff 2006:186-187), De Hulster understands conceptual metaphor as an essential enterprise of human thought, which is expressed in both language and art:
STYLISTIC FEATURES IN OLD GREEK JOB: AN ANALYSIS OF JOB 5:6-7

ABSTRACT

When a translator claims some artistic freedom in the way in which he handles his source text, as seems to be the case with the Old Greek translator of Job, literary motivations are likely to be able to explain certain translational differences. OG Job has often been characterized as “literary,” but this has not yet been examined in detail. The rendering of Job 5:6-7 provides an intriguing example which allows us to study the literary character of OG Job and demonstrate the value of a sustained analysis of literary phenomena in the Septuagint translations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Scholars characterize the Old Greek (OG) text of the book of Job as a very “free” translation in “good” Greek, attesting to an evident effort at literary style. When a translator claims some artistic freedom in the way in which he handles his source text, as seems to be the case with the Greek translator of Job, literary motivations are likely to be able to explain certain translational differences. What precisely the aspects of this “literary character” of OG Job are, and how they relate to the Hebrew text, has not yet been systematically studied. In what follows, I will

1 The author holds a predoctoral mandate funded by the F.R.S.-FNRS.
2 This article contains a revision of a paper presented during the SBL International Meeting in Vienna, 2014.
4 The influence of stylistic or rhetorical considerations on the OG translation of several biblical books has most recently been demonstrated by many scholars, such as in the contributions in the volume Et Sapienter et Eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint (ed. E. Bons & T. Kraus; FRLANT 241; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011). Other relevant publications on this topic include Aitken (2011:507-521; 2005:55-78); Dines (2013:397-411); Gera (2007:107-120); Kabergs (2014); Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014).
5 A scholarly consensus regarding the relationship between the Hebrew text of
THE SEMANTIC MAP OF SUBORDINATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO ARAMAIC דָּי IN EZRA

ABSTRACT

Lexicographic study of Aramaic דָּי has either produced a list of its meanings or has assigned it a general meaning. Both have proved inadequate for describing meaning either synchronically or diachronically. This paper will demonstrate the usefulness of the semantic map method for understanding דָּי. The method is applied not only to דָּי in Ezra and Old Aramaic but also to English subordinate clauses. This method illustrates synchronic, diachronic, and cross-linguistic features of דָּי and helps us move beyond simple translation to understand the semantic functions of דָּי.

1. INTRODUCTION

The many attempts at describing subordination through the use of דָּי in Aramaic have either compiled a list of its meanings or assigned it a general meaning. Following Haspelmath’s terminology (2003:214), I will call these respectively the list method and the general-meaning method. Rosenthal’s grammar (1961) offers a list of glosses in accord with the list method, and Pat-El’s characterization of דָּי as a relativizer (2008: 58) offers a single general meaning. However, recent advances in linguistic typology suggest that both the list method and the general-meaning method fail to capture the relationships between the functions. Typologists have uncovered these relationships between functions through cross-linguistic comparison, and have illustrated their findings by drawing maps of functions; these maps may be utilized to illustrate subordination. This more recent method is called the semantic map method. The semantic map method may be applied to Aramaic דָּי to facilitate easier understanding of its meaning, as well as to explain various synchronic and diachronic features. In this paper, I will first describe the semantic map

---

1 I thank Jeremy Hutton and Ronald Troxel for looking over and giving valuable comments on different versions of this project. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for their incisive suggestions.

2 The method has already been applied to Semitic Linguistics by the Stellenbosch Cognitive School in a series of articles since 2010. For a representative description of methodology, see Andrason (2011).
FOLLOWED BY PROCLITIC ד IN TARGUM LATTER PROPHETS: A STANDARD RENDERING OF HEBREW אָן

ABSTRACT

Extant Aramaic grammars are not consistent and systematic in their discussion of the ד particle as it occurs throughout the various Aramaic dialects. This study therefore looks at the theory of several developmental stages of the ד particle before it took on its proclitic form in Late Aramaic. Moreover, incidences are investigated where the combination אָן דְּ is used in Targum Latter Prophets to render Hebrew noun clauses that commence with the interrogative adverb אַיֵּה (where?). The aim is to establish the status and function of proclitic ד in renderings where proclitic ד is combined with the antecedent אָן. The hypothesis is put forward that אָן דְּ is a standard combination, which is employed in Jewish Literary Aramaic targumim to render interrogative verbal clauses that match the Hebrew compound word אֵי־זֶה.

1. INTRODUCTION

Taken literally, the term targum means “translation”. In the period of formative Judaism, the noun תַּרְגּוּם was used to indicate the Aramaic versions of the Bible. Among these is Targum Jonathan to the Prophets (TgJ) and part of this is Targum Latter Prophets. The prevalent dialect in Targum Latter Prophets is Jewish Literary Aramaic targumim (JLAtg). JLAtg originated from Middle Aramaic and manifests properties of both the later Eastern and Western branches of Aramaic, commonly referred to as Late Aramaic. The Eastern and Western Aramaic dialects have several common characteristics (Kaufman 2013a:1-26; 2013b:11-48; Kutscher 2007:347-348). Both dialects regularly make use of the ד particle which is employed in several different ways.

Extant Aramaic grammars discuss the use of the ד element from various perspectives: (i) as genitive particle for connecting two nouns to express possession; (ii) to function as a relative pronoun (who, which); (iii) as independent pronoun (the one[s] who); (iv) to express a causative relation (because) or (v) to express purpose (so that); (vi) before direct speech or (vii) in compound conjunctions with correlatives; and (viii) as a
TEXTUAL RECONSTRUCTIONS OF KTU² RETRACTED IN KTU³

ABSTRACT

This article discusses some of the few reconstructions of Ugaritic texts in KTU² that were not repeated in KTU³. Some illuminating examples of the withdrawal of older reconstructions and the introduction of new ones are described, with the aim of showing when the inclusion of textual reconstruction in a text edition can be justifiable and when not. It is demonstrated that a text edition should not include hypothetical reconstructions in the main text. Footnotes are a better means to show which reconstructions have been proposed. They can also be used to specify which interpretations of damaged letters are possible.

1. INTRODUCTION

Both in KTU² and KTU³, many sections of the cuneiform alphabetic texts from Ugarit that were missing when they were excavated have been reconstructed. Restorations of lost letters are given between square brackets. The first examples occur in KTU 1.1:II.1-2. KTU² gives the text as follows:

[ḥšk . ʾšk . ʾbšk . ʾmy p’nk
[tlsmn . ʾmy . twt]ḥ išdk

KTU³ reads:

[ḥšk . ʾšk . ʾbšk . ʾmy p’nk
[tlsmn . ʾmy . twt]ḥ išdk

In this case, the reconstruction between square brackets in KTU² was taken over completely in KTU³. The extensive reconstruction occurs also in other editions of this text (CTA, KTU¹, CARTU) and seems to be undisputed. It is based on a different passage from Ilimilku’s Ba’lu Cycle, KTU 1.3:III.18-20, as the footnotes in KTU² and KTU³ indicate. The reconstructions in KTU 1.1:II.1-2 are substantiated by traces of the same phrases in other damaged sections of the tablet (1.1:II.21-23; 1.1:III.10-11; cf. also 1.3:IV.11-12). In the preserved part of KTU 1.1:II.1, there are some minute differences between the text of KTU² and the text of KTU³:

Thanks are due to Wilfred Watson for his valuable suggestions.
BOOK REVIEWS


This book is a publication of the main papers presented at an international conference titled Iconographie de la guerre dans le monde syro-mésopotamien, IIIe-Ie mill av. J.-C. that took place on 4 December 2012 in Lyon, France. There are an introduction and seven papers, all of which add to the study of war iconography in Syro-Mesopotamia.

In the “Introduction: The War and Its Representations” (pp. 1-3), Laura Battini notes that there have been several articles investigating how war is represented in the visual sources of the Neo-Assyrian period, but that the earlier periods have been little studied (p. 1). It is interesting then that of the seven articles, two discuss the Neo-Assyrian period, one the Middle Assyrian period and how the war iconography of this period prefigures that of the Neo-Assyrian period, one the Old Babylonian period, two study war iconography at Mari, and one covers the third to first millennia BCE. While three millennia are therefore covered in this book, it is curious that the third millennium in Mesopotamia is not studied in a separate paper, as there are many examples of war iconography from this period, for example, the Standard of Ur, Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures, and the various Akkadian war monuments. However, Nigro (1998a and 1998b) has given great contributions to the study of Akkadian war iconography, and Bänder’s (1995) monograph on the Victory Stele of Naram-Sin covers this monument in depth. There have also been a number of studies on Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures, as for example the reconstructions by Winter (2010b), Barrelet (1970) and Romano (2007), and the recent article by Nadali (2014), who also provides the final paper of the present volume, on the amount of soldiers represented on the stele. Battini also states that the papers published in this volume reveal “the relevance of textual data to any analysis of iconological material. And this is not only true for iconology, but for all the archaeological material discovered in historical sites” (p. 2). It was disappointing to read this statement in a book on iconology/iconography, as it undermines the importance of visual and archaeological material as a separate source of evidence. As Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:8) state, “the tendency to treat images merely as illustrations of texts or texts as clues to better understand images are methods that do not appreciate images as independent media with its own ‘language’ and sources for inspiration”. Furthermore, Battini’s statement is debatable, as not all of the papers in the volume make use of textual sources.
In the first paper, “Some Observations on the War Scenes on the Seals from Mari City II (pp. 5-12), Dominique Beyer relooks at the findings of his 2007 paper, discussing the differences between the scenes depicted on the two seals of King Ishqi-Mari, and publishing an updated version of the scene depicted on seal version B. Overall, the work is well researched and argued, but there are some points to note. On p. 6, Beyer suggests that the scorpion on seal version A represents Išḫara (Išhara by Beyer). However, while the scorpion is labelled as the symbol of this goddess on Kassite period kudurrus, this appears to be the earliest attestation of the scorpion as a symbol of a deity (Seidl 1957-1971:488). Furthermore, Išḫara was first associated with the bašmu, a snake or hydra, and not the scorpion (Lambert 1976-1980:177). It is therefore unlikely that the scorpion depicted on seal version A represents Išḫara. On p. 7, Beyer suggests that the scenes on the two seals represent a specific battle and victory of Ishai-Mari, and states that he will return to the matter. However, on p. 10 he states that the possibility of the scenes representing a specific battle “has already been raised and can have multiple answers”, and he provides further literature in a footnote. One would have liked to have read some more in this article on the subject. Also on p. 10, Beyer discusses the head depicted above the chariot on seal version B, suggesting that it is represented as upside-down so that it could not be confused with a living occupant of the chariot. Further support for this head being symbolic of a deceased enemy is Collon’s (1986:74) assertion that inversion signifies death.

In the second paper, “Elements of War Iconography at Mari” (pp. 13-28), Béatrice Muller discusses how war is represented at the city of Mari in different media such as shell inlays, plaques and wall paintings. This discussion includes the different costumes and weapons used and the iconographic context within which these are found, as well as what Muller calls “iconographic syntax”, i.e., how various iconographic elements work together and relate to each other. In this respect, her insights into how military hierarchy may be depicted on shell inlays (pp. 20-22) is particularly interesting. She also discusses the overall compositions and significance of war imagery at Mari and the place of Mari in ancient Near Eastern war iconography. Here her suggestion that chariots depicted in the mosaic shell panels may represent moving chariots actually involved in battle, rather than stationary vehicles (p. 25) is compelling and well argued. In the conclusion of this article, the ways in which war iconography at Mari prefigures later war iconography of Assyria and Persia are also given (pp. 26-27).

The third paper, “Visualizing War in the Old Babylonian Period: Drama and Canon” (pp. 29-36) by Silvana Di Paolo, unfortunately has many spelling/typing errors and grammatical errors, which, at times, make it difficult to read. There are interesting sections on how conflicts can be traced in year names during the Isin-Larsa period, which Di Paolo links with the stele of Dadusha of Eshnunna (pp. 29-31), acts
of violence committed as a ritual of war, and how this is visible on a series of Old Babylonian seals (pp. 31-33), and the motif of the trampling ruler (pp. 33-35). Di Paolo gives a very important reason for representing concepts visually when she states that “one can communicate visually with much more force and immediacy than verbal communication allows” (p. 33).

“Middle Assyrian Drama in Depicting War: A Step towards Neo-Assyrian Art” (pp. 37-44) by Laura Battini discusses the limited amount of iconographic material for war from the Middle Assyrian period and how these prefigure and inspire Neo-Assyrian examples of war iconography. The Middle Assyrian iconographic material is limited to a pyxis lid, the altar of Tukulti-Ninurta I, the Broken Obelisk, and some cylinder seals. It is an important paper, as studies into Assyrian war iconography usually focus on the Neo-Assyrian period.

In the fifth paper, “‘Losing one’s head’: Some hints on the procedures and meanings of decapitation in the ancient Near East” (pp. 45-56), Rita Dolce discusses the significance of decapitation during war as represented in the visual record of Mesopotamia and Syria. Her primary focus is during the period of the third to first millennia BCE, but mention is also made of earlier examples from the Uruk period, and there is a short excursus on decapitation in Çatalhöyük in iconography as well as archaeology (p. 50). Various aspects of the treatment of severed heads in the visual sources are discussed, including how decapitated heads were used as display objects, how and why decapitated heads were counted, and the removal of severed heads by both humans and vultures.

The sixth paper, Ariel Bagg’s “Where is the Public? A New Look at the Brutality Scenes in Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions and Art” (pp. 57-82) is the longest paper of the collection. It includes many tables and an appendix, a “catalogue of brutality scenes in Neo-Assyrian art” with 56 brutality scenes (pp. 70-82). The paper examines the representation in both royal inscriptions and iconographic material of atrocities committed by the Neo-Assyrians after a battle or siege, as well as the audience for which the two types of source were intended. The iconographic material is fragmentary and limited to palace reliefs, the bands on the Balawat Gates, and wall paintings from Til-Barsip. The atrocities committed by the Neo-Assyrians are discussed in terms of who they were committed against – soldiers, members of the elite, and civilians. Bagg reaches some interesting conclusions about the acts of brutality themselves versus how these are represented in both text and image. There could have been more of a comparison between the depiction of the atrocities in the written and visual sources, but both were well discussed individually. Bagg argues convincingly against the royal inscriptions and iconographic material being propaganda, as the intended audience for these was future kings and deities, and not the Assyrian people and the enemies of the Neo-Assyrian empire.
This argument is also taken up by Davide Nadali in the final paper of the collection, “Images of War in the Assyrian Period: What They Show and What They Hide” (pp. 83-88), who, as Bagg, argues convincingly that images of war during the Neo-Assyrian period were directed to future kings and the deities, and were not primarily intended as propaganda. In this paper, Nadali discusses what type of scenes related to war are omitted in Neo-Assyrian art, and why this omission occurs. These types of scenes include losses incurred by the Neo-Assyrian army and “all logistical aspects of preparing for war” (p. 84).

Although there are some limitations to this volume as a study in war iconography, for example the lack of a separate paper on third millennium Mesopotamia and on prehistoric sources, the papers included are of a high standard, and the book is very well illustrated with 73 figures. It is a welcome addition to the study of ancient Near Eastern war iconography, and anybody interested in war and war iconography in Syro-Mesopotamia should consider acquiring it.
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