

JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

VOLUME 43/2

2017

EDITORS:

J COOK

I CORNELIUS
C H J VAN DER MERWE

G R KOTZÉ

VOLUME EDITOR:

C H J VAN DER MERWE

*at Stellenbosch University
South Africa*

Editorial Board:

Jan Joosten (Oxford), Meir Malul (Haifa), Cynthia Miller-Naudé (Bloemfontein), Jacobus Naudé (Bloemfontein), Herbert Niehr (Tübingen), Hermann-Josef Stipp (München), Ernst Wendland (Lusaka), Arie van der Kooij (Leiden)

Department of Ancient Studies
Stellenbosch University

The *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
(ISSN 0259-0131) is published half-yearly

JNSL is an accredited South African journal. It publishes peer reviewed research articles on the Ancient Near East. As part of the *peer review policy* all contributions are refereed before publication by scholars who are recognised as experts in the particular field of study.

Contributions and books for review should be sent to

The Editor: *JNSL*
Department of Ancient Studies
Stellenbosch University
Private Bag X1, Matieland, ZA-7602
SOUTH AFRICA
e-mail: ancient7@sun.ac.za

Subscriptions should be sent to the same address but marked as

Subscription: *JNSL*

Copyright

Department of Ancient Studies, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch,
SOUTH AFRICA

House rules

Articles submitted for publication must be according to the house rules
on the homepage

JNSL homepage (house rules, contents, subscription)

<http://academic.sun.ac.za/jnsl/>

TO ORDER: Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
Send an e-mail to Ms L C Swanepoel (ancient7@sun.ac.za)

Per Invoice	\$ 70.00
	€ 55.00
Booksellers	- 30%

For further subscription information: e-mail Ms L C Swanepoel (ancient7@sun.ac.za)

CONTENTS

Articles

Mitka R. Golub, Interchanges between יהו, יה, and יו in Biblical Personal Names from the First Temple Period	1-6
Amanda R. Morrow, I Hate My Spouse: The Performative Act of Divorce in Elephantine Aramaic	7-25
Aron Pinker, Lightening a Cloudy Job 37:11	27-51
Simon P. Stocks, On the Inter-Dependence of Diachronic Analysis and Prosodic Theory: Mowinckel's <i>Tricola</i> as a Case Study	53-64
Juan Manuel Tebes, Desert Place-Names in Numbers 33:34, Assurbanipal's Arabian Wars and the Historical Geography of the Biblical Wilderness Toponymy	65-96
David Van Acker, צלמות, An Etymological and Semantic Reconsideration	97-123
<i>Book Reviews</i>	125-129
<i>Book List</i>	131
<i>Addresses of Authors</i>	133

Mitka R. Golub (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

**INTERCHANGES BETWEEN יהו, יה, AND יו IN
BIBLICAL PERSONAL NAMES FROM THE FIRST
TEMPLE PERIOD**

ABSTRACT

*In the Bible, people are sometimes known by more than one name, i.e., various names or variants of the same name may appear in different books, or even in the same book. This study examines the interchanges between the various forms of YHWH (יהו, יה, יו) found in the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles in the context of the First Temple period. The study reveals that the YHWH interchanges are systematic and therefore should not be attributed to copying errors. Additionally, the majority of these interchanges appear within the same book, more frequently in Samuel-Kings than in Chronicles.**

Amanda R. Morrow (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

I HATE MY SPOUSE: THE PERFORMATIVE ACT OF DIVORCE IN ELEPHANTINE ARAMAIC¹

ABSTRACT

“Documents of Wifehood” from Elephantine contain a stipulation in which either the husband or wife can stand up in an assembly and say שְׁנֵאָתָא, after which they follow the stipulations laid out in the contract. This verb שְׁנֵאָתָא in the context of these contracts is a performative utterance, which is demonstrated by the act of speaking it in front of an assembly and by the verb’s suffix-conjugation form. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate the existence of a performative perfect in Aramaic as a function of the suffix-form and to establish the legal meaning of שְׁנֵאָתָא in Aramaic as “divorce”. This paper argues that שְׁנֵאָתָא cannot mean “demotion”, as has been previously argued.

Aron Pinker (Silver Spring, Maryland, USA)

LIGHTENING A CLOUDY JOB 37:11

ABSTRACT

This study suggests that the difficulties associated with the interpretation of Job 37:11 can be resolved, if it is assumed that Elihu capitalizes on the puzzling behavior of clouds, such as their constant moving from place to place, their yielding rain, and seemingly their causing the jagged form of lightning, to accuse Job of hubris. This perspective assumes the reading בְּאֲרוֹ instead of MT בְּרִי and draws upon the Arabic اري, which could mean “driving clouds and bringing rain”. In Elihu’s view, Job presumes that he can understand God’s actions toward himself. But it is obvious that this cannot be true, since even the cloud-related meteorological phenomena are beyond his capability to understand.

Simon P. Stocks (St Augustine's College of Theology)

**ON THE INTER-DEPENDENCE OF DIACHRONIC
ANALYSIS AND PROSODIC THEORY: MOWINCKEL'S
TRICOLA AS A CASE STUDY¹**

ABSTRACT

In Mowinckel's Real and Apparent Tricola in Hebrew Psalm Poetry he argued that tricola occur throughout a psalm (or distinct section), only very rarely in isolation. In forming this argument, Mowinckel proposed emendations to MT, implying that an earlier form has been changed and needs reconstruction. His analysis was based on his proposition that Hebrew poetry has an iambic metre. Could his claims be sustained if alternative prosodic theories were employed? This study takes a sample of poetic lines that Mowinckel dealt with and assesses them on the basis of some alternative theories of colometry. This reveals the strong dependence of Mowinckel's diachronic analysis on his prosodic theory and yields some insight into the likely inter-dependence of prosodic and diachronic analyses.

*Juan Manuel Tebes (IMHICIHU-CONICET – Catholic University of
Argentina –University of Buenos Aires)*

**DESERT PLACE-NAMES IN NUMBERS 33:34,
ASSURBANIPAL’S ARABIAN WARS AND THE
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLICAL
WILDERNESS TOPONYMY**

ABSTRACT

Among the geographical narratives of the book of Numbers stand two toponym descriptions that include place-names in the Sinai Peninsula and the Negev Desert: Num 33:5-49, an account of the itinerary of the Exodus with new toponym material; and Num 34:1-12, a description of the borders of the land of Canaan as told by Yahweh. Both texts have been largely regarded as having very different historical value. While Num 34:1-12 is traditionally viewed as a good source of information for the historical geography of Palestine, Num 33:5-49 is often seen as a toponym description composed for purely theological or ritual reasons, with little primary historical information. This short article will attempt a hermeneutical exercise by studying two southern toponyms from both lists and test out their historical reliability in the light of a 7th century BCE Akkadian source, Rassam Cylinder (Prism A), the most important of Neo-Assyrian king Assurbanipal’s descriptions of his wars against the Arabs in the Syro-Arabian Desert. The analysis of this inscription suggests, for the first time, plausible parallels in two Aramized/Arabianized southern Transjordanian place-names for two toponyms in Numbers (Haradah in 33:24, and Hazar Addar in 34:4), strongly suggesting that the origin of these biblical site-names fits well into a specific historical-geographical setting: the arid margins of the southern Levant during the time of the Neo-Assyrian hegemony over the area. The historicity of both geographical descriptions in Numbers, then, should be re-considered in the light of this new interpretation.

*David Van Acker*¹ (University of Leuven)

צְלֻמוֹת, AN ETYMOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC RECONSIDERATION

ABSTRACT

צְלֻמוֹת is a dubious word in the Hebrew Bible. It has been commonly interpreted as a compound noun *צֶל-מָוֶת*, translated with “shadow of death” or an abstract noun *צְלֻמוֹת* from the Semitic stem *šlm-II*, “darkness”. However, both readings are cumbersome: a translation “shadow of death” fits badly in most contexts of *צְלֻמוֹת*, while the mere existence of *šlm-II* in Northwest Semitic is problematic. With some new evidence from Ugaritic research, I will argue that the *צֶל-מָוֶת* etymology is to be preferred. However, the translation should indeed be centred around the concept of ‘darkness’. Using collocation analysis and insights from cognitive semantics, I will make a semantic analysis of the term, charting all its meaning aspects. Thus I will demonstrate how *צְלֻמוֹת* has a conceptual structure including the notions of ‘darkness’, ‘terror (of death)’ and ‘locality’. These notions can be explained with a *צֶל-מָוֶת* reading and less so with a *šlm-II* reading.

BOOK REVIEWS

Zevit, Z (ed.) 2017. *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield, UK and Bristol, CT, USA: Equinox. ISBN-13 9781781792667 (Hardback), 978178179674 (Paperback), 9781781794555 (e-PDF). 262 pages. Hardback price: £75.00, Paperback price: £25.00, Epublication price: £22.95 (individual), £75.00 (institutional).

The essays in this book are the fruit of research presented at Fall meetings of the National Association of Professors of Hebrew (NAPH) between 2012 and 2014. Following an introduction by the editor, Zevit, they are arranged in four sections: “Clarifying Matters of Theory and Method”, Multi-Lingual Scribes and Their Archives”, “Inner Biblical Allusions and Citations”, and “Extra-Biblical Allusions, Citations, and Translations”. Contributors were asked to describe their working model of an alluded-to text (ATT) when a citation or allusion in a later text is obvious; how they identify the ATT when a citation or allusion is less so; what criteria should be used to evaluate claims about the presence of a citation or allusion; and how the presence within the Bible of a “translation” of a non-Israelite text can be detected. A broader purpose for the sessions was to bring some order to the terminological chaos that has bedeviled these studies and to encourage more conscious reflection on their underlying assumptions and methodologies.

The title of the book raises the question of what exactly would be the difference between an “allusion” and a “subtle citation”, a question that is never answered. As is well known, explicit citation formulae are rare in the Hebrew Bible, and cases of sustained verbatim repetition of one text by another normally are not “allusions” or “citations” at all. In the introduction, Zevit aptly characterizes allusions as “friendly winks of the inner, literary eye that an author directs to her audience”, devices that “traffic in insider-information to enrich a work by connecting it to prior works and to create a slight bond between author and reader on the basis of their common knowledge” (p. 2). That stops short of a comprehensive definition, but the mention of 1) a diachronic relationship between two texts; 2) authorial intention; 3) some level of covertness; 4) knowledge shared between author and reader, with a resulting “bond”; and 5) textual “enrichment” would make this a workable starting point. Had the participants who treat “allusion” agreed on this much, the coherence of this volume—and, no doubt, of these discussions—would have been enhanced significantly.

Together, the essays can be read as a dialogue among session participants on five questions, *viz.*:

1. May we, or may we not, describe what we are doing as “intertextuality”?

2. (Closely related to #1 above) Is what we are engaged in synchronic or diachronic?
3. (Also closely related to #1) Is the presence of an allusion a reader decision, an author decision, or a bit of both?
4. What (and whose) criteria do we use to evaluate a claim that “Here *x* is alluding to *y*”? How important is the presence of shared vocabulary?
5. What (if any) methodological shifts are necessary when we move from inner-biblical allusion to allusion across the Ancient Near East (ANE)?

With regard to the first question, Zevit’s introduction calls “intertextuality” a current “buzzword” in biblical studies (p. 14 n. 41), which is accurate. In the sense in which Julia Kristeva coined the term (by way of distilling Bakhtin’s concept of “dialogism”), *intertextualité* refers to the view that every text, not only the self-consciously allusive, participates in a dialogue with every other text and is thus a “mosaic of quotations” (Kristeva 1986:37). In the hands of post-structuralists like Roland Barthes, “intertextuality” became an approach in which questions of diachrony and availability are irrelevant; accordingly, Benjamin Sommer helpfully distinguished his own landmark study of “allusion” in Deutero-Isaiah (*A Prophet Reads Scripture*) from studies of intertextuality in Kristeva’s sense.

The essays in this volume all take a diachronic rather than a Kristevan approach (Zevit, p. 15). Peter Machinist in “To Refer or Not To Refer: That is the Question” acknowledges the usefulness of Sommer’s distinction and defines his own interest as “‘influence/allusion’ rather than intertextuality” (p. 185). On the other hand, in his “Identifying Torah Sources in the Historical Psalms”, Marc Zvi Brettler includes his work under “intertextuality”, drawing a line between “author-oriented intertextuality” (i.e., what he means by “allusion”) and “reader-oriented intertextuality” (p. 79). Marvin Sweeney, in his “Isaiah 60-62 in Intertextual Perspective”, offers a definition of “intertextuality” broad enough to include both approaches where diachrony is irrelevant and those (like his own) where it is essential.

It may be that reserving the term “intertextuality” for approaches like Kristeva’s or Barthes’s is now a lost cause. On the other hand, when Brettler urges “all who discuss intertextuality to make clear what approach they are taking” (p. 79), one wonders whether agreement on the more restrictive definition, *a la* Sommer, would not be a helpful move toward greater clarity.

As in Brettler’s distinction between “author-oriented” and “reader-oriented intertextuality”, the third question – whether the presence of an allusion is an authorial or reader decision – is engaged more or less explicitly by most of the essays on allusion. Sweeney’s presentation of the issue is outstanding, and he notes that to “polarize” the field along “author vs. reader” lines is unhelpful; “a synthesis of these views” is required (p. 134). What is largely missing, however, is direct application of the matter to the

question: What exactly are we saying by the claim, “Here *x* is alluding to *y*”? The range of options includes (but is not limited to):

1. The author of *x* chose a linguistic expression with its source in *y* in the hope that the implied reader would notice, mentally activating *y* to some degree.
2. The implied reader of *y* could not have failed to call *x* to mind at this point, and there would have been certain effects on his/her reading of one text, or the other, or both.
3. I choose to read *x* in the light of *y* (and/or vice versa) because I find it productive.

These claims (and many more) may be legitimate, but they are not the same; and it is premature to establish criteria on which to evaluate a claim before precisely what is being claimed has been articulated.

Nevertheless, criteria may be the issue that receives the most attention in this “dialogue”; those most often employed or at least discussed are Richard Hays’s and Jeffery Leonard’s. The criterion of shared vocabulary is a particular focal point. For Edward L. Greenstein (“The Book of Job and Mesopotamian Literature: How Many Degrees of Separation?”), “textual influence cannot be demonstrated by generic and thematic parallels alone but must be supported by a linguistic link” (p. 152). Among the other essayists there is probably more consensus around Joseph Ryan Kelly’s view (“Identifying Literary Allusions: Theory and the Criteria of Shared Language”) that common vocabulary is a useful starting point, but in and of itself it is neither sufficient nor necessary (p. 38), and there is no reason to demand that shared language reach a certain “threshold” before a proposed allusion should be considered (p. 31). Jeffery M. Leonard’s argument is intriguing (“Identifying Subtle Allusions: The Promise of Narrative Tracking”): those psalms that re-present traditions about Israel’s history often establish links to prior texts by following their narrative structures, a way of alluding that requires no shared language at all.

What changes in methodology are necessary when the proposed ATT lies outside the Bible? Essays on proposed extra-biblical connections include Greenstein’s, Machinist’s, David M. Carr’s “Method in Determining the Dependence of Biblical on Non-biblical Texts”, Ada Taggar-Cohen’s “Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation: Evidence in Hittite Texts and Some Biblical Implications”, Joel S. Baden’s “Literary Allusions and Assumptions about Textual Familiarity”, David P. Wright’s “Method in the Study of Textual Source Dependence: The Covenant Code”, and Michael V. Fox’s “Gauging Egyptian Influences on Biblical Literature”. Three of Carr’s common-sense observations are worth repeating nonetheless:

1. Demonstrating the plausible availability of the alleged ATT to the alluding author (the first of Hays’s criteria) is even more necessary (and difficult) when the ATT is extra-biblical (cf. also Machinist, p. 184).

2. The scholar's task is not simply "to find the closest analogy" to a biblical text in the ANE and proceed on the basis of an assumed connection, although this is frequently done (p. 50).
3. It is important not to treat our accidental evidence for the literature of the ANE as if "it formed a semi-canon that interprets itself" (p. 51).

Fox's description of what we are looking for is eminently sensible: "a strong congruity between source and receptor in specific and independent variables, both in form and content, with unpredictable similarities unique to the texts in question, together with a verifiable path of textual transmission" (p. 239). This suggests that the criteria and cautions that apply to the search for allusions across the ANE differ from those for inner-biblical allusion in degree, not in kind.

This volume suggests that perhaps it is time for explicit attention in these sessions to a sixth question: If cases of demonstrable relationships between texts are interesting, why is this exactly? For some essayists (Sweeney, Brettler), connections are important mainly for the light they shed on the composition history of the alluding text; as R. L. Schultz has noted, historically most studies of allusion have proceeded with this interest primarily or even exclusively in mind (Schultz 1999:56). The light shed on the broader literary and cultural milieu of the ANE receives special attention from others (Machinist, Taggar-Cohen, Fox). For others, studies of allusion and influence are most useful when a proposed allusion helps to explain a feature of the alluding text that otherwise remains obscure. The most concrete examples of this are "blind motifs" (similar to Ben-Porat's "allusion marker", Ben-Porat 1976:110), like the re-use of Amenemope's phrase "thirty sayings" in Prov 22:20 where Proverbs does not seem to count "thirty" of anything in particular (Carr, p. 47; Fox, p. 235). Wright's use of the Code of Hammurabi to explicate the Covenant Code where it is rather cryptic is an example of a study of a "translation" undertaken with this objective in view, although some of Wright's examples require forays into the mind of the Covenant Code "translator" that seem a bit adventuresome (e.g., p. 173).

An attempt may be made to prove awareness of one text on the part of another for a number of reasons that are not mutually exclusive. For this reviewer, however, Baden's point should be borne in mind: "No biblical author wrote in order that his readers should be able to trace the Bible's literary history, nor is knowledge of that literary history a necessary precondition for understanding any biblical writing" (p. 128). Naturally, one may approach a biblical text for many reasons other than to understand it. But as the field of allusion and influence studies progresses toward maturity, might we hope for a coalescing around the terminology and methods used in those studies that demonstrate their value for exegesis of the biblical texts? Might these approaches be the ones that enable us to plausibly reconstruct what an alluding text, and thus (at least presumably) the alluding author, was anxious to communicate?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakhtin, M M 1982. Discourse in the Novel, in: Holquist, M (ed.). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 259-422.
- Barthes, R 1986. *The Rustle of Language*. Howard, R (trans.). New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Inc.
- Ben-Porat, Z 1976. The Poetics of Literary Allusion. *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1, 105-128.
- Hays, R B 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kristeva, J 1986. Word, Dialogue, Novel, in: Moi, T (ed.). *The Kristeva Reader*. New York: Columbia, 34-61.
- Leonard, J M 2008. Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case. *JBL* 127/2, 241-265.
- Schultz, R L 1999. *Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (JSOT Supplement Series 180). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Sommer, B D 1998. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kenneth A. Cherney, Jr.
Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary