JOURNAL OF NORTHWEST SEMITIC LANGUAGES

VOLUME 45/2

2019

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*

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
		€ 65.00
	Booksellers	- 30%

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

CONTENTS

Nicholas P L Allen & Pierre J Jordaan (North-West University)

FILLED WITH THE SPIRIT; OR NEW WINE, WHICH CHEERS BOTH GOD AND MEN?
ANALYSING THE *TOPOS* OF INTOXICATION IN 3 MACCABEES

ABSTRACT

This paper is an exploration of the topos of intoxication as it applies to a reading of 3 Macc. Here the topos is examined as regards its Hellenistic rhetorical strategy to highlight the differences between Jew and non-Jew; and between righteous and non-righteous actors in the narrative. In the process it becomes evident that the author is concerned with the topos of intoxication to highlight both orthopraxy and heteropraxy. Ultimately, three purposes for the topos are identified: (1) An association purely with Philopater and his friends as adherents of the cult of Dionysus. (2) Alcohol is linked to the irrational behavior of drunken party goers who exhibit qualities that oppose both Dionysian as well as Jewish orthopraxy. (3) Both ironically and antithetically, from 3 Macc 6:30 onwards, alcohol suddenly becomes a symbol of orthopraxy.

Phil J Botha & Beat Weber (University of Pretoria)[1]

"THE LORD IS MY LIGHT AND MY SALVATION …" (PS 27:1): PSALM 27 IN THE LITERARY CONTEXT OF PSALMS 25-34

ABSTRACT

Psalm 27 has some unique interpretational difficulties. The article briefly refers to the various ways in which its arrangement of elements has been explained. It then attempts to understand the psalm within its literary context, the cluster Pss 25-34, in two ways: First, in understanding the features and contents of Ps 27 in terms of a linear reading of the sequence from Ps 25 to 27. Second, Ps 27 is considered in relation to Ps 31, the corresponding psalm in the chiastically arranged group running from Ps 25 to Ps 34. The implications of the connections between Ps 25 and Ps 31 are also considered in this phase. It is argued that the structure and contents of Ps 27 become more transparent within this literary context created by the editors of the Psalms.

Guy Darshan (Tel Aviv University)

RUAḤ 'ELOHIM IN GENESIS 1:2 IN LIGHT OF PHOENICIAN COSMOGONIES: A TRADITION'S HISTORY*

ABSTRACT

Genesis 1 has been the subject of many comparative studies, focusing especially on its similarity to Enuma Elish. *However, verse 2 in this chapter, which has no parallels in Mesopotamian cosmogonies whatsoever, deserves a separate discussion. The closest parallel to this verse is found in the Phoenician world. While several scholars, such as Gunkel, Eissfeldt, Moscati, and Koch, have noted briefly this similarity, they have not collected and analyzed all the testimonies and fragments preserved from the Phoenician world. The present study attempts to review the entire corpus of extant Phoenician sources within the context of the ancient Near East (especially Egyptian) coupled with an understanding of the Greco-Roman world, in which the Phoenician traditions were preserved, in order to trace the history of the tradition of the primordial wind (רוח) through the cosmogonies of the Phoenician world and Gen 1:2. This analysis may have important ramifications for the widespread discussions of pneumatology in the literature of the Second Temple.*

Christian Locatell (Stellenbosch University / Ariel University)

CAUSAL CATEGORIES IN BIBLICAL HEBREW DISCOURSE:
A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO CAUSAL כי

ABSTRACT

The particle כי communicates a variety of causal relationships as an adverbial conjunction. This has led to a profusion of different approaches to describe its use, from the taxonomy approach of many lexica which simply list a variety of uses without any clear and principled groupings, to various proposals of causal categories which attempt to explain the varying distribution of causal כי. Much of the previous research on this topic has been the fruitful result of keen observations by seasoned Hebraists. Building on the intuitive insights of past work, this paper offers an analysis of causal כי based on theoretically grounded and psychologically plausible causal categories attested to by converging evidence from crosslinguistic and cognitively-oriented research on adverbial conjunctions.

Emanuel Pfoh (CONICET & National University of La Plata)

ON THE PROSPECTS FOR WRITING A SOCIAL HISTORY OF IRON AGE PALESTINE[*]

ABSTRACT

This paper surveys some recent approaches to the social history of ancient Israel/Palestine – or rather the problems and perspectives involved in such attempts. It places the impulses towards writing social histories of Israel considering the developments of this perspective in general history during the 1960s and 1970s. Two key factors – class and state – are analysed in their usefulness for assessing the archaeological, epigraphic and textual (biblical) data of ancient Palestine when social history is aimed at being produced. The social history of Iron Age Palestine, finally, should be written according to primary data and apart from biblical images of social organisation and practice, which constitute a later reflection, and probably distorted, of previous historical contexts.

BOOK REVIEW

Coleman, S M 2018. *The Biblical Hebrew Transitivity Alternation in Cognitive Linguistic Perspective* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 114). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 266 pages. ISBN 978-3-447-11117-1 (Paperback), ISBN 978-3-447-19809-7 (eBook). €68.00.

In this revision of his PhD dissertation that Coleman completed in 2016 at the Catholic University of America, he uses insights from Cognitive Linguistics (=CL), in particular Cognitive Grammar (=CG), to investigate the phenomenon of "transitivity alternation" in Biblical Hebrew. His aim is to explain in terms of insights provided by CG why (1) some verbs appear in both one-, two- or even more argument constructions, and (2) why with other verbs, one and the same verb in one- or two-argument constructions allows different participant roles to be profiled.

After spelling out the goals, corpus and basic thesis of his investigation in **Chapter One**, Coleman provides a succinct *history* of the treatment of the phenomena that he envisages to study in **Chapter Two**. He starts with the debate by asking whether BH indeed has an accusative case and then considers how the *nota accusativi* has been understood up until now. He concludes with a historical perspective of BH transitivity alternation.

Although he accepts that Biblical Hebrew no longer has a case system, he does side with the view that the notion of "accusative" could be used to label a range of language-specific syntactic-semantic functions (p. 14), e.g., the objective (which includes the affected, the effected and internal accusative), the adverbial (which includes specifications of time, place, manner, state, etc.) and double accusative (in cases a verb has two objects associated with them, also referred to as a ditransitive). He acknowledges the need to distinguish between complements and adjuncts, but also aptly points out that it is widely accepted that the borderline between a complement and adjunct could be fuzzy. What he found significant for his study is that in recent years there has been a growing interest in the range of senses associated with ditransitives and the relationship between those senses (e.g., whether they could be arranged with reference to a prototype). He hypothesizes that if a range of senses could be associated with prototypical ditransitives, the same should in principle be true for prototypical transitive constructions (p. 16).

As far as the treatment of אֵת is concerned, Coleman distinguishes two lines of thought, "those which appeal to emphasis and those which appeal to its functions in marking the accusative" (p. 16). Referring to work done by Khan (1984), Garr (1991), Malessa (2006) and in particular Bekins (2014), Coleman avers that it is an over-simplification to maintain (like Hoftijzer 1965) that BH has no overt case marking. Although he agrees that marking the accusative with אֵת is variable, the "the variability follows established cross-linguistic patterns based on notions of prototypical transitivity" (pp. 20-21). In this regard Coleman also follows Bekins (2014), who places BH with languages that have a Differential Object Marking (=DOM) system (p. 20).

In his historical perspective on transitivity alternation, Coleman looks at the ancient translations (in particular the LXX), medieval commentaries, modern lexica and grammars, as well as more recent specialized studies. Not surprisingly, his findings are somewhat of a mixed bag. A significant finding, though, is that the LXX appears to have captured sometimes the subtle semantic differences between the alternative constructions; some of the medieval scholars operated with an acute awareness of the semantic implications of formal differences between constructions; the lexica tend to list the different constructions and their relative frequency without considering the possible semantic differences between them; and he finds the treatment of transitivity in most of the grammars not satisfactory. Of the specialized studies, Coleman focuses on Garr (1991), since it "seeks to identify the sometimes subtle yet significant semantic nuances of the various syntactic pattern or representations of certain verbs and verb classes" (p. 43). According to Garr, the variable marking of objects could be explained in terms of the notions of "affectedness" and "aspect".

In **Chapter Three** Coleman formulates his Cognitive Grammar-based *theoretical framework*. He commences in 3.1 with the Theory of Cognitive Grammar. He hypothesizes that CG could be used to address the central questions of his investigation (see the first paragraph of this review), because, apart from its intuitiveness, it does not regard grammar (as Chomsky had done) as a self-contained system that could be studied independently of semantics. On the contrary, it allows for grammar to interface with semantics. Furthermore, "at the heart of the theory of CG is the conviction that 'meaning is conceptualization'" (p. 253). Linguistic meaning does not refer to something that exists objectively out in the real world, but rather presents an individual's conceptualization of that world in a specific communicative event. Such a conceptualization represents a

construal from various possibilities and is typically opted for in order to serve the communicative goals of a speaker (p. 253).

Coleman distinguishes five CG concepts (he calls them "principles") that are relevant for his analysis of BH transitivity alternation, viz. form-meaning pairs, construal (on the basis of a speaker's attention, judgement and constitution), motivation, prototypes and constructions.

For CL, language is a collection of symbolic units, each representing a *form-meaning* pair. The forms that are involved may range from a phoneme, a grammatical morpheme, a syntactic construction to a lexical construction (which may be a function word, a content word or a fixed construction). The meanings of these forms may range from the highly schematic meanings of grammatical constructions at one end of the continuum to very specific meanings of lexical units at the other end.

As noted above, when humans use language, it typically does not reflect an object reality "out there", but their construal of an event in terms of their subjective experiences. In the process some aspects of an event will receive more attention than others, since each construal involves a judgement of what is the figure (primary focus) and the ground (secondary focus) of the event. However, *construals* do not take place in a socio-cultural vacuum. They are embedded in the experiences and shared conceptual worlds of social groups. Coleman (p. 56) discusses this reality under the notion of "constitution". Those conceptual worlds contain shared scripts, frames and image schemes of the social groups, as well as the conventionalized linguistic constructions encoding these shared conceptual worlds. As far as his investigation is concerned, Coleman (p.58) states: "it is this alternative construal based on alternative image schemas that explains the contrasting syntactic expressions of many of the BH verbs that exhibit the transitivity alternation".

While the construal of the figure and ground of an event cannot be predicted, it can be motivated. This *motivation* could be provided, firstly, by the conventionalized image scheme invoked by the linguistic constructions that are involved, e.g., in the "The bike is near the house" the item that could be moved (the bike) will typically be considered to be the figure while the immovable item (the house) will be ground. Secondly, if a speaker talks about "The house near the bike", this unconventional construal could be motivated by the fact that the speaker and his social group shared some special information about the bike, viz. it was, for example, a display or monument of a well-known bike.

The insight that humans do not categorize their world in terms of discrete categories with necessary and sufficient conditions, but in terms of *prototypical* and less-prototypical members is one of the cornerstones of CL. For Coleman (p. 61) the "prototypical form is the more or less conventional mode of expressing a concept: however, as we will see, conventionality can be contravened for semantic or pragmatic purposes".

As implied by the notion of "form-meaning pairs" noted above, for CG, grammatical constructions (e.g., transitive, ditransitive, intransitive, caused motion, passive and middle) have meaning, even though at a highly schematic level. This implies that when a verb displays an unusual valence pattern, no separate sense needs to be postulated for the verb. The "new" meaning involved should rather be attributed to the grammatical construction. Furthermore, as in the case of lexemes, the meaning of a grammatical construction can also be extended metonymically or metaphorically. Coleman (p. 63) hypothesizes that "verbs exhibiting the BH transitive alternation achieve their meaning, at least in part, through the semantic contribution of the transitive constructions".

Coleman takes special care in section 3.2 to ensure that the theoretical assumptions of his conceptualization of transitivity are well founded. In this regard he draws on recent pioneering works of Hopper & Thompson (1980), Naess (2007), Rice (1987), Goldberg (1995) and Langacker (2008). In terms of the theoretical framework that he eventually formulates, transitivity is not a feature depending on the valence of a verb alone. It is rather a graded concept that is dependent on the range of "transitivity" parameters of the clause in which the verb is used. These parameters determine whether the clause is high or low in transitivity. A clause high in transitivity is regarded as the prototype. In the prototypical transitive clause, the actor is a volitional animate actor affecting an inanimate affected patient (pp. 67-68). Of crucial importance for Coleman is that transitivity is conceptually grounded. Whether a clause "low in transitivity" is categorized as transitive or not depends whether a linguist identifies it as approximating the prototype sufficiently.

In section 3.3 Coleman discusses recent insights from a cross-linguistic perspective as far as certain verb classes that allow complement alternation, and the subtle semantic differences those alternative constructions may convey, are concerned. After substantiating his view that categories like valence, complement, adjunct and lability are of a gradable nature in section 3.4, he turns to a final note on his methodology. In this section he explains, with reference to the corpus linguist Hanks' (2013) notions of norms and

exploitations, a crucial aspect of his methodology. He sums this up as: "1) identify the conventional and unconventional usages (norms and exploitations) of verbs undergoing transitivity alternation, and 2) analyse them with reference to construal operations outlined in CG" (p. 78). Since BH is a non-spoken ancient language, he uses frequency as the criterion for what the normative constructions are. Those occurring more seldom are regarded as potential exploitations of the normative constructions and they may have distinctive meanings.

In **Chapter Four**, after providing a linguistic typological orientation, with special reference to the work of Naess (2007), Coleman investigates the various syntactic constructions in which six *verbs of dress* and one of *undress* occur in the Hebrew Bible. Among other things, he comes to the conclusion that dress verbs are typically used in transitive constructions, with the direct object that profiles the role of [Dress]. The [Dressee] as direct object is also relatively frequently attested and its use represents a secondary norm. The alternation is attested cross-linguistically and is called metonymic object change, because the conceptual contiguity of the [Dress] and [Dressee] allows either of them to be profiled in a particular scene. In such cases no difference in the semantics of the verb needs be postulated; the difference represents only a difference in subjective construal by a speaker. Although either the [Dress] or the [Dressee] could be the direct object of a construction, the latter is typically the ultimate goal of an action and is marked either by אֶת, a pronominal suffix or fronting (p. 119). With dress verbs, an indefinite object may also be omitted (as in Hag 1:6), "serving a pragmatic function of focusing on the affectedness of the agent" (p. 119). The intransitive use of dress verbs is relatively infrequent and "limited to certain syntactic-semantic environments" (p. 119), while passives only appear as passives and serve to downplay the agency role of the subject.

Coleman starts **Chapter Five** with a discussion of how *verbs of dwelling* and the *Loci Accusativus* that are sometimes used with this class of verbs (instead of prepositions of location) have been dealt with unsatisfactorily by most BH grammars. While, on the basis of his analysis of verbs of dwelling in the rest of Chapter Five, he regards the use of locative prepositions with all verbs of dwelling as the unmarked construction, instances where the accusative is used he regards as "increasing the salience of the [location]". He continues, "This serves a variety of pragmatic purposes often associated with the general term 'emphasis'. From a Cognitive Linguistic perspective, emphasis refers to the focusing of

attention on an element of the event of a scenario for a variety of communicative purposes including contrast, surprise, to name a few" (p. 157). In his translation of examples in this regard (see e.g., pp. 148-149, 155), he opts to associate "emphasis" mainly with the function of an English "cleft construction" – a construction which typically expresses narrow constituent focus from an information structure point of view. In BH the equivalent of a cleft construction is typically expressed by means of fronting (see Van der Merwe *et al.* 2017). Although it cannot be ruled out that verbs of dwelling with a direct object profile a type of salience, Coleman would have been more convincing if he had at least indicated how his pragmatic category could be related to the fairly widely used notion of information structure. My impression is that his attempts to use mainly "cleft constructions" tend to over-translate what he has in mind with "emphasis". The profiling of the location that is involved may often be more subtle than "narrow focus".

Verbs of fullness and want are dealt with in **Chapter Six**, the longest in the book (pp. 159-232). Coleman acknowledges that the verbs lumped together in this chapter display a family relationship at a very abstract level of conceptualization. He then uses the syntactic patterns in which each is used as a point of departure "to elucidate both the general schema they evoke" (p. 160) as well as the sense of each construction. Using the parameters of image scheme, event structure and force dynamics, he distinguishes four types of constructions. I am going to discuss only his treatment of Type 1 verbs in more detail, since it illustrates how Coleman accounts for constructions that could be regarded as relatively lower in transitivity than the prototypical transitive construction.

Type 1 verbs are container focused. They profile two participants in an asymmetrical relationship and express simple containment. Coleman (pp. 161-177) distinguishes between 4 different configurations, e.g., pattern 1: intransitive verb+*container* (Joel 4:13 "For *the winepress* is full); pattern 2: verb+*container*+contents (Isa 21:3 "*My loins* are full of anguish"); pattern 3: verb+contents+*container* (Ezek 10:3 "The cloud filled *the inner court*") and pattern 4: verb+filler+*container*+contents (Ezek 8:17 "They filled *the land* with violence"). With reference to insights from spatial semantics and Langacker (1987), Coleman convincingly argues that although each of these configurations is low on the transitivity spectrum and not a prototypical transitive clause, "a Figure is related to Ground in an asymmetrical relationship, a relationship which is motivated primarily according to the parameter of individuation" (p. 177).

Type 2 verbs are content focused and express a change of state. These verbs also display different configurations, i.e., those that are intransitive (e.g., שׁטף in Ps 78:20 "streams *overflowed*"), and those that are transitive (e.g., שׁטף in Isa 28:17 "Waters will flood the shelter"). Type 3 verbs profile an effected object (e.g., שׁרץ in Exod 7:28 "and the Nile cause to swarm forth/produce frogs"). Type 4 verbs profile an affected object (i.e., זרע in Deut 11:10 "where you planted *your seed*").

Although Coleman acknowledges that the "objects" of these four types of verbs are not the same, i.e., they do not have the same relationship with the verbal action or state (p. 231), from a CG perspective they are objects. This is because each one "sets up a relation between Figure and Ground … which approximates to a greater or lesser degree the prototypical transitive scenario" (p. 213). Type 1 verbs are the furthest from the prototype and the figure and ground status of the participants are a matter of subjective construal, while Type 4 verbs are the closest with an agent and patient (which could be a container, contents or both). Types 2 and 3 "fall in between these two poles in proximity to the prototypical transitivity scenario" (p. 232).

Coleman is fully aware of the fact that addressing the challenges of transitivity alternations cannot be exhaustive if one uses only a few classes of verbs. In **Chapter Seven** he therefore selects a number of "miscellaneous" verbs that do not belong to those classes he has dealt with in Chapters Four to Six, but also display transitivity alternation, and applies his CG model to analyse and describe the subtle and less subtle differences between them. He provides convincing evidence that his CG model is equally applicable to advancing an understanding of these verbal constructions.

Although I found some of his translations forced (e.g., examples 203 and 251), and have reservations about his use of cleft constructions to express his notion of "emphasis", overall I find Coleman's study convincing. I think he makes an important contribution towards a better understanding of a construction that is not dealt with satisfactorily in BH grammars and lexica. He also illustrates in an exemplary fashion how insights from CG and cross-linguistic typological studies could be employed with great effect to enhance the understanding of an ancient language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bekins, P 2014. *Transitivity and Object Marking in Biblical Hebrew: An Investigation of the Object Preposition 'et*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Garr, W R 1991. Affectedness, Aspect, and Biblical *'et*. *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 4/2, 119-134.

Goldberg, A E 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hanks, P 2013. *Lexical Analysis: Norms and Exploitation*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Hopper, P J & Thompson, S A 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56, 251-299.

Khan, G A 1984. Object Markers and Agreement Pronouns in Semitic Languages. *BSOAS* 47, 468-500.

Langacker, R W 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*.Vol. 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R W 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malessa, M 2006. *Untersuchungen zur Verbalen Valenz im Biblischen Hebräisch*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Naess, A 2007. *Prototypical Transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rice, S 1987. Towards a Cognitive Model of Transitivity. PhD Dissertation, University of California San Diego.

Van der Merwe, C H J, Naudé, J A & Kroeze, J A 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar.* 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury.

Christo H J van der Merwe
Stellenbosch University