MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS AND REVIEWS 1951–2011

Thomas F. McDaniel
Professor Emeritus
Palmer Theoogical Seminary
The Seminary of Eastern University
Saint Davids, Pennsylvania

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP
IN 1850 AND 1950 ON PROBLEMS OF
THE NATURE OF JESUS
AND THE VALIDITY OF
THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNTS

A term paper submitted
by
Thomas F. McDaniel
to
Dr. Carl Morgan,
Professor of New Testament
Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary

February 15, 1951

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In dealing with a comparative study of the problems pertinent to Biblical scholarship in the periods of 1850 and 1950, one is confronted with such vast fields of interest and multitude of details that it becomes necessary to limit the discussion of the problems to some particu1ar phase of the total field. It is for this reason that I am considering in this paper only those problems concerned with the attempts of scholars to discover the true and historic nature of Christ and the determination of the historicity and validity of the New Testament narratives as developed primarily in Germany around 1850 and relevant to the total field of scholarship in. 1950. Other problems equally important and pertinent to Biblical scholarship during these same periods, such as textual criticism, Biblical introduction, theology, exegesis, etc. will be considered only as they enter into the discussion of the stated subject

In studying the eras of 1850 and 1950, it is impossible to isolate a definite time within the immediate periods when the problems were initially introduced. Intellectual and historical problems are rarely created overnight; and the problems of 1850 and 1950 were not among the exceptions to this generalization. (On the contrary, these problems had backgrounds which involved many years.) For decades and centuries, those who dared to doubt and deny the existence and presence of complete supernaturalism in the life and ministry of Christ and the apostolic record of these events were not only a small minority, but the few that there were were dismissed with little attention and concern. However, the nineteenth century witnesses the downfall of "tradition" as it came to be doubted, denied, and rejected. A result of this downfall was the decline of supernaturalism and the substitution of rationalism.

But even the reign of rationalism subsided to the steady growth of skepticism.

It was this growing rationalism and fatal skepticism that became the center of the stated problem in 1850. The first section of this paper will be concerned with this problem as it grew and developed in Germany and began to filter into English thought.

Within a century, the storm of skepticism, and the shocking disturbances it had created, had for the most part passed away. What followed though was not a return to the previous status quo, for the problems and questions on the nature of Jesus and the validity of the Biblical accounts still remained and were awaiting a satisfactory answer. It was the task of twentieth century scholarship to produce the answer from its growing reservoir of improved materials, method, and insight. In the second section of the paper the work and progress of the first half of the twentieth will be considered. (Here again other relevant problems will be mentioned only as they become involved in the general problem.)

CHAPTER ONE
PROBLEM IN 1850

The nineteenth century was not a silent century in the field of Biblical scholarship. In Europe, and especially in Germany, It was preceded by a century in which the characteristic atmosphere had already become one of growing doubt and criticism. The advent of new modes of thought, the accumulation of material and knowledge, and the fresh intellectual and scholarly impulses forced the nineteenth century to bring to maturity this skepticism which had been born and nursed in earlier years. Where tradition had once been accepted almost universally as an adequate and complete source of authority, it came more and more to be thought of as an impostor and an obstacle in the search for truth. Tradition was then subsequently dismissed, and the resulting vacancy was filled with both rationalism and skepticism.

The first significant influences of the rationalistic approach came from such men as Ernesti (died 1781) who formulated the principle that the "verbal sense of the Scripture must be determined in the same way in whioh we ascertain that of other books," and his pupil, Johann Semler.[1] Of the two, it was Semler who marked the coming of a new era and revolution in Biblical introduction and interpretation. In the early church the interpretation had been typical, with the church fathers it had been allegorical, in the middle ages it had been dogmatic, in the Renaissance grammatical, since the Reformation confessional. But as introduced by Semler it was to be historical which implied and permitted a naturalistic explanation when desired.

---

1. Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, 402.

In his book, *Abhandlung von Freier Untersuchlung des Kanon*, (Halle, 1771–1775) Semler originated and defended his new concept of interpretation; namely, there is a distinction between what in the New Testament should be regarded as "the Word of God" and that which is purposed only for moral improvement and had the nature of being temporal, local, or Jewish in context.[2] This view was completely opposed to the traditional view held in the first half of the century by Bengel (1734), Wetstein (1750), and Michaelis (1750) that the assumption of having an inspired Scripture could be proven through an appeal to miracles and prophecy, the incredibility of the books themselves, and throught the testimony of the early church. Thus, Semler initiated the complete separation of scholarship from what he considered the "burden and restraint of tradition.

Though not by unanimous consent, the eighteenth century closed its doors with the introduction of a new critical and rationalistic approach to New Testament scholarship. It was hoped by some that the philosophical approach of Immanuel Kant would be the means whereby this new critical approach would be reduced and dismissed; but Kant's postulates were negative in effect and only added to the rationalistic approach already created.[3]

In the early part of the new century, rationalistic scholarship went beyond the historical critical interpretation to a point

2. Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduotion to the New Testament*. Vol.1, p. 7.

3. Eduard Reuss, *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*. p. 596.

where it began to theorize. Expressions of such theorizing are found in the works of J. E. C. Schmidt, who attempted to relegate all examinations respecting the origin of the New Testament material to the realm of dogmatics, and J. G. Eichhorn, by whom the attempt was made "to read and examine the writings of the New Testament from a human point of view" and raise Biblical introduction to a criticism of the canon.[4]

The situation in England was for the most part completely different than that of the continent, for in England the traditional standards of inspiration and authority still prevailed. The statement made by Locke in 1703, "[The Bible] has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter," was held in the strictest form almost everywhere in England throughout the eighteenth century.[5] However, exceptions were present, for Conyers Middleton (1752) and Edmund Law (1774) arrived at the same conclusions as had Ernesti; and Herbert Marsh closed the century in England with an analysis of gospel origins which was neither acceptable nor compatible with the contemporary evangelical conceptions.[6] The introduction of rationalism by these men gained little support and received even less appreciative attention.

On the continent the years immediately preceding the middle of the eighteenth century were ones in which rational-

---

4. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

5. J. E. Carpenter, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*. p. 7.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

ism was channeled into what appeared to be a more construc-tive movement. In Germany Friedrich Schleiermacher, whom the orthodox called a rationalist because he believed in the right to free criticism, and whom the rationalists called a mys-tic becaused he believed equally in positive spiritual qualities, founded what has been called "the psychological school of exegesis."[7] Schliermacher was not concerned with a restate-ment of a theory of dogmatics but with an indication of the necessity of going beyond the historical point of view, show-ing the source of faith and religion as basically a "religious feeling."[8] Having united within his thought the principles of speculation and faith, which had generally been considered as completely hostile to each other, Schleiermacher offered hope towards a netural and mediating position of faith and rationalism.

His advocates were divided amongst themselves depending upon their following the impulses of the faith more com-pletely or the pursual of added investigation and thought. Listed among them were the men of strict orthodoxy as Nitzsch and Muller and those of a rational inclination as De Wette and Gieseler. In intermediate position were Olshausen, Hagenbach, and Neander. The most notable contribution of Sohleiermacher was expressed in the attitude of his followers as they concerned themselves with the finding of the higher harmony of all revelation instead of dwelling upon mere argu-ment over subordinate points and emphasizing the lack of agreement in the letter of the Scriptures.

---

7. Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation.* p. 409.

8. Reuss, *op.cit.*, p. 608.

In England the work of Schleiermacher was translated by Cannop Thirwall, and an increasing change of attitude in English scholarship is noted in the translators introduction, for he states:

> The doctrine of inspiration once universally prevalent . . . according to which the sacred writers were merely passive organs or instruments of the Holy Spirit . . . .had been so long abandoned that it would now be waste of time to attack it.[9]

However, this "long abandoned" doctrine still held strong reins, and English scholarship retained its slowness in accepting the rationalistic approach to Biblical studies. It seems quite natural then that the next impetus of rationalism came not from the field of theology but rather from philosophy and history. It was the poet-philosopher Coleridge and the historian Arnold who announced the final introduction of historical criticism into English scholarship.[10] It should be noted though that this rationalism of Coleridge and Arnold came not from skeptical and agnostic backgrounds, but it pursued the direction of Schleiermacher's mediating school of thought.

The quieting and positive influence of Schleiermacher's approach was comparatively short lived and soon lost in the quake of the newly developing Hegelian philosophy. Where Schleiermacher had attempted to establish the Christian conviction from the point where it met human needs and satisfied human objectives, Hegelian philosophy ushered in again the trend towards theorizing and treated religious dogma as the method whereby *a priori* principles could be explained.

---

9. Carpenter, *op. cit.*, 22

10. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

Hegel's "contribution" to the problems faced in Biblical scholarship came not from his works in the field of the philosophy of religion, as significant as these were, but his lasting effects came from the religious critiques of his followers: Strauss, Bauer, and Baur. It was their attempt to unite and couple the principles of Hegelian philosophy to the already existing critical and historical techniques that composed the characteristic atmosphere of Biblical scholarship around 1850.

David Friedrich Strauss, Bruno Bauer, and Fredreich Christian Baur were the three men responsible for the extreme rationalistic and skeptical atmosphere of German thought. These men who were the final products of the rationalism that had preceded their full load of criticism at the steps of Biblical scholarship between the years 1830 and 1860. Strauss and Bauer were concerned with the analysis of the New Testament accounts on the life of Jesus in order to determine the the historical validity of the total portrayal found in these narratives. Baur was concerned with the literary relationships of the Gospels to each other and their respective values when compared.

Leben Jesu (*Life of Jesus*), a two volume work of 1480 pages, was published between 1833 and 1836. Its author, David F. Strauss, sensed the need for a new approach toward Biblical studies as a result of the advancing historical research. The following depicts his attitude:

> He ventured to believe that the time had come when all religion was to be destroyed; the hour (had come) when the sacred writings and sacred history no longer satisfied the consciousness of the age, and the claim of religion to be absolute

and divine must be abandoned.[11]

Making use of the critical studies, the historical methods, and Hegelian constructs, Strauss sought to prove his theory that traditional material in the Biblical record was for the most part little more than the free creation of the contemporary imagination and its finished products of myths and legends.[12] Where Immanuel Kant had seen in the existence of the church adequate proof for the pre-existence of its founder, Strauss could see but the opposite. The idea of Christ could but prove itself to be the invention of an already existing and established church.[13] Strauss was free to go futher in his analysis and study than those who had preceded him for he had attained through his Hegelian philosophy an inner "emancipation" from the thoughts and feelings which had restrained his predecessors who, in their respective works had limited themselves in fear of what little would remain of the historical life of Christ were they to apply completely the concept of myth and legend.[14]

Not only did the Hegelian philosophy forbid normal restraint and caution in Strauss' approach, but the Hegelain

---

11. H. W. Weinel and A.G. Wedgery, *Jesus in the Nineteenth Century*. p. *77*.

12. Albert Schweitzer, *Quest for the Historical Jesus*. See p. 79, where Schweitzer defines "myth" as "the clothing in historic form of religious ideas, shaped by the unconsciously inventive power of legend, and embodied in historic personality."

13. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

14. Schweitzer, *op.cit.*, p. 79.

model became Strauss' method, namely that of synthesis, thesis, and antithesis. The criteria of his analysis was basically four-fold. First, the Biblical account could not be considered historical if its component parts were irreconcilable with the established universal laws which govern natural phenomena. Second, an account was unhistorical if it was inconsistent with itself or other parallel accounts. Third, an account was unhistorical when the actors conversed in poetry or elevated discourse which was not characteristic of their training or situation. And fourth, the account was unhistorical if it was not in agreement with the contemporary religious concepts peculiar to the region where the narrative originated.[15]

Th. following is a brief listing of several of the main conclusions which were the results of Strauss' extreme criticism as reviewed by Albert Schweitzer.[16] All the stories prior to the baptism of Jesus are mythological for there is not only a complete lack of historical evidence outside of the Gospels, but even the Gospels' giving a genealogy indicates that the authors are endeavoring to present concepts which had not previously been suggested—the Davidic lineage being one of them. Jesus was actually a "follower" of John the Baptist and the concept of Jesus' receiving the Holy Ghost at the baptism

---

15. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics.* p. 169. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

16. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp 81–84. In each case it should be noted the traditional acceptance of supernatural qualities are not merely rationalized to explain their existence in the narrative, but they are rejected and are forced to give way to his theory of mythological development.

by John arose later. If otherwise, how could John have ever doubted the office of Jesus?

The story of Jesus temptation is equally unhistorical, regardless whether it be interpreted literally or symbolically. Even the calling of the twelve disciples has its origin, not in a historical fact, but in the story of Elijah's calling Elisha. The healing ministry of Christ is true only in part, and the miracle performances are but a collection of "sea-stories and fish-stories." Strauss concluded that eveh the ressurrection account is mythological in character as is evident from the forms the story followed in its legendary development: Matthew had access to the legend which was familiar with only the Galilaean appearances, whereas Luke has access to the legend which contained the account of an appearance in Jerusalem. Such were the conclusions of Strauss.

The manner in which Strauss derived such conclusions from the application of his criteria to the problem is illustrated very vividly in his analysis of the infancy narratives. For Strauss the accounts of the birth of Jesus are filled with a series of miraculous events (angels, dreams, visions, wandering stars, etc.) which are not true to the real world. Such events as these which are natural phenomena can have their origins only in myths and legends. The following argument is the base which he stated for such a deduction.[17] The star in the east could only announce the birth of a king through the medium of astrology; but this practice had long since been recognized as superstition, and it would be absurd for one to believe that such a false and deceitful art could have been

---

17. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

correct on this one occasion.

The infancy accounts as found in Matthew and Luke are also too divergent to be harmonized adequately. Matthew states that the birth was announced to Joseph in a dream by night, whereas Luke records that the event was announced to Mary by day. Luke likewise records that the shepherds who had witnessed the appearance of the angels had spread the news everywhere; but if this were true, how was it that no one in Jerusalem had heard of the event. Was not Bethlehem just a short distance from Jerusalem? Why also would it have been necessary for a special star to have guided the wise men to the child if all had heard? A final point necessitating a dismissal of the narratives as legendary was the different statement of Matthew as to the home of Joseph being in Bethlehem, for Luke had stated it as being in Nazareth.

Such evidence was sufficient for Strauss to discount the historical accuracy of the narratives on an internal basis, but to add to his positive proof he also submitted external evidence.[18] There is a complete absence of any other account or record which attributed to Jesus a supernatural birth other than the two gospel accounts. There was also the apparent ignorance of such a fact on the part of John the Baptist and even his own family. In a similiar manner, Strauss preceded to illustrate through the entire life of Jesus the error of tradition in attributing a historical value to the New Testament portrayal of Jesus.

To be certain, *Leben Jesu* stirred Biblical scholarship more than had any other previous work in this field. Strauss had denied tradition and supernaturalism, had by-passed rational-

---

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 82–83.

ism, and had introduced skepticism. In reply to this work, August W. Neander, August Tholuck, Edgar Quinet, and others raised their voices in protest and refutation. On the other hand there were some, such as Christoph von Ammon and Christian Wilke, who commended him and sought to continue the work thus initiated.

In 1837, *The Credibility of the Gospel* by Tholuok was published with the purpose of showing that the miracle stories as recorded in the Gospels were historically valid. One of the main indictments of Strauss' work by Tholuok was the manner in which Strauss had pursued his work under the influence of preconceived ideas. Tholuck stated:

> Had this latest critic been able to approach the gospel miracles without prejudice . . .he would certainly, since he is a man who in addition to acumen of a scholar possesses sound common sense, have come to different conclusions in regard to the difficulties. As it is however, he approached the Gospels with the conviction that miracles are impossible; and on that assumption it was certain before he started that the Evangelists were either deceived or were deceivers.[19]

Neander produced the most significant and important criticism against the works of Strauss. His approach to the total problem was more reserve than had been the approach of Tholuck. This is evident from his statement of the problem and its answer, and through his reaction to the Prussian government which was considering banning of the works of Strauss. Having been requested to review the book *Leben Jesu* for the Prussian government, Neander reported that the book was extremely rationalistic in content and would be a

---

19. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

danger point to the interests of the church. However, he urged the government not to suppress the book for he thought the book could be challenged by argument for argument, for the former method would be "unfavorable . . .interference with the freedom of science."[20]

The manner in which Neander refuted Strauss' work is illustrated in his treatment in the miracle of Cana. Admitting that it is impossible to have any clear concept of what happened when the supernatural creative power was introduced into natural occurrences, since there had been no contemporary or immediate experiences of such, Neander concludes that it is not necessary to go to such extreme ends as had Strauss, but one may well suppose that Christ by an "immediate influence upon the water communicated to it a higher potency which enabled it to produce the effects of strong drink."[21] For states Neander, "Christ's miracles are to be understood as an influencing of nature, (both) human and material."[22]

The attack of Edgar Quinet against the works of Strauss was more of an indictment against German theology as a whole as viewed from the major French scholars and from the Catholic Church. The following is a typical expression of his attitudes:

A new barbarian invasion was rolling up against sacred Rome . . . bringing their strange gods with them, . . . let

---

20. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 101.

the Papacy wave back the devastating hordes into that moral wilderness which is their home.[23]

Such opposition as this continued to plague Strauss through the remaining years of his life to such a degree that it could be said that *Leben Jesu* had inwardly and outwardly cost Strauss his life's blood. Yet nearly thirty years later (after the first publication of *Leben Jesu*) Strauss published another book, *The New Life of Jesus*. But this later writing taken as a whole was far inferior to his earlier work, for, having advanced in years, Strauss lacked not only the form and power of reconstruction but also original ideas necessary for another book.

In such a manner Strauss made his mark upon Biblical scholarship, but it was not long before the mark was completely erased. From the beginning, his work had been inadequate and one-sided. For while he attempted to show how the church spontaneously originated the Christ of faith, be failed to show the cause for the origin of the church or Christianity. According to Milton Terry, his four-fold criteria was illogical for a religious problem in that in simply denied miracles and stated if two counts varied both were wrong; and his criteria left the door open for any and all subjective opinions.[24]

In 1838, shortly after the publication of *Leben Jesu*, C. H. Weisse published his critical and philosophical treatise on the same problem. This two volume work, entitled *Evangelical History*, employed the same basic principles of Strauss. His method has been termed "idealistic" for the gospel history is but an "ideal representation of the divine process by which

---

23. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

24. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, p.170.

God reveals himself subjectively in man through all periods
of the world's history," and the character and person of Jesus
exhibits this revelation in the highest perfection.[25] Through-
out this work, persons and events are regarded as symbolical
representations of religious truths. For example, John the
Baptist represents the whole body of Jewish prophets in their
relation to Christ.[26]

This work of Weisse encountered the same objections and
criticisms as had the works of Strauss for he had depicted the
Gospel narratives as being the products of the imagination
and loving devotion of the disciples of Christ who were ex-
tremely impressed with the excellent and magnetic personality
of Christ and his healing abilities.

Bruno Bauer was the next to proceed with this same prob-
lem, and he intended "to take by regular siege the fortress
which Strauss had thought to surprise by storm."[27] As has
been indicated, Strauss conceived the Christ of faith as being
an invention of an already existing church based upon a his-
torical Jesus who actually had lived, but only in the sphere of
natural phenomena. On the other hand, Bruno Bauer attempt-
ed to offer positive proof that not only was it impossible for
Christianity to have been founded by an individual named
Jesus but there is an equal impossibility that the man Jesus
had ever lived. If Jesus had ever lived there is no dependable
source in existence of his life and sayings.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 711.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 710.

27. Farrar, *op.cit.*, p. 414.

At the outset of his studies and investigations, Bauer was concerned with continuing the theory of Strauss as it was stated. His writings were numerous consisting of his critique of John's Gospel (1840), volumes on the Synoptic Gospels (1841–42)), and his last work, *Christus und die Caesaren*. It is in this last work that he states his theory fully. In the midst of his investigations Bauer concluded that the myth and legend concept of Strauss was too vague to explain the apparent "transformation of a personality," and there must be substituted for the "myth" theory the theory of "reflection."[28]

> The life which pulses in the Gospel history is too vigorous to be explained as created by legend; it is real "experience," only not the experience of Jesus but of the church.[29]

By this Bauer means that the narratives are historical only in the sense that they are the experience of the church personified in and animated through an individual who was created and purposed for such a projection; namely Jesus.

Bauer's theory follows the following line of thought: "The representation of this experience of the Church in the life of a Person is not the work of a number of persons, but of a single author, the original evangelist."[30] Between 117 A.D. and 135 A.D., during the reign of Emperor Hadrian, an unknown evangelist created out of his own philosophical genius the

---

28. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

29. *Ibid.*,

30. *Ibid.*

work which is now known as the Gospel of Mark.[31] Stemming from the philosophical and reform groups of the 'Jewish Greco-Roman world, this was to act as a philosophy of redemption for the lower classes of people. The other gospels were the later products of this same group of philosophers and reformers who were endeavoring to expand the original ideals depicted in Mark, as well as furthering the projection of the "church" experiences upon the created Christ.

The facts that Jesus is practically not mentioned in the contemporary extra-biblical literature and that what is essentially characteristic of Christianity appears almost identically in the other contemporary writings are the two main factors which Bauer considered as adequate justification for such a theory. What records of Christianity there are, Bauer attempted to discredit by stating that they must be spurious or in part falsified. And much of what exists in the New Testament narratives, Bauer dismissed as the result of evolution and addition to the original writings in order to explain the increasing experiences of the church.

The following example illustrates the manner in which Bauer dismissed much of the Gospel narratives. In the temptation experience there exists a "reflection" of the temptation experiences of the early pre-existing church.[32] It presents the inner conflicts of this church as it passes through the wilderness of the world and as it is confronted with the diverse methods in its possession for the attainment of its goals. The mission of the twelve disciples is equally unhistorical in its

---

31. Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

32. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–147.

literal meaning; it is a reflection of the struggles of the church as it later encounters the hostile world and severe sufferings.

It should be noted that Bauer's skepticism came from a hostile and repugnant attitude toward theologians and not from any inner compulsion to discover the truth in and about Christ. In expressing his feeling of contempt for theologians on one occasion Bauer stated:

> The expression of his contempt is the last weapon which the critic . . . . has at his disposal for their (the theologians) discomfiture; it is his right to use it, that puts the finishing touch upon his task and points to the happy time when the arguments of theologians shall no more be heard.[33]

This contempt was not limited to theologians alone but was extended to Christianity in general. It is this reason that his ideas of Christ to a large degree were rapidly rejected by scholars. His contemporaries considered him eccentric; and his contributions to Christian scholarship were completely negative, naturalistic, and skeptical.

Both Strauss and Bauer had availed themselves to the works and ideas of Fredreich Christian Baur and were influenced to a certain degree by him and the school of thought which he founded, called at times the Tübigen School, based upon its locations and at other times the "tendency school," based upon the nature of its theories. Baur's concern was not with the life of Jesus directly, but his interest lay in the analaysis of the New Testament books and narratives.

In 1831 Baur first introduced his theory in an article

---

33. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

published in the *Tübigen Zeitschrift*, but he did not fully develope it until 1845 in his publication of a work entitled *Paulus*.[34]

According to Baur, the New Testament books did not compose a canon of the "innocent, purposeless colldction of legendary tales for which the disciples of Strauss might have taken them," but all of the books, even those which seem the least artful, are constructed with "a purpose and a 'tendency.[35]" The early church yielded to the temptation of falsifying the historical narratives. Each of the New Testament books regardless of their apparent innocence was "written with a secret design to inculcate certain dogmatic views."[36] These original dogmatic views are now obscured in the Biblical narratives as a result of the reworkings in later years in an attempt to cover over the original difficulties.

Basic to the Tübigen school was its theory of church history. For them the early church was split apart in bitter and hostile factions. Dissension was strong and party lines were rigid. This hostility was between the Petrine and Pauline parties in the church. The indication of the strife which is found in the New Testament is but the small remanant still visible from altered narratives. It was a controversy over the gentile gospel of Paul and the Jewish gospel of Peter. With this basic assumption of a divided church, the Tübigen school

---

34. George Salmon, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 12.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

36. *Ibid.*

asserted that each book in the New Testament had a "tendency" toward the Pauline interpretation of the gospel or the Petrine interpretation.[37] And for the Tübigen school this underlying tendency had to be determined before one could make an analysis or factual history of the life of Christ. And discovering what was the work of later scribes, who attempted to conceal this tendency factor, made the task all the more difficult and less accurate.

The "tendency school" ultimately collapsed for it lacked evidence, made extreme hypotheses, and merely dismissed contrary evidence. The portrayal of an abrupt ending of the schism without listing any reasons is an example of the weak theorizing of the Tübigen school and the theories of F. C. Baur. Some of the other leading advocates of the "tendency theory," though they did not all agree completely, were Edward Zeller, Albert Schwegler, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar.

These were the basic problems of Biblical scholarship around 1850 as affected by the minds of the German rationalists. As has been seen, there was a change from the acceptance of tradition and complete supernaturalism to the introduction and growth of rationalism—this in turn giving way to the increasing tide of skepticism. In general, Germany was the center of the whole rationalistic development. England, France, etc. did not feel the full impact of these trends until after 1850. By the time it had spread to other countries, the weakness and shortcomings were becoming more and more apparent. It was not many years after 1850 until the cycle began to turn in reverse, going back to rationalism and

---

37. *Ibid.*, p. 12.Weinel and Wedgery, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

tradition and advoiding skepticism. (This was not necessarily true of Old Testament scholarship.)

As the cycle moved in reverse, it did not draw back within itself the problems and questions which had been raised. These remained to be answered. It was the hope of Biblical scholarship that a more successful medium of faith and reason would be determined so that these question and problems could be given a satisfactory answer. Within the past century this hope has been realized in part; and it is this development that will be considered now.

CHAPTER TWO

Though it is still too soon for an accurate and complete retrospect, the problems of Biblical scholarship in 1950 were basically the same as those of 1850, for, not only were the questions of 1850 still remaining since they had been answered inadequately, but the increasing discoveries, the continual development of method and technique, and the rising demand placed upon Christ and the Bible to meet the needs of a more complexed and advanced society were pressing the issue even futher than it had been advanced before. And so 1950 scholarship continued to determine the accurate historical life of Christ and the historical validity of the New Testament accounts.

It should be noted that 1950 scholarship differed for the most part in its approach to the problem in comparison with the rationalistic and skeptical approach of 1850. The preceding scholarship was characterized by its inductive method and theorizing contrary to the known facts. This was not characteristic of 1950 scholarship. It is true that it remained rationalistic, but for the majority this was a deductive method.

To attain the answers to the question with which it was confronted scholarship approached the subject through a careful examination of the sources of the New Testament and through a thorough study of the contemporary environment of Jesus. The basic prerequisite to any accurate study, the ruling out of all preconceived ideas, was also employed, but with varying degrees.

First to be considered will be the attempt of scholars to determine the nature of Jesus and the New Testament through the analysis of the sources. Prior to 1918 rationalistic critics and scholars, as led by H. Holtzman, B. Weiss, T. Weiz-

sacher, and John Hawkins, had generally agreed that the solution to the synoptic problem was found in the "two-document hypothesis."[38] According to this hypothesis Mark was assumed to have priority (as the oldest) over the other Gospels, and the strange *concordia discors* of Matthew and Luke could be explained by ascribing to each two common sources; namely, the Gospel of Mark and a source containing the sayings of Jesus which is usually designated as "Q" (the first letter in the German word for "source" being "*Quelle*").[39]

The basis for listing Mark as a source were the common subject matter (Matthew and Luke contain over half the material in Mark), common wording (Matthew and Luke reproduce 51% and 50% of Mark's language respectively), and a common order of events (both follow Mark's chronology largely and when one deviates the other still follows).[40] The bases for considering the probability of another source such as "Q" are that Matthew and Luke have from 200 to 250 verses peculiar to themselves and often in close agreement. These sayings are in relatively the same order in Matthew and Luke, and there are some sayings which appear in two forms in Matthew and Luke, one of these apparently Markan and thus the other form inferred by analogy was derived from

---

38. Edwin P. Booth, *New Testament Studies*. p. 43.

39. Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*, p. 1.

40. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospels*. pp. 45–46.

another written source.[41]

Since 1918 source criticism has proceeded largely upon this basis and has enlarged its scope also to include two futher aspects of this same subject: first, a study of the source material which is peculiar to Matthew and Luke not derived from Mark or "Q"; and second a study of those years between the death of Christ and the first written Gospel. Rowlingson differentiates between these by applying the term "source criticism" for the former and "form criticism" for the latter.[42]

This differentiation was also a result of the influence of Wrede and Wellhausen. Looking back again at the turn of the century, it can be seen that the two-document hypothesis was widely accepted by everyone, although there were some divergent differences on details, such as the existence a primitive Mark (*Urmarkus*) or an earlier form of "Q." The acceptance was so wide spread that for a time the investigations changed from a study of the sources to a study of the development of Jesus' career. It was at this time that Wrede shook the foundation of the hypothesis and the historicity of Mark, for he had come to the conclusion that

> though the author of Mark had genuine historical material at his disposal, he grouped and interpreted it in accordance with his own dogmatic ideas and the beliefs of the Christian community.[43]

And thus, according to Wrede, tradition had to be disting-

---

41. *Ibid.*, pp. 20–22.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

43. McGinley, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

uished from the evangelist's redaction, and the historicity of Mark was no longer valuable.

In response to this, the majority of critics sought to renew their efforts in an analysis of the sources and they continued further to solve the problems by analysis of the Gospel material as recorded. Here again then was "source criticism" and "form criticism."

One of the most significant studies in the field of source criticism was that of Canon B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, (1924). He set for himself the task of solving the questions stemming out of the material peculiar to Mathew and Luke which was not found in Mark or "Q." His conclusion was a "four-document hypothesis" instead of the two-document hypothesis. In this manner the problems—which were previously thought of as results of different recensions containing a common nucleus, or the results of a translation from other Greek or Aramaic sources, or even the results of free editorial work of the evangelists themselves—now had a satisfactory explanation.[44]

The four-document hypothesis is generally as follows: in addition to Mark and "Q" there was a Jerusalem sayings-document called "M" which was used by the first evangelist. This would suggest that Luke also had access to another source to account for the material peculiar to his Gospel, this being called "L." And there were also the oral stories of the nativity peculiar to each Gospel.[45] Although Streeter makes no attempt to reconstruct "M," he believes there is ample

---

44. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

45. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10.

evidence for its existence in three factors. First, the evident overlapping of Mark and "Q" makes it reasonable to assume that other similar and. identical sayings of Jesus have been preserved served in different cycles of tradition. Second, as Matthew conflated the material of Mark and "Q" into a mosaic, it is equally possible that he did the same with another source ("M") and "Q." Third, the material in Matthew exhibits a strong Jewish character which is in contrast to the Gentile material in "Q."[46]

Many other scholars and critics along with Streeter have traced the material peculiar to Luke to a special source entitled "L." Among these have been Feine, B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Easton, and Manson. The contemporaries who agreed with Streeter most favorably were C. H. Dodd, A. H. McNeile, V. Taylor, and T. W. Manson. But criticism of Streeter's work was not always favorable. B..S. Easton, M. Goguel, E. F. Scott, J. M. C. Crum, and F. C. Grant balanced the scale with their vigorous criticisms against Streeter's hypothesis.

Although the whole of the four-document hypothesis is being debated, the focus of criticism is centered upon the lack of adequate criteria for separating "M" from "Q." The opinions of F. C. Grant will illustrate the general feelings on this subject:

> I am strongly convinced of the fundamental correctness of Streeter's hypothesis of the development of Luke's Gospel . . . (and) the conviction that *L* was a real document. . . . but I am equally strongly unpersuaded of the existence of a document, which Streeter labels 'M,' underlying the peculiar matter of Matthew. Neither on linguistic nor historical or

---

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 30–31. Booth, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47.

literary-critical grounds does the evidence seem sufficient to warrant its isolation.[47]

And it is here that Grant postulated his "multiple source theory" to take the place of Streeter's four-document hypothesis; and Easton suggested the title "three document-hypothesis" as more applicable to the true situation. It is interesting to note the reason which Grant gives for a "multiple source theory" in preference to any of the documentary hypotheses. He states:

> Instead of identifying the "peculiar" matter of Matthew as fragments of a special source or document, M, a careful examination of it suggests as equally tenable . . . the hypothesis that we have here a number of strands of tradition whose homogeneity is due, not to a single or distinct document, but to a common origin in the teaching, praxis, and worship of the early Syrian or North Palestinian church.[48]

Another of the hypotheses which Streeter set forth caused a great deal of consideration. This was the "Proto-Luke" hypothesis. According to this theory Luke was not the same as Matthew (being a new edition of the Gospel of Mark), but was originally a combination of the sources "L" and "Q," beginning with "world-historical datum" and ending with the resurrection narratives.[49] It was a complete Gospel free of all Markan influences. However, before it was published the author came across a copy of Mark and decided to enlarge his

---

47. Frederick C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospels*. pp. 9–10.

48. *Ibid*., p. 14.

49. *Ibid*., 159.

original work by incorporating within his own work the Markan accounts.

In general most of the critics have rejected this hypothesis, especially Easton, Cadbury, Bacon. Easton was of the opinion that all that had been proven was that the author of Luke knew his sources well and his preference for "Q" and "L" could have come from sundry reasons.[50] V. Taylor and Grant were two of the critics who favored the "proto-Luke" hypothesis.

Another branch of this general field of source criticism was concerned with the sources from which Mark had derived his Gospel. Scholars and critics who had written on this field include B. W. Bacon, Streeter, Grant, Taylor, A. T. Cadoux, E..Meyer, W. Bussmann, and H. Branscomb. The general attitude of this group is well expressed in a statement of Branscomb:

> The last half century of study has definitely eliminated this comfortable and easy answer (that Mark is simply the memoirs of Peter). For it has become increasingly clear that instead of the simple, direct testimony of an eyewitness we have an account made up by piecing together materials of different origin and date.[51]

and a statement by Rowlingson:

> Peter is not eliminated as one important source of Mark's material, but the Papias statement is interpreted in such a liberal manner as to allow for Mark's use of other material.

Except for A. T. Cadoux none of the critics attempt to recon-

---

50. *Ibid*., p. 160.

51. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

struct the sources of Mark, but they would include as a portion of the sources the "apoclyptic flyleaf" in chapter 13 and some of the passion narrative.

McNeile is one of the scholars who is not in agreement with this theory, as well as a host of the more conservative scholars who follow as stated the Papias account of Mark's origin. This theory has not been met with any degree of general acceptance.

Perhaps the most outstanding problem of the twentieth century was that of "form-criticism." The exponents of this type of study followed the same basic concept as had those who worked on the sources of Mark; namely, the Gospels reveal in themselves something of the processes through which their respective source material has grown. Form-criticism from its first initial works was greatly influenced by Wellhausen, especially by one of his fundamental principles:

> . . . that in the Gospels we have an historical picture not of Jesus himself, but only the concept of Jesus which prevailed in the primitive community. Tradition fashioned and transmitted, as words of Jesus, ideas actually arising from the faith of the community.[52]

(Throughout this entire discussion of form-criticism it is evident that there is a strong hangover of the ideas of Strauss and Bauer.)

To begin with, form-criticism was confronted with a two-fold problem: first it had to distinguish the tradition itself from the editorial work of the evangelists; and second, it was necessary to separate the layers of tradition as created by the community. K. L. Schmidt was the first to undertake the first

---

52. McGinley, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

of these two problems. His conclusions were answers to both. Upon study of the problem from this perspective, he came to the following conclusions: the source units existed in definite and fixed form prior to their incorporation into the Gospels; the framework of history listed in Mark was the creation of the evangelist; and this artificial chronology created by the evangelist could not be of great value in furnishing the details on the life of Jesus.[53]

With this work of Schmidt, the way was open for a clear study of the individual units composing the "Gospel tradition." The studies and publications in this phase of scholarship began to multiply. First had appeared Schmidt's book, *Die Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, then followed Martin Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel* (1919 and translated in 1935), Ruldoph Bultmann's *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921), and E. Fascher's *The Method of Form-Criticism* (1924). Other less important works were L. G. Bertram's *The Story of Jesus' Passion and the Cult of Christ* (1922), and L. M. Albertz's *The Synoptic Disputations* (1921). American and English scholarship 1ater wrote extensively on the subject: B. S. Easton, *The Gospel Before the Gospels* (1928); R. H.. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*; F. C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospels* (1933); F. V. Filson, *Origins of the Gospels*; and other works by V. Taylor and D. W. Riddle.

The most significant work in this field came from Dibelius and Bultmann who independently of each other followed the introductory work of Schmidt and applied the principles of *formgeschichte* to the Gospels in general. The aim of the

---

53. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

method as stated by Dibelius was two-fold:

> The method of *formgeschichte* has a two-fold objective. In the first place, by reconstruction and analysis, it seeks to explain the origin of tradition about Jesus and then penetrate into a period previous to that which our Gospels and their written sources were recorded. (Secondly) . . . it seeks to make clear the intention and real interest of the earliest tradition.[54]

The complete aim for the whole school was to distinguish earlier and later strata from among the single units of tradition and to evaluate the historical value of these units by discovering their original form.[55]

Both Dibelius and Bultmann were students of folklore, and they approached their investigation of the Gospels with a three-fold theory. First, in folklore the material falls into fixed forms and patterns which is transmitted with little or no change. Second, the forms are shaped and developed by the situation out of which the investigation came. And third, one can determine the history (apart from the history which it seeks to convey) by a study of form.[56]

The result of the application of these theories of folklore to the Gospels was found in five general principles.[57] The synoptic Gospels are popular, sub-literary compositions. They

---

54. Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, preface, p. v.

55. McGinley, *op. cit*., pp. 2–3.

56. From lecture notes of Dr. Carl Morgan, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

57. MoGinley, *op. cit.*, p.

depict the faith of the Christians who created them, not the faith of the historical Jesus. They are artificial collections of isolated units of tradition. These units originally had a definite literary form which can still be detected. And, this form was the creation of a definite social situation.

Both Bultmann and Dibelius offered theories as to the causes which operated in the formation of the tradition. Bultmann suggested the growing need for sayings of Jesus which would combat the Jewish opposition in the growing gentile churches. Dibelius on the other hand suggested and stressed the need there must have been for illustrations in the early Christian evangelism, for it was esentially a preaching mission to the unconverted and gentile world. Bultmann and Dibelius also classified the narratives in the synoptic Gospels into their corresponding literary forms. For Dibelius these forms included paradigms, which is a short illustrative notice or story of an event that is no more descriptive than is necessary to make the point for which it was introduced.[58] They are: (a) "stories" which supplement the preacher as teacher and story-teller and contain no general application; (b) legends where the additions, making it an enlarged paradigm, give individuality to some one other then Jesus; (c) epiphany stories wherein the supernatural is revealed to the chosen but hidden from the public; and (d) the "myth" which shows the doings of the divine person, which in turn explains some cosmic phenomena or cultus aspect.[59]

---

58. Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. xv.

59. Burton S. Easton, *The Gospel Before The Gospels*. pp. 34–41.

Bultmann on the other hand classified them as (a) "apo-thegms," short, pithy sayings and significant acts that were enclosed in an historical setting and always depicted Jesus as being questioned; (b) "sayings of Jesus" which consisted of *logia* or maxims, prophetic or apoclyptic utterances, legalistic rules for the church, parables, and sayings in the first person; (c) and all the rest classified as "miracles" and "legends," the former being defined as having independent value and the latter as that which gains significance only as it is applied to the life of a hero.[60]

The contemporaries in Germany reacted immediately. Martin A1bertz' reaction and opinion—that despite the fact that the primary motives for the collection was practical and apologetical, rather than historical, the final literary form could be traced back to the utterances of Jesus himself—was wholeheartedly commended. Betram's conclusion that the passion narrative of Mark contained more of the reflections of the early church than it did of the true historical situation was dismissed as being far more unreasonable and skeptical even than Bultmann.[61]

The most significant criticism in Germany came from Fascher. The entire reconstruction by Dibelius is questioned by Fascher for he thinks the assumption that "preaching" set the mood for the development of the forms is unwarranted and too heavily depended upon by Dibelius.[62] And although

---

60. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–46.

61. Booth, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

62. *Ibid.*

he gave credit for Bultmann's analytical skill, he still condemned him for his extreme skeptisism and inadequate criterion. In addition, Fascher also argued that "form" was inadequate and unable in itself to establish an accurate test whereby historical judgments could be made. And he in the same manner rejected the terminology used by both Bultmann and Dibelius.[63]

The most important critiques of form-criticism outside of Germany came from England by such men as A. E .J. Rawlinson, A. H. McNeile, J. M. Creed, M. Jones, T. W. Manson, G. Kendall, and the others already cited above. Of all of these the works of V. Taylor in his *The Gospels* (1930) and *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (1933) are the most effective treatment of the subject. Although he accepts the method of form-criticism in its general approach, he (a) is less skeptical of the historical value of the tradition, (b) avoids the terminology of folkore, and (c) avoids also the extremes of Debilius and Bultman.

C. H. Dodd in a series of articles between 1931 and 1936 took issue with Schmidt on the Gospel of Mark; but R. H. Lightfoot retained a large part of the skeptidism when he stated:

> For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his way.[64]

Another work in this field was that of E. B. Redlich, *Form*

---

63. *Ibid.*

64. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. p. 225,.

Criticism, which is a review of the whole movement.

American scholarship has also entered the field of form criticism. B. W. Bacon had anticipated the ideas of Schmidt and Dibelius. Cadbury, although he criticizes the classification of material under a foreign terminology, accepts the general approach and was in full sympathy with Schmidt's conclusions. E. F. Scott also accepted the approach generally but would not go so far as to state the historical interest of Jesus played only a minor role in bringing the early Christians' thoughts of Jesus back again. J. .S. Case was influenced by Schmidt and considered Mark only a "literary mosaic." F. C. Grant was critical only of *formgeschichte* in its extremes.[65]

B. S. Easton rejected the conclusions of form-criticism, for he believed that from the beginning there existed a tradition of sayings of Jesus which was highly respected. He made his greatest criticism against the ability of the early community having a creative influence upon the tradition. He stated:

> Where beliefs of the Synoptic period can be distinguished with certainty from the teachings of Jesus, we find the former most scantily supported by sayings placed in his mouth.[66]

In addition to these criticisms listed under the respective critiques of other scholars, the major weaknesses of the *form-gesohichte* school would include the following factors. The date of the composition of Mark appears to be closer to 50 A.D. then 70 A.D. This would mean that the period of active evolution as designated by form-criticism was only approximately fifteen years, with the full development as early as 35

---

65. Booth, *op. cit.*, pp. 61–63.

66. Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

A.D. and no later than 85 A.D. This would indicate that the eyewitnesses were a constant check on the historicity of the "tradition," both those eyewitnesses who were hostile and friendly to the new faith.[67] Another weakness of this whole school is its complete neglect of the historical testimony offered on this same question. Papias statement is dismissed as error by Dibelius and as the false view of the sub-apostolic age by Bultmann.[68]

Still other short comings were the neglect of the role which individual influence played in the shaping of the tradition, for it was more likely that the teachings of the apostles were depended upon rather than any community creation. The inability of the form critics to explain by the rule of development out of the church those elements which were difficult and obscure for the primitive church.

Upon such conclusions the general field and science of *formgeschichte* has been widely rejected by 1950 scholarship. The ultimate question imposed upon the scholarship of 1950 was whether the truth of the matter lies in the conservatism of Easton or in a middle position between Bultmann, Bertram, and Lightfoot, on the one hand, and Easton, Burney, Albertz on the other. The question is still being studied, but the implications are pointing toward the conservative approach. The real value of form-criticism is being reduced to its pointing to the pre-synoptic period and having given an impetus to a type of study which is beneficial as a tool in the study of the historical Jesus.

---

67. McGinl.y, *op. cit.*, pp. 23—26.

68. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

As was indicated earlier, the second manner in which 1950 scholarship attempted to ascertain the historicity of the New Testament (the Synoptic Gospels in particular) was through a careful study of the environment in which Jesus lived and within which the Gospels were composed.

This complete field of study is concerned mostly with the religious environment and the socio-political environment. One of the important aspects of the study of religious environment is the renewed interest in the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament. The trend which scholarship has taken is not in the analysis of type and antitype as carried through Cooceius, Hutchinson, Marsh, and Fairbairn, but it is instead more concerned with the general Semitic backgrounds of New Testament times and the realization of Old Testament ideas and ideals in the New Testament.[69] Scholarship was seeking to see fully all that was implied in Augustine's statement, "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old: the Old Testament lies open in the New," and the statement of G. A. Smith, "The Old Testament lies not *under* but *behind* the New."[70]

Perhaps more important of the scholarship in this field was that devoted to the contemporary religions of Rome, Greece, and the mystery religions of the East. Some of the conclusions reached in this sphere were for a large part extreme and rationalistic, but the greatest contribution were not found in these but in the background material which they furnished.

---

69. Booth, op. cit., p. 12.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 11 and 14.

The attempt some have made to derive important elements of the New Testament message from pagan cults and philosophies has been widely and rightly rejected. Study of the Gentile world throws light on the background and setting and details of the New Testament. But as Cadbury says, "There is a noticeable absence of traceable Gentile religious influence on the New Testament."[71]

And thus for the most part the study of the religious environment aided in a negative manner, through the argument of silence, the authenticity of the Synoptic Gospels and their portrayal of the life of Jesus. The greatest contributions to Biblical scholarship from this whole field is found in its enlightenment on the problems of the early church, not in the origin and content of the Gospels. This is true also of the socio-political and philosophical environment and will for that reason not be discussed here.

In concluding this discussion of Biblical scholarship on the questions of the historical value of the Gospels and the accounts of the life of Jesus which they contain, it should be noted that the problems have in no wise been answered completely, nor has the investigation and examination ceased. It is apparent though that the closer the faculties of intellect and reason are integrated with a deep spiritual faith, the closer the scholar is to the answers to the basic questions. The Biblical scholarship of 1975 looks extremely encouraging if these. two faculties are in the future brought even closer together.

One cannot make such a survey of a problem without having come to some conclusions of one's own in reference to

---

71. Arnold S. Nash, *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century.* p. 67.

the total appearance of the problem. It would be so easy from my conservative outlook just to pass over the great works of the critics and skeptics as the ultimate results of sin and self. But I sense through it all the strange and mystical Providence of God. For in the extremes of rationalism and skepticism two dynamic factors have been the ultimate and eternal results. First, the Word of God has endured the severe test of it all. It has come out as a diamond, unharmed by the scratches and cuts of glass. It has been tempered through the ages, *not* by the mechanical acceptance of the pious, but by such blows of criticism, making it stronger with each critique. Second, the criticism has been able to remove the "fetish nature" attached to the New Testament by so many, and has made possible a much clearer understanding of the origin, nature, and content of the New Testament.

Numerous works have appeared on the general subject of life and thought in the New Testament world. Included would be Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christanity* (1920); S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christanity* (1925); E. R. Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration* (1929); T. R. *Glover,The World of the New Testament* (1931); M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941); Riddle and Hutson, *New Testament Life and Literature* (1946); R. H. Pfeiffer, *A History of New Testament Times With an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (1949); and F. V. Filson, *The New Testament Against its Environment*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Booth, Edwin Prince, *New Testament Studies*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, *The Bible in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Green and Company, 1903.

Dibelius, Martin, *From Tradition to Gospel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Easton, Burtin Scott, *The Gospel Before the Gospels*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Farrar, F. W., *History of Interpretation.* New York: E. P. Putton Company, 1886.

Grant, Frederick C., *The Growth of the Gospels*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1933.

McGinley, T. M., *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*. Woodstook, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944.

Nash, Arnold S., *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1951.

Reuse, Edward, *History of the Sacred Scriptures*. Edinburgh:T. & T. Clark, 1884.

Salman, George, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. New York: E.& J. B. Young, 1889.

Schweitzer, Albert, *The Quest for the Historioal Jesus*. London: A. & C. Black Ltd., 1911.

Taylor, Vincent, *The Gospels: A Short Introduction*. London: The Epwortb Press, 1945.

Terry, Milton S., *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Weinel, H. W. and Wedgery, **A.** G*., Jesus in the Nineteenth Century*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914.

Weiss, Bernhard, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament.* Now York: Funk & Wagnals, 1889.

THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF

THE EXODUS AND CONQUEST

A THESIS

IN ORIENTAL STUDIES

PRESENTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

THOMAS FRANCIS MCDANIEL

1956

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approved by:
        Professor Ephraim A. Speiser
        Professor Moshe Greenberg

PREFACE

The Israelite descent to and exodus from Egypt and the subsequent conquest of Palestine is surrounded by a series of complex and interrelated questions and problems. These stem from the nature of the biblical sources, the evidence of extra-biblical and archaeological material, and the uncertainty pervading the chronological material. This study addresses itself to the primary question of the participants in the Egyptian exodus and Palestinian conquest. Consequently, the problems of chronology, archaeology, *etc*. will be considered only as they bear upon the problem at hand.

The bibliography compiled by Dr. H. H. Rowley in his recent study, *From Joseph to Joshua*, was a great help in the preparation of this study.

Assistance was given by Miss Adelheid Buss for some of the source material in German

- Thomas McDaniel

Philadelphia, Pa.
January, 1956

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.*
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature.*
APAW	*Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.*
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist.*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.*
BEHJ	*Bulletin des études historiques juives,*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.*
ET	*Expository Times*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union college Annual.*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society.*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature.*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.*
PEFQS	*Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.*
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly.*

PJB	*Palastinajahrbuch des deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes zu Jerusalem.*
RB	*Revue Biblique.*
RHR	*Revue de l'historie des religions.*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlische Wissenschaft.*

CHAPTER I

THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF THE EXODUS

The first phase of the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites followed the initial migration of the Hebrew patriarchs into Palestine from the northeast[1] by some three hundred fifty to five hundred years.[2] During this interval from entrance to conquest, the tribal descendants of the patriarchs, having settled in the hill-country of western Palestine and desert Negeb, lived as immigrants without legal rights or territorial claims.[3] This region of settlement, which was only sparsely populated and a relatively good distance from the settled civilizations and cultural centers along the Palestinian coast, was susceptible to two types of migratory movements; namely, the successive waves of migrating ethnic units and composite groups, and the ever shifting movements of nomadic clans seeking grazing and pasture lands.[4]

It was in response to the conditions involved in either one or both of these two types of migratory movements that certain elements of the Israelite tribes went down into Egypt. Meek[5] asserts that the Hyksos avalanche from the north was the cause of the initial entrance and descent of some Hebrews into Egypt, with the possibility that the Hebrews even constituted a part of the conglomerate mass of the Hyksos in Egypt. The basic reasons underlying this assertion of Meek are (1) the reflection in the Old Testament accounts of Abraham's visit to Egypt (Gn. 12:10) and Joseph's sojourn (Gn. 39ff) of the successive waves by which the Hyksos invaded Egypt; and (2) the presence of a Hyksos king named

Jacob-Har, which would indicate that Jacob was a good Hyksos name and suggests that the Hebrews participated in the Hyksos regime in Egypt.[6]

However, Meek does not identify the Hebrews of the Hyksos period with the Hebrews involved in the Biblical accounts of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. He states:

> The Hebrews who went with the Hyksos to Egypt must have had an exodus, but it can scarcely have been th e exodus recorded in the Bible. No people who had been in Egypt as conquerors and masters would have represented their sojourn there as servitude, as the Hebrews have throughout all their literature.[7]

As for the Hebrew participants of the exodus narratives in particular, Meek maintains that the cause of their entrance and descent into Egypt was the Ḫabiru migration and activity.[8] As a result of the Ḫabiru movements in Palestine, certain masses of migrating hordes (of which the Hebrews were a part) had been forced to seek home and pasturage elsewhere for their flocks and families. The push of this migrating mass was westward; but, according to Meek, be- cause of their inability to conquer southern Palestine, some groups from the total body made a circuit southward and mingled with the Calebites, Kenites, and Jerahmeelites while others went to the border country of Egypt where they were allowed entrance into Wadi Tumilat, the land of Goshen.[9] This latter group which entered Egypt made up that element of Hebrews which experienced the sojourn, oppression, and exodus as recorded in the biblical tradition.

Albright accepts as definite the hypothesis which identi- fies the Hebrew descent into Egypt with the Hyksos inva-

sion.[10] This he states in summary as follows:

> The Hyksos conquerors are now known to have been mainly—perhaps entirely—of Hebrew Semitic stock. closely akin to the Hebrews, who probably formed one of their component elements. . . . There are numerous details in Hebrew tradition which square so completely with Egyptian records that an intimate connection between the Hebrew settlement in Egypt and the Hyksos conquest may be considered certain.[11]

Albright, differing from Meek, identifies the Semites of the Hyksos invasion with the Israelites of the biblical sojourn and exodus narratives.[12] However, along with Meek, he does not identify the retreat and exodus of the Hyksos after their defeat by Amosis I, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, with the biblical account of the Hebrew exodus. According to Albright, the Semites were not necessarily driven out of the country, although some of the leaders and the more nomadic elements may have withdrawn to Palestine. It is more likely that those who escaped death at the time of the Hyksos fall were either enslaved or permitted to remain in a status of serfdom.[13]

Wright,[14] however, asserts that the migration of the Hebrews to Egypt was due to the nomadic search for agricultural and grazing lands. Egyptian reliefs and inscriptions indicate that Egyptian border officials were constantly allowing such nomadic peoples to enter the land in the area of Wadi Tumilat.[15] According to Wright, the inevitable problem which arose from an increase in the nomadic minority were solved by the Egyptians by forcing the people into public works and labor battalions. Such was the experience of the Hebrews in Egypt and the nature of their oppression until the exodus under Moses.[16]

Rowley[17] has not only disassociated the Israelite descent into Egypt from the Hyksos invasion, but he has completely rejected the possibility. His rejection is based primarily on the absence of any biblical evidence indicative of such an entrance and the incompatibility of such a view with the biblical tradition as it now stands, especially the chronologies of Ex 12:40 and I Kings 6:1. Rowley prefers to assign the Hebrew descent to the Amarna age, with the cause of the migration being the physical insecurity in this era and the inability of certain tribes to maintain their land claims. According to Rowley, it is the Amarna period which is in closest harmony with the Joseph traditions in reference to both chronology and the cause and effect sequence.[18]

Thus, while there is lack of complete agreement as to the immediate reason and era of the Hebrew descent into Egypt, it is now—in light of the vast amount of corroborative evidence coming from the delta area[19]—agreed that the Hebrews did go to Egypt.[20] The question on which there is almost total disagreement addresses itself to determining the particular migrating groups which, from all of the Hebrew tribes, went to Egypt.[21]

It has long been realized that the traditional interpretations as derived from the Joseph traditions (Gn, 39ff) and the fragments of P (Ex. 6:16–23; Num. 3:17–19, 16:1, 26:33), which assume that all the sons of Jacob participated in the sojourn and exodus, give rise to a great number of problems when related to other biblical data.

These problems and differences may be summarily listed as follows:

(1) The place of settlement in Egypt, which was only sixty to eighty square miles, could not have supported the supposed 600,000 as reported by P in Ex. 12:37 and Num.

11:21.[22] Thus it has been suggested by Petrie that no more than 5,000 people could have been taken out of Goshen or into Sinai.[23]

(2) According to Ex. 1:15 the Hebrew group in Egypt was small enough to be ministered to by only two midwives; and, according to J, was small enough to be called together to one place to be addressed by Moses.

(3) The record of P in Gn. 46:27 is that only seventy went into Egypt.

(4) The genealogies in I Chronicles 1–8 ignore the exodus and suggests the continuous presence of Hebrews in Palestine since their initial migration.

(5) According to Skinner[24] Gn 46:12 (P), which is from a cycle of tradition quite independent of the Joseph traditions and speaks of Judah's separation from his brethren, has the intention of relating Judah's permanent settlement in Palestine, and evidently ignores the exodus altogether.

(6) Ju. 11L26 speaks of the Hebrews as living in certain cities in the Trans-Jordan three hundred years before Jephtah which is c. 1400 B.C., and they would subsequently precede the Hebrews of the exodus.[25]

The obvious conclusion which grew out of these problems and differences within the narratives of the sojourn and exodus was that all the tribes did not go down into Egypt. This same conclusion is reflected in the later developments of the individual tribes, and indirectly in the available extra-biblical material.

The available extra-biblical data, pertinent to this problem, consists primarily of names found in texts and inscriptions which possibly refer to or are equal to Israelite names. These sources include Egyptian execration texts of both the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties; inscriptions from the reign

of Seti I and Ramases II; alleged references from Ras Shamra, Mari, and Amarna; and the names of certain Hyksos rulers.[26]

In 1926, Sethe[27] published a series of Egyptian execration texts which were from the Eleventh Dynasty (c. 20th century B.C.). These texts contained the names of numerous Palestinian and Syrian states and rulers, including a name which Albright vocalizes as $\underline{T}b_c^cnw$ and equates it with Zebulun.[28] However, if this is equated with the Israelite tribe of Zebulun, it would necessitate dating Zebulun's existence some two centuries before Abraham since the text is dated to the twentieth century B.C. Thus the identification would invalidate all the biblical chronology and tradition as it is known today. Consequently, the identification of this group with the Israelite tribe has not been widely accepted.[29]

In 1940, another series of Egyptian execration texts were published by Posener[30] which were dated within the Twelfth Dynasty. Among the names which appear in this list is ʾsmᶜn, which is vocalized by Posener as su-má-ᶜ-ni and identified with Simeon. Posener had made the following statement earlier:

> Il ya de fortes possibilités que nous ayons de la nom propre שמעון (Συμεον) que est escrit dans les textes cuneformes ša-ma-aḫ-u-nu.[31]

However, this identification is not commonly accepted; and Albright makes the following statement rejecting the identification with Simeon:

> (Shamuᶜanu) is probably šamḫuna of the Amarna tablets, reflecting a later pronunciation of samʾon(a). . . . while the latter form of the name cannot be separated from the name Simeon (šimᶜon in Hebrew),

the Brussels spelling suggests an original form which contained the elements *šamu . . .* and *ᶜAnu . . . .*[32]

Were the identification of *su-má-ᶜ-ni* with Simeon certain and fully accepted, there would still exist the problem of chronology since Simeon would antedate Abraham by more than a century. Thus, this alleged reference offers little aid in identifying the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus.

Mention of *ᵓAsaru* (*ᵓsr*) in the inscriptions of Set I (c. 1301 B.C.) and Rameses II (c. 1301-1234 B.C.) has generally been accepted as the equivalent of the biblical Asher since the name refers to precisely the same territorial district.[33] On the basis of a late date of the exodus, this would indicate that Asher was already settled in Palestine and had not participated in the Egyptian exodus.[34] However, Rowley and others accept this reference as an indication of an early exodus with Asher being one of the tribes which was settled only after the exodus.[35] The value of this identification is relative to the interpretation placed on the date of the exodus and is thus non-conclusive of itself as Asher's participation.

From Ras Shamra there have come several alleged references to Asher and Zebulun, which, if identified for certain, would necessitate their residence in Palestine prior to the fifteenth century and would thus prohibit their participation in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. Rowley, who states, "it is clear that the alleged occurrence of the names of the Israelite tribes are too insecure to build on,"[36] accepts the following conclusions of Albright: (1) the alleged reference to Zebulun is to be pronounced approximately as *zabûlânîm* which is a collective plural formation of *zabul* (exalted, noble) and has nothing to do with the Israelite tribe of Zebulun; (2) and the

alleged reference to Asher is but the perfect plural of the verb ʾatr (to step), and likewise is not a reference to the tribe of Asher.[37]

The possible mention of an Israelite tribe from Mari stems from the words *Banû Yamîna*, identified with Benjamin.[38] However, Albright pointed out the meaning of these words to be manifest in its counter part, *Banû Simʾal*; the meaning of these being "children of the South" and "children of the North," respectively.[39]

Dossin's identification of *Banû Yamîna* with the southern branch of the Rachel tribes of Israel limits this term far more than is likely, for such a term could well be applied to any number of different groups who lived in southern territory. If this identification were made, it would also necessitate the existence of the tribe of Benjamin c. 2000 B.C., which is much earlier than the birth of Benjamin in any chronology.

The reference to Jacob and Joseph in the place names Jacob-el and Joseph-el which were inscribed in the time of Thutmoses III (c. 1504–1450 B.C.) in the temple of Karnak are only questionably so read.[40] The š sibilant in the Egyptian text, which reads *Y-š-pʾa-ra* and is identified with Joseph, is not the normal sibilant equivalent of the ס in Joseph's name.

Thus, in summary it should be noted that of the six alleged references to Israelite tribal names coming from Egyptian, only two are considered as somewhat definite, namely *Ṯbʿnw* with Zebulun and *ʾAsaru* with Asher. But of these two, the first is in disagreement with the chronology of the period, and the second is relative to the dating of the exodus. The other four alleged references are extremely doubtful from a linguistic examination, and three of these four are incompatible with the chronology. Consequently, the extra-biblical

data, consisting primarily of names in texts and inscriptions, offer no definite evidence of settled Israelite tribes in Palestine, and which, by virtue of the fact that they were settled, would probably not have participated in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus.

Most biblical scholars have approached this question of identifying the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus through either (1) an analysis of the biblical material in an attempt to attain the primary source(s) and historical elements and thereby determine the actual events, or (2) determine the course of events by retrospect after the examination of the later developments in the individual tribes. The biblical scholars at the turn of the twentieth century, including Meyer, Cook, Luther, Schiele, Haupt, Wellhausen, Benzinger, Steuernagel, and Paton, approached this problem primarily in terms of the latter option.

The older scholars made a sharp division in the tribes of Israel into the Rachel group and the Leah group. This division was extended further so as to identify the Rachel group with Sinai and the Leah group with Kadesh—the assumption being that Sinai was geographically distinct from Kadesh and the activities at each locale were the activities of distinct groups.[41] The problem was then simply a matter of determining which group, Kadesh-Leah or Sinai-Rachel, made the descent into Egypt.[42]

Paton in a summary presentation of this approach listed the following factors as the basic areas of inquiry in this approach: (1) the most prominent tribe in the sojourn tradition; (2) determining the tribe to which Moses belonged; (3) determining the site to which Moses was connected, i.e., Sinai or Kadesh; (4) what was the source of the Mosaic religion.[43]

But as evident from the lack of agreement, these factors were inadequate and unsatisfactory to determine the tribal participants. for, although the Joseph tribes were admitted to the most prominent in the sojourn traditions of Genesis 37–49, this tradition was dismissed by the advocates of the Sinai-Rachel group as a late invention.

The determining of the tribal relationship of Moses was also non-conclusive. For, as Paton summarized, Ex. 2:1 (E) and 6:16–20 (P) consider Moses as a Levite, but Ju 7:17 mentions a Levite from Bethlehem-Judah, and 18:30 says of him, "Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses,[44] he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Danites unto the day of the captivity of the land," thus witnessing to a tradition that the Levites of Dan were descended from Moses.[45]

Paton also maintains that J never refers to Moses as a Levite, but rather (after Luther) refers to him as an Ephramite. Likewise, the attempt to identify Moses with either of the two sites was unsuccessful. On the one hand Ex. 2:15f (J) and 3:1 (E), which state respectively that Moses fled from Egypt to Midian and lived with the priest of Midian and that Moses attended the flocks of his Midianite father-in-law in Horeb, identify him with Sinai. On the other hand, Meyer joined Ex. 2:33 with 4:19 and asserted that the revelation of Yahweh came to Moses on his way to Egypt from Midian, and argued that the burning bush (Ex. 3:2) was a thorn bush in Kadesh which burned from natural gas in the area.[46]

The conclusion of these earlier scholars as to the origin of the Mosaic religion was also unsuccessful in definitely identifying the tribal participants of the sojourn and exodus. While maintaining that Judah and the Kenites worshiped Yahweh prior to the exodus[47] and that the Mosaic concept of Yahweh was introduced to the Joseph tribes in consequence

of the exodus, it was impossible to account for the following: (1) the compound names with Yahweh in the Rachel tribes[48] and (2) that the ark of Yahweh was connected with Sinai and the Rachel-Sinai group.[49]

It was assumed necessary for purposes on consistency to assign an early settlement in Canaan to that group of Israelite tribes which did not go down into Egypt. Thus, Myer, Schiele, and Haupt claimed that the Rachel tribes were settled in Canaan long before the Leah tribes went to Egypt; and Wellhausen, followed by Steuernagel, Benzinger, and Paton, claimed the weight of evidence was in favor of the earlier settlement of the Leah tribes.[50]

Burney in his Schweich lectures of 1917 claimed that Joshua led only the Joseph tribes across the Jordan and that in all probability, if Joshua were the successor to Moses in the leadership of Israel, the tribes led out of Egypt by Moses included only Joseph and certain elements of Simeon and Levi.[51] Burney reconstructed the course of events as follows: Simeon and Levi suffered together in the retribution which followed their treacherous outrage against Shechem and subsequently settled as two small tribal remnants in the desert region bordering Egypt where they would perforce be nomads and probably seek refuge at some time in Egypt. This they did, according to Burney, and thus came into association with the Joseph tribes who had settled in Goshen.[52]

Of the other tribes, Burney claimed that five of the six Leah tribes were grouped together in early times in the central hill country at a period possibly long before the entrance of the Joseph tribes under Joshua. These tribes include Simeon and Levi in the Shechem district, Issachar in an unidentifiable position, Zebulun in the southwest, and Reuben in the southeast.[53] Judah, the remaining Leah tribe to be accounted

for, was considered by Burney to have been stationed in the neighborhood of Adullam where it entered into relationships with the Canaanites prior to "its reinforcement by the Arabian clans to which its name was subsequently extended."[54] The concubine tribes were not involved in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus according to Burney since they were at least partially of alien extraction.[55]

This position of Burney was generally accepted and followed by Jack, even though he considered the solution as extremely questionable since there was little or no direct evidence available.[56]

Rowley in his reconstruction of early Israelite history comes to the following conclusions concerning the tribal participants of the exodus and sojourn:

> A group of Israelite tribes including Joseph, Simeon and Levi, with associated Kenite and other elements, pressed into Palestine from the south in the Amarna age. . . . .In the same age other Israelite elements[57] separated from the group that pressed in from the south, and went into Egypt. . . .The Simeonite and Levite elements reached the district of Shechem, of which the took treacherous advantage, with the result that they suffered some serious disaster. This caused Simeon to fall back on Judah, to be absorbed in the tribe, while Levi was more widely scattered. Some Levite elements fell back on Judah, while some went into Egypt to join the recently separated group that had gone thither.[58]

Rowley arrived at these conclusions in the following way. According to Ju 11:16, which is identified by Rowley as the earliest tradition, the Israelites who came out of Egypt proceeded straight to Kadesh; but, as the tradition now stands

in the Pentateuch, the tribes went to Horeb or Sinai and only came to Kadesh, which was a good distance away, subsequently. It is therefore likely that the two accounts have been combined, namely a J narrative which displays a particular interest in Judah, and an E narrative which has a similar interest in Ephraim. The conflation of these two accounts is unhistorical, but the separate traditions may be accepted as genuinely historical.[59]

Even though every element cannot be taken literally, since accretions are generally made to such stories, Rowley accepts the substantial historical value of the Joseph story. Thus, he accepts the evidence of the biblical tradition that the Joseph tribes which were born in Egypt came out under Moses rather than the group of tribes associated with Judah. According to the biblical account, Joseph is later joined by several of his kinsmen (plus wives and dependents) who include the ancestors of all the tribes. For Rowley this joining of the seventy was the descent of the Levite and Simeonite elements who were scattered after the treachery of Shechem. Included amongst them was the ancestor of Moses.[60]

Rowley draws this same conclusion from his consideration of Yahwism. In view of the differences in the statements of J and E[61] he maintains that the Leah tribes which were not with Moses at the time of the exodus were the ones that did not ascribe their Yahwism to him, and the Joseph tribes who were with him did so ascribe their Yahwism to him.[62]

Asher, Dan, and Zebulun are considered as kindred tribes of the north who were generally related to the Israelites proper. They exerted pressure simultaneously from the north as the Hebrew, including Judah, at Kadesh exerted pressure along with the Kenites from the south.[63]

Albright claims that both the Leah tribes and the Joseph tribes were in Egypt and that each of these tribal groups had

an exodus of its own.[64] That Moses was a Hebrew who was born in Egypt and reared under a strong Egyptian influence is assumed by Albright on the basis of biblical tradition and the evidence of his Egyptian name and the Egyptian names current among his Aaronid kinsmen for two centuries.[65] Thus, on the basis of the Egyptian background of Moses, Albright finds it necessary to identify the Leah tribes with Moses and Egypt. He states:

> The close connection of the Leah tribes with Moses is supported by a number of traditions, and especially by the fact that the first conquered territory, the land of Sihon, became the heritage of Reuben, the eldest son of Leah. Moses himself, as a Levite, belonged to a Leah tribe.[66]

On the basis of this identification, Albright states that Judah itself probably came with Moses out of Egypt since it was one of the Leah tribes and entered the land from the north in the thirteenth century B.C.

However, Albright also maintains that the Joseph tribes were in Egypt at the time of the Hyksos control, and may even have played a part in the Hyksos movement.[67] But as early as 1918 he maintained that Joseph returned from Egypt to Palestine much earlier than the group led by Moses.[68]

Meek limits the participants of the sojourn and exodus to the tribe of Levi alone, and interprets the biblical account which represents all the tribes as being in Egypt as a later fused account. This later account reflects, according to Meek, the consolidation of various tribes and groups into a national unit, at which time the traditions of each tribe became the common possession of the whole.[69] Meek's reasons for identifying the Levites as the only Israelite tribe in Egypt may be

summarily listed as follows:

(1) Both Moses and Aaron were traditionally "Levites and chief shamans of the Levites."[70]

(2) Ex. 2:1 (J), which is identified by Meek as the oldest source, calls them Levites.

(3) I Chr 6:3, 23:13 state that Moses was the son of Amram, a Levite.

(4) Ex. 6:20 and Num. 26:59 (P) state that Moses was the son of Amram and Jochebed, both of whom were Levites.

(5) I Sam. 2:21–22 which reads "house of your fathers" equals the house of Levi.

(6) Egyptian names in Levite genealogies (I Chr. 6:22, 23, 37; Jer. 20:1, 21:1, 38:1; Ex. 2:38, 8:33; Ju. 20:28, I Sam. 1:3, 2:27), e.g., Assir, Pashur, Merari, Phinehas, and Hophni. The Levites alone possess the Egyptian names.[71]

Meek also maintains that Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulun are all more native than Hebrew and only became Hebrew as they were later drawn into the Hebrew confederacy by the common peril and menace of Sisera in the time of Judges.[72] He also finds strong suggestions that certain elements of Judah were native to the land of Canaan, *e.g.*, Gn. 38 which states that Judah in patriarchal times separated from his brothers, intermarried with the natives, and settled down there.[73]

According to Noth, it is difficult to identify those tribes which had settled in Egypt since the tribal structure as such was not well-defines until later times.[74] Those who fled from Egypt probably mixed again with other tribal groups. But Noth states that how this happened is not known. They mingled enough to tell to all the others what had happened in

the exodus and desert wanderings so that all in the course of time told and retold the story with a complete identification of themselves, with the result that it became common knowledge to all and a unifying bond.[75]

Noth further maintains that it seems highly probable that it was the Rachel tribes which experienced the exodus from Egypt, but admits that the grounds for this identification are very poor. He discounts all value in the Joseph traditions as being a historical source since the motive of this narrative was not a historical explanation.[76]

Thus in summary it should be noted that the extra-biblical material is inconclusive for identifying and determining the tribal participants of the sojourn and exodus, and the conclusions of the biblical scholars is the same. All the scholars are generally agreed that the concubine tribes were at least partially alien to the Israelites proper. In turn, the following scholars identify the following tribes as those who descended into Egypt and made the exodus:

(1) Meyer, Schiele, Haupt, and Albright identify the tribes as the Leah tribes.

(2) Meek identifies the Israelites there as the Levites.

(3) Wellhausen (followed by Steuernagel, Benzinger, Paton, and Noth) identify them as the Rachel tribes.

(4) Burney, Rowley, and Albright (with an earlier exodus) identify them with the Joseph tribes plus certain Simeonite and Levite elements.

CHAPTER I NOTES

1. The date of Abraham is generally accepted as c. 1750 B.C., although this is no longer based on the questionable identification of Amraphel of Gn. 14 with Hammurabi. See Albright, *BASOR* 88 (Dec., 1942) p. 35; *JPOS* I (1942) pp. 68–70.; Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 14–16. Garstang, however, maintains a date of 2092 B.C. for Abraham's departure from Haran; see Garstang, *Heritage of Solomon*, p. 151.

2. The problem of dating the Israelite exodus and conquest is extremely complex and inconclusive at present. A date of c. 1400 B.C. is demanded by Garstang's dating of the fall of Jericho and the chronology implied in I Kings 6:1. A date within the thirteenth century is demanded by Palestinian archaeology in general and the chronology implied in Exodus 12:40. See Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, for the latest complete discussion of the problems of dating; also see Garstang, *AJSL* 58 (1941) pp. 368–370; Albright, *BASOR* 57 (Feb., 1935) p. 30; and Glueck, *BASOR* 55 (Sept., 1934) p. 3–4.

3. The biblical term *gerîm* means living in a land with certain moral rights, but without any legal rights and claims, i.e., living in the land on sufferance.

4. Wright, *BA* 3 (Sept., 1940) pp. 28–30.

5. Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–32.

6. The Hyksos invasion of Egypt occurred c. 1700 B.C. and lasted until c. 1570 B.C. (15th–17th dynasties). Concerning the ethnic composition of the Hyksos, see Speiser, *AASOR* 13

(1933) pp, 147–151, especially his summary statement, " . . . the Hyksos were composed of several disparate groups. They were not simply Semites, or Hurrians, but definitely a conglomeration of Semites and Hurrians, with an admixture of other strains which defy identification at present" (p. 5). See also Meek, *ibid*., p. 5 where he maintains that the Hyksos contained a Hittite element; and Albright, *JPOS* 15 (1935) pp. 228–230, where Albright claims that the efforts to show that the non-Semitic Hyksos names were Hurrian are unsuccessful.

7. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

8. See below, Chapter III, which deals with the Ḫabiru problem.

9. The Wadi Tumilat is a narrow valley about thirty to forty mile long in the eastern part of the Nile delta, connecting the Nile with Lake Timsah. See Wright and Filson, *Westminster Historical Atlas*, p. 150.

10. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine*, p. 83; and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 150.

11. Albright, *Biblical Period*, p. 7. (Reprinted from *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*, edited by Finkelstein.)

12. See Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918) pp. 138–140, where Albright maintained that there were two exodi: the first was obscure and nowhere indicated in the Hexateuch, but involved the withdrawal into Central Palestine of the Hebrew tribes after the decline of the Hyksos power; and the second was the

exodus some three centuries later under Moses of the Hebrews who had been imported into Egypt as slaves.

13. Albright, *Biblical Period*, *op.cit.*

14. Wright, *BA* 3:1.

15. See Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I, p. 281; and Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

16. This is the same position which is held in general by Noth who rejects the view that the entrance was associated with the Hyksos. He maintains that the Egyptian sojourn was the result of drought and famine among the nomadic Hebrews. See Noth, *Geschichte Israels*, pp. 72 and 98.

17. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 77ff and 117–119. (See also his earlier article in *BJRL* 22 (1938) pp. 243–290.

18. See Rowley, *ibid.*, p. 116, where he states, "Since the carrying of Joseph into Egypt is represented as taking place while some Israelites were in the vicinity of Shechem, this would appear to point to the Amarna age for the background of the Joseph story. That age would provide a more satisfactory background for it than any other age we know. "

19. See Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 184, and the following statement made there: "That there was a long Semitic occupation in the northeastern delta before the new empire is certain from Canaanite place names found there in the New Empire, which include Succoth, Baal-zephon, Migdol, Zilu (Sillo), and probably Goshen itself . . . It must be considered as practically certain that the ancestors of part of

Israel, at least, had lived for several centuries in Egypt before migrating to Palestine."

20. Several older scholars, as Cheyne and Winckler, denied an Egyptian sojourn and identified North Arabic Muṣri with the biblical Miṣraim; others held that Goshen only extended to the southern Palestine-Egyptian border. See Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) pp. 25–27.

21. See Wright, *BASOR* 86 (April, 1942) p. 35 where he states: ". . . when, however, we attempt to divide up the tribes into groups, telling just what they did and when, we immediately enter a realm which is largely speculative and for which there is almost no extra Biblical data."

22. This is now generally accepted as the census taken by David (II Sam. 24) which has been incorrectly placed here. See Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

23. For the statement of Petrie, see Driver, *Exodus*, p. xlv.

24. Skinner, *Genesis,* p. 450.

25. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

26. The Merneptah stela is of little aid in identifying any of the tribal activities since it refers only to "Israel"; it is though of extreme importance in dating the *terminus as quem* of the conquest.

27. Sethe, "Die Achtungstexte," *APAW*, 1926, No. 5.

28. Albright, *The Vocalization of Egyptian Syllabic Ortho-graphy*, p. 7.

29. See Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 34, note 2.

30. Posener, *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie.*

31. Posener, *Syria* 18 (1937), p. 191.

32. Albright, *BASOR* 81 (Feb., 1941), p. 19.

33. See Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 82, and Rowley, *BJRL* 22, p. 259–260. For those who oppose the identification, see Jack, *The Date of the Exodus*, p. 230, where Jack states, "The identity of ᵓ*Asaru*, however, with Asher of the Biblical records must be regarded as most uncertain." See also Dussaud, *Syria* 19 (1938).

34. See Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–31.

35. Rowley, *op. cit.*, and *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 33–34.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 67 and 115, respectively.

37. Albright, *BASOR* 63, pp. 27 and 29.

38. Dossin, *Syria* 19 (1938) pp. 111 and 116.

39. Albright, *BASOR* 81 (Feb., 1941), pp. 19–20.

40. See Petrie, *History of Egypt*, Vol. II, pp. 323–325; Meyer, *Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 281–282 and *ZAW* 6 (1886). pp. 2–4; and Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 36–37.

The attempt by Dassaud (*Syria* 8 [1927] p. 231; and 21 [1940] p. 172) to identify the name *Ijsipj* from the Egyptian execration text c. 20th century B.C. with Joseph-el has not been readily accepted. See Albright, *JPOS* 8 (1928) p. 249. Even if it were accepted, the chronological problems of placing Joseph in the 20th century B.C. would still remain.

41. Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) p. 21. It was considered impossible to combine successfully the stay at Kadesh as reported by E (Ex. 15:25b, 4–6; 17:8–16; 18; and Num. 11:16f) with the stay at Sinai as reported by J (Num. 10:33; 11:35; 12:16). It was commonly held that either Exodus 19–Numbers 10 is late and unauthentic, or J and E held different views as to the relation of Kadesh and Sinai, and these have been confused in later composition. See the recent statement of Meek (*op. cit.*, p. 36), "It is impossible to determine exactly what occurred at each site, and it is equally impossible to determine their location."

42. Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) pp. 28–30.

43. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–31.

44. Paton obviously read the משׁה here (with the נ suspended, indicating an earlier reading) as משׁה .

45. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 31–33. Compare the included statement of Haupt who, in disagreement with Meyer, thought that the flaming bush was due to volcanic phenomena in Sinai. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 354 suggested that *sinai* (Sinai)

should be read as *sene* (bush) since according to Dt. 33:2 Yahweh comes from Sinai to Kadesh.

47. It has long been recognized that the biblical tradition contains two accounts of the introduction of Yahwism to the Israelites. The one, Gn. 4:26 (J) declares that Yahweh was known from the beginning; the second, Ex. 3:13–15 (E) and 6:3 (P) assign its introduction to the foundation of Hebrew nationality under Moses. The following factors strongly suggest the hypothesis that Judah, which was associated with the Kenites in the south, adopted the Kenite religion of Yahwism: (1) Cain who had the mark of Yahweh upon him (Gn. 4:15) was the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites (Ju. 4:11); (2) Kenites settled with Judah in the southland (Ju 1:16); (3) Moses received from Jethro, the Midianite priest, the Kenite Yahwism and introduced it to Israelites of the sojourn (Nu. 10:29 and Ju 1:16); (4) the extra-biblical reference (presented by Gridsloff, *BEHJ* 1 [1946] pp. 81–82) of an Egyptian text in which the place name *Yhw* is found referring to an area in the neighborhood of Kenite settlements and dating from the time of Rameses II.

48. Examples of such names are (a) Joshua of Ephraim, (b) Joash, the father of Gideon, from Manesseh, (3) Jothan, the son of Gideon, (4) and Abijah, the son of Samuel.

49. Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–33.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 45–47. It was stated that, aside from the Merneptah stela (if the name Israel there has reference to only the northern tribes), the 'theories' of the Egyptian sojourn alone support the position of Meyer and the others mentioned. His

own position was defended in part by (1) the statement in Ju. 1:2 that Judah and Simeon were the first ones to invade Canaan, (2) Gen 34 states that Simeon and Levi attacked Shechem immediately after their arrival in Canaan, and (3) the geographical location of the Leah tribes into two divisions indicates a later intrusion of the Rachel tribes.

51. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

55. Note Burney's statements (*Ibid.*, 54 and 57) where he argues: "It is highly probable that these tribes were originally regarded as not fully Israelite, *i.e.* as partially (or, it may be, wholly) of alien extraction, and that it was only by degrees that they won their full place in the circle of the tribes. . . at the stage which the legend originated the Bilhah tribes, Dan and Naphtali, dwelt in contiguity to the Joseph tribes upon their southwest, whereas the Zilpah tribes, Asher and Gad, were among the Leah tribes, the one in the north, and the other east of the Jordan. "

56. Jack, *op. cit.*; see especially pp. 17 and 234. Because of their descent from handmaids and their alien worship, Jack maintained that the concubine tribes of Asher, Gad, Dan, and Naphtali were "hardly entitled to a position in Israel" until the final settlement of all the tribes, and were thus excluded from any participation in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. Beyond

this point, Jack makes no attempt to identify the tribes; he considers it impossible. "It is evident we can never know the true relation of the tribes of the Exodus to the twelve tribes afterwards known as Israel, so long as we have no contemporary documents" (p. 17).

57. *i.e.*, the Joseph tribes.

58. Rowley, *BASOR* 85 (Feb., 1942) p. 28. These same general conclusions have not changed in his latest presentation, *From Joseph to Joshua*.

59. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 105–107.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 123. It should be noted that for Rowley Moses' presence suggests the presence of Levite elements, and the tradition that Simeon was held a prisoner by Joseph (Gn. 42:24) suggests that Simeonites were amongst the Israelites in Egypt.

61. See note 47 above and note 53 in Chapter II.

62. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 144–145 and 153. In the latter reference he states in more detail that Yahweh was not a new name, but a new name for the God of Israel (*i.e.* the Joseph tribes). The southern tribes learned of Yahweh by a gradual penetration of the Kenite religion, so that there was no moment of dramatic adoption. Moses learned of Yahweh when he came to the Kenite worshipers who initiated him into the faith (Num. 10:29, Ju. 2:16).

63. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

64. Albright, *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) pp. 14–16.

65. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 193.

66. Albright, *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) p. 21.

67. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*. pp. 143–145.

68. Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918) pp. 138–140. The following statement should be noted, "The circumstances and date of the first exodus are obscure; I do not know of any passage in the Heptateuch which may have any bearing on the problem. . . . More than three centuries after the first 'exodus' comes the Mosaic period." Compare his statement in *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) p. 15, "That the Joseph tribes returned from Egypt to Palestine much earlier than the group led by Moses has been maintained by the writer since his original statement (although) very antiquated now in method and data."

69. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

71. *Ibid.*, pp. 31–33, and Meek, *AJSL* 56 (1938) pp. 117–120. Compare Waterman, *AJSL* 58 (1941) pp. 49–56 and his concluding statement, ". . . of the six names discussed, three (Assir, Hophni, and Merari) have ample Semitic rootage and formation; one (Pashur) is doubtful, and of the remainder, Moses is very possibly Egyptian and Phineas certainly so. . . None of these names with the exception of Moses . . . can be shown to have come into Palestine with the original Levites" (p. 56).

72. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

73. Waterman (*AJSL* 55, p. 25) maintains that there were no Israelite-Hebrew clans in the south, and that Judah was a later name for a new fusion of Edomite clans in the district of Judah. He states, "As soon as Judah declared independence under David, everything of Edomite origin . . . could now become Judean, not by antithesis or opposition but by political domination." *Ibid.*, p. 42.

74. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

75. *Ibid.*

76. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

CHAPTER II

THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF THE CONQUEST

In that it is not merely a question of identification, the problem of the tribal participants of the conquest is more complex than the same problem of the exodus. Aside from the concubine tribes which are considered to have contained at least partial alien elements, the Israelite tribes were definitely not an indigenous ethnic group in Palestine. Yet, their ascendance in Canaan to the position of a relatively significant political group by the time of Merneptah and their developing into a nation by the time of David necessitated a conquest of some sort since in their initial entrance they came as *gerîm*. That this conquest involved all the tribes except Levi has not been seriously questioned by any biblical scholar, although the type of conquest has been subject to disagreement.

The nature of the problem here is to determine the tribal participants of the conquest in reference to their role and action and in respect to time and location, The complexity of this problem is multiplied by (1) the inner inconsistencies of the biblical tradition, (2) the demands of archaeology on the chronology of the events, and (3) certain ambiguous relationships and movements of the tribes.[1]

The inner inconsistencies of the biblical tradition are centered primarily in the accounts of the conquest as recorded in Joshua (chapters 11 and 12 particularly) and the Book of Judges. According to the tradition of Joshua, Palestine was conquered by the Israelites in several different stages, including:

I. The conquest of Gilead and Bashan. Most of the strip country of the Trans-Jordan was depicted as won under Moses prior to his death. This was in turn promised to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half-Manesseh on the condition that they assist their kinsmen in conquering the territory west of the Jordan.[2]

II. The conquest of south-central Palestine. After crossing the Jordan, Jericho fell shortly after it was attacked. The advance was then to Ai, on the east side of the hill-country, which was captured after an initial repulse. Next came the alliance with Gibeon, Kephirah, Beeroth, Kiriath-jearim, all from the western hill-country. The Amorite alliance of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon against Gibeon drew the Israelites further west to Beth-heron, Azekah, and Makkedah in the lowlands west of the central range.[3]

III. The conquest of southern Palestine. After the defeat of the Amorite kings, Joshua is depicted as capturing Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Gezer, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir.[4]

IV. The conquest of northern Palestine. A northern confederation of kings under Jabin of Hazor, including Achshaph, Madon, Shimron, Dor, and others is depicted as defeating them, claiming victory.[5]

According to the narrative in Ju. 1:1–2:15 the conquest was of a different nature; namely, the conquests of the various districts were represented as the efforts of the individual tribes which, in making their settlements, appear in many cases to have been unable to exterminate or drive out the inhabitants whom they found and were thus forced to settle down side by side with them.

The pertinent elements of this narrative may be summarily stated as follows. Judah, having enlisted the mutual cooperation of Simeon, conquers Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem and then advances against the Canaanites in the hill-country, Negeb, and Shephelah, attacking Hebron, Debir, Zophath (Hormah), Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron. Benjamin, unable to drive out the Jebusites of Jerusalem, settles down with them. Joseph goes up against Bethel and destroys it, but the Joseph tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh are unable to dislodge the Canaanites from Beth-shean, Tannaach, Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, and Gezer. Likewise, Zebulun does not dislodge the inhabitants of Kitron and Nahalal. Nor does Asher those inhabitants in Acco, Zidon, Ahlab, Achzib, Helbah, Aphik, and Rehod; nor Naphtali those in Beth-Shemesh and Beth-Anath. Dan was forced into the hill-country by the Amorites, and the Amorites in turn became tributary to Joseph,

Another very significant inconsistency in the biblical tradition is the dual account of Num. 21:1–2 and Ju. 1:16–17. According to the former, the Israelites when they left Kadesh-Barnea were attacked by the king of Arad. Thereupon the Israelites vowed to put the enemy cities to the ban. This they did, and in turn called the name of the place Hormah. But, according to the latter account Judah and Simeon attacked Arad, having come from the city of palm trees,[6] and killed the inhabitants of Zephath and called in consequence the name of the place Hormah.

The archaeological evidence coming from Palestine has created a highly complex problem in reference to the tribal activities during the conquest. Garstang dated the fall of Jericho between 1400 B.C. and the ascension of Akhenaton (c. 1370 B.C.);[7] but both Albright and Vincent disagreed with this date. Albright states, "The fall of Canaanite Jericho therefore

took place somewhere between *cir.* 1375 and *cir.* 1300 B.C. in all probability."[8] Vincent set the date for the fall of Jericho between 1250 and 1200 B.C.[9] This latter date given by Vincent, as will be seen, harmonizes much more closely with the dates of the fall of other Palestinian sites. However, Wright has maintained that the final blow to Vincent's date has been given.[10]

The evidence from the other Palestinian sites would indicate that they fell within the late thirteenth century B.C. Albright dates the fall of Lachish into Israelite hands as 1231 B.C.[11] and Vincent dates it similarly by placing the date after 1250 B.C.[12] Debir is likewise dated in the same period of the thirteenth century,[13] and Bethel is also assigned a destruction sometime within the thirteenth century B.C.[14]

The problem of dating the fall of Ai is quite different. It is certain that this site was in ruins between 2000 to 1200 B.C., and was thus not inhabited at any time during this interval. Albright's suggestion that there was a confusion between Ai and the neighboring town of Bethel is commonly accepted as the reason for its being included in Jos 8:28 as one of the towns conquered by Joshua.[15]

The exploration of Glueck in the Negeb and Trans-Jordan have far reaching implications on the historical value and interpretation of biblical accounts of the tribal activities in these areas. The results of his work have only further validated his conclusion of 1934, namely,

> Had the exodus through southern Palestine taken place before the thirteenth century B.C. the Israelites would have found neither Edomites or Moabites who could have given or withheld permission to traverse their territories.[16]

The third area of difficulty which surrounds the role of the tribal participants includes a series of diverse elements within the biblical traditions, namely, (1) the activity and role of those tribes which did not go to Egypt in reference to how and when they acquired their lands of permanent residence, (2) the transition in the tribe of Levi from a secular tribe which was cursed after the Shechem incident into a tribe invested with priestly functions of Yahwism, and (3) the uncertainty of the experiences at Kadesh and Sinai.

The biblical scholars of the past fifty years, assuming that any tentative solution would of necessity have to discard some material as unhistorical, have been concerned with determining the primary tradition and harmonizing the material as it stands.

Paton,[17] who followed the majority of the older scholars (including Wellhausen, Meyer, Stade, and Kuenen) maintained that a sharp contradiction existed between Judges 1 and the Book of Joshua. Through a process of source analysis he sought to determine the historical value of the respective narratives and thereby ascertain the actual historical events and participants. His conclusion was the same as that of his earlier colleagues, namely, that the Judges account was more reliable than that of Joshua. Underlying this conclusion were the following three factors:

(1) The other histories of the Bible (II Sam 24:7; I Kings 9:20–21; Ju. 3:1–6) were in agreement with Judges 1 that the Canaanites were not exterminated or driven out of the land, but continued to live with the Israelites.

(2) Nowhere else in biblical tradition is the tribal union as claimed in Joshua mentioned. According to the Song of Deborah voluntary assistance came only from the northern

tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar, and Naphtali. Reuben, Gilead, Dan, and Asher will not come; and Judah, Simeon, and Levi are not invited. Throughout Judges, except for what was considered as editorial passages, the judges were only tribal leaders, and the tribes are often at war with each other (Ju. 3:27, 6:34–35, 8:1, 9:6, and elsewhere).

(3) The strongholds reportedly captured by Joshua in D and P in the Book of Joshua were not captured until later according to other sources, *e.g.*, Jerusalem was not captured until the time of David (II Sam. 5:6–9, Ju. 19:2), Gezer was not captured until the time of Solomon (I Kings 9:16, Ju. 1:29), Beth-shan remained in Philistine hands until the time of David (I Sam 31:10, Ju. 1:27), and Tanaach and Megiddo were in Canaanite hands until the time of Deborah (Ju. 5:19).[18]

In summary Paton states:

> There is general agreement that Ju. 1 and the identical verses in Josh. 15–17 contain the earliest form of J's account of the conquest, and that the J section in Josh. 1–11 which represent the tribes as united under the command of Joshua form a secondary status in the J document that approximates the standpoint of D. These sections show a more legendary embellishment than is found in J's narrative in numbers of conquest east of the Jordan, and it is probable, therefore, that they are of a later origin.[19]

Paton also maintained that Num. 21:1–2 was not in its correct context but was evidently the continuation of J's account of that defeat at Hormah in Num. 14:45. The parallel narrative of this in Ju. 1:16–17 was assigned by Wellhausen, Kittel, and others as the more historical tradition; but Paton

identifies himself with Meyer, Steuernagel, and Kuenen who prefer to accept the accounts in Numbers as more historical.[20]

Paton's final conclusion was that the Leah tribes were at Kadesh and advanced northwards while the Rachel tribes were at Sinai and advanced from the east Jordan.[21] After the foundation of the monarchy when the two groups were united, the accounts of the two conquests were combined into a single account, and the various positions that Kadesh occupies in the tradition were due to the various attempts to combine the distinct cycles of tradition which dealt with Kadesh and Sinai.[22]

Burney argued for the validity of the Judges' account of the conquest, as opposed to Joshua's account, since it first depicts the conquest as gradual and partial and since R^D in Joshua could readily be accounted for as the interpretation of the conditions of the conquest from a later time (i.e., the period of the Davidic reign onward).[23] Burney similarly dismisses the P narratives of Joshua (13:15–21:42), which regard Joshua as settling by lot the districts to be occupied by the tribes, since it presumes the whole of Palestine, with the exception of the Maritime Plain, to have been under the control of the Israelites. Although this document is "of immense value for topographical information . . . it does not represent the historical course of events."[24]

Burney also held that there were two distinct movements of conquests which came from two different tribal elements at different times. The conquest of Arad as stated in Num. 21:1–3 is assumed to be more correct than its parallel in Ju. 1:16–17. The tribal groups mentioned in the Judges account are believed by Burney to be that group which participated in the northward thrust in the Negeb; namely, Judah and Simeon in alliance with the Kenites.[25] From this Burney inferred that

those clans which formed the tribe of Judah (North Arabian Kenites, Calebites, and Jerahmeelites) advanced northward from Kadesh-Barnea and, along with part of Simeon, conquered Arad and settled in the Negeb, after which they advanced further north into the hill-country of Judah.

The second half of the conquest according to Burney was the westward movement across the Jordan of the Joseph tribes which had been in Egypt under the leadership of Joshua. In light of the following factors this was the only valid conclusion for Burney. First, the only tribes mentioned in the old J narrative, Judges 1, which are involved in any conquest are the central tribes of Joseph which attacked Bethel, *etc*. Second, Judges 1 depicts the Joseph tribes as making an independent attack upon the hill-country, "to which they go up, *i.e.*, presumably from the Jordan valley after the passage of the river."[26] Third, the Simeonite and Levite groups which had been with Joseph in Egypt left him when he turned east around Edom to enter Canaan from the east Jordan.[27]

As for the other Leah tribes, Burney maintained that Reuben was originally settled in east Jordan in southern Gilead, but evidently attempted to settle in west Jordan.[28] Zebulun and Issachar are placed in the southwest central hill-country since Ju. 12:11–12 states that Elon the Zebulunite was buried in Ajalon in the land of Zebulun and this is identified with the Vale of Ajalon. These last two tribes later moved northward and occupied territory which was entirely inland from the sea (contrary to Gn. 49:13 and Dt. 33:18–19).[29]

The position of Burney, as indicated above, is generally accepted by Jack, although his conclusions are not as emphatically nor definitely stated. According to the remaining fragments of J in Joshua and the accounts in Judges, Jack

stated that Judah, Simeon, and probably Levi — with some of the nomadic groups of the Sinai peninsula (Kenites, Caleb-ites, *etc.*) which ultimately became a part of Judah — made a gradual conquest of the southern hill-country and Negeb, but were unable to settle the western Maritime Plain and Jeru-salem.[30] The Joseph tribes established themselves on the central ridge at Bethel but were shut off from the southwest plains by Canaanite strongholds. These tribes were settled south of the Canaanite cities of Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, Tanaach, *etc.*[31] Dan and Naphtali, who had taken up their positions in the Shephelah and Asher and Gad, were ousted and compelled to move northward and lived north of this same belt of Canaanite cities.

The movement of the northern tribes led by Joshua was directed from the east across the hill-country and was confined to the north and the west. The distinct movement of the southern tribes was a northward thrust confined to the southern plains and Negeb. It was the northern confederacy of Joshua which issued into what became the nation of Israel. The northern group had been in contact with the southern group at Kadesh-Barnea where they "certainly mingled with each other . . . under the leadership of Moses and had a common bond as Hebrews and worshipers of Yahweh."[32] After their arrival in Canaan the northern group evidently joined hands with the Israelites who had been in Canaan all along.[33]

In opposition to the general consensus among earlier biblical scholars, Wright has denied that a contradiction exists between Joshua 10 and Judges 1 since such a distinction is an oversimplification of the whole import of Joshua on the one hand and the reliability of Judges 1 on the other.[34] Thus, according to Wright, the Deuteronomic editor of Joshua was

guilty of over schematizing his material, but he did not deliberately falsify his picture of the conquest. The account in Judges is at best a collection of miscellaneous fragments of varying dates and reliability within the general period of the Judges and not a unified document.

By thus identifying the accounts in Joshua as the primary source of information, Wright reconstructs the tribal activity as follows. After a year spent at Mount Sinai, Israel made a journey through the wilderness of Paran until they arrived at Kadesh-Barnea where they remained until the advent of a new and more optimistic generation. The movement from Kadesh-Barnea north through the Trans-Jordan was frustrated by Edom and Moab, and Moses was forced to lead the group northward into the Arabah. After crossing the river Arnon, the kingdom of Sihon was defeated. At this point, Joshua assumed command of the tribes and moved westward into Canaan. The area of central Palestine where the Joseph tribes were located probably did not need to be conquered since it was possible that either friends or relatives of the Israelites were already settled there and all Joshua needed to do was to make a covenant with them.[35] The southern and northern campaigns followed in turn as recorded in Joshua 10.

At the conclusion of the conquest the territory was parceled out among the eleven tribes, with the tribe of Levi being distributed among the others since it was to attend to religious matters. Reuben and Gad were settled in the territory of Sihon, and Reuben was later (in the ninth century B.C.) overcome by Moab which had been a continuous threat along with Ammon. Half-Manasseh occupied the kingdom of Og. The settlement of the tribes in Western Palestine, according to Wright, is accurately recorded in the documentary lists of Joshua 15 and 19,[36]

Wright's general conclusion was that the campaigns a-gainst the Canaanite royal cities attributed to Joshua are historically accurate, and that after Joshua's death there was a long period of struggle for possession. This is verified for Wright by the archaeological finds at Bethel which had a major destruction during the middle of the thirteenth century and three additional destructions within the next two centuries.[37]

According to Meek, the foreshortened account of the conquest in Joshua is highly inaccurate since the settlement must have been a gradual infiltration of the Hebrews into the country in small groups or clans. Meek holds that there were two distinct settlements in Palestine by the Israelites, both in reference to time and participants.[38] In light of the archaeo-logical evidence of Jericho, Hazor, Shechem, and Bethel (all of which were destroyed at an earlier time than the cities in the south) Meek affirms that the first Hebrew conquest was in the north c. 1400 B.C. and the participants were the Joseph tribes, Gilead, Gad, Benjamin, and later Reuben. These tribes were organized into a confederacy or amphictyony under the leadership of Joshua at Shechem. It was probably just the Joseph tribes at first, but the common cause and enemy led other groups to unite with them. Of this group, Meek states:

> The Israelites are to be identified with the Ḥabiru, they came down from the north and made their first conquest east of the Jordan a little before 1400 B.C.; they captured Jericho c. 1400 B.C. or slightly later, and then gradually extended their conquests into the highlands of Ephraim, capturing Bethel in the west c. 1300, or slightly later, from which reign they de-scended gradually into the borders of the coastal plain.[39]

While this section of the Israelites were making their home in the north, a mass of migrating hordes, which had been displaced in the midst of the *Ḫabiru* activity, sought territory in the west. An attempt at a southern conquest had been thwarted, and the group was driven back and forced to make a circuit southward where they either mingled with the Kenites, Calebites, *etc.* or pushed their way into Egypt where they were permitted to enter the Wadi Tumilat.[40]

There in Egypt, this latter group consisting of Judah, Simeon, Levi, and Reuben grew and prospered under a benevolent government until the time of Rameses II, at which time they were subjugated to a status of serfdom. Then, in the reign of Seti II (c. 1215 B.C.) this group was led out of Egypt by Moses. They returned thus via Yam Suph to the desert and mingled with their kinsmen whom they had left behind in the Negeb. Here a confederate code was instituted by Moses which united the tribes and served as the stimulus in their gradual push to the north from Kadesh to Beersheba and Hebron, and even further north until they finally controlled most of the land south of Jerusalem between the Dead Sea and Philistia.[41] This southern group was only later called Judah (named after the strongest tribe of the group) even though it was an amalgamation of Simeonites, Levites, Reubenites,[42] Kenites, and Calebites.

The tribes of the far north including Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulun were all considered to be more native than Hebrew. The became Hebrew only as they were drawn into the confederacy by a common peril beginning about the time of Deborah with the menace of Sisera.

It is important to note that Meek, in contradiction to the biblical tradition, makes Joshua antedate Moses:

He is so inextricably connected with Jericho that we have to disassociate him from Moses, and again we

would account for the disorder in the Old Testament narratives by the fusion of two different sagas of several groups that eventually coalesced to make the Hebrew people.[43]

The conclusions which Albright drew concerning the tribal participants of the conquest are similar to those of Meek for Albright considers there to have been three dominant groups participating in the settlement of Palestine; namely, the Joseph tribes, the Leah tribes, and the concubine tribes. Albright, in following the method of Alt[44] and the evidence of archaeology, maintains the Israelites first settled in the wooded hill-country of East-West Manasseh and Ephraim.

> Both from the results of archaeological surveys and from the early records we know that the Canaanite occupation was heavily centered in the low hill-country and plains of West Palestine, and that much of the higher hill-country of both East and West Palestine was not occupied at all by a sedentary population until the beginning of the Iron Age in the twelfth century B.C. It was therefore in these regions where the Hebrews first settled down late in patriarchal times and where they were first joined by the Israelites proper in the thirteenth century.[45]

And Albright further notes that this area is not mentioned in the Egyptian records, nor the Amarna tablets, nor Joshua's campaigns in the Book of Joshua, nor in the independent Israelite traditions of Genesis, Judges, chronicles, and Jubilees of Joshua's conquests. [46]

It was this territory that the Joseph tribes settled after their early exodus from Egypt in the reign of Amenhophis III (between 1415 and 1380 B.C.). Albright admits that there is

no evidence from Tell Beit Mirsim or elsewhere that the Joseph tribes settled down in towns until the second half of the thirteenth century, *i.e.*, prior to the settlement of the other Israelites in the Shephelah — at which time there is abundant evidence that the Israelites proceeded immediately to destroy and occupy Canaanite towns.[47]

Albright accepts the basic historical value of the wilderness wanderings since there has been discovered nothing to throw doubt upon them; and from this acceptance he projects the following reconstruction of the tribal activity and participants. Early in the reign of Rameses II the Leah tribes were led out of Egypt by Moses; and after a wandering experience of a generation the group conquered Sihon's territory, at which time the wandering experience came to an end. At this juncture came the confederation of Israelite tribes led by Moses with the other kindred pre-Hebrew tribes of Joseph and the remotely related concubine tribes.[48] This new Israelite confederation was then led by Joshua over a group of Canaanite city-states in Galilee.

Albright differs with Meek on two important points. First, Albright maintains that Judah came north with the Leah tribes and Moses, and they entered the land from the east and the north, whereas southern Judah was settled by Calebites and Kenites who were not related to Judah but were only amalgamated with the tribes. Second, Albright separates Joshua from Jericho rather than placing Joshua before Moses as Meek does.

Rowley's complete interpretation of the historical events in the period of Israelite settlement is dependent upon the equation of the age of Jacob with the Amarna age, and in turn the Amarna age is equated with the period of Israelite settlement.[49] The reference to Ḥabiru activity in northern, southern,

and central Palestine around Shechem is considered by Rowley to reflect the Israelite conquest.

In this manner he identifies the southern thrust in the Amarna age with the Israelite attack from Kadesh-Barnea. The tribes represented in this attack included Judah, Simeon, Levi, Reuben and other related tribes of the Kenites and Calebites.[50] According to Rowley, Simeon and Levi pressed further north than the other tribes did, and they finally reached Shechem but were unable to hold the city.[51] In consequence they were unable to secure any permanent settlement, and eventually a portion of these tribes migrated to Egypt and joined the Joseph tribes which were living there. Reuben also moved northward up the western side of the Jordan and finally obtained a foothold east of the Dead Sea.

The simultaneous SA-GAZ activity in the north was equated by Rowley with the settlement and conquests of Dan, Asher, and Zebulun. It was in the later part of this age that Joseph was carried into Egypt and there joined by elements of Simeon and Levi which had not fallen back and had not been absorbed into the tribe of Judah. While in Egypt, the Simeonites became absorbed into Joseph and lost their identity, but the Levites retained their tribal distinctiveness and made the exodus out of Egypt along with the Joseph tribes under Moses. This group which was led by Moses was in turn led by Joshua into central Palestine c. 1230 B.C..[52]

Rowley makes no apparent attempt to indicate how these tribes came together aside from stating that all the tribes were of kindred stock, and that those who went to Egypt came back and settled in their midst about a century and a half later. It was not until the time of David and Solomon that these kindred tribes were united, and this union grew out of their common worship of Yahweh.[53]

Noth approached this problem of the tribal participants of the conquest and settlement by employing his own threefold approach which invested little authority and value in the archaeological method.[54] This method led him to this general conclusion: "the individual traditions from the time of the conquest in the Old Testament are in general either heroic sagas or aetiological traditions."[55]

In particular, Noth maintained that the tribes entered those parts of the land which were thinly settled during the Bronze Age, namely, the highlands of central East-Jordan and the mountainous areas of West-Jordan. Because of their settlement in such areas, he holds that there were no great battles in which the tribes conquered their territories. Rather they came in as individual tribes in a peaceful and quiet manner and settled only gradually a little at a time.[56]

Noth indicates the following to have been the experience of the individual tribes:[57] Reuben seems to have settled in the West Jordan near Judah but was later forced out by Judah and took up its position in Trans-Jordan. Simeon did not come out of the Negeb but moved to its position in the southern tip of Judah from central Palestine. Evidence from the Shechem incident would indicate that it was forced out of its original position along with Levi in the same manner as Reuben was, but the tribe which displaced these two was that of Joseph. The place of settlement of Levi has been completely lost. The settlement of Judah was from the east since it apparently entered the land along with the earlier tribes and since its entrance from either north or south was blocked by strong Canaanite cities.

The tribe of Joseph including Ephraim and Manesseh undoubtedly came in from the east or southeast Trans-Jordan as two separate tribes. They were probably not admitted to the

amphictyony until the tribe of Levi was counted out. They settled slightly north of Benjamin at the Ephraim mountains. The Galilean tribes were the most difficult to account for in reference to their settlement. Zebulun and Issachar apparently came over the Jordan with Judah, Reuben, Simeon, and Levi. Among the Galilean tribes were the ones closest to the central West-Jordan hill-country. Issachar evidently gave itself to the Canaanites as servants in order to be able to settle in the territory of Sunem. Zebulun and Asher apparently served the Canaanites in a similar manner along the coastal area although they themselves did not settle on the coast. Dan was in service to Sidon and worked in the harbors of the Sidonites. The only Galilean tribe which was able to remain independent was Naphtali which was content with her own territory even though it was the least desirable.

Noth assigns the beginning of the Israelite settlement in the second half of the fourteenth century B.C. and sets its terminus ad quem at 1100 B.C..[58]

Kaufmann in his recent study on the conquest of Canaan[59] has approached the problem in a distinct manner. Accepting the basic historicity of the conquests narratives in Joshua and Judges, he rejects the idea that there are "inconsistencies" in the narrative since the higher critics who have claimed the presence of such have failed to accept and understand the unreal utopian conception of the land of Israel in these sources and the Pentateuch. For Kaufmann, this unreal utopian conception of the land cannot be explained by the "real ethnic settlement of tribes or by the real political development of the Kingdom of Israel."[60] Instead, it can only be understood in the context of five different conceptions of the land of Israel which corresponds to the changes in the historical situation; namely, (1) the land of Canaan, or the

land of the patriarchs, (2) Moses' land of Israel, (3) Joshua's land of Israel, (4) the land of the real Israelite settlement, and (5) the Kingdom of Israel.[61]

Kaufmann also points out that Joshua 23 contains the first reference to the idea of "the remaining peoples." It is at this point that the conquest becomes problematical and conditional, with the strong possibility that such a conquest may not be realized. Accordingly, Ju. 2:11–3:6 indicate the hope for a complete conquest is entirely abandoned.

Kaufmann defines the wars of Joshua as wars of destruction and extermination as opposed to wars of occupation by immediate settlement. Joshua did not leave garrison behind in the cities which he had destroyed, but returned all his forces to one place. Nor did he distribute by lot the territory before the major portion of the fighting was over. The consequences of this action, Kaufmann notes as follows:

> Here we merely note that the natural consequences of such wars was that the Canaanite survivors fortified themselves in various places as best they could. Hence the tribes had to continue to fight when they started to settling in their portions. In such a situation a war by tribes was the inevitable second stage.[62]

On this basis Kaufman maintains that Ju. 1 is the perfect continuation of the Joshua narratives. This same conclusion seems to be made evident by the following facts as well. First, the Canaanites disappear as a force after Judges 5. Second, the Israelites did not take over the military art of the Canaanites. Third, the Israelites did not adopt the political organization of the city-state after the Canaanites but maintained the tribal system. And fourth, in the area of Israelite settlement there were no Canaanite communities which exerted an idolatrous influence.

All these facts add up to a single monumental testimony that the Canaanite factor *had been liquidated* in the real land of Israel as early as the beginning of the period of Judges. At *no stage* was the conquest of the land a process of peaceful settlement. It did not produce a national or cultural *intermingling*. The Canaanite element was *defeated and driven out.* This was possible only by *great national wars.* Herein is a decisive proof of the truthfulness of the narrative in the Book of Joshua.[63]

Thus, Kaufmann accepts as recorded the accounts of Joshua's conquest but with two exceptions. And these exceptions include the aetiological accounts about Gilgal (Josh. 4:2–24; 5:2–9) and the admitted legendary stamp which is the essence of the stories.[64] In like manner he accepts the accounts of the tribes and the tribal activity in Judges 1 and subsequent chapters.

In summary the following general conclusions in reference to the time, activity, and location of the tribal participants of the conquest should be noted. With the one exception of Jericho, and perhaps Bethel, the archaeological investigations in the Negeb, Trans-Jordan, and Canaan testify to a date about 1300 B.C. or a little earlier for the main era of conquest and destruction. Jericho has been dated variously between 1400 B.C. and 1200 B.C. and the heavy erosion which has occurred at this site in recent years has made the solution of this problem more remote than ever.

The activity of the tribal participants has been interpreted in several distinct ways. Wellhausen, Meyer, Stade, Paton, Burney, Jack, Albright, Rowley, and Meek have invested more historical accuracy in the accounts of Judges than

Joshua, and thereby make the tribes the primary units of conquest in the territory of each. Noth has denied the essential historicity of both accounts and considers the conquest to have been a slow and gradual infiltration of nomadic groups. Both Wright and Kaufmann maintained that the Joshua account is historically accurate and that Judges narrates the continued wars of settlement.

In reference to the location of the tribal movements, the following have maintained that all or part of the Leah tribes made a northward movement from Kadesh: Paton, Burney, Jack, Meek, and Rowley. Likewise, the following have maintained that the Rachel and Joseph tribes made a westward movement across the Jordan: Paton, Burney, Jack, Meek, Rowley, and Albright. And it has been maintained by Albright that the Leah tribes also made their approach from the Trans-Jordan.

CHAPTER II NOTES

1. The Israelite tribal structure which underlies the sequence of historical events has been dealt with by Noth in his *Das System der Zwolf Stämme Israels.* Therein he states (pp. 28–30) that the arising of the twelve tribe system can only be correctly understood from a time when the tribes claimed interest for themselves as they historically formed individual and separate groups. The *terminus ad quo* cannot be determined by the Old Testament record although the *terminus ad quem* is the Davidic formation of the nation. See also his statement (*op. cit.*, p. 25) that at no one time were all the tribes (either as recorded by Genesis. 49, in which Levi is

included, or Numbers 26, in which Levi is not included) in existence together.

2. Joshua 1 and 2.

3. Joshua 3:1–10:27.

4. Joshua 10:28–43.

5. Joshua 11. For a summary statement, see Joshua 10:40–41 and 11:16–17.

6. See Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, p. 101. "The city of palm-tree is commonly understood to be Jericho."

7. Garstang, *Joshua-Judges*, p. 146; *PEFQS* 1936, p. 170. See also his earlier statement in ; PEFQS 1930, p. 132, that the fall was "in round figures about 1400 B.C."

8. Albright *BASOR* 74 (April, 1939), p. 20.

9. Vincent, *RB* 39 (1930) pp. 403–433; *PEFQS* 1931, pp. 104–106.

10. "If there is anything certain in Palestinian archaeology, it is that the painted pottery from the 'Middle Building' is earlier than the thirteenth century. . . . The chronology of this type of painting . . . does not antedate the fourteenth century. At Jericho this sort of thing is entirely absent, and the final destruction of the Late Bronze city *must*, therefore, be earlier than the thirteenth century." Wright, *BASOR* 87 (April, 1942), pp. 33–34.

11. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 194.

12. Vincent, *RB* 48 (1939), p. 419.

13. Albright, *AASOR* 17 (1938) pp. 71 and 78–79, and *Archaeology and the Bible*, Chapter 2.

14. Albright *BASOR* 74, p. 17 and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.

15. Albright, *BASOR* 56 (Dec., 1934) p. 11; and 74, pp. 16–17. Noth, *Joshua*, pp. 23–25, where he maintains that archaeological evidence proves that the account of Ai in Joshua 7–8 is completely aetiological and legendary. Ai belonged to Benjamin and Bethel to Ephraim.

16. Glueck, *BASOR* 55 (1934) p. 16. Note also his latest statements, *BASOR* 138 (Apr. 1955) pp. 7–30. He states in part, ". . . history of the occupation there (Negeb) paralleled that of the Trans-Jordan more closely than Palestine proper north of the Beersheba area . . . we proved furthermore that during the following MB II and in most of Trans-Jordan during the whole of LB I and LB II periods there was a sharp decline, if not an almost complete lack of strong authority to keep Bedouin in check and enable agriculture and trade to be carried on" (p. 30).

17. Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–24.

18. For each of these strongholds see Josh, 12:10, 12, 21, and 21:25, respectively.

19. Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

20. He states the basis of this conclusion as "the writer of the main stock of J harmonized the tradition of the southern tribes with that of the northern tribes by bringing all the tribes first to Kadesh and then around Edom (Num. 20:13–21) to invade the land from the east. He still preserved the memory, however, that the tribes has conquered their territories independently."

21. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

23. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 25. Compare Moore, *Judges* p. 8, "All the we know of the history of Israel in Canaan in the succeeding centuries confirms the representation of Judges that the subjugation of the land by the tribes was gradual and partial."

24. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–31.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 48–50.

28. The Blessing of Jacob when "divested of its symbolism and interpreted in inter-tribal relations seems to picture some sort of aggression upon the right of the Bilhah clan." *Ibid.*, p. 51.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 53. See Chapter I, p. 12 and note 55 for Burney's position on the concubine tribes.

30. Jack, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73, 149.

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

33. *i.e.*, those tribes so identified by Burney (above pp. 11–12) and implied in the accounts of Jacob at Hebron and Simeon and Levi at Shechem. Jack identifies the covenant made at Mount Ebal (Deuteronomy 27 and Joshua 8) with the joining of the Shechemite Israelites to the Joshua community, at which time they accepted Yahwism.

34. Wright, *BA* 3 (1940) pp. 25–26, and *JNES* 5 (1946), pp. 105–114.

35. Wright completely disassociated the conquest of Jericho from Joshua. "It is probable that the author (*i.e.*, D of Joshua) again relying on an old tradition was wrong in ascribing the capture of Jericho to Joshua." (*JNES* 5 [1946], p. 114). Note also Wright and Filson, *op. cit*, p. 40, "Jericho fell not to Joshua but to relatives of Israel, perhaps from the Shechem area during the disturbances of the fourteenth century."

36. These documentary lists are dated by Wright before 900 B.C. since Shechem was destroyed shortly after 900 B.C. and not occupied again for four centuries. See Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

37. Wright, *JNES* 5 (1946), p. 111.

38. Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–25.

39. Meek, *BASOR* 61 (Feb., 1946) p. 19. See also *Hebrew Origins*, p. 25, where he asserts—after identifying the *ᶜApiru* with *Ḫabiru* and *ᶜIbrîm*—that the Hebrews were in Palestine as early as Amenophis II if the statement is correct that he captured 3,600 *ᶜApiru* on his second campaign since it was the northern limit of his campaign (northern Palestine or Southern Syria) that he captured them.

40. For Meek (*Hebrew Origins*, p. 28) the attempt at a southern campaign is reflected in Num. 14:39–45 and Dt 1:41–44. These events must have occurred before the exodus since the account "does not seem to have much point there and could well have occurred earlier."

41. This reconstruction of the history of the southern tribes is verified for Meek by the excavations of Glueck in the Negeb, Albright at Tel Beit Mirsim, and Sellers at Beth-Zur since all indicate a Hebrew occupation c. 1200 B.C. He also finds evidence for it in the following accounts of preparation for a southern invasion: Num. 21:1–3; Josh. 15:14–19; and Ju. 1: 1–21. See also *Hebrew Origins* pp. 39–41.

42. Since the earliest traditions of Gn. 35:22, 49:3–4; Num. 16; and Ju. 5:15–16 speak of Reuben's arrogance, lack of cooperation, and dissension, Meek maintains that Reuben was undoubtedly expelled from the southern group and moved northward around Edom and through Moab to settle northeast of the Dead Sea. (See *Hebrew Origins*, p. 42.)

43. *Ibid.*, p. 35. In like manner he accounts for all the inconsistencies in the biblical tradition: "the nationalized form has dove-tailed the two conquests into each other as the work of

a single people, resulting naturally in a good deal of confusion and inconsistent" (*Ibid.*, p. 45).

44. See Alt, *Die Landnahme der Isreliten in Palestina*, and Albright, *BASOR* 58, pp. 14–15. Alt's system is a combination of physical and historical geography with social and political history.

45. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 211.

46. Albright, *BASOR* 58, p. 14.

47. This would seem to verified for Albright by Glueck's excavations in Trans-Jordan.

48. Albright, *BASOR* 58, p. 17 and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.

49. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 110–112.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

51. It is this reference to Shechem that dates the Amarna age as the time of Jacob. Concerning the role of Shechem in the early history of Israel, Rowley states, "we may then with some probability find evidence of temporary Hebrew dominance in Shechem in the Amarna age, followed by a Hebrew withdrawal, and a reversion of the city to Canaanite control until after the time of Joshua." Ibid., p. 128. Compare also Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 122–124, where he suggests that Gn. 34 has nothing to do with Simeon and Levi.

52. Rowley, *ibid.*, pp. 123 and 141–142.

53. Rowley holds that the southern tribes adopted their faith in Yahweh out of their association with the Yahweh-worshiping Kenites. The Joseph tribes came to accept Yahwism through Moses who came under the influence of Jethro. The other tribes received it in undetermined ways.

54. This method included *Gattungsgeschichte*, aetiological explanations, and recognizing the tenacity of names and stories to particular sites. Compare Albright, *BASOR* 74, pp. 12–14 for a critique of this approach. Note also Noth, *Das Buch Josua.*

55. Noth, *PJB* 34 (1938), p. 10.

56. Noth cites the example of half nomads who came into the area during the various seasons and remained in the land without ever returning to their previous place of settlement. See *Geschichte Israels*, p. 59.

57. Noth, *Ibid.*, pp. 60–68.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

59. Kaufmann, *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine.*

60. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

61. Ibid., 48–55.   Here he defines these territories as follows: (1) the land of Canaan was that territory destined for Israel in the Pentateuch (Genesis 12 to Numbers 26) and had its borders the Jordan on the east, the sea on the west, the Wadi of Egypt or the desert on the south, and the Euphrates

or Gateway to Hamath on the north; (2) Moses' land of Israel reflected in Num. 21:21–35; 32; and Dt. 2–3 consisted of Canaan and the Trans-Jordanian territories which had not been promised to Israel but which were captured by the tribes prior to the conquest of Canaan proper; (3) Joshua's land of Israel was a dynamic territorial unit, the boundaries of which were only temporary. It was made up of three countries: one conquered and allotted (Baal Gad to Negeb), a second was allotted but not conquered (the coastal strip, Emeq, Jerusalem, portion of Dan, *etc.*), a third neither allotted or conquered (Baal Gad to Gateway of Hamath); (4) the real land of Israel was that territory in which the tribes were located at the end of the Judges' period (marked by the expression of Ju. 20:1, "from Dan to Beersheba"); (5) the Israelite empire came with the establishment of the Davidic kingdom and it included the real land of Israel as its nucleus and surrounding non-ethnic territories as imperialistic provinces.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 74. "The legendary element is the essence of these stories, expressing as it does the idea which gives them their life and form. . . . (*i.e.*) that the conquest of the land is a miraculous sign."

CHAPTER III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ḤABIRU
TO THE HEBREWS

The archaeological investigations in the Near East within the past sixty to seventy years have recovered a wide variety of texts in which there is reference to the *Ḫabiru*, the *SA.GAZ*, and the *ᶜApiru*. It has now been well established by the scholars in this field that these terms apply to the same group,[1] and this group was spread throughout the entire Near East during the second millennium B.C. According to the analysis of Greenberg the *SAG.AZ* were found in Ur III (20th century B.C.), Isin (19th century B.C.), Larsa (18th century B.C.), Babylon (17th century B.C.), Alalaḫ (19th century B.C.), and Phoenicia, Boghazköi, and Palestine (14–13th century B.C.). The *Ḫabiru* were found at Alishar (19th century B.C.); Alalaḫ, vicinity of Harran, Mari, and Larsa (18th century B.C.), Boghazköi (17th century B.C.); Nuzi and Alalaḫ (15th century B.C.); and Palestine and Boghazköi (14–13th century B.C.). The *ᶜApiru* were found at Joppa and in Egypt (15th century B.C.); in Palestine and Egypt (14–13th century B.C.); and the *ᶜprm* were at Ugarit (14th century B.C.).[2]

The problem at hand is the proposed identification of this *Ḫabiru / SAG.AZ / ᶜApiru* group (hereafter referred to as *Ḫabiru*) with the *ᶜIbrîm*, the Hebrew of the Bible. Of primary importance is the identification of the *Ḫabiru* of Tell el-Amarna with the tribal participants of the Israelite conquest of Palestine. But since both terms, *Ḫabiru* and *ᶜIbrîm*, are used of larger groups over several centuries, it is necessary

to consider the relationship of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrew patriarchs.

Whether or not this identification and equation of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrews is valid or not is dependent on the following three factors: (1) the philological relationship of the terms *ḫabiru* and *ʿibrî*, (2) the nature of the ethnic-social structure of both groups, and (3) the historical activity of both groups.

The philological relationship of the two terms is dependent upon the etymology of the terms as well as their morphological relationship. That *ʿibrî* is a gentilic form of the root *ʿbr*, having the basic meaning "to cross, pass, or traverse" is now generally accepted.[3] Without the gentilic ending it is found in the name of the eponymous ancestor of the Hebrew people, Eber. Just as *melek* is derived from the earlier form of *milk* (and that from an earlier form of *malk*), so *ʿeber* and *ʿibrî* are derived from an earlier form of *ʿabir(u)*.[4] The cuneiform equivalent of *ʿab/piru* would be *ḫabiru*. Thus, the equation of *ʿibrî* to *ʿab/piru* to *ḫabiru* is quite possible.

Speiser indicates that there is good evidence that etymologically the relationship of *ʿibrî* to *ḫabiru* is very close. The root *ʿbr* is capable of yielding the meaning "passing from place to place," and in a derived sense "being a nomad."

> Such an interpretation is by no means inconsistent with what we have learned about the Ḥabiru. . . . They were nomads in the same sense as the Bedouin . . . 'Nomad' is not an ethnic designation, it is an appellative, but so was also *ḫabiru* at the start. As yet there is no way of establishing this etymology beyond possibility of dispute; it appears however to be gaining in likelihood with each new strand of evidence.[5]

The social status of the *Ḥabiru*, who were scattered throughout the Near East in the second millennium B.C., varied from place to place and from time to time in the same place. These various social positions included being socially independents, military auxiliaries, private dependents, state dependents, slaves, vagrants, or members of a settled population.[6]

The social status of the migrating and nomadic Hebrew patriarchs is well expressed in the term *gerîm*, "being sojourners, living in the land on sufferance, without legal nights." Thus, only in part is the social status of the Hebrews coincident with the *Ḥabiru*.

Concerning the Amarna period and the conquest in particular, the Hebrews and the Israelites which participated in the conquest were united into tribal units of related kinsmen and moved in large massive tribal groups. Contrary to this it should be noted that there is no indication that the scattered *Ḥabiru* of the Amarna period were ever constituted into such a structured social organization and moved in such large and ordered groups.

Also of importance in the problem of the ethnic nature of these two groups is the question whether the respective terms for these groups are appellatives or ethnicons.. There is little, if any, doubt raised that the term *ᶜibrî* is an ethnicon in the gentilic, denoting the descendants of Eber the Noachide, and in particular the ancestors of the Israelite nation. As Greenberg indicates, this is well demonstrated by (1) the antithesis of the *ᶜibrîm / ᶜibriyyot* and the *miṣrîm / miṣriyyot* in Gn 43:32, Ex 1:19, and implied in Ex 2:7; (2) the use of *ᶜibrî* as a distinguishing term after the honorific *běnê yisraᵓēl* is assumed in Ex. 1:19; and (3) the distinction of the ethnic Israelites from the non-Israelites in the slave laws of Lev. 25:44–46,

Ex. 21:2. Dt. 15:12—the former serve for a limited period and the latter for a lifetime.[7]

However, there has been widespread disagreement as to whether ᶜ*apiru* / *ḫabiru* is an ethnic form of an appellative. According to Speiser, an ethnic form ᶜ*ibrî* developed from the appellative ᶜ*abiri* (*ḫabiru*).[8] This development was as follows: the term *ḫabiru* represent in earlier times socially organized groups of diverse national elements, but the large Semitic element in this group at the Amarna period may have imparted to this group as quasi-ethnic status. Full ethnic content, issuing in the tern ᶜ*ibrî*, paralleled the conquest of the *Ḫabiru* over the Ammonites, Moabites, *etc*. On the other hand, Rowley — contrary to the social usage of the term in Nuzi—on the basis of the reference to the gods of the *Ḫabiru* in Hittite texts maintains that the term is essentially ethnic and may have developed into an appellative and non-ethnic term.[9]

Dhorme has also rejected any possibility of *ḫabiru* being an ethnic term. He states, "Les *Ḫabiri* ne seraient donc pas une peuplade, une quantité ethnique ou géographique, mais la désignation d'une collectivité."[10] Greenberg likewise rejected the ethnic usage of the term, saying, "ᶜ*Apiru* is the appellation of a population element composed of diverse ethnic elements, having in common only a general inferior social status."[11]

It should be noted that Greenberg disagrees with the view of Parzen, Meek, and Rowley that there is a corresponding derogatory nuance to the term ᶜ*ibrî* as there is to the term *ḫabiru*.[12]

> When Abraham is called an ᶜ*ibrî*, when the land of the patriarchs' sojourn is called ᵓ*ereṣ* ha ᶜ*ibrîm* (Gn. 40: 15), when Joseph and his brothers are called ᶜ*ibrîm* (Gn 39:14, 43:32) it is merely because this was the

only gentilic available to the writer to set off those proto-Israelites from the surrounding Canaanites and Egyptians of his narrative.[13]

The equation of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrews with reference to the historical activity of each group addresses itself to the identification of the *Ḥabiru* with the patriarchs and with the tribes of the Palestinian conquest. In reference to the question of the *Ḥabiru* and the patriarchs, Albright stated, "The Khabiru correspond closely, at all events, to the Hebrews of the patriarchal period in many important respects: in their independence of towns, in their geographical location, in their warlike spirit."[14] Likewise, Speiser stated, "If Abraham had not been called a Hebrew, we should be nevertheless justified in classing him with the *Ḥabiru*."[15]

The identification and equation of *Ḥabiru* of the Amarna letters with the Israelite conquest of Palestine has been made by Meek[16] Rowley,[17] Albright,[18] and others[19] on the basis of the following factors: (1) the biblical accounts speak of the infiltration of the migrating patriarchs and their attacking Shechem, which is the only place where the *Ḥabiru* are known to have been active in the center of the land;[20] (2) the chronology of Jericho and I Kings 6:1 demand a date of the conquest in the Amarna period; (3) Ju. 1 would suggest a conquest different from the united movement under Joshua in that it was gradual, sporadic, and executed by individual tribes; (4) the unlikeliness of a historical coincidence of two different peoples, having the same form of a name, invading the same area in the same general era; and (5) the strong parallels between the two accounts, including the actions of the native princes in making alliance with the invaders, the intrigue of the petty kings of the city-states, and the evidence

of an incomplete conquest.

Speiser's statement,

> Historical conditions render the equation attractive; there are still many knotty problems on the whole subject, but the situation become hopeless if the equation is rejected "[21]

is perhaps the most accurate statement of those who maintain the equation of the two groups, in that it recognizes the problems inherent in the identification and makes no final and particular identification.

Opposed to this identification and equation of the *Ḥabiru* to the Israelites of the conquest are Greenberg and Dhorme.[22] This rejection is based upon the following evidence: (1) the apparent purpose of the *Ḥabiru* was the ending of the Egyptian authority, as opposed to the Hebrew conquest in which there is evidently an absence of Egyptian authority; (2) the lack of evidence that the *Ḥabiru* of Amarna were an invading element,[23] (3) the *Ḥabiru* adopted the role of military contingents subordinate to the local chieftains; (4) the purpose of the *Ḥabiru* attacks was the acquisition of the spoils of razzia as compared to the destruction, depopulation, and acquisition of land of the Hebrews; (5) the *Ḥabiru* of Amarna gave the appearance of being small bands of fugitives and renegades which throve on the anarchy that existed in that era and not the appearance of united and organized tribes of kinsmen which was characteristic of the Israelites; and (6) the ease with which one could become a *Ḥabiru*—which would indicate a social and political status—had no parallel among the Israelites.[24]

In summary, it may be stated that the equation of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrews and the identification of the Amarna

groups to the Israelite tribes of conquest is philologically possible from both the standpoint of morphology and etymology, but it is neither certain nor required. In reference to the social-ethnic aspect, it appears certain that *Ḫabiru* was an appellative (which may easily have developed into an ethnicon) even though the geographical determinative is found in reference to the gods of the *Ḫabiru* (for these latter references may well indicate a familial relationship). Nor did the social status of the *Ḫabiru* correspond directly to the Hebrew *gerîm* or the Israelite tribal units. In reference to the historical aspect, there seems to be adequate grounds for accepting the possibility of a relationship or equation between the patriarchal *ᶜibrîm* and the *Ḫabiru*. However, the identification of the *Ḫabiru* of the Amarna period with the Israelite tribes of the conquest, or even with the patriarchal period, seems most unlikely. The evidence against this equation, based on concrete and specific differences of the two groups, seems definitely to outweigh the evidence for the identification, based as it is upon indefinite references in the Bible and possible similarities between the two groups.

CHAPTER III NOTES

1. See Greenberg, *The Ḫab/piru*, pp. 210–211 and 224–228. Here he states that the primary support for the identification of the *SA.GAZ* with the *Ḫabiru* (*Ḫab/piru*) is from the texts themselves. The Hittite god-lists coming from the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries alternate freely the terms *DINGER. MES* ^lu *SA.GAZ* and *DINGER. MES ḫa-BI-ri.* There is also evidence from Ugarit in the parallel usages of *SA.GAZ* and *ᶜprm*, and from Larsa in which there is reference to the state-

supported *SA.GAZ* of Warad-Sin, the state supported *Ḫabiru* of Rim-sin, and the *SA.GAZ* under Hammurabi's *aklum*—all of which can hardly be disassociated from each other. The validity of this identification is evident also from the social status of the *SA.GAZ* and the *Ḫabiru* as they are found in Larsa, El-Amarna Syria-Palestine, and Alalaḫ; namely, an element of the settled population as over against the nomadic population, and an ethnic composite as over against an ethnic unit.

As for the identification of the *Ḫabiru* and the *ᶜApiru* Greenberg makes the following statements: "The derivation of *Ḫab/piru* is still obscure. In form it appears to be a *qatil* verbal adjective. The first consonant is established as ᶜ [*ᶜayin*] by Ugaritic and Egyptian *ᶜpr.w*. Its appearance in Akkadian as ḫ points to a West Semitic derivation since an original ᶜ would have become ᵓ [*ᵓaleph*] in Akkadian. The quality of the labial is still a matter of dispute. On the one hand is the unequivocal Ugaritic and Egyptian evidence for *p*. . . . On the other hand, *b* offers the advantage of an immediately trans-parent etymology from West Semitic *ᶜbr* and facilitates the combination with Biblical *ᶜibrî* . . . . Some evidence is available to show that Egyptian *p* occasionally represented a foreign *b* and Ugaritic as well can be made to yield an original *b* losing its voice" (pp. 224–226).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 209.

3. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 41. See also Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 7, and Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

4. Speiser, *ibid.*, and Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

5. Speiser, *Ibid.*

6. Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 230–234.

8. Speiser, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–42. This is also the position of Meek (*op. cit.*, p. 13) who stated, "That the word ᶜ*apiru*, *ḫabiru*, was not an ethnic term originally, but an appellative, is confirmed by an examination of all the *ḫabiru* names that we have. . . . But though the term had no ethnic content originally, tendencies early developed in that direction, as was natural under the circumstances."

9. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–53. See also Albright, *JBL* 18 (1934) p. 391 and Jack *PEQ* (1940), p. 95, where the ethnic usage of the term is maintained.

10. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p. 166. He also made the statement "que le terme Ḥabiru est un mot du vocabularie cananeen qui re-presente essentiellement les ennemis de la domination egyp-tienne en Canaan" (p. 163).

11. Greenberg, *op.cit.*, p. 230.

12. See Greenberg, *ibid.*; Parzen, *AJSL* 49 (1933) pp. 254–258; Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–11; and Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

13. Greenberg, *ibid.*, p. 30.

14. Albright, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 132.

15. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

16. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 21. He states: "This contemporaneous account of the settlement of the *Ḥabiru* in Palestine so exactly parallels the Old Testament account of the Israelite conquest of Jericho and the invasion of the highlands of Ephraim under Joshua that the two manifestly must reference the same episode."

17. Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 164. Rowley, whose entire reconstruction of the period relies on this identification, states, "Pressure northwards from Kadesh of Hebrew groups, together with Kenite and other elements equals the *Ḥabiru* of the Amarna letters. Simultaneous pressure from the north of kindred groups including Asher, Zebulun, Dan, and other Israelite tribes, together with other groups, equals the *SA.GAZ* of the Amarna letters."

18. Albright *BASOR* 58, p. 15. He identifies at least a part of the Israelites with the *Ḥabiru* in his statement, "That the tribe of Joseph belonged to the group designated as Khabiru in the Amarna Tablets and as Shasu in the inscriptions of Sethos I is more and more probable."

19. See Lewy, *HUCA* 14 (1939), pp. 609 and 620; and Jack, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

20. See especially Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 111–113, who states, "I connect the Amarna age rather with the age of Jacob."

21. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

22. Dhorme (*JPOS* 4, p. 126) rejects this identification completely, stating, "Le mouvement des *Ḥabiri* est l'insurrection

de l'indigene contre de l'etranger. L'invasion d'Israel est l'installation de l'etranger chez l'indigene. . . . l'identification des Hebreux et des *Ḥabiri* ne nous semble acceptable." Likewise Greenberg in his statement (*op. cit.*, p. 243), "The proposed *ᶜApiru* - Hebrew equation faces thus at present a series of objections. None of these is indeed decisive, but their accumulative effect must be conceded to diminish its probability. . . . Further historical combinations between the two groups appear to be highly doubtful; they may serve now as they served in the past, only to obscure the distinctive features of each." See also Garstang, J*oshua – Judges*, p. 255.

23. Greenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–187, 238–239.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 186. "It seems that to 'become a *Ḥabiru*' did not involve any particular ethnic affiliation, but rather the assumption of a special status. "

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions which are submitted are in no way considered to be final and definitive. The preceding study of the problems and the various interpretations given them has pointed out several areas where the divergent views might be in harmony with each other. As has been evident in the preceding chapters, no conclusion can account for all of the material and answer all of the questions satisfactorily.

Concerning the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus, it may be concluded with a great deal of certainty that the accumulative result of the various inconsistencies and diverse biblical statements as listed is that only a portion of the Israelites went into Egypt.

Since the extra-biblical material is of no substantial aid in identifying the particular tribal participants, the biblical account becomes the only source of information. The division of the tribes into three groups (Leah, Rachel, and concubine) seems natural and valid. In view of the evidence which would locate Sinai in Seir, away from the Sinai peninsula, there would seem to be no reason to identify the Leah and Rachel tribes with a distinct geographical place of Kadesh and Sinai respectively. Nor does it seem necessary, in light of the nomadic and migratory nature of the Israelites, to define the descent into Egypt as an either-or matter in reference to the Leah and Rachel tribes. The predominant conclusion of the scholars that the concubine tribes were at least partially of alien stock can readily be accepted as valid.

As Albright and Rowley have indicated, there is no reason why the historicity of the account of Joseph's sojourn should

be questioned. Meek, on the other hand, has given good reasons for identifying the Levites with Egypt. Albright's identification of Levi with the tribes in Egypt has led him to conclude that all the Leah tribes were there. However, in and of itself, the presence of Levi would not necessitate the presence of all the Leah tribes. That the Simeonites went with the Levites to Egypt is possible though not conclusive. Thus, the tribes which went to Egypt would include the Joseph tribes, the Levites, and perhaps Simeon. The other Leah tribes, with Judah being the strongest and largest, were located in the Negeb and territory of the Kenites, The concubine tribes evidently remained in the highlands of the north and central hill-country.

In reference to the tribal participants of the conquest of Palestine, the conclusions are somewhat more tentative. First, in addition to the summary remarks which were made above (pp. 62–63) on the equation of the *Ḫabiru* with the Israelites/ Hebrews of the conquest, it may be stated that the probability is that the *Ḫabiru* of Amarna cannot be equated with the Israelites of the conquest, although there is a possibility that they might. This would seem to be more accurate than the obverse statement that the probability is that they can be equated although there is the possibility that they were not. This would not exclude though a relationship or identification of the patriarchal *ᶜibrîm* with the *Ḫabiru*.

Any identification of the tribal participants of the conquest and their respective activities must take into consideration (1) the fact that the accounts in Joshua nd Judges do not relate the events of the same historical situation; (2) that, aside from Jericho, all archaeological evidence would indicate that the conquest of Canaan occurred in the thirteenth century: central Palestine at the beginning and southern Palestine at the

end; (3) that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that there was a "dual" conquest, *i.e.*, a movement westward across the Jordan and a movement northward from the Negeb.

If the conclusions of Wright and Kaufmann (in reference to the historical accuracy of Joshua and the accounts in Judges being a continuation of Joshua) can be accepted, the following reconstruction of the tribal activity is possible. The Joseph and Levi tribes, who had come to adopt Yahwism through Moses' contact with Jethro his Kenite kinsman, made the exodus from Egypt, perhaps under Rameses II. In Kadesh / Sinai they joined their kinsmen of the Leah tribes who had adopted Yahwism through their close interconnections with the Kenites.

The movement was then north according to the basic traditions of Joshua. From the highlands of central Trans-Jordan, the tribes of Joseph, Levi, and Leah—having united with the more distantly related and partially alien concubine tribes—made the assault westward and the wars of extermination were commenced. Towards the end of this conquest the tribes received their lots and the wars of occupation and settlement were begun, namely, the tribal wars as recorded in Judges. The strategy of Judah may have demanded a movement from the south into their territory, and subsequently the northward thrust from Kadesh.

This possible reconstruction of events would account for the earlier destruction of towns in central Palestine as over against the slightly later destruction of the towns in southern Palestine. It would also account for the separate westward and northward movements of the conquest, as well as the two distinct types of military activity in Joshua and Judges.

A final conclusion which would account for all the material is at present not available. The following statement

of Albright (*Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 329) seems to summarize the present state of biblical scholarship:

> The probability is that the actual course of events was closer to the Biblical tradition than any of our critical reconstructions have been, and that some vital clues still elude or search.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, W. F. 1918, "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph," *JBL* 37: 111–143.

Albright, W. F. 1924. "The Topography of Simeon," *JPOS* 4: 149–161.

Albright, W. F. 1929. "The American Excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim," *ZAW* N. F. 6: 1–17.

Albright, W. F. 1931. "The Third Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim and Its Historical Results," *JPOS* 11: 105– 129.

Albright, W. F. 1932. *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible.* New York: Fleming H. Revell

Albright, W. F. 1935. "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," BASOR 58: 10–18.

Albright, W. F. 1934. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. AOS 5. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Albright, W. F. 1935. "Palestine in the Earliest Historical Period," JPOS 15: 193–234.

Albright, W. F. 1936. "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology." *BASOR* 62: 26-31.

Albright, W. F. 1937. "Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo." *BASOR* 68: 22-26.

Albright, W. F. 1939, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in Light of Archaeology," *BASOR* 65 1939: 11–23.

Albright, W. F. 1941, "New Egyptian Data on Palestine in the Patriarchal Age," BASOR 81: 16–21.

Albright, W. F. 1946, *From Stone Age to Christianity. Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Albright, W. F. 1946. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Albright, W. F. 1954. *The Archaeology of Palestine*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Alt, A. 1953. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* Munchen: C. H. Beck.

Barton, G. A. 1935. "The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters," *ET* 47: 380.

Bergman, A. 1936. "The Israelite Tribe of Half-Manasseh," JPOS 16: 224–254.

Breasted, J. H. 1906. *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest.* Volume I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burney, C. F. 1918. *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*. (Schweich Lecture, 1917). London: Oxford University Press.

Burrows, M. 1941. *What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archaeology for Biblical Studies*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Burrows, M. 1942. "A Comment on Professor Rowley's Paper in the February Bulletin," *BASOR* 86:35–26.

Chiera, E. 1932. "Ḫabiru and Hebrews," *AJSL* 49: 115–124.

Cook, S. A. 1909. "Simeon and Levi," *AJSL* 13: 370–386.

Cooke, G. A. 1918. *The Book of Joshua*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam.

Cooke, G. A. 1918. *The Book of Judges*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam.

Dhorme, P. E.1908-1909. "Les pays bibliques au temps d'el Amarna," *RB* N. S. 5: 500–519, 6: 50–73.

Dhorme, P. E. 1924. "Les Ḫabiru et lex Hebreux," *JPOS* 4: 162–168.

Dhorme, P. E. 1938. "La question des Ḫabiri, " RHR 118: 170–187.

Dossin, G. 1938, "Les Archives epistolaries de Mari," *Syria* 19: 105–126.

Driver, S. R. 1953, *The Book of Exodus*. Cambridge: University Press.

Dussaud, R. 1930. "La chronologie de Jericho et les nouvelles fouilles de M. J. Garstang." *Syria* 11: 390–392.

Dussaud, R. 1938. "Review of J. Simons, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*," *Syria* 19: 176–177.

Finkelstein, L. 1949. *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America.

Garstang, J. 1930. "Jericho," *PEFQ* 1930: 123–132.

Garstang, J. 1931. *The Foundations of Bible History: Joshua, Judges*. London: Constable.

Garstang, J. 1935. "The Fall of Bronze Age Jericho," *PEFQ* 1935: 61–68.

Garstang, J. 1931. "The Story of Jericho: Further Light on the Biblical Narrative," *AJSL* 58: 369–372.

Glueck, N. 1934. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," *BASOR* 55: 3–21.

Garstang, J. 1934. *The Heritage of Solomon: An Historical Introduction to the Sociology of Ancient Palestine*. 1934. London: Williams and Norgate.

Glueck, N. 1940. "Kenites and Kenizzites," *PEQ* 1940: 22–24.

Glueck, N. 1955. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," *BASOR* 138: 7–30.

Greenberg, M. 1955. The *Ḫab/piru*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Jack, J. W. 1925. *The Date of the Exodus in the Light of External Evidence*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Jack, J. W. 1936. "Recent Biblical Archaeology," *ET* 48: 549–551.

Jack, J. W. 1940. "New Light in the Ḫabiru-Hebrew Question," *PEQ* 1940: 95–115.

Kaufmann, Y. 1953. *The Biblical Account of the conquest of Palestine*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University.

Kraeling, E. G. H. 1941. "The Origin of the Name Hebrews," *AJSL* 58: 237–253.

Lewy, J. 1939. "Ḫâbîru and Hebrews" *HUCA* 14: 587–623.

Lewy, J. 1940. "A New Parallel Between the Ḫâbîru and Hebrews, " *HUCA* 47–58.

Meek, T. J. 1920. "A Proposed Reconstruction of Hebrew History," *AJTh* 24: 209–216.

Meek, T. J. 1950. *Hebrew Origins*. New York: Harper.

Meek, T. J. 1936. "The Israelite Conquest of Ephraim," *BASOR* 61: 17–19.

Meek, T. J. 1939. "Moses and the Levites," *AJSL* 56: 113–120.

Meyer, E. 1905. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle.

Moore, G. F. 1898. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Noth, M. 1930. *Das System der zwolf Stämme Israels*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

Noth, M. 1938. *Das Buch Joshua*. Tübigen: Mohr.

Noth, M. 1950. *Geschichte Israels*. Gottigen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Olmstead, A. T. 1931. *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest.* New York: Scribners.

Parzen, H. 1933. "The Problem of the Ibrim ('Hebrews') in the Bible," *AJSL* 49: 254–261.

Paton, L. B. 1913. "Israel's Conquest of Canaan," *JBL* 32: 1–53.

Posener, G. 1937. "Une liste de noms propres étrangers sur deux ostraca hiératiques du nouvel empire," Syria 18: 183–197.

Posener, G. 1940. *Princes et pays d'Asie rt de Nubie*.

Robinson. T. H. 1932–1938. *The History of Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Robinson. T. H. 1932. "The Exodus and Conquest of Palestine," *Theology* 25: 267–274.

Robinson. T. H. 1935. "The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters," *ET* 47: 380.

Rowley, H. H. 1938. "Israel's Sojourn in Egypt," *BJRL* 22: 243–290.

Rowley, H. H. 1938. "The Eisodus and the Exodus," *ET* 50: 503–508.

Rowley, H. H. 1939. "The Danite Migration to Laish," *ET* 51: 466–471.

Rowley, H. H. 1940. "Ras Shamra and the Ḫabiru Question," *PEQ* 1941: 90–94.

Rowley, H. H. 1941. "The Date of the Exodus," *PEQ* 1941: 152–157.

Rowley, H. H. 1942. "The Exodus and the Settlement in Canaan," *BASOR* 85: 27–31.

Rowley, H. H. 1942. "Ḫabiru and Hebrews," *PEQ* 1942: 41–53.

Rowley, H. H. 1944. "Early Levite History and the Question of the Exodus," *JNES* 53: 73–78.

Rowley, H. H. 1949. "The Patriarchal Age." *BJRL* 32: 44–79.

Rowley, H. H. 195o. *From Joseph to Joshua: Biblical Traditions in the Light of Archaeology*. London: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, J. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Speiser, E. A. 1933. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B. C., "*AASOR* 13: 13–54.

Steuernagel, C. 1901. *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*. Berlin, C. A. Schwetschke und sohn.

Vincent, L. H. 1931. "The Chronology of Jericho," *PEFQS* 1931: 104–106.

Waterman, L. 1937. "Some Determining Factors in the Northward Progress of Levi," *JAOS* 57: 375–380.

Waterman, L. 1938. "Jacob the Forgotten Supplanter," *AJSL* 55: 25–43.

Waterman, L. 19341. "Some Late Repercussions from Late Levitical Genealogical Accretions in P and the Chronicler," *AJSL* 58: 49–56.

Wellhausen, J. 1885. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.

Wright, G. E. 1940. "Epic of Conquest," *BA* 3:1–40.

Wright, G. E. 1942. "Two Misunderstood Items of the Exodus-Conquest Cycle," *BASOR* 86: 32–35.

Wright, G. E. 1946. "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," *JNES* 5: 105–114.

Wright, G. E. and F. V. Filson. 1945. *The Westminster Historical Atlas*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

A REVIEW
by
Thomas F. McDaniel [1]
of
BERTIL ALBREKTSON'S
STUDIES IN THE TEXT AND THEOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS: WITH A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE PESHITTA TEXT [2]

This work is Albrektson's doctoral dissertation done at the University of Lund (Sweden) in which he acknowledges his indebtedness to Professors Gillis Gerleman, D. Winton Thomas. L. G. Rignell, and others. The book is divided into three chapters: (I) The Peshitta Text, (II) The Hebrew Text, the Septuagint, and the Peshitta, and (III) The Background and Origin of the Theology of Lamentations. A good bibliography and a useful index of biblical references are appended.

The book is a major contribution to the study of the text and interpretation of the book of Lamentations. This reviewer would cite the following contributions: (1) a handy critical edition of the Peshitta text and an adequate survey of the history of the Peshitta text of Lamentations, (2) a thorough presentation of the Greek, Syriac and Hebrew variants within the textual traditions, (3) a rather complete survey of all the significant opinions of the many commentators who have

---

[1] This review was published in 1966 in *Seisho to Shingaku*, which was the journal of the College of Theology of Kanto Gakuin University, Yokohama, Japan.

[2] Studia Theologica Lundensia, 21. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963, viii/258 pages.

written on the text of Lamentations, and (4) a he1pful
criticism of Gottwald's views on the theology of Lanenta-
tions. Albrektson has put his finger on almost all of the
problems and interpretations. This is, indeed, his major
contribution, a work is a handy summary of problems and
opinions. But whereas one may use Albrektson's study to find
out what the problems are, one will *not* be able to use this
work to find a so1ution or answer to these textual and
interpretive problems. This is partly due to the nature of the
study and in part to Albrektson's own methodology. While
Albrektson establishes with tolerable certainty the underlying
Hebrew text of Lamentations, this kind of versional study
seldom offers any real help is clarifying the obscure passages
once the text is established.

Albrektson's presentation reveals that his investigation of
the text has been made with a very strong bias in favor of the
Massoretic Text just as it stands. One of the recurring points
of Albrektson's analysis of the versions is that the Septuagint
translation is a literalistic and often slavish translation (see pp.
58, 87, 130, l54, 161, and 208–209). For this reason one
would expect the LXX to be of assistance in establishing the
Hebrew *Vorlage*, but nowhere does Albrektson permit the
LXX to point to a more original or authoritative reading than
the Massoretic Text. For example, his treatment of the textual
variants is Lam. 2:19 is noteworthy. The MT reads *lĕrō°š
°ašmurôt* but the LXX reads *eis archas phulakēs sou*, while
the Syriac text has *bĕriš maṭrĕtā°*. Not only does the LXX
add a suffix, but it reverses the plural/singular of the Hebrew,
reading a plural form for the MT *rō°ôš* and a singular noun
for the MT plural *°ašmurôt*. The Syriac reads both nouns in
the singular. Despite the fact that the LXX is extremely
literalistic, Albrektson wants to ascribe a certain freedom to
the Greek translator ("Even if the translation is generally

extremely literal, one cannot presuppose that the translator was always fully consistent" [p. 119].) In the case of the Peshitta and Targum which has both nouns is the singular, Albrektson concludes, "there is no reason whatsoever to assume a different Hebrew text" (p. 119). It is one thing to dismiss minor variants in the Peshitta text as an expression of the translators "freedom" with the text, but the consistent use of this same reason to account for variants in the LXX reflects more of a subjective bias for the MT than it does of objective evaluation of all possibilities.

Another example of how Albrektson interprets the facts to serve his bias in favor of the Massoretic Text is his treatment of the pronouns in the Septuagint. For example in Lam 1:3 the LXX reads *apo tapeinōseōs autēs* for the MT *mēʿōnî* and *douleias autē*s for the MT *ʿăbōdāh*, i.e., the LXX has a pronoun although the Hebrew has no suffix. Albrektson accounts for these pronouns in the LXX by suggesting an internal Greek corruption of *autē* to *autēs*, the *autē* being the literal translation of the pronoun which starts the next poetic line in the Hebrew text of 1:3b. He states,

> The *hîʾ* of MT has no equivalent in the LXX text, which is unexpected in view of the general literalness of the Greek translation of Lam. . . . It may at least be suggested that the *autēs* of 1:3a is in fact a corruption of an original *autē* which equals the *hîʾ* in l:3b . . . . The resultant *douleias autēs* may have influenced a scribe to add an *autēs* after *tapeinōseōs* as well (in 1:3a).

Here Albrektson is quite clear—he expects the Hebrew pronoun to be reflected in the LXX; but he takes just the opposite position when it comes to dealing with the textual problems in Lam 3:42, where the Greek does *not* reflect the Hebrew pronouns. Here he states,

The personal pronoun *ʾattah* is thus not represented by a separate word in Greek, and accordingly it is not to be expected that *naḥnû* in 3:42a should have been translated separately either. It is included in the endings -*amen* just as *ʾattah* in 42b is expressed by th ending of the verb" (pp. 155-56).

One can only wonder what Albrektsson really expects when it comes to the LXX representation of Hebrew pronouns.

Albrektson has many helpful suggestions with reference to interpretation and critical problems, but the reader must evaluate each one independently. This reviewer will cite several examples of how Albrektson fails to consider all the factors in arriving at a solution. Lam. 1:7 contains four poetic lines instead of usual three line. Albrektson, following Rudolph, states, "the third line must be deleted; it is possibly originally a marginal note on the difficult *wmrwdyh* of the first line." Albrektson might better have questioned Rudolph's explanation, for can it be assumed that "marginal notes" were written metrica1ly? Lam l:7c is clearly a 3 + 2 metrical line. In view of the freedom which the writer(s) used with reference to the acrostic form, meter, and varying number of poetic lines in the different chapters, it seems better to retain 1:7d as another example of the poet's freedom of sty1e. The same would also be true, contra Albrektson, for Lam 2:19 which also has four poetic lines instead of the usual three. To assume that the scribes who wrote marginal notes were at the same time poets, seems quite improbable.

A good example of where there may have been a marginal note incorporated into the Hebrew text is not recognised by Albrektson. The MT *Qere* of Lam. 1:11b reads *maḥămaddē-hem*, but the LXX pronoun *autēs* reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that read *maḥămaddēhā*, while the Syriac *reggathōn* reflects a Hebrew *maḥămaddām*. The *he* and *mem* were frequently

confused, and one can easily assume that the *he* or *mem* of the original suffix on this word was confused, giving rise to a marginal note marking the variant. However, the MT did not chose between a *mem* or *he*, it probably incorporated the marginal note into the text, conflating the two letters into the plural suffix *hm*.

On page 84, Albrektson notes that the Greek translator failed to understand the difficult Hebrew construction of the asyndetic relative clause contained in the *qārāʾtā* of Lam. l:21c. But Albrektson himself fails to note the same difficult construction in l:21b where *šamĕᶜu* is part of a relative clause (without the relative particle) modifying *ʾoyĕbay* which has *sāsû* as its predicate.

Another example of Albrektson's over-anxious defense of the MT against the LXX is his suggestion that in Lam 2:2c the Greek *basilea autē*s (for MT *mamlākah*) is due to an internal Greek corruption, namely, an original *basileian* corrupted to *basileia*. But this suggestion actually demands an emendation of the MT, for a Greek *basileian autēs* would demand a *Vorlage* reading *malkth*, not the *mmlkh* of the MT. This reviewer doubts that Albrektson really wishes to emend the MT on the basis of a Greek variant.

No serious study of the text and exegesis of Lamentations can be made without paying attention to the suggestions proposed by Albrektson; but at the same time, no serious student can afford to follow Albrektson without first re-examining the problems and possibilities involved.

In the last chapter of this book Albrektson presents his criticism of Norman Gottwald's views (which appeared in Gottwald's *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*) that the key to the theology of Lamentations is in the tension between the Deuteronomic doctrine of retribution and reward and the historic reality of destruction. This reviewer agrees with

Albrektson (contra Gottwald) that such a tension is not at all evident, for the writer of Lamentation emphasizes the fact that defiance and desertion have earned them their punishment. On the other hand, Albrektson's arguments for his own "key" to the theology of Lamentations seem as weak as Gottwald's. Albrektson states,

> 'The key to the theology of Lamentations is in fact found in the tension between specific religious conceptions and historical realities: between the confident belief of the Zion traditions in the inviolability of the temple and city, and the actual brute facts (of the destruction)" (p. 230).

As a basis for this statement, Albrektson seeks to show that the writer of Lamentations was reared in the temple traditions of Jersulaem, and particularly was influenced by the tradition of the inviolability of Zion. As evidence for this, Albrektson cites passages from Lamentations (namely, 2:l5c, 3:35, 4:12, 4:20, and 5:19) which contain ideas and words found in the Psalms of the Zion tradition. But it is doubtful on the basis of the evidence which Albrektson gives that these or other verses must be restricted to the "Zion tradition" alone. But even if one were to admit that the poetic lines cited were indirectly related to the "Zion tradition" as proposed, it seems to be quite unlikely that one can reconstruct a "key to the theology" by calling attention to only *five* out of 246 poetic lines.

In conclusion it may be stated that Albrektson's work marks a milestone in the study of the text and exegesis of Lamentations. It will serve as a useful tool for any future study of this biblical book.

A REVIEW
by
Thomas F. McDaniel.[1]
of
WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT'S
HISTORY, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND CHRISTIAN HUMANISM [2]

The scholarly contributions of William F. Albright need no introduction. To the contrary, they have been widely recognized and acclaimed in the United States, Europe and Israel. In the past twenty years, Albright has received twenty honorary doctorates from such universities as Harvard, Yale, Hebrew Union College, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Saint Andrews University, the University of Oslo, the University of Uppsala, etc. He is one of three humanistic scholars ever to have been elected to the American Academy of Sciences. Albright's first scholarly paper appeared in the *Orientalistiche Literaturseitung* in 1913, and they have poured forth ever since. The bibliography of Albright's works (including books, articles, reports, and book reviews) listed at the end of the Albright *Festschrift*, (entitled, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, edited by G. Ernest Wright) is a list of over 825 published scholarly contributions which appeared between 1911 and 1958.

The present book under review is the first in a series of books to be published by McGraw-Hill which will (1) gather together previously published articles which are now

---

[1] This review was published in 1966 in *Seisho to Shingaku*, which was the journal of the College of Theology of Kanto Gakuin University, Yokohama, Japan.

[2] New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964, ix / 342 pages.

thoroughly revised, annotated, and indexed, and (2) present
the results of Albright's continuing research and writing.
This first volume includes fifteen selected lectures, essays
and review articles—three of which have never been
published before.

The book is divided into four parts: Part One, consists of
three chapters, namely, "Toward a Theistic Humanism,'
"The Human Mind in Action: Magic, Science, and Reli-
gion," and "The Place of the Old Testament in the History
of Thought." Part Two, "Surveys of Special Areas," consists
of five chapters entitled respectively, "How Well Do We
Know the Ancient Near East?" "The Ancient Near East and
the Religion of Israel," "Islam and the Religions of the
Ancient Orient," "Historical Adjustments of Political
Authority in the Near East," and "Some Functions of
Organized Minorities." In the third part, "Some Scholarly
Approaches," Albright contributes a critical chapter on each
of the following scholars: James Breasted., Gerhard Kittel,
Arnold Toynbee, Eric Voegelin, and Rudolf Bultmann. The
last section of the book, "More Personal," consists of two
chapters entitled, "Return to Biblical Theology," and
"William Foxwell Albright (Autobiographical Sketch)."
The book concludes with an appendix containing some
chronological data on Albright's career and a full index of
names and subjects. In his own words, Albright notes that
"the first chapter, 'Toward a Theistic Humanism strikes the
keynote; the remaining fourteen chapters are supplementary
and illustrative" (p. v).

Since the first chapter is the keynote to the whole book, it
deserves the careful attention of the reader and reviewer. In
presenting his own views which lead "toward a theistic
humanism," Albright begins with a discussion of the three
main types of humanism: (1) classical, (2) modern atheistic,

and (3) recent theistic. With reference to the classical humanism of the Renaissance, Albright notes the indebtedness of the West to the mediating Arab and Jewish scholars who introduced Aristotle and Galen to the West in translation and the impetus given to classical studies in the West when the flood of Greek manuscripts and teachers entered Europe after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Albright traces the rise of atheistic humanism back to the nineteenth century, beginning with Auguste Comte's attempt to establish a "religion of humanity." Through the efforts of Ernest Renan, Gilbert Murray, James Breasted and the signers of the "Humanist Manifesto" (including John Dewey), the movement has continued through to the present day. (The journal, *The Humanists* should be consulted for contemporary leaders of the movement.) The atheistic humanists in general are criticized by Albright for devoting their energies to opposing religion rather than in a love for humanity— altruism in its highest sense (p. 66). John Dewey comes under Albright's severe criticism, not only for his optimistic meliorism, but for his dislike of history, his over-optimistic predictions on the Chinese Republic, and his treating of man as a subject for detached experimentation on the part of a scientific elite (i.e., materialistic experimentalism).

Albright gives his definition of theistic humanism as "the study and cultivation of our higher cultural heritage in light of Judeo-Christian religious tradition" (p. 10). Albright includes the following scholars among those who incorporate this ideal of theistic humanism: Christopher Dawson, Arnold Toynbee, Herbert Butterfield, Etienne Gilson, Jean Denielou and Henri de Lubac. There is not a German or an American scholar whom Albright would include in this list of theistic humanists. German professional specialization

prohibited a scholar from crossing boundaries into other academic areas. German philosophers remained primarily metaphysicians. Historians (like Eduard Meyer and Leopold von Ranke) remained historians; and "earlier twentieth-century German thinkers were philosophical idealists who seldom paid more than lip service to theism" (p. 11). The situation in America was somewhat different. Albright called attention to the earlier "intellectually underdeveloped" Roman Catholicism and the "evolutionary meliorism" of liberal American Protestantism which left out history and dismissed theology as irrelevant.

Albright notes that the decline of evolutionary meliorism after World War II and the advent of the nuclear Age has *no*t produced a theistic humanism in America or on the Continent, but various forms of neo-orthodoxy, existentialism, and a historico-philosophical theology (going back through Kierkegaard or Barth to earlier German thinkers). In this context Albright reviews and criticizes the contributions of Niebuhr, Tillich, Bultmann and Bultmann's disciples. For Albright, Tillich's ideas are often vague and contradictory: "through his (Tillich's) career he has shifted philosophical and theological notions and terms in a most bewildering fashion." On a protean substructure of Schelling's idealism and a strong vein of neo-Platonism "have been superimposed strong influence from Jung, less from Freud, and an increasing use of existentialist ideas and terminology." Of particular importance for Albright is the fact that there is no place for history in Tillich's system: "the revelation of God in history is replaced by direct intuition of God as "ultimate concern" and of one's current aesthetic preference as 'ultimate reality'" (p. 15). (His critique of Bultmann will be given later in this review.)

Since theistic humanism is rooted in a study of the higher cultural heritage in light of the Judeo-Christian tradition, Albright deals at some length with the scientific method of archaeology and the revolution in historical method. Natural science has had an impact on archaeology, not only through the radio carbon counts of nuclear physics, but in the discovery by geophysicists "that careful measurement of magnetic declination in iron molecules of ancient pottery ovens and baked-clay objects" is opening up a new method of determining archaeological dates. Furthermore, Albright notes, "the most important scientific triumph of archaeology is its autonomous development of scientific method . . . . (i.e.) the analysis of stratigraphic sequences and the classification in categories of all objects made by the hand of man (artifacts)." "The typology of human artifacts is just as Aristotelian in principle as is that of genetic variation," and philological and linguistic studies apply the standard principles of induction and classification, deduction and analogy.

The revolution in historical method as outlined by Albright consist of the methodology employed by archaeologist and by the philologists, the awareness the historian of his own "proto-philosophy" (his underlying logical postulates and philosophical principles), and the clear differentiation made in the types of historical cognition. Following Maurice Mandelbaum, Albright distinguishes five types of historical cognition/judgment: judgments of typical occurrence, judgments of particular facts, judgments of cause and effect, judgments of value, and judgments about personal reactions. The first three of these are objective in character, while the last two are almost purely subjective and affected directly by existential considerations. In this context, Albright states that "the epistemo-

logical importance of archaeology and comparable fields
ancillary to history, is that they deal almost entirely with
judgments of fact and typical occurrence rather than with
judgments of cause and effect, value or personal reactions,
thus redressing the imbalance which has given rise to
exaggerated forms of historical relativism" (p. 27).

In a brief survey of areas where archaeological discovery
has affected our understanding of the Bible, Albright deals
with the following areas:

(1) the patriarchal narratives and the Mari excavations.

(2) the *ᶜApiru*, the *ᶜIbri*, and the donkey-caravan traders.

(3) ancient legal codes and Wellhausen's Hegelian views.

(4) Syro-Hittite suzerainty treaties and biblical covenants.

(5) Hebrew inscriptions, Babylonian records and Israelite
history.

(6) the Qumran recensions, the Septuagint, and the com-
plexity of the textual tradition.

(7) Psalms and North-West Semitic philology.

(8) Egyptian papyri and the Semitic substratum of *koine*
Greek.

(9) Qumran scrolls, the Essenes and the New Testament
background.

(10) Chenoboskion (Nag Hammadi) codices, the origin of
the gnostics, and Bultmann's view of New Testament
dualism.

(11) the New Testament in relation to the Essenes and
Gnosticism.

In a subsection of Chapter One entitled, "Religion and
Civilization," Albright makes some general observations
with which most scholars would agree. For example. "there
is no known past culture of any kind without religion, and
no experienced archaeologist expects to find one." But his

statement that "archaeologist have now proved the historical as well as the contemporary primacy of Western civilization" will surely cause some disagreement among Japanese scholars, especially with reference to the "contemporary primacy," for most would disassociate technology from civilization. Although Albright does not give any documentation of this proof he has in mind, a statement toward the end of the book (p. 293) will show precisely what he means:

> The Near East was thousands of years in advance of any other focus of higher culture, and it is becoming more and more probable that other such foci (China, Middle America) owed part of their original stimulation to borrowing across continents and oceans. The tremendous advance of modern Western civilization when transplanted to Japan little over a century ago, is a vivid illustration of a process familiar to all serious historians. The great progress of the West in science and technology since the fifteenth century has come precisely because we stand on the shoulders of our Greco-Roman predecessors, not because we are in any way more gifted than the ancients.

Despite the fact that religion is the nucleus of all cultures of the past, philosophical idealists tend to agree with positivists and naturalists that religion will no longer be need when a "rational" culture can be developed. But Albright notes that two such contemporary "rational" cultures have been propagated by dictators who actually had to introduce "emotional and ceremonial. practices in imitation of older religions, particularly Germanic paganism and Eastern Christianity," i.e., the Nazi *Blut und Bloden* and emphasis on *die heilige Urquell deutsaher Macht* and the assorted communist "personality cults."

The first chapter of this book closes with a theme that is encountered again and again throughout the book, namely

that there are three distinct stages in the history of thought. For Levy-Bruhl's "prelogical" label for primitive thinking (later rejected by Levy-Bruhl, himself) Albright prefers the term "proto-logical." The following stages are "empirico-logical" and classical "formal logic." Proto-logical thought (which survives today in much modern art and poetry) was the thought pattern of early Egyptian, Sumerian, and Baby-lonian literature, but Israelite thought is primarily empirico-logical. Formal logic dawned with Thales of Miletus. It is in the third chapter that Albright develops this concept more thoroughly. There he states,

> "I place the Old Testament, from the standpoint of the his-tory of the ways of thinking, between the protological thought of the pagan world (which includes non-meta-physical Greco-Roman and Indic polytheism) and Greek systematic reasoning . . . . The religious literature of Israel is therefore mostly later than the now known canonical religious literature of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, the Hittites, Canaanites, etc. Nearly all these literatures reflect mytho-logical, i.e. proto-logical ways of thinking . . . . On the other hand, the literature of the Bible is earlier than any clear evidence of specific Greek literary or philosophical influence" (pp. 85–86).

In the Hebrew Bible we have something quite different from what preceded or followed it, and as an example of the empirico-logical thinking of the Israelites, Albright cites Israelite monotheism.

> "There is good reason to suppose that Moses was just as monotheistic as Hillel, though he could certainly not have employed the logical reasoning in support of his beliefs that was possible later . . . Formal creeds were impossible before classification, generalization, and syllogistic formulas were invented by the Greeks . . . . The implicit monotheism of the Old Testament was derived from Hebrew empirical logic,

i.e.,. "The intuitive (subconscious interpretation of empirical information) discovery that the incongruities of polytheism flouted the empirically realized unity of nature" (pp. 57, 91, 99).

By way of summing up Albright's views given in the first section of this book, this reviewer would call attention to Albright's views on the function of religion. He notes that,

> philosophical analysis remains essential, but all philosophical systems are Hellenic or post-Hellenic in conception; they are, therefore, based on either explicitly stated or presupposed postulates or assumptions. Since the ultimate postulates are not themselves subject to proof, philosophers have to reason logically from what George Boas calls their proto-philosophy, seldom explicitly developed. The more rigorous the internal logic of any system, the more uncertain are its conclusions, given the fact that one cannot rigorously prove any of the basic presuppositions in a philosophical system . . . . Religion alone unites the intellectual and aesthetic in man with the affective and altruistic. If man's biological and psychological evolution have required the synergistic collaboration of his genetic structure and environmental background, surely we cannot reject the religious feelings and aspirations of man as irrelevant to the evolution of the human spirit (pp. 8l–82).

More briefly we consider the main themes in the remaining sections of the book. In Chapter Four, "How Well Can We Know the Ancient Near East?" Albright notes the rise of American research in the area of Near Eastern studies (due to the brilliant career of James Henry Breasted) and the decline of such studies in Germany where, for example, the classical historian of Leipzig, Helmut Berve, affirmed that studies of the ancient orient were condemned to inactivity and lost their right to exist in the new standard of values within the realm of the German intellectual spirit. The bulk

of the chapter is given to a recital of the steps made in Near Eastern research since 1835, listing the many scholars and their significant contributions.

In the Chapter Five, "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel," Albright points out how the great Semitic and biblical scholars of the 19th century (including Nöldeke, Wellhausen, Robertson Smith, Budde, Driver, etc.) neglected and disregarded the new literary and philological material from the ancient orient, preferring instead to arrange the data of Israelite history according to the evolutionary philosophies of Hegel or the English positivists. Albright examines the four main groups of Ancient Near Eastern literature now available (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, West Semitic, and Hurro-Hittite) and comes to the following conclusion,

> the henotheistic form constructed by scholars sinks below the level attained in the surrounding ancient orient, where the only alternatives were polytheism or practical monotheism, henotheism in the sense used by most modern Biblical scholars being apparently unknown (p. 156).

In Chapter Six, "Islam and the Religion of the Ancient Orient," Albright seeks to demonstrate that the "Islamic civilization is essentially an outgrowth of Hellenism, just as Islam itself is an offshoot of Judeo-Christian religion." This is the opposite position of Winckler for whom the literature and folklore of late pre-Islamic and early Islamic Arabia were filled with reflections and carry-overs from the ancient Orient.

Chapter Seven deals with the historical patterns of political authority. Albright traces from the third millennium to the Roman period the two general patterns, namely, absolute royal power on the one hand and gerontocratic reaction against it on the other. It is in this chapter that the author

corrects a common error by many New Testament scholars In dealing with the Roman occupation of Judah: "Actually the Roman conquest (of the eastern Mediterranean basin) gave a new freedom and security to the common man—however little he might appreciate it when oppressed by publican exactions. For the first time in history a relatively uniform system of codified law—public law, not arbitrary royal decree or legal interpretation—spread over most of the civilized world. Under Augustus and the Antonines the Near East was probably more peaceful and more prosperous than ever before in history. But while republican forms were sedulously preserved in Rome itself, in the East the emperor became a real divinity both in official theory and in private belief. Jewish and Christian opposition to Rome was nearly always the direct result of irreconcilable hostility to emperor-worship" (p. 190).

Of interest to this reviewer in Chapter Eight, "Some Functions of Organized Minorities," is Albright's evidence that no religious majority has been guiltless in respect to intolerance and religious persecution. He. recalls, for example, the persecution by Asoka of Brahman and Buddhist heretics, the Vitasoka story of the kings slaying of 18,000 Hindus in a single day because a statue of Buddha had been destroyed, and the Brahman account of a king's issuing a proclamation that he would execute any subject of his that did not participate in the slaughter of the Buddhists.

The third section of this volume presents Albright's critique of the ideas and activities of five scholars. James Breasted (in Chapter Nine) receives his highest esteem for his Egyptian studies, his work in founding (with the aid of a Rockefeller grant) of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and making America the focus of interest for the recovery of the Ancient Near East. Albright, however, does no share Breasted's meliorism or humanism.

The chapters on Arnold Toynbee and Eric Voegelin are expansions of rather recent reviews that appeared in the 1957 edition of *From Stone Age to Christianity* and *Theological Studies*, 22, 1961, respectively. Since these works are rather readily available, they need not detain us in this review.

The harshest words in this volume are found in Chapter Ten, "Gerhard Kittel and the Jewish Question in Antiquity." Gerhard Kittel, the youngest son of Rudolph Kittel,

> "was a distinguished Protestant theologian, professor of New Testament at Tübingen and Vienna. . . . yet he became the mouthpiece of the most vicious Nazi anti-Semiticism, sharing with Emanuel Hirsch of Göttingen the grim distinction of making extermination of the Jews theologically respectable . . . Hirsch and Kittel were between them clearly responsible for much of the guilt resting on German Protestant churches for their silence while the Nazis were carrying out the liquidation of the Jews" (pp. 229 and 233).

Albright supports these statements with a careful analysis of *Das antike Weltjudentum*, written by Kittel in collaboration with Eugen Fischer. We need not review here either Kittel's work or Albright's analysis, but should note the closing sentence in this chapter, "And what happened in Germany can take place wherever the human intellect turns its back on the spiritual traditions which we have inherited from their sources in ancient Israel" (p. 240).

Chapter Thirteen, "Rudolph Bultmann on History and Eschatology," should be of interest to both the critics and disciples of Bultmann. The chapter is an expansion of a review which appeared in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (l958). Albright first registers his difficulty with Bultmann's acceptance of the "modern scientific world view" of the 20th century, for the following reasons: (1) the

supposed modern scientific world view is itself fluid, (2) ChristIanity is not dependent for its spiritual impact on the cosmology of any age, (3) there is no beed to demythologize accepted metaphors, (4) "we know so little about ultimate scientific reality that we cannot base theological revolutions on consensus of cosmological opinion in any period." When Bultmann states that there can be no intervention of supernatural powers in the inner life of the soul, he "demythologizes just as though we really knew something of the relation between man as a 'phenomenon' and the universe in which he lives" (p. 275).

And so Albright proceeds to hammer away at Bultmann's views on John's gnosticism, Essene gnosticism, the transmutation of eschatology into existential decisions of the "here-and-now" and the general human feeling of *Angst* in face of death and extinction. Bultmann is also accused (and rightly so) of distorting the chronological perspective by dealing with Greek historians first and then discussing Israelite historical writings against the background of Greek thought. In closing Albright calls attention to Bultmann's silence on the "Nazi Abomination of Desolation"—not as a personal criticism of Bultmann himself, "but rather (as) an emphasis on the stoic neutrality toward the problems of others which Bultmannian existentialism fosters" (p. 284).

The last section of this book, being more autobiographical than anything else, is better read than reviewed. So this reviewer would encourage the careful reading of this broad and stimulating book. Other volumes in this series are anxiously awaited.

Philological Studies in Lamentations. I (*)

Thomas F. McDaniel – Yokohama

The book of Lamentations has received the careful attention of numerous scholars during the past century. In addition to commentaries, numerous special studies have been directed to the problems of authorship, historical context, textual criticism, literary form and meter. But despite the advances which these past studies have made, many problems remain, including a number of obscure and enigmatic passages. The most recent extensive study of this text is Bertil Albrektson's *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations: With a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (1). It presents a summary of the views of the commentators on the exegetical problems of Lamentations as well as a detailed study of the Septuagint and Peshitta texts. Its value lies in establishing with tolerable certainty the underlying Hebrew text; but its weakness is in the fact that such versional studies seldom offer any real help in clarifying obscure passages once the text is established. Norman Gottwald, in his review of this book, concludes, "Albrektson's book shows that far more must be done to recover the *Sitz im Leben* and thought world of Lamentations " (2).

This study is the writer's attempt to further the inquiry by utilizing linguistic and literary materials which thus far have not been systematically employed in the study of the Hebrew text of

---

(*) This study represents the first two chapters (slightly modified and abbreviated) of the writer's doctoral dissertation submitted in May, 1966, to the Faculty of Philosophy of The Johns Hopkins University.

(1) (Studia Theologica Lundensia 21; Lund 1963) (cited hereafter as ALBREKTSON). Important reviews of this work have been published by P. WERNBERG-MØLLER, in *JSS* 10 (1965) 103-110; Mitchell DAHOOD, in *Bib* 44 (1963) 547-549 (cited hereafter as "Review of Albrektson"); and Norman GOTTWALD, in *JBL* 83 (1964) 204-207.

(2) Op. cit. 206.

Lamentations. The archaeological discoveries and resulting publication of new Northwest Semitic texts within the last half century have changed the whole approach to biblical Hebrew philology [1]. Numerous works have already appeared which deal generally with the relationship between the Ras Shamra discoveries and the Bible [2], and an increasing number of works continue to appear which deal with Hebrew and Northwest Semitic language and literature [3], including many studies which treat individual biblical books in the light of this new linguisitic material [4]. But the insights derived from this new material have only sporadically been brought to bear upon the problems of Lamentations. This study is offered as an addition to this growing corpus of scholarly literature, with the writer convinced that not only does reference to Northwest Semitic linguistics bring clarity to many lines in Lamentations, including

[1] See W. F. ALBRIGHT, "The Psalm of Habakkuk", *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. ROWLEY (New York 1950) 2; and William L. MORAN, "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background", *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (New York 1961) 56-58 (cited hereafter as MORAN, *BANE*).

[2] The most recent of these are Arvid S. KAPELRUD, *The Ras Shamra Discoveries and the Old Testament* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1963) and Edmund JACOB, *Ras Shamra–Ugarit et l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchâtel 1960). These works contain bibliographical references to earlier studies.

[3] See, for example MORAN, *BANE*; Mitchell DAHOOD, *Ugaritic–Hebrew Philology* (Rome 1965) (cited hereafter as *UHP*); IDEM, "Hebrew–Ugaritic Lexicography", *Bib* 44 (1963) 289-303; 45 (1964) 393-412; 46 (1965) 311-322 (cited hereafter as *HUL* I, II, III, respectively).

[4] Major studies in this latter category include John PATTON, *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* (Baltimore 1944); Charles L. Feinberg, *Canaanite Influence on the Language of Job* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1945); Cullen I. K. STORY, "The Book of Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Literature", *JBL* 64 (1945) 319-337; J. COPPENS, "Les paralleles du Psautier avec les textes de Ras Shamra–Ougarit", in the *Bulletin d'Histoire et d'Exégèse de l'Ancien Testament* 18 (1946) of the Séminaire Biblique, Louvain; Frank NEUBERG, *Ugaritic and the Book of Isaiah* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1950); Mitchell DAHOOD, "Canaanite–Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth", *Bib* 33 (1952) 30-52, 191-221; R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms", *VT* 4 (1954) 164-176; Mitchell DAHOOD, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome 1963); IDEM, *Psalms I* (AB 16; New York 1965); Marvin Pope, *Job* (AB 15; New York 1965).

ancient cruces, but that Lamentations sheds light upon the problems of how long and to what extent archaic Northwest Semitic linguistic elements survived in Hebrew literary traditions.

The first part of this study is given to lexical matters. In addition to obscure words which were enigmatic even to the early translators, other words which traditionally have been "adequately understood" will be examined in the light of Northwest Semitic cognates. When a more reasonable rendering is achieved by relating words to other cognates in Akkadian or Arabic (and in one case Egyptian), these suggestions are included in this study. In an attempt to show all cases of Canaanite parallels, and in order to assess their merit, the published suggestions of other scholars (particularly Mitchell Dahood) for reading of various words in Lamentations in terms of Northwest Semitic cognates or parallels have been included in either the text of the notes. In the last half of this study over twenty words or particles are presented in light of nine grammatical and syntactic elements which are common in Northwest Semitic and frequently attested in other, older parts of the Bible. Studies in this section have a twofold significance in that they bear directly upon the meaning given to many passages in Lamentations and indirectly illustrate the use of archaic linguistic elements in a literary work that comes from the mid-sixth century B.C.

I. Lexical Studies

1,1 rabbāti:

The word *rabbāti* as it appears here in the parallel phrases *rabbāti ʿām* and *rabbāti baggóyim* (in chiastic parallelism with *śārātī bammᵉdīnôt*) has traditionally been read as the feminine construct singular of the adjective *rab* 'great, much.' The Syriac renders it both times as *saggi'at*, the LXX translates *ē peplēthummenō*, but RSV gives two different readings, "full of ... great among" [1].

---

[1] A typical translation of the commentators is that of Max HALLER, "einst so volkreich... die einst gross unter Völkern", in his "Klagelieder", in M. HALLER and K. GALLING, *Die fünf Megilloth* (*HAT*; Tübingen 1940) 96. Most commentators agree that the *yodh* of *rabbāti* and *śārātī* is the *hireq compaginis*; see A. E. COWLEY, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as Edited and Enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch* (Oxford 1910) § 90¹ (cited hereafter as *GKC*).

A parallel to the phrase *rabbātî 'ām* occurs in 1 Sm 2,5, *wᵉrabbat bānîm 'umlālāh*, "she who had many children is forlorn". But there is no parallel to *rabbātî haggôyim* where this adjective occurs in the construct followed by a prepositional phrase as the *nomen rectum* ([1]).

Herman Wiesmann comes close to what must have been the original meaning and significance of *rabbātî* in his translation of 1,1b as, "*die Herrin über die Völker*", i.e., by translating the word as an honorific appellative like the *rbt* 'Lady, Mistress' which occurs in Ugaritic, Phoenician and Punic epithets. But in view of his rendering 1,1a as, "*die (einst) so gefolgreiche*", and his exegetical comments, it is obvious that he did not identify MT *rabbātî* with the honorific *rbt* but simply translated from context ([2]).

Instead of identifying this word with the adjective *rab*, one should probably read it as the feminine counterpart of the masculine substantive *rab* 'chief' (used as a title or a title component) ([3]) and equate it with the above-mentioned *rbt* 'Lady, Mistress'.

In the poetic idiom of Northwest Semitic honorific appellatives were frequently employed, usually in divine epithets in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Punic but with place names and references in Hebrew. The Ugaritic goddesses Anat and Asherah were often spoken of as *btlt 'nt*, "the Virgin Anat" and *rbt atrt ym*, "the Lady Aṯirat Yam" ([4]). In Phoenician and Punic the use of such honorific appellatives can be well illustrated by a typical formula from the dedicatory inscriptions, such as, *l'm lrbt ltnt pn b'l wl'dn lb'l ḥmn*, "to the Mother, to the Lady, to Tanit face of Baal, and to the Lord, to Baal Ḥamon" ([5]). In the personification of Zion, Judah and Israel, the Hebrew poets showed a preferance for *bᵉtûlāh* as in *bᵉtûlat bat ṣiyyôn* (Jer 14,17), *bᵉtûlat bat yᵉhûdāh* (Lam 1.15), and *bᵉtûlat yiśrā'ēl* (Jer 18.13). Even

---

([1]) See *GKC*, § 130ᵉ for other examples of this syntactic pattern of the noun in the construct followed by the preposition.

([2]) *Die Klagelieder übersetzt und erklärt*, ed. Wilhelm KOESTER (Frankfurt 1954) 107, and for his understanding of the text note his statement on p. 103, "nach der zweifachen Bedeutung von רב *viel* und *gross* bezeichnet רבתי hier die Vielheit, Menge der Menschen, in *b* die Grösse oder Erhabenheit der Stellung, die Jerusalem unter den Völkern einnahm (C. F. Keil)". (Cited hereafter as Wiesmann).

([3]) See, *sub voce*, BROWN–DRIVER–BRIGGS, JEAN–HOFTIJZER, and *UT*.

([4]) See especially *UT* § 19.540: § 19.2297.

([5]) CIS (Paris 1881) I. 298. Text 195.

Babylon, Egypt, and Sidon were addressed with this title (Is 47,1; Jer 46,11; Is 23,12). The widespread use of this honorific indicates that the similar epithet *rbt* could also be used.

The close parallelism between *rabbātî* and *śārātî* calls to mind the interchange of the masculine nouns *rab* and *śar* in the titles *rab-ṭabbāḥîm* (2 Kgs 25,8-9; Jer 39,9-10) and *śar haṭṭabbāḥîm* (Gn 37,36; 39,1; etc.). Similarily the Akkadian *rab ša rēši*, reflected in the Hebrew *rab sārîsāw* of Dn 1,3, is rendered in Hebrew as *śar hassārîsîm* in Dn 1,1-11. Such an interchange of the two masculine nouns would suggest that when *rabbātî* and *śārātî* come in parallelism one is presented with two feminine nouns of similar honorific import.

Additional support for equating MT *rabbātî* with the noun *rbt* 'Lady' is offered by Is 47,1-5, which is a close parallel to Lam 1,1 in that it is a call for Babylon to sit and mourn over her impending destruction. The passage employs three epithets for Babylon: *betûlat bat bābel*, *bat kaśdîm* and *geberet mamlākôt* (vv. 1, 5), i.e., two appellatives from the feminine honorifics and an appellative from the lexicon of royalty. This is precisely the combination of Lam 1,1, where *rabbātî* occurs two times in parallelism with *śārātî*.

Thus the epithets of 1,1 would be best translated as, "the Mistress of the people ... the Mistress among the nations ... the Princess among the provinces".

1,8 gam:

The traditional understanding of *gam* in 1,8c as reflected in the LXX *kai ge*, Syriac *'ap*, AV and RSV "yea" hardly fits the context of this colon since in the antecedent clauses of 1,8a-b there is nothing to suggest or necessitate the use of a particle or adverb of addition. For this reason it seems most probable that *gam* should be read here as the adverbial modifier of *ne'enḥāh*, "she groaned", with the meaning of "aloud, loudly" which it has in Ugaritic and elsewhere in biblical Hebrew.

In Ugaritic adverbial *gm* 'aloud' occurs frequently with the root *ṣḥ* 'to cry out', and perhaps with the root *ṣḥq* 'to laugh' [1]. Dahood's

---

[1] See GORDON, *UT* § 19.547. H. L. GINSBERG in his "The North Canaanite Myth of Anat", *BASOR* 98 (Apr., 1945) 22, n. 67, would restore II Aqht as *g]m tṣḥq 'nt* and translate, "loud]ly Anat laughs". He states,

identification of this adverbial *gam* as the modifier of the root *bākāh* in Ps 137,1 has been accepted by Gordon; and D. Beirne has noted the same use of *gam* in Nm 11,4, *wayyibkû gam bᵉnê yiśrā'êl* (¹).   In several other studies, Dahood has convincingly proposed to read this adverbial *gam* as the modifier with the roots *dāmam* (Jer 48,2), *qārā'* (Is 13,3), *yādāh* (Ps 71,22), and *hāgāh* (Ps 71,24) (²).

On the basis of this evidence wherein adverbial *gam* is employed with a wide variety of verbs, it seems most likely that MT *gam hî' ne'enḥāh* should be translated as, "loudly she groaned" (³).

1,16 'ênî 'ênî:

The LXX and Syriac read only one *'ênî*, but the Targum's *tᵉrên 'ênay* may well reflect the *'ênî 'ênî* of MT.   The commentators have almost without exception followed LXX and Syriac by deleting one of the two *'ênî*'s, but such emendation of the text seems unnecessary in light of approximate parallels in Jeremiah and Ugaritic (⁴).

H. L. Ginsberg, in 1946, called attention to the kinship between Jer 8,23, *mî yitten ro'šî mayim wᵉ'ênî mᵉqôr dimāh*, "O that my head were waters and my eyes a fountain of tears", and the text of *UT* 125: 25-27, *bn . al . tbkn . al | tdm . ly . al tkl . bn | qr . 'nk . mḫ . rišk | udm't*, "My son, weep not for me, do not wail for me.   Waste not thine eye with

---

"if correct this is the only passage where *gm* is used with any other verb than *ṣ-ḥ*".   The present writer finds support for this suggestion of Ginsberg by reading *gam* in Prv 1,26a as the adverb "aloud".   MT reads *gam 'ᵃnî bᵉ'êdᵉkem 'eśḥāq* which could be rendered, "I will laugh out loud at your calamity".   Syntactically Prv 1,26a (adverb–subject–prepositional phrase–verb) is quite similar to *UT* 51:VII:52-55 (adverb–prepositional phrase–subject–verb), *gm . lǧ/[lm]h . b'l kyṣḥ*, "verily Baal cried aloud to his servant".

(¹) DAHOOD, "Textual Problems in Isaia", *CBQ* 22 (1960) 402; GORDON, *UT* § 19.547; and BEIRNE, "A Note on Numbers 11,4", *Bib* 44 (1963) 201-203.

(²) "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible", *Greg* 43 (1962) 70; IDEM, *HUL* II, 399.

(³) In Prv 21,13, *gm* could also be read as "aloud", since there is nothing in the antecedent clause to necessitate the particle of addition, and the verse could be translated, "he who closes his ear to the cry of the poor will himself cry out loud, but he will not be heard /answered".

(⁴) See ALBREKTSON, 16-17, for a summary of the views of the commentators.

flowing, the brain (waters?) (¹) of thy head with tears". He states, "along with the more obvious points of similarity, note that in both passages there is a pun on the word *'ēnu/'ayin*, which means both 'eye' and 'fountain' " (²).

In 1960, Dahood pointed out the similarity of this Ugaritic passage to Lam 1,16a (when emended by deleting a *yodh*), the Ugaritic *qr 'nk*, "the fount of your eyes", being semantically identical with Hebrew *'ēn 'ēni* (for MT *'ēnî 'ēnî*), "the fount of my eyes" (³). In view of the extensive use of paronomasia throughout biblical literature (⁴) and the striking similarity of these two motifs effected through this minor emendation, Dahood's reconstruction appears correct and the colon should be translated, "the fount of my eye runs down with water" (⁵).

1,19 hĕmmāh:

Hĕmmāh followed here by the plural verb with pronominal suffix, *rimmûnî*, appears at first to be the third person plural pronoun "they". Yet there is no apparent reason why the subject of the verb should be emphasized since it is the verb, the action of the "lovers", which demands attention. If *hĕmmāh* is the pronoun it is simply an extra word used to extend the line metrically. But

(¹) The emendation of the text here to read "waters" was suggested by S. GEVIRTZ in "Ugaritic Parallels to Jeremiah 8:23", *JNES* 20 (1961) 42, and involves the reading of ⚌ (y) for ⚍ (ḥ), a type of error attested elsewhere, as in 'nt V:45. The emendation has been accepted by GORDON (*UT* § 4.13) and DAHOOD (*UHP* 5, 42). Marvin POPE, however, questions the emendation; see his "Marginalia to M. Dahood's *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*", *JBL* 85 (1966) 456.

(²) H. L. GINSBERG, *The Legend of King Keret* (*BASOR* Supplementary Studies, Nos. 2-3; New Haven 1946) 45. (Cited hereafter as *BASOR* SS 2-3).

(³) "Dittografia, glossa o paronomasia?", *RBibIt* 8 (1960) 364-365.

(⁴) For a full discussion on biblical paronomasia, see Immanuel CASANOWICZ, "Paronomasia in the Old Testament", *JBL* 12 (1893) 105-167; Robert GORDIS, "Koheleth—Hebrew or Aramaic?", *JBL* 67 (1952) 103-109; and A. GUILLAUME, "Paronomasia in the Old Testament", *JSS* 9 (1964) 282-290.

(⁵) The meter of this line would be 3 + 3, with eight syllables in each half of the bicolon.

rather than being the pronoun, it is more likely that *hēmmāh* is here a demonstrative particle, equal in force to *hinnēh*.

C. Virolleaud was the first to recognize that Ugaritic *hm* was, 'une autre form de *hn* = הִנֵּה' ([1]). In *UT* 52 : 42-43, *whm a[t]tm tṣḥn* is followed by the variant in line 46, *whn attm tṣḥn*, both meaning, "and behold the women cry out". A semantic parallel to this demonstrative use in Ugaritic of *hm* 'if' is the Amarna *šumma* (generally rendered "if"), as noted by W. L. Moran, "abandoning 'denn' [the reading of Knudtzon] in view of the comparative evidence (Hebrew, South Arabic, Ugaritic, etc.) we retain the more original force of the particle, conventionally rendered by, 'lo, behold' " ([2]).

The use of Hebrew *hēmmāh* with its original demonstrative force was first pointed out by John H. Patton who cited several examples occurring in Psalms ([3]). Additions to the list cited by Patton have been made by Cross and Freedman, Milik, and Dahood — for a total of at least fourteen examples cited ([4]). *Hēmmāh* as it occurs here in Lam 1,19, may well be added to the list, for in reading the demonstrative particle instead of the pronoun, the desiderated emphasis becomes transparent by translating, "I called to my lovers, (but) behold, they betrayed me!"

2,1 yā'ib:

The Syriac *'a'ib* 'overcloud, darken' and the LXX *egnophōsen* 'obscure, darken' both connect this *hapax legomenon* with *'āb* 'cloud', a reading accepted by many exegetes, though rejected by others in preference for an Arabic cognate *'yb*, 'blame, revile' ([5]). Neither

---

([1]) "La Mort de Baal", *Syr* 15 (1934) 311. See Joseph AISTLEITNER, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin 1963) 90, for a list of occurrences of *hm* 'behold' in Ugaritic. GORDON (*UT* § 19.773) does not include this meaning "behold" in his discussion of *hm*.

([2]) "Amarna *šumma* in Main Clauses", *JCS* 7 (1953) 78. See also MORAN, *BANE* 61.

([3]) *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* 37.

([4]) Frank M. CROSS, Jr. and David N. FREEDMAN, "The Blessing of Moses", *JBL* 67 (1948) 195; J. T. MILIK, "Deux documents inédits du désert de Juda", *Bib* 38 (1957) 252, n. 1; and DAHOOD, "The Language and Date of Psalm 48(47)", *CBQ* 16 (1954) 16; IDEM, "Some Northwest Semitic Words in Job", *Bib* 38 (1957) 306-307; IDEM, *Psalms I* 56, 291.

([5]) See ALBREKTSON, 86, where he cites Ewald, Keil, Budde, Löhr, Haller, Wiesmann, Weiser, and Kraus in favor of reading "overcloud",

identification seems satisfactory. In the context of Jerusalem's utter destruction and in view of the verbs that follow in the succeeding verses (*hišlik, billaʿ, hāras, higgiaʿ, gādaʿ*) the terms "overcloud" or "revile" seem too weak.

The root behind MT *yāʿib* is more likely to be the Egyptian (and Arabic) *wʿb*. Albright has argued that this root has a semantic development closely akin to that of *ḥāram*. He states, "in Hebrew the denominative verb *heḥrîm* means both, 'to devote something to destruction as abominable' and 'to consecrate something to God as sacred'. An excellent illustration is offered by the stem *wʿb* which means 'to purify' in Egyptian whereas in Hebrew the derived noun *tôʿebāh* means 'negative tabu, abomination' ". Albright also suggests that "the original sense of the root may be preserved partly in Arabic *waʿaba*, 'to take (something) entirely', i.e. to have something intact or unsullied" (¹). It seems quite possible that the original root *wʿb* persisted in Hebrew down to the time of the exile (independent of the denominative verb *tāʿab*) with a semantic development comparable to *ḥrm*. The MT *'ēkāh yāʿib* could reflect an original *Hiph'il* of *wʿb*, as either איך הועיב or איכה (ה)ועיב with the same meaning as the *Hiph'il* of the denominative verb, *hitʿib* 'make abominable'. Such an understanding of the verb permits the following translation of 2,1a, "O how the Lord in his anger has made an abomination of the daughter Zion!" This rendering finds a very close parallel in Ps 106,40, "the anger of the Lord was kindled against his people, he made an abomination (*wayᵉtāʿēb*) of his inheritance".

2,2 ḥillēl mamlākāh:

The noun *mamlākāh* in this passage has been identified by Albright, followed by Dahood, as a nominal form like Phoenician *mmlkt* 'king' (²). Other passages where *mamlākāh* has the meaning

---

and Ehrlich, Rudolph, Meek, and Kopf as those who favor "revile" or "disgrace". Albrektson prefers the meaning "overcloud".

(¹) *From Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore ³1957) 176, n. 45. One might also note the Arabic causative *'awʿaba* 'to eradicate, extirpate, cut off' as listed by E. W. LANE, *An Arabic English Lexicon* (London 1863-85) 2951.

(²) ALBRIGHT, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems", *HUCA* 23 (1950-51) I, 34; DAHOOD, "Review of Albrektson" 548.

of 'king' are 1 Sm 10,18; 1 Kgs 10,20 and Ps 68,30. This writer concurs with the identification in the latter passages, but has some reservations about the identification here in 2,2c, since the phrase recurs in 2,9b as *malkāh wᵉśārèhā*. The initial *mem* of *mamlākāh* may well have been read originally as the final letter of the preceding *ḥll*, and the final *he* as the feminine suffix (¹).

Consonantal *ḥllm* could stand for the plural *ḥᵉlālîm*, as object of *higgîᵃʿ*, reflecting the same syntactical structure as in 2,14c (verb–prepositional phrase–object / appositional double object). But it could equally as well stand for *ḥālāl* with enclitic or adverbial *mem* reflecting the syntactical pattern of 2,1b (verb–prepositional modifier–adverbial accusative / compound object) (²). Translating after this latter suggestion, the bicolon could read, "he has struck to the ground, fatally wounded, her king and her princess" (³).

2,6a wayyaḥmos kaggan śukkô:

The reading and meaning of this clause has yet to receive a satisfactory explanation. The commentators are widely divided as to whether MT *kaggan* should be (1) retained in accord with the Syriac ʿayk *gannᵉtā*', "like a garden", (2) read as *kᵉgepen*, "like a vine", in accord with LXX ʿōs *ampelon*, or (3) emended to read *kᵉgannāb*, *kᵉqaw* or the like. Similarly there is uncertainty as to whether MT *śukkô* should be (a) read as equal to *sukkô*, which appears in twenty-seven manuscripts of Kennicott, meaning "his booth" and identified with the temple as in Ps 27,4-5, or (b) related to *mᵉśukkāh* 'hedge, fence' (⁴). The recent suggestion of Albrektson, who translates

---

(¹) No support for the identification of *mmlkh* with "king" can be drawn from the LXX *ebebēlōse basilea autēs*, for while the initial *mem* of *mmlkh* could be reflected in *basilea*, the final *he* was read as a suffix and rendered by *autēs*. Most commentators assume that the LXX *Vorlage* had only *malkāh*, while ALBREKTSON (88) prefers to see an inner-Greek corruption (original *basileian* corrupted into *basilea*, which would presuppose an original Hebrew *mmlkth*).

(²) Compare the syntax of 2,21a. A discussion of] the adverbial and enclitic *mem* will be found in the Second Part of this article, to be published in *Bib* 49 (1968) fascicle 2.

(³) Perhaps a poetic recall of the events recorded in Jer 52,9-11, 24-27; 2 Kgs 25,3-6.18-21.

(⁴) For bibliography and fuller discussion of the traditional readings of the verse, see ALBREKTSON, 94-97.

the phrase, "he has broken down his booth as in a garden", and his exegetical comment that this is "a concise way, typical of Hebrew poetry, of saying 'he has broken down his booth as easily as one shatters a booth in a garden' ", is not very convincing (¹). Clues from early Hebrew orthography and Northwest Semitic syntax provide a more reasonable explanation.

MT *śukkô* should be disassociated from the roots *śkk* and *skk* and their derived nouns, "hedge" and "booth". Instead MT *śkw* should be associated with the noun *śôk* 'branch' which appears in Jgs 9,48-49, *wayyikrōt śôkat 'ēṣîm wayyikrᵉlû* ... *'îš śôkōh*, "and he cut off a branch of the tree, and each one (of them) cut off a branch" (²). Like the *'nšw* (*'anašêw* or *'anašaw*) 'his men' found in the contemporaneous Lachish Letters, MT *śkw* retains the original defective orthography of the plural noun with third masculine singular suffix, *śôkāw* 'its branches' (³).

Once MT *śukkô* is corrected to *śôkāw* it becomes clear that LXX *ampelon* 'vine' retains the desiderated noun behind MT *gan*, which should be restored to read *gepen*. The haplography of the medial *pe* in *gepen* could easily have occurred in the palaeo-Hebrew script when there was greater similarity between the letters *pe* (⌐) and *nun* (⌐) (⁴). Although the noun *śôk* does not occur elsewhere in the O.T. with *gepen*, the fact that the six most common terms used for vine branches are also used for tree branches (olive, fig, cedar) would seem to indicate that there was no real distinction made between the vine and trees (⁵). In Ugaritic the vine is referred to as

(¹) Ibid. 95.

(²) See S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford ²1913) XXXIV-XXXV, where he notes that the *he* of *śôkōh* is not the feminine ending but the original orthography of suffix *-ahū*. As in Jewish Aramaic and Syriac, the noun *śôk* occurs in Hebrew in both a masculine and a feminine form.

(³) See Frank M. CROSS, Jr. and David N. FREEDMAN, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (Baltimore 1952) 54-55, 68-69. Compare the *Qere* and *Kethib* of Lam 3,25.32.39.

(⁴) Compare G. R. DRIVER, "Once Again Abbreviations", in *Textus, IV: Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project*, ed. S. TALMON (Jerusalem 1964) 80, where he cites MT *gn* here as one of fifteen examples where the medial letter(s) were omitted by way of abbreviation. But here haplography seems more plausible than abbreviation.

(⁵) These are *zᵉmôrah* (Nm 13,23, Ez 15,2), *yôneqet* (Ps 80,12, Ez 17, 22), *dāliyyot* (Ez 17,6-7, Jer 11,16), *'ānāp* (Ps 8,11, Lv 23,40), *pōʾrāh*

a tree in the expression *dm 'ṣm*, "blood of the trees", which occurs in parallelism with *yn* 'wine', like the Hebrew *dam 'ᵃnābîm* in parallelism with *yayin* (*UT* 51:IV:37-38; Gn 49,11).

The final clue for understanding this colon is in the reading and meaning of the preposition. *Beth* and *kaph* were frequently mistaken for one another after the introduction of the square script when their forms became much more alike (¹). A scribal error of this kind is reflected in this verse. By reading MT *k* as *b* with the meaning here of "from" (²), the text as reconstructed would read *wayyaḥmos baggepen śōkāw*, "and he has stripped from the vine its branches". This reflects the imagery of Hos 10,1, *gepen bôqēq yiśrā'ēl*, "Israel is a luxuriant vine".

The syntax of 2,6 appears to be the reverse of what occurs in 3,34-36. The poetic stanza of the latter consists of a delineation of three unethical deeds (34, 35, 36a) followed by the declarative summation, "the Lord does not approve". The poetic stanza of 2,6 *begins* with the declarative, "he has stripped from the vine its branches", and in the remaining lines of the stanza there is a delineation of the three branches stripped away, namely, the place of sacrifice, the appointed feast and sabbath, and the king and priest.

2,10 yiddᵉmû:
3,26 wᵉdûmām:
3,28 wᵉyiddōm:

These verbs have generally been related to *dāmam* 'be silent' as illustrated by LXX *esiōpēsan*, *'ēsuchasei*, *siōpēsetai* and RSV "in silence", "quietly", and "in silence". But several scholars have questioned this meaning of *dāman*, first in the light of Akkadian and recently in the light of Ugaritic cognates. The derivation

---

(Ez 17,6, Is 10,33), and *śārîg* (Gn 40,10; Jl 1,7). This lack of distinction between vine branches and tree branches is quite natural since "the grape vine ... assumes the habit of a tree, with a stem up to one and a half feet in diameter" (H. N. and A. L. MOLDENKE, *Plants of the Bible* (Waltham 1952) 243.

(¹) See Friedrich DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament* (Berlin–Leipzig 1920) 110.

(²) A discussion on the interchange of *b* and *min* will be found in Part II of the present study, to be published in *Bib* 49 (1968) fascicle 2.

suggested by Friedrich Delitzsch in 1884, that Hebrew *dmm* equals
Akkadian *damâmu* 'to mourn, moan' was followed by Paul Haupt,
who in 1909 advanced the theory that there was no Hebrew root
dmm 'to be silent' but only *dmm* 'to mutter, moan' and *dwm* 'to
abide, wait '([1]). In 1913, George Schick made a study of the roots
dāmam and *dûm* and their semantic development as reflected in
biblical Hebrew. His conclusions generally confirmed the theory of
Haupt ([2]). What is of particular note here are Schick's conclusions
and his translations of these passages in Lamentations. His trans-
lation of 2,10, "there sat on the ground mourning maid Zion's elders",
anticipated the understanding of the verse suggested by Dahood over
fifty years later on the basis of Ugaritic *dmm* and the widespread
imagery of "sitting and mourning" ([3]).

On the basis of the parallelism of *dmm* with *bky* in such a pas-
sage as *UT* 125:25-26, *bn.al.tbkn.al / tdm.ly*, "my son, cry not for
me, do not grieve for me", Dahood cites at least seven passages (in-
cluding Lam 2,10, but not 3,26 or 3,28) where Hebrew *dmm* has
the meaning "to mourn, weep". In light of the convincing evidence
from both Akkadian and Ugaritic, it seems much more advisable
to follow Schick and Dahood rather than the traditional under-
standing, and translate 2,10 "the elders of the daughter Zion sat
on the ground mourning".

Schick also suggested transposing the *weyiddōm* of 3,28 with the
wedûmām of 3,26, and translated the transposed lines as, "it is good
to wait and stay for JHVH's help", (3,26) and "let him sit alone
and moaning when it is laid upon him (3,28) ([4]). While the meaning
which Schick gives these verses seems correct, his transposition of
the two clauses seems unnecessary. In the light of Ps 37,7, *dóm
layhwh wehithōlēl lô*, "wait for Yahweh and hope in him", and Ps 62,6,
'ak lē'lōhîm dômmi napši kî mimmennû tiqwāti, "O my soul, wait for
God alone, for from him comes my help", this writer would concur

---

([1]) See DELITZSCH, "Specimen Glossarii Ezechielico–Babylonici", in
S. BAER, *Liber Ezechielis* (Leipzig 1884) XI; and Haupt, "Some Assyr-
ian Etymologies", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Liter-
atures* 26 (1909) 4.

([2]) *The Stems Dûm and Damâm in Hebrew* (Leipzig 1913).

([3]) Ibid. 22; DAHOOD, *CBQ* 22 (1960) 400-402; IDEM, *HUL* II, 402-
403; IDEM, *Psalms I* 25. To Dahood's list of the occurrences of
"sit and mourn", Is 47,5; Jer 15,17; and Lam 3,28 should be added.

([4]) SCHICK, op. cit. 22-23.

with Schick that the roots in 3,26 are *dûm* 'to wait, stay' and *yāḥal* in *Hiph'îl* 'to wait, to hope for''.   By reading 3,26 MT *weyāḥil wedû-mām* as *weyāḥilû dômēm* (or *dômām*)—a corruption due simply to misdivision—a suitable reading for this context appears without changing the consonantal text or without the questionable trans-position.   The subject of the plural verb *yāḥilû* would be the *qōwāw*. ''those who wait for him'', of 3,25a; and *dômēn* the intensive *Pōlēl* infinitive used adverbially (*GKC* § 114ʰ¹), with the second possibility, *dômām*, being the *Qal* infinitive with enclitic *mem*.   Thus 3,26 might be best rendered as ''it is good that they have hope (while) awaiting the salvation of Yahweh''.

The MT of 3,28, as is, contains two clauses that speak of mourn-ing.   *Yēšēb bādād* is discussed below.   Here it should be noted that MT *weyiddôm* like the *yiddemû* of 2,10 should be associated with *dmm* 'to mourn, moan', not the traditional ''be silent''.   This poetic line should probably be translated as, ''Let him sit moaning and let him mourn when (the yoke) is laid upon him''.

3,28 bādād:

Although not next in the textual sequence followed in this sec-tion, it seems best in the context of the above discussion on *dāmam* 'to mourn, moan' to consider what may well be a synonym, namely *bādād*.   The poetic stanza consisting of 3,28-30, employs the imagery and motifs of a mourning scene much like those found in 2,10.   Just as *yitten be'āpār pîhû* (3,20) is a variant of the same theme expressed in 2,10c as *hôrîdû lā'āreṣ rō'šan*, so the *yēšēb bādād weyiddôm* (3,28) is likely to be but a variant of the *yēšebû lā'āreṣ yiddemû* in 2,10a, or the *šebî dûmām* of Is 47,5.

In such a clearly elegiac context, the traditional meaning of *bādād* 'alone, solitary' seems somewhat inappropriate since isolation and separation were probably no more a part of the ancient Near Eastern mourning scene than were silence or quietude (¹).   The ar-tistic representations of mourning from Egypt to Phoenicia depict mourners in groups (²).   In biblical and extra-biblical literature alike the mourning ritual is a group activity — the following plurals are

(¹) Ibid. 22; contrast Norbert LOHFINK, ''Enthielten die im Alten Testament bezeugten Klageriten eine Phase des Schweigens?'', *VT* 12 (1962) 275-277.
(²) *ANEP*, plates 456-459, 638.

typical: *šam hannāšîm yōšᵉbôt mᵉbakkôt* "there sat the women weeping", (Ez 8,14) and *'rb.b/kyt.bhklh.mšspdt.bhzrh*, "weeping women entered his palace, wailing women his courtyard" (I Aqht 171-172, cf. 182-184).

A more plausible meaning of *bdd* when it occurs in an elegiac context as here may be "to moan, groan, or mutter". One might infer from the use of *yāšab bādād* in parallelism with *dāmam* that they are somewhat synonymous. The inference is strengthened by a motif occurring in both Akkadian and Hebrew, in which in Akkadian the root *dmm* occurs, while in Hebrew the root *bdd* appears. In "Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi" the following analogy is given, "I moan like a dove (*ki-ma su-um-me a-dam-mu-ma*) all my days; [for a] song I emit groans" (107-108) ([1]). The similar motif as it appears in Ps 102,8 reads, *šāqadtî wā'ehgeh* (MT *wā'ehyeh*) *kᵉṣippôr bôdēd 'al gāg*, "I lie awake and moan, I like a bird moaning / muttering on the roof" ([2]).

Further support for identifying *bdd* in an elegiac context as a synonym of *dāmam* (and, if the above emendation and understanding of Ps 102,8 is correct, as a synonym also of *hāgāh*) can possibly be derived from the Ugaritic *bd*. In *UT* 125:5-6, *bd* appears in parallelism with *bky* 'weep, mourn'. The bicolon reads, *bd.att.ab.ṣrry/tbkyk.ab*, "the women will chant, O my father, the co-wives will mourn thee, my father ([3])". Albright reads *bd* as an infinitive from the root *b(w)d*, and if this be correct, Ugaritic *bd* and Hebrew *bdd* would reflect an original *radix bilittera* appearing as both עוד and עיד with the same meaning, like *nwd/ndd* 'wander', *mwš/mšš* 'feel', and Hebrew *dwk*, but Arabic and Aramaic *dkk* 'beat' ([4]).

([1]) W. G. LAMBERT, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford 1960) 36. See also C. J. Mullo WEIR, *A Lexicon of Accadian Prayers* (London 1934) *sub voce summatu*.

([2]) The writer is indebted to Dr. D. R. Hillers for having made available to him an unpublished paper on "The 'Lonely Bird' of Ps 102,8". The emendation follows G. BEER, *Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen* (Marburg 1894) 74. Dr. Hillers suggests translating *bôdēd* in this verse by "singing".

([3]) Translation follows ALBRIGHT, "Baal-Zephon", *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet* 3. Compare the reading of this line as preferred by POPE (*JBL* 85 [1966] 460-462). Pope's view does not permit the possibility of an ellipsis in the parallel lines (*UT* 125:19-20, 104-6). *Ṣrry* in *UT* 125:19 and 104 could be in apposition to *att*. (Pope's reference to the passage in Dahood should be corrected from 8.61 to 861).

([4]) On the other hand one cannot rule out the possibility that Ugaritic *bd* may be the infinitive of *bdd*. As Hillers states, "it is true that

While Ugaritic *bd* in parallelism with *bky* (and Hebrew *bdd* followed by *dmm*) seems best translated as "mourn, moan", it should be recognized that Ugaritic *bd* also appears in parallelism with *šr* 'to sing' and may even have the meaning of "play (an instrument)". This spread of meanings found within the Hebrew and Ugaritic uses of *bd/bdd* is quite similar to the range of meanings found in the verbal and nominal uses of the root *hāgāh* which include the roar of thunder, the growl of a lion, the moaning of a dove, the sighing and moaning in lament, meditation of the heart, plus a musical nuance in Ps 92,4; 9,17 [1].

2,22 m°gûray missābîb:

Most commentators relate this phrase to the similar phrase occurring repeatedly in Jeremiah as *māgôr missābîb*, and translate the line more or less like RSV, "thou didst invite as to the day of an appointed feast my terrors on every side" [2]. Assuming for the moment that this identification is correct, it is not at all certain that the phrase should be translated here or in Jeremiah as "terror(s) all around". In a study on this expression by A. M. Honeyman, it has been pointed out that the translation "terror all around" goes back no further than to Kimchi. The LXX never relates *māgôr* to the idea of fear or terror, nor does the Targum, which associated it with the combined meaning of "assembling" and "destroying", e.g. Jer 20,3, "but they will assemble against you to kill by the sword from all around". Honeyman proposes to translate *māgôr* as "destruction", (except for Is 31,9 where it does mean "terror") partly on the basis

---

on the basis of Hebrew one would expect an infinitive absolute *bdd* if the root were *bdd*, but ... we have no other certain examples of the infinitive absolute of verbs of this class, and one cannot be certain that the Ugaritic form would be like the Hebrew" (unpublished paper, see above note 2, p. 41).

[1] See BROWN–DRIVER–BRIGGS, *sub voce*. For another occurrence of *bd* in Hebrew, see POPE, *Job* 263, where MT *b°dê šōpār* in Job 39,25 is translated, "at the call of the trumpet". Lam 1,1 *yāš°bāh bādād* could possibly also be read as "she sat mourning/moaning", but in light of Is 49,21, *hēn °anî niš°artî l°baddî*, "behold, I was left alone", it is probably best to follow the traditional reading, "she sits alone", the parallelism being with *k°almānāh*, "like a widow".

[2] See ALBREKTSON, 124-125.

of the Targum's reading and partly on his understanding of the pun on Pashur's name, which he believes to be made up of the roots *pšḥ* 'to strip away' and *shr* 'to travel around' coalescing into *pšḥr* (¹).

As attractive as this suggestion is for the occurrences of the phrase in Jeremiah, it does not improve the reading here in 2,22. "He has invited ... my destructions" is as awkward and as unusual as "he has invited ... my terrors". In view of the awkwardness of the phrase whether translated by "terror" or "destruction", and in view of the fact that the phrases have neither the same function nor form, they should be disassociated. Nowhere else does *māgôr* appear with a suffix or occur as the object of *qārā'*.

A more plausible meaning of *meǵûray* may be found by relating it to the Akkadian *gerû* 'to be hostile' (G-stem) and *gurrû* 'to make war, to open hostilities' (D-stem) (²). The Hebrew cognates *gārāh* and *gûr* (which occur only in *Pi'ēl/Hithpa'ēl* and *Qal/Hithpō'ēl*, respectively) usually have the meaning "to stir up strife, quarrel" (³). It seems quite possible that these verbs were also used in *Hiph'îl*, with the same force of meaning as the D-causative *gurrû* 'to make war' or 'to attack'. Thus for MT *meǵûray* the writer would propose to read *meǵîray*, a participle plural (*Hiph'îl*) with noun suffix understood like that of *qāmay* (which equals *qamîm 'ālāy*), "those that rise up against me" (Lam 3,62; Ps 18,40.49), *meḥôlālay*, "all that are mad with me" (Ps 102,9), or *kol šôbèhā*, "all that fight against her" (Is 29,7) (⁴). The restored *meǵîray missābîb* would have the meaning, "my attackers / assailants from all over".

The root *gr* 'attack' (G-stem) probably occurs in the following lines of the Keret text: *wgr.nn.'rm.šrn / pdrm* (110-111, see also 212). H. L. Ginsberg, following T. H. Gaster, translates the lines, "and do thou *attack* the villages, *harass* the towns" (⁵). Similarily Driver translates, "and attack the cities, destroy the towns" (⁶).

(¹) A. M. HONEYMAN, "Māgôr Mis-sābîb and Jeremiah's Pun", *VT* 4 (1954) 424-426.

(²) *CAD* V (G), 61.

(³) See BROWN–DRIVER–BRIGGS, *sub voce*.

(⁴) See *GKC* § 116¹.

(⁵) *BASOR* SS 2-3, pp. 16, 38.

(⁶) *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh 1956) 146. Not all scholars agree that this is the meaning of *gr*. Gordon gives no meaning to the root in his glossary, and earlier translated these lines as, "And *occupy* the towns / *Invest* the cities". (GORDON, *Ugaritic Literature* [Rome

The image of Yahweh summoning an aggressive force for an attack is met elsewhere, as in Is 13,3, where it appears in the same idiom as proposed here, the verb *qārā'* plus accusative: *qārā'tî gibbôray*, "I have summoned my mighty men". Rather than the awkward "invite my terrors", it is most probable that the writer intended *tiqrā' mᵉgiray* to mean "thou hast summoned my assailants". Thus it seems best to disassociate the *mᵉgiray missābîb* here in Lamentations from the *māgôr missābîb* in Jeremiah (which perhaps should be read with Honeyman as "destruction all around").

3,16 hikpišanî:

In 1897, F. E. Peiser correctly identified this *hapax legomenon* by relating it to the Amarna *kapašu* 'to trample' [1]. Hebrew *kapaš*, as a by-form of *kābāš* 'to tread down, subdue', reflects the interchange of *beth* and *pe* that is now attested in Ugaritic, Phoenician Aramaic as well as Hebrew [2]. Dahood has cited the above contribution of Peiser and follows him by translating 3,16b as, "he trampled upon me in the dust" [3].

3,58 rîbê:

The plural forms *ribîm* and *ribôt* of the noun *rîb* are both very rare, occurring only five times altogether in the O.T. the former three times (in the construct) and the latter twice. The MT *rîbê*

1949] 69). Aistleitner in his *Die Mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra* (Budapest 1959) 91, translates the line as, "Weizen-(felder) umgeben die Stadt, bei der Ortschaft ist (üppiges) Getreide". Compare also John Gray, *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, (Leiden ²1964) 45-46.

[1] "Miscellen", *ZAW* 17 (1897) 350-351.

[2] See Dahood, *HUL* I, 303; *HUL* III, 320; Idem, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome 1963) 10, 32, 43 (cited hereafter as *PNWSP*); Idem, *UHP* 8-9; Gordon, *UT* 5.28; and Giovanni Garbini, *Il semitico di Nord-Ovest* (Instituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, Quaderni della sezione linguistica degli Annali 1; Napoli 1960) 23-24; and for the East Semitic evidence, see Franz M. Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kanaanismen* (Leipziger Semitische Studien V/2; Leipzig 1909) 20-22; and W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (AnOr 33; Rome 1952) 27-28.

[3] *HUL* III, 331.

napši (which is reflected in LXX *tas dikas tēs psuchēs mou*), "the causes of my soul" occurs only here. Some commentators suggest reading the more normal singular, *rib napši* ([1]). Another plausible emendation has been proposed by Dahood on the basis of Ps 35,1, *ribāh yhwh 'et yerîbay*, which he translates, "attack, O Yahweh, those who attack me". Assuming haplography of *yodh*, Dahood reads *'adōnāy yerîbê* for MT *'adōnāy rîbê*. By taking the initial verb as a precative and giving *yārîb* the same meaning it has Ps 35,1, Dahood translates, "oppose, Yahweh, those who oppose me" ([2]).

But Dahood's proposal, though it supplies an antecedent for the plural suffixes occurring in the last line of the stanza, eliminates the parallelism between 58a and 59b, *rabtā rîbê napši* with *šāpaṭṭāh* (MT *šopeṭāh*) ([3]) *mišpāṭî*. This writer prefers to retain the parallelism and, if emendation is to be made, to emend by deleting a *yodh* and read a singular like the Syriac *dînā'*. The use of suffixes without an immediate antecedent occurs elsewhere, e.g., 4,7-8, where the antecedent is in 4,6a. The logical antecedent of the plural suffixes in 3,60-66 is found in 3,52.

4,6 welō' ḥālû bāh yādāyim:

This phrase is translated in RSV as, "no hand being laid on it", with a note indicating that the Hebrew is uncertain. The crux is primarily in the derivation and nuance of the verb *ḥālû*. Some commentators relate it to *ḥālāh* 'to become weak or ill', while others prefer to identify it with *ḥûl* 'writhe, turn against, turn helpful toward' ([4]). The solution to this crux is to be found in the recognition and understanding of the same idiom which appears repeatedly in the "War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness". The relevant lines of this text are listed here as follows ([5]):

([1]) See ALBREKTSON, 166.

([2]) *HUL* III, 323; *Psalms I* 210.

([3]) Reading here after W. RUDOLPH, *Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohe Lied. Die Klagelieder* (KAT; Gütersloh 1962) 233, who suggests an assimilation of the *taw* to *ṭeth*. (Cited hereafter as Rudolph). Compare the assimilation of *taw* to *ṭeth* in the *Hithpa'ēl*.

([4]) See ALBREKTSON, 179-181, for a summary of the textual evidence and the views of the various commentators.

([5]) See Eleazar Lipa SUKENIK, *Oẓar ha-Megilloth ha-Genuzoth* (Jerusalem 1956), and Yigael YADIN, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light*

> *r'šyt mšlwḥ yd bny 'wr lhḥl bgwrl bny ḥwšk*

The first putting forth of the hand of the Sons of Light *shall be* to attack the lot of the Sons of Darkness. (Col 1:1)

> *yḥlw ydm lhpyl bḥllym*

They shall attack (lit. 'they shall cause their hand to begin') to fell among the slain. (Col 9:1)

> *yrymw 'yš ydw bkly mlḥmtw*

They shall each raise his hand with his weapon. (Col 16:5-6)

> *yḥlw ydm lhpyl bḥlly ktyym*

They shall attack to fell among the slain of the Kittim. (Col 16:7)

> *yrymw 'yš ydw bkly mlḥmtw* ... *yšlḥw ydm bḥyl hktyym*... *yḥlw lhpyl bḥllyhm*

They shall each man raise his hand with his weapon...
They shall attack the army of the Kittim...
They shall begin to fell their slain. (Col 17:12-14)

The above parallel in Col 17:13-14 between *yšlḥw ydm bḥyl* without the infinitive) and *yḥlw lhpyl bḥllyhm* (without the object *ydm*) would suggest that these phrases are somewhat synonymous. The inference seems confirmed by the striking similarity between Col 16:7 (above) and a line from 4Qp Hosea, *yšlḥ ydw lhkwt b'prym*, "he will put forth his hand to smite Ephraim" [1]. In these two lines the same sentence pattern is used, the only real difference being in the use of *ḥl* ... *lhpyl* over against *šlḥ* ... *lhkwt*. The force of both idioms is the same. For variants within the latter idiom one should note 2 Sm 1,14, *lišlōaḥ yadᵉkā lᵉšaḥet*, "to put forth your hand to destroy", and 4QPs 37, *lšlwḥ yd bkwhyn*, "to put forth the hand against the priest" [2].

From these parallels two conclusions seem proper: *ḥl* followed by *yad* and/or the infinitive plus the prepositional phrase is synonymous with *šlḥ* followed by *yad*, plus the infinitive and/or the prepositional phrase; and within each idiom there are variants due to the

---

Against the Sons of Darkness, trans. Batya and Chaim RABIN (Oxford 1962). The translations included here follow those of Yadin.

[1] J. M. ALLEGRO, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect", *JBL* 75 (1956) 95.

[2] Ibid. 93.

elision or modification of *one* of the elements. In light of these conclusions, the MT of 4,6, *ḥālú bāh yādāyim* appears as a variant of the idiomatic *yḥlw ydm lhpyl b*... in the War Scroll, having an elision of the usual infinitive. In the latter respect it approximates the synonymous *lšlwḥ yd b*... in 4QPs 37.

The remaining question is to identify the root behind consonantal *ḥl* in the War Scroll (IQM). Numerous scholars have concerned themselves with this question, and summaries of the various views, with suggestive criticism, are to be found in the recent studies of Edmund F. Sutcliffe and Bastiaan Jongeling [1]. Here it will be sufficient to note that most scholars associate the verb with the root *ḥll* and translate "to begin". This writer concurs with the identification of *ḥl* with *ḥll* but is not convinced that "begin" is the best translation [2]. The root *ḥll* means "begin" only in the *Hiph'il*, but if MT *ḥālú* (Qal) is related to *yḥlw*, as seems most probable, then *yḥlw* also must be read as *Qal*. Forthermore, *hēḥēl* is not a likely synonym of *šālāḥ*. If however *ḥālú* and *yḥlw* are understood as retaining in an idiomatic expression the *Qal* of *ḥll*, cognate to Arabic *ḥalla* 'to let loose, release, undo, etc.', a satisfactory meaning becomes readily transparent and one has a good synonym of *šlḥ*, as illustrated through other examples [3].

Yḥlw ydm could be translated "they shall let loose (with) their hands" or "they shall let their hands go" (compare an American idiom "let go with his fists"). Arabic *ḥalla* in the sense of "to re-

---

[1] SUTCLIFFE, "A Note on Milḥama 9:1 and 16:8", *Bib* 41 (1960) 66-69; JONGELING, *Le rouleau de la guerre des manuscripts de Qumran* (Assen 1962) 224-225.

[2] In the one example where *ḥll* means "begin" in the sense of "attack" (as in Jgs 10,18), namely column 1:1 *lhḥl*, there is no object *yd* and/or infinitive which appears elsewhere with *yḥlw*. It seems most probable that *ḥll* is used here in two distinct idioms.

[3] See LANE, *An Arabic-English Lexicon, sub voce ḥll*. In light of this Arabic cognate it is difficult to concur with Jongeling, that, "la signification initiale de *ḥll* est 'profaner', puis le verbe veut aussi dire 'commencer', 'toucher quelque chose pour la premiere fois' " (p. 225). It seems more likely that from the original meaning preserved in Arabic of "let go, release" there developed the meanings of "profane" and "begin". When something holy was "let loose" or "set free" it was "profaned"; and when one "caused something to let go" (i.e., in *Hiph'il*) he initiated some act or movement, i.e., he "began" something.

lease, set free, divorce" finds its Hebrew counterpart in the synonymous uses of *šālaḥ* (¹).

In light of the above parallels and derivation, and in light of
certain syntactic features to be discussed in the following section,
the writer would propose to read MT *welō' ḥālû bāh yādāyim* as *welu'
ḥilû bāh yādāw-m* (or *yādāyîm*, without the explicit suffix), "when
verily His hands were let loose against her"; or *welu' ḥal* (or *ḥālal*)
bāh yādāw-m, "when verily He let loose his hands against her" (²).

4,16 peně yhwh ḥilleqam:

The phrase is usually translated as "the Lord himself has scattered them", in the context of Ex 33,14-15 where *pānay* and *pānèkā*
are used of the very presence of Yahweh, and Gn 49,7 where *ḥālaq*
is used in parallelism with the *Hiph'îl* of *pûṣ* 'to scatter'. Dahood
has proposed the following translation, "the fury of Yahweh destroyed them" (³). The reading here of *peně* as "wrath" is based upon
context, especially as the phrase *pānèkā yhwh* is used in parallelism
with *be'appô* in Ps 21,10a. Other passages cited by Dahood which
support this meaning are Ps 34,17; 80,17; Qoh 8,1 and possibly
UT 75:I:33, *wbhm pn b'l*, "and with them was the fury of Baal" (⁴).

The rendering of *ḥilleqam* as "destroyed them" is based upon
the Ugaritic *ḥlq*, cognate to Ethiopic *ḥlq* (D–stem, "ad finem perduxit") and Akkadian *ḥalāqu* (D–stem, "destroy"). Patton (⁵) recognized this meaning in Hebrew root *ḥlq*, as it occurs in Ps 73,18.
To this occurrence Dahood adds the word here in 4,16 and in five
other passages (⁶).

This writer readily accepts the reading of *ḥlq* 'destroy' but is
not fully convinced on the basis of the evidence Dahood presents
that here *peně* means the wrath or fury of Yahweh. The wrath of
Yahweh is a recurring motif in Lamentations (1,12; 2,1.2.3.6.22; 3,1;

(¹) Compare Arabic *'ant fi ḥilli minni*, "thou art freed (divorced)
from me", with 2 Sm 3,21-24; Jgs 19,25, etc.
(²) The asseverative *lamed*, the enclitic *mêm*, and *Qal* passive will
be discussed in Part II of the present study, to be published in *Bib* 49
(1968) fasc. 2.
(³) *Psalms I* 207; "Review of Albrektson" 548.
(⁴) *Psalms I* 133-134, 207.
(⁵) *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* 38-39.
(⁶) *Psalms I* 35, 133.

4,11.16) but it is never the subject of a verbal clause. The agent is Yahweh himself, and for this reason the following translation seems preferable, "Yahweh himself has destroyed them".

4,18 ṣadû:

This verb has been identified with either ṣûd 'to hunt' or ṣādāh 'to lie in wait for'. Dahood has convincingly related the verb to the Ugaritic ṣd 'wander, range' which occurs in *UT* 49:II:15-16, *an.itlk.waṣd[.]kl ǵr.lkbd.arṣ.kl.gb'*, "I myself went about and did wander over every rock in the heart of the earth, every mountain". He translates 4,18a as, "our feet have ranged far without coming into our squares" (¹). This seems much more plausible than the usual translation as given in RSV, "men dogged our steps" or that of Albrektson, "they watched our steps" (²). The idea expressed here in Dahood's translation is similar to the motif appearing in one of the *kudurru* curses, "may he be excluded from his house, may he roam the desert... and may he not tread the square of his city" (³).

4,20 rūaḥ 'appênû mᵉšîaḥ yhwh nilkad bišḥîtôtām:

The rather extensive change in the reading and meaning of this verse advanced by Dahood needs careful consideration (⁴). Reading *rûaḥ 'appênû mašḥe* (sic) *yhwh nilkad bišᵉḥîtôt-m* for the above clause in MT, he translates 4,20a as, "the Lord inflamed the breath of our nostrils; we are seized by our boils". On the basis of Ugaritic *šḥn* 'to be hot, feverish' and the Hebrew substantive *šᵉḥin* 'boil, inflammation' Dahood postulates a root *šḥy* 'to inflame', and evidently wants to read a *Hiph'il* participle, *mšḥḥ* for MT *mšyḥ*, with the

---

(¹) "Ugaritic Studies" 71-72; "Review of Albrektson" 548. For occurrence of the root ṣd in Akkadian, see *CAD* XVI (Ṣ), 57-58, 65-66, and W. G. LAMBERT, "The Incantation of the *Maqlû* Type", *AfO* 18 (1957) 295.

(²) ALBREKTSON, 192.

(³) See Delbert R. HILLERS, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (BibOrPont 16; Rome 1964) 16. Hillers cites seven other passages in Lamentations where the motifs are similar to those found in curses. In addition to this motif in 4,18, the present writer would also add to Hiller's list 5,11 and 5,18, the curse motifs of the city becoming a dwelling place for wild animals and the ravishing of the wives.

(⁴) "Review of Albrektson" 192; *PNSWP* 27-28.

force of a perfect. As for the second word emended he states, "that *šᵉḥîtôt-m*, with enclitic *mem* balancing the pron. suffix..., has nothing to do with *šaḥat* 'pit' may be argued from Ps 107,20, *yišlaḥ dabrô* (MT *dᵉbārô*) *wᵉyirpā'ēm wimallēṭ miššᵉḥîtôtām*, 'He sent his pestilence, but He healed them, and delivered them from their boils' ". Furthermore, Dahood proposes to take *bᵉṣillo* in 20b as a reference to "the coolness of the Lord's shade".

These proposals seem to confuse rather than clarify the text. If the relative clause in 20b stands as a modifying clause to *yhwh*, the syntax of the sentence is most unusual. Not only is the root *šḥy* unattested, but the special nuance given to *lākad* 'capture, ensare' is likewise unattested.

The present writer prefers to retain MT which contains two well-known epithets given to a monarch. *Mᵉšiaḥ yhwh* was David's favorite epithet for Saul (1 Sm 24,17.11; 26,9.11.16.23); and *rûaḥ 'appēnû* finds a semantic parallel in the Amarna *ša-ri balāṭi-ia*, "the breath (= wind) of my life" [1]. The MT *bᵉṣillô niḥyeh baggôyim* (20b) more than likely refers to the king, like the *yāšᵉbû bᵉṣillô bᵉtôk gôyim* of Ez 31,17 which refers to Pharoah [2]. There may well be a historical reference here to the Babylonian imprisonment of Jehoiakin and Zedekiah as related in 2 Kgs 24,15; 25,4-7; 2 Chr 36,5-20; Jer 22,24; 39,7; and Ez 12,13.

5,4 yābō'û:

The difficulties surrounding 5,5a, *'al ṣawwā'rēnû nirdāpnû*, meaning literally, "upon our necks we are pursued", have led most commentators to emend the text [3]. A more probable and easier solution is to read the last word of 4a *yābō'û* as the defective *Hiph'il*, *yābî'û*, as one would expect in the original sixth century orthography, and connect it with the initial words of 5,5a (as did the Syriac). Redividing and revocalizing the verses in this manner, 5,5a could be read, *yābî'û 'ōl ṣawwārēnû*, "they put our neck (to) the yoke". Such a

---

[1] J. A. KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* I (Leipzig 1907), EA 141.2, p. 592. See also KRAUS, 82; RUDOLPH, 254.

[2] Compare Is 30,2 and Ct 2,3.

[3] See ALBREKTSON, 197, where he cites Bickell, Budde, Ehrlich, Robinson, Rudolph, Haller, Driver, Wiesmann, Meek, and Weiser as those who wish to emend the text, while he prefers to retain MT as it stands.

reading seems quite feasible in light of the following passages where *hēbî'* is followed by the double accusative: *hābî'î habbiryāh haḥeder*, "bring the food (into) the chamber" (2 Sm 13,10); and *wayyābē' 'et qodšê 'ābîw... bet hā'elōhîm*, "and he brought (into) the house of God the votive gifts of his father..." (2 Chr 15,18). This proposed reading of 5,5a would find an approximate parallel in Jer 27,11, *wehaggôy 'ašer yābî' 'et ṣawwā'rô be'ōl melek bābel*, "and the people that puts its neck to the yoke of the king of Babylon". The differences between this passages in Jeremiah and the suggested reading of 5,5a are in the use of the accusative particle *'et*, use of an adverbial accusative instead of the prepositional modifier, and the unusual word order of the adverbial accusative *'ōl*. The absence of *'et* is no problem in a concise poetic text where it is not needed as a ballast variant; and the adverbial accusative in an unusual word order finds a parallel in a like idiom in Ps 105,18, *barzel bā'āh napšô*, literally, "his neck entered iron", i.e., "his neck was put into an iron collar".

Assuming this reading of 5,4-5 to be correct, 5,4 would be read as a 3 + 2 bicolon with an ellipsis of the verb in the second colon, and 5:5 would become a $3+2+2$ which could be translated as follows: "They put our neck (to) the yoke / we were driven [1], we were wearied / (but) no rest was granted us" [2].

5,9 ḥereb hammidbār:

Kraus reflects the traditional understanding of this unique phrase when he calls it a 'shortened mode of expression which has the meaning, 'the sword of the Bedouin' ' " [1]. But reference here to

---

[1] G. R. DRIVER, "Hebrew Notes on 'Song of Songs' and 'Lamentations' ", *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*, edd. Walter BAUMGARTNER *et al.* (Tübingen 1950) 142, suggests that here the Hebrew *rādap* has the weakened meaning as found in Syriac *redap* 'drive hard, overdrive'.

[2] This would be the only example of 3 + 2 + 2 meter in Lamentations, but various metrical forms appear in the book besides the typical 3 + 2 *qināh* meter, e.g., 2 + 3 (2,12a), 2 + 2 + 3 (4,15; 5,1.21), and 2 + 2 + 2 (3,56; 4,18c). See K. BUDDE, "Zum Kina-Verse", *ZAW* 52 (1934) 306-308.

[1] Hans-Joachim KRAUS, *Klagelieder (Threni)* (BK; Neukirchen ²1960) 89.

—

the Bedouin is most unlikely — Jerusalem fell at the hands of the
Babylonians. Again one is indebted to Dahood for offering a more
plausible reading of this passage. He cites this passage along with
several others where MT *dbr* should be related to the Amarna *dpr/dbr*
'to drive out, pursue' and the Syriac *dbr* 'subdue, drive, lead' ([2]).
His translation yields the desiderated meaning, "at the peril of our
lives we gain our bread because of the sword of the pursuer". This,
as he notes, is closely akin to Jer 46,16, *mippᵉnê ḥereb hayyôneh*
(MT *hayyônāh*), because of the oppressor's sword". One might also
compare Jer 6,25, "go not forth into the field... for the enemy
has a sword".

5,18 šeššāmēm:

This verse is usually translated as in RSV, "for Mount Zion
which lies desolate; jackals prowl over it". But Dahood proposes to
read instead "upon Mount Zion are looters, jackals prowl over it",
by equating a proposed Hebrew root *ššm* with Ugaritic *ṯšm* 'prey,
loot' which he believes is cognate to Hebrew *šāsāh* and *šāsas*, 'spoil
plunder' ([3]). But the meaning of *ṯšm* is still uncertain and Dahood
is not even sure that the root is *ṯšm* ("it could be an absolute plural
participle from *ṯšy*"). Hebrew *šāsāh* and *šāsās* could possibly be
synonyms but not cognates since the *samekh* of these roots cannot
go back to an original *shin*. Furthermore, the parallelism in 5,18
favors the traditional reading. A. Dupont-Sommer, F.C. Fensham
and D. R. Hillers have noted the similarity of the following curse in
Sefire I with its biblical counterparts, *wthwy 'rpd tl l[rbq ṣy w]ṣby
wš'l...*, "and may Arpad become a mound to [house the desert animal
and the] gazelle and the fox..." ([4]) (compare Is 13,20-22; 23,13;
34,11-15). The occurrence here of *tl* 'a desolate ruin' followed by

---

([2]) *HUL* II, 401. See also DAHOOD, "Two Pauline Quotations from
the Old Testament", *CBQ* 27 (1955) 23-24. The Akkadian *duppuru*
(*dubburu*) is not limited to Amarna, see *CAD* III (D), 186-188.

([3]) *UHP* 75.

([4]) DUPONT-SOMMER, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré (Stèles I
et II)* (Paris 1958) 47-48; F. C. FENSHAM, "Common Trends in Curses
of the Near Eastern Treaties and KUDURRU–Inscriptions Compared
with Maledictions of Amos and Isaiah", *ZAW* 75 (1963) 166-168; HILLERS,
Treaty Curses 44-45.

š'l 'fox' is so close to the imagery of 5,18, šāmēm followed by š'l, that there seems to need to change the motif to an unattested parallelism of "looters" and "jackals" (¹).

(*To be continued*)

(¹) Dahood has recently suggested several other changes in reading and/or translation on the basis of the Ugaritic evidence which demand notice and brief comment. In *Psalms I* 45, he proposes to read Lam 3,61 as, "hear their insults, O Yahweh, all their plottings, O Most High". This necessitates reading the MT 'ālāy as a divine name, 'ēli. But nowhere in Lam is there a repetition of the divine name in the second half of the bicolon. The MT kol maḥšᵉbōtām 'ālāy of 3,61 seems to be but a variant of the same theme found in Ps 56,6 as 'ālāy kol maḥšᵉbōtām, "all their plottings are against me" (compare 3,60).

In *Psalms I* 69, DAHOOD tentatively proposes to translate ḥinnām, which is usually rendered as "without cause" or "gratuitously", as "stealthily", on the basis of the Ugaritic ḥnn. He renders Lam 3,52 as, "my stealthy foes hunted me down like a bird". In view of the uncertainty which surrounds Ugaritic ḥnn, and the numerous passages in Hebrew where ḥnn cannot have the meaning of "stealthily" (e.g., 1 Sm 19,5; Jb 2,3) it seems better to keep the traditional reading here. Such a statement of innocence (cf. 5,7) need not have its roots in a theological contradiction (cf. 1,5b.8a.18a) but simply in the poet's use of a traditional literary formula.

On page 96 of *Psalms I*, DAHOOD suggests reading MT bat 'ēnēk of 2,18 as batᵃ'înekā, a Pi'ēl infinitive construct like Ugaritic tdmm, tbrrt, tidm (*UT* § 8.48). He translates the clause as, "do not desist from your weeping". But this writer knows of no case in Ugaritic or Hebrew where the verb 'yn means "weep"; its usual meaning is "to behold" or "to gaze".

In an earlier article, "Is 'Eben Yiśrā'ēl a Divine Title? (Gn 49,24)", *Bib* 40 (1959) 1003, DAHOOD proposes to read the MT mišbatteha (1,7) as mᵉšabbōtehā, relating it to the root šbb which appears in the hapax legomenon of Hos 8,6, šᵉbābim 'splinters'. Cognate to this Hebrew šbb, Dahood posits a Ugaritic root tbb 'smash', based upon the occurence of ytb in I Aqhat 107-108 and 122-123, in parallelism with the root tbr 'break'. Although T. H. GASTER in "Ugaritic Philology", *JAOS* 70 (1950) 10, suggested that tb may be a deliberate variation from tbr, most scholars prefer to see a scribal error in the Ugaritic lines and emend the text to agree with lines 114-115, 128-129, 137, 143, and 149, where the parallelism is tbr... tbr. Thus without undisputed evidence for a Ugaritic root tbb, and only the *hapax legomenon* šᵉbābim in Hebrew, it seems better to associate mišbattehā with the root šābat which in Hiph'il means "destroy, exterminate" (see ALBREKTSON, 61-62).

Philological Studies in Lamentations. II (*)

Thomas F. McDaniel — Yokohama

II. Syntactical Elements

A. *Prepositions*

1. b with the meaning "from":

The functional interchange of the prepositions *b* and *min* had been formulated by the medieval grammarians Saadya, Ibn Janaḥ, Ibn Ezra, and Kimchi ([1]). Modern students of semitic grammar have recognized the "ablative" use of *b* "from" in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, and Old South Arabic ([2]). In the light of this widespread usage of *b* "from" it is not surprising that about sixty examples of its occurrence have been found in biblical Hebrew ([3]). Among these OT passages three are in Lamentations: (a) *hiśbîʿanî bammᵉrôrîm*, "he has filled me with bitterness" (3,15); (b) *yiśbaʿ bᵉḥerpāh*, "let him be filled with insults" (3,30); and (c) *bᵉṣippiyātēnû ṣippînû*, "from our watch-towers we watched" (4,17) ([4]). The root *śābaʿ* is

---

(*) For Part I ("Lexical Studies") of this article cf. *Bib* 49 (1968) 27-53. The abbreviations and references peculiar to this article are explained in Part I.

([1]) N. M. SARNA, "The Interchange of the Prepositions *Beth* and *Min* in Biblical Hebrew", *JBL* 78 (1959) 311.

([2]) For Ugaritic see GORDON, *UT* § 10.1; for Phoenecian see JEAN-HOFTIJZER, 31; ALBRIGHT, "The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblus", *JAOS* 67 (1947) 158, n. 42; GORDON, "Aramaic Incantations", *Or* 10 (1941) 341 and 348; IDEM, "Review of H. S. Drower's *The Book of the Zodiac*", *Or* 20 (1951) 507; SARNA, op. cit. 310-311; for Old South Arabic, see Maria HÖFNER, *Altsüdarabische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1943) 143.

([3]) See SARNA, op. cit. 310-316; GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook* (AnOr 25; Rome 1947) § 10.1; IDEM, *UT* § 10.1; DAHOOD, *UHP* 27; IDEM, *HUL* I, 300-301; IDEM, *PNWSP* 5, 11, 12, 39.

([4]) SARNA, op. cit. 311.

usually followed by the accusative or by the preposition *min* (¹). The
few times when the verb is followed by *b*, it seems quite plausible
that the *b* has the force of *min*. Compare the interchange as in
Qoh 6,3, *tiśba' min haṭṭôbāh*, and Ps 65,5, *niśb°'āh b°ṭôb*. The example
cited in 4,17 is a possible example of *b* "from" but the meaning could
just as easily be "on / at our watch-towers".

To these examples should be added the *b* which occurs in the
text of 2,6a, as reconstructed, *wayyaḥmōs baggepen* (MT *kaggan*)
śōkāw, "and he has stripped from the vine its branches" (²).

2. b°yad with the meaning "because of":

Most modern translators follow Gesenius in understanding 1,14c
MT *bîdê lō' 'ûkal qûm* as a construct noun (*y°dê*) followed by a rela-
tive clause without the relative particle (³). The RSV for example
translates 1,14c as, "the Lord gave me into the hand of those whom
I cannot withstand". It is also possible that MT *bîdê* should be
read as *b°yādô*, "because of it". It has long been recognized that
Ugaritic *yd* can have the force of the preposition "with" (⁴), and it
has recently been pointed out that Ugaritic *byd* can have the mean-
ing "because of", as in *UT* 49:II:25, *la.šmm.byd.bn ilm.mt*, "the
heavens sag because of divine Mot" (⁵).

This use of *byd* "because of" is not restricted to Ugaritic, for
several occurrences have been cited in Hebrew, e.g., Is 64,7; Jer 41,9;
Job 8,4; and Sir 46,6 (⁶). Some of the textual difficulties of Lam 1,14
may be cleared up by recognizing in MT *bîdê* the prepositional phrase
b°yādô with the meaning "because of it". The antecedent of the

---

(¹) See BROWN–DRIVER–BRIGGS, 959.

(²) See *Bib* 49 (1968) 36 for other examples of the misreading of
kaph and *beth*; see DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler* 110.

(³) *GKC* § 130ᵈ; ALBREKTSON, 75-76. Albrektson fails to note that
Gesenius had some doubt about the integrity of the text.

(⁴) GORDON *UT* § 10.17. See also *Or* 20 (1951) 507 where Gordon
cites the meaning "for" or "through".

(⁵) DAHOOD, *HUL* I, 301-302. Translation is that of Dahood (ibid).

(⁶) Ibid. Note that AV by force of context renders Is 64,7 and
Jer 41,9 as "because" but RSV reads, "into the hand of". It may be
that the LXX *'oti* in 1,14, (concerning which Albrektson states, "There
is nothing to correspond to it") is a misplaced marginal variant reflecting
another LXX reading where *bydy/w* was by force of context rendered
"because".

pronominal suffix would be *piš'i* (MT *p̊šā'ay*) of 1,14a.   1,14c could
be translated as "the Lord has delivered me up because of it (i.e.,
my sin), I am not able to endure".

B. *Enclitic* Mem

The use of the enclitic *mem* in biblical Hebrew was long un-
recognized.   Only in the light of the Ugaritic enclitic *mem*, where
it occurs even after nouns in the construct state, was its use also
recognized in biblical Hebrew ([1]).   In 1957, H. D. Hummel listed
over one hundred examples of enclitic *mem* in the OT; and since
publication of his study several scholars have added to the list of
its appearances in biblical Hebrew ([2]).   Two or three examples prob-
ably occur in Lamentations.

3,17 wattiznaḥ miššālôm:

The initial *mem* of *miššālôm* has caused some difficulty in the
understanding of the entire clause.   The LXX *kai apōsato ex eirēnēs
psuchēn mou*, "he removed my soul from peace", and the Syriac
ẘeṭṭa'yat men š̊lāmā' napši, "my soul has been led astray from
peace", both reflect the difficulty or reading the *mem* as the prepo-
sition "from".   Modern translators follow the same two patterns.
For example, Albrektson translates, "thou hast rejected me from
peace", while the RSV reads, "my soul is bereft of peace" ([3]).

The solution to this enigmatic *mem* may well be found in the
suggestion of Hummel who identifies it as enclitic and states, "*znḥ*
in an intransitive sense appears only here, but we may regain its
usual transitive force if we read (with Peshitta and Vulgate) *wtznḥ-m
šlwm npšy*, 'and my soul rejected peace' " ([4]).

[1] See GORDON, *UT* § 11.8
[2] "Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially in
Hebrew", *JBL* 76 (1957) 85-107.   Hummel adds seventy-six examples
of his own to more than thirty examples previously cited.   See in ad-
dition, P. J. CALDERONE, "The Rivers of 'Maṣor' ", *Bib* 42 (1961) 423-
432; Marvin POPE, *Job* 112; DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 12, 21, *et passim*; IDEM,
Psalms I 19, 27, *et passim*.
[3] ALBREKTSON, 138.
[4] HUMMEL, op. cit. 105.   Hummel is incorrect in citing the Syriac
text in support of this reading, for it reads the verb as an intransitive
and reflects the preposition *min* in its translation.

The poetic circumlocution of using *napší* plus verb is found elsewhere in this chapter as a ballast variant (e.g., 3,20). Reading *šālóm* as the object of the verb yields a synonymous parallel in the second half of the bicolon where the first person singular verb plus object is used, *nāšítí ṭôbāh*, "I forgot prosperity".

3,26 w°yāḥil w°dûmān:

As proposed above in part I of this study, these two words should be redivided and vocalized as *w°yāḥilû dômēm* or *w°yāḥilû dômām*. *Dômēm* would be the *Pōlēl* infinitive, while the second possibility, *dômām*, would be the *Qal* infinitive with enclitic *mem* [1].

4,6 yādāw-m (MT yādāyim):

The basis for this emendation has been given above on the discussion of *ḥalû* [2]. Here it will be sufficient to note that in the War Scroll (1QM) when the verb *ḥll* is followed by the object *yad*, the object always has a suffix, either as *ydw* or *ydm*. By reading as emended here, one finds a pattern of noun plus suffix plus enclitic *mem*, a pattern which appears elsewhere in the OT. Hummel has convincingly proposed to read the MT of Ps 22,16, *l°šôní mudbāq* (the only occurrence of *dābaq* in *Hoph'al* as *l°šôní-m dôbēq*, "my tongue sticks" [3].

C. *Adverbial* Mem

It may well be that the "adverbial *mem*" is but the adverbial accusative plus enclitic *mem* (as in Hebrew *yômām*) and as such should be included in the above discussion on enclitic *mem*. But as Albright and Gordon have pointed out, more than one suffix may be represented

---

[1] See *Bib* 49 (1968) 39-40.
[2] Ibid. 45-48.
[3] Op. cit. 99. Altogether Hummel lists thirteen examples of enclitic *mem* after a suffix. See also DAHOOD, *Psalms I* 27, 140, 182, 237. Otto RÖSSLER, "Die Präfixkonjugation Qal der Verba Iᵃᵉ Nûn", *ZAW* 74 (1962) 128, suggests reading MT *'°ní manginātām* as *'°ní-ma n°ginātām* in Lam 3,63, i.e., the enclitic *mem* following the independent pronoun, followed by the noun without the *mem* preformative, as it occurs in 3,14.

in final –*m*, such as –*mi*, –*ma*, –*umma/–um* ([1]). For this reason affixed *mem* on a word used adverbially may best be considered under a separate category from enclitic *mem*, recognizing though, with Marvin Pope that, "it cannot be proven that the adverbial force is resident in the –*m*" ([2]). The vocalization –*ām* (**–am* > –*ām*) adopted below is based upon the probability that the noun goes back to an adverbial accusative in –*a*, with the loss of any final short vowel that may have originally followed the *mem*. Recognition of such an adverbial *mem* brings clarity to the following difficult and disputed passages in Lamentations.

2,2 higgîaʻ lāʼāreṣ ḥillēl mamlākāh weśārèhā:

As proposed in the above discussion of MT *mamlākāh* ([3]) the text should probably be redivided and revocalized as *higgîaʻ lāʼāreṣ ḥllm malkāh weśārèhā*, "he has struck to the ground mortally wounded her king and her princes". Such a reading improves both the meter and the syntax: a 3 + 2 read as verb-double modifier / compound object. The masoretic vocalization demands an unusual 2 + 3 line, and though the verse division in *BH*[3] produces the desiderated 3 + 2 line, the kind of verse division demanded (verb–modifier–verb / object of second verb) is not found elsewhere in the book.

2,18 ṣāʻaq libbām:

The MT, which is considered corrupt by most scholars, is reflected in the LXX *eboēse kardia autōn* and Syriac *geʻaʼ lebhōn*. Ewald's emendation of *ṣāʻaq* to *ṣaʻaqî* has generally been accepted in the light of the imperatives which follow ([4]). The real crux has been in the understanding of *libbām*. None of the proposed emendations of MT *lbm* seem very convincing, including the latest by Albrektson who reads *lbtm* "about their rage" ([5]). Driver's attempt to read MT here as an abbreviation for *ṣaʻaqî lēb mālēʼ* "cry with a full heart

([1]) See ALBRIGHT in his review of Gordon's *Ugaritic Handbook*, in *JBL* 69 (1950) 387; GORDON, *UT* § 11.4.

([2]) "Ugaritic Enclitic –*m*", *JCS* 5 (1951) 128.

([3]) See *Bib* 49 (1968) 35-36.

([4]) *Die Psalmen und die Klagelieder erklärt* (Göttingen [3]1866) 335.

([5]) ALBREKTSON, 116.

to the Lord" is unconvincing since there is no other evidence of
such an idiom, plus the fact that there remains yet some doubt as
to this scribal practice of abbreviating the text (¹).

The correct understanding of *libbām* is probably not to be found
in either emendation or abbreviation, but in recognizing the final
mem as adverbial. The verb *zā'aq* appears with a prepositional phrase
as adverbial modifier in Hos 7,14, *wᵉlō' zā'ᵃqû 'ēlay bᵉlibbām*, "they
do not cry to me from their heart". Similarily this verb occurs with
simply the adverbial accusative in Ps 142,2, *qôlî 'el yhwh 'ez'āq*, "I
cry with my voice to the Lord". The phrase *ṣa'aqî libbām* here
in 2,18 would reflect the same idiom as found in Hos 7,14, but in
place of the prepositional adverbial modifier, the adverbial *mem* is
employed, much like the adverbial accusative of Ps 142,2 (²).

The subject of this verb in MT is *ḥômat bat ṣiyyôn*, "wall of
daughter Zion". Most commentators agree that such a personifi-
cation of the wall does not fit the imagery of this verse. Instead of
the proposed emendations of *bᵉtûlat* or *hᵉmî* or *habat* for MT *ḥômat*,
this writer would propose to read *hômat*, the feminine participle of
hāmāh "to be tumultuous", with the original feminine –*at* retained
here as in *pûgat* of 2,18c (³). A parallel occurrence is found in Is 22,2,
tᵉšu'ôt mᵉlē'āh 'îr hômiyyāh qiryāh 'allîzāh, "you who are full of shout-
ings, tumultuous city, exultant town". By thus emending *ṣā'aq* to
ṣa'aqî, *ḥômat* to *hômat*, and reading the *mem* of *libbām* as adverbial,
a most enigmatic line can be read smoothly as, "cry out unto the
Lord (from) the heart, O tumultuous one, daughter Zion".

3,63 šibtām wᵉqîmātām habbîṭāh:

The final *mem* of the first two words has been read by the trans-
lators and commentators alike as the third person plural suffix, e.g.,
RSV, "behold their sitting and their rising". This permits a smooth
translation, but the meaning of such a phrase in this stanza is not

---

(¹) "Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text", *Textus I: Annual of
the Hebrew University Bible Project*, ed. C. RABIN (Jerusalem 1960) 92.
(²) Compare Ps 3,5; 66,17; 119,145; and see GORDON, *UT* § 11.6 for
examples of the prepositional phrase paralleled by final –*m*.
(³) For proposed emendations of the commentators, see ALBREKTSON,
116-117. On the old feminine ending, see *GKC* § 80ᵗ; GORDON, *UT* § 8.3.
On the reading of *he* for MT *ḥeth* see DELITZSCH, *Die Lese- und Schreib-
fehler* 109.

at all transparent. If however one reads adverbial *mem* instead of the pronominal suffix, the whole verse can be read with greater clarity and continuity in the stanza.

As will be noted further on in this section, the word *habbīṭāh* should be read with *'anî* as the infinitive absolute plus pronoun with the force of a past tense. The first two words of the verse should be read as adverbial modifiers, composed of the infinitives *šebet* and *qûmāh* plus adverbial *mem*, "upon sitting down and getting up". Such an idiomatic expression would indicate totality like the *kol hayyôm* of the preceding line or *yômām wālaylāh* in 2,18. The continuity and parallelism in this stanza can be seen in this proposed translation of vv. 62-63, "the lips and thoughts of my assailants are against me / all the day long // continually / I have endured their derisive song(s)". This chiastic parallelism and $3 + 2 / 2 + 3$ meter instead of the usual synonymous parallelism and $3 + 2 / 3 + 2$ meter, are probably due here to the use of *šibtām* as the initial word in the *šin*-stanza. Another example where the acrostic pattern has influenced the meter, producing a $2 + 3$ bicolon, is in 2,12a where the prepositional phrase *lᵉʾimmōtām* comes first in the *lamed*-stanza.

D. *The Energic Form of the Verb*

The energic form of the verb, analogous to the Arabic *yaqtulan* and *yaqtulanna*, was quite common in Ugaritic and was found in Western Aramaic with verbs that have a suffix [1]. It has long been recognized that in Hebrew "energic *nun*" survived before certain pronominal suffixes [2]. On the basis of the Ugaritic evidence where the energic form of the verb appears also without suffixes, numerous Hebraists have cited occurrences of the independent energic form of the verb in biblical Hebrew [3]. These occurrences in-

[1] GORDON, *UT* § 9.11; Carl BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin 1908-1913) I, 641. Brockelmann cites examples from Egyptian, biblical, and Palestinian Aramaic.

[2] See *GKC* § 58ᶦ⁻ᶦ.

[3] See G. R. DRIVER, "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs", *JTS* 41 (1940) 163-164; ALBRIGHT, "The Oracles of Balaam", *JBL* 63 (1944) 212, n. 23; CROSS and FREEDMAN, "The Blessing of Moses", *JBL* 67 (1948) 203, n. 25; FREEDMAN, "Notes on Genesis", *ZAW* 64 (1952)

clude one example from Lamentations, namely, MT *wayyirdennāh* of 1,13.

The LXX *katēgagen*, Syriac '*aḥtany*, and RSV, "he made it descend", all render this verb as though it were the *Hiph'il* of *yārad* with pronominal suffix. The Targum's *ûkᵉbaš yātôn* and AV, "and it prevailed against them", read the verb as *Qal* of *rādāh* "to rule, dominate" plus suffix. Scholarly opinion has been divided, generally in favor of the LXX and Syriac [1].

The identification of the verb and its form was proposed, convincingly, by Dahood, who equates the *nun* of *wayyirdennāh* with the energic *nun* and revocalizes the word as *wayyᵉrēdannāh*. He translates 1,13a as, "from high He sent forth fire; into my bones has it descended" [2]. It should be noted that the translation does not reflect the copula of MT—and rightly so since *waw* with the verb in the final position is best understood as pleonastic [3].

E. *Emphatic* Lamed

As early as 1894, when P. Haupt made the following statement, the emphatic *lamed* was recognized as occurring in biblical Hebrew. "A comprehensive study of the use of the ל *praefixum* in the Old Testament will no doubt reveal a considerable number of cases where the ל is not the preposition but the emphatic particle ל = Arabic *la* and Assyrian *lû* 'verily'... " [4]. Since this statement was made

---

191; IDEM, "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry", *ZAW* 72 (1960) 102; DAHOOD, *PNWSP* 4. Note also C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges* (London ³1920) 152-153.

[1] See ALBREKTSON, 72.

[2] *PNWSP* 4.

[3] See GORDON, *UT* § 13.102; Marvin POPE, " 'Pleonastic' *Wāw* before Nouns in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *JAOS* 73 (1953) 95-98; and DAHOOD, *UHP* 40.

[4] "A New Hebrew Particle", *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* 13, No. 104 (1894) 107-108. See also HAUPT, "The Hebrew Stem *Nahal*, To Rest", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 22 (1905) 201. For the Arabic use of *la* see W. A. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language, translated from the German of Caspari...*, edd. W. R. SMITH and M. J. DE GOEJE (Cambridge ³1896-1898) I, 282-283; II, 41-42. The Hebrew emphatic *lamed* should probably be vocalized as *lu/lu'*, see GESENIUS–BUHL, 380 a.

the emphatic *lamed* has been detected in most Northwest Semitic dialects ([1]), and a host of scholars have added to Haupt's original list of the particle's appearances in Hebrew ([2]).

Israel Eitan was the first to recognize this particle in the *le'akzār* "cruel" of Lam 4,3 ([3]). His suggestion has been accepted by Rudolph, Kraus, and Nötscher, though rejected by Albrektson who prefers to read *le'akzār* as similar to *lenîdāh hāyātāh* of 1,8 ([4]). In addition to this occurrence (which should be translated, "was indeed cruel") the emphatic *lamed* also appears two more times in 3,37-38, *'adōnāy lō' ṣiwwāh mippî 'elyôn lō' tēṣē'*. The *lō'* in both of these phrases is usually read with the force of *halō'* and rendered as in RSV, "...unless the Lord has ordained it? Is it not from the mouth of the Most High?" Glanzman, following Nötscher, has recently affirmed this understanding in his statement, "it is true that *lō'* can be used

([1]) See for Ugaritic: GORDON, *UT* § 9.16; Albrecht GOETZE, " The Tenses of Ugaritic", *JAOS* 58 (1938) 292; for Amorite: Herbert B. HUFFMON, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study* (Baltimore 1965) 223; MORAN, *BANE* 60, 69; ALBRIGHT, *JBL* 69 (1950) 389; for Aramaic: H. INGHOLT, *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie* (1932-1938) (København 1940) 117, n. 4; DONNER–RÖLLIG, op. cit. II, 211; for Phoenician: Johannes FRIEDRICH, *Phönizisch–punische Grammatik* (AnOr 32; Rome 1951) § 257e; G. A. COOKE, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford 1903) 47; for Punic: H. BERTHIER – R. CHARLIER, *Le Sanctuaire punique d'El Hofra à Constantine* (Paris 1955) 33-34, 139.

([2]) See I. M. CASANOWICZ, "The Emphatic Particle ל in the OT", *JAOS* 16 (1896) CLXVI-CLXXI; Henry P. SMITH, "Old Testament Notes", *JBL* 24 (1905) 30; Israel EITAN, "Le particule emphatique 'la' dans la Bible", *RÉJuivHJud* 74 (1922) 1-16; IDEM, "Hebrew and Semitic Particles", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 45 (1928) 202; ALBRIGHT, "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature", *CBQ* 7 (1945) 24; DAHOOD, "Canaanite and Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth", *Bib* 33 (1952) 192-194; F. NÖTSCHER, "Zum emphatischen Lamed", *VT* 3 (1953) 372-380; DAHOOD, "Two Pauline Quotations from the Old Testament", *CBQ* 17 (1955) 24; IDEM, "Enclitic *Mem* and Emphatic *Lamedh* in Psalm 85", *Bib* 37 (1956) 338-340; IDEM, *PNWSP*, 19; IDEM, *Psalms I*, 143, 158, 188; John BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (The Anchor Bible; New York 1965) 333; and H. Neil RICHARDSON, "A Critical Note on Amos 7:14", *JBL* 85 (1966) 89.

([3]) *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 45 (1928) 202.

([4]) RUDOLPH, 247; KRAUS, 72; NÖTSCHER, op. cit. 379-380; and ALBREKTSON, 176-177.

for *hᵃlō'* to introduce a question, but generally the context makes it
clear; either it is preceded by a positive question (Lam 3, 37-38) or
by some statement to which the clause introduced by *lō'* corresponds
as a kind of apodosis (Job 2, 10)" [1].

But just as Glanzman rejects T. H. Robinson's equating the
lō' of Hos 11,9 with *hᵃlō'* [2] in favor of the emphatic particle, so
it seems best to read the emphatic particle *lu'* here in 3,37-38. The
use of a rhetorical question as a literary device is elsewhere unattested
in Lamentations. But the emphatic *lamed* does occur, as well as
the similar asseverative *kaph*. The following translation is proposed
for 3,37-38, "Who has commanded and it came to pass? Verily, the
Lord has ordained it! Verily, from the mouth of the most High
goeth forth good and evil!"

F. *The Infinitive Absolute*

The use of the infinitive absolute "as a substitute for the finite
verb" has long been recognized in Hebrew [3]. Comparative Se-
mitic studies have shown that not only in Hebrew, but in Amarna
Canaanite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician the infinitive absolute was em-
ployed with the force of a finite verb [4]. However, not until very

---

[1] "Two Notes: Am 3,15 and Os 11,8-9", *CBQ* 23 (1961) 231-232.
ALBREKTSON (152) adopts the same idea, but seems unaware of Nöt-
scher's article.

[2] T. H. ROBINSON, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, (HAT, ed. Otto
EISSFELDT, Tübingen ²1953) 44-45.

[3] *GKC*, § 113ʳ⁻ᵇᵇ.

[4] See for Amarna: MORAN, "The Use of the Canaanite Infinitive
Absolute as a Finite Verb in the Amarna Letters from Byblos", *JCS* 4
(1950) 169-172; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, 168; for Ugaritic: GORDON,
UT § 9.29; J. HUESMAN, "Finite Use of the Infinitive Absolute", *Bib*
37 (1956) 271-295; for Phoenician: HUESMAN, op. cit. On the Phoe-
nician evidence compare E. HAMMERSHAIMB, "On the So-Called Infinitive
Absolute in Hebrew", *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to G. R.
Driver*, edd. D. Winton THOMAS and W. D. MCHARDY (Oxford 1963) 92.
Similar to the views of Hammershaimb are those of FRIEDRICH (op. cit.
§ 286, n. 1) and DRIVER, "Reflections on Recent Articles", *JBL* 73 (1954)
129. For the possible finite use of the infinitive absolute in other Semitic
languages see, for Syriac: BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, § 88ᶜ; Theodor
NÖLDEKE, *Compendious Syriac Grammar*, trans. James A. CRICHTON
(London 1904) 236 (both assume an ellipsis of the finite verb); for South

recently has this use of the infinitive absolute been given its due consideration. In his extensive study of the Hebrew infinitive in 1956, J. Huesman cites twenty-five examples where the MT should be read (with no change in the text) as the infinitive absolute with the force of a finite verb, and twenty-three examples where it should be thus read after some alteration of MT (usually a revocalization of a perfect form as an infinitive). In addition he would read forty-three cases of the anomalous copula plus perfect as being actually the infinitive absolute used as a finite verb (¹). Although not every example cited by Huesman may prove to be correct, it seems quite certain that, as in the other Semitic languages noted above, Hebrew frequently employed the infinitive absolute with the force of a finite verb, and Lamentations contains one example of this syntactic feature.

The MT of 3,63, *šibtām weqîmātām habbiṭāh ʾanî manginātām*, is generally read as a 3 + 2 bicolon, "behold their sitting and their rising; I am the burden of their songs". But as suggested above (²) this understanding of the text seems to be based upon a wrong division of the verse and a misunderstanding of two syntactic elements, e. g., the adverbial *mem*'s were read as objective suffixes, and the infinitive absolute followed by personal pronoun — having the force of a preterite — was taken as an imperative belonging to the first colon, with the pronoun read as the subject of the second colon.

Once *šbtm* and *qymtm* are recognized as adverbial, it becomes clear that the verb modified, *hbyth*, must be related to the following

---

Arabic: Höfner, op. cit. § 54; for Ethiopic: A. Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar*, 2nd ed. 1899, ed. Carl Bezold, trans. James A. Crichton (London 1907) § 181.

(¹) Huesman's doctoral dissertation has been published in two articles, the first part (cited above) in *Bib* 37 (1956) 271-295, and the second as "The Infinitive Absolute and the waw + Perfect Problem", *Bib* 37 (1956) 410-434. One should compare the position of Driver (*JBL* 73 [1954] 129) that the construction is to be found in that "well-known rule of Semitic syntax that, when the verb precedes the subject, it may stand in the simplest form, *i.e.* the masculine singular third person, instead of agreeing with it...". But this rule of syntax is an Arabic rule, not a general Semitic one. There is no real evidence that the third person masculine singular form was recognized as the simplest form by the people who spoke these Semitic languages.

(²) See above, p. 204-205.

'*ani* and not the *yhwh* of verse 61. By reading the infinitive *habbêṭ*, for the imperative *habbiṭāh*, and combining with it '*ani*, the meaning is readily transparent when translated as a past tense, "I endured their mocking songs". The proposed emendation of *hbyṭ* for MT *hbyṭh* has only the slightest manuscript evidence (one MS in Kennicott), but in light of the *Kethib* of the imperative in 5,1, *hbyṭ* (*Qere hbyṭh*), and the mixed manuscript evidence on the *wᵉhabbiṭāh* of 2,20 (four MSS of Kennicott *whbyṭ*), it seems reasonable to assume that the final *he* may not have been original in 3,63, even if it were to be read as the imperative and not the infinitive. In addition, the preceding precative perfects (vv. 58-61) and the following jussives (vv. 64-66) make the presence here of an imperative in v. 63 all the more questionable.

One should note that the Syriac translated *hbyṭh* by the first person singular '*estaklet* "I perceive". It is doubtful whether the Syriac translator recognized or understood the syntax of this line, but at least from the force of the context he comprehended in part the import of the original verbal element. The proposed translation of *habbêṭ* '*ani* "I endured" is based upon the use of the verb with this meaning in Hb 1,3, *lāmmāh tar'ēni 'āwen wᵉ'āmāl tabbiṭ*, "why dost thou cause me to experience wickedness and endure trouble?"[1].

G. *The Asseverative* K *and* Kî

A growing list of examples of the vocable *kî* used as an asseverative particle have been compiled by Pfeiffer, O'Callaghan, Gordis, Driver, Dahood, and Muilenburg[2]. Since the time of Kimchi, who coined the phrase *kaph ha'amittuth*, Hebrew grammarians have re-

[1] See Brown–Driver–Briggs, 613 and 909. Note especially the parallel use of *rā'āh* in Ps 60,5 and 71,20. Compare also Ex 20,18, "and all the people saw (*rō'îm*) the thunderings...".

[2] See Egon Pfeiffer, "Glaube im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 71 (1959) 160; R. T. O'Callaghan, "Echoes of Canaanite Literature in the Psalms", *VT* 4 (1954) 175; R. Gordis, "The Asseverative *Kaph* in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *JAOS* 63 (1943) 176-178; Driver, *CML* 144; Dahood, *UHL* III, 327; James Muilenburg, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כ in the Old Testament", *HUCA* 32 (1961) 135-160.

cognized a *kaph* which cannot have the meaning of "like" [1].   The presence of the asseverative proclitic *kaph* in Ugaritic has reinforced the conclusions about such a *kaph* in Hebrew.   In the words of Gordis, "Biblical Hebrew uses the proclitic *kaph* as well as the vocable *ki* for asseverative purposes, the former generally at the end, the latter either at the beginning or end of the clause.   The former is used before substantives, the latter to modify verbs or an entire clause" [2].   Both the asseverative *ki* and *k* appear in Lamentations, and recognition of them brings clarity to several difficult passages.

1,20 miḥûṣ šikkᵉlāh ḥereb babbayit kammāwet:

The second colon, *babbayit kammāwet*, has been a very ancient crux.   Commentators for the most part have either rejected the *kaph* (like the Syriac which reads simply *môtā'*), read the *kaph* as part of the root (with Hebrew **kᵉmût* equal to the Akkadian *kamûtu* "captivity"), or assume the elision of the preposition *b* after *k*, so that an original *kbmwt* became *kmwt* [3].   But none of these explanations has yielded a reasonable solution for this text.

Gordis is certainly correct when he cites, among a list of twelve OT passages where the proclitic *kaph* heightens the emphasis, the *kaph* of *kammāwet* as asseverative.   He translates 1,20c as follows, "Without, the sword bereaved / Within there was death" [4].

Though unnoticed by the commentators, the best commentary on the imagery and meaning of this bicolon is Ez 7,15, *haḥereb baḥûṣ wᵉhaddeber wᵉhārā'āb mibbāyit 'ᵃšer baśśādeh baḥereb yāmût wa'ᵃšer bā'îr rā'āb wādeber yō'kᵃlennû*.   The same idea is expressed in Jer 14,18, although the parallelism of *baḥûṣ* and *mibbayit* is not included, "if I go into the field, behold those slain by the sword, and if I enter the city, behold the diseases of famine".   Other passages which make a comparison between violent death and non-violent death are Jer 16,4; 32,24; and Lam 4,9.

---

[1] GORDIS, op. cit. 176; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* II, § 51.   Compare *GKC* § 118ˣ where nine passages are cited in which *k* appears to be inserted for emphasis and is translated as "in every respect like".

[2] Op. cit. 178.   See also GORDON, *UT* § 13.51.

[3] See ALBREKTSON, 81-82, for a summary of the various views and bibliographical notations.

[4] Op. cit. 178.

In the light of these parallels between violent and non-violent death inside of and outside of the city, respectively, 1,20c should be translated as, "outside (the city) the sword bereaved; inside (the city) verily death (bereaved)" ([1]).

3,22 kî lō' timmānû (MT tam⁽n⁾û) kî lō' kīlû (MT kālû):

These two *kî* particles should be added to the collection of asseverative *kî*'s already attested in biblical Hebrew. The commentators have sought to explain *kî* ... *kî* here in several different ways. For example, Kraus relates 3,22 to the preceding '*al kēn 'ōḥil* of v. 21, with the initial *kî* clause coming after *ḥasdê yhwh* since this is the *ḥet* strophe ([2]). But '*al kēn* usually points backwards and it seems unlikely and unnecessary to relate it to the following verses ([3]). Albrektson reads the first *kî* as introducing a subject clause and translates 3,22, as, "it is Yhwh's mercies that we are not consumed, his compassions fail not" ([4]). But this destroys the synonymous parallelism of the two *kî* clauses and produces a syntactic pattern which is awkward

---

([1]) Compare Dt 32,25, *miḥûṣ t⁽š⁾akkel ḥereb ûmēḥ⁽a⁾dārîm 'êmāh*, "outside the sword shall bereave, and inside terror (shall bereave)".

([2]) KRAUS, 53.

([3]) The verb '*ōḥil* of 3,21 is usually read as the verb *yḥl* "to hope" which appears also in 3,24. It would give much better sense, especially since '*al kēn* points backwards to the wormwood, gall, etc. of 3,19, to read the verb as '*āḥûl*, "I writhe in anguish", from the root *ḥyl* "to writhe in pain, travail". Compare the *Kethib* of Jer 4,19, *mē'ay mē'ay 'ōḥîlāh* ('*ḥwlh*), "my bowels, my bowels, I writhe in anguish". The following verses (22-24) express hope and confidence, concluding with an affirmation — in good paronomastic style — by repeating the almost identical phrase with an apposite meaning, '*ōḥil lô*, "I will hope in him". Contrary to Albrektson (142), and N. GOTTWALD, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (Studies in Biblical Theology 14; London 1954) 13, MT *napšî* in Lam 3,20 is to be preferred as original to the reading *npšk* of the *tiqqûnê hassōp⁽⁾rîm*, for not only is the use of the *tiqqûnê hassōp⁽⁾rîm* for textual criticism very risky (see W. E. BARNES, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament 'Tikkune Sopherim' ", *JTS* 1 [1900] 387-414), but there is also a difference within this tradition. While Gottwald quotes C. D. GINSBURG (*Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition to the Bible* [London 1897] 361), who cites ms. Orient 1379 fol. 26B with a massoretic notation that *npšy* is from an original *npšk*, ms. Orient 1425 reads, *wtswḥ 'ly npšy npšw hyh ktw*.

([4]) ALBREKTSON, 145.

in both Hebrew and English. As will become clear from the discussion below, the only explanation that does justice to the text and context is to read these particles as asseverative.

H. *Third Masculine Plural Preformative* taw

The use of *taw* as the preformative of the third masculine plural imperfect is attested in Amarna Canaanite and Ugaritic, and probably in Punic (¹). Several scholars, including Gordon and Dahood, have claimed to find the *taw* third masculine plural preformative also in Hebrew (²). Yet other scholars such as Albright and Driver are unconvinced that such a *taw* preformative occurs in Hebrew. They prefer to read the masculine plural noun as a kind of collective noun treated as a feminine singular, with the *taw* being the regular preformative of the third feminine singular (³). The following verse in Lamentations may bring some additional light to the problem.

The MT of 3,22 *kî lōʼ tāmᵉnû kî lōʼ kālû* is generally emended. Most scholars prefer to read *tmw* for MT *tmnw*, after the Syriac *ṭᵉlaqnan* "we are ended" and the Targum's *pᵉsaqû* "they have ceased" (⁴). With this emendation, MT could be read as, "the mercies of Yahweh are not ended". But Albrektson, though wrong in his vocalization as *tammônû* and translation, "it is Yhwh's mercies that we are not

(¹) On the Amarna imperfect see Franz M. Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* 48-58; Édouard Dhorme, "La langue de Canaan", *RB* 10 (1913) 379; A. Herdner, "Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra", *Revue des études sémitiques*, 1938, 76-83; Moran, "New Evidence of Canaanite *taqtulū(na)*", *JCS* 5 (1951) 33-35; and Gordon, "The New Amarna Tablets", *Or* 16 (1947) 1-21, especially 10. For Ugaritic see Gordon, *UT* § 9.14; and on the Punic imperfect see Albrecht Alt, "Zu den Schlussformeln der punischer Weihinschriften", *ZAW* 60 (1944) 156-159, where he cites CIS I 3226, 3604 and states that *taw* and *yodh* are used along side of each other. On the other hand Friedrich prefers to leave undecided the question of the third masculine plural preformative *taw* in Punic (see op. cit. 156-157).

(²) See Gordon, *UT* § 9.14, and Dahood, *PNWSP* 5; idem, *UHP* 38; compare Moran, *BANE* 63.

(³) Albright, *CBQ* 7 (1945) 22-23; Driver, *CML* 130. Albright and Moran, "A Reinterpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)", *JCS* 2 (1948) 243; Albright, *HUCA* 23 (1950) I, 17.

(⁴) See Albrektson, 145-146, for a summary discussion on the views of the commentators.

consumed", is correct in retaining consonantal MT which is reflected
in the Syro-hexaplaric reading of Aquila (*g^emarnan* "we are consumed")
and Symmachus (*'etţalleqnan* "we have perished") [1].

Before discussing the vocalization of MT *tmnw* and *klw*, it will
be best to establish first the roots of these verbs. A careful study
of Hebrew and Ugaritic roots which occur in poetic parallelism makes
it seem just about certain that the verbs behind MT are the syno-
nyms *mānāh* "to number, count" and *kûl* "to measure". The desidera-
ted use of *mānāh* is attested in the following passages: *'am rāb
'^ašer lō' yimmāneh w^elō' yissāpēr mērōb*, "a great people that cannot
be numbered or counted for multitude" (1 Kgs 3,8); *'^ašer lō' yissāpēr
ṣ^ebā' haššāmayim w^elō' yimmad ḥôl hayyām*, "as the hosts of heaven
cannot be numbered, and the sands of the sea cannot be measured"
(Jer 33,22); and *bpy sprhn bšpty mnthn*, "their number (is) in my
mouth, their count is upon my lips" (*UT* 77:46-47).

Although MT *kālû* has been identified by all commentators with
the root *kālāh* "to be complete, to end", the synonymous parallelism
of *mānāh* with *mādad* "measure" and *sāpar* "number" strongly favors
reading the root here as *kûl* "to measure" cognate to Aramaic *kûl* and
Arabic *kâla* "to measure grain" [2]. The *Qal* of this verb is attested
only once in Biblical Hebrew, namely in Is 40,12, "who measured
(*mādad*) the water in the hollow of his hand and marked off (*tikkēn*)
the heaven with a span, enclosed (*w^ekāl*) [3] the dust of the earth
in a measure and weighed (*w^ešāqal*) the mountains in scales and the
hills in a balance" (RSV).

But the *Qal* is elsewhere attested, as in the tenth century B.C.
Gezer Calendar (*yrḥ qṣr wkl*, "one month for harvesting and measur-
ing" [4] and the seventh century B.C. Yabneh Yam Letter (*wyqṣr 'bdk
wykl w'sm*, "and thy servant harvested, measured, and stored [the
grain]" [5].

[1] Ibid.

[2] See JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim* and LANE, *An
Arabic–English Lexicon*, s. v.

[3] The RSV "enclosed" is obviously inadequate in this series of
verbs of measuring. C. R. NORTH has better translated, "measured
earth's soil", in his *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford 1964) 83.

[4] This derivation is accepted by most scholars; for other sugges-
tions see DONNER–RÖLLIG, op. cit. II, 128-130.

[5] See Frank M. CROSS, Jr., "Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Docu-
ments of the Eighth – Sixth Centuries B.C.: II. The Murabba'at Pa-

The desiderated reading here in 3,22 of these two roots is achieved by vocalizing *tmmw* as the *Niph'al timmānû* and *klw* as the *Qal* passive *kilû* (see below). Following the asseverative *kî* as discussed above, this bicolon is best translated as, "Verily, the mercies of Yahweh are innumerable! Verily, his compassions are immeasurable!" (¹).

The possibility that *timmānû* is a third masculine plural with prefix *taw* is suggested by the fact that the parallel masculine plural *raḥ*ᵃmāw is not treated as a singular feminine collective. Since the plural noun *raḥ*ᵃmāw is preceded by a verb in the third masculine plural perfect, there is some reason to assume that the parallel phrase *ḥasdê yhwh* is preceded by a third masculine plural imperfect, *timmānû*. To read, *ḥasdê yhwh* as a third feminine singular collective would require an emendation of the text to *timmāneh*. In this connection one may note that elsewhere the masculine plural force of these nouns is reflected in the choice of the pronoun used in parallelism, e.g., Ps 25,6, *zᵉkōr raḥ*ᵃmèkā yhwh wāḥ*ᵃsādèkā kî mē'ôlām hěmmāh* (not *hĕnnāh* or *hî'*).

I. Qal *Passive*

It has been almost a full century since F. Böttcher suggested that *Pu'al* forms which occur without a *Pi'ēl* should be understood as *Qal* passives (²). Not only did this thesis seem convincing in light of the Arabic *qutila/yuqtalu*, but it has been proven correct by means

---

pyrus and the Letter Found Near Yabneh-Yam", *BASOR* 165 (Feb. 1962) 44; J. NAVEH, "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.", *IsrEJ* 10 (1960) 129-139; and S. YEIVIN, "The Judicial Petition from Mezad Ḥashavyahu", *BO* 19 (1962) 3-10. The latter two scholars derive *wykl* from *kālāh* "to finish".

(¹) The *yqtl–qtl* sequence here is found elsewhere, e.g., Ps 8,7, *tamšîlēhû . . . šattāh*. For a study of this stylistic variation with identical verbs, see Moshe HELD, "The YQTL–QTL (QTL–YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic", in *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman*, M. BEN-HORIM *et al.*, edd. (Leiden 1962) 281-290. Held notes that an active-passive sequence of identical verbs also appears in Ugaritic and Hebrew. Here the sequence is not with identical, but synonymous verbs. See also GORDON, *UT* § 13.58 and DAHOOD, *UHP* 39.

(²) *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1868) II, 98-106. See also *GKC* § 52ᵉ and 53ᵘ.

of the well-attested *Qal* passive in Amarna Canaanite, Ugaritic, and
its possible appearance in Phoenician. It has since been recognized
that behind the consonantal text of many Hebrew *Qal* verbs, vo-
calized as active, lies an original passive form [1]. The above trans-
lation of MT *lō'kālû* as "they are immeasurable" assumes that MT
active should be read as passive, *kīlû* (like the Arabic *qīla*). Likewise,
as indicated above, MT *ḥālû* in 4,6 may be read better as a *Qal*
passive *ḥīlû*, "they were let loose", if not emended to either *ḥal*
or *ḥālal* [2].

Conclusions

In the first part of this study suggestions have been made for
a new rendering of the Hebrew text in nineteen different passages.
Of these, eleven are proposed for the first time, and eight proposed
derivations advanced by other writers have been presented (some-
times with additional arguments) and adopted as most probable.
In the second part new renderings have been proposed for over twenty
words or particles, fourteen of which are original with this study,
while seven are the suggestions of other scholars with whom the
writer agrees. If the suggestions advanced above are accepted, the
understanding and translation of the following thirty poetic lines
of the book's 266 poetic lines will be affected: 1,1a.1b.8c.13a.14c.
16a.19a.20c;   2,1a.2c.6a.10a.18a.22a;   3,16.17.21.22.26.28.37.
38.63; 4,3b.6b.16a.18a; 5,4-5.9.

The question of whether Lamentations was written in Palestine
or Babylon may never be resolved, but on the basis of the lexical
and syntactic elements employed by the poet, it seems certain that
Lamentations was deeply rooted in the literary traditions of ancient
Israel and Canaan. There has been no need to discuss or dispute
the dating of Lamentations to the first half of the sixth century as
argued by virtually all modern commentators. It is in the unexpec-
ted combination of the relatively fixed date and the clear evidence

---

[1] See BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss I*, 537-540; *UT* § 9.31; Paul JOÜON,
Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique (Rome 1923) 125-127; DAHOOD, *PNWSP*
8; IDEM, *Psalms I*, 19, 97 *et passim*. For a probable example in Phoeni-
cian, see Eshmunazar 5, *k 'y šm bn mnm*, "for nothing whatsoever has
been placed in it", (DONNER-RÖLLIG, op. cit. I, 3).

[2] See *Bib* 49 (1968) 48.

of many archaic syntactic and grammatical elements that Lamenta-
tions makes its contribution to the study of Hebrew literary traditions.
For many years it has been recognized that archaic Canaanite lin-
guistic features appear in the early poetic passages of the Bible,
e.g., the "Song of Deborah" (Jgs 5), and certain archaizing texts
such as the "Psalm of Habakkuk" (Hb 3). The use of these same
elements in a work of the mid-sixth century would indicate that
down to the exile itself these archaic features not only survived but
were a part of the literary repertoire, readily accessible to the poet
and those of the learned tradition. This literary repertoire included
not only the *hireq compaginis* and old feminine ending *-at* but enclitic
mem, adverbial *mem*, energic *nun*, emphatic *lamed*, asseverative *k* and
ki, the *Qal* passive, the infinitive absolute with the force of a perfect,
and the third masculine plural preformative *taw* — as well as a larger
lexicon of archaic words and particles than previously realized. The
failure of the Septuagint translators to recognize these archaic elements
would indicate that their use did not survive the exile. One might
well conclude that although written during the exile, Lamentations
is the last of the "pre-exilic" books.

Indices

I. – Scripture References

II. Hebrew Words

lō' ṣiwwāh 207
lō'tēṣē' 207
libbām 203
lāhad 49-50
māgôr missābîb 42
meḡîray 43
meḡûray missābîb
                    42-44

mādad 214
meḥôlālay 43
mēḥᵃdārîm 212¹
maḥšᵉbōtām 53¹
malkāh 36 203
mamlākāh 35-36 203
mangînātām 202²
                    209

mānāh 214
timmānû 212-215.
mē'ay 212²
mᵉšukkāh 36
mišbattehā 53¹
mᵉṣîaḥ yhwh 49-50
mšl: tamšîlēhû 215¹
miššālôm 201
nbṭ: **habbîṭāh** 204-205
                    209-210
tabbîṭ 210
ng': higgî'a 35 36
nāsîtî ṭôbāh 202
ṣḥr 43
sukkô 36 37
sāpar 214
'*āb* 34

'*wb* 35
'*yb* 34
yā'îb 34-35
'**ēn: 'ēnî 'ēnî** 32-33
'*yn* 53¹
'*al kēn* 212 212³
'*alāy* 53¹
'*ēlî* 53¹
'*allîzāh* 204
pûṣ 48
pᵉnê yhwh 48
pšḥ 43
ṣādāh 49
ṣwd: ṣādû 49
ṣawwā'rēnû 50-51
ṣl: bᵉṣillô 50
ṣā'aq 203
qāmay 43
qûmāh 205
qîmātām 204 209-
                    210

qṣr 214
qārā' 32 43 44
rab 29-30 30³
rabbātî 29-31
rab ṭabbāḥîm 31
rab šarîsāw 31
rîb/rîbê 44
rîbāh 45
rîbîm/rîbôt 44
rādāh 206
rādap 51¹
nirdāpnû 50

rûaḥ 'appênû 49-50
raḥᵃmāw 215
rā'āb 211
šāba' 199-200
šar 31
šar haṭṭabbāḥîm 31
šārātî 29 31
šārèhā 36 203
šôk 37 37²
šukkô 36, 37
šāḥaq 32⁰
šbb 53¹
šᵉbābîm 53¹
ṣābat 53¹
šw': tᵉšu'ôt 204
šḥy 49 50
šᵉḥîn 49
šḥt: bišḥitôtām 49-50
škl 211 212¹
šālaḥ 46-48
hišlîḥ 35
šāsāh 52
šāsas 52
š'l 52-53
šāqal 214
ššm 52
šattāh 215¹
tikkēn 214
tamᵉnû 212-213
tammônû 213
tā'ab 35
hit'îb 35
tô'ēbāh 35

THE ALLEGED SUMERIAN INFLUENCE UPON LAMENTATIONS

BY

THOMAS F. McDANIEL

Yokohama

Sumerian literary catalogues from the early second millenium contain the titles of numerous lamentations over the destruction of Sumerian city-states, including Akkad (Agade), Eridu, Lagash, Nippur, and Ur, and over the whole land of Sumer [1]). Portions of most of these lamentations have been recovered, and parts of several of them have been published in translation, including the "Lamentation Over the Destruction of Ur" [2]), "The Second Lamentation for Ur" [3]), the "Lamentation Over the Destruction of Nippur" [4]), and the "Lamentation Over the Destruction of Akkad" [5]).

---

[1]) See S. N. KRAMER, "The Oldest Literary Catalogue: A Sumerian List of Literary Compositions Compiled about 2000 B. C.," *BASOR* 88 (Dec., 1942), 10-19; *idem*, "New Literary Catalogue from Ur", *RA* LV (1961), 169-176. For a listing of the lamentations with full bibliographical notations, see KRAMER, *Sumerian Literary Texts From Nippur in the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul*, *AASOR* XXIII (1944), 33-36; and Maurice LAMBERT, "La littérature Sumérienne à propos d'ouvrages recents", *RA* LV (1961), 190-191. The term "Sumerian lamentations" in this study refers only to those lamentations which mourn the destruction of Sumerian cities and city-states. It does not include those lamentations concerned with the death of Dumuzi or one of his counterparts.

[2]) KRAMER, *Lamentation Over the Destruction of Ur*, *OIP* XII (Chicago, 1940); *idem*, "Lamentation Over the Destruction of Ur", in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. James B. PRITCHARD, 2nd ed. (Princeton, 1955), pp. 455-463 (cited below as I Ur); Maurus WITZEL, "Die Klage über Ur", *Or* XIV (1945), 185-235; XV (1946), 46-63; A. FALKENSTEIN, "Klage um die Zerstörung von Ur", in A. FALKENSTEIN and W. VON SODEN, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebet* (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1953), pp. 192-213 (cited as IUr-F and *SAHG*, respectively).

[3]) C. J. GADD, "The Second Lamentation for Ur", in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*, edd. D. W. THOMAS and W. D. McHARDY (London, 1963), pp. 59-71 (cited below as IIUR); Thorkild JACOBSEN, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia", *JNES* II (1943), 172 (cited below as IIUr-J); A. FALKENSTEIN, "Ibbisin Klage", in *SAHG*, pp. 189-192 (cited IIUr-F).

[4]) See KRAMER, *AASOR* XXIII (1944), 3; M. LAMBERT, *op. cit.*; and Wilhelm RUDOLPH, *Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohe Leid. Die Klagelieder* (*Kommentar zum Alten Testament*), 2nd ed. (Gütersloh, 1962), p. 213, where he cites a passage from Maurus WITZEL, *Perlen sumerischer Poesie*, a book which this writer has not seen.

[5]) This lamentation over Akkad is part of "The Curse of Agade", a historio-

Within the past decade statements have been made by several scholars concerning the relationship of these Sumerian lamentations to the biblical Lamentations, claiming that the Hebrew book was influenced by and dependent upon the earlier Sumerian works. S. N. KRAMER has stated, without going into detail, "there is little doubt that it was the Sumerian poets who originated and developed the 'lamentation' genre . . . and that the Biblical Book of Lamentations as well as the 'burden' laments of the prophets, represented a profoundly moving transformation of the more formal and conventional prototypes" [1]. Similarly C. J. GADD, without detailed discussion, has stated that the biblical Lamentations is "manifestly under the influence" of these Sumerian lamentations. He criticizes Norman GOTTWALD for not giving, in his *Studies in the Book of Lamentations*, sufficient recognition to the alien influence upon the origin, themes and theology of the Hebrew lamentation motif. He states, "certainly not all the harps were left hanging by the waters of Babylon, and some were attuned to sing at home the songs of a strange land" [2]. Speaking somewhat more emphatically, H.-J. KRAUS has stated, "die Klage um das zerstörte Heiligtum von Ur z.B. bietet eine erstaunliche Paralelle zu den Threni . . . Vergleicht man einmal sorgfältig das Klagelied über die Zerstörung von Ur (man könnte auch noch die Klage um die Zerstörung von Akkade hinzunehmen) und die alttestamentlichen Threni, so zeigen sich sowohl im formalen Ansatz wie auch in den Motiven überraschende Parallelen" [3]. KRAUS follows these statements by briefly citing (usually with text references only) examples of these parallels.

However, not all biblical scholars are in agreement with these views of Sumerian influence upon the Hebrew Lamentations. W. RUDOLPH, without any discussion, simply states that the parallels

---

graphic text, and not from the "lamentation" genre like the others cited above. But since it is cited by Hans-Joachim KRAUS, *Klagelieder (Threni) (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament)*, 2nd ed. (Neukirchen, 1960), p. 10, as a parallel lamentation and is included among the "lamentations" translated by FALKENSTEIN (*SAHG*, pp. 187-189), it is included here in this list. See KRAMER, *History Begins at Sumer*, Anchor Book ed. (New York, 1959), pp. 228-232; *idem*, "Sumerian Literature", *Analecta Biblica* XII (Rome, 1959), 196-197; *idem*, Sumerian Literature, A General Survey", *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest WRIGHT (New York, 1961). p. 257; I. J. GELB, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary, 2nd ed. (Chicago, 1961), p. 201; FALKENSTEIN, *SAHG*, p. 376.

[1] "Sumerian Literature and the Bible", 201.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

[3] *Op. sit.*, pp. 9-10.

are not too close and are due simply to a similar experience and situation [1]). Similarly, OTTO EISSFELDT opposes any historical connection between the Sumerian lamentations and the biblical Lamentations [2]).

In view of these assertions and reservations on the question of Sumerian influence upon the Hebrew Lamentations, a fuller examination of both the evidence and the problems involved merits consideration. In this study the attempt will be made to present and evaluate the parallel motifs appearing in both the Hebrew and Sumerian works, including not only the more probable ones cited by KRAUS but other motifs which could possibly suggest literary influence or dependence. A discussion of the problems involved in relating second millenium Sumerian works to sixth century Hebrew poetry, along with some general conclusions, will be given in conclusion. The writer is not a Sumerologist and has had to depend on available translations. He is aware of the limitations that this imposes, especially when it comes to a Sumerian passage where the translators treat the text differently. In such cases, the writer will cite the different translations. The procedure will be to follow the textual sequence of the biblical passages, listing first the relevant lines from the Hebrew Lamentations, followed by the Sumerian parallels. Comments and evaluation of the alleged parallels will be given after each parallel cited.

First it is important to note that certain parallels in the Sumerian and Hebrew texts should not be given undue significance in a study of possible literary influence. The experience of most cities in the ancient Near East under siege, and their fate upon subsequent defeat, were usually the same. Poets writing on the general theme of war and defeat, though at different times and at different places, would likely refer to the hunger, famine, pestilence, the social disintegration during the siege, the destruction of the city, the spoils taken by the victor, and the captivity of the conquered following defeat. Therefore, contrary to KRAUS, the parallel references in the Hebrew and Sumerian lamentations to hunger and famine, the destruction of the city walls and temple, the burning of the city, the loss of valuables, and the captivity of the inhabitants speak not so much of parallel literary motifs but of the common experience of the vanquished at the hands

---

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.
[2]) *Einleitung in Das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1964), p. 683.

of the victor [1]). One would normally expect to find in any kind of lamentation numerous references to weeping, crying and mourning. Thus the recurring parallels in Lam. i 2 a, 16 a; ii 18-19 *et passim* and IUr 96, 100 *et passim* could hardly be called upon as evidence of literary dependence. It is in these passages which deal with crying that one notes a significant difference between the Hebrew and Sumerian lamentations. In the former it is the personified city, Jerusalem, which weeps and mourns, but in the latter, Ur is never personified and the one who weeps and mourns is the goddess Ningal. Since the metaphor of bitterness which appears in Lam. i 4 c and IUr 315-316 is of such a general nature, it should be included among those parallel motifs that cannot reflect any kind of influence.

(a) Hebrew *'êkāh* 'how!' and the Sumerian word translated "alas" (Lam. i 1, ii 1, iv 1, 2 and IUr 41, 81 *et passim*) have been cited by KRAUS as a characteristic element of the literary genre which he calls "Klage um das zerstörte Heiligtum" [2]). But the expostulatory particle *'êkāh* is frequently found in other elegiac and non-elegiac passages of the Bible [3]). It is attested in an elegiac passage in Ugaritic, *ikm . yrgm . bn il ' krt*, "how (mournfully) it shall be said (that) Keret was the son of El" (*UT* 125 :20-21) [4]). It seems much more probable that the Hebrew poet had in mind this Hebrew and Northwest Semitic particle than some more remote Sumerian prototype.

(b) "She dwells among the nations, she finds no resting place . . . We are wearied (but) we are given no rest" (i 3 b; v 5); and "I am one who has been exiled from the city, I am one who has found no rest . . . I am one who has been exiled from the house, I am one who has found no dwelling place" (IUr 306-308). Here the point of similarity is the reference to exile followed by an allusion to the lack of rest or a resting (dwelling) place. In the biblical text the

---

[1]) Compare KRAUS, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.

[2]) *Ibid.* This title seems a little misleading. The whole city-state was destroyed. The Sumerian poets did not restrict themselves to lamenting only the destruction of the temples and shrines. The Sumerians thought in terms of the "destruction of cities" as reflected in a *me* which deals specifically with the destruction of cities (see below, p. 205).

[3]) On the occurrence in non-elegiac passages see G. S. GLANZMAN, "Two Notes: Amos 3, 15 and Os. 11, 8-9" *CBQ* XXIII (1961), 230-232.

[4]) The particle is usually understood as the interrogative particle "how?" with enclitic *mem* (see Cyrus H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook* [*Analecta Orientalia*, 38] [Rome, 1965], 19.147), but in this elegiac context it is more likely to be the expostulatory particle. On the necessity of adding an adverb in the English translation, see GLANZMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

reference is to Judah, but in the Ur lamentation the reference is to the goddess. The combination of "exile" and "no rest" into a single motif is not limited to these lamentations. One should compare the similar motif appearing in the covenant warning to Israel, "the Lord will scatter you among all peoples . . . among these nations you shall find no ease, and there shall be no rest for the sole of your foot" (Deut. xxviii 64-65). It seems more reasonable to assume that the poet had in mind these words, rather than knowledge of the words about Ningal which he then transformed into suitable words for the personified Jerusalem.

(c) "The roads of Zion mourn, for none come to the appointed feasts, all her gates are desolate" (i 4 a-b); and "In its lofty gates, where they were wont to promenade, dead bodies were lying about; In its boulevards, where the feasts were celebrated, . . . In all its streets, . . . In its places, where the festivities of the land took place, the people lay in heaps" (IUr 215-217). The parallel references in these lines to "roads" and "gates" are quite dissimilar. In the Hebrew text they are personified, like the city walls in ii 8, but in the Sumerian lamentation there is no parallel personification. The Sumerian poet calls attention to the gates and streets so as to contrast what used to happen in those places with what had happened in defeat and destruction. The mere mention of "gates" and "roads" together in different lamentations over destroyed cities is not suggestive of literary influence.

(d) "From on high he sent fire" (i 13 a); and "upon him who comes from below verily he hurled fire . . . Enlil upon him who comes from above verily hurled the flame" (IUr 259-260). Although both passages make reference to the divine use of fire, the motifs are only superficially related. Fire as a divine instrument is a recurring motif in biblical literature and Canaanite mythology [1]. The burning of conquered cities and the theme of divine use of fire are so sufficiently attested in Syria-Palestine that there is no need to go all the way to Sumer to find a literary parallel or prototype.

(e) "He spread a net for my feet" (i 13 b); and "über Sumer ist das Fangnetz gefallen" (IUr-F 200 :30). KRAUS includes these lines in his list of parallel motifs. KRAMER is less certain of the meaning

---

[1] See Delbert R. HILLERS, "Amos 7, 4 and Ancient Parallels", *CBQ* XXVI (1964), 221-225; and Patrick D. MILLER, "Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel", *CBQ* XXVII (1965), 256-261, for studies on the use of fire as a divine instrument in Northwest Semitic literature.

of this line in the Ur lamentation and translates, "Sumer *is broken up by the gišburru*" (IUr 195). But within the Hebrew literary and prophetic tradition the picture of Yahweh spreading a net was an established motif. Both Hosea and Ezekiel employ the motif, e.g., "I will spread my net over him, and he shall be taken away in my snare; and I will bring him to Babylon . . ." (Ez. xii 13; see also xvii 20; Ho. vii 12).

(f) "How the Lord in his anger . . ." (ii 1a); and "because of the wrath of Enlil" (Akkad 1). A frequently recurring theme in Lam. ii is the anger of Yahweh, and although not mentioned in the IUr lamentation, there are numerous references in the Sumerian lamentations to the wrath of Anu and Enlil [1]). Although Sumerian references to divine wrath appear in lamentations (including for the purpose of this study "The Curse of Agade") [2]) Hebrew references to the wrath of Yahweh are not restricted to this particular genre. A cursory look at any biblical concordance will be sufficient to indicate how widespread the concept of divine wrath was among the ancient Israelites. The Sumerian and Hebrew emphasis upon divine wrath in the interpretation of tragic national events is more likely to reflect an older and more general common religious tradition among the two peoples than literary dependence of the Hebrew poet upon the Sumerian lamentations.

(g) "He has bent his bow like an enemy . . . like an enemy he has slain . . . the Lord has become like an enemy" (ii 4a, 5); and "Mother Ningal in her city like an enemy stood aside . . . How long, pray, wilt thou stand aside in the city like an enemy? O Mother Ningal, (how long) wilt thou hurl challenges in the city like an enemy?" (IUr 253, 374-375). The simile "like an enemy" as applied to Yahweh does not appear elsewhere in the Bible, although there are other references to Yahweh's being an "enemy". In Ex. xxiii 22, the motif appears as follows, *weʾāyabtî ʾet ʾōyebèkā weṣartî ʾet ṣōrrèkā*, "I will be an enemy to your enemies and an adversary to your adversaries". In Is. lxiii 10, a similar phrase occurs, *wayyēhāpēk lāhem leʾōyēb*, "he became their enemy". Accordingly, although there is no biblical parallel as close as the same simile in IUr, the idea itself is found in Israel's religious tradition, and the Hebrew poet could well have coined this simile without recourse to a Sumerian prototype.

---

[1]) The title of the lamentation over Akkad in the Old Babylonian literary catalogue is listed as, "Because of the Wrath of Enlil". See KRAMER, *BASOR* 88 (1942), 15.   [2]) See p. 198, note 5.

(h) "The Lord has rejected his altar, he has abandoned [1]) his sanctuary" (ii 7 a); and "Enlil has abandoned ... Nippur ... Ninlil has abandoned their house ..." (IUr 4, 6, *et passim*). The first thirty-seven lines of IUr are a list of the various temples and shrines which the different Sumerian deities had abandoned. By contrast, in the Hebrew Lamentations the motif appears only once, assuming that the above translation of MT *ni'ēr* as "abandon" is correct. At best, the parallel is in the word and not in the meaning behind the word. Whereas in the Hebrew text Yahweh has rejected his holy city because of her sin and rebellion, Ningal and Nanna, the deities at Ur, plead for the safety of Ur and affirm her innocence. Only because the gods had not decreed eternal kingship for Ur must they bear with the calamity [2]). The idea of deliberate rejection is not a part of the Sumerian parallel, but it is basic in Yahweh's abandonment of Jerusalem.

(i) "Yahweh has determined to lay in ruins the wall of the daughter Zion ... Yahweh has done what he purposed, he has fulfilled his words which he commanded long ago; he has demolished without pity ... Who has given this (order) that it should come to pass? Yahweh verily [3]) has given the order" (ii 8 a, 17 a-b; iii 37); and "after they had *pronounced* the utter destruction of my city; after they had *pronounced* the utter destruction of Ur, after they had directed that its people be killed ... Anu changed not his command; Enlil altered not the command which he had issued" (IUr 140-142, 168-169). The same theme appears in the second lamentation, "the destruction of my city they verily gave in commission; the destruction of Ur they verily gave in commission; that its people be killed, as its fate they verily commanded" (IIUr-J). These parallel motifs of divine command and purpose are seemingly quite similar. But a closer study of the thought behind these motifs indicates that the similarity is only of words, not of meaning. According to Israelite religious traditions, the destruction of Jerusalem had not been inexorably decreed by Yahweh. What was commanded and purposed by Yahweh was a *covenant relationship* which could not be changed. Obedience would bring blessing; disobedience would bring destruction (see Deut. xxviii and Lev. xvi). Israel's acknowledged rebellion demanded Yahweh's just

---

[1]) See L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1953), *sub voce ni'ēr*.

[2]) See Gadd, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

[3]) Reading here the asseverative particle *lu'* for MT *lō'*. For a full discussion with bibliographic notes, see the writer's "Philological Studies in Lamentations", *Biblica* XLIX (1968).

fulfillment of his word (i 8 a, 18 a). Thus, in the context of Israel's faith, things could have been different if Jerusalem had been either faithful or repentant.

An entirely different understanding lies behind the Sumerian motifs of divine commission. In the myth of "Inanna and Enki: The Transfer of the Arts of Civilization from Eridu to Erech", the poet lists over one hundred "cultural traits and complexes" for which there is a *me*, i.e., "a set of rules and regulation assigned to each cosmic entity and cultural phenomenon for the purpose of keeping it operating forever in accordance with the plans laid down by the deity creating it" [1]). The thirty-eighth *me* cited by the Sumerian poet, in his list of over one hundred, is the *me* of the "destruction of cities" [2]). Apparently Ur's fate was inexorably fixed by this *me*, so that, innocent or not, even the gods' intercession could not change the *me* which Anu and Enlil had established.

There is no need to assume here that the Hebrew poet of Lamentations drew from outside his own covenant traditions when he wrote of divine purpose. The parallels with the Sumerian lamentations are only superficial.

(j) "He caused the rampart and wall to lament; they languish together (ii 8); and "O thou brickwork of Ur, a bitter lament set up as thy lament" (IUr 48, 53 *et passim*). The personification of inanimate objects is frequently encountered in funeral songs [3]). What is noteworthy here is the fact that although the verb *'ābal* is used with numerous other inanimate subjects or objects (including gates, land, pastures and the deep), this is the only occurrence where it is used with *ḥēl weḥōmāh*, somewhat like the Sumerian "brickwork". But there is no reasonable basis to assume that though the Hebrew poets independently composed metaphors like "her gates shall lament and mourn" (Is. iii 26) and "her land mourns" (Ho. iv 3), they were influenced by a Sumerian prototype for the motif "rampart and wall lament".

(k)". . . infants and babes faint in the streets of the city. Cry out in the night . . . for the lives of your children who faint with hunger at the head of every street" (ii 11 c, 19); and "the father turned away

[1]) S. N. KRAMER, *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character* (Chicago, 1963), p. 115.

[2]) *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[3]) See H. JAHNOW, *Das hebräische Leichenlied im Rahmen der Völkerdichtung* (*ZAW* Beiheft 36) (Giessen, 1923), pp. 102-103.

from his son . . . the child was abandoned . . . Ur like the child of a street which has been destroyed *seeks a place* before thee" (IUr 235-236, 370). The most that can be said of these parallel motifs is that they both refer to children. There is no reference in the Sumerian lamentations to the starvation of the children, nor to the cannibalism mentioned in Lam. ii 10 and iv 20. FALKENSTEIN translates IUr 370 as, "Ur sucht dich wie ein Kind, das sich in den Strassen verloren hat" (IUr-F 210 :15), and this fits the parallelism which follows, "thy house, like a man who has lost *everything stretches out* the hands to thee". There are no parallels to these similes in the Hebrew Lamentations.

(1) "My enemies have hunted me like a bird without cause" (iii 52); and "O my (city) attacked and destroyed, my (city) attacked without cause" (IUr 324-325). In the biblical lamentation there is no real assumption of the city's innocence or plea of ignorance, such as appears in IIUr 45-46: "what has my city done to thee, why hast thou turned from it? Enlil, what has my Ur done to thee . . ." The poet, who combines the motifs of individual and collective Hebrew laments, introduces here the theme of personal innocence, a typical motif of individual laments as found in Ps. xxxv 7, "for without cause they hid their net for me".

(m) "The young men (have quit) their music. The joy of our hearts has ceased; our dancing has turned to mourning" (v 14-15); and "On the *uppu* and *alû* they play not for thee that which brings joy to the heart . . . Thy song has been turned into weeping . . . The . . . -music has been turned into lamentation" (IUr 356). This motif of joy being turned into mourning is a recurring one, appearing in numerous Akkadian texts, the eighth century Aramaic Sefire treaty, and prophetic passages (Ez. xxvi 13; Jer. vii 34 *et passim*) [1]). Although the original motif could possibly go back to some Sumerian source, there is no reason to assume that the motif's appearance in v 14-15 is directly related to the Sumerian lamentations.

(n) "Restore us to thyself, O Yahweh, that we may return; renew our days as of old" (v 21); and "O father, my begetter, return my city in its unity to thy side again. O Enlil, return my Ur in its unity to thy side again" (IIUr 55-56). GADD has called attention to the similarity of these passages [2]), but though they are similar it is not

---

[1]) See Delbert R. HILLERS, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets.* (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 16) (Rome, 1964,) pp. 57-58.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, p. 70. GADD cites (p. 66) one other parallel, namely Lam. ii 6 and IIUr 5, but does not elaborate, and this writer fails to see any similarity between,

necessary to assume literary influence. The plea for renewal is as natural in this context as plea for renewed health in a lamentation due to sickness, e.g. Ps. vi 5, "return O Lord, and rescue my life, save me . . .' If there is a literary parallel, the poet may well be echoing words from Jeremiah, "restore me that I may return, for thou art the Lord my God" (xxxi 18).

Other more remote parallels could possibly be added to this list, but they would add little evidence either for or against the influence of Sumerian lamentations upon the Hebrew Lamentations. These fourteen examples that have been quoted are the closest parallels and include those motifs which are basic to any assumption of literary dependency. Certain preliminary conclusions can be drawn on the basis of this evidence. First, the parallel motifs do not seem to be as "amazing" as KRAUS suggests in his commentary. All of the motifs cited from Lamentations are either attested otherwise in biblical literature or have a prototype in the literary motifs current in Syria-Palestine. Second, certain dominant themes of the Sumerian lamentations find no parallel at all in this Hebrew lament. For example, one would expect to find the motif of the "evil storm" (which makes up all of the fifth song and part of the sixth song of IUr, and occurs in IIUr 10) somewhere in the biblical lamentation if there were any real literary dependency.

Any attempt to postulate Sumerian influence upon the Hebrew poets must deal with the problem of how the Hebrew poets of the mid-sixth century had knowledge of this particular Sumerian literary genre of the early second millenium. There is clear evidence that a part of the scribal and learned tradition in the post Sumerian period in Mesopotamia included knowing the Sumerian language and literary works; and even in the West, a part of the (syllabic) cuneiform scribe's learned tradition involved some elementary knowledge of Sumerian [1]). Furthermore, Akkadian versions of Sumerian literary works were known in the West. A large quantity of Babylonian literary fragments, including fragments of the Gilgamesh epic, were found at the Hittite capital of Boghazkhoy; and fragments of Sumero-Babylonian epics have been found at Ras Shamra [2]). Moreover, several

"Ur like a single reed makes no resistance (?)", and ii 6, "he has broken down his booth like that of a garden . . ." (RSV).

[1]) See KRAMER, "Sumerian Literature", p. 253; *idem*, "Sumerian Literature, A General Survey", 186; and D. J. WISEMAN, "Some Aspects of Babylonian Influence at Alalah", *Syria* XXXIX (1962), 180-187.

[2]) See Hans G. GÜTERBOCK, "Hittite Mythology", in *Mythologies of the Ancient*

fragments of Babylonian literary texts have turned up at Megiddo and
Amarna [1]). According to W. G. LAMBERT, these literary works and
traditions moved westward during the Amarna period (14th century)
when Babylonian cuneiform was the international language from
Egypt to the Persian Gulf [2]). But there is no evidence that these
literary works survived in Syria-Palestine. One has to assume with
KRAMER that, "Sumerian influence penetrated the Bible through
Canaanite, Hurrian, Hittite, and Akkadian literature", and with
LAMBERT (who writes with particular reference to the Genesis paral-
lels) that the traditions "reached the Hebrews in oral form" [3]).

To date there is no evidence of a literary genre of "lamentations
over destroyed cities" in any of the above literatures, though according
to A. Leo OPPENHEIM this genre of the Sumerian literary tradition is
reflected in the fourth tablet of the Era Epic which includes a long
lament over the destruction of Babylon [4]). Nor is there any evidence
that this particular literary tradition moved westward, which is not
surprising since there is no special reason to assume that a lamentation
over the destruction of a city would have wide popular appeal. Thus
without any evidence that the Sumerian literary works survived in
Syria-Palestine, or that this particular lamentation genre was known

World, ed. S. N. KRAMER (New York, 1961), pp. 154-155, 178; and for a recent
discussion on Mesopotamian literary works in Syria-Palestine, with references,
see W. G. LAMBERT, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis",
JTS NS XVI (1965), 287-300. See also M. JEAN NOUGAYROL, "L'influence baby-
lonienne à Ugarit, d'après les Textes en cunéiformes classique", Syria XXXIX
(1962), 28-35.

[1]) See W. G. LAMBERT, *op. cit.*, 299.

[2]) *Op. cit.*, 299-300.

[3]) KRAMER, "Sumerian Literature, a General Survey", 190; and W. G. LAMBERT,
op. cit., 300.

[4]) *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), p. 267. For the Era Epic itself, see
F. GÖSSMAN, *Das Era-Epos* (Würtzburg, 1956), and reviews of this work by
W. G. LAMBERT in *AfO* XVIII (1958), 395-401; and B. KIENAST in *ZA* LIV
(1961), 244-249. LAMBERT suggests that the historical background of this epic
is in the Sutû raids and civil war during the reign of Adad-apal-idinna (1067-1046)
and that it was composed at the order of Nabû-apal-iddina (c. 880-850) to chronicle
the fall and rise of Akkad. See also Erica REINER, "Plague Amulets and House
Blessings", *JNES* XIX (1960), 148-155, for a discussion on the use of parts of the
Era Epic on amulets to preserve one from the plague. For an English translation
of portions of the text, see KRAMER in *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, ed. S. N.
KRAMER (New York, 1961), pp. 127-135. In terms of literary form, style and
motifs, there is little, if any, resemblance between Tablet IV of the Era Epic
and the Sumerian lamentations; there is no resemblance to the Hebrew Lamen-
tations. The only apparent parallel is that the three works are concerned with
the destruction of a city and references are made to wailing and crying.

in the West, it is highly improbable that one can reconstruct a reasonable chain of literary transmission. Even if this lamentation genre had been known during the Amarna period, there is no reason to assume that the tradition was kept alive. Residents of Syria-Palestine were more apt to rejoice than lament over the destruction of Mesopotamian cities. If the Hebrew poets of the sixth century had knowledge of this Sumerian lamentation tradition, it is difficult to see how they could have learned of it in Palestine.

On the other hand it is difficult to agree with GADD that the Hebrews learned and adopted this literary genre during the exile [1]), since there is no evidence that the Israelites were in a mood, so shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, to adopt a foreign form to express the loss of national treasures in lieu of their own rich local literary traditions [2]).

Since the suggested parallel motifs discussed above have at best only general—and quite natural—similarities, and in light of the difficulties encountered in accounting for the transmission of this literary genre down to mid-sixth century Palestine, it seems best to abandon any claim of literary dependence or influence of the Sumerian lamentations on the biblical Lamentations. At most the indebtedness would be the *idea* of a lamentation over a beloved city. But since there is such a natural corollary to individual and collective lamentations or funeral laments, indebtedness may properly be discarded.

---

[1]) "The Second Lamentation for Ur", p. 61.

[2]) For a full discussion of Northwest Semitic lexical and syntactical elements in Lamentations, see the writer's "Philological Studies in Lamentations", *Biblica* XLIX (1968).

BIBLE AND THEOLOGY

—— No. 12 ——

November 1968

THE CONSONANTAL FORCE OF *HE* IN THE TETRAGRAMMATON*

Dr. Thomas F. McDaniel

Over twenty-five years ago, W. F. Albright stated in his review of Cyrus Gordon's *Ugaritic Grammar*, "thorough knowledge of Ugaritic grammar, vocabulary and style is an absolute prerequisite for comparative research on the part of biblical scholars. Moreover, the significance of Ugaritic for historical Hebrew grammar, on which will increasingly rest our reconstruction of the literary history of Israel, cannot be overestimated."[1] The validity of this observation by Albright is confirmed by Cyrus Gordon in his latest revision of the *Ugaritic Grammar* (now entitled, *Ugaritic Textbook*) where he states without reservation, "Ugaritic has already revolutionized the study of the Old Testament."[2] The linguistic significance of Ugaritic is noted by Gordon in the following manner: "As the evidence now stands the most important change in the status of Semitics since Brockelmann's *Grundriss*[3] is the addition of Ugaritic to the repertoire of the Semitic languages. This will sooner or later necessitate the revision of nearly every section of the *Grundriss*."[4] If Gordon had elaborated on other revisions which Ugaritic will necessitate, no doubt, he would have included historical Hebrew grammar, in full agreement with Albright.

Several studies have appeared in recent years dealing with Hebrew and Northwest Semitic (Ugaritic) language and linguistics, including William Moran's "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background,"[5] and Mitchell Dahood's *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* and

"Hebrew–Ugaritic Lexicography."[6] The insights derived from such comparative Northwest Semitic studies have already yielded excellent results in solving some of the enigmas in Biblical Hebrew. So much so, that Northwest Semitic philology has become one of the necessary tools for contemporary Hebrew grammarians.

Such comparative studies do not generally assist the scholar by offering conspicious parallels; rather it is in the careful analysis of grammatical and/or syntactic details that benefit is usually derived. With this in mind, the writer's purpose in this study is not to deal with Ugaritic and historical Hebrew grammar in general, but to assemble the Ugaritic and Hebrew evidence indicative of one particular phonetic phenomenon, the quiescence and/or elision of the postvocalic *he*. After presenting and evaluating the evidence of this phenomenon in Ugaritic as well as Hebrew, the significance of this material for a current problem in Japanese biblical scholarship will be presented, namely, the problem of how to represent the tetragrammaton YHWH in Japanese syllabic orthography (ヤハウェ or ヤーウェ or the like).

I

INTERVOCALIC ELISION OF *HE* IN HEBREW

Before surveying the new evidence for the postvocalic quiescence and elision of *he*, it may prove beneficial to review the evidence for the intervocalic elision of *he*, and loss of *he* by assimilation. This material is presented with varying degrees of detail in the Hebrew grammars of Wilhelm Gesenius,[7] G. Bergstrasser,[8] and Hans Bauer and Paul Leander.[9] Utilizing these studies, some six types of elision, or conditions under which intervocalic *he* is lost, can be summarized as follows.

(A) Syncope of the definite article following a preposition. In ele-

mentary descriptive grammars this phenomenon is described as the weak *he* of the article surrendering its vowel to the preposition and then disappearing, i. e. an original *$l^e h\bar{a}'\bar{a}m$* became *$l\bar{a}'\bar{a}m$*, 'to the people.'[10] Such an explanation, or even that in Gesenius' grammar that this elision takes place when the 'vowel is thrown back to the place of a preceding *$š^e w\hat{a}$ mobile,*'[11] is inadequate in light of the forward movement of the spoken language wherein it would not be possible to 'throw back' a vowel to an already uttered syllable. The explanation of Bauer and Leander seems more reasonable, namely that the elision of the *he* of the article came before the reduction of the original short vowel of the preposition to *$š^e w\hat{a}$* (e.g. before *la* became *l^e*).[12] Thus MT *$l\bar{a}'\bar{a}m$* would go back to an original *$laha''\bar{a}m$*, which with loss of intervocalic *he* would become *$la''\bar{a}m > l\bar{a}'\bar{a}m$*. The long *$\bar{a}$* vowel is due to compensatory lengthening since the *ayin* cannot take the *dagesh* of gemination. Otherwise there would be no compensatory lengthening of the initial *a* vowel since gemination of the first radical of the noun produces a closed, unaccented syllable.

(B) Elision of the *he* of the *Niphal* and *Hiphil* infinitive after a preposition. This elision of *he* is much like the above syncope of the article. However, examples of such an elision in the *Niphal* infinitive are problematic, for while Bauer and Leander cite seven examples, Bergstrasser makes no reference to such examples in his discussion of the *Niphal* infinitive, and Gesenius-Kautzsch prefer to read them according to the *Kethib*, as *Qal* infinitives.[13] But if the *Qere* is correct, one does have a *Niphal* infinitive plus preposition with *he* elided, as *$bikk\bar{a}š^e l\hat{o}$* (Ez. 26:15) for an original *$b^e hikk\bar{a}š^e l\hat{o} < *bahikk\bar{a}š^e l\hat{o}$*. The elision of the *he* of the *Hiphil* infinitive after the preposition is frequent, but not normative.[14] Alongside such usual forms as *$l^e hašmid$* and

lᵉhašmiʿa are the elided forms *lašmid* and *lašmiʿa*, which obviously go back to **lahašmid* and **lahašmiʿa*.

(C) Loss of the preformative *he* of the *Hiphil* imperfect and participle. As noted immediately above, the *he* of the *Hiphil* infinitive is sometimes elided after a preposition, but in the *Hiphil* imperfect and participle it is regularly elided.[15] Thus the paradigm form *yaqtil* is derived from a proto-semitic **yahaqatil*, with the elision of the intervocalic *he* and the loss of the short *a* vowel of *qa* between the primary and secondary accents (yàq-tíl). Similarily, the participle *maqtil* goes back to a proto-semitic *mahaqatil*, with loss of intervocalic *he* and reduction of the vowel between primary and secondary accents.[16]

(D) Elision of the *he* in the third person pronominal suffixes. For clarity, this category may be sub-divided into the following five types: elision after a short *ă* vowel; after a short *i* vowel; after a long *i* vowel; after a long *ū* vowel; and elision after the diphthong *ay*.[17]

(1) Examples of elision after short *ă* include the 3 m. s. suffix, as in MT *rûḥô* ('his breath') from **ruḥahū*, due to loss of the intervocalic *he* and contraction of the diphthong *aū* to *ô*. So also *lô* ('to him'), from **lahū> *laū>lô*. An example with the 3 f. s. is in MT *ḥēlâ* ('her wall') from **ḥaylaā <*ḥaylahā*, i.e., with loss of intervocalic *he*, coalescence of *aā* into *ā*, along with contraction of the diphthong *ay* to *ê*. The *he* of MT *ḥêlāh* is only a vowel letter, not the *he* of the original feminine suffix–*hā*. But when there is a *mappiq* in the *he*, one has to assume with Bergstrasser that the 3 f. s. suffix is *hā*, not *hā*, with the *hă* losing its final short vowel, whereby the final *he* would be consonantal and take the *mappiq*.[18] So also *lāh* ('to her'), from **lahā> laā> lā>lâ*. Examples of the 3 m. pl. are MT *lāmô* ('to them') from an original **lahumū*, and MT *bᵉtām* ('their house') from an original **baytahumu*.[19]

(2) Examples of elision after short *ĭ* vowel are with the 3 m. pl. suffix attached to verbs, which appears only as *m* in Biblical Hebrew, although it goes back to an original **-humū*. The final short *ŭ* of *-humū* was dropped, and after short *ĭ*, **-ihum* developed into *-ēm*, as in MT *'ett^enēm* ('I will give them') from an original **'antinihumu*.[20] Quite similar is the development of MT *yo'k^elēmō* from **yo'kilihumo* ('he will eat them').

(3) The *he* of the third masculine suffixes is elided after a long *ī* vowel.[21] Examples are MT *'ābiw* ('his father'), from **'abihū*; MT *pimô* ('his mouth'), from **pihumō*; and MT *y^eda'tim* ('I knew them') from **yada'tihumu*.

(4) The *he* of the third person plural suffixes is elided after a long *ū* vowel, as in the MT *'^akûlûm* ('they ate them') from **'akalūhumu* and MT *yahargun* ('they killed them') from **yahrugūhinna*.[22]

(5) The *he* of the third masculine suffixes is elided after the diphthong *ay* as in MT *bānāyw* ('his sons'), from **banayhū*, and MT *'ālêmô* ('upon them'), from **'alayhumō*. Cross and Feedman are no doubt correct in maintaining that MT *-āyw* (as in *bānāyw*) is a mixture of two forms, representing (1) the northern Israelite pronunciation in the orthography (*bnyw=banêw*), where with the early contraction of the diphthong **-ayhū >êhū> êw*, and (2) the southern Judahite pronunciation in the vocalization (*bnyw=banāw*), where there was no contraction of diphthongs (hence **-ayhū> *-ayū>-āw*).[23]

The retention of the *he* in the following suffixed forms is only a graphic representation of diphthongs that otherwise would be lost in the strictly consonantal orthography: *-ēhû* (**-eu*), *-ehā* (**-ea*), *-ihā* (**-ia*), and *-ûhā* (**-ûa*).[24] This being the case, the force of the *he* in these suffixes is more that of *matres lectionis* for the *a* or *u* vowel

of the diphthong, rather than full consonantal force as attributed to it in the Masoretic tradition. Although in the vocalization the *he* had quiesced, it was retained in the orthography to represent the diphthong that developed after its quiescence.

(E)   Related to the complete elision of the *he* in the third person suffixes is the assimilation of the *he* of the 3 m. s. verbal suffix, e. g., as in *qᵉtālattû*, a variant form of *qᵉtālathû* ('she killed him'), and similar variants for the first and second person perfect verbs with 3 m. s. suffix: *qᵉtaltāhû/qᵉtaltô* and *qᵉtaltîhû/qᵉtaltîw*. These variants may well be examples of a literary form (with *he* represented in the orthography) and a colloquial form (spelled phonetically without *he*). The loss of the *he* of the suffix when attached to verbs with the energic ending should also be noted, for example –*enhû* may become –*ennû*.[25]

(F)   Quiescence of the *he* in the trigrammaton YHW when used in the formation of personal names. The theophoric element used as the final element in Hebrew names appears as either –*yāhû* or –*yâ* (–*yh*), but as the initial element it appears as either *Yô*– or *Yᵉhô*–. The theophoric *Yô* element is generally assumed to go back to *yahū, which became *yô*– through elision of intervocalic *he* and contraction of the diphthong.[26]

The variation between *Yᵉhô*– and *Yô*– is much like the variation in the *Hiphil* forms *yᵉhôdeh* and *yôdeh* ('he will praise'), *yᵉhôšî'a* and *yôšî'a* ('he will save'), or like the variant spellings for proper names: *Yᵉhôsēp* and *Yôsēp*, *Yᵉhûkal* and *Yûkal*. Albright has convincingly argued that the MT *Yᵉhô*– is only an artificial Masoretic spelling, formed on the analogy of the contracted form *Yô*–.[27] Though vocalized by the Masoretes as *Yᵉhô*–, it was still pronounced as *Yô*–.

The Masoretes took the spelling YHW, handed down to

them, and tried to vocalize it. They were faced with the same problem as in other cases of superfluous letters due to historical spelling......They found the spelling YHW with the pronunciation Yô. There was only one way out of the difficulty......to point the initial *yôd* with *šewâ*......At all events, their system forced them to create an anomalous punctuation which presently became a literary pronunciation.....[28]

Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the names *YHWSP* and *YHWKL* were actually pronounced as *Yôsēp* and *Yûkal*, with full quiescence of the intervocalic *he*, though the *he* was either retained as historic spelling or later introduced as an archaizing feature. The same would be true of the variant forms of the *Hiphil* imperfect given above.[29]

In concluding this summary on the elision of intervocalic *he*, the following observations can be made. First, intervocalic *he* was elided in some of the most common and frequently recurring forms in Hebrew. In some cases it was obviously retained in the vocalization to differentiate between otherwise indistinguishable forms: *q^etālûhû* ('they killed him') does not become *q^etālû*, which would be identical with the same verb without a suffix. In some cases *he* was retained in the orthography even though it had been lost in the pronunciation. Variant spellings of the same noun or verb in MT offer undisputable evidence for this, and it is reasonable to assume that behind the vocalization of other words in the Masoretic tradition there are additional examples of simple historic spelling, wherein the *he* has no real consonantal force.

II
POSTVOCALIC ELISION OF *HE* IN UGARITIC
AND HEBREW

The Hebrew reference grammars used above, because of the limited comparative material available for Northwest Semitics, do not deal with the postvocalic elision or quiescence of *he*. One reads in Gesenius-Kautzsch the simple statement, "the *he* is stronger and firmer than the *aleph*, and never loses its consonantal sound (i.e. *quiesces*) in the middle of a word except in the case noted below."[30] The exceptions that follow therein are the syncope of the article after prepositions (above I-A) and the syncope of *he* in the third person suffixes (above I-D), plus the quiescence in the names *ᵃšá'ĕl* and *pᵉdáṣûr* and the artificially divided *yᵉpēh-piyyāh*.

At best there are only two examples of the postvocalic elision of *he* cited in these grammars:

(a) The shift from final *he* (with *mappiq*) to final *he* with *rāphē*.[31] Examples include *lāh> lâ* ('to her') from **laha*, and *yāh> yâ* (as in *halᵉ-lî-yāh* 'hallelujah', but *yirmᵉyâ* 'Jeremiah') from **yahū*. These examples are problematic in that one must assume final short vowels for *yahu* and the 3 f. s. suffix, although they are usually long.[32] (Final short vowels were lost in Hebrew, but not final long vowels.)[33] *He* with *mappiq* would suggest the lost of final *a* short vowel, and the variant forms of *he* with *rāphē* would suggest further elision of the postvocalic *he*; whereas if the final vowel were long there would be an intervocalic elision of *he*, with the resulting long vowel being indicated by a vowel letter.[34]

(b) The elision of the postvocalic *he* in the Hiphil of the verb

hālak, wherein MT *hôlîk* was derived from **hahlîk*. This is frequently described as a dissimilation of *hah-* to *hô-*, analogous to the development of *'a'-*, as in **'a'kul* which became *'ôkal* ('I will eat') because of the elision of the second *aleph*, compensatory lengthening of the *a* vowel, then the shift of long *ā* to long *ō*, followed by the dissimilation of the thematic vowel from *ū* to *ā*.[35] The *Hiphil hôlîk* is assumed to have then developed on the analogy of the *pe-yodh*, *pe-waw* verbs.[36]

The variant forms of the *Qal* imperfect of *hālak* (*yēlēk* and *yahᵃlōk*) may reflect in their consonantal spelling (a) the colloquial phonetic spelling of **yahluk*, which with elision of the post vocalic *he* became *ylk* (=MT *yēlēk*, the Masoretes having vocalized on analogy of *pe-yodh* verbs), and (b) a literary spelling found in poetry and later books where the archaic **yahluk* was retained as *yhlk* (=MT *yahᵃlōk*).[37]

It is now known that the quiescence or elision of the postvocalic *he* is not limited to just these few examples. Numerous examples have been noted in Ugaritic, and the evidence of this development in Ugaritic has led to the recognition of other examples in Biblical Hebrew.[38] To the two kinds of examples listed above it is now possible to add the following examples from either Ugaritic or from Hebrew, as proven by Ugaritic cognates.

(1) First it should be noted that in the *yqtl* (=imperfect) of the G-stem (*Qal*) and Gt-stem (reflexive stem of G, equals Arabic VIII) of Ugaritic *hlk*, 'walk' the *he* is absent, so that, in Gordon's words, "in these forms.... the verb is to all intents and purposes treated like *pe-yodh*."[39] But in the causative stem (Ugaritic *Šapēl*, for Hebrew *Hiphil*) the *he* is retained. (Compare the forms *ylk*, 'goes', *itlk*, 'I was going,' but *ašhlk*, 'I shall cause to flow.')

More than mere analogy to *pe-yodh*, these variations are similar to

what happens in some *pe-aleph* verbs.[40] That is to say, the weak nature
of *he* in *hālak*, 'walk' appears to be the same as weak *aleph* in *'āzal*,
'go,' where the *aleph* is elided in the imperfect (reading *tēzᵉli*, 'she
will go,' for the expected *te'zᵉli*). Therefore, Hebrew and Ugaritic *ylk*
is to *hlk* what *yzl* is to *'zl*: the weak postvocalic consonants have been
lost.

(2) Usually in Ugaritic the *he* is retained in the orthography of
the *yqtl* of *pe-he* verbs, but with the root *hlm*, 'to strike,' the *yqtl*
appears as *ylm*, 'he strikes,' although the imperative retains the *he* as
in *hlm* 'strike!'[41] This appearance of the *he* in the imperative but not
in the *yqtl* is analogous to those *pe-aleph* verbs where there are similar
forms. For example, *'ēhāb*, 'I will love' (<*'eᵉhab*), where the *aleph* of
the root has been lost, but in the imperative it appears, *'ᵉhab*, 'love!'[42]

The Ugaritic forms *ylk* instead of *yhlk* and *ylm* instead of *yhlm*
suggest that although the weak postvocalic *he* was not regularly elided
in verb forms, like the weak postvocalic *aleph*, it was at least irregu-
larly elided in the orthography. And permitting the very real possibility
of historical spelling, both weak postvocalic *he* and *aleph* may have
quiesced with greater regularity in the pronunciation than indicated
in the written text.

(3) The enigmatic spelling of MT *bāttim*, 'houses' (with *dagesh*
in the *taw* after the long *ā* vowel) finds its explanation in the plural
of this noun in Ugaritic: *bhtm* (vocalized as *bahtim-*). In both Hebrew
and Ugaritic the plural is built on a different stem than the singular;
the singular being **bayt>bêt* (with the contraction of the diphthong)
while the plural is *bht* (or possibly *bwt*).[43] In Ugaritic the postvocalic *he*
was retained in the orthography and the pronunciation; but in Hebrew
this *he* was elided——but only after the process of spirantization

had ceased. Consequently, in Hebrew *bahtim* became *batim*, with the dagesh lene retained to indicate the original stop of the *taw* when the *he* of *bah-* had full consonantal force. It is clear, then, that the dagesh in the *taw* of *btm* is not dagesh forte(=*bttm*), but dagesh lene(=*batim*). Just as the lack of spirantization in MT *malkᵊ* (*k* after the closed syllable *mal-* would naturally have the dagesh forte) reflects the presence of the original *a* vowel (**malakᵊ*), so the presence of the dagesh lene in *taw* of *btm* reflects the lost *he* between the *b* and *t*.

(4) The word *bâmāh*, 'high place,' goes back to the root *bhm* and is related to the word *behēmāh*, 'beast.' This identification was convincingly argued by Albright and Iwry and was suggested to them in part by the fact that in the Qumran text 1QIsᵃ the word *bâmāh* appears three times as *bwmh* (*bômāh*).[44] The *waw* in the Qumran spelling suggests an original **bahmāh*, which, with lost of postvocalic *he*, compensatory lengthening, and the shift of long $\bar{a}$ to long $\bar{o}$, became *bômāh*. In Albright's own words:

> The original form of the word was certainly **bahamatu*, whence *bâmatu*....In any event the initial accented vowel (in proto-Hebrew) was long, so the spelling with *ô* is correct, while the spelling with *â* perhaps reflects the fact that *he* was preserved until a time after the bulk of proto-Hebrew words had already shifted accented *â* to *ô*.... After collecting a large number of cases in Hebrew, Ugaritic, Aramaic, Accadian and Arabic, in which an anomalous *â* or *ū*, without recognized phonological explanation, go back to *ah* or *uh*, where *he* quiesced in the preceding short vowel, it becomes obvious that *bâmāh-bômāh* should go back to **bahmatu*; the uncertainty of the quality of the vowel may be due to dialectal

phenomena, *ah* being preserved in some places until after the principle that an accented *â* became *ô* had cease to operate.[45]

Albright goes on to note that those words which still preserve the *he* of the stem have usually developed different meanings. He illustrates by noting that *behēmāh*, 'beast' goes back to an original sense of "back" or "torso" of an animal, *bâmāh*. And parallel to this loss of *he* in Hebrew is the same development in Ugaritic where both words are found, *bmt*, 'back,' without the *he*, and *bhmt*, 'cattle,' with the *he*.[46]

(5) Hebrew *'ōhel*, 'tent' indicates in its vocalization a similar development. It is clear from the Ugaritic *ahl*, 'tent' and Akkadian *âlu*, 'tent' that this noun is a *qatl* noun (like **malku*, 'king') and not a *qutl* form (like *'ōkel < *'uklu*, 'food') nor a *qātil* form (like *'ōkēl < *'ākil*, 'eating').[47] Yet it is vocalized with long *ō* and not *ā*. This comparative evidence makes it clear that the word developed as follows: **'ahlu >* **'ālu > 'ōl*, due to quiescence of the *he* with the preceding homogeneous *a* vowel, with compensatory lengthening of *a* to *ā*, followed by the shift of *ā* to *ō*, and loss of case ending *ŭ*. The *he* of *'hl* was retained only as historical spelling. The Masoretes, however, treated the noun as a typical *segolate* and vocalized *'ōhl* (with quiescent *he*) as *'ōhel*.

(6) Whereas in *'ōhel* the quiescent postvocalic *he* is retained as historical spelling, there are other examples in Hebrew where the quiescent postvocalic *he* is completely elided in both pronunciation and orthography. Such an example is *qôl*, 'voice.' Albright's concise statement on the origin of this noun is as follows:

> Hebrew *qôl*, "voice" cannot go back to **qawlu*, **qaulu*, as formerly thought, since it is written *QL*, not *QWL*, in the Siloam inscription (diphthongs were left uncontracted in the speech of Israel) and appears as *qâlâ* in Aramaic;

the true explanation is certainly that *qôl* goes back to *qahlu*, "call," from the stem QHL, "to call, assemble", cognate with Arabic *qalq*, "to speak".[48]

Thus, *qahlu* became *qôl*, through elision/quiescence of *he* to the preceding homogeneous *a* vowel, compensatory lengthening of the *a* vowel, shift of *ā* to *ō*, plus loss of the case ending. MT *qwl* (*qôl*) is *scriptio plene*, while the Siloam inscription's *ql* (*qōl*) is *scriptio defectiva*.

(7) An Ugaritic example where postvocalic *he* is likewise completely elided is *ẓr*, 'top' which is from the root *ẓhr*, cognate to Arabic *ẓahrun* and Hebrew *ṣhr* (*ṣohar*, 'noon').[49]

(8) Compared to the example listed above in (4) where the meaning of the word varies with the presence or absence of the *he*, there are two Ugaritic words written with or without the *he*, but either way having the same meaning. These are listed by Gordon and Dahood, and need only be noted here: *ḏhrt* and *ḏrt*, 'vision' and *bhṯ* and *bṯ*, 'hail, welcome.'[50]

(9) The final point to be reviewed in reference to the postvocalic elision of *he* in Ugaritic and Hebrew is that of the so-called *he-locale*. In Ugaritic this *he* (unaccented *-ah*) is regularly indicated in the orthography as *h*, indicating——since vowel letters were not employed in Ugaritic——that the *he-locale* was originally consonantal.[51] However, in Hebrew the *he-locale* is regularly expressed by *-â* (i.e. *-āh*, without the *mappiq* in the *he*, indicating that the *he* is only a vowel letter with no consonantal force). Hebrew grammarians have until now assumed that the Hebrew *he-locale* was the original short *a* vowel of the accusative case ending, retained in Hebrew as a kind of adverbial accusative.[52] But the Ugaritic evidence now indicates that this traditional explanation is

incorrect. To the contrary, Hebrew *he-locale* goes back to an original suffixed *-ah* where the *he* was originally consonantal. But in Hebrew this postvocalic *he* lost its consonantal value and quiesced with the preceding homogeneous *a* vowel, producing long $\bar{a}$. In turn this long $\bar{a}$ vowel was represented through the use of *he* as a vowel letter (i. e., $-\bar{a}h=\hat{a}$).

Even in Ugaritic this weakening of the *he* in *he-locale* may be reflected in those cases where "heavenward" is written simply as *šmm* and "to the elbow" is spelled *amt*.[53]

Other examples of the elision of postvocalic *he* will certainly turn up in both Hebrew and Ugaritic. One wishes that Albright had published his list (mentioned above, II-4) of Aramaic, Arabic and Akkadian examples. In Hebrew there are no doubt many examples hidden behind the Masoretic vocalization, just as the quiescent *aleph* is hidden in the MT *bᵉ'-er*, which is artificially pointed for *bᵉ'r* from an original **bi'r*.[54]

Recognition of quiescent postvocalic *he* in Hebrew permits another possible explanation for the origin of the variant *yô* (yw) for *yāhû* (yhw). The usual explanation is that *yāhû* became *yô* through the elision of intervocalic *he*, followed by contraction of the diphthong.[55] This involves a rather long chain of development: **yahw>*yahuw>yahû>*yaû>yô*. Actually, *yô* may reflect a different (dialectical) development wherein **yahw>*yāw>yô*, through elision of postvocalic *he* and contraction of the diphthong.

This same explanation could also apply to the *-yw* of *šmryw* (*šᵉmar-yaw*) of the Samaria ostraca.[56] However, it cannot be applied to *yw*, a divine name in Ugaritic. B. W. Anderson, in his article in the *Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, is incorrect in reading Ugaritic *yw* as *yô*, since Ugaritic does not employ vowel letters.[57] In Ugaritic the

waw must be consonantal. If the Ugaritic *yw* is related to Yahweh and /or the imperfect (*yqtl*) of the root *hwy*, 'to be,' it can only be derived from the G-stem (*Qal*) jussive or the D-stem (*Piel*) jussive; i.e. either **yahwi>yāwi* (with postvocalic elision of *he*) or **yahawwi>yāwwi* (with intervocalic elision of *he*). Since, as argued below, the pronunciation of *YHW* as 'Iaô points back to a Hebrew *Piel* jussive (**yahaw>yāhô*), Ugaritic *yw* is probably a similar D-stem jussive possibly with the force of a causative.[58]

But even without these conjectural points there is sufficient undisputable evidence that not only was intervocalic *he* elided, but that postvocalic *he* in both Hebrew and Ugaritic was weak to the point where it frequently was quiescent, especially following the homogeneous *a* vowel. With this evidence on hand, it is now possible to consider the probable consonantal force of *he* in the tetragrammaton.

III

The Consonant *He* in *YHWH*

The final *he* of *YHWH* is a vowel letter with no consonantal force. This is clear from the Masoretic tradition which did not point the *he* with *mappiq*. In early Hebrew orthography *he* was used to represent *ō*, *ē*, and *ā*.[59] The attempts by some scholars to vocalize *YHWH* with a final *ō* or *ā* vowel have not met with wide acceptance, although there is some evidence from the early fathers that the divine name was pronounced as 'Iaô, 'Iao, and *Yahô*.[60] G. J. Thierry has convincingly argued that these three pronunciations of the divine name point to the trigrammaton, *YHW* (used in personal names), not to the tetrag-

rammaton, *YHWH*.[61] In the opinion of this writer, these three vocalizations of *YHW* point back to the *Piel* jussive **yahaw* which became **yāhô* with contraction of the diphthong. The root *hwy / hyh* regularly has the *Piel* causative; and if this derivation proves correct, *yāhô* would have the same force as the *Hiphil* jussive *yāhû*, as argued by Albright.[62]

The vocalization of *YHWH* is reflected in those traditions which give the pronunciation of the divine as '*Iabe*, '*Iaoue* or '*Iaē*.[63] Albright gives the most satisfactory derivation of *YHWH* by identifying it with the *Hiphil* imperfect, **yahwiy > yahwẹ*.[64] Consequently, with agreement from three converging lines of evidence (the Masoretic tradition, the early fathers, and a contemporary scholarly derivation of the form) it is quite certain that the final *he* is only a vowel letter and should not be represented in any phonetic transliteration wherein it would receive consonantal value. In English it is possible to represent the *he* (Yahweh = *yāwe*) for the *h* is homogeneous to the *e* vowel; but with Japanese syllabic orthography, this is obviously not possible.

The first *he* of *YHWH* is consonantal. But the question is what was the force of this consonant? It is well recognized that the Greek '*Iabe* or '*Iaoue* are of no help since Greek has no way to represent medial or final *h*. The Akkadian syllabic transliterations offer some help, however, since in Akkadian transcriptions of Hebrew names the *he* is sometimes reflected by the use of *ḥ*, although in Akkadian itself the *he*, *ḥet*, and '*ayin* had fallen together with *aleph*. Even though the following names have nothing to do with Yahweh as once thought,[65] they do illustrate the weak force of postvocalic *he* in the imperfect of the root *hwy*: (a) *Ia-aḫ-wi* and *Ia-aḫ-wi-ilum*; (b) *Ia-wi-ilum, Ia-wi-um*, and *Ia-wi-Dagan*.[66] The *ḥ* in the spelling of the first two indicates the etymol-

ogical *he* of the root *hwy*; but the spelling in the last three, without the ḫ, indicate that the *he* was weak. From this evidence it seems reasonable to assume that despite the fact that Akkadian could represent a strong consonantal *he* by using ḫ, the postvocalic *he* of the imperfect **yahwiy* was of such a weak nature that it was not regularly nor uniformily represented. Those forms without ḫ may well be phonetic colloquial spellings, compared to the more formal spelling with ḫ.

The Akkadian transcription of the names of Jonothan, Jehoahaz and Azariah, for example, offers similar evidence for the weak nature of intervocalic *he* in the trigrammaton. Whereas Jonothan is written as *Ya-a-ḫu-u-na-tan-nu* (with the *he* represented by ḫ), Azariah is transcribed as *Az-ri-ia-a-u* (without any reflection of the *he*) and Jehoahaz appears as *Ia-u-ḫa-zi* (likewise without any representation of the *he*, though ḫ is used for the ḥ).[67] The first example, which Albright takes as a pronunciation used on formal occasions,[68] indicates that the *he* was present, but the last two indicate that it was weak, otherwise it would have been uniformily represented by ḫ.

The material presented thus far in these three sections would permit the following conclusions. Unlike the Arabic *ha* (which was distinctly aspirated at the beginning and end of a syllable) the Hebrew *he* was naturally weak and could lose completely its consonantal force in both medial and final positions, both when intervocalic and postvocalic.[69] The weakness of the *he* in the digrammaton *YH* (*Yāh* and *Yâ*) and in the trigrammaton *YHW* (*Yahû*, *Yōhw/Yô*), coupled with all the other evidence of the frequent quiesence of *he*, would certainly suggest that the *he* of the tetragrammaton *YHWH* did not have a very strong consonantal force. To be sure, there is no evidence that it was quiescent, but it obviously was not emphasized—especially since it followed

the homogeneous *a* vowel with which it frequently coalesced.

These conclusions lead clearly to the following principle when transliterating or transcribing the tetragrammaton into Japanese syllabic orthography, namely, every effort should be made to avoid emphasizing in Japanese what was naturally weak in Hebrew. Application of this principle would definitely favor transcribing *YHWH* in Japanese as ヤーウェ (*Yā—wē*) rather than ヤハウェ (*Yāʰᵃwē*). There is little real difference between ヤハウェ and ヤハウェ (*Yāhāwē*), for in popular speech there is no noticeable difference between the anomalous ハ and the regular ハ. The ハ is questionable enough, for even when the pronunciation is carefully guarded, this ハ gives the *he* more consonantal force than it had in the days of early Israel.

The usual pronunciation of ヤハウェ as *Yāhāwē* actually reproduces a *yaqatala* form of the verb (like the Akkadian *ipar(r)as* or Ethiopic *yeqatel*). But it is highly doubtful that this verb form ever existed in Hebrew, let alone that it could be related to *YHWH*. Since Hebrew *he* was weak and should not be emphasized, it seems particularly unwise to try to represent it in Japanese by an anomalous use of a small ハ, which produces, even if unintentionally, a dubious verb form and an over-emphasis of the *he*. Japanese has no natural way to reflect weak consonants; indeed in Japanese orthography it is even difficult to represent some very strong consonants. But since postvocalic *he* and a preceding homogeneous *a* vowel often coalesce into *â*, (the closed syllable *yah* of Yahweh, with a silent *šᵉwâ* under the *he*, is only an artificial modern reconstruction based on analogy to the Tiberian system of vocalization), it might well be that YHWH is best pronounced as *Yâ-wê*. At least this is what Northwest Semitic phonology strongly suggests. And since this should be the basis for any accurate translite-

ration of the Hebrew consonantal text, it seems that ヤーウェ is the more preferable transcription of *YHWH*. To be sure the consonantal *he* is not visually reflected, but it must be remembered that it wasn't usually represented in the contemporary Akkadian transcriptions. But there is a phonetic representation of the *he* by use of the *bō*(—), which well indicates a kind of compensatory lengthening of the *-ah* to *â*.

The choice between ヤーウェ and ヤハウェ cannot be made on the basis of which one sounds better or more forceful in Japanese. Such arguments are entirely subjective, superficial and outside the realm of sound scholarship on which such a decision has to be made. Transliteration, like translation, must be based on the best available evidence; and the knowledge of Ugaritic and early Hebrew phonology offers fresh evidence supporting the transcription of *YHWH* as ヤーウェ.

NOTES

*The system for transliterating Hebrew words is generally the same as that found in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. The Ugaritic words are transliterated as in Gordon's *Ugaritic Textbook*. The asterisk (*) indicates an original or later unattested form. The sign > means "became" or "which developed into," whereas < means "which developed from." Abbreviations are cited in notes 1-3, and 5-9.

1 In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* LX (1941), p. 438. (Cited hereafter as *JBL*.)

2 *Ugaritic Textbook*, Analecta Orientalia, 38 (Rome, 1965), p. 1. (Cited hereafter as *UT*.)

3 Carl Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1908-13). (Cited hereafter as *Grundriss*, with references being to section divisions.)

4 *UT*, p. 2.

5 In *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Ernest Wright (New

York, 1961), pp. 32–53.

6 Biblica et Orientalia, 17 (Rome, 1965) (cited hereafter as *UHP*); and *Biblica*, XLIV (1963), pp. 289–303; XLV(1964), pp. 393–412; XLVI (1965), pp. 311–332.

7 A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as Edited and Enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch* (Oxford, 1910). (Cited hereafter as *GKC*, meaning Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley.)

8 *Hebräische Grammatik mit Benutzung der von E. Kautzsch bearbeiten 28. Auflage von Wilhelm Gesenius hebräischer Grammatik* (Berlin, 1918 and 1929; photographic reproduction in one volume, Hildesheim, 1962). (Cited hereafter as *Berg: I* [for I. *Teil: Einleitung, Shrift-und Lautlehre*] and *Berg: II* [for II: *Verbum*]. References are to the section divisions.)

9 *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes* (Halle, 1922; photographic reproduction, Hildesheim, 1965). (Cited hereafter as *B-L*, with references being to section divisions.)

10 E. g., A. B. Davidson, *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, revised by J. E. McFadyen, 24th ed. (New York, 1932), p. 51.

11 *GKC*, 23k and 35n.

12 *B-L*, 25w.

13 Cf. *B-L*, 25z; *Berg: I*, 16b; and *GKC*, 51L and 53q.

14 Cf. *GKC*, 53q; *B-L*, 25a', 46j'; *Berg: II*, 19k.

15 *Berg: I*, 16b; *Berg: II*, 19k; *B-L*, 25e'; *GKC*, 53q.

16 *B-L*, 46v and *GKC*, 53q.

17 *B-L*, 25L-v.

18 *Berg: I* 16f; see below, Section II (1). The spirantization of the *bᵉgadkᵉpat* letters following the 3f. s. suffix without *mappiq* (see *GKC*, 91g) is a kind of double evidence of the weak nature of final consonantal *he*. Compare the interchange of *aleph* and *he* in Is. 45:6, *kullā'* for *kullā*h.

19 See *B-L*, 14d', 17j, 21j, 25r, and 29p' for the various phonetic developments in these forms.

20 For this phonetic development, see *B-L*, 25u.

21 There are cases where the *he* is not elided after long *i*, see *B-L*, 25p.

22 The *he* of the 3 m. s. suffix –*hū* is not elided after verbal forms ending in long *ū* or *û*, e. g. *qᵉtalûhû* does not reduce to **qᵉtalû*, for this would *he* to lose the suffix completely in pronunciation and orthography.

23 Frank M. Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence*, American Oriental Series, 36 (New Haven, 1952), pp. 68-9. The retention in MT of the 3 m. s. suffix with *he* (-*êhū*) may be a literary form, whereas the more common -*ayw* (-*āw* or -*êw*) is a colloquial form.

24 See *Berg: I* 16d; and *B-L*, 25m. Compare *UT* 5.23 and 6.17 for the assimilation of *he* to the energic *nun* in both Ugaritic and Hebrew.

25 See *GKC* 58k and paradigm C, p. 512; and *Berg: I*, 16d. It is also possible that in the case of *q*ᵉ*tālathu* becoming *q*ᵉ*talāttu*, instead of actual assimilation of the suffix, the *he* was fully elided, but in order to keep the original accent structure there was an artificial gemination of the *taw*.

26 See *B-L*, 25c′ and *Berg: I*, 16e. For another explanation on the development of *yô*, see the end of Section II and note 55.

27 "The Name *Yahweh*," *JBL* XLIII (1924), pp. 370-378.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 374. See also Martin Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart, 1928), pp. 101-106.

29 See *GKC*, 53q and *B-L*, 25f′ and g′.

30 *GKC*, 23k.

31 See *GKC* 23k, 58g, 91e, 103g.

32 See *Berg: I*, 16f.

33 See *B-L*, 12n.

34 See above, Section I:D-1.

35 *Berg: I*, 15a, 16a. On the shift of *ā* to *ō*, see *GKC*, 9b, 9q and 68b.

36 *Grundriss* I, 89k and 265k; *GKC*, 70x. For the more recent grammars, see Georg Beer and Rudolf Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1955), vol. II, p. 52.

37 See above, Section I (E), and Albright's article, cited in note 27, for other examples of colloquial and literary spellings. Other examples are cited in Albright's "The Names 'Israel' and 'Judah'," *JBL*, XLVI (1927), pp. 151-185.

38 The major references for this evidence in Ugaritic are found in *UT*, 5.39 and *UHP*, 5.39 and 11.1.

39 *UT*, 9.49. Gordon's suggestion given in the glossary (p. 390) that the root *hlk* is a blend of **lk* and **hk* is problematic since there are other roots which elide the *he* but cannot be explained readily on the principle of a blend of different roots.

40 *Berg: I*, 15a and *UT*, 9.47.

41 *UT*: Glossary #770 and 9.49.

42 Compare the same with *wattōḥez* in II Sam. 29:9, but *ᵉḥoz* in Ex. 4:4.

43 Compare Gordon, *UT*: Glossary #463. Gordon's suggestion that the Hebrew plural should be vocalized as *bottîm* (i. e., with the contraction of the diphthong *aw* to *ô*) is problematical since he fails to account for the retention of the diphthong in Ugaritic where one would expect it to contract and therefore not be represented in the orthography.

44 See Albright, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. IV (Leiden, 1957), pp. 242-258.

45 *Ibid.*, pp. 245 and 256.

46 *Ibid.*, p. 256 and *UHP* 5.39.

47 On these noun forms, see *B-L*, 61 (pp. 455-460 and 475).

48 "The High Place in Ancient Palestine," p. 256. See below, note 54, the phonetic spelling of *nᵉhi* as *ni*.

49 *UT*, 5.39.

50 *UT*: Glossary, #735 and *UHP* 5.39.

51 *UT*, 11.1 and *UHP* 11.1

52 *GKC*, 90c-i; and Beer and Meyer, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 119-120. Note especially Dahood's criticism of this traditional view, *UHP*, 11.1.

53 *UT*, 11.1.

54 *Berg*: *I*, 15b; Albright, "Further Observations on the Name Yahweh and its Modifications in Proper Names," *JBL* XLIV (1925), p.159. One such possibility is MT *nᵉhi* 'wailing' which is simply written as *ni* in Ezek. 27:32. The spelling *ni* is phonetic, while the more usual *nᵉhi* is historic spelling of the word (which was pronounced *ni* but artificially pointed by the Masoretes as *nᵉhi*).

55 Albright, *ibid.*, pp. 158-159.

56 See Cross and Freedman, *op. cit.*, p. 48 and H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, Vol. II (Wiesbaden, 1964), p. 183.

57 "Names of God," *Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, Vol. II (New York, 1962), pp. 407-417.

58 See below, Section III, paragraph 1. For the equation of Ugaritic *YW* to *YHWH*, Gordon is certainly correct when he states that the equation has been dismissed too hastily (*UT*: Glossary, #1084). Albright's desire to read *yr* for *yw* (see *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 259) is questioned by John Gray who states, "Virolleaud's photograph seems clearly to read *w*, without

any possible corruption (*La Dèesse Anat*, Pl. XIII)." (See Gray, The God *YW* in the Religion of Canaan," *Journal of Near East Studies*," XII [1953], p. 279, n. 7.) The root *hwy* is attested in Ugaritic (*UT*: Glossary, #754a), and the reading of Ugaritic *yw* as a *Piel* jussive causative would actually lend support to Albright's argument in reading *YHWH* and *YHW* as *Hiphil* imperfect and jussive, respectively. Compare the discussion of Gray in *The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra Texts and Their Relevance to the Old Testament*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, V (Leiden, 1965), pp. 180–184.

59 Cross and Freedman, *op. cit.*, p. 57; and on the Moabite *YHWH*, see p. 41, and Albright, *JBL* XLIV (1925), p. 161.

60 The evidence of the early fathers is summarily presented in the articles of B. D. Eerdmans, "The Name Jahu," and G. J. Thierry, "The Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton," both in *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, V (1951), pp. 1–6 and 31–34, respectively.

61 *Op. cit.*, pp. 30–32.

62 On the *Piel* jussive, see *GKC* 75bb; and on the *Piel–Hiphil* causative, *GKC* 53c. Compare Albright, *JBL* XLIII (1924), pp. 373–374; *JBL* XLIV (1925), pp. 158–159; and *JBL* XLVI (1927), pp. 176. On *YW=YHWH*, see above, note 58.

63 See above, note 60.

64 See above, note 62. For a more recent statement, see *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Anchor Book, 2nd ed. (Garden City, 1957), pp. 259–260. Not everyone finds this derivation as satisfactory as this writer; compare for example Hans Kosmala, "The Name of God (YHWH and HU')," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, II (Leiden, 1963), pp. 103–106. But the objection to Albright's view on the basis of the lack of evidence for the *Hiphil* of the root *hāyāh* in Hebrew is really not a very strong one! The only Hebrew available for any practical comparative purpose is Biblical Hebrew, but this has all passed through the hands of those who regarded any form of *yhwh* as related to the ineffable name. No doubt originally there was a free interchange of the various names of God, but once *YHWH* was recognized as *the holy name*, synonyms were naturally used to express the profane idea of the verb wherever there was an audible similarity or graphic identity with the ineffable name. Surrogates of the divine name (*YHW, YH, YW*) were able to survive because there was no audible or graphic similarity to the divine name. In time the writing 15 as *yodh he* was proscribed because it was a

profane use of a letter combination reserved to express a surrogate of the name of God; so also 16 was usually written *tet zayin*, instead of *yodh waw*. Profane graphic similarity (i.e., an isolated and independently standing *YH* or *YW*) of even the surrogates had to be avoided. When *yw* or *yh* formed part of a word there was no strictly graphic or audible similarity, except when used as the theophoric element in a personal name, but then they retain their "holy" quality. The early shift of *'ayin-waw* verbs to *'ayin-yodh* verbs and the shift of the imperfect preformative Qal from *ya-* to *yi-* removed any graphic or audible similarity of *yhyh* to the tetragrammaton.

65 See Gray, "The God *YW* in the Religion of Canaan," p. 279, and references cited there.

66 See Gray, *ibid.*, and Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 108–110.

67 See Albright, *JBL*, XLIV (1925), p. 160 ; and D. D. Lukenbill, "The Pronunciation of the Name of the God of Israel," *American Journal* of *Semitic Languages*, XL (1924), p. 281.

68 Albright, *ibid.*

69 For the possibility of Arabic influence upon the Tiberian vocalization, see Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), pp. 59–63.

＜委員会報告＞　　　　　　　　　　１９６９年５月２６日　（月）

出席者：左近義慈、関根正雄、左近淑

　　　　関西方面委員は委任状提出

○総会及び部会に関する件

　1.　新入会員承認

　　　　佐藤陽二氏、伊藤嘉朗氏（他の委員は書面にて承認）

　2.　幹事交代

　　　　田中清胤氏辞任、伊藤嘉朗氏就任

○総会会場の件

　　今年度総会はルーテル神学大学と交渉する。

○会計の件

　1.　TEFから３８，０００円の寄付があった。これは雑誌論文の分類カードやボックス購入等の

　　　ために使われる。

１９６９年　総 会 予 告

　日：１０月最終の週間

　所：ルーテル神学大学（交渉中）

　奮って御出席下さい。

　　なお、当日の研究発表者を募集しています。希望者は８月３１日までに、題をそえて

　学会宛お申込下さい。

　　　　　　三鷹市大沢３－１０－３０　　東京神学大学内　　日本旧約学会（郵便番号１８１）

　　　　　　１９６９年旧約学会東部々会報告

　５月２６日（月）青山学院ＡＶＡＣＯにおいて開催された。出席者は２９名（内聴講１名）。

　今回の研究発表は、Tokayer 氏（ユダヤ教センター・ラビ）「The Story of

Joseph in Egyptian Biblical and Rabbinic Literatures」。

時田光彦氏（青山学院大学）「旧約における偶像禁止の法」。マクダニエル氏（関東学院大学）

「A Critique of James Barr's Critique of Old Testament

Philology」であった。

　なお、中沢洽樹氏（立教大学）も「聖書翻訳の問題点」という研究発表を予定されていたが、大

A Critique of James Barr's Critique
of Old Testament Philology

Thomas McDaniel

Because of the expanded interest in the philological approach in recent years, Barr proposes in his most recent work (*Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1968) to provide the student with the necessary critical equipment through a general survey of the philological approach (pp. 8–9). But this purpose seems secondary to Barr's attack upon the philological method for its (a) weakness on questions of semantics (p. 88), (b) taking specialized meanings in one language as a generalized meaning in another language (p. 165), (c) dismissal of Massoretic vocalization (p. 218), (d) insisting that linguistic misunderstanding rather than graphic error has produced an unintelligible text (p. 194), (e) producing an overabundance of homonyms (p. 125), and (f) assuming an excessive degree of cognate community and overlap (p. 156).

Either way Barr seems to have failed in the fulfillment of his purposes. The student who does not already have the critical tools of the philological approach will not be able to evaluate Barr's arguments and presentation. He must uncritically accept Barr's very critical presentation. But this is hardly an improvement over the present situation. On the other hand, O. T. philologists will not be convinced of the validity of Barr's criticism because of Barr's own poor methodology and homework.

Barr's subjectivity shows through on such statements as those made on page 12 where Greek, Sanskrit, Gothic and Lithuanian are paralleled with the cognate languages of the Near East. More serious though is his failure to be specific, as on pages 80, 82, 93, 102, 109, 128.

Poor homework is reflected in his footnotes on pages 15, 237 and 251. On page 15 he notes that Reider does not call upon the LXX to reinforce his arguments that *KLM* means "speak" in Judges 18:7; but Barr himself adds what he thinks to be the evidence of the LXX. Nevertheless, he lists the use of an ancient version as a characteristic of Reider's methodology and then refutes his own use of the LXX evidence through a footnote. The footnote on p. 237 does not save Barr's argument that *Qameṣ* had no previous history of usage. Barr must show that the technical usage of this word in Modern Hebrew is based on Löw's suggestion. Otherwise his whole argument falls.

Another example of oversight is his failure to note the one occurrence of the preposition *min* in Ugaritic in Text 1015.11. Its presence in Ugaritic has been general knowledge since 1957.

Barr's methodology in Chapter 7 is inadequate and misleading. In this chapter he deals with the degree of coincidence in the vocabulary of Semitic languages. His contention is that the degree of coincidence is very low and he finds support for this through his analysis of Syriac verbs beginning with *b* over against Hebrew verbs beginning with *b*. He finds about 40% of the Syriac verbs have corresponding cognates in Hebrew with similar meanings. But can dictionaries and lexicons really be compared? Barr notes elsewhere the inherent weakness of the lexicons that are available (p. 115). These weaknesses caution one against too great a dependence on lexical notations. Any adequate check on cognate correspondence would have to be made on a uniform body of literature that could be carefully controlled in both languages. Furthermore, is it fair to impose the larger Syriac lexicon upon the smaller lexicon of Biblical Hebrew? Why not try Ugaritic words beginning with *b* and

see what correspondence there is with Biblical Hebrew beginning with *b*. A quick survey shows that there are 55 Semitic roots in Ugaritic beginning with *b*, of which 39 are found in Hebrew with similar meanings, plus three more presumed to be found. Only 12 Ugaritic roots (about 20%) are not found in the BDB lexicon. All of which proves nothing except that comparing lexicons is no better than the lexicons available, and a larger lexicon imposed upon a smaller lexicon will yield obviously more roots in the larger lexicon than the smaller.

Sometimes Barr omits significant information as on p. 101, where he fails to note that the preposition *b* means "from" also in Amarna Canaanite, Phoenician and Akkadian, as well as Ugaritic and Yaᶜudi. On page 160, one would have expected Barr to indicate that the root *LʾK* "to send" occurs in Ugaritic, as well as the more remote Ethiopic.

One area of seeming inconsistency is Barr's treatment of Jewish tradition. He argues strongly (pp. 195–203) for a reliable tradition behind the Massoretic vocalization, but on questions of meaning Barr finds tradition to be wholly inadequate (cf. pp. 39, 42–43, 56, 59, 60, 65, 209). He fails to explain though how the vocalization could be so accurately transmitted while the meaning of the words could be so readily lost.

Barr's work is certain to initiate a more rigorous discussion on O. T. research. But it cannot be used as a textbook for would-be philologists nor a canon for philological methods. Perhaps its greatest contribution is the negative one of calling attention to the weaknesses of the philological approach while at the same time demonstrating the weakness of a traditional textual approach.

RESPONSE TO PROFESSOR PAUL VAN BUREN

Professor Thomas F. McDaniel[1]

Because Professor van Buren's paper was unavailable until just before this meeting, I availed myself to a copy of his presentation before the American Academy of Religion, in Chicago, 1975, expecting his statement today to be an elaboration on Part Four of that paper read three years ago which included the following statement:

> The fourth area which I would single out as crucial for demolition and reconstruction is the relationship between the New Testament and the Old Testament, or as I am convinced we must learn to call them, in conformity with the early Christian community, the apostolic writings and the Scriptures. My suggestions are simply these: that we must learn to put the Scriptures first, and to learn to read critically the apostolic writings in the light of Scriptures. Rather than using the apostolic writings as a critical screen through which we sift the Scriptures—and it can hardly be denied that this is the Christian tradition, only beginning to be brought into question in this century—we need to learn to return to the Scriptures as the norm and critical screen through which we read the apostolic writings.

In the paper presented at Chicago, Professor van Buren gave a much needed shift away from the traditional question: "How do we as Christians interpret the Old Testament?" But we did not hear anything in today's statement about that radical step on how we are to screen the apostolic writings of the New Testament through the Scriptures (Old Testament). For this reason I am inclined to prefer the proposals of Professor van Buren made in 1975, more than the suggestions presented in this paper of 1978.

The apostolic writings are only the first word to the Gentiles *about* God's plan for their salvation; the apostolic writings are not the first word *from* God about Gentiles or their salvation. While this fact is alluded to in the text of Professor van Buren's paper, there is a need that it be highlighted and clarified. Credit should go to the theologian who

---

[1] Thomas F. McDaniel, Professor of Theology, The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA.

penned Psalms 82 and expressed therein the reality of monotheism, but in addition, in the closing prayer (82:8) recognized that the God of Israel would become the Judge of all nations since the whole earth was His inheritance. The theologian of Psalm 82 reversed the traditional understanding that Yahweh's relationship was established only with Israel, since the nations were allocated by Yahweh only the elements in the natural order for their worship (Deuteronomy 4:19; 32:8 LXX). Other statements about God's word to the Gentiles are found in the theology of the anonymous prophet responsible for the book of Jonah. Its internationalism, if not universalism,[1] recalls the affirmation of the theologian who gave the promise of hope in the covenant with Abraham: ". . . in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed (*nibreku*)."

If we are to interpret the apostolic writings in the context of history, it must be recognized that history did not begin with the birth, death and resurrection of Jesus. The history before the common era which includes the history and text of the Scripture (O.T.) cannot be ignored. It seems imperative to incorporate into the exegetical process ideas which Professor van Buren has expressed in his papers of 1975 and 1978, although he himself makes no cross references.

Professor van Buren stated that we are in no infallible position which gives us the prerogative to improve upon or to correct the apostolic writings. (In the context of this statement today we can appreciate the response Professor van Buren made yesterday to Professor's Sanders' statement that "Paul was/is wrong!") Certainly we cannot claim infallibility, but we must admit that we stand in a good position to evaluate the apostolic writings since we have an authoritative statement within the apostolic writings as to that which is normative: "all scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (2 Timothy 3 :16) . If there is one point in which there is general agreement in New Testament scholarship, it is that "Scripture" in this text refers to the *Tanakh*, i.e. "Scriptures" in Professor van Buren's terminology. Torah and *Tanakh* can be used as a screen through which we interpret the apostolic writings, and if necessary to make corrections or offer reproof.

Although there is no merit in our blaming the apostolic writers for the ill effects of their inner-Jewish polemics, we must not repeat the process or the polemic. We must hold ourselves responsible for the history we produce. This responsibility calls for an exegetical model which does not preclude the use of a historical-critical methodology in the interpretation of both the Scriptures and the apostolic writings.

Professor van Buren correctly noted that there is a growing consensus that Jesus' ministry ranged within the framework of the Pharisaic party. He called attention to the Semitic and Judaic context and style of the apostolic writings. I strongly concur and would like to reinforce that argument. Although there is no decisive evidence, I, have a suspicion that John 14:6 may actually be an affirmation of a common objective of Jesus with the Pharisaic community, more than a statement about the exclusive uniqueness of the Christian position. "I am the way, the truth and the life . . ." seemingly reflects a statement originally made in Aramaic which has been translated into Greek, namely, *ʾănâ halakĕtâʾ ʾĕmûnatâʾ wĕḥayyatâʾ*.[2] The statement would contain a play on the stem *halak* "walk" and could reflect the idea, "I am the *halakah*, the true (*halakah*) and the living (*halakah*); no one *halak*'s to the Father but by me (i.e. by my *halakah* of love)." The Pharisees were also concerned about a *halakah* of love.[3] The difference was not in terms of the objective but in the source of authority. Jesus seems to have parted company with the Pharisees on the issue of oral tradition / law having more authority than his own spoken word.

Although Professor van Buren raised the issue about the inadequacy of translating *Ioudaioi* "the Jews," he offered no alternatives. A better translation, per se, may not be available; therefore I would suggest the alternative of paraphrase by such terms as "compatriot," "clergy" and "religious opponents," as the differing contexts necessitate. Then a literal translation misses the "deep meaning" of a term and at the same time fuels the fires of antisemitism, then a paraphrase must replace translation or transliteration.

This speaker was obviously disappointed with Professor van Buren's present disinterest in interpreting the apostolic writings in the light of Scripture (O.T.). Following his prolegomena, the major focus of the paper moved from the issue of "How do we interpret the apostolic writings?" to "How do we understand the Jew, vis-a-vis Jesus of Nazareth?" With reference to those answers reflected in the statements of the various church councils and synods, which Professor van Buren noted, the following question must be addressed (especially for those of us who come from an ecclesiastical tradition which seeks to proselytize): "In what way does the Jew need Jesus?" The solution concerning the Jew, vis-a-vis Jesus, offered by the Synod of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands in 1970 was that Jesus calls the Jew back to the covenant. This is the role of the prophet, and Jesus was not the first prophet to call the Israelites / Jews to repentance. Can we Christians honestly be satisfied if Jews recognize Jesus as a *nabiʾ*, or will we continue to insist that they affirm with us that he was divine, God incarnate or the Logos? The intent o f the Synod of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands was not made fully clear in this brief reference.

Such a statement calls for a more detailed discussion both in terms of intent and content.

The new attitude reflected in current dialogue needs to be stated with a bit more clarity so as to avoid a misunderstanding. In my initial reading of Professor van Buren's manuscript I read with surprise the statement that the new dialogue between Jews and Christians is not rooted in a new spirit of reconciliation, but is rooted essentially in the fact of the Holocaust and the reality of the modern state of Israel. This could be misunderstood, contrary to its intent, that this dialogue is only a Christian final solution since the Jew has not converted and has not been eliminated, i.e., we are forced to make room for the Jew in our theology. I would be more comfortable with a statement which precluded the possibility of such misunderstanding, and at the same time recognized the degree to which the dialogue is rooted in reconciliation and a spirit of theological growth from antisemitism to a consideration of a salvific element in the vicarious suffering of the Jewish community.

Several issues which I raise in this second half of my response to Professor van Buren's paper reflect my concern that we interpret the apostolic writings in the context of history and that history before Jesus be included, especially the text of *Tanakh*. Following up on Professor van Buren's ideas articulated in his paper in 1975, alluded to earlier, that we "screen" the apostolic writings through the Scriptures, several examples can be given to illustrate the possibilities particularly as they center on the issue of antisemitism and the seeds of the Holocaust.

In Peter's sermon in Acts 2:21 he quotes a passage from Joel 3: 30–32, "And it shall be that whoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." It may well be that Peter was using the Septuagint text and consequently interpreted *kurios* "lord, master," as a reference to Jesus as Lord. But if the apostolic witness were interpreted in light of the *Tanak*, the prophet's own words would have precluded this possibility, for he stated, "all who call upon the name of Yahweh shall be delivered." Since current hermeneutical principles differ from those of Peter and other apostolic writers, prohibiting the interchange of Jesus for Yahweh via *kurios*, the question must be asked: "In the light of Torah/*Tanakh* why is salvation denied to those who call upon the name of Yahweh (or the surrogate *Adonai*) and why is salvation restricted to those who call upon the name of Jesus?" The Scriptures can serve as a corrective through the "screening process" and the Scriptures could instruct the Christian to affirm the integrity of the prophetic witness that all who call on Yahweh will be saved. Therefore the ambiguity of the apostolic tradition on the status of the Jews vis-a-vis Jesus stands to be clarified by the prophetic witness.

The other example, drawn from the biblical texts which have contributed to the antisemitism which resulted in the Holocaust is Matthew 27:25, "And all the people answered, 'His blood be on us and on our children.'" Perhaps these words, more than any other statement in the N. T, have contributed to the continuing antisemitism in Christian circles. But when these words of the people are screened through the Scriptures (O.T.) they can be seen as being meaningless. One can screen the mob's statement through Deuteronomy 5:9b, "for I , Yahweh your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the father upon the children to the third and fourth generation o f those who hate me." This would appear to give some credibility to the words. But a complete screening of words with the apostolic writings through the Scriptures would require input from Ezekie1 18: 2, "What do you mean by repeating this proverb concerning the land of Israel, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge'? As I live says the Lord God, this proverb shall no more be used in Israel." If Ezekiel's repudiation of the old proverb was valid and if the principle he articulated has any prophetic authority (i.e., "The soul that sins shall die" 18:20), the theology expressed by the mob, "his blood be on our children," was obviously meaningless. Yet in a survey in available commentaries on Matthew, only one commentator alluded to the text in Ezekiel as a corrective to the Christian efforts to make those words of the crowd come true.[4] Many of the older commentators justified continuing the curse on the Jew solely on the basis of the text from Deuteronomy 5. But the screening process fully implemented would validate Ezekiel's statement which negated the principle of retribution assumed by those who called for Jesus' death; and it would preclude any Christian validation of the negated principle.

This raises another issue if we are to interpret the apostolic writing in the context of history and have the Scriptures as a part of that history. Serious consideration must be given to the various theologies in the scriptures, and some value judgment must be made as to which theology is to be normative. For example, in Exodus 15:3 the statement is made, "Yahweh is ʾîš *milḥamâ* (a man of war); and within the Scriptures there is a pervasive "holy war" theology.[5] Yet over against this theology of the divine warrior is the (minority) opinion reflecting a peace theology, articulated, for example by the writer of Psalm 46, "He makes wars to cease to the end of the earth, he breaks the bow and shatters the spear, he burns the chariot with fire!" (46:9). When the apostolic writings are "screened" through the Scriptures, which biblical theology is to be used for correction, reproof and instruction. This raises the larger issues of revelation and authority of the biblical texts.

It seems to me that as much as Christians need to move away from the category of two "testaments" they need equally to move toward the

recognition of two dimensions in the revelation within the Scriptures and the Apostolic Writings; i.e., there is a revelation about the nature of God and there is a revelation about the nature of man. The "holy war" theology which is a part of biblical tradition belongs to the category of the revelation about the nature of man, not the category about the revelation of the nature of God. Consequently when the Apostolic Writings are interpreted in the light of Scriptures, and when both the Scriptures and the Apostolic Writings are interpreted in the light of the Holocaust some difficult hermeneutical and theological decisions have to be made.

There are those who have successfully traced the thread of blood and violence culminating in the Holocaust back to the Antisemitism of the Church Fathers and the New Testament writers. But the seeds of religious violence which served as paradigm for political violence did not begin there. It seems to me that we can trace the antecedents of Holocaust violence back to earlier elements within our tradition, including our apocalyptic literature which envisioned one's salvation secured by the suffering and death of others, as well as the more ancient "holy war" theology which envisioned God as *ʾîš milḥamâ*, a man of war, and fostered, for example, the idea that Saul could be stripped of his royal power because he refused to obey an order for *ḥerem*, the total destruction of enemy life.

The institutions of violence—"holy war, *ḥerem* (whether historical or only a Deuteronomic or Deuteronomistic framework), as well as Holocaust in our generation—cannot be viewed as a revelation about God or His will but only as a revelation about the human predicament. Similarly, when we encounter words in the apostolic writings which feed the sin of antisemitism, we need not invest these words as part of God's revelation about His will, but an integral part of the revelation about our propensity as human beings to build ourselves up by tearing someone else down.

Concluding this response I move to that concern of Professor van Buren that the apostolic writings must be interpreted in the light of history since the Christ event, a history which includes the Holocaust, and appeal to the question of the morning session: "God Active in History?" If there is any meaning to the Holocaust, and if there is any activity of God in events of the Holocaust, the only thing I find it possible to say is that God lived down the reputation of his being as *ʾîš milḥamâ*, "a man of war." At that point the Holocaust and the cross share a common point: God remained silent when death consumed His children and His Son. There was no killing intervention explicitly on their behalf. The appeal of the apostolic writers to God's salvific work in the vicarious suffering of Jesus must be interpreted with full sensitivity to the vicarious suffering of the Jews, who, in the words of the prophet

concerning the suffering-servant Israel, have suffered because of us and for us:

> Behold my servant Israel. Surely they (the Jews) have borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . . They were wounded for our transgressions; they were bruised for our iniquities. Upon them was chastisement made for us. By their stripes we healed . . . .

God may yet work in history if the apostolic writings are interpreted in the light of the Scriptures, in the light of history, and in light of the Holocaust.

Notes

[1] Harry M. Orlinsky, "Nationalism-Universalism and Internationalism in Ancient Israel," *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament: Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May*, H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed, editors. (Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1970), 206–236.

[2] The Spanish exegete Johannes Maldonatus, S.J., (1534–1583) saw a Hebraism behind the Greek of this text: See Raymond Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Vol. 2 (Anchor Bible 29A, Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 621.

[3] Berakoth XI, 14b .

[4] James Morison, *Matthew's Memoirs of Jesus Christ: A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 3rd edition. (London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1873).

[5] See the recent studies of P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) and D.L. Christensen, *Transformation of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion No. 3, Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975).

A REVIEW
by
Thomas F. McDaniel [1]
of
HANS GOTTLIEB'S
A STUDY ON THE TEXT OF LAMENTATIONS [2]

In this monograph Hans Gottlieb gives an account of and
evaluates the debate on the text of Lamentations since the
publication of Bertil Albrektson's *Studies in the Text and
Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (Lund: Gleerup, 1963).
His primary purpose was to examine those passages where he
disagreed with Albrektson's solutions of text-critical prob-
lems even though he agreed with Albrektson's methodology
and conclusion that the MT is the superior text tradition. In
five sections which follow the chapter divisions of Lamenta-
tions (plus a four page excursus on "Past and Present in Lam.
3:52–66"), Gottlieb comments on 80 words or phrases from
72 of the 154 verses of Lamentations. Much of Gottlieb's
study is a restatement of Albrektson's review of textual vari-
ants reflected by the versions and the conclusions of other
commentators. Less than half of Gottlieb's work is concerned
with the issues surrounding the integrity of the MT. Most of
his comments, which vary in length from two lines to two
pages, are directed to lexical and philological proposals ad-
vanced by Dahood, McDaniel, Gordis, and Hillers and fre-
quently appeal to the conclusions of Albrektson, Driver,

---

[1] This review was published in 1979 in the *Journal of Biblical
Literature*, Volume 98: 4 (1979), p. 598.

[2] *Acta Jutlandica* xlviii, Theology Series 12. Arhus: Aarhus
Universitet, 1978 (80 pages).

Rudolph and others to counter the interpretations of the former.

Gottlieb does not view favorably the appeal of Dahood and McDaniel to elements of Northwest Semitic philology to establish the text or interpretation of disputed passages in Lamentations. His bias is reflected in the statement, "When as here the choice is between assuming the existence of an 'enclitic mem' in Hebrew, or assuming that *nun* has against the general rule not been assimilated . . . , I for one would prefer to follow the latter alternative" (p. 55). Yet Gottlieb recognizes the emphatic *lamed* in 4:3 (following Eitan), but not in 3:37–38 (as proposed by McDaniel). He recognizes the asseverative *kaph* in 1:20 (following Gordis) but not in 2:5 or 3:22 (contra Gordis).

Gottlieb is not totally committed to the superiority of the MT. He recognizes a scribal error in 3:60 and concurs with Driver's emendation of 4:7. He agrees that glosses are found in 1:7; 2:19 and 4:15. When Gottlieb offers an independent opinion, he is extremely speculative and inconsistent. An example is his treatment of 2:18a (the LXX and Syriac support the MT here). Gottlieb suggests *that ṣāᶜaq libbām ʾel ʾădōnāy* is a marginal gloss which has driven out the original text in which case "all we know of the original text is that it may have begun with *ṣ*, and that it probably contained a call to lament" (p. 37). Gottlieb succeeds in summarizing Albrektson's work and the debate on Lamentations, but he does little to end that debate.

A REVIEW
by
Thomas F. McDaniel [1]
of
JOHN L. TOPOLEWSKI'S
THE RABBI'S ELIXIR: EPISTEMOLOGY
AND STORY TELLING [2]

Topolewski addresses himself to the issue of our contemporary distrust for the genre of "story" (both storytelling and "storybecoming") because of our passion for factual verifiable truth. This distrust for the story he views with regret, noting the richness of the biblical stories, the profound parables of Jesus, and the excellent rabbinic didactic models.

The author notes that since the professional identity of the clergy carries symbolic meaning. this process of symbolization is well communicated by storytellittg and storybecoming. Topolewski is indebted to Kantian criticism and epistemology for his views on storytelling, which he summarizes in a linguistic equation: 'Experence + Symbolization = Meaning. He prefers *Geschichte* (story) to *Historie* (fact) since the former comes from the heart, whereas the latter comes from the head. This idea was already latent in a statement he quotes from Phillips Brooks, "Preaching . . . has two essential elements, truth and personality." In Topolewski's own words. "Real transformation, re-symbolization, comes then when the biblical stories we encounter become our stories, *Geschichte*, appropriated in a uniquely personal way."

---

[1] This review was published in 1980 in *Homiletic*, Volume 5: 1 (1980), pp. 9–10.

[2] His article was published in the journal *Nexus* 56, Volume 12: 1 (1978).

Topolewski employs several brief stories to illustrate his essay.

Rein Bos. *We Have Heard That God Is With You:
Preaching the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI, and
Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
2008. Pp. 384. $28.00. Paper.

Bos's work gives seminarians and pastors a very creative textbook for Hebrew Bible Hermeneutics and Homiletics, which testifies that "Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ in accordance with the Scripture, without implying that the New Testament church has replaced or superseded Israel as the people of God" (p. xi).

In Chapter 11, Bos provides a four dimensional hermeneutical model that can serve the contemporary practice of preaching. The first element in this model is the *sensus Israeliticus* (pp. 168–171), which recognizes "that Christians are not the first intended audience of the words of Moses and the prophets." Because the first audience was, is, and will be Israel, Bos states, "It is for this reason that I propose to pay attention to Israel, to God's way with Israel, and to acknowledge Jewish contributions to the interpretation of Moses and the prophets in the first level or dimension of meaning." The second dimension in Bos's *hermeneutical* model is the Christological Sense (pp. 171–174, 214–248), in which "The way apostles and evangelists quote the Old Testament texts provides us with a creative 'grammar' for such a Christological recontextualization of Moses and the prophets." The third dimension is the Ecclesiological Sense (pp. 174–177, 249–287), wherein it is recognized that "In and through Jesus Christ, the Lord is not only the God of Israel but also the God of the Gentiles (Rom 3:29) . . . [C]ontemporary preaching is mandated to extend the dynamics of Moses and the prophets to the farthest parts of the earth." The fourth dimension is the Eschatological Sense (pp.

177–181, 288–317), wherein "Israel has the right to raise her voice and invite the nations to hold on to God's pledges" and the prophets' dreams of another world "is not only, and may not be even primarily, a beatific lie in the hereafter." For Bos, these four "senses" become the "voices" in "A Four-Voice Choir," which is the title of the third section of the book.

The book's first section, "The Old Testament in the Theory and Practice of Preaching" (chaps 1–7), includes "the homiletical profile of five prominent and often used hermeneutical keys: allegory, typology, salvation-historical approach, promise and fulfillment, and the model of Karl Barth" (p. 12). In the second section, "Ingredients of a New Model," (chaps. 8–11), Bos recognizes the fourfold sense of Scripture which emerged in the Middle Ages—the literal sense, the allegorical sense, the tropological sense, and the anagogical sense. In the last chapter of the third section, "A Four-Voiced Choir" (chaps. 12–16), the "Four Voices" are utilized in sermon preparation focused on Exodos 3, the Servant of the Lord passages (Is 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12), and Psalm 22.

RIGHTLY SAID,

WRONGLY READ:

LOST HEBREW WORDS

RESCUED BY COGNATES

BY

THOMAS F. McDANIEL, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus,
Palmer Theological Seminary,
The Seminary of Eastern University,
Saint Davids, Pennsylvania
©
2011

RIGHTLY SAID, WRONGLY READ

The ambiguities in the *written* Hebrew and Aramaic scriptures would not have been present in the *spoken* words of the prophets, psalmists, and sages since vowels are a requisite for speech. In speech the vowels precluded most ambiguities. Consequently most words were *rightly said*. The ʾā dā m "man," the ʾō dē m "reconciler," and the ʾē dā m "provost" were as distinctly different as the English 'a dam,' 'a dame,' 'a dome," and 'a dime.' But when all four are spelled simply as "a dm" the ambiguity is real. What Jesus said in Aramaic and Hebrew was well understood. But once his words were written down in Aramaic and Hebrew they became instantly and automatically ambiguous since vowels were not recorded along with the consonants. Sometimes the words he *rightly said* were poorly recorded with consonants only and were subsequently *wrongly read*.

One has only to browse through Edmund Castell's *Lexicon Heptaglotton* of 1669) to appreciate how dependent Hebrew lexicography was upon Arabic lexicography. The "hyper-arabism" of the eighteenth century declined after the discovery of Akkadian texts in the nineteenth century and the Ugaritic texts in the twentieth century. But while the focus in biblical Aramaic and Hebrew lexicography shifted to the newly discovered Semitic texts, Edward Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1863–1893) continued to be a gold mine wherein lay the missing links for recovering the meaning of obscure and problematic words in the Hebrew Bible and in the Hebrew and Aramaic *Vorlagen* which underlie the Gospel traditions and other New Testament semiticisms. Although Arabic is seldom a tool used by New Testament scholars, it has proven to be a helpful tool for recovering the meaning of the more obscure Hebrew and Aramaic words. It should come as no surprise that the most beneficial reference works for interpreting the obscure passages of Shem Tob ben-Isaac ben-Shaprut's *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* (c, 1400) have been the Arabic lexicons.

This document entitled "Rightly Said, Wrongly Read: Lost Hebrew Words Rescued by Cognates," provides an introduction *to* and a summary *of* two hundred new translations of Biblical verses which I have argued for in five books which are available online, namely:

1. *The Song of Deborah: Poetry in Dialect* (my translation of Judges 5 is cited in the ADDENDUM below);
2. *Clarifing Baffling Biblical Passages*, which is abbreviated in the text below as CBBP;
3. *Clarifying More Baffling Biblical Passages*, which is abbreviated in the text below as CMBBP;
4. *Clarifying New Testament Aramaic Names and Words and Shem Tob's Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*, which is abbreviated in the text below as SHEM TOB;
5. *Miscellaneous Biblical Studies*, which is abbreviated in the text below as MBS.

The Roman numerals below indicate the Chapter in the book where the interpretation and translation of that biblical passage is presented more fully. (Click on the *blue abbreviation* to open that chapter; and click on the *blue Roman numeral* next to it to open a list of lexical items germane to that chapter and the biblical passage cited.) [The six items in the list marked off by brackets are not from these books but are clearly identified.]

James Barr (1968), in *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, cited three hundred-thirty-four selected philological proposals made by numerous scholars. Of these proposals one hundred sixty-five were based upon Arabic cognates. John Kaltner (1996), in *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography*, provided another list of sixty Arabic cognates to which other scholars have appealed in order to clarify baffling biblical passages. The two hundred lost Hebrew words recovered mostly by Arabic cognates discussed in my five books noted above should be added to the lists cited by Barr and Kaltner and become candidates for inclusion in subsequent ventures in Hebrew lexicography.

200 NEW TRANSLATIONS:
GENESIS to REVELATION

GENESIS 2:1 (CMBBP I)

וַיְכֻלּוּ "they were *perfected*," rather than "they were finished." Though the MT *Puᶜal* plural וַיְכֻלּוּ in 2:1 and the *Piᶜel* singular וַיְכַל in 2: 2 appear to be from כָּלָה "to be complete, to be finished " the וַיְכֻלּוּ is more likely to be from כָּלַל "to perfect, to complete."

GENESIS 2:2 (CMBBP I)

וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי "and God was *fatigued* on the seventh day." The narrator shifted the verb from כָּלַל, stem I, "to perfect" to כָּלַל, stem III, "to be tired, fatigued, weary," which is the cognate of the Arabic كل (*kalla*) "he became, fatigued, weary, tired."

GENESIS 2:3 (CMBBP I)

אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת "which God created to make." The Septuagint reading is ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι "which God began to make"— reflecting a *Vorlage* having בְּדָא for the בָּרָא. This בְּדָא is the cognate of Arabic بدا (*badaᵓ*) "he began." The לַעֲשׂוֹת "to make" needs to be re-pointed as לְעֲשׂוֹת, i.e., the preposition לְ attached to עֲשׂוֹת, an abstracted noun meaning "livelihood, life, the sustenance of life." This עֲשׂוֹת is the cognate of Arabic عاش (ᶜâᵓša) "he became possessed of life" and عيش (ᶜaiš) "life, the means of life or subsistence, livelihood, the way of living." Thus the MT אֲשֶׁר־

בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת can be translated as "*which God created to sustain life*."

GENESIS 2:18 (CBBP II)

אֶעֱשֶׂה־לּוֹ עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, Ποιήσωμεν αὐτῷ βοηθὸν κατ᾽ αὐτόν, "I will make him a helper meet for him." Traditional translations are misleading in that they suggests a subordinate role for the woman as a "helpmate." Actually, עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ indicates an elevated role for the woman. The עֵזֶר was a "savior, rescuer" (found in Psa 20:3 to describe God's being the savior of Israel) and is the cognate of Ugaritic *ᶜḏr* "to rescue." The כְּנֶגְדּוֹ "as his front-one" could also be read as כְּנֶגְדּוֹ "as his leader." The woman named אָדָם "Adam" (Gen 5:2) was created to be "a savior as his front one," i.e., in front of the man also named אָדָם "Adam" (Gen 5:2).

GENESIS 3:14 (CBBP I)

עָפָר תֹּאכַל "*small creatures* shall you eat," rather than "you will eat dust." The עָפָר here is the cognate of Arabic غفر (*gifr*) "a small beast or creeping thing, or an insect."

GENESIS 3:16 (CBBP II)

וְאֶל־אִישֵׁךְ תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בָּךְ, Καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα σου ἡ ἀποστροφή σου καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει, "And your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you." The תְּשׁוּקָה "desire" is the cognate of the Arabic شوق (*šûq*) "desire" and أشواق (*ᵓašwâq*) "yearning"; and the מָשַׁל "to be like" is the cognate of the Arabic مثل (*maṯala*), form 5, "to be similar" and مثل (*miṯlᵘⁿ*) "a similar person." Thus by re-pointing the *Qal* יִמְשָׁל "he will rule" to the *Piᶜel* יִמַשֵּׁל "he will

be similar " the verse is best translated as "and your desire will be for your husband, and he will be just like you."

GENESIS 6:3 (CMBBP II)

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לֹא־יָדוֹן רוּחִי בָאָדָם לְעֹלָם בְּשַׁגַּם הוּא בָשָׂר, "and Yahweh said, 'my spirit will not always strive with man forever for that he also is flesh.'" The last three words need to be read in reverse order and repointed as בְּשַׁגִּים בָּשָׂר הוּא. The בָּשָׂר "human" is the cognate of Arabic بشر (bašar) "human being" and the שַׁגִּם is the cognate of Arabic شج / شجة (šaj / šajjat) "to bash in the skull, skull fracture." In light of the violence mentioned in Gen 6:11 and 6:13 the שׁגם in Gen 6:3 is probably the cognate of the Arabic شج (šaj) "skull bashing." If so the ם of שׁגם would be the suffix ים indicating a *pluralis intensivus*, and the singular בָּשָׂר would be a collective noun. Thus the בָּשָׂר הוּא בְּשַׁגִּם can be translated as "humans were into skull bashing."

GENESIS 6:4 (CMBBP II)

הֵמָּה הַגִּבֹּרִים אֲשֶׁר מֵעוֹלָם אַנְשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם, Ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί, "they were the giants / mighty men of old, men of renown." The הַשֵּׁם "the name" in this context is more likely to be the cognate of Arabic هشم (hašama) "to destroy, smash, shatter" and its adjective هشيم (hašîm) "broken, crushed," so that הָשֵׁם / הַשֵּׁם is a synonym of חָמָס "to treat violently." If so, the phrase needs to be repointed as אַנְשֵׁי הָשָׁם; "men of violence," those gifted in skull bashing (שַׁגִּם = שַׁגִּים) and skullduggery.

GENESIS 8:11 (CBBP II)

עֲלֵה־זַיִת טָרָף, "an olive leaf plucked off." The Septuagint reads Φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος, "an olive leaf, a dry twig." But the טָרָף here is the cognate of the Arabic طَرِيف (ṭarîf) "a thing that is good, recent, new, fresh" and طَرِيفة (ṭarîfat) "anything new, recent, or fresh." Thus the עֲלֵה־זַיִת טָרָף means "a fresh olive leaf." The leaf's being fresh was evidence that the flood waters had abated.

GENESIS 16:12 (CBBP III)

הוּא יִהְיֶה פֶּרֶא אָדָם, "he shall be a wild ass of a man." Οὗτος ἔσται ἄγροικος ἄνθρωπος, "He shall be a country-man." The פרא need not mean "wild ass." The verb פָּרָא "to be fruitful, to have progeny" appears in Hosea 13:15. The אדם פרא may be another way of stating what appears unambig-uously in Gen 17:20, "I will make him fruitful and exceedingly numerous." Moreover, like the verbs גָּמָא and גָּמַע "to suck," פָּרָא may be a variant spelling of the פָּרַע which is the cognate of Arabic فرع (faraᶜa) "he intervened, he made peace, he effected a reconciliation." If so the אָדָם "man" is better read as the verb אָדַם, the cognate of (a) Arabic أدم (ʾadama) "he effected a reconciliation between them, he induce love and agreement between them," (b) Arabic أدام (ʾidâm) "the aider, and manager of the affairs of his people," and (c) Arabic أدمة (ʾadamat) "the chief or provost of his people. Ishmael would be *prolific* (פרא) and become the *chief* and *provost* (אדם) of his tribe, setting the example as a p*eacemaker* (פרע = פרא) and *reconciler* (אדם).

GENESIS 16:12 (CBBP III)

יָדוֹ בַכֹּל וְיַד כֹּל בּוֹ, "His hand in all and the hand of all in his." Αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ αἱ χεῖρες πάντων ἐπ' αὐτόν, "His hands on all and the hand of all on him." Were the hand movements hostile the preposition would have been עַל "against," not בְּ "in." The "hand-in-hand" here may not be the same as a Western "handshake" or a "high-five," but the hand movements support the idea of Hagar's being given the good news that Ishmael would become a congenial person active in reconciliation.

GENESIS 16:12 (CBBP III)

עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־אֶחָיו יִשְׁכֹּן, Καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατοικήσει, "And he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." In light of the phrase in Job 33:26, וַיִּרְצֵהוּ וַיַּרְא פָּנָיו, "he will be favorable to him: and he shall see his face," this phrase in 16:12 can be read as "in the *favor* of all his brothers he will dwell."

GENESIS 17:5 (CBBP IV)

וְלֹא־יִקָּרֵא עוֹד אֶת־שִׁמְךָ אַבְרָם, "No longer shall your name be Abram." The רָם of אַבְרָם is the cognate of Arabic رام (*râm*), "he went away, departed, he quit a place." Thus אַבְרָם "Abram" (= "father departed") was a very fitting name for someone who would obey the command, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you" (Gen 12:1).

GENESIS 17:5 (CBBP IV)

וְהָיָה שִׁמְךָ אַבְרָהָם כִּי אַב־הֲמוֹן גּוֹיִם נְתַתִּיךָ, "But your name shall be Abraham, for the father of a multitude of

nations have I made you." The רהם of אַבְרָהָם means "pro-
lific." It is the cognate of the Arabic رهام (*ruhâm*) "numerous,
copious," رهمة (*rihmat*) "a lot of rain drops," and أرهم (*ʾirham*)
"fruitful, abundant." The patriarch's progeny would become as
numerous (a) as the stars: "look toward heaven, and number the
stars, if you are able to number them . . . so shall your
descendants be" (Gen 15:5); (b) as sand: "I will indeed bless
you, and I will multiply your descendants as . . . the sand which
is on the seashore" (Gen 22:17); and (c) as the "drizzling rain
drops," i.e., the *raham* of the name *Abraham*.

GENESIS 17:15 (CBBP IV)
    "As for Sarai your wife, you are no longer to call her Sarai;
her name will be *Sarah*." The Arabic cognate of *Sarah* is ثرى / ثرأ
(*ṭarrâ* / *ṭarî*) "he became great in number or quantity, many,
numerous," which is confirmed by Gen. 17:16b, וְהָיְתָה לְגוֹיִם
 "and she will become nations."

GENESIS 18:13 (MBS XI)
    "The LORD said to Abraham, "Why did Sarah laugh, and
say, `Shall I indeed bear a child, now that I am old?" But in light
of the Arabic cognate ضحك (*ṣaḥaka* = צָחַק) "to menstruate"
this verse is better translated as "Yahweh said to Abraham,
Verily, this is the situation: Sarah has menstruated, saying, 'Oh!
Wow! Truly I will give birth though I am old!'"

GENESIS 18:15 (MBS XI)
    "But Sarah denied, saying, 'I did not laugh'; for she was
afraid. He said, 'No, but you did laugh.' But in light of the
Arabic cognate ضحك (*ṣaḥaka* = צָחַק) "to menstruate" this
verse is better translated as "But Sarah denied saying: 'I did not
menstruate!'—for she was afraid—and he said, 'Not so! You
did indeed menstruate!'"

GENESIS 25:18 (CBBP III)

עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־אֶחָיו נָפָל, "he fell upon the faces of all his brothers." Κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατῴκησεν, "he dwelt in the presence of all his brethren." This phrase is essentially the same as וַיִּפֹּל עַל־צַוְּארֵי בִנְיָמִן אָחִיו, "and he embraced Benjamin his brother" (Gen 45:14), and exactly the same idiom found in Genesis 50:1, וַיִּפֹּל יוֹסֵף עַל פְּנֵי אָבִי, "Joseph embraced his father.

GENESIS 39:6 (CMBBP II)

וְלֹא־יָדַע אִתּוֹ מְאוּמָה, "and he knew not ought he had," which became in the Septuagint Καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει τῶν καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν οὐδὲ, "And he did not know of anything that belonged to him." The verb יָדַע "to know" is widely attested, but the יָדַע in this verse is the cognate of the Arabic يدع / ودع (wadaʿa / yadaʿa) "to entrust, to consign for safekeeping." The לֹא here is not the negative לֹא but the emphatic לֹא "indeed." Thus לֹא יָדַע אִתּוֹ מְאוּמָה is best translated as "Verily he entrusted to him anything."

EXODUS 4:24 (CBBP V)

וַיִּפְגְּשֵׁהוּ יְהוָה וַיְבַקֵּשׁ הֲמִיתוֹ, "Yahweh met him and sought to kill him." Συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, "The angel of the Lord met him by the way in the inn, and sought to slay him." The verb הֲמִיתוֹ has two meanings. At first glance it appears to be the *Hiphᶜîl* infinitive of מוּת "to die," the cognate of Arabic مات (mât) "he died." But it can also be the *Hiphᶜîl* infinitive of מתת which is the cognate of the Arabic مت (matta) "he sought to bring himself near, to gain access, or to advance himself in favor by a relationship and by affection or by love," as in the expression

بيـنـنا رحم ماتة (*baynanâ raḥim mâttat*) "between us is an in-violable relationship." Thus ויבקש יהוה המיתו could be translated as "Yahweh sought to make inviolable the relation-ship / marriage."

EXODUS 4:26 (CBBP V)

וַיִּרֶף מִמֶּנּוּ "So he [Yahweh] let him [Moses] alone." The verb וַיִּרֶף has two meanings. At first glance it appears to be from רָפָה "to sink, to relax, to withdraw from, to let one alone." But it may also be from רפא, stem II, which is the cognate of the Arabic رفا (*rafâ*) "he effected a reconciliation, made peace between them, he married, took a wife" and رفاع (*rifâ'un*) "a close union / marriage" Thus Exod 4:26 should be read as וַיִּרְפוּ אָז אָמְרָה חֹתַן דָּמִים לַמּוּלֹת "they became irre-vocably bonded when she said 'You are a blood relative by circumcision.'" (The מִמֶּנּוּ "from him" is restored to 4:25, which once read "she cut off her son's foreskin *from him*.")

EXODUS 6:3 (MBS XIV)

וּשְׁמִי יְהוָה לֹא נוֹדַעְתִּי לָהֶם, "By my name Yahweh I did not make myself known." By changing the negative לֹא into the emphatic לֹא the verse reads "By my name Yahweh I did indeed make myself known."

EXODUS 21:22–23 (MBS XXI)

The Septuagint has the correct translation of Exo 21:22–23. The Hebrew dialect of the Septuagint translators in Alexandria included two words spelled אסון, namely, (a) the אָסֹון which was translated as μαλακία, "affliction, disease" (Gen 42: 28) and (b) the אסון (= אסֹון / אָסֹן) which was translated as

ἐξεικονιζομαι, "to be fully formed." The word אַסוֹן / אסון / אַסֹן did not survive in the Judean and Samaritan Hebrew dialects. Thanks to the Arabic cognate سوى (*sawaya*), "he made it equal, he became full-grown in body," the lost lexeme אַסֹן / אַסוֹן "to be fully formed" has been recovered. The Septuagint of Exo 21:22–23 states quite clearly that a fully developed fetus was a person protected by the *lex talionis*, but a fetus which was not fully formed was not a person but was a property properly protected by the *lex pensitationis*.]

LEVITICUS 16:8 (CBBP VI)

גּוֹרָל אֶחָד לַיהוָה וְגוֹרָל אֶחָד לַעֲזָאזֵל, "one lot for Yahweh and one lot for Azazel." Κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ, "One lot for the Lord, and the other for the scape-goat." In Lev. 16:26, *Azazel* was read as a compound of עזל "to separate" and אזל "to go away" and translated as Τὸν χίμαρον τὸν διεσταλμένον εἰς ἄφεσιν, "The goat separated for release." Many interpreters have identified *Azazel* as a demon in the wilderness, but the Talmud (*Yoma* 67[b]) rightly noted: (1) עזאזל שיהא עז וקשה, "*Azazel* which must be a *rugged height* and *harsh*," and (2) עזאזל קשה שבהרים, "*Azazel* is any *harsh place* which is in the *mountains*." The עזאזל is a compound of עז "rugged peak" and אזל "difficult, distressful, dearth," with the אזל being the modifier of the עז. The Arabic cognates are (1) عنـز (*ʿanz*) "land having in it ruggedness and sand and stones," and (2) ازل (*ʾazala*) "he became in the state of straitness and suffering from dearth, drought, or sterility," and مازل (*mâʾzil*) "the place where the means of subsistence are strait." Thus the עזאזל in Lev 16:8, 10, 26 means "the badlands" rather than being the name of

a demon or a noun meaning "scapegoat."

LEVITICUS 16:21 (CBBP VI)

וְשִׁלַּח בְּיַד־אִישׁ עִתִּי הַמִּדְבָּרָה, "and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task" [NRS]. Καὶ ἐξαποστελεῖ ἐν χειρὶ ἀνθρώπου ἑτοίμου εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, "And shall send him by the hand of a ready man into the wilderness." The עִתִּי "timely" in this verse is the cognate of the Arabic عـتى (ᶜitîy) / أعـتى (ᵓaᶜtay) "a man who transgressed the commandment of God," as found in the *Qurᵓan* (*Sura* 51:44), "they *rebelled* against their Lord's decree," and عـات (ᶜâti) "inordinately proud or corrupt." Thus the goat would be dispatched "by the hand of an *extremely corrupt* man" (בְּיַד־אִישׁ עִתִּי / עָתִי).

LEVITICUS 18:20 (MBS I)

וְאֶל־אֵשֶׁת עֲמִיתְךָ לֹא־תִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתְּךָ לְזָרַע לְטָמְאָה־בָהּ, "Moreover thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour's wife, to defile thyself with her" (KJV). Καὶ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου οὐ δώσεις κοίτην σπέρματός σου ἐκμιαν-θῆναι πρὸς αὐτήν, "And with thy neighbor's wife you shall not give a bed of your sperm to copulate with her." There is no Arabic cognate of שָׁכַב, stem I, "to lie down." But שָׁכַב, stem II, "to (sexually) penetrate" is the cognate of Arabic ثـقب (ṯaqaba) "to bore, to penetrate"; and שָׁכַב, stem III, "to ejaculate" is the cognate of Arabic سكب (sakaba) "to pour out/forth, to gush forth." The Hebrew nouns שְׁכָבֶת, שִׁכְבָה and שְׁכִיבָה all mean "the effusion of semen." The לְזָרַע "to a seed" is better read as the *Hiphᶜîl* infinitive (*scriptio defectiva*) for לְהַזְרִיעַ "to impregnate." Thus this verse commands, *Unto your kinsman's wife you shall not give your effusion to*

impregnate and defile yourself with her." (The שָׁכַב, stem II, "to [sexually] penetrate" appears also in II Sam 13:14 and Ezek 23:8.)

LEVITICUS 18:22 (MBS I)

וְאֶת־זָכָר לֹא תִשְׁכַּב מִשְׁכְּבֵי אִשָּׁה "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind." (KJV). Hebrew שָׁכַב, stem II, "to (sexually) penetrate" is the cognate of Arabic ثقب (ṯaqaba) "to bore, to penetrate"; and שָׁכַב, stem III, "to ejaculate" is the cognate of Arabic سكب (sakaba) "to pour out / forth, to gush forth." Thus this verse can be translated as "Do not penetrate / ejaculate with a male rather than the penetratings / ejaculations with a woman."

NUMBERS 12:3 (CBBP VII)

וְהָאִישׁ מֹשֶׁה עָנָו [עֲנָיו] מְאֹד, Καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος Μωυσῆς πραΰς σφόδρα, "And the man Moses was very meek." The הָאִישׁ "the man" should have been vocalized as הָאִישׁ "he was brought to despair," the *Hophᶜal* of אִישׁ "to despair," the cognate of Arabic أيس (ʾayisa) and إياس (ʾiyâs) "to despair most vehemently of a thing, to become disheartened, to be without hope." The עֲנָיו / עָנָו "meek, humble" (from עָנָה, stem III) is the cognate of Arabic عنى (ʿanaya) "to be disquieted, to suffer difficulty, distress, trouble, fatigue, or weariness." The variants עֲנָיו / עָנָו need to be vocalized as עֻנִּיו and עֻנּוּ, indicating that "Moses was brought to despair — intensely perplexed" by the challenges from Miriam and Aaron.

NUMBERS 20:8 (CMBBP V)

וְדִבַּרְתֶּם אֶל־הַסֶּלַע לְעֵינֵיהֶם, "and speak to the rock

before their eyes, that it may yield its water." Καὶ λαλήσατε πρὸς τὴν πέτραν ἔναντι αὐτῶν καὶ δώσει τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς "Speak to the rock before them, and it shall give forth its waters." The וְדִבַּרְתֶּם "and speak" needs to be repointed as וְדָבַרְתֶּם and this דבר read as the cognate of the Arabic دبار (dibâr) "ridges of earth which retain water for irrigation," and دبارة (dibârat) / دبارات (dibârât) "channels, rivulets that flow through a land." Thus וְדָבַרְתֶּם אֶל־הַסֶּלַע means "you will make channels up to the rock." The MT לְעֵינֵיהֶם "to their eyes" should be repointed as לְעוּנֵיהֶם meaning "with their help / assistance." This עון "help, assistance" is the cognate of Arabic عون (ʿawn) "aid, assistance." Thus וְדָבַרְתֶּם אֶל־הַסֶּלַע לְעוּנֵיהֶם means "and you will make channels up to the rock *with their help*."

NUMBERS 20:10 (CMBBP V)

שִׁמְעוּ־נָא הַמֹּרִים הֲמִן־הַסֶּלַע הַזֶּה נוֹצִיא לָכֶם מָיִם, "Hear now, you rebels; shall we bring forth water for you out of this rock?" (RSV). Ἀκούσατέ μου οἱ ἀπειθεῖς μὴ ἐκ τῆς πέτρας ταύτης ἐξάξομεν ὑμῖν ὕδωρ, "Hear, I pray you, O rebels, from this rock do we bring out to you water?" The MT הַמֹּרִים "O rebels!" needs to be vocalized as מַרְוֹם (*scriptio defectiva* for מַרְוִים), the *Hiphʿîl* participle plural of רָוָה, meaning "water carriers." This רָוָה is the cognate of the Arabic راو (raʾwi) "one who brings water to his family" and رواء (rawwâʾun) "one whose occupation is the drawing of water." The interrogative הֲ of הֲמִן is better read as the interjection הָ or הֶ (without an א as in the interjection הָאֱלֹאהַ "By God!"). Thus Moses probably said, שִׁמְעוּ־נָא הַמַרְוֹם הָמִן־הַסֶּלַע

הַזֶּה נוֹצִיא לָכֶם מָיִם, "Please listen, O water carriers!" Behold! From this rock we bring forth water for you!"

NUMBERS 21:15 (MBS XIV)

וְנִשְׁעַן לִגְבוּל מוֹאָב, "it leans to the border of Moab." By changing the preposition לְ "to" into the emphatic לֹא the verse reads "We easily entered the *very* borders of Moab."

NUMBERS 24:7 (CMBBP VI)

יִזַּל־מַיִם מִדָּלְיָו וְזַרְעוֹ בְּמַיִם רַבִּים, "Water shall flow from his buckets and his seed in many waters." Ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν, "There shall come a man out of his seed and he shall rule over many nations." The מַיִם "water" was read by the Greek translators as מְתוּ/מֵת "man." The מִדָּלְיָו is pointed as a dual with a 3ms suffix of דְלִי "bucket," the cognate of Arabic دلو (*dalw*) and Persian دول (*dûl*) "bucket." The translation of the דל of מִדָּלְיָו as κυριεύω "to rule over" shows that the translators were aware of the דל which was a cognate of the Arabic دال / دول (*dûl*/ *dâla*) "to give someone ascendency or superiority, to make victorious." Following the Septuagint the text once read:

יֵאזַל מֵתוּ מִן זַרְעוֹ וְיִָדוֹל בְּאֻמִּים רַבִּים
"a man from his seed shall go forth,
and he shall become superior by means of many tribes."

NUMBERS 24:17 (CMBBP VI)

דָּרַךְ כּוֹכָב מִיַּעֲקֹב וְקָם שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, "A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel." Ἄστρον ἐξ Ιακωβ καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ισραηλ. "A star shall rise out of Jacob, a man shall spring out of Israel."

The translation of שֵׁבֶט as ἄνθρωπος "man" remains problematic, but the translation of שֵׁבֶט as "scepter" or "comet" was a matter of homographs: שֵׁבֶט, stem I, "scepter" was the cognate of the Akkadian *šibṭu* and the Egyptian *ša-ba-t*. שֵׁבֶט, stem II, was the cognate of the Arabic سبط (*sabiṭ/sabaṭ*) and سباطة (*sîbâṭat/sûbâṭat*), all meaning "lank, loose, long hair," i.e., a star with long hair, similar to the use in Arabic of نجم ذو ذنب (*najmu ḏû ḏanab*) "a star having a tail." Thus the metaphors in this verse state, "a *star* shall come forth out of Jacob, and a *comet* shall rise out of Israel."

NUMBERS 33:32–33 (CBBP XXXIV)

וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּחֹר הַגִּדְגָּד . . . וַיִּסְעוּ מֵחֹר הַגִּדְגָּד, "and they encamped at Horhaggidgad . . . and they set out from Horhaggidgad (RSV). Καὶ παρενέβαλον εἰς τὸ ὄρος Γαδγαδ . . . καὶ ἀπῆραν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους, "And they encamped in the mountain Gadgad . . . and they departed from the mountain Gadgad." The Septuagint translators mistakenly read the MT מֵחֹר "from the hollow" as מֵהַר "from the mountain." The noun חֹר can be the cognate of Arabic خور (*ḥawr*) "the depressed ground between hills" or Arabic خار (*ḥâra*)) "entrance to a river, the land around a gulf, the shore of a bay, an inlet from a sea or a large river." Thus these six Hebrew words are best translated as "and they encamped at the *inlet* of the (Wadi) Gidgad . . . and they set out from the *inlet* of the (Wadi) Gidgad."

DEUTERONOMY 15:4, 11 (CBBP VIII)

לֹא יִהְיֶה־בְּךָ אֶבְיוֹן . . . לֹא־יֶחְדַּל אֶבְיוֹן מִקֶּרֶב הָאָרֶץ "There will be no poor among you . . . the poor will never cease out of the land." Οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ ἐνδεής . . . μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἐνδεὴς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, "There will be no poor among you . . . the

poor will never cease out of the land." The verb חָדֵל need not mean "to cease." Here it is best read as the cognate of the Arabic حدل (ḥadala) "to treat unjustly" or خذل (ḫaḏala) "to refuse to help someone." If יחדל is the cognate of the former it is a *Niphᶜal* passive (יֵחָדֵל), "for the poor from the midst of the land *must not be treated unjustly*." If יחדל is the cognate of the latter it is the *Niphᶜal* passive (יֵחָדֵל) meaning, "the poor *must not be denied assistance*." In John 12:8 Jesus, while in Bethany, seemingly quoted Deu 15:11. But "Bethany" is a name which means "House of the Poor" (בֵּית "house" and עָנִי "poor"). To have stated while in "Poor Town" that "you will always have the poor with you" does not require the statement to be interpreted as a universal absolute, especially when the text from the Torah probably meant "the poor must not be treated unjustly" or "the poor must not be denied assistance."

DEUTERONOMY 26:5 (CMBBP IV)

אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד אָבִי . . . וַיְהִי־שָׁם לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל עָצוּם וָרָב:
"A Syrian ready to perish *was* my father, . . . became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous" (KJV). Συρίαν ἀπέβα-λεν ὁ πατήρ μου . . . .καὶ ἐγένετο ἐκεῖ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ καὶ μέγα, "My father abandoned Syria, . . . and became there a mighty nation and a great multitude." Most translations render the אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד אָבִי as "a wandering Ara-mean was my father." The Arabic cognate of the ambiguous אבד here is أبل (ᵓabid / ᵓibid) meaning "prolific, one that breeds or brings forth plentifully." This definition fits the context perfectly and parallels Psalm 105: 23–24, "then Israel came to Egypt; Jacob sojourned in the land of Ham; and he increased his people greatly . . . ." With twelve sons and at least one daughter Jacob well deserved to be called "a prolific Aramean"— with his

progeny at the time of the exodus numbering six hundred thousand men, plus children (Exod 12:37).

DEUTERONOMY 33:27 (CMBBP V)

מְעֹנָה אֱלֹהֵי קֶדֶם, "the eternal God is your refuge / dwelling place." The root of מְעֹנָה is עון, stem II, "help, assistance" which is the cognate of Arabic عون (ᶜawn) "aid, assistance." This phrase means "(Your) savior / helper is the God of old."

DEUTERONOMY 33:28 (CMBBP V)

וַיִּשְׁכֹּן יִשְׂרָאֵל בֶּטַח בָּדָד עֵין יַעֲקֹב . . . ., "So Israel dwelt in safety alone, the fountain / eye of Jacob . . . ." Καὶ κατασκηνώσει Ισραηλ πεποιθὼς μόνος ἐπὶ γῆς Ιακωβ . . . , "And Israel shall dwell in confidence alone on the land of Jacob." (The Septuagint has nothing for the עֵין "fountain / eye.") The phrase בָּדָד עֵין יַעֲקֹב should be repointed to בָּדָד עָיֵן יַעֲקֹב, meaning "by himself he helped Jacob." The root of the עָיֵן is עון, stem II, "help, assistance," the cognate of Arabic عون (ᶜawn) "aid, assistance."

JOSHUA 2:1 (CBBP IX)

וַיֵּלְכוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ בֵית־אִשָּׁה זוֹנָה וּשְׁמָהּ רָחָב וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ־שָׁמָּה, "And they went and came into an harlot's house, named Rahab, and lodged there." Καὶ εἰσήλθοσαν εἰς οἰκίαν γυναικὸς πόρνης ᾗ ὄνομα Ρααβ καὶ κατέλυσαν ἐκεῖ, "And they entered into the house of a harlot, whose name was Raab, and lodged there." The Hebrew זוֹנָה definitely means "harlot"; but the unpointed זונה has other possible definitions depending upon which Arabic cognate the זונה is identified. Rahab may have been זנה "short" (= زناء [zanâ']), or Rahab was זנה "hyper-

emotional" (= زناء [zanâ']), or Rahab was זונה "smart and skillful" (= ذهن [ḍahin]), or Rahab was זנה "beautiful" (= زينه [zînat]). The adjective which best fits the context of Rahab's providing the spies with "bed and breakfast" is the cognate زناء (zanâ') "having the ability to offer lodging, refuge, and concealment." Targum Jonathan stated that Rahab was an "innkeeper," using the Greek πανδοκεύς "innkeeper," transliterated as פֻּנְדְּקִי. Josephus followed the same tradition as the Targum, referring to Rahab's "inn" rather than a "brothel."

JOSHUA 10:12–13 (CBBP X)

שֶׁמֶשׁ בְּגִבְעוֹן דּוֹם וְיָרֵחַ בְּעֵמֶק אַיָּלוֹן, Στήτω ὁ ἥλιος κατὰ Γαβαων καὶ ἡ σελήνη κατὰ φάραγγα Αιλων, "Let the sun stand over against Gibeon, and the moon over against the valley of Ajalon. וַיִּדֹּם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְיָרֵחַ עָמָד . . . וַיַּעֲמֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בַּחֲצִי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלֹא־אָץ לָבוֹא כְּיוֹם תָּמִים: Καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ σελήνη ἐν στάσει . . . καὶ ἔστη ὁ ἥλιος κατὰ μέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐ προεπορεύετο εἰς δυσμὰς εἰς τέλος ἡμέρας μιᾶς, "And the sun and the moon stood still . . . and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven; it did not proceed to set till the end of one day." These verses actually refer to a complete solar eclipse, probably the one that occurred on September 30, 1131 B.C. at 12:35 PM (lasting for 4.5 minutes) which darkened the area between Sidon and Jerusalem Here the verbs עָמָד / וַיַּעֲמֹד and וַיִּדֹּם / דּוֹם do not mean "to stand still" but "to become dark." The וַיִּדֹּם / דּוֹם is the cognate of (a) the Arabic دهم (dahama) "it became black" and الدهمان ('addahmânu) "the night" and (b) the Akkadian da'āmu, as in the phrase id-ḫi-im šamšum "the sun became darkened." The וַיַּעֲמֹד / עָמָד is the cognate of Arabic غمل (ġamada) "to con-

ceal," as in اغتمد الليل (*'iǵtamada ʾallayla*) "he entered into [the darkness] of the night." Thus this verse states that "the sun concealed itself while in the middle of the sky." Similarly, by reading the לֹא as the emphatic לֵא "indeed, actually" 10:13 can be translated as "and [the sun] *actually* hasten to set as though it were a whole day."

JOSHUA 24:10 (MBS XIV)

וְלֹא אָבִיתִי לִשְׁמֹעַ לְבִלְעָם, "I was not willing to listen to Balaam." By changing the negative לֹא into the emphatic לֵא the verse reads "I was *indeed* willing to listen to Balaam."

JUDGES 5:1–31. The ADDENDUM at the end of this document contains the McDaniel translation of "The Song of Deborah" with the new interpretations highlighted by italics.

JUDGES 5:11 (MBS XIV)

אָז יֵרְדוּ לַשְּׁעָרִים עַם־יְהוָה, "Down to the gates marched the people of Yahweh." By changing the preposition לְ "to" into the emphatic לֵא the verse reads "When *indeed* the storms would descend from Yahweh."

JUDGES 5:17 (MBS XIV)

וְדָן לָמָה יָגוּר אֳנִיּוֹת, "And Dan, why did he abide with the ships?" By changing the interrogative לָמָה into the emphatic לָמָה the verse reads "Then Dan *indeed* attacked ships."

JUDGES 5:25 (MBS XIV)

בְּסֵפֶל אַדִּירִים הִקְרִיבָה חֶמְאָה, "She brought him curds in a lordly bowl." When this phrase is emended by adding an א that was lost by happlography and by dividing the first two words to read בְּסַף לֵא—with the emphatic לֵא "truly"—this

verse can be translated as "in a *truly* magnificent goblet she brought cream."

II SAMUEL 12:14 (CMBBP)

אֶפֶס כִּי־נִאֵץ נִאַצְתָּ אֶת־אֹיְבֵי יְהוָה בַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה, "However, because by this deed you have given great occasion to the enemies of the LORD to blaspheme" (NKJ). The RSV, NRS, and NJB omit the MT אֶת־אֹיְבֵי "the enemies of." However, the אֶת־אֹיְבֵי here is not the well attested noun אֹיֵב "enemy," but the *Hithpaᶜel* of אָיַב (ʾiyyēb), the cognate of the Arabic أوب (ʾawwâb) "wont to repent, frequent in repenting unto God, or turning from disobedience to obedience" The final י of the MT אֶת־אֹיְבֵי can be transposed to become an initial ו; and the reconstructed ואתאיב can be pointed as וְאֶתְאַיֵּב, a *Hithpaᶜel* imperfect meaning "but I have shown myself to be repentant." Thus II Sam 12:13–14 can be translated as "And David said to Nathan, 'I have sinned against Yahweh, *but I have shown myself to be repentant.*' And Nathan said to David, 'Indeed, Yahweh has transferred your sin, you will not die. But, since you have outraged Yahweh with this matter, the child born to you will die.'"

II KINGS 22:14 & II CHRONICLES 34:22 (CBBP XI)

חֻלְדָּה הַנְּבִיאָה אֵשֶׁת שַׁלֻּם . . . שֹׁמֵר הַבְּגָדִים, "Huldah, the prophetess, wife of Shallum . . . keeper of the clothes." The masculine שֹׁמֵר הַבְּגָדִים "guardian of the clothes," referring to Shallum, must be read as the feminine שֹׁמְרָה בְּגָדִים, referring to Huldah. The בְּגָדִים "clothes" must be read as the cognate of Arabic بجل (bajdat / bujudat) "the true state and circumstances thereof; the established, truth," as in the

expression هو عالم بيجذة أمرك (*hûʿâlmun bibajdatiʾamrika*) "he is acquainted with the established truth thereof." Thus the prophetess Huldah was "the guardian of the traditions, the guardian of the essential truths." Huldah's name should not be identified with the Arabic cognate خـلد (*ḫald / ḫuld / ḫild*) "a mole, a blind rat, weasel" but the cognate خالد (*ḫâlid*) "ever-lasting, perpetual, immortal, undying, unforgettable, glorious." The מִשְׁנֶה in the phrase בְּמִשְׁנֶה בִּירוּשָׁלַם יוֹשֶׁבֶת "dwelling in Jerusalem in MISHNEH," has several derivations. MISHNEH may mean: (a) "in her old age," with the מֹשֶן being the cognate of the Arabic مسن (*musinn*) "old age," (b) a place name where the שֶׁן was the cognate of the Arabic سن (*sanna*) "the place where the commandments of God are disclosed," (c) the place named "Second District," with the שׁנה being cognate of the Arabic ثـنى (*ṯanay*) "to double," and (d) following the tradition in the Targum that Huldah had an "academy" in Jerusalem, the שׁנה of מִשׁנה would be the cognate of the Aramaic תְּנָה "to teach."

I CHRONICLES 4:9 (CMBBP VII)

וַיְהִי יַעְבֵּץ נִכְבָּד מֵאֶחָיו וְאִמּוֹ קָרְאָה שְׁמוֹ יַעְבֵּץ
לֵאמֹר כִּי יָלַדְתִּי בְּעֹצֶב: , "Jabez was more honorable than his brothers; and his mother called his name Jabez, saying, 'Because I bore him in pain.'" The Peshitta reads, "And one of them was dear to his father and to his mother, so they called his name My Eye." Castell (1669) cited the Arabic عبص (*ʿabiṣa*) "to be sick with very sore eyes, what flows from the eyes" and "a sudden, unexpected appearance." This cognate accounts for the Syriac translation of עבץ as "My Eye" and provides the clue for translating עבץ as "a premature birth" — which accounts

also for the Septuagint's ἔτεκον ὡς γαβης, "I have born very quickly/unexpectedly." (Others have linked עבץ with Arabic cognate عبظ (ʿabaḍa) "to hasten.") The נִכְבָּד מֵאֶחָיו "he was more honorable than his brothers," can also mean "he had been more afflicted than his brothers" — the כָּבַד here being the cognate of the Arabic كبد (kabad) "difficulty, distress, affliction," and كابد (kâbada) "he endured, struggled with (difficulties)." This verse is best translated as, "And Jabez was more *afflicted* than his brethren, and his mother called his name Jabez ("*Preemie*"), saying, '*Indeed* I gave birth in sudden unexpected haste.'"

I Chronicles 4:10 ([CMBBP VII])

אִם־בָּרֵךְ תְּבָרֲכֵנִי וְהִרְבִּיתָ אֶת־גְּבוּלִי, "Oh that you would bless me and enlarge my border." The optative particle אִם is the cognate of Arabic ايم (ʾaymu) and أم (ʾamI), as in the expression ايم الله (ʾaymu ʾlallahi) "I swear by God." The גְּבוּל "border" in this verse can also be the cognate of Arabic جبل (jibill / jubull) and جبيل (jabîl) "a great company of men." The feminine جبلة (jibillat) signified the same as أمة (ʾummat) "a nation or people." Thus Jabez may have prayed, "Increase my *people* (גְּבִילִי)," rather than "Increase my *property* (גְּבוּלִי)."

I Chronicles 4:10 ([CMBBP VII])

וְעָשִׂיתָ מֵּרָעָה לְבִלְתִּי עָצְבִּי, "And that you would keep me from hurt and harm!" (NRS). Καὶ ποιήσεις γνῶσιν τοῦ μὴ ταπεινῶσαί με, Aand that you would make me know that you will not grieve me!" The Septuagint's γνῶσιν "knowledge" reflects a *Vorlage* with מדעה "knowledge" instead of מרעה

"evil." The dot in the מ of מֶרְעָה indicates that the מ is not a prefix but the מ of the root מרע "sickness," the cognate of Aramaic מְרַע, Syriac מרע (*mĕra*ᶜ), and Arabic مرض (*mariḍa*)—all meaning "to be sick." Jabez' linking the מֶרְעָה with עָצְבִּי "my suffering/pain" is sufficient reason for reading מֶרְעָה as "sickness."

II CHRONICLES 25:16 (MBS XIV)

חֲדַל־לְךָ לָמָה יַכּוּךָ, "Stop! Why should you be struck down?" By changing the interrogative לָמָה into the emphatic לָמָה the verse reads "Stop! You will *surely* be struck down."

II CHRONICLES 28:6, 8 (CBBP XII)

וַיַּהֲרֹג פֶּקַח . . . מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף בְּיוֹם אֶחָד, "Pekah . . . slew a hundred and twenty thousand in Judah in one day." וַיִּשְׁבּוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֲחֵיהֶם מָאתַיִם אֶלֶף, "The sons of Israel took captive two hundred thousand of their kinsfolk." Ἠχμαλώτισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν τριακοσίας χιλιάδας, "The sons of Israel captured of their brethren three hundred thousand." In light of the 120,000 casualties and the 200,000 to 300,000 captives this narrative reads like a midrashic fiction rather than a historical recollection. However, the אֶלֶף in these verses need not mean 1,000. This אלף is probably the cognate of (a) the Arabic ألف (ᵓ*ilf*) "a companion, associate, fellow, comrade" and (b) the Arabic ألوف (ᵓ*ulûf*) appearing in the *Qurᵓan* (*Sura* 2:244), which has been interpreted as "a united band." Thus 28:6 can be read as "Pekah . . . slew a hundred and twenty contingents in Judah in one day"; and 28:8 can be read as "the sons of Israel took captive two hundred bands of their kinsfolk."

II CHRONICLES 28:9 (CBBP XII)

וְשָׁם הָיָה נָבִיא לַיהוָה עֹדֵד שְׁמוֹ, "and a prophet of
Yahweh was there whose name was Oded." The name Oded
(עֹדֵד) carried multiple meanings, including (a) "old man,"
which is suggested by the Arabic cognate عـود (ᶜawd) and عادى
(ᶜâdiy) "old, ancient," (b) "restorer," which is suggested by the
Arabic عـود (ᶜawd) "he returned, restored" and his restoring
captured property and returning people to their homes, (c)
"benefactor," which is suggested by the Arabic عائل (ᶜâʾid) "a
visitor of one who is sick" along with the feminine noun عائـدة
(ᶜâʾidat) "kindness, pity, compassion, or mercy, an act of bene-
ficence."

II CHRONICLES 28:15 (CBBP XII)

וַיָּקֻמוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־נִקְּבוּ בְשֵׁמוֹת, "and the men who
have been mentioned by name arose." The נִקְּבוּ, though com-
monly derived from נָקַב "to pierce, to prick off," is more likely
a *Niphᶜal* of קבב, the cognate of Arabic قب (qabb) "a head,
chief, ruler or elder upon [the control of] whom the affairs of the
people, or party, turn." With this cognate in mind, the MT אֲשֶׁר
נִקְּבוּ means "who were designated to be in charge." The plural
שֵׁמוֹת "names" here is probably the cognate of Arabic سومة
(sûmat) and سيمة (sîmat) "a mark, sign, token, or badge, by
which a thing/person is known" and تسوم (tasawim) "he set a
mark, badge, upon himself, whereby he might be known." Thus
this phrase in 28:15 can be translated "the men, who were
designated by badges to be in charge, arose."

JOB 16:15 (CBBP XXI)

שֹׂק תָּפַרְתִּי עֲלֵי גִלְדִּי וְעֹלַלְתִּי בֶעָפָר קַרְנִי׃, "I have

sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and defiled my horn in the dust"
(KJV); "I have sewn sackcloth over my skin, And laid my head
in the dust" (NKJ). Σάκκον ἔρραψα ἐπὶ βύρσης μου τὸ δὲ
σθένος μου ἐν γῇ ἐσβέσθη, "They sewed sackcloth upon my
skin, and my strength has been spent on the ground." The noun
גֶּלֶד is the cognate of Arabic جلــد (*jild ᵘⁿ* / *jalada*) "skin, to
beat, hurt, or flog the skin." The noun קֶרֶן means "horn," but
קֶרֶן can also mean "forehead" and "strength"—like its Arabic
cognate قرن (*qarn*) "head, forehead" and أقرن (*ʾaqrana*) "he
was strong enough to do the thing." This explains the varied
translations of קרן as "horn, head, forehead, brow, strength."

PSALM 2:1 (MBS XIV)

לָמָּה רָגְשׁוּ גוֹיִם, "Why do the nations rage?" By changing
the interrogative לָמָּה into the emphatic לָמָה the verse reads
"*Indeed* the nations rage!"

PSALM 2:11–12 (CBBP XIV)

וְגִילוּ בִּרְעָדָה׃ נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר פֶּן־יֶאֱנַף, "And rejoice with
trembling. Kiss the son, lest he be angry. Καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐ-
τῷ ἐν τρόμῳ δράξασθε παιδείας μήποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος,
"And rejoice in him with trembling; accept correction, lest at any
time the Lord be angry." The Septuagint's παιδείας "instruc-
tion" reflects an internal Greek corruption of παιδίον "child";
and the δράξασθε "catch, trap" reflects a reading of the MT
נַשְּׁקוּ "kiss" as if it were from שׁוּק, the cognate of the Arabic
سوق (*sûq*) "grasp." The initial imperative גִילוּ "rejoice" is
better read as the cognate of the Arabic جــل (*jalla*) "to honor,
dignify, exalt the majesty of God." By removing the י vowel
letter the גִילוּ becomes the imperative וְגִלּוּ "and magnify

[Him]," which logically follows the call in 2:11a to worship Yahweh with great reverence." The רַעַד of בִּרְעָדָה "with trembling" is better read as the cognate of the Arabic رغد (*raġada*) "it became ample and unrestrained" and رغد (*raġd*) "plentiful, pleasant, easy." Thus 2:11b can be translated as "worship Yahweh in reverence, adore with unrestraint!" The נַשְּׁקוּ is probably a variant for נַשְׂכוּ, and if so it would be the cognate of Arabic نسك (*nasaka*) "to worship." The בַר could be the Aramaic בַּר "son," but it is more likely to mean "pure, pious, honest," which is the cognate of Arabic بِر (*birr / barr*) "fidelity, piety towards God or parents, obedience" or بِرى (*bariy*) "free, clear, pure in heart from associating any [other] with God."

PSALM 19:4–5 (MT 19:5-6) ([CMBBP](#) [VIII](#))

לַשֶּׁמֶשׁ שָׂם־אֹהֶל בָּהֶם וְהוּא כְּחָתָן יֹצֵא מֵחֻפָּתוֹ יָשִׂישׂ כְגִבּוֹר לָרוּץ אֹרַח׃, "In them he has set a tent for the sun, which as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber rejoices as a strong man to run his course." The Hebrew text can also be translated as "Verily, in the skies *the scorching sun shines*; it comes out like *a fire-carrier* from his canopy and like a champion runs its course with joy." The לְ of לַשֶּׁמֶשׁ can be read as the emphatic לְ "indeed, verily," and the שָׂם "he set" can be repointed as שָׁם "scorching," the cognate of the Arabic سموم (*samûm*) "a hot violent wind in a sand storm" (which became the loanword *simoom* in English). Instead of reading the אהל as אֹהֶל "tent" it can be read as אֹהֵל "shining." The בהם "in them" refers to the heavens and firmament in 19:1. The חָתָן can be read as חָתֹן (*scriptio defectiva* for חָתוֹן) "a fire-carrier,"

derived from חָתָה "to snatch up fire / coals" and מַחְתָּה "a fire-holder." The חוּפָּה "canopy, chamber" is a cognate of Arabic حفيف/حـف (ḥaffa / ḥafîf) "to circuit, to surround, to enclose" and "to make (rustling) sounds from running feet or the whizzing sounds of wind." With these nuances of חוּפָּה in focus, the transition was easily made from the "circuit of the sun" to a noisy "champion running his course."

PSALM 22:1 (MBS XIV)

אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָה עֲזַבְתָּנִי, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" By changing the interrogative לָמָה into the emphatic לָמָה the verse reads "My God, my God, you have *surely* forsaken me." (See Matthew 27:46, below.)

PSALM 40:2 (CMBBP IX)

וַיַּעֲלֵנִי מִבּוֹר שָׁאוֹן, "He drew me up from the desolate pit." Καὶ ἀνήγαγέν με ἐκ λάκκου ταλαιπωρίας, "And he brought me up out of a pit of misery." The שָׁאוֹן is the cognate of Arabic ثوى (ṯawaya) "he remained, stayed, or abode, he was slain and remained where he was, or he remained in his grave . . . he died," with the passive ثوى (ṯuwiya) meaning "he was buried." Thus the בּוֹר שָׁאוֹן is equal to "grave site" or "burial plot," and this phrase would mean, "he drew me up from the burial plot."

PSALM 40:4 (CMBBP IX)

וְלֹא־פָנָה אֶל־רְהָבִים וְשָׂטֵי כָזָב "and does not respect the proud, nor such as turn aside to lies." The MT רְהָבִים "proud / defiant" can also be recognized as the cognate of the Arabic راب/ريب (raib / râba) "it made me to doubt, to be

suspicious and skeptical" and مرتاب (*murtâb*) "a sceptic in matters of religion." Given the positive references in 40:3–4 to those who trust (מִבְטָח) a negative reference to skeptics and doubters רֹהֲבִים) in 40:5 would be contextually appropriate. The שָׂטֵי/שׂוֹטֵיה "fool, madman" became in the Septuagint μανίας ψευδεῖς "false frenzies." The שָׂטֵי "ones turning aside" should probably be emended to שָׂטַר, stem II, "lies, fiction, myths," the cognate of the Arabic سطر (*saṭara*) "he composed lies, falsehoods" and أسطورة / سطر (*saṭr* / *ʾusṭûrat*) "lies, fictions, fables, myths." Thus this phrase can be translated as "who does not turn to skeptics nor misleading myth."

PSALM 40:6 (CMBBP IX)

זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה לֹא־חָפַצְתָּ אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי, "Sacrifice and offering you did not desire; ears you dug for me." Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι (𝕲 ᴬ ᴮ ˢ), "Sacrifice and offering you not desire but a body you have prepared for me." The Greek σῶμα "body" was probably due to scribal errors in the uncials when the final ς of ἠθέλησας was mistakenly read as the initial letter of the ὠτία "ears." Then the τι of this erroneous σωτια was misread as a μ, resulting in the σῶμα now in the text. In light of the Arabic cognates (a) أذان (*ʾaḏân* = אזן) "notification, announcement," and (b) كر (*karra* = כרה) "to repeat, to reiterate," the phrase אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי is best translated as "you *reiterated* to me the *pronouncement*s" — namely the fact that burnt offerings and sin offerings were not required.

PSALM 48:3 (CBBP XXXIV)

יְפֵה נוֹף מְשׂוֹשׂ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַר־צִיּוֹן יַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן

קִרְיַת מֶלֶךְ רָב׃, "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, *is* mount Zion, *on* the sides of the north, the city of the great King" (KJV). "It is beautiful in its loftiness, the joy of the whole earth. Like the utmost heights of Zaphon is Mount Zion, the city of the Great King King" (NIV). Εὖ ῥιζῶν ἀγαλλιάματι πάσης τῆς γῆς ὄρη Σιων τὰ πλευρὰ τοῦ βορρᾶ ἡ πόλις τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου (47:3), "The city of the great King is well planted *on* the mountains of Sion, with the joy of the whole earth, *on* the sides of the north." The desiderated Semitic meaning of *Zaphon* is not צָפַן "to hide" or צָפוֹן "north" but the Arabic cognate صفوان / صفو (ṣafwun / ṣafwân) "pure, choice, selected purely or exclusively belonging to God. Here the הַר־צִיּוֹן יַרְכְּתֵי is a plural of intensity and צָפוֹן is best translated as "Mount Zion, the quintessence of purity."

PSALM 55:20 (CMBBP XI)

אֲשֶׁר אֵין חֲלִיפוֹת לָמוֹ וְלֹא יָרְאוּ אֱלֹהִים, "Because they have no changes, therefore they fear not God" (KJV); "because they keep no law, and do not fear God" (RSV). Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἀντάλλαγμα καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν θεόν, "For they suffer no reverse, and they have not feared God." The MT חֲלִיפוֹת "changes" is better read as the cognate of the Arabic حلف (ḥalif) meaning "the act of confederating to assist," permitting this verse to be read as, "There were no *oaths of allegiance* from them, and they did not fear God."

PSALM 68:31 (CBBP XXXV)

יֶאֱתָיוּ חַשְׁמַנִּים מִנִּי מִצְרָיִם, "Envoys will come out of Egypt" (NKJ). "Let bronze be brought from Egypt" (RSV). Ἥξουσιν πρέσβεις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου (67:32), "Elders shall arrive

out of Egypt." The Arabic cognate حشيم (ḥašîm) means one who is "regarded with reverence, veneration, respect, honor, and fear." This cognate explains the Septuagint's translation of חַשְׁמַנִּים as πρέσβεις "ambassadors, elders, venerable men." In the language of Psalm 68:32, the Hasmoneans (חַשְׁמַנִּים/חַשְׁמוֹנַאי) would have been the Judean men "held in high esteem" or "regarded with fear."

PSALM 70:1 (CMBBP IX)

לַמְנַצֵּחַ לְדָוִד לְהַזְכִּיר, "To the choirmaster. A Psalm of David, for the memorial offering." Εἰς τὸ τέλος τῷ Δαυιδ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, "For the end, by David for a remembrance." The מְנַצֵּחַ here means "bass voices," the נָצַח being the cognate of the Syriac נצח (nĕṣaḥ) "to celebrate, to triumph," which when used of the voice meant "clear, sonorous." The original finite verb which began this verse survives in the לְהַזְכִּיר "to hold in memory" of the superscription. This הַזְכִּיר was mistakenly read as the Hiph‘îl infinitive and given the preposition לְ and made the final word of the superscription. But הַזְכִּיר was a Hiph‘îl imperative and was originally the first word of the psalm itself: "*Remember*, O God, to save me" The text may have had the infinitive and the imperative: הַזְכִּיר הַזְכִּיר

PSALM 109:4 (CMBBP X)

וַאֲנִי תְפִלָּה, "And I am a prayer." Ἐγὼ δὲ προσευχόμην, "And I am praying." The תפלה here is not the same as the תְּפִלָּה "prayer" in 109:7 (from the stem פָּלַל). The initial ת of the תפלה here in 109:4 is the first letter of the stem תָּפַל "to be unseemly, to be indecent." The MT תִּפְלָה "prayer" should be

pointed as (1) תִּפְלָה "impropriety, indecency, obscenity, triviality" or as (2) תֹּפְלָה, a participle meaning "an indecent / obscene (woman)." The Hebrew תָּפֵל is the cognate of Syriac ܛܦܠ (ṭĕpal) "defiled, corrupt." The female psalmist laments the deceitful mouths, lying tongues, words of hate, and verbal attacks which besmirch her. The curses in verses 6–15 were invoked by this castaway concubine or divorced wife against her former mate, his fellows, and his family.

PSALM 109:23 (CMBBP X)

כְּצֵל־כִּנְטוֹתוֹ נֶהֱלָכְתִּי, "I am gone like the shadow when it declineth" (KJV) or "I fade away like an evening shadow" (NIV). The Arabic cognate of this הָלַךְ (stem II) is هلك (halaka), which in form 10 means "he became distressed, trouble, or fatigued." Thus this phrase probably meant, "like a fading shadow I became fatigued," for this psalmist had become weary of the false allegations and lies.

PSALM 109:31 (CMBBP X)

כִּי־יַעֲמֹד לִימִין אֶבְיוֹן לְהוֹשִׁיעַ מִשֹּׁפְטֵי נַפְשׁוֹ, "For he stands at the right hand of the needy, to save from the ones judging his soul." Ὅτι παρέστη ἐκ δεξιῶν πένητος τοῦ σῶσαι ἐκ τῶν καταδιωκόντων τὴν ψυχήν μου, "For he stood at the right hand of the poor, to save from the ones pursuing my soul." The מִשֹּׁפְטֵי "from the ones judging" was read by the Septuagint translators as a Šaphᶜēl participle of פיט, the cognate of Arabic فيظ (fîẓ) and فيض (fîḍ) "to die." The משפטי, when pointed as מַשֹּׁפְטֵי and coupled with נֶפֶשׁ, was a perfect match with this cognate in form IV, أفظت نفسه (ʾafaḏtu nafsahu) "I made his soul to depart."

PSALM 118:25 ([SHEM TOB](#))

אָנָּא יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא אָנָּא יְהוָה הַצְלִיחָה נָּא, "O Yahweh, *please save*! O Yahweh, please send prosperity!" Ὦ κύριε σῶσον δή ὦ κύριε εὐόδωσον δη, "O Lord, save now: O Lord, send now prosperity." The MT הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא can be transliterated as *hoshianna*. It is one of three different imperatives which became Ὡσαννά in Greek and *Hosanna* in English. The initial הוֹ of הוֹשִׁיעָה marks it as a *Hiphᶜîl* imperative of יָשַׁע "to save," and the נָּא is the polite particle of entreaty — which when combined mean "Please save!" This Ὡσαννά/*Hosanna* is the cognate of the Arabic وسع (*wasaᶜa /wassaᶜ*) "he made one's means of subsistence ample and abundant and the related noun سعة (*šaᶜat*) "richness, wealthiness, plentifulness, and easiness of life." The הוֹשַׁעְנָא (Ὡσαννά/ *Hosanna*) of the Feast of Booths (Succoth) is more likely to be the cognate of Arabic وشع (*wašaᶜa*) "to mix things," for the festival of Succoth (based upon Lev 23:40) requires the mixing of a piece of quality fruit with branches from palm, willow, and myrtle trees. (The third הוֹשַׁעְנָא/Ὡσαννά/*Hosanna* is noted below in the paragraph focused on Matt 21:9.)

PROVERBS 25:21–22   ([MBS V](#))

אִם־רָעֵב שֹׂנַאֲךָ הַאֲכִלֵהוּ לָחֶם . . . כִּי גֶחָלִים אַתָּה חֹתֶה עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ, "If your enemy is hungry, give him food to eat . . . For you will heap burning coals on his head." Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου τρέφε αὐτόν . . . τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, If your enemy is hungry, give him bread to eat; . . . for so doing you will heap coals of fire upon his head." The metaphor of "heaping coals of fire upon the head," meaning "to teach someone a good lesson,"

is based upon the usage in Arabic of قبس (*qabasa*) "fire, a live coal." It is the cognate of כְּפַשׁ "hot ashes, coals"— a synonym of the גֶּחָלִים "glowing coals" in Prov 25:22. The Arabic نار قبس النار (*qabasa nâran*) means "he took fire" and قبس النار (*qabasa 'alnârâ*) means "he lighted the fire." But قبس علما (*qabasa ʿilmâ*) means "he acquired / sought knowledge." In the causative form اقبسه نار ('*aqbasahu nârâ*) means "he gave him fire"; and اقبسه علما ('*aqbasahu ʿilmâ*) means "he taught him knowledge." The plural noun القوابس ('*alqawâbisu*) means "those who teach what is good." Thus the Arabic idiom and metaphor removes the obscurity of the Hebrew idiom and metaphor of "heaping of glowing coals upon the head" in Prov 25:22 and its quotation in Rom 12:20. If the *firey coals* have to do with *heat*, then crowning someone with *coals* would be an act of torture. If the *firey coals* have to do with *light*, then crowning someone with *glowing coals* would be an act of *illumination* with the recipient's becoming *enlightened*.

PROVRBS 30:1 (CBBP XV)
  דִּבְרֵי אָגוּר בִּן־יָקֶה הַמַּשָּׂא נְאֻם הַגֶּבֶר לְאִיתִיאֵל
לְאִיתִיאֵל וְאֻכָל, "The words of Agur the son of Jakeh, *even* the prophecy: the man spake unto Ithiel, even unto Ithiel and Ucal." Τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους υἱέ φοβήθητι καὶ δεξάμενος αὐτοὺς μετανόει τάδε λέγει ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν θεῷ καὶ παύομαι, "'Reverence my words, son, and receiving them, repent,' says the man to them that trust in God; and I cease." The first four words of the MT can be rendered, "the words of a pious person rewarded for righteousness," for the name אָגוּר (Agur) is a cognate of Arabic اجر ('*ajara*) "a reward from God to a man for righteous conduct," and the name יָקֶה (Yakeh) is

a cognate of Arabic وقى (*waqî*) "to be pious, to be obedient, to guard oneself from sin." The next two words, הַמַּשָּׂא נְאֻם, mean "the one authoring the saying," for הַמַּשָּׂא is the cognate of Arabic نشأ (*naša'a*) "he created or composed a proverb" and منشى (*munšî*) "author, originator." The word, הַגֶּבֶר is the cognate of Arabic جبر (*jabara*) "he restored to a good estate, to treat anyone in a kind and conciliatory manner." Thus the first seven words of 30:1 mean "the words of Agur [= the one-rewarded-for-righteousness], the son of Jakeh [= the pious one], the one authoring the declaration [= המשׂא נאם] of the one-restored-to-sound-estate" [= הַגֶּבֶר].

PROVERBS 30:1 (CBBP XV)

נְאֻם הַגֶּבֶר לְאִיתִיאֵל לְאִיתִיאֵל וְאֻכָל, "The man says to Ithiel, to Ithiel and Ucal" (RSV). Recognizing the Aramaic איתי, "to exist" and changing the preposition ל "to" into the emphatic ל the phrase reads, "The declaration of the one-restored-to-good health: '*Surely* there is a God! *Surely* there is a God! I will be safeguarded.'" The אֻכָל is a *Hoph°al* imperfect of כָּלָא, the cognate of the Arabic كلا (*kala'a*) "to guard, to keep safe," as in the expression, كلاءة الله (*kilâ'at 'allahi*) "the safe keeping of God").

PROVERBS 30:2 (CBBP XV)

כִּי בַעַר אָנֹכִי מֵאִישׁ וְלֹא־בִינַת אָדָם לִי, "'Surely I am too stupid to be a man. I have not the understanding of a man." Ἀφρονέστατος γάρ εἰμι πάντων ἀνθρώ πων καὶ φρόνησις ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοι, "For I am the most simple of all men, and there is not in me the wisdom of men."

The בַּעַר is better read as בָּעֵר, the *Qal* passive participle of בָּעַר stem II, "to burn, to be consumed with anger or emotion"; and the מֵאִישׁ can be repointed to מֵאָיָשׁ "from despair"— the אָיַשׁ being the cognate of Arabic ايس (*ʾayisa*) "he despaired" and اياس (*ʾiyās*) "desperation." Thus this verse states, "for I was consumed from despair and I did not have (normal) human discernment.

PROVERBS 30:4 (CBBP XV)

מַה־שְּׁמוֹ וּמַה־שֶּׁם־בְּנוֹ כִּי תֵדָע, "What is his name, and what is his son's name? Surely you know!" Τί ὄνομα αὐτῷ ἢ τί ὄνομα τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ ἵνα γνῷς, "What is his name and what is his son's name so that you know." The מה here is not the interrogative "what" but the exclamatory "how!" as in מָה־אַדִּיר שִׁמְךָ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ, how majestic is thy name in all he earth!" (Psa 8:2). The שְׁמוֹ in 30:4 may be the cognate of Arabic سمو (*sumû*) "exaltedness, eminence." If so, the MT מַה־שְּׁמוֹ matches the מָה־אַדִּיר of Psa 8:2. The *Vorlage* could have been מָה שָׁמוּ שְׁמוֹ "How exalted his name!" The phrase וּמַה־שֶּׁם־בְּנוֹ "What is his son's name?" may actually mean "How *sublime* his *intelligence*!" The MT בְּנוֹ "his son" can be read as בְּנוֹ (*scriptio defectiva* for בִּין, the masculine variant of בִּינָה "intelligence"). The closing כִּי תֵדָע "Surely you know!" (RSV) should be read as the initial words of 30:5, "*Certainly you know* every saying of God has stood the test!"

PROVERBS 30:31 (CMBBP XI)

וּמֶלֶךְ אַלְקוּם עִמּוֹ, "And a king, against whom *there is* no rising up" (KJV). Καὶ βασιλεὺς δημηγορῶν ἐν ἔθνει, "And

a king orating before a nation." The Septuagint translators read the אלקום as if it were אלקוס, the Latin *eloquens* "expressing one's thoughts forcefully." Here the אל can be read as the cognate of Arabic آل (ʾā la) "he ruled / governed his subjects," and the קום of אל קום can be read as the cognate of Arabic قوم (qawm) "a community, a body of men and women, kinfolk, or tribe." This phrase, when divided as ומלך אל קום עמו, means "and a king governing / demagoging a tribe of his people."

PROVERBS 31:2 (CMBBP XI)

מַה־בְּרִי וּמַה־בַּר־בִּטְנִי וּמֶה בַּר־נְדָרָי, "What, my son? What, son of my womb? What, son of my vows?" (RSV). Τί τέκνον τηρήσεις τί ῥήσεις θεοῦ πρωτογενές σοὶ λέγω υἱέ τί τέκνον ἐμῆς κοιλίας τί τέκνον ἐμῶν εὐχῶν, "What, O child, will you observe? What are the dictates of God? My firstborn, I am speaking to you, O son, What is it, son of my womb? What is it, son of my vows?" Behind the threefold interrogative מַה...וּמַה...וּמֶה, "What... what...what?" of the MT stand three imperatives of the verb נָמָה, the cognate of Arabic نماء / نمى (namy / namā ʾ) "to grow, increase, expand, prosper, flourish, thrive." Thus this phrase can be translated as "*Prosper*, my son! *Flourish*, son of my womb! *Thrive*, son of my vows!"

PROVERBS 31:3 (CMBBP XI)

אַל־תִּתֵּן לַנָּשִׁים חֵילֶךָ וּדְרָכֶיךָ לַמְחוֹת מְלָכִין, "Give not your strength to women, your ways to those who destroy kings" (RSV). Μὴ δῷς γυναιξὶ σὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὸν σὸν νοῦν καὶ βίον εἰς ὑστεροβουλίαν, "Give not your wealth to women, nor your mind and living to remorse." The דְּרָךְ here is

the cognate of the Arabic درك (*darak*) "the attainment or acquisition of an object of want." The מָחָה here is not stem I "to wipe out, to exterminate" but stem II, the cognate of Arabic محاح (*maḥḥâḥ*) "one who pleases with his words but does nothing, a habitual liar." The advice of Lemuel's mother was essentially "Son, beware of female flatterers who do lip service only!" The Septuagint's νοῦν "mind, reason" is an alternative translation of the חַיִל which was read as though it were the cognate of Arabic خال/خيل (*ḫyl/ḫâl*a) "he thought, fancied, imagined." Here the advise of the mother to her son was, "Give not your wealth to women nor your *acquisitions* to (women) who *deceive* kings."

PROVERBS 31:5 (CMBBP XI)

פֶּן־יִשְׁתֶּה וְיִשְׁכַּח מְחֻקָּק וִישַׁנֶּה דִּין כָּל־בְּנֵי־עֹנִי, "Lest he drink, and forget the decree, and change the judgment of any of the sons of affliction." Ἵνα μὴ πιόντες ἐπιλάθωνται τῆς σοφίας καὶ ὀρθὰ κρῖναι οὐ μὴ δύνωνται τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς, Lest they drink and forget wisdom and be not able to judge the poor rightly." The MT עֹנִי needs to be vocalized as עָנִי and identified as the cognate of the Arabic غـنـى (*ġaniya*) "he was free from want, he became wealthy," and غـنـىً (*ġinan*) and غـناء (*ġana*ʾ) "wealth, riches"— not to be confused with עֲנִי / עָנִי "poor," the cognates of Arabic عـنـو (*ʿunūw*) and عـنـا (*ʿanā*) "to be humble, miserable." Lemuel's need to adjudicate on behalf of the poor is stated in 31:9 (וְדִין עָנִי וְאֶבְיוֹן, "maintain the rights of the poor and needy"). Here in 31:5 Lemuel was advised not to drink wine and strong drink lest it interfere with his ability to properly adjudicate for the wealthy.

PROVERBS 31:8 (CMBBP XI)

פְּתַח־פִּיךָ לְאִלֵּם אֶל־דִּין כָּל־בְּנֵי חֲלוֹף, "Open your mouth for the dumb, for the rights of all who are left desolate" (RSV). Ἄνοιγε σὸν στόμα λόγῳ θεοῦ καὶ κρῖνε πάντας ὑγιῶς, "Open thy mouth with the word of God, and judge all fairly." The Septuagint's λόγῳ θεοῦ "to the word of God" translates what now stands in the MT as לְאִלֵּם אֶל, as if the *Vorlage* read לכלם אל, with the כלם being the cognate of Arabic كلام (*kalâm*) "saying, words," used in a similar expression, فتح فمه بالكلام (*fataḥa famahū biʾlkalâm*) "he opened his mouth to say something." The MT אִלֵּם "dumb" is better read as *scriptio defectiva* for לְאִלִּים "to kith-and-kin,"— the אלה being the cognate of Arabic أل (*ʾâl / ʾill*) and ايلة (*ʾîlat*) "a man's family and kinfolk." The בְּנֵי חֲלוֹף is the equivalent of בְּנֵי בְרִית "sons of the covenant," a reference to the confederates and affiliates of the kingdom of Massa. The Arabic cognate of this חלף is حلف (*ḥalif*) meaning "the act of confederating, to assist and make an agreement to aid those wronged." Thus this verse should be translated as "open your mouth for kith-and-kin, for the rights of all who are associates."

PROVERBS 31:10 (CMBBP XI)

אֵשֶׁת־חַיִל מִי יִמְצָא, "Who can find a virtuous woman?" (KJV); "A good wife who can find?" (RSV). Γυναῖκα ἀνδ-ρείαν τίς εὑρήσει, "Who can find a manly woman?" The חַיִל can mean (a) "might," the cognate of Arabic (1) حول/حيل / حال (*ḥwl / ḥyl / ḥâl*) "strength, power, might," or (b) حول (*ḥuwwal*) "intelligent, smart in turning affairs over in the mind,

or (c) خال/خيل (*ḫyl / ḫâl*) "a bountiful, liberal, generous person." Here the חַיִל carries multiple levels of meaning which permits this *paraphrase*: "Who can find a rich, generous, dynamic, smart woman, gifted with administrative skills?"

PROVERBS 31:11 (CMBBP XI)
וְשָׁלָל לֹא יֶחְסָר, "And he will have no lack of gain." Ἡ τοιαύτη καλῶν σκύλων οὐκ ἀπορήσει, "Such a one shall not be at a loss for fine spoils." As Driver (1951) noted, the שָׁלָל here is the cognate of Arabic سليل (*salîl*) "a child or male offspring." Thus this phrase can be translated as "he will not lack a son."

PROVERBS 31:15 (CMBBP XI)
וַתִּתֵּן טֶרֶף לְבֵיתָהּ וְחֹק לְנַעֲרֹתֶיהָ, "She provides food for her household and tasks for her maidens." Καὶ ἔδωκεν βρώματα τῷ οἴκῳ καὶ ἔργα ταῖς θεραπαίναις, "And gives food to her household, and work to her maidens." The MT טֶרֶף is the cognate of Arabic طريف (*ṭarîf*) "a thing that is good and fresh and pleasing to the eye of fruits and other things." Therefore it can be said that "she gave *fresh quality food* to her household," rather than just "food." The חֹק here is probably the cognate of the Arabic حقة (*ḥuqqat*) "small pot, jar, container," rather than "tasks" or "work," base upon the חֹק "statute" (from חָקַק, stem I, "to inscribe, to decree").

PROVERBS 31:30 (CMBBP XI)
שֶׁקֶר הַחֵן וְהֶבֶל הַיֹּפִי אִשָּׁה יִרְאַת־יְהוָה הִיא תִתְהַלָּל, "Grace is deceitful, and beauty is vain; *But* a woman that feareth Jehovah, she shall be praised" (ASV). Ψευδεῖς ἀρέσκειαι καὶ

μάταιον κάλλος γυναικός γυνὴ γὰρ συνετὴ εὐλογεῖται φόβον δὲ κυρίου αὕτη αἰνείτω, "Desires to please are false, and woman's beauty is vain: for it is a wise woman that is blessed, and let her praise the fear the Lord." The Septuagint's ἀρέσκειαι "desires to please" is a doublet reflecting the שֶׁקֶר "a lie" and variant which was read as שָׁפַר / שֶׁפֶר "comliness, beauty, to be pleasing." The MT הַחֵן is not from חָנַן "to be gracious," but from חוּן which is the cognate of Arabic خان/خون (ḫwn / ḫân) meaning "he was disloyal, false, unfaithful, he acted perfidiously." Thus the שֶׁקֶר הַחֵן וְהֶבֶל הַיֹּפִי should be translated as "infidelity is deceitful, and beauty is fleeting."

ECCLESIASTES 2:8 (CBBP XVI)

וְתַעֲנוּגֹת בְּנֵי הָאָדָם שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת, "And the luxuries of the sons of man—a wife and wives" (YLT). Καὶ ἐντρυφήματα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἰνοχόον καὶ οἰνοχόας, "And delights of the sons of men, a butler and female cupbearers." The nouns שִׁדָּה וְשִׁדּוֹת are cognates of Arabic شدا / شدو (šadw / šadā) "he sang, chanted, recited poetry." They should be repointed as participles שֹׁדֶה וְשֹׁדוֹת "a chanter and chanting women," like the preceding שָׁרִים וְשָׁרוֹת "singing men and singing women."

ECCLESIASTES 7:26 (CBBP XVI)

וּמוֹצֶא אֲנִי מַר מִמָּוֶת אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר־הִיא מְצוֹדִים וַחֲרָמִים לִבָּהּ, "And I find more bitter than death the woman, whose heart is snares and nets" (KJV). Καὶ εὑρίσκω ἐγὼ πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον σὺν τὴν γυναῖκα ἥτις ἐστὶν θηρεύματα, "And I find her to be, and I will pronounce to be more bitter than death the woman which is a snare and her heart

nets." The הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר־הִיא needs to be emended to אִשָּׁה אֲשֹׁרָה הִיא, and the אֲשֹׁרָה can then be read as the cognate of Arabic أشر (ʾašir) "exulting greatly or excessively by reason of wealth and behaving with pride and self-conceitedness." Thus the verse can be translated as "more bitter than death is a self-conceited / thankless woman; she is snares and her heart is nets."

ECCLESIASTES 7:28 (CBBP XVI)

אָדָם אֶחָד מֵאֶלֶף מָצָאתִי וְאִשָּׁה בְכָל־אֵלֶּה לֹא מָצָאתִי
"One man in a thousand I found, but a woman in all these I did not find." The word מַאֲלֵף "familiar, friendly" which dropped out due to a haplography needs to be restored. The מַאֲלֵף is the cognate of Arabic مالوف (mâʾlūf) "familiar," مالف (mâʾlāf) "an object of familiarity," and الف (ʾilf) "close friend, intimate, confidant, lover." Thus this verse states, "one friendly (מַאֲלֵף) man out of a thousand (מֵאֶלֶף) I found but a woman in all these I did not find."

ECCLESIASTES 7:29 (CBBP XVI)

מָצָאתִי אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם יָשָׁר וְהֵמָּה בִקְשׁוּ חִשְּׁבֹנוֹת רַבִּים "I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many devices." Here the MT הָאָדָם "the man" is gender inclusive, as it is in Gen 1: 27, where הָאָדָם "the human being" includes the זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה "male *and* female," and as it is in Gen 5:2b, וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמָם אָדָם "and he called *their* name 'Adam.'" The Arabic cognate of יָשָׁר is يسر (yusr), "ease, easiness of circumstance, and what is made easy." This verse is a clear allusion to Eden where הָאָדָם (Adam *and* Eve) had "easiness of circumstance." But the ease of

Eden ended when הָאָדָם (Adam *and* Eve) "willfully turned to many reckonings of their own" (7:29b).

SONG OF SOLOMON 1:3 (CBBP XVII)

לְרֵיחַ שְׁמָנֶיךָ טוֹבִים שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק שְׁמֶךָ עַל־כֵּן עֲלָמוֹת אֲהֵבוּךָ, "Your oils are fragrant, your name is oil poured out; therefore the maidens love you." Καὶ ὀσμὴ μύρων σου ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα μύρον ἐκκενωθὲν ὄνομά σου διὰ τοῦτο νεάνιδες ἠγάπησάν σε, "And the smell of your ointments is better than all spices: your name is ointment poured forth; therefore do the young maidens love you." By changing the initial preposition לְ "to" into the emphatic לְ the לְרֵיחַ שְׁמָנֶיךָ טוֹבִים reads "*Truly*, the scent of your oils / perfumes is delightful." The שֶׁמֶן of שְׁמָנֶיךָ is the cognate of Arabic شم (*šamma*) "scent," but the שֶׁמֶן of שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק is the cognate of Arabic ثمن (*ṯaman*) "high-priced, expensive." The רַק of תּוּרַק is the cognate of the Arabic روق/رأق (*ruq/râqa*) "to be clear/pure, to excel, to delight," Thus this verse stated, "Truly, the scent of your perfume is very delightful. Precious, your scent was made to induce pleasure; therefore (young) women have loved you."

SONG OF SOLOMON 1:4 (CBBP XVII)

נַזְכִּירָה דֹדֶיךָ מִיַּיִן מֵישָׁרִים אֲהֵבוּךָ, "We will extol your love more than wine; rightly do they love you." Ἀγαπήσομεν μαστούς σου ὑπὲρ οἶνον εὐθύτης ἠγάπησέν σε, "We will love your breasts more than wine: righteousness loves you." The מישרים אֲהֵבוּךָ "the upright love you" is better read as "they loved you more than *great luxuries*"— recognizing here the Arabic cognate يسر (*yusr*) "richness, opulence, wealth, luxury." (The *plural* מֵישָׁרִים is a plural of intensity indicated

by the adjective "*great.*")

ISAIAH 8:6 ([CMBBP](#) [XIII](#))

אֶת מֵי הַשִּׁלֹחַ הַהֹלְכִים לְאַט וּמְשׂוֹשׂ, "The waters of
Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice." Τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σιλωαμ τὸ
πορευόμενον ἡσυχῇ ἀλλὰ βούλεσθαι ἔχειν . . . βασιλέα ἐφ᾽
ὑμῶν, "The water of Siloam that goes softly, but wills to have
. . . a king over you." The Greek ἔχειν . . . βασιλέα reflects a
reading of the MT מְשׂוֹשׂ with the stem שׁוּשׁ, the cognate of the
Arabic ساس / سوس (*saws/sâs*) "he ruled, he governed,."(The
וּמְשׂוֹשׂ needs to be repointed as וּמְשָׁוֵשׁ or וּמְשָׁוֵשׁ.) The
βούλεσθαι "to desire" translates the MT אֵת, which must have
appeared as אות and was read and as the construct of אַוְּה
"desire. Actually the MT מְשׂוֹשׂ is the cognate of the Arabic
adjective مشاوش/ مشاوِش (*mušâwis / mušawiš*) "water hardly
to be seen, by reason of its remoteness from the surface of the
ground or its paucity and the depth to which it has sunk." Thus
אֶת מֵי הַשִּׁלֹחַ הַהֹלְכִים לְאַט וּמְשָׁוֵשׁ means "the waters of
Shiloah that flow gently and are barely visible."

ISAIAH 8:8 ([CMBBP](#) [XII](#))

וְהָיָה מֻטּוֹת כְּנָפָיו מְלֹא רֹחַב־אַרְצְךָ עִמָּנוּ אֵל, "And
its outspread wings will fill the breadth of your land, O
Immanuel." Καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ ὥστε τὸ πλάτος
τῆς χώρας σου μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, "And his camp shall fill the
breadth of thy land, O God with us." The כנף of the MT כְּנָפָיו
is the cognate of Arabic كنف (*kanafa*) "to guard, to protect, to
provide with an enclosure" and the noun كنف (*kanaf*) "shelter,
fold, protection." The Septuagint's παρεμβολη "a fortified en-

closure" reflects this derivation and is the true meaning here of the MT כְּנָפָיו.

ISAIAH 8:9 (CMBBP XIII)

רְעוּ עַמִּים וָחֹתּוּ, "Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces" (KJV); "Make an uproar, O ye peoples, and be broken in pieces" (ASV); "Be broken, O peoples, and be shattered" (NAS). Γνῶτε ἔθνη καὶ ἡττᾶσθε, "Know, ye peoples, and be conquered." The γνῶτε "know ye" reflects a *Vorlage* with דעו for the MT רעו. The Syriac text reads זועו (zûᶜû) "quake, quiver, tremble," which reflects the verb רוע (stem II) "to be frightened / tremble with fear." It is the cognate of the widely attested Arabic راع / روع (rûᶜ / râᶜ) "he was frightened, it affected his heart with fear." This meaning is the perfect parallel for the imperative וחתו "be dismayed, scared, terrified" which follows.

ISAIAH 8:14 (CMBBP XIII)

וְהָיָה לְמִקְדָּשׁ, "And he will become a sanctuary." Καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα, "And if thou shalt trust in him, he shall be to thee for a sanctuary." The MT מִקְדָּשׁ "sanctuary" needs to be emended to מַקְרִשׁ, a *Hiphᶜîl* participle of the stem קרשׁ, which is the cognate of the Arabic كرث (karaṯa) "it oppressed, afflicted, grieved him" and كارثة (kâriṯat) "disaster, catastrophe. Thus the king of Assyria, *not* Yahweh, will become the "oppressor" (literally, "the grief-maker") as well as his becoming "a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling."

ISAIAH 9:6 (MBS XX)

וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גִּבּוֹר אֲבִיעַד שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם

"And his name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Seven Hebrew words have traditionally been translated as these five names. Taking a clue from the Septuagint's αὐτω "to him" at the end of the verse and recognizing it as the translation of the initial לם (read as לְמוֹ "to him") of the initial word לְמַרבֵּה in 9:6, nine Hebrew words emerge which make up three titles composed of three words: (1) פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֵל, "Wonderful Counselor of God," (2) גִּבּוֹר אֲבִי עַד שַׂר "Mighty One of the Eternal Father," and (3) שָׁלוֹם לֵם שַׂר, "Reconciling Prince of Peace." The לֵם "reconciling" in the third title (which lies behind the Septuagint's αὐτω "to him") is the cognate of Arabic verb لام (lâm) "to reconcile" and the noun لِم (liʾm) "peace, concord, agreement, unity."

[ISAIAH 11:1 1998 Graduation Sermon Lexical Data on "Jesse" "A shoot shall forth from the stump of Jesse (אִישָׁי/יִשָׁי)."]

ISAIAH 24:12 (CMBBP IX)

נִשְׁאַר בָּעִיר שַׁמָּה וּשְׁאִיָּה יֻכַּת־שָׁעַר, "Desolation is left in the city, the gates are battered into ruins (RSV). Καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι καὶ οἶκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι ἀπολοῦνται, "And cities shall be left desolate, and houses being left shall fall to ruin." The οἶκοι "houses" reflects the MT שְׁאִיָּה (perhaps read as the plural שְׁאִית [*scriptio defectiva*] in the *Vorlage*). This שְׁאִית/שְׁאִיָּה is a cognate of the Arabic ثوى (ṯawaya) "he dwelt, or abode," and مـثـوى (maṯwan) "a place where one stays, dwells, or abides, an abode or a dwelling."

ISAIAH 53:9 (<u>CMBBP</u> <u>XIV</u>)

וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־רְשָׁעִים קִבְרוֹ וְאֶת־עָשִׁיר בְּמֹתָיו, "And they made his grave with the wicked and with a rich man in his death." Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, "And I will give the wicked for his burial and the rich for his death." The MT עָשִׁיר "rich" is not the contextually desiderated parallel for the רְשָׁעִים "wicked (ones)." The NAB translation rightly reads, "A grave was assigned him among the wicked and a burial place with evildoers." The MT עָשִׁיר "rich" when repointed as עָשִׁיר can be recognized as the cognate of Arabic غثر (ǵu t̠ru) "vile, ignoble."

ISAIAH 61:3 (<u>CBBP</u> <u>XXXIII</u>)

וְקֹרָא לָהֶם אֵילֵי הַצֶּדֶק מַטַּע יְהוָה לְהִתְפָּאֵר, "That they might be called oaks of righteousness." Καὶ κληθήσονται γενεαὶ δικαιοσύνης, "And they shall be called *generations* of righteousness." The MT אֵילֵי "trees, oaks terebinths" became in Greek the plural of γενεά "family, race, generation, clan, offspring." The translators were aware of the איל / אלה which was the cognate of the Arabic أل (ʾâl/ʾill) and ايلة (ʾîlat) meaning "a man's family, relations or kinfolk." Thus Hebrew אלה can mean (1) אֵלֶה "these", (2) אָלָה "to curse," (3) אָלָה "to wail," (4) אֵלָה "terebinth, oak tree" (5) אַלָּה "lance, fork, sign-pole," (6) אֱלוֹהַ/אֱלָהּ "God," and (7) אָלָה "kith and kin." This last definition is the key for interpreting Jesus' question to Peter in John 21:15, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων "do you love me more than these?" which read originally as האהב אתה אתי יתר מאלה, "do you love me more than kith-and-kin?" (See below on John 21:15.)

[ISAIAH 64:5 (Classroom Notes & Handouts #49)

"They remember you in your ways. *But we sinned in spite of them. Behold you became angry*.]

[ISAIAH 64:9 (Classroom Notes & Handouts #49)

"Be not exceedingly angry, O LORD, and remember not iniquity for ever. Behold, consider, we are all thy people. *and would that we be saved forever*."]

ISAIAH 65:25 (CBBP I)

וְנָחָשׁ עָפָר לַחְמוֹ, "And dust shall be the serpent's food." The עפר in this vrse is עפר, stem IV, which is the cognate of Arabic غـفر (*ǵafar*) ""small herbage, a sort of small sprouting herbage which when green resembles green passerine birds." Thus the phrase וְנָחָשׁ עָפָר לַחְמוֹ can be translated "sprouts (will be) the serpent's food," The עפר in Gen 3:14 is a collective noun meaning "small crawling or creeping creatures"; but here in 65:25 the עפר refers to "sprouting vegetation" (analogous to the lion's eating תֶּבֶן "straw" in Isaiah 11:7).

JEREMIAH 5:7 (CBBP XVIII)

וּבֵית זוֹנָה יִתְגֹּדָדוּ, "And at the house of a harlot they gather themselves together." Καὶ ἐν οἴκοις πορνῶν κατέ-λυον, "And lodged in harlots' houses." The Greek translators read the MT יִתְגֹּדָדוּ as יִתְגּוֹרָרוּ and translated it as κατέ-λυον, "they were lodging," as though the stem was גּוּר "to sojourn, to dwell." The most probable meaning of the יִתְגֹּדָדוּ / יִתְגּוֹרָרוּ is גּוּר, stem IV, the cognate of the Arabic جار/ جور (*jâra*) "he deviated from the right course, he acted wrongfully, unjustly, injuriously, or tyrannically." Thus these three words stated that "at the house of a harlot they acted wrongfully."

JEREMIAH 5:8 (CBBP XVIII)

סוּסִים מְיֻזָּנִים מַשְׁכִּים הָיוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אֵשֶׁת רֵעֵהוּ יִצְהָלוּ

"They were well-fed lusty stallions, each neighing for his neighbor's wife" (RSV). Ἵπποι θηλυμανεῖς ἐγενήθησαν ἕκαστος ἐπὶ τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐχρεμέτιζον, "They became stallions frenzied-by-females, they neighed each one after his neighbor's wife." The MT מְיֻזָּנִים (and variant מוּזָנִים) have been identified as זוּן "to feed" or יָזַן "to be heavy," resulting in the translations "well-fed" or "weighty" horses. But in this context the מוּזָנִים/מְיֻזָּנִים is better identified as the זָנַן which is the cognate of the Arabic (a) ذنين (ḏinîn) "any sort of thin mucus or seminal fluid of a stallion or of a man that flows from the penis by reason of excessive appetence," and (b) the verb ذن (ḏanna) "it (mucus or seminal fluid) flowed." The MT מַשְׁכִּים when repointed as מֻשְׁכִּים can be read as the *Hophʿal* participle of יָשַׁךְ, which is the cognate of the Arabic وشك (wašuka) "to be quick, to hurry, to be on the verge (of doing something)." Thus the first four words of 5:8 can be translated as "they were horses whose seminal fluid have been made to flow" or "they were stallions about to discharge semen."

JERRMIAH 20:7a (CMBBP XV)

פִּתִּיתַנִי יְהוָה וָאֶפָּת, "O LORD, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived" (KJV); "O LORD, You induced me, and I was persuaded" (NKJ). Ἠπάτησάς με κύριε καὶ ἠπατήθην, "You have deceived me, O Lord, and I have been deceived." The פָּתָה / פֶּתִי here in Jer 20:7 is not the denominative of פֶּתִי / פְּתִי "simple/simplicity," meaning in the *Piʿel* "to deceive," but a cognate of the Arabic فتو (fatawa) "he notified the decision of

the law." The noun فـتـوى (*fatwā*) means "the giving of an answer, or a reply, stating the decision of the law respecting a particular case, and the related title مـفت (*mufti*) means "a juris-consult who notifies the decisions of the law." Jeremiah had been informed of the divine *fatwa* (summarized in Deut 28:15–68). Thus this phase can be translated as "You told me, O Yahweh, of the *fiat* and I was informed of the *decree*."

JEREMIAH 20:7b (CMBBP XV)

חֲזַקְתַּנִי וַתּוּכָל, "You have overpowered me, and you have prevailed" (NKJ). Ἐκράτησας καὶ ἠδυνάσθης, "You have taken hold and have prevailed." The חָזַק here in 20:7 is not the verb "to be strong, to strengthen," but the cognate of Arabic حذق (*ḥaḏaqa*) "he made him skilful" (form II) and حاذق (*ḥâḏiq*) "a man chaste or eloquent of tongue, perspicuous in language and thoroughly learned." Thus חֲזַקְתַּנִי means "you made me eloquent" or "you made me quite articulate"— an idea which is reinforced by Yahweh's having promised Jeremiah "you will become as my mouth" (15:19). Similarly, the וַתּוּכָל here in 20:7 is not from the verb יָכֹל "to be able, to prevail" but the cognate of the Arabic وكل (*wakala*) "he left him to his opinion, judgment," and in form II "he appointed him as his commissioned agent," and in form V "he relied upon him and confided in him." Consequently, חֲזַקְתַּנִי וַתּוּכָל is best trans-lated as "You made me articulate and you commissioned (me)."

JEREMIAH 20:10 (CMBBP XV)

הִגִּידוּ וְנַגִּידֶנּוּ כֹּל אֱנוֹשׁ שְׁלוֹמִי שֹׁמְרֵי צַלְעִי, "Denounce, and we will denounce him, *say* all my familiar friends, they that watch for my fall" (ASV); "Report him! Let's report him! All my friends are waiting for me to slip" (NIV). Ἐπισύστητε καὶ

ἐπισυστῶμεν αὐτῶ πάντες ἄνδρες φίλοι αὐτοῦ τηρήσατε τὴν ἐπίνοιαν αὐτοῦ, "Conspire and let us conspire against him all men his friends watch his intent." The verb נגד here in 20:10 is the cognate of Arabic نجد (*najada*)"he overcame, he over-powered, he subdued." It calls for a physical attack, not just a verbal attack. The MT כל is the cognate of the Arabic كل (*kalla*) "he became fatigued, tired, weary, incapacitated" and كليل (*kalîl*) "weak, faint." The MT אֱנוֹשׁ "man" needs to be read as אָנוּשׁ "sickened, incurable." The צַלְעִי "limp" is best read as the cognate of the Arabic أصلع (*ʾaṣlaᶜ*) "distressing, calamitous," and صليعاء (*ṣulayᶜâʾ*), a calamity or misfortune hard to bare." This verse is better translated as, "Overpower him! Let us overpower him! An incurable weariness is my recompense; my being on guard is a calamity for me."

JEREMIAH 31:21 ([CBBP](#) [XIX](#))

הַצִּיבִי לָךְ צִיֻּנִים שִׂמִי לָךְ תַּמְרוּרִים שִׁתִי לִבֵּךְ לַמְסִלָּה
דֶּרֶךְ הָלָכְתְּ שׁוּבִי בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל שֻׁבִי אֶל־עָרַיִךְ אֵלֶּה

"Set up road markers for yourself, make yourself guideposts;
    consider well the highway, the road by which you went.
Return, O virgin Israel, return to these your cities" (NRS).

Στῆσον σεαυτήν Σιων ποίησον τιμωρίαν δὸς καρδίαν σου εἰς τοὺς ὤμους ὁδὸν ἣν ἐπορεύθης ἀποστράφητι παρθένος Ισραηλ ἀποστράφητι εἰς τὰς πόλεις σου πενθοῦσα,

"Prepare yourself, O Sion; execute vengeance;
    rouse up your heart upon the shoulders.
Turn away from the road you traveled,
O virgin of Israel, return mourning to your cities."

The Septuagint translators transliterated צִיֻּנִים as σιωνιμ, which was then read as Σιων (Zion). The τιμωρίαν "ven-

geance" reflects the *transliteration* of תַּמְרוּרִים as τιμρωριμ ; and the δὸς καρδίαν σου εἰς τοὺς ὤμους , "set your heart upon the shoulders," reflects the misreading of the οἴμους "roads" as ὤμους "shoulder." The Arabic cognate of the בתל of בְּתוּלַת "virgin" is بتـل (*batala*), which in form V means "he detached himself from worldly things and devoted himself to God exclusively without hypocrisy." Only secondarily did بتـل (*batala*) focus on celibacy and virginity. If the Hebrew בתל shared the Arabic nuance the title בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל "Virgin Israel" would be better translated as "Virtuous Israel." The MT אֵלֶּה "these" became πενθοῦσα "mourner" in the Septuagint — indicating that אלה was read as the cognate of Arabic (1) اٰله (ʾ*aliha*) "he manifested vehement grief and agitation," or (2) وله (w*aliha*) "he became bereft of his reason or intellect in consequence of grief or the loss of a beloved," or (3) اليل (ʿ*alîl*) "the state of a mother who has lost her children."

JEREMIAH 31:22

עַד־מָתַי תִּתְחַמָּקִין הַבַּת הַשּׁוֹבֵבָה, "How long wilt thou go about, O thou backsliding daughter?" (KJV). Ἕως πότε ἀποστρέψεις θυγάτηρ ἠτιμωμένη, How long, O disgraced daughter, wilt thou turn away?" The verb חָמַק "to turn away" can also mean "to be stupid, foolish," which would make it the cognate of Arabic حمق (*ḥumaq*) "foolishness or stupidity; i.e., unsoundness in the intellect or understanding." Jeremiah frequently reminded the Virgin Israel that she had been stupid, as in 4:22 (כִּי אֱוִיל עַמִּי, "for my people are foolish"); 5:4 (וְאֵין לֵב עַם סָכָל, "they have no sense"); 5:21 (הֵם נוֹאֲלוּ, "O foolish and senseless people"); 10:8 (וְיִכְסָלוּ יִבְעָרוּ, "they

are stupid and foolish"); 17:11 (נָבָל יִהְיֶה, "he will become a fool"). The חמק of 31:22 can be added to Jeremiah's synonyms for "foolish," and 31:22 can be translated as "How long will you *stupify yourself*, O faithless daughter?"

JEREMIAH 31:22 (CBBP XIX)

כִּי־בָרָא יְהוָה חֲדָשָׁה בָּאָרֶץ נְקֵבָה תְּסוֹבֵב גָּבֶר,

"For the LORD has created a new thing on the earth: a woman protects a man" (RSV). Ὅτι ἔκτισεν κύριος σωτηρίαν εἰς καταφύτευσιν καινήν ἐν σωτηρία περιελεύσονται ἄνθρω-ποι, "For the Lord has created safety for a new plantation: men shall go about in safety." In the Septuagint the נְקֵבָה "woman" appears as σωτηρίαν "safety" *and* σωτηρία "safety," reflecting a misreading of נקבה as נקדה "to save," the cognate of the Arabic نقذ (*naqiḏa*) "he became safe, he saved, he liberated." The Arabic cognate of נְקֵבָה is نقاب (*naqâb*) "a man of great knowledge who is intelligent, and enters deeply into things." The תְּסוֹבֵב "encompass" (NKJ) is the cognate of Arabic شب (*šab-ba*), which in stems II and V means "to rhapsodize about a beloved woman and one's relationship to her, to celebrate her in verse with amatory language, to compose love sonnets." In Jer 31:3–4 Yahweh affirmed in masculine amatory language his love for the "Virgin / Virtuous Israel," and now in Jer 31:22 the new thing that Yahweh had created was this gender reversal: the Virtuous / Virgin Israel would now "*lovingly rhapsodize*" (תְּסוֹבֵב) with sincerity about *her* God and *her* relationship with *Him*.

JEREMIAH 31:32 (CMBBP XV)

אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה הֵפֵרוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִי וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם נְאֻם־

יְהוָֹה, "My covenant which they broke, though I was their husband, oracle of Yahweh" (RSV). Ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου καὶ ἐγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν φησὶν κύριος, "For they abode not in my covenant, and I disregarded them, saith the Lord." The MT בָּעַלְתִּי "I was a husband" is from בָּעַל, stem I, the cognate of Arabic بعل (baʿala) "he became a husband, or lord, or master," and the Greek ἠμέλησα "I disregarded" translated בָּעַל, stem II, the cognate of Arabic بعل (baʿala) "he became confounded or perplexed, he was disgusted." The Syriac reads with the Septuagint "and so I despised בסית [bĕsît]) them," but the Vulgate reads *ego dominatus sum eorum*, "and I had dominion over them." The Septuagint's reading is the preferred reading.

JEREMIAH 51:53 ([CBBP](#) [VI](#))

כִּי־תַעֲלֶה בָבֶל הַשָּׁמַיִם וְכִי תְבַצֵּר מְרוֹם עֻזָּהּ מֵאִתִּי יָבֹאוּ שֹׁדְדִים לָהּ, "Though Babylon should mount up to heaven, and though she should fortify the height of her strength, *yet* from me shall spoilers come unto her." Ὅτι ἐὰν ἀναβῇ Βαβυλὼν ὡς ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν ὀχυρώσῃ ὕψος ἰσχύος αὐτῆς παρ' ἐμοῦ ἥξουσιν ἐξολεθρεύοντες αὐτήν, "For though Babylon should go up as the heaven, and though she should strengthen her walls with her power, from me shall come they that shall destroy her." The MT עֻזָּהּ may not mean ἰσχύος αὐτῆς "her strength." Here עֻזָּה is probably the cognate of the Arabic عنز (ʿanz) "an eminence or hill, a synonym for a *tel*." (The נ of ענז was simply assimilated so that ענז became עז.) Thus the phrase וְכִי תְבַצֵּר מְרוֹם עֻזָּה means, "though she make inaccessible the top of her *tel*."

LAMENTATIONS 3:37–38 (*Biblica* 1968)

אֲדֹנָי לֹא צִוָּה מִפִּי עֶלְיוֹן לֹא תֵצֵא הָרָעוֹת וְהַטּוֹב,
"The Lord has not commanded it. Out of the mouth of the Most
High there shall not come forth evil and good." By changing the
negative לֹא into the emphatic לֻא the verse reads "*Verily* the
Lord has ordained it! *Verily* from the mouth of the Most High
there shall come forth evil and good."

LAMENTATIONS 4:3 (*Biblica* 1968)

בַּת־עַמִּי לְאַכְזָר, the daughter of my people is cruel." By
changing the ל "to" into the emphatic לֻ the phrase reads "the
daughter of my people is *truly* cruel."

EZEKIEL (*passim*) בן אדם "the son of man" or "the son of
      reconciliation" = "the reconciler" or "the son of authority"
      = "the One with Authority."

EZEKIEL 3:14 (CBBP XX)

וְרוּחַ נְשָׂאַתְנִי וַתִּקָּחֵנִי וָאֵלֵךְ מַר בַּחֲמַת רוּחִי, "The Spirit
lifted me up and took me away, and I went in bitterness in the
heat of my spirit." Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐξῆρέν με καὶ ἀνέλαβέν
με καὶ ἐπορεύθην ἐν ὁρμῇ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, "And the
Spirit lifted me, and took me up, and I went in the impulse of my
spirit." Here the MT מַר is probably from the stem מרא, the
cognate of the Arabic مرى (*maraya*) a verb used for the
movement of the wind and clouds. This derivation accounts for
the Septuagint's ὁρμῇ "rapid motion forward." The חֵמָה of the
MT בַּחֲמַת רוּחִי, "in the heat of my spirit," it is more likely the
cognate of the Arabic حام / حوم (*ḥûm / ḥâma*) used of the mo-
tion of birds flying or hovering in circles." If the י of רוּחִי were
dropped as a dittography of the following ו of וְיַד the phrase

would mean, "I went flying off in circles of wind." Far from being depressed, this phrase speaks of the physical means of transport (even if only in a vision or in the imagination) which carried Ezekiel to the exiles along the Chebar River. Whatever acrophobia he may have had, his fear (*not* depression) was allayed because, while airborne, he was firmly gripped by the hand of God (חָזְקָה וְיַד־יְהֹוָה עָלַי).

EZEKIEL 13:18a (CBBP XXI)

הוֹי לִמְתַפְּרוֹת כְּסָתוֹת עַל כָּל־אַצִּילֵי יָדַי, "Woe to the women who sew magic bands upon all wrists" (RSV). Οὐαὶ ταῖς συρραπτούσαις προσκεφάλαια ἐπὶ πάντα ἀγκῶνα χειρὸς. "Woe to the women that sew pillows under every elbow." The כְּסָתוֹת / כֶּסֶת, translated as "pillows" or "magic bands" is actually the cognate of Arabic كسآء (*kisâʾ*) / أكسية (*ʾaksiyat*) meaning "a simple oblong piece of cloth, a wrapper of a single piece." This كسآء (*kisâʾ*) is probably the etymon of the English "gauze" and French *gaze*, and the כְּסָתוֹת here is best translated as "bandages." The יָדַי in the phrase כָּל־אַצִּילֵי יָדַי "every joint of my hand" should be emended to יָדוּי, a *Qal* passive participle meaning "maimed" from יָדָה, the denominative of יָד and the equivalent of Arabic يدى (*yaday / yadî*) "to wound anyone on the hand, to maim the hand," or ودى (*wadaya*) "to cut off." The אַצִּיל "joint" can refer also to an entire limb, like the Arabic وصل (*wuṣl* or *wiṣl*) "limb." Thus this phrase in 13:18a is best translated as "Woe to the ones tying *bandages* on every *maimed* limb."

EZEKIEL 13:18b (CBBP XXI)

וְעֹשׂוֹת הַמִּסְפָּחוֹת עַל־רֹאשׁ כָּל־קוֹמָה לְצוֹדֵד נְפָשׁוֹת,

"And make veils for the heads of persons of every stature, in the hunt for souls" (RSV). The הַמִּסְפָּחוֹת has been variously translated as ἐπιβόλαια "wrappers / kerchiefs," or "rags." The Arabic cognate of מִסְפָּחוֹת / סָפַח is سفيح (safîḥ) "a thick, course garment or piece of cloth called كسآء (kisâʾ)." The מִסְפָּחָה "(gauze) bandage" and the כֶּסֶת "(gauze) dressing" are synonyms. The לְצוֹדֵד should be corrected to לְצוֹדִיד and read as the cognate of Arabic صديد (ṣadîd) "ichor, i.e. the thin water or watery humour of a wound tinged with blood or pus." The עַל־רֹאשׁ כָּל־קוֹמָה לְצוֹדֵד נְפָשׁוֹת "upon the head of every height to hunt souls" is better read as עַל כָּל־רֹאשׁ צוֹדִיד לְקִים הַנֹּפְשׁוֹת, "upon every oozing head, to revive the ones breathing." Thus this phrase in 13:18b is best translated as "and placing *compresses* upon every *oozing* head, to revive those *breathing*."

EZEKIEL 13:18c (CBBP XXI)

הַנֹּפְשׁוֹת תְּצוֹדֵדְנָה לְעַמִּי וּנְפָשׁוֹת לָכֶנָה תְחַיֶּינָה, "Will you hunt down souls belonging to my people, and keep other souls alive for your profit?" (RSV)." Αἱ ψυχαὶ διεστράφησαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου καὶ ψυχὰς περιεποιοῦντο, "The souls of my people are perverted, and they have saved souls alive." The MT נפשות (13:18–19) and נפשים (13:20) are plural participles of the denominative נָפַשׁ "to breathe" (the cognate of Arabic نفس [nafas] in form V "to breathe, to inhale and exhale") and should be repointed נֹפְשִׁים "breathing men" and נֹפְשׁוֹת "breathing women." The תְּצוֹדֵדְנָה here is not from צוּד "to hunt down" but from צדד, the cognate of Arabic صل

(ṣadda) "to shun, to alienate, to turn away." The ל of לעמי is the emphatic לְ. Thus the phrase הַנְּפָשׁוֹת תְּצוֹדֵדְנָה לְעַמִּי means "they shun the ones breathing of my *very own* people," which is contrasted with לְכֶנָה תְחַיֶּינָה נְפָשׁוֹת "those of their own [*still*] *breathing*, they restore to life."

EZEKIEL 13:19d (CBBP XXI)

וַתְּחַלֶּלְנָה אֹתִי אֶל־עַמִּי, "You have profaned me among my people." Καὶ ἐβεβήλουν με πρὸς τὸν λαόν μου, "And they have dishonored me before my people." The MT אתי is best read as אוֹתִי "my sign," which is a cognate of Arabic آيـة (ʾayat) "a sign, an example, or a warning." This phrase can be translated as "they have undermined my warning unto my people."

EZEKIEL 13:20c (CBBP XXI)

וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי אֶת־הַנְּפָשׁוֹת אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצֹדְדוֹת אֶת־נְפָשִׁים לְפֹרְחֹת "And [I] let the souls go, the souls you hunt like birds" (NKJ). Καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ τὰς ψυχάς ἃς ὑμεῖς ἐκστρέφετε τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς διασκορπισμόν, "And will set at liberty their souls which you pervert to scatter them." The Hebrew word order needs to be altered to read and translated as follows:

וְשִׁלַּחְתִּי לִפֹרחֹת אֶת הַנְּפָשׁוֹת
אֶת־נְפָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם מְצֹדְדוֹת

"and I will let go to [become] *the-ones-set-free*
— the breathing women (and the) breathing men—
whom you have shunned."

EZEKIEL 14:9 (CMBBP XVI)

וְהַנָּבִיא כִי־יְפֻתֶּה וְדִבֶּר דָּבָר אֲנִי יְהוָה פִּתֵּיתִי אֵת

הַנָּבִיא הַהוּא, "And if the prophet be deceived and speak a word, I, the LORD, have deceived that prophet" (RSV). Καὶ ὁ προφήτης ἐὰν πλανηθῇ καὶ λαλήσῃ ἐγὼ κύριος πεπλάνηκα τὸν προφήτην ἐκεῖνον, "And if a prophet should deceive and should speak, I the Lord have deceived that prophet." The *Puᶜal* יְפֻתֶּה (פָּתָה, stem I) "he will be deceived" needs to be repointed as the *Piᶜel* יְפַתֶּה "he deceives"— which is the reading of the Septuagint. But the *Piᶜel* פִּתִּיתִי is from פָּתָה, stem II, the cognate of Arabic فَتْوٰ (*fatawa*) "he issued a fiat / *fatwa* ." Thus the apodosis contains a wordplay: if a prophet *deceives* (פָּתָה, stem I) then I *decree* (פָּתָה, stem II). Yahweh then explicitly spelled out his *fatwa* / fiat: "I will stretch out my hand against him and destroy him from among my people Israel."

EZEKIEL 20:25 (CMBBP XVI)

וְגַם־אֲנִי נָתַתִּי לָהֶם חֻקִּים לֹא טוֹבִים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים לֹא יִחְיוּ בָּהֶם, "And I also gave them statutes that were not good. and ordinances by which they could not have life." By changing the negative לֹא into the emphatic לֻא the verse reads "I gave them statutes that were *indeed* good and ordinances by which they could *indeed* have life."

EZEKIEL 20:25–27 (CMBBP XVI)

These three verses need to be read in this sequence (25 [a-b], 26 [c], 27, 26 [a-b]): *Moreover I gave them statutes that were indeed good and ordinances by which they could indeed have life. I did it that they might know that I am Yahweh. Therefore, son of man, speak to the house of Israel and say to them, "Thus says my Lord Yahweh: 'In this again your fathers blasphemed me, in their transgressing they transgressed against me, {say-*

*ing} "I defile them through their very gifts in making them
offer by fire all their first-born, that I might horrify them."'*

EZEKIEL 23:8 (MBS I)

וְאֶת־תַּזְנוּתֶיהָ מִמִּצְרַיִם לֹא עָזָבָה . . . וַיִּשְׁפְּכוּ תַזְנוּתָם
עָלֶיהָ, "And her fornications out of Egypt she had not forsaken
. . . they poured out their lust on her." The initial תַּזְנוּתֶיהָ "her
fornications," is from זָנָה, stem I, the cognate of Arabic زنى
(*zanay*) "to commit fornication"; but the תַזְנוּתָם "their lust" is
from זָנָה, stem II, the cognate of Arabic ذن (*ḏanna*) "it (semen
or mucus) flowed" and the corresponding noun ذنين (*ḏanîn*)
"thin mucus, semen, seminal fluid." The phrase means "they
poured out their semen upon her."

EZEKIEL 28:12 (CBBP XXII)

אַתָּה חוֹתֵם תָּכְנִית מָלֵא חָכְמָה וּכְלִיל יֹפִי, "You
were the model of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in
beauty." Σὺ ἀποσφράγισμα ὁμοιώσεως καὶ στέφανος κάλ-
λους. "You are a seal of resemblance, and crown of beauty."
The MT תָּכְנִית "measurement" needs to be emended to תְּבוּנָה
"understanding," The στέφανος translates the כָּלִיל "crown"
which is the cognate of the Syriac כליל (*kĕlîl*) "crown." Thus
this verse states, "you were the signet of erudition, full of wisdom
and a crown of beauty."

EZEKIEL 28:13 (CBBP XXII)

בְּעֵדֶן גַּן־אֱלֹהִים הָיִיתָ, "You were in Eden, the garden of
God." ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγενήθης,
"You were in the luxury of the paradise of God." By reading
הָיִיתִי "I was" for the MT הָיִיתָ "you were" the King of Tyre

stated, "I was in Eden, the garden of God," or "I was in the luxury of the paradise of God." The Septuagint's τρυφῇ "luxury" reflects עֶדֶן, stem II, which is the cognate of the Arabic غَدِن (ġadan) "luxuriant."

EZEKIEL 28:13 (CBBP XXII)

בְּיוֹם הִבָּרַאֲךָ כּוֹנָנוּ, On the day that you were created they were prepared." Ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγενήθης, "You were in the luxury of the paradise of God." In light of the Arabic cognate بَرِئَ (baraʾ) "he became free of a thing, he became safe from any sickness or imperfection" and بَرِيء (barîʾ) "to be clear of evil qualities or dispositions, shunning what is vain and false, sound in body and intellect," the MT הִבָּרַאֲךָ "you were created" can also be translated as "you were perfected." Thus this phrase stated, "On the day that you were perfected they were prepared." (Reading הָיִיתִי "I was" for the MT הָיִיתָ "you were" which appears also in 28:14, and the הִבָּרָאֲךָ "you were perfected" which appears also in 28:15).

EZEKIEL 28:14 (CBBP XXII)

אַתְּ־כְּרוּב מִמְשַׁח הַסּוֹכֵךְ וּנְתַתִּיךָ בְּהַר קֹדֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים הָיִיתָ, "You are the anointed cherub who covers, and I gave you; you were on the holy mountain of God." The first five words must be read as אַתָּה נְתַתִּיךָ כְּרַב הַסּוֹכֵן מְשִׁיחִים, meaning "You — I set you as the chief statesman of those anointed." The הַסּוֹכֵן (read here in lieu of the MT הַסּוֹכֵךְ "the one covering") is from סָכַן, the cognate of Ugaritic skn "governor, high official," used in parallelism with mlk "king."

EZEKIEL 32:27 (CMBBP XVI)

וְלֹא יִשְׁכְּבוּ אֶת־גִּבּוֹרִים נֹפְלִים, "nor do they lie beside the fallen heroes." By changing the negative לֹא into the emphatic לֻא the verse reads "they are *indeed* buried with the fallen heroes."

EZEKIEL 38:21 (CMBBP XVIII)

"'I וְקָרָאתִי עָלָיו לְכָל־הָרַי חֶרֶב נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה will call for a sword against him on all My mountains,' declares the Lord GOD" (NAU). "I will summon every kind of terror against Gog, says the Lord GOD" (RSV). Καὶ καλέσω ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶν φόβον λέγει κύριος, "And I will summon against it even every fear, saith the Lord." The עָלָיו "against him" refers to Gog who appears by name in 38:16 and 18. The הָרַי "my mountain" needs to be repointed as הֹרִי and recognized as the cognate of Arabic هاره/هور (hwr/hâra) "he threw it down, pulled it down, demolished it," هائر/هاري (hârî/hâ'ir) "becoming thrown down, pulled to pieces, demolished." The י of הרי is not a 1cs suffix but a part of the stem." In the context of destruction mentioned in Ezekiel 38, this הרי is best translated as "demolition" or "collapse." The MT חֶרֶב "sword" can be repointed as חֹרֶב "desolation; and the לְכָל "to all" can be emended to לְכָלָה "for annihilation" — restoring a ה which was lost by haplography — like the בְחֵמָה לְכָלָה "destructive fury" in Ezek 13:13. Thus the וְקָרָאתִי עָלָיו לְכָל־הָרַי חֶרֶב "and I called against him to all of my mountains a sword," now becomes וְקָרָאתִי עָלָיו לְכָלָה הֹרִי חֹרֶב "and against him I have called for annihilation, demolition, desolation."

EZEKIEL 43:7 (CMBBP XIV)

וְלֹא יְטַמְּאוּ עוֹד בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁם קָדְשִׁי . . . בְּפִגְרֵי מַלְכֵיהֶם בָּמוֹתָם, "And my holy name shall the house of Israel no more defile . . . by the carcases of their kings in their high places" (KJV); "And the house of Israel will not again defile My holy name . . . by the corpses of their kings when they die" (NAS, NAU). The בָּמוֹתָם was translated in the Septuagint as ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν "in their midst," evidently having a *Vorlage* with בתוכם for the MT במותם. Eissfeldt (1935) argued that מֹלֶךְ was not a divine name but a cognate of the Punic *mlk*, a technical term for a child-sacrifice. Thus the מַלְכֵיהֶם needs to be repointed as מִלָכֵיהֶם, a segolate plural meaning "their child-sacrifices"— which accounts for the reference to all of the dead bodies. The בְּפִגְרֵי מַלְכֵיהֶם בָּמוֹתָם should be translated as "by the corpses of their child-sacrifices at their high places."

JOEL 2:31 (CBBP XXIII)

הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ יֵהָפֵךְ לְחֹשֶׁךְ וְהַיָּרֵחַ לְדָם, "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood." Ὀήλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood." Although the Septuagint translated the דָם as αἷμα "blood" this דָם is from דָּהַם / דָּהַם, stem II, the synonym of עֲלָטָה "darkness," and the cognate of Akkadian *da'āmu* "to darken" and Arabic دهم (*dahama*) "it became black," دهمة (*duhmat*) "blackness," and الدهمان (*'addahmânu*) "the night." Thus this verse states, "The sun will be turned to darkness and the moon to blackness."

AMOS 1:1 (<u>CBBP</u> <u>XXIV</u>)

דִּבְרֵי עָמוֹס אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה בַנֹּקְדִים מִתְּקוֹעַ, "The words of Amos, who was among the shepherds of Tekoa," Λόγοι Αμως οἳ ἐγένοντο ἐν νακκαριμ ἐκ Θεκουε, "The words of Amos which came in Naccarim out of Thecue." The Septuagint's νακκαριμ / *Naccarim* reflects a misreading of the MT נֹקְדִים "ranchers" as נֹקְרִים, a place name. Were the נֹקְרִים correct the נקר would be a cognate of the Arabic نقر (*naqara*) "to investigate, to examine." An Arabic cognate of נֹקֵד is نقد (*naqada*) "he examined money, he separated the bad from the good, he paid the price in cash or ready money"— suggesting that Amos could have been an affluent rancher. The Arabic نقد (*naqada*) also means "to examine critically, to criticize, to call to account, to find fault, to show up the shortcomings," which matches Amos' prophesying.

AMOS 7:14 (<u>CBBP</u> <u>XXIV</u>)

לֹא־נָבִיא אָנֹכִי וְלֹא בֶן־נָבִיא אָנֹכִי כִּי־בוֹקֵר אָנֹכִי וּבוֹלֵס שִׁקְמִים, "I am no prophet, nor a prophet's son; but I am a herdsman, and a dresser of sycamore trees." Οὐκ ἤμην προφήτης ἐγὼ οὐδὲ υἱὸς προφήτου ἀλλ' ἢ αἰπόλος ἤμην καὶ κνίζων συκάμινα, " I was not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; but I was a goatherder and a gatherer of sycamore fruits." The לֹא of MT לֹא־נָבִיא אָנֹכִי needs to be vocalized as the emphatic לֻא, but the negative לֹא of the וְלֹא בֶן־נָבִיא אָנֹכִי must be retained. Amos stated, "Indeed, I am a prophet! But not of '*the corps of prophets*.'" In light of the Arabic بقر (*baqara*) "he examined, inspected, inquired, searched," the MT בוֹקֵר "herdsman" can also mean "examiner, investigator,"

which has the support of the Septuagint's ναĸĸαριμ (= נקרים "investigators") in 1:1. Aquila translated בּוֹלֵס as ἔρευνον "he examined," which suggests that the *Vorlage* was בולש (= בּוֹלֵשׁ) "searcher." The MT שִׁקְמִים "sycamore trees" can also be read as שֶׁקָמִים, i.e. the relative particle שֶׁ affixed to the plural participle of קוּם "to arise, to happen." Amos' statement, כִּי בוֹקֵר אָנֹכִי וּבוֹלֵשׁ שְׁקָמִים, probably meant "I am an inquirer and an investigator of what are the happenings." Amos may well have been a master of ranching and research. This prophet's wealth from ranching gave him the leisure to do research and opened the doors of the royal chapel for him.

AMOS 9:12 ([CMBBP](#) [XXV](#))

לְמַעַן יִירְשׁוּ אֶת־שְׁאֵרִית אֱדוֹם, "That they may possess the remnant of Edom" (KJV). Ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατά- λοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "That they seek the remnant of men." The MT יִירְשׁוּ "they may possess" was read as ידרשו "they may seek" by the Septuagint translators, and the Septuagint version is quoted in part in Acts 15:17, ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν ĸύριον, "that the rest of men may seek the Lord." A second misreading was the אֱדוֹם "Edom" which the Septuagint translators read it as אָדָם "man," and this was followed by Luke in Acts 15:17. The אדם here can be the cognate of Arabic ادم (ʾadama) "he effected a reconciliation between them, induced love and agreement between them." Thus the אדום / אדם could be a sequential infinitive construct אֲדֹם / אֱדֹם "to reconcile." By inverting the שְׁאֵרִית אֱדוֹם to אֱדוֹם שְׁאֵרִית the purpose for Yahweh's rebuilding the fallen booth and breaches of David was "in order that they seek *to reconcile the remnant* and all the gentiles upon whom

my name is called." The imperial and ethnocentric statement in the MT of Amos 9:12 may once have been a statement of the universalism which survives in the Septuagint, "that the remnant of men and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called may earnestly seek *me*, saith the Lord who does all these things."

MICAH 5:1 (CMBBP XXII)

וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה,

"But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah." Καὶ σύ Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα ὀλίγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ιουδα, "And you, Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, are few in number to be among the thousands of Judah." The root of אֶפְרָתָה "Ephrathah" could be פְּרָת which was used for the river Euphrates (פְּרָת) and is related to the Arabic فرت (*furat*) "sweet" (applied to water that subdues thirst by its excessive sweetness). But given the frequent interchange of the ת and the ט the root of אֶפְרָתָה is more readily identified as the פְּרַט which has opposite meanings. There was פְּרוּטָה / פַּרְטוּם "a small portion" and פְּרִיטָה / פְּרוּטָה "small change, a small coin," which addressed the fact that Bethlehem had "too few in number to be among the thousands of Judah." Then there was the פָּרַט which was the cognate of the Arabic (a) فرط (*faraṭa*) "he preceded, he was or became first," (b) فرط (*farṭ*[un]) "prevalence, mastery, ascendency, or predominance," and (c) فارط (*fârṭ*[un]) "becoming foremost, getting priority or precedence." This פָּרַט addressed the prediction that "from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel."

HABAKKUK 2:2 (CMBBP XVII)

כְּתוֹב חָזוֹן וּבָאֵר עַל־הַלֻּחוֹת לְמַעַן יָרוּץ קוֹרֵא בוֹ,

"Write the vision; makeit plain upon tablets, so he may run who reads it (RSV). "Write down the revelation and make it plain on tablets so that a herald may run with it." (NIV) Γράψον ὄρασιν καὶ σαφῶς ἐπὶ πυξίον ὅπως διώκῃ ὁ ἀναγινώσκων αὐτα, "Write the vision and plainly on a tablet that he that reads it may run." The MT יָרוּץ is not from רוּץ, stem I, "to run," but רוּץ, stem II, "to train, discipline oneself," the cognate of the Arabic راض / روض (rûḍ / râḍa) "to train, to discipline oneself." The phrase روض نفسك بالتقوى (rawwiḍ nafsaka biʾlattaqway) "discipline thyself well by piety" provides the clue to the meaning of רוּץ in this verse. Thus this verse can be read as, "Write the vision! Make it plain upon tablets so that the one reading it may be disciplined!

HABAKKUK 2:3 (CMBBP XVII)

כִּי עוֹד חָזוֹן לַמּוֹעֵד וְיָפֵחַ לַקֵּץ וְלֹא יְכַזֵּב אִם־
יִתְמַהְמָהּ חַכֵּה־לוֹ כִּי־בֹא יָבֹא לֹא יְאַחֵר:

"For the vision *is* yet for an appointed time;
But at the end it will speak, and it will not lie.
Though it tarries, wait for it;
Because it will surely come, It will not tarry." (NKJ)

The MT כִּי עוֹד must be restored as כִּי יָעוּד by vocalizing the יעוד as a passive participle. The verb is not יָעַד, stem I, "to appoint" but יָעַד, stem II, "to promise, to threaten," the cognate of Arabic وعد (waʿada) "he promised, he threatened." The MT מוֹעֵד does not mean "appointed time or place." Rather it is the *Hiphʿîl* participle מוֹעִיד / מוֹעֵד of עוּד, stem II, "to exhort, to protest, to warn." Also the MT וְיָפֵחַ is not from פּוּחַ "to blow, to breathe" but the cognate of the Arabic فحا / فحو (faḥw / faḥâ)

"he meant, he intended." The קץ has traditionally been read as קֵץ "end," as in the Septuagint which has πέρας "conclusion." But here it is better read as the cognate of Arabic قاص (*qâṣ*) "a narrator, a preacher." Consequently, this phrase in Habakkuk, כִּי יָעוֹד חָזוֹן לַמּוֹעֵד וְיָפֵחַ לַקֵּץ, stated "for a vision was promised to the protestor; its intent would be understood by the preacher."

HABAKKUK 2:4 (CMBBP XVII)

הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה, "Behold, he whose soul is not upright in him shall fail, but the righteous shall live by his faith" (RSV). Ἐὰν ὑποστείληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται, "If he should draw back, my soul has no pleasure in him: but the just shall live by my faith." The final ה of עֻפְּלָה needs to be shifted to the וְצַדִּיק, thereby making the verb masculine (עֻפַּל) and the noun definite (וְהַצַּדִּיק). In light of the Septuagint's ὑποστείληται "should he draw back" the עֻפַּל needs to be emended to עֻבַּל, the cognate of Arabic عبل (*ʿabala*) "he cut it, he cut it off (said of a man when he has died)." This verse should be translated as, "Behold! The un-righteous soul has been cut off [from life], but the righteous lives by his faithfulness."

HABAKKUK 2:5 (CMBBP XVII)

וְאַף כִּי־הַיַּיִן בּוֹגֵד גֶּבֶר יָהִיר וְלֹא יִנְוֶה, "Yea also, be-cause he transgresseth by wine, *he is* a proud man, neither keep-eth at home" (KJV). "Moreover, wealth (הוֹן) is treacherous; the arrogant do not endure" (NRS). Ὁ δὲ κατοινωμένος καὶ καταφρονητὴς ἀνὴρ ἀλαζών οὐδὲν μὴ περάνῃ, "But the arrogant

man and the scorner, the boastful man, shall not finish anything."
By moving כִּי־הַיַּיִן בּוֹגֵד from 2:5 to the last line in 2:15, the
rest of 2:5 can be read as a description of the unrighteous person
mentioned to in 2:4a. The MT גֶּבֶר יָהִיר "a proud man" needs
to be corrected to read גִּבּוֹר יָהִיר "the strong man demolishes"
— the verb היר of the MT יָהִיר being a cognate of Arabic هـير
(*hayyir*) "he threw down, he demolished." Wellhausen rightly
emended the MT וְלֹא יִרְוֶה "he will not abide" to וְלֹא יִרְוֶה
"he will not be sated," which balances the וְלֹא יִשְׂבָּע "he will
not be satisfied" that follows in the next line.

ZECHARIAH 2:8 [MT 2:12] (MBS XXII)

The כָּבוֹד in the MT אַחַר כָּבוֹד שְׁלָחַנִי אֶל־הַגּוֹיִם,
"after glory he sent me to the nations," must be repointed as
כֹּבֶד / כֹּבֶד "struggle, difficulty." This word appears in Isaiah
21:15. It is the cognate of the Arabic كبد (*kabad*[un]) "difficulty,
distress" and كبد (*kabada*) III, "to struggle with difficulties."
The original phrase was אַחַר כֹּבֶד שְׁלָחַנִי אֶל־הַגּוֹיִם,
"after a struggle he sent me to the nations,"

ZECHARIAH 5:6 (CBBP XXV)

וַיֹּאמֶר זֹאת הָאֵיפָה הַיּוֹצֵאת וַיֹּאמֶר זֹאת עֵינָם בְּכָל
הָאָרֶץ, "And he said, 'This is the ephah / measuring basket going
forth.' Again he said,' This is their appearance in all the land.'"
Καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτο τὸ μέτρον τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ εἶπεν
αὕτη ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ, "And he said, 'This is
the measure that goes forth.' And he said, 'This is their iniquity
in all the earth.'" The masculine form (*'ap*) of אֵיפָה appears in
the Ugaritic texts as a synonym for *ḥdrm* "rooms." Marenof

suggested that the Sumerian ***e-pa*** "shrine" became the Hebrew אֵיפָה in the same way the Sumerian *e-gal* became the הֵיכָל "palace, temple." The הַיּוֹצֵאת "the one going forth" indicates that the shrine was portable and mobile. The עוֹן of the MT עֵינָם, "their appearance" or "their iniquity," is better identified as the cognate of Arabic عون (ᶜawn) "aid, assistance," used in reference to God's aiding a person—as in the prayer "O my Lord, *aid* me, and *aid* not against me." The figure in the portable shrine was no doubt that of the goddess who aided her devotees in Shinar.

ZECHARIAH 5:7 ([CBBP](#) [XXV](#))

וְהִנֵּה כִּכַּר עֹפֶרֶת נִשֵּׂאת וְזֹאת אִשָּׁה אַחַת יוֹשֶׁבֶת בְּתוֹךְ הָאֵיפָה, "And behold, the leaden cover was lifted, and there was one woman sitting in the ephah!" Καὶ ἰδοὺ τάλαντον μολίβου ἐξαιρόμενον καὶ ἰδοὺ μία γυνὴ ἐκάθητο ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ μέτρου, "And behold a talent of lead lifted up, and behold one woman sat in the midst of the measure." The כִּכַּר עֹפֶרֶת usually translated "lead weight," which served as the roof of the shrine, was just a simple "circular cover." The עֹפֶרֶת is a cognate of the Arabic غفيرة (ǵufirat) "a cover." The אִשָּׁה אַחַת "a single woman" can be paraphrased as '*the first lady*,' referring to the idol of the goddess in the mobile *shrine*."

ZECHARIAH 5:8 ([CBBP](#) [XXV](#))

זֹאת הָרִשְׁעָה וַיַּשְׁלֵךְ אֹתָהּ אֶל־תּוֹךְ הָאֵיפָה, "This *is* Wickedness! and he thrust her down into the basket." When recognized as the cognate of Arabic رسغ (rasaǵa) "he made abundant," the noun רִשְׁעָה, translated here as "wickedness," can also mean "abundance." For the devotees in Shinar this

goddess figure in the mobile shrine would be הָרְשָׁעָה "the one making [the means of subsistence] abundant," but for the people of Judah in covenant with Yahweh she was הָרְשָׁעָה "the wicked one."

GOSPELS (*passim*) ὁ υἱὸς [τοῦ] ἀνθρώπου "the son of [the] Man" can equal (1) בר אנש "the son of man," or "the most pure person," (2) בן אדם "son of man" or "the concilator" or "the one with authority," and (3) בן האדם "the son of the-one-with authority," i.e., "the Son of the Sovereign."

MATTHEW 2:9 (CBBP XXVI)
Ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον,
  "The star which they had seen in the East went before them, until it came and stood over the place where the child was."

הכּוֹכָב אֲשֶׁר־רָאוּ בַקֶּדֶם עָלָה לִפְנֵיהֶם עַד
אֲשֶׁר־בָּא וַיַּעֲמֹד מִמַּעַל לַאֲשֶׁר הָיָה שָׁם הַיָּלֶד

Salkinson's translating ἐστάθη "it stood" as עָמַד "it stood" is not problematic for עָמַד, stem I. However, if the עמד was in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Matthew it may well have been עָמַד, stem II, which is the cognate of (a) the Syriac עמד (ʿămad) "to go down, to plunge, to set (used with the sun or stars)," and (b) the Arabic غمد (ġamada) "to conceal a star, to engulfed a star in darkness, or for a star to set." Thus a star somehow standing over a manger, as though it were a laser beam from infinity, appears to be the result of a mistranslation of עָמַד, stem II, "to set," as if it were עָמַד, stem I, "to stand."

MATTHEW 3:7 (MBS IX)

Πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομέ νους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ, "Many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism." An Ethiopic variant has "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming *secretly* to his baptism," which equals רַבִּים מִן־הַפְּרוּשִׁים וּמִן־הַצַּדּוּקִים בָּאִים לט לִטְבִילָתוֹ. There was a dittography in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the לט of לִטְבִילָתוֹ or a haplography of the לט "secretly" in the original phrase of לט לִטְבִילָתוֹ "*secretly* to his baptism."

MATTHEW 5:22 (MBS XII)

"Every one who is angry with his brother *without cause* (εἰκῇ) shall be liable to judgment; whoever insults (Ῥακα) his brother shall be liable to the council, and whoever says, 'You fool!' (Μωρέ) shall be liable to the hell of fire" (RSV). A back translation into Hebrew and identifying the Arabic cognates permits the following interpretation: "*Whoever is obscenely* (εἰκῇ = הַנָם, stem III, a cognate of Arabic خنى [*ḥanaya*] "he uttered obscene speech") *angry with his brother shall be in danger of the court: and he who says to his brother "Vile-Fool- Slave"* (Ῥακά = רָקָה, a cognate of the Arabic رقيق [*raqîq*] "fool, slave" or ركيك [*rakîk*] "ignoble, vile") *shall be in danger of the Sanhedrin: and he who says "Drop Dead"* (Μωρέ, which translated a *vocative* נָבָל "Fool!" or an intensive imperative נַבֵּל "Die! / Drop Dead!" and a cognate of the Arabic نبل [*nabala*] "to die") *will be in danger of the fire of Gehenna.*"

MATTHEW 6:19 (CMBBP XXIV)

Μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal" (KJV). The Greek βρῶσις "food" — along with the Vulgate's *erugo* "rust," the Peshitta's ܐܟܠܐ (*ʾaklaʾ*) "eaters / worms," and the Old Syriac's מחבל (*mḥabel*) "worm" — point to a Hebrew *Vorlage* (of the "*where moth and rust doth corrupt*") which read אשר שם סס ואכל יאכלו, meaning literally: (1) "where maggot and worm eat" or (2) "where moth and food eat." The Greek should have used σκώληξ "maggot, worm" rather than βρῶσις "food." The Arabic cognates of the Hebrew אכל indicate that this root was used for "corrosion" and "rust" (which was understood by Jerome) including: آكلة (*ʾakilat*) "rust," أكال (*ʾukâl*) "corrosion," أكال (*ʾukâl*) "corroded, cankered, decayed." The fact is the Greek βρῶσις never meant "rust" or "worm" or "maggot." But the Hebrew אכל behind Matthew's βρῶσις "food" could also mean "rust" or "worm" or "maggot"—all of which requires a Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the Greek text of Matthew.

MATTHEW 6:34 (MBS VII)

Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον, ἡ γὰρ αὔριον μεριμνήσει ἑαυτῆς· ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς. "Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day *is* the evil thereof." The Codex Sinaiticus text of Neh 9:9, וַתֵּרֶא אֶת עֳנִי אֲבֹתֵינוּ בְּמִצְרָיִם, "you saw the distress of our fathers in Egypt," has κακία "evil, trouble" for the MT עֳנִי, which is the

same Greek word here in Matt 6:34c. The Hebrew עני is a homograph of two antithetical words. There is the well attested עָנִי/עני "poor," the cognate of the Arabic عنا/عنو (ʿanaʾ / ʿanaw) "he became lowly, humble"; and there is the rare עָנָי/עני "rich," which is the cognate of Arabic غـنـى (ġaniya) "he was free from want, he was wealthy" and غناء (ġanaʾ) "wealth, resources." Once Jesus' words were written down in unpointed Hebrew the text may have read די ליום עני לו, meaning either (a) "sufficient unto the day is the *evil / trouble* (עָנִי = κακ ία) thereof," or (b) "sufficient unto the day are the *resources / welfare* (עָנָי = πλοῦτος) thereof." Option (b) here removes the tension between Jesus' optimistic teaching in 6:25–33 — especially "all these things shall be added unto you" — and the more pessimistic conclusion in 6:34c when option (a) is the only option available.

MATTHEW 7:6 (CBBP XXVIII)

If the prohibitions in Matt 7:6 were spoken by Jesus in Hebrew they could have been written in a consonantal text as:

אל תתנו הטהור לכלבים ואל תרו תורתכם לפני החזרים

פן מטריפים אותה ברגליהם וחזרים אתוה יקרעו אתכם.

Were they spoken in Aramaic, they could have been written as

אל תוהב קדשא לכלביא ולא תאורון אורייתא דלכן קדם

חזריא די למא מטרפין יתה ברגליהון וחזירין יקרעון יתכון.

Both the Hebrew and Aramaic statements can mean, "Do not give dogs what is holy; and do not throw your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under foot and turn to attack you."

But the Hebrew reconstruction can be vocalized as:

אַל תִּתְּנוּ הַטָּהוּר לַכַּלָּבִים וְאַל תּוֹרוּ תוֹרַתְכֶם לִפְנֵי הַחֲזָרִים

פֶּן מַטְרִיפִים אוֹתָה בְּרַגְלֵיהֶם וְחוֹזְרִים יִקְרְעוּ אֶתְכֶם.

The Aramaic reconstruction, with the same meaning, can be:

אַל תּוֹהֵב קְדוּשָׁא לְכַלְבַּיָא וְלָא תְּאוֹרוּן אוֹרָיְיתָא דִּילְכוֹן קֳדָם
חֲזָרַיָּא דִּי לְמָא מַטְרִיפִין יָתָה בְּרַגְלֵיהוֹן וְחַזִירִין יִקְרְעוּן יַתְכוֹן.

These fully vocalized retroversions can readily be translated as:

> "Do not give the holy (word) to dog-keepers,
> and do not teach your Torah before swine-herders,
> lest, blaspheming it with their slander
> and disavowing it, they malign you."

MATTHEW 7:11 (CBBP XXXIII)

Εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν. "If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him." Salkinson translated this as:

וְאַף כִּי רָעִים אַתֶּם תֵּדְעוּן לָתֵת מַתָּנוֹת טבוֹת
לִבְנֵיכֶם אַף כִּי־אֲבִיכֶם שֶׁבַּשָּׁמַיִם יִתֶּן־טוֹב לְדֹרְשָׁיו׃

The πονηροὶ "evil ones" reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* having the word רעים, which was wrongly read as רָעִים "evil ones." It should have been read as רֵעִים "kin / kinfolk / family members." The Aramaic חַבְרָא "family, friends" could not have produced such a misunderstanding— adding support for there being a Hebrew *Vorlage* for this Matthean tradition. At one time Matt 7:11 surely carried the meaning, "If you who are *kinfolk* know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more so will your *heavenly father* give good things to those who ask him!"

MATTHEW 8:4 (MBS XIV)

Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς, "Behold, you may tell no one," can

be translated back into Hebrew as ראה לא תגד לאיש. The Greek translator vocalized this as רְאֵה לֹא תַגֵּד לְאִישׁ "See! You must not tell anyone." However what Jesus probably said was רְאֵה לֵא תַגֵּד לְאִישׁ "See! *Indeed* you must tell every-one!" In Shem Tob's *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* (c.1400) Jesus' warning reads השמרו לך פן תגיד לאדם "Beware lest you tell a man" (and in 9:30 as השמרו פן יודע הדבר, "Beware lest the matter be made known") and this has also been mistranslated. The פן has been read as the conjunction פֶּן "lest," but it can also be read as the defectively spelled particle פּוֹן "would that," which introduces a subjunctive. Here the impera-tive השמרו is the cognate of the Arabic شمر (*šamara*) "he strove vigorously and laboriously and was quick in [the religious service]." The השמרו פן יודע הדבר in the Shem Tob text, which approximates what must have been in the Hebrew *Vor-lage*, means "Strive hard! Would that the matter be known!"

MATTHEW 8:9 (SHEM TOB)

Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ὑπ᾽ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, "For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me" (KJV). Shem Tob's *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* reads: ואני אדם חוטא ויש לי ממשלת תחת ידי פירושים ופרשים ורוכבים "I am a sinful man and I have au-thority under the Pharisees and [I have] horses and riders" (Howard's translation). Contra Howard, the אדם here is not אָדָם "man" but אָדָם "commander," which is the cognate of the Arabic أدم (*ʾidâmu*) and أدمة (*ᶜadamat*) "the chief / provost of his people." Similarly, contra Howard, the חוטא is not חוֹטָא "sinner" but the Aramaic word which is the cognate of the Ara-

bic حوط (ḥawîṭ / ḥayyiṭ) "one who guards, takes charge, pro-
tects" as in the expression حواط أمر (ḥuwwâtu ʾamr[in]) "super-
intendent of an affair" This חוטא is a by-form of the Aramaic
חטי "nobleman, one who lives in luxury." The Roman centurion
introduced himself to Jesus using Hebrew and Aramaic titles,
and his אני אדם חוטא needs to be translated as ""I am a
provost, a superintendent"— which he then explains saying "I
have authority! Under my hand (= control) are mounted horse-
men, and equestrians and charioteers." Thanks to a Roman cen-
turion and to Shem Tob Ibn Shaprut it has been possible to
recover with confidence the lost Hebrew word אָדָם "the-one-
with-authority." This provides the clue for the proper interpre-
tation of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the Son of the Man"
(בֶּן־הָאָדָם). It was a pious substitute for the titles "the Son of
the Sovereign" (בֶּן־הָאֵדָם) and "the Son of God."

MATTHEW 8:22b (CBBP XXIX)

᾿Ακολούθει μοι καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς
ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead."
The Shem Tob Gospel reads here בא אחרי ועזוב המתים
לקבור מתיהם. The νεκροὺς certainly means "dead ones," but
the מת of the unpointed המתים is ambiguous. It can be (a) מת
"a dead (man)," a cognate of Arabic مات (mâta), Syriac מית
(mît), and Aramaic מות — all meaning "to die" and are related
to the Egyptian m(w)t "a dead man"; and (b) the noun מת "a
male, a man," a cognate of Ugaritic mt, Akkadian mutu, and
Ethiopic ምት (mĕtĕ)— all meaning "man, male, or husband"
and all are related to the Egyptian mt, "man, male"; and (c) the
noun מת which is the cognate of the Arabic مت (matta) "to be-

come related by marriage" and ماتّة (*mâttat*) "close ties, family ties, kinship." Thus the הַמֵּתִים can mean (a) "the dead," (b) "the dying," (3) "the men," or (d) "the family members / next-of-kin." This last definition reflects most likely the הַמֵּתִים that Jesus said without any ambiguity: "Follow me; and let the next-of-kin bury their dead."

MATTHEW 9:30 (MBS XVI)

Καὶ ἐνεβριμήθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "And Jesus strictly charged them." The Hebrew *Vorlage* may have had וַיָּעַד בָּם יֵשׁוּעַ. If so, the Greek translators of Matthew were aware of עוּד, stem II, the cognate of the Arabic غل (form 4) "to be angry." This would explain why they used ἐνεβριμήθη "he became angry" rather than παρεκάλει "he exhorted," which would have translated עוּד, stem I, "to exhort."

MATTHEW 9:30 (MBS XIV)

Ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω "See, to no one be it known." Jesus probably said was ראו לא יודע לאיש, which can be vocalized as רְאוּ לָא יוּדַע לְאִישׁ "See! *Indeed*, let it be known to everyone."

MATTHEW 10:17 (SHEM TOB)

Παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, "For they will give you up to councils." The Shem Tob text reads לא ימסרו אתכם בקהלותם, "they will *not* deliver you up in their congregations." By reading the לא as the emphatic לְא the verse reads "they will *surely* deliver you up in their congregations."

MATTHEW 10:34 (CBBP XXX)

Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν, "Do not think

that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword." The Salkinson-Ginsburg translation reads

אַל־תַּחְשְׁבוּ כִּי בָאתִי לְהָבִיא שָׁלוֹם בָּאָרֶץ
לֹא בָאתִי לְהָבִיא שָׁלוֹם כִּי אִם־חָרֶב:

The εἰρήνην "peace" translated the שלם (read as שָׁלֹם) which must have been in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. But שלם can also be read as (a) שִׁלֵּם "recompense," (b) שִׁלּוּם "retribution," and (c) שֶׁלֶם "end, *Finis*." In disagreement with John the Baptist Jesus may well have said, "Do not think that I have come to bring retribution (שִׁלּוּם) upon the earth," or "Do not think that I have come to bring an end (שֶׁלֶם) on earth." The Syriac Curetonian text has the doublet פלגותא דרעינא וסיפא (*pelgûtā² dreᶜyānā² wĕsaypā²*) "the division of opinion and the sword" (for the μάχαιραν "sword," in contrast to the διαμερισμόν "division" in Luke 12:41). This doublet reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* with an ambiguous חלף, that can mean many things including (a) חֵלֶף "a difference of opinion," which is the cognate of Arabic خلاف (*ḫilâf*), (b) חֵלֶף "contention," the cognate of Arabic خلف (*ḫilf*) "opposition, contention, (c) חַלֶף "knife," the cognate of Arabic حليف (*ḥallîf*) "a sharp spear," (d) حلف (*ḥalafa*) "to swear an oath, to establish a brotherhood, to unite in a covenant," (e) حلف (*ḥîlf*) "confederacy, league, covenant," and (f) חֵלֶף "change," the cognate of Arabic خلوف (*ḫillûf*) "change." Thus instead of Jesus' having said, "I have not come to bring peace . . . but a sword.," he may well have said, "I have not come to bring the end (שֶׁלֶם) . . . but to *make a change* (חֵלֶף)," or "I have not come to bring retribution but *to establish*

a covenant community (חֶלֶף)."

MATTHEW 11:6 (MBS XIV)

Καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοι, "And blessed is he who may not be scandalized over me." The Hebrew *Vorlage* of this blessing (and in Luke 7:23) may well have been אשרי אשר לא יהיה כשל בי, which could also mean, "*Blessed is he who truly has trust in me!*" if the לא was the emphatic לְא and the כשל was not כָּשַׁל "to stumble" but כֶּשֶׁל "confidence, trust"—a variant spelling of the כֶּסֶל in Psalm 78:7.

MATTHEW 12:16 (SHEM TOB)

Ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν, "That they should not make him known." Shem Tob's *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* (c.1400) reads ויצום לאמר לא יגלוהו (mss G) and ויצום לאמר שלא יגלוהו (mss H), "he commanded them saying that they should not reveal him." By reading the לא and the שלא as the emphatic לְא the verse reads "he commanded them saying they should *indeed* reveal him."

MATTHEW 16:20 (MBS XIV)

The Greek Μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, "They should tell no one that he was the Christ," appears in Shem Tob's *Hebrew Matthew* as אז צוה לתלמידיו לבל יאמרו שהוא משיח, where the negative לבל "to not" should probably be emended to לכל "to all," so that Jesus charged his disciples to tell *everyone* that he was the Messiah.

MATTHEW 18:10 (SHEM TOB)

Οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, "Their messengers in the heavens do always behold the face of my Father who is in the heavens." The Shem Tob text reads here למלאכיהם הם רואים תמיד בני אבי שבשמים, "to their angels they always see the sons of my father in heaven." The ל prefixed to מלאכיהם "their angels" is the emphatic ל (לוֹ/לָא). The רואים is not from רָאָה "to see" but the participle of רְוָא "to report, to give an account of," the cognate of the Arabic روى (*rawiya*) "to report, to give an account of." Thus the Sem Tob text stated, "*Verily* their angels are constantly giving an account of the sons of my heavenly father."

MATTHEW 19:4 (SHEM TOB)

Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, "Have you not read that he who made them of old," appears in the Shem Tob manuscript Add. no. 26964, and manuscripts C and H as הלא קראתם לעושיהם מקדם. The ל of לעושיהם is probably the emphatic ל, so that the phrase read "have you not read that *indeed* he who made them of old."

MATTHEW 19:14 (SHEM TOB)

Τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, "For of such is the kingdom of heaven." The Shem Tob text reads שלא יכנס במלכות שמים אם לא כאלה, "One will not enter the kingdom of heaven except (he shall be) like these." If the שלא and לא are read as emphatic particles the verse means "*Indeed* one will enter the kingdom of heaven if (one is) *indeed* like these."

MATTHEW 19:22 ([SHEM TOB])

'Απῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά, "He went away sorrowful, for he had many possessions." The Shem Tob text has הלך זעף לפי שלא היה לו קרקעות רבות "He went away angry because he did not have much property." But the שלא "for not" is actually the emphatic "for *indeed*." Thus the verse states that "he went raging at the mouth because he *indeed* had much property."

[MATTHEW 19:24; Mark 10:25 ([Item 44 in Classroom Notes] and [Lexical Data and Quran Texts]). Ted Lorah, one of my students in the 1970's, translated "*As they* [the disciples] *used their hand-held needles and thread to mend nets, Jesus said: 'It is easier for a hawser to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven."*]

MATTHEW 21:9 ([CMBBP] [XXI])

'Ωσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· 'Ωσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest!" The Shem Tob text reads:

הושענא מושיע העולם ברוך הבא בשם ה"
הושענא מושיענו תתפאר בשמים ובארץ:

"Hosanna, savior of the world,
blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord;
hosanna, our savior, may you be glorified
in heaven and on earth."

The 'Ωσαννὰ / *Hosanna* in the Gospels probably transliterates the Aramaic הַשָׁנָא, from the root הָשַׁ (with an affixed ן), the cognate of Arabic هاش/هش (*hašš / hâšš*) "he was or became joyful and cheerful, one who rejoices or is glad." If so, the noun

obviously functioned as an exclamatory interjection meaning "Hail! Cheers! Hooray! Hurrah!" The exclamatory Aramaic הַשָּׁנָא "Cheers! Hurrah! Hail!" and the Hebrew polite imperative הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא "Please help!" became blended and Ὡσαννὰ / *Hosanna* carried both meanings — as in the Shem Tob text with its use of "O Savior" and "our savior," plus "be glorified."

MATTHEW 22:2 ([MBS](#) [XVIII](#))

Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ἐποίησεν γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, "The reign of the heavens was likened to a man, a king, who made marriage feasts for his son." The Hebrew *Vorlage* of this verse was probably

$$\text{דִּמְתָה מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם לְגִבֶּר מֶלֶךְ}$$
$$\text{אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה חֲתָנֹת / חֲתָנָת לִבְנוֹ,}$$

"The kingdom of the heavens was likened to a lord, a king, who made circumcision / marriage feasts for his son." The unpointed חתנת could have been read as the plural of חֲתָנָה "marriage, marriage feast" or as חֲתָנָה "circumcision, circumcision feast." This חתנה is the cognate of Arabic ختان (*ḥitân^{un}*) "circumcision, a feast or banquet to which people are invited on account of a circumcision or a wedding."

MATTHEW 22:11 ([MBS](#) [XVIII](#))

Εἶδεν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου, "He saw there a man who had no wedding garment." In Hebrew there may well have been a *double entendre* for the noun מִדָּה means ἔνδυμα "garment" as well as φόρος "tribute, contribution, gift."

MATTHEW 22:12 (MBS XVIII)

Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου;
"Friend, how did you come in here without a wedding garment?"
The *Vorlage* of this phrase was probably רעי איך באת
הלם בלתי נתן מדת חתנה, the last three words of which
could also mean (a) "giving a wedding gift" and (b) "giving a
circumcision gift."

MATTHEW 22:12 (MBS XVIII)

Ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη, "He was put to silence." This "silence" points
to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which had אלם, stem I, "silence, dumb,
speechless." But the אלם here should have been read either as
אֶלֶם or אָלֶם, stem II, which is the cognate of the Syriac אָלֶם
"to keep anger" and Arabic أَليم (ʾalîm / אָלִים) "rancorous" and
تألّم (taʾallam / תְּאַלַּם) "to be irritated." Instead of reading this
verb as the *Niphᶜal* passive וַיֵּאָלֵם (= ἐφιμώθη) "he was
silenced" it should have been read as the *Qal* active וַיֶּאֱלֹם (=
ὀργισθεὶς) "he became rancorous/ angry."

MATTHEW 22:14 (MBS XVIII)

Πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, "For
many are called, but few are chosen." The Hebrew *Vorlage* was
probably כי רבים הם מזמנים והבחרים מעטים, to be
vocalized as כִּי רַבִּים הֵם מְזֻמָּנִים וְהַבּוֹחֲרִים מְעַטִּים,
"Indeed, many have been invited, but *the ones accepting* are
few." The adjective ἐκλεκτοί can only mean "chosen" (=
בחרים, *scriptio defective* for the *Qal* passive בָּחוּרִים "the
ones being chosen"). But the בחרים was the *scriptio defectiva*
for the *Qal* active participle בּוֹחֲרִים "the ones choosing/

accepting (the invitation)."

MATTHEW 26:14 (CMBBP XXVI)

᾽Ιούδας ᾽Ισκαριώτης = אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת = "Judas the Lector," rather than "Judas Iscariot." (See Luke 6:16, below.)

MATTHEW 27:46 (SHEM TOB)

Ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι; τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, Θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἱνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες; "᾽*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*?᾽ that is, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" The Shem Tob text reads אלי אלי למה עזבתני, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" But this Hebrew text can also be translated as "My God! My God! *Oh how* you made me suffer!" In this case the למה is an emphatic particle and the verb עזב may well be עָזַב, stem III, the cognate of Arabic عـذب (*ᶜaḏaba*) "he castigated, chastised, punished, tortured, and tormented." This identification would explain the variants (a) ωνειδισας με "you reproached, you reproved me" in Mk 15:34 D[gr], (b) *exprobasti me* "upbraided me" in Mk 15:34 Old Latin *c*, and (c) *dereliquisti me* "you reproved me" in the Vulgate and Old Latin *aur v g d ff² l n* of Matt 27:46 and Mk 15:34. Thus there need be no tension between this verse and John 16:32, "and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

MARK 1:41 (MBS XV)

Καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι, "Moved with compassion, Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, and said to him, 'I am willing; be cleansed.'" This verse can be translated into Hebrew as

ויחמל וישלח ידו נגע בו ואמר רוצה אני טהר:

Surprisingly, Ephraem (fourth century), five manuscripts

(Codex Bezae from the sixth century and the Old Latin manu-scripts *a, d, ff*[2], *and r*[1]) have ὀργισθεὶς "becoming angry" as Jesus' initial response to the leper, not σπλαγχνισθεὶς "compas-sion." The verb σπλαγχνισθεὶς translated חמל, stem I, "to have compassion," (which is the cognate of the Arabic حمل [ḥamala] "to accept responsibility, to accept the trust"). The verb ὀργισθεὶς translated חמל, stem II, which is the cognate of the Arabic حمل (ḥamala), stem II, meaning in forms 1 and 8 "he became angry."

MARK 1:44 ([MBS](#) [XIV](#))

Ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς, "Behold you may say nothing to no one," which can be translated back into Hebrew as ראה לא תגד לאיש הדבר. If so, this was read by Mark as רְאֵה לֹא תַגֵּד לְאִישׁ הַדָּבָר, "See! You may not tell anyone a thing!" But Jesus most likely said רְאֵה לֵא תַגֵּד לְאִישׁ הַדָּבָר, "See! *Indeed* you must tell everyone the matter!"

MARK 3:17 ([CMBBP](#))

Καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόμα[τα] Βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν Υἱοὶ Βροντῆς·, "And James the son of Zebedee and John the brother of James, whom he surnamed Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder." The Βοανη element of Βοανηργές, has nothing to do with the Hebrew בְּנֵי "the sons of." Rather it is to be identified with the place name בְּעֹן (*Beon*) in Num 32:3. The root בען is a by-form of בוע and נָבַע "to burst forth, to shout, to rejoice." The ργές element of βοανη-ργές is the transliteration of the Hebrew רְגֶשׁ "thunder," which

is the cognate of the Arabic رجس (*rajasa*) "it thundered" and رجاس / راجس (*râjis / rajjâs*) "thunder, a vehement sound." Thus "Boanerges" equals בּוֹעֲנֵי רֶגֶשׁ "Shouters of Thunder."

MARK 5:43 (MBS XIV)

    Καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, "And he charged them much, that no one may know this thing," which can be readily translated back into Hebrew as וַיְצַו אוֹתָם זָהִיר לֹא יִוָּדַע הַדָּבָר לְאִישׁ. But the particle לֹא "not" should have been read as the emphatic particle לָא. Jesus probably said "*Verily!* Let the matter be known to anybody!"

MARK 7:36 (MBS XIV)

    Καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν, "And he charged them to tell no one." The Hebrew *Vorlage* was probably ויצו אותם שלא יגידו לכל, in which case the שלא was misread as שֶׁלֹא "that not," rather than being read as intended as שֶׁלָא "that *indeed* they should tell everyone."

MARK 8:26 (MBS XIV)

    Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς καὶ μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην, "Do not go into the village; and do not tell anyone in the village." The Hebrew *Vorlage* behind these commands was probably לא תבא בכפר ולא תגיד לכל בכפר, which was read and interpreted by Mark as if Jesus said תָבֹא בַכִּפֶּר וְלֹא תַגִּיד לַכֹּל בַּכִּפֶּר לֹא. But what Jesus probably said was לָא תָבֹא בַכִּפֶּר וְלָא תַגִּיד לַכֹּל בַּכִּפֶּר, "*Indeed*, you must go into the village; and you must *indeed* tell everyone in the village."

MARK 9:49 ([CMBBP](#) [XXII](#))

Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται, "For everyone will be salted with fire." In Hebrew these four Greek words become כי הכל ימלח בבערה, which can mean more than "for everyone will be salted with fire." The γέεενναν "Gehenna" in Mark 9:43, 45, and 47 does not refer to hell but to the very earthly גֵּי הִנֹּם, "the Valley of Hinnom," which was accessible through Jerusalem's Dung Gate and became the municipal dump for corpses, carcasses, excrement, and garbage. With this in focus, the *Vorlage* of 9:49, כי הכל ימלח בבערה, can be translated as "*for everyone will be dragged through the dung / muck*." The noun מלח means "salt" but the verb מלח can mean "to drag, to dissipate, to vanish" when it is the cognate of the Arabic ملخ (*malaḫa*) "he pulled or dragged a thing, he drew it forth quickly, vehemently." The בערה which translates the πυρὶ "fire" can also be the cognate of Arabic بعر (*baᶜara*) "he voided dung" and بعر (*baᶜr*) "dung." The association of death and dung appears in Jer 8:2, "and they shall not be gathered or buried; they shall be as dung on the surface of the ground," in Jer 9:22, "the corpses of men will fall like dung on the open field," Jer 16:4, "they shall die grievous deaths: they shall not be lamented, neither shall they be buried; they shall be as dung upon the face of the ground," and Jer 25:33, "they shall not be lamented, or gathered, or buried; they shall be dung on the surface of the ground."

MARK 9:50 ([CMBBP](#))

Ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἄναλον γένηται ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε, "But if the salt has become insipid, how will you season it." The *Vorlage* was probably ואם ימלח המלח במה תמלחו אתו.

The noun מלח "salt" is the cognate of Arabic ملح (*milḥ*), Syriac מלחא (*melḥā'*), and Aramaic מִלְחָא. The verb מלח "to become insipid" is the cognate of Arabic مليخ (*malîḥ*) "tasteless, insipid, applied to meat that has no taste." But here the verb תמלחו is the cognate of Arabic ملح (*milḥ*) "to season, to salt." A verb and noun from one lexeme (*mlḥ*) and another verb from a second lexeme (*mlḫ*) provided paronomasia enhanced by assonance.

[Mark 10:25, see Matthew 19:24 above.]

MARK 11:13 ([MBS](#) [XVII](#))

The Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the Greek Ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων, "for it was not the time of figs," was probably כִּי לֹא הָיְתָה עֵת פְּגִים, which was misread as כִּי לֹא הָיְתָה עֵת פַּגִּים. It should have been read as כִּי לֻא הָיְתָה עֵת פַּגִּים, "though *indeed* it was the time of [early unripe] figs." The לֹא here was not the negative particle לֹא but the emphatic לֻא "verily, indeed."

MARK 11:14 ([MBS](#) [VII](#))

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "And answering he said to it." In I Sam 20:3 ἀποκρίθη appears as the translation of the יִשָּׁבַע "he swore," and this was probably the Hebrew verb translated as ἀποκριθεὶς in Mark 11:14, "and *swearing* he [Jesus] said to it [the fig tree]."

MARK 11:23 ([MBS](#) [XVII](#))

Ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, ἄρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, "Whoever says to this mountain, 'be taken up

and cast into the sea'" reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* which prob-
ably read **כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר אֶל־הַגְּבוּל הַזֶּה הִנָּשֵׂא**
וְהִתְנַפֵּל אֶל־תּוֹךְ הַיָּם. This **גְּבוּל** (= ὄρος / mountain), the
cognate of the Arabic جبل (*jabal*) "mountain," can also mean
"boundary stone, landmark" (= ὅριον), as in Deut 19:14, "You
shall not remove your neighbor's **גְּבוּל** (boundary stone) and
27:17, "cursed is he who moves his neighbor's **גְּבוּל** (boundary
stone)." Jesus' statement recorded in Matt 17:20 and 21:21 and
in Mark 1:23 probably used **גְּבוּל** "boundary stone, landmark"
(= ὅριον) rather than **גְּבוּל** "mountain" (= ὄρος).

LUKE 5:14 ([MBS](#) [XIV](#))

Μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, "To no one to tell," can be translated back
into Hebrew as **לֹא תַגֵּד לְאִישׁ**. If this was in Luke's source he
obviously read this as **לֹא הַגֵּד לְאִישׁ**, "Tell not to anyone."
But Jesus probably used the emphatic particle **לֹא** and said
לֹא הַגֵּד לְאִישׁ "*Indeed*, you must tell anybody."

LUKE 6:16 ([CMBBP](#) XXVI)

Καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς ἐγέ-
νετο προδότης, "Judas of James, and Judas Iscariot, who also
became betrayer." The *cariot* found in the name *Iscariot* is best
identified as the Hebrew **קְרוּאוֹת** "lectors," for the **קְרוּאוֹת**
were those called to read from the Torah — comparable to the
Arabic قارىء (*qâʾrīyᵘⁿ*) "a reader / reciter of the *Qurʾan*," and
similar to the Arabic قرّاء (*qurrâʾ*) "a devotee, one who devotes
himself / herself to religious exercise." This interpretation does
justice to the Greek definite article ὁ in the named spelled as
Ἰούδαν ὁ Ἰσκαριώθ or as Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης. This
definite article in Greek requires the name to be reconstructed as

אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, with the ὁ Ἰσ of the ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης reflecting an אִישׁ in the construct state ("the man of ") followed by the קְרִיּוֹת "lectors" in the absolute state.

LUKE 9:21 (MBS XIV)

The Greek Παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο, "He commanded they should tell this to no man," reflects a misreading of the וַיְצַו לֹא יַגִּידוּ הַדָּבָר לְכָל in the Hebrew *Vorlage* as וַיְצַו לֹא יַגִּידוּ הַדָּבָר לַכֹּל, which should have been read as וַיְצַו לֵא יַגִּידוּ הַדָּבָר לַכֹּל, "he commanded they should *indeed* tell the matter to everyone."

LUKE 12:33 (CMBBP XXIV)

Ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα, θησαυ ρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖςοὐρανοῖς, ὅπου κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει, "Provide yourselves money bags which do not grow old, a treasure in the heavens that does not fail, where no thief approaches nor moth destroys" (NKJ). The first phrase of this text probably came from a Hebrew *Vorlage* reading עשו לכם כסים אשר לא יבלו. This Hebrew can mean either (1) "make for yourselves *purses* (βαλλάντια = כִּיסִים, the plural of כִּיס "purse) which do not wear out," or (2) "make for yourselves *clothes* (ἱμάτια = כְּסוּיִם, the plural of כָּסוּי "clothing) which do not wear out." According to Luke 10:4, Jesus prohibited his disciples from carrying a *purse* (βαλλάντιον) or a *bag* (πήραν); and Luke 22:34 indicates that the disciples had carefully obeyed him. Once the כסים in the *Vorlage* is read as כְּסֻיִם "clothing" rather than כִּיסִים "purse" or "bag" the contradiction between Luke 10:4

and 12:33 disappears. Once the "maggot" is restored in Matt 6:19–20 and the thieves mentioned there are recognized as "grave robbers," it becomes obvious that "laying up treasure in heaven," and "providing one's self with the ageless clothes of heaven's eternal treasure" (Luke 12:33) address the reality of human mortality, as well as the promise of immortality.

LUKE 14:26 ([CBBP](#) [XXXI](#))

Εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ . . . . οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής, "If any one comes to me and does not hate . . . he cannot be my disciple." The *Vorlage* here was probably

אִם יָבֹא אִישׁ וְלֹא יִשְׂנָא . . .
לֹא יוּכַל לִהְיוֹת תַּלְמִידִי:

This verse has Jesus contradicting the second greatest commandment, וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֲךָ כָּמוֹךָ, "you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev 19:18, Matt 5:43, 19:19, 22:39, Mark 12:31, 12:33, Luke 10:27, Rom 13:9, Gal 5:14, and James 2:8). If the Greek had the emphatic οὖν "really" rather than the negative οὐ "not" there would be no contradiction. Or had the לֹא in the *Vorlage* been the emphatic לְ "indeed," rather than לֹא "not," there would have been no contradiction. If Jesus used the negative לֹא the questions turn to the ambiguous ישׂנא / ישׂנה in the *Vorlage*, with its interchange of א and ה and its שׂ which can be read as a שׂ (ś) or שׁ (š). When the שׂ is read a שׂ the verb is שָׂנֵא / שָׂנֶה "to hate," the cognate of Arabic شنأ (šanaʾa) or شنئ (šaniʾa). When the שׂ is read a שׂ the verb is (a) שָׂנָא / שָׂנָה, the cognate of Arabic سنو / سنى (sanay / sanaw) "he treated him with gentleness, behaved well with him in social

intercourse" or (b) שָׁנָה/שָׁנָא "to change, to go away, to forsake," the cognate of Syriac שֵׁנָא (šěnaʾ) "to change from one place to another, to remove, to depart," and Ugaritic šnw "to go away." This (b) option removes the contradiction between Luke 14:26 and Luke 10:27. Forsaking one's own family for a new love has its roots in Gen 2:24, "a man leaves / forsakes (יַעֲזָב) his father and his mother and cleaves (וְדָבַק) to his wife, and they become one flesh." The forsaking of kith and kin for a new love required no hate, just a change and new priorities.

LUKE 14:27 ([CBBP](#) [XXXI](#))

Ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναταιεἶναί μου μαθητής, "Whoever does not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple." וּמִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִקַּח אֶת־צְלָבוֹ וְיֵלֶךְ אַחֲרַי לֹא יוּכַל לִהְיוֹת תַּלְמִידִי (Salkinson-Ginsburg). In the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Luke 9: 23 and 14:27 the σταυρὸν "cross" may not have been צְלוּב "a pole, a cross" but תְּלָה / תְּלָא. If so this תְּלָה / תְּלָא may well have been the cognate of (a) Arabic تلآء (talâʾa) "a bond by which one becomes responsible for the safety of another" and اتلى (ʾatlay) "he gave him his bond by which he became responsible for his safety" and (b) Arabic تلا / تلو (tilw / talâ) "companion who imitates such a one and follows him in action." With these definitions in focus the original meaning behind Jesus' statement, "whoever does not carry the cross and follow me cannot be my disciple," may well have been "whoever does *not bear responsibility* and does not *imitate me* cannot be my disciple.

LUKE 16:9 (CMBBP)

Ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness" reflects an original התרעו מן הממון העול which should have been interpreted to mean "abstain yourselves from unrighteous mammon." The verb התרעו is not the *Hithpaᶜel* of רָעָה, stem II, "to cherish, to be a friend, a companion," but רָעָה, stem III, which is the cognate of the Arabic رعا / رعو (*raᶜwa / raᶜâ*) "he refrained from things or affairs, he forebore, or he abstained from bad or foul conduct."

JOHN 3:3 (MBS XV)

Ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, "If anyone may not be born *from above*, he is not able to see the kingdom of God," or "If any one may not be born *again*, he is not able to see the kingdom of God." The ambiguity of ἄνωθεν reflects the ambiguity in Jesus' reply to Nicodemus in Hebrew speech: אִם־לֹא יִוָּלֵד אִישׁ מעלה לֹא־יוּכַל לִרְאוֹת אֶת־מַלְכוּת הָאֱלֹהִים. The unpointed מעלה could be read as מַעְלָה "above" (from the stem עָלָה) or מְעַלָּה "a second time" (from עָלַל / עָלָה, stem IV, which is the cognate of the Arabic عل (ᶜalla) "a second time).

JOHN 8:6 (MBS VIII)

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κάτω κύψας τῷ δακτύλῳ κατέγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν can be translated back into Hebrew as ושחה ישוע כתב בצבע צבעו על העפר "bending over Jesus wrote with a finger (בצבע) *his religious-decision* (צבעו) in the dust"—the צבעו being the cognate of Arabic صبغة (ṣibġat) "a religious law." There was a haplography which changed the

original בצבע צבבע to just בצבעו "with his finger."

JOHN 8:8 (MBS VIII)

Ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, "He wrote upon the ground" can be translated back into Hebrew as כָּתַב עַל־הֶעָפָר עַל־עָפֵּר "he wrote upon the *dust* about *forgiveness.*" The עָפֵּר "forgiveness" is the cognate of Arabic verb غَفَر (*ġafara*) "he forgave" and the nouns غَافِر (*ġāfir*) and غَفُور (*ġafūr*) which are epithets of God meaning "covering and forgiving the sins, crimes, and offences of his people." There was seemingly a haplography which changed the original על העפר על עפר to just על העפר "upon the dust."

JOHN 9:35 (CMBBP XXV)

Καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν εἶπεν· σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "And when He had found him, He said to him, 'Do you believe in the Son of God?'" (NKJ). "And having found him he said, 'Do you believe in the Son of man?'" The manuscripts and versions differ over which title was actually used by Jesus. The Greek manuscripts 𝔭 [66, 75] ℵ B D W read τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου "the son of man," but manuscripts A K L X Δ Θ Ψ read τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ "Son of God." The Peshitta reads בברה דאלהא "in the Son of God," but the Old Syriac reads בברה דאנשא "in the Son of Man." Once the Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is translated back into Hebrew and Aramaic and written without vowels at least fifteen meanings become possible (seven for אדם and eight for אנש). Even if Jesus and the disciples knew perfectly well what was meant when they spoke, ambiguity was unavoidable once the sayings were written Hebrew and Aramaic using consonants only. The most likely

meanings of בֶּן־אָדָם, or בֶּן־אֱנָשׁ, or בַּר־אֱנָשׁ— which be-
came the anarthrous ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου "the son of man" and
the arthrous ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου "the son of _the_ man"— are:
(1) "_the son of man_" = a mortal human being, i.e., בֶּן אָדָם, or
בַּר אֱנָשׁ בֶּן אֱנוֹשׁ or, with the אנשׁ being the cognate of the
Arabic أنس (ʾanisa) "to be friendly, social"; (2) "_the man of
purity_" = the purest person, i.e., בַּר אֱנוֹשׁ, with the בר being
the cognate of the Arabic بر (barra) "he was pious, kind, good,
gentle"; (3) "_the son of reconciliation_" conciliator, i.e., בֶּן־
אָדָם, with the אדם being the cognate of Arabic ادم (ʾadama)
"he effected a reconciliation between them and brought them
together"; (4) "the son of authority"= one in authority, i.e.,
בֶּן־אָדָם, with the אָדָם being the cognate of the Arabic ادم
(ʾidâmu) and ادمة (ʿadamat) "the chief/provost of his people,
the aider or manager of the affairs, the examplar of his people";
and (5) "the son of the-one-in-charge" = the Sovereign," i.e.,
בֶּן־הָאֱדָם. With all of the right vowels restored and with the
lexical options in focus, it is easy to recognize הָאֱדָם "the
Sovereign" as a title for Yahweh. Reverence for the name may
well have been extended to הָאֱדָם itself so that the בֶּן־הָאֱדָם
"the Son of _the_ Sovereign" was intentionally mispronounced as
בֶּן־הָאָדָם "the Son of _the_ Man" which, in turn, produced the
baffling ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου "_the son of the man_." The
disciples and those in the early church certainly knew that "_the
Son of the Man_" meant "_the Son of the Sovereign_," which was
but another way of saying "_the Son of God_." It was apparently
so well understood it required no commentary.

JOHN 11:33 (MBS XVI)

The Ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν, "He became angry in his spirit, and shook himself," reflects an original Hebrew phrase זעם זעם רוח, which was read as זָעַם זָעַם רוּחַ, as though it included זָעַם, stem I, "to be indignant, to be angry," and רוּחַ, stem I, "wind, breath, spirit." But the זעם זעם רוח should have been read as זָעַם זָעַם רָוַח, which included זָעַם, stem II, "to be assertive, to be responsible" and רָוַח, stem II, "to act quickly, promptly." The Arabic cognate of זָעַם, stem II, is زعم (zaʿama) "he asserted, he became responsible, amenable." The cognate of רָוַח, stem II, is راح/روح (rwḥ / râḥa) "he was active, prompt," as in the phrase له ارياح (ʾaryâḥa lah), "he was prompt to do what was beneficent." Thus זעם זעם רוח can mean "becoming assertive he immediately took full responsibility upon himself."

JOHN 11:38 (MBS XVI)

Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, has traditionally been translated as "then Jesus, again groaning in himself, came to the tomb." But initially the text probably stated, "*then Jesus, again asserting himself, came to the tomb*." (See above on John 11:33.)

JOHN 19:39 (MBS IX)

Φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν, "Bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds." The Hebrew *Vorlage* for this verse may have been מֵבִיא אָסוּךְ סוּךְ מֶסֶךְ מֹר־וַאֲהָלוֹת כְּלִיטְרָא מְאָהָה, "he came bringing a flask of ointment—a mixture of myrrh and aloes

about a liter— wailing (as he came)." The מְאַהֵה is the cognate of the Arabic أهـ (ʿahhaha) "he expressed pain or grief or sorrow."

JOHN 20:15 (MBS IX)

Ἐκείνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστιν λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε, "She, supposing him to be the *mortician* said to him, Lord . . . ." The Greek κηπουρός "gardener," was one who took care of the flowers, plants, and trees; but the Hebrew גַּנָּן "gardener" could have been a homograph for the one who handled dead bodies. Its Arabic cognates include جنن (janan) "grave" (= גנן), جنن (janan) "dead body (= גנן), جنين (janîn) "grave clothes" (= גנין), and جنين (janîn) "buried, placed in the grave" (= גנין).

JOHN 21:15–17 (CBBP XXXIII)

Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων; λέγει αὐτῷ· ναὶ κύριε, σὺ οἶδαςὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ· βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου, "'Simon son of John, do you truly love me more than these?' 'Yes, Lord,' he said, 'you know that I love you.' Jesus said, 'Feed my lambs.'" In Hebrew this became:

שִׁמְעוֹן בַּר־יוֹנָה הַאֹהֵב אַתָּה אֹתִי יֶתֶר מֵאֵלֶּה
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו הֵן אֲדֹנִי אַתָּה
יָדַעְתָּ כִּי אֲהַבְתִּיךָ וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו נַהֵל אֶת־עֲלֹתָי:
(Salkinson-Ginsburg).

The Greek text has ἀγαπᾷς, the lofty word for "love" in Jesus' question and φιλῶ, a less lofty word for "love" in Peter's response. The Hebrew in Jesus' initial question would have been אָהַב "to love" and the verb in Peter's response would have been

רָעָה, the intensive *Pi ͨel* "to love intensively, to cherish." Peter's choice of רָעָה matches its use in Psalm 37:3–4, וּרְעֵה אֱמוּנָה וְהִתְעַנַּג עַל־יְהוָה, "cherish faithfulness and take exquisite delight in Yahweh." Not conspicuous in the Greek text of Jesus' and Peter's dialogue, but very conspicuous in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, is the wordplay with (a) רָעָה "to cherish," (b) רָעָה "to pasture, to feed," and (c) רָעָה used as the metaphor "to pastor, to lead, to teach." Verses 15–17 once read: "Simon of Jonah, do you *love* (אהב) me more than *kith-and-kin* (אלה)?" He said to him, "Yes, Lord, you know that I *cherish* (רָעָה) you." Jesus said to him, "Feed (רְעֵה) my lambs!" A second time he said to him, "Simon of Jonah, do you love (אהב) me?" He said to him, "Yes, Lord; you know that I *cherish* (רָעָה) you." Jesus said to him, "*Lead* (רְעֵה) my sheep!" He said to him the third time, "Simon of John, do you *cherish* (רָעָה) me?" Peter felt hurt because he said to him the third time, "Do you *cherish* (רָעָה) me?" And he said to him, "Lord, you know everything; you know that I *cherish* (רָעָה) you." Jesus said to him, "*cherish* (רָעָה) my lambs!" The אלה behind the πλέον τούτων (יֶתֶר מֵאֵלֶּה) "more than these" was certainly the אלה that was the cognate of Arabic ال (ʾâl / ʾill) and إيلة (ʾîlat) "a man's family, relations, or kinfolk."

ACTS 26:14 (MBS XIII)

The Hebrew phrase spoken by Jesus and quoted by Paul —which Luke translated as σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτιζειν, "it is hard for thee against goads to kick"— was probably קשה לך בעט בפרשים. If so, Luke misread the

phrase as קָשֶׁה לְךָ בָּעֹט בִּפְרָשִׁים, "it is hard for you to kick against goads." What Jesus probably said to Paul in Hebrew was קָשֶׁה לְךָ בְּעֹט בַּפְּרָשִׁים, "it is hard for you to reject the Pharisees."

ROMANS 12:20 (MBS V)

Ἀλλὰ ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτογὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, "If your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink; for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads." The metaphor of "heaping coals of fire upon the head"— meaning "to teach someone a good lesson"— is based upon the usage in Arabic of قبس (*qabasa*) "fire, a live coal." It is the cognate of כֶּפֶשׁ "hot ashes, coals"— a synonym of the גֶּחָלִים "glowing coals" in Proverbs 25:22. The Arabic قبس نارا (*qabasa nârâ*) means "he took fire" and قبس النارا (*qabasa 'alnârâ*) means "he lighted the fire." But قبس علما (*qabasa ᶜilmâ*) means "he acquired knowledge, he sought knowledge." In the causative اقبسه نارا (*'aqbasahu nârâ*) means "he gave him fire" and اقبسه علما (*'aqbasahu ᶜilmâ*) means "he taught him knowledge." The plural noun القوابس (*'alqawâbisu*) means "those who teach what is good." Thus the Arabic idiom and metaphor removes the obscurity of the Hebrew idiom and metaphor of "heaping of glowing coals upon the head" in Prov 25:22 and its quotation here in Rom 12:20. If the *firey coals* have to do with *heat*, then crowning someone with *coals* would be an act of torture. If the *firey coals* have to do with *light*, then crowning someone with *glowing coals* would be an act of *illumination* with the recipient's becoming *enlightened*.

I Corinthians 11:10 (MBS I & Shem Tob)

Διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, "That is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head, because of the angels" (RSV). "Therefore ought the woman to have a power over her head, because of the angels" (DRA)." The "veil" versus "authority" issue disappears once the σ of ἐξουσία is removed and the re- maining letters are recognized as a transliterated Aramaic loanword. The ἐξουσίαν "power" found in every major Greek manuscript needs to be corrected to ἐξουίαν and read as the loanword אֲכְסוּיָא "a covering," a variant of the well attested כְּסוּי "covering." The prosthetic א of אֲכְסוּי is analogous to the prosthetic ἐ with the variants ἐχθές and χθές "yesterday." (Using a loanword for an item of clothing is still common, like the English *scarf* coming from the Old French *escherpe* and the English *gown* coming from the Late Latin *gunna*).

I Corinthians 11:24 (MBS X)

Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, "This is my body." The variants here and in Matt 26:26, Mark 14:22 and Luke 22:19 include: [a] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, [b] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον, [c] τὸὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, [d] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν θρυπτόμενον). These *texts and variants* read, "*This is my body, which is for you, which is broken for you, which is given for you, which is broken-in-pieces for you.*" These variants reflect a Hebrew tradition which read זה פגרי הפגור הנפגר בעדכם— with פגר stems I, II, and III. The פגר, stem I, means "body"; the פגר, stem II "to break," is the cognate of Arabic فجر (*fajara*) "to cleave, to brake open, to pour forth, to make water, blood, or a fluid to flow"; and the פגר, stem III "to give," is the cognate of Arabic فجر (*fajara*) "he gave, he made his gift large."

REVELATION 13:18 (CMBBP XXV)

Ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου, ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπουἐστίν, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ, "Let anyone with understanding calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a person. Its number is six hundred sixty-six." The most obvious name which the Christ and the beast shared in common with a numerical equivalent of 666 would have been *sôter*, which had antithetical meanings depending on whether the *sôter* was a Greek word or a Hebrew word. The Greek σωτηρ "savior" (as in Luke 2:11, σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς κύριος "a savior who is Christ, the Lord") would be transliterated in Hebrew and Aramaic as סותר (= *swtr* = *sôtē r*). In Hebrew the ס (S) = 60, the ו (W) = 6, the ת (T) = 400, and the ר (R) = 200— which all together equals 666. The Hebrew and Aramaic סותר (= *swtr* = *sôter*), in contrast to the Greek word transliterated into Hebrew using these same letters, means "destroyer" or "one who tears down," being the cognate of Arabic شتر (*šatar*) "to offend, abuse, revile" and شتير (*šatîr*) "knave, rogue." Therefore, 666 can be a numeric code for "savior" when based upon the Greek loanword σωτηρ (*sôtēr*) or 666 can be a numeric code for "destroyer" when based upon the Hebrew / Aramaic סותר (= *swtr* = *sôtēr*).

PSALMS OF SOLOMON 2:26–27 (CBBP XXXIV)

Ἐκκεκεντημένον ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων Αἰγύπτου, "He [Pompey] was pierced through upon the mountains of Egypt." The *Vorlage* was either נחר על הרי מצרים, "he was stabbed upon the mountains of Egypt," or נחר על חרי מצרים, "he was stabbed along the inlets of Egypt." The ὀρέων "mountains" is problematic since there are no mountains in the Egyptian Delta at Pelusium or even at Mons Cassius. Moreover, Dio Cassius,

Plutarch, and Lucanus concurred that Pompey's assassination occurred on a small boat in the shallow waters off Pelusium, on the eastern edge of the Egyptian delta. The Greek ὀρέων "mountains" — minus the genitive plural suffix ων — may actually be the *transliteration* of הֹרֵי "inlets" in the Hebrew *Vorlage* rather than the *translation* of הָרֵי "mountains." The Arabic cognate خور (*ḥawr*) means "an inlet from a sea or a large river entering into the land, a channel where water pours into a sea or large river, or a canal from a sea or river." The Syriac "when he was slain upon the mountains in Egypt," simply misread the original חרי in its *Vorlage* as הרי, as well as having misread נכה "slain" instead of the original נחר "stabbed."

GOSPEL OF THOMAS, LOGIA 114 (MBS I)

"For every woman who makes herself male (= Arabic ذكر [*ḏakara*] = זכר) will enter the Kingdom of Heaven," can also mean "For every woman who is repentant / obedient (= Arabic ذكر [*ḏakara*] = זכר) will enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

ADDENDUM

THE SONG OF DEBORAH *

I. PROSE PROLOGUE: 4:23–24

4:23 God subdued in that day Jabin, King of Canaan, before the Israelites. 4:24 Yea, the hand of the Israelites bore harder and harder on Jabin, King of Canaan, until they finally destroyed Jabin, King of Canaan.

II. POETIC PROLOGUE: 3:31; 5:6–7, 5:1–2b

3:31 Then later Shamgar ben-Anat appeared on the scene! He smote with a mattock *two marauding bands*; he *plundered* hundreds of men with a(n) (ox)goad. He was *appointed overseer*, and gained victories by himself for Israel! 5:6 From the days of Shamgar ben-Anat, from the days he *used to attack (covertly)*, caravans ceased and *caravaneers* had to travel roundabout routes. Warriors *deserted*, in Israel they *failed to assist*, until the arising of Deborah, the arising of a Mother in Israel! 5:1 Then Deborah made Barak ben-Abinoam *march forth* on that day when the *heroine called for heroism* in Israel, when the militia was summoned, (by her) saying:

III. DEBORAH'S EXHORTATION: 5:2c–4, 5:8–9

5:2c "PRAISE YAHWEH!

Hear, O kings! Listen, O princes! I am for Yahweh! I, yes I, *I will attack*, *I will fight* for Yahweh, the God of Israel. 5:4 O Yahweh, when you went out from Seir, when you marched from the plain of Edom, the earth trembled *noisily*, the heavens dropped open, the clouds dropped *torrentially*. The waters of the mountains flowed from the presence of Yahweh, the One of Sinai, from the presence of Yahweh, my God. *God will provide strength*. 5:8 God will muster the *recruits*. When *the brave ones* battle, shield, *moreover*, and spear will appear among the forty thousand in Israel.

Respond to the call, O leaders of Israel!
O you who are summoned for the militia!
5:9c PRAISE YAHWEH!"

IV. MUSTERING THE TROOPS: 5:10–13

5:10 Riders on young donkeys, those sitting on *mules*, and those walking along the way 5:11 *hastened on mountain roads, hurrying between the mountain-passes*, where the victories of

Yahweh would be given—the victories of his two warriors in Israel, when the *very storms* would descend from Yahweh. 5:12 The *troops* of Deborah roused themselves *to rout the troops of the pursuer*. Barak *made preparations to attack*, ben-Abinoam to take prisoners. 5:13 When the *caravan-leader* went forth against the nobles, (when) the militia of Yahweh descended, *they were accompanied* by (heavenly) warriors.

V. Strategy Of The Forces: 5:14–16

5:14 Some from Ephraim, *hastening* through Amalek, would strike at the rear; Benjamin from *concealment* would attack. 5:15 From Machir commanders would go down. Yea, from Zebulon, (those) brandishing the marshal's mace, and officers from Issachar along with Deborah. That *he might inflict defeat*, Barak was *concealed* in the plain. Dispatched with his footmen along the tributaries was Reuben. Gad had *joined* them. 5:16 Those of *true courage circled about* to wait between the *ravines*, to listen, *to look for stragglers* along the tributaries, *to triumph over* the cowardly chieftains.

VI. Israelite Attack: 5:17–18

5:17 Gilead in Trans-Jordan went on *alert*. then Dan *boldly attacked* ships; Asher *assailed* along the water's edge and *struck* against its *harbors*. 5:18 Zebulon *swam (underwater)*, risking his life; Naphtali *attacked* Merom.

VII. Canaanite Counterattack: 5:19

5:19 The kings were forced to come. They fought. (But) when the kings of Canaan fought, from Taanach along the waters of Megiddo, silver spoils they did not take.

VIII. The Defeat Of The Canaanites: 5:20–23

5:20 From the heavens fought the stars, from their stations they fought against Sisera. 5:21 The Wadi Kishon swept them [the

chariots] away, the Wadi *surged seaward*. The Wadi Kishon *overtook* (them), *it overflowed, they sought refuge*. 5:22 Then *retreated up the slopes* their horses (and their) *chariots — his chariot*, his stallions. 5:23 *Doomed to die, they panicked—* Yahweh had sent a cloudburst! Their riders *were in total panic! Truly victorious* were the ones going forth for the *Warrior* Yahweh, for the *Warrior* Yahweh, with the (heavenly) heroes!

IX. ASSASSINATION OF SISERA:
5:24–25, 5:27a, 5:26, 5:27b

5:24 Most blessed among women is Yael, wife of Heber the Kenite, among women in tents she is most blessed. 5:25 Water he requested, milk she gave, in a *truly magnificent goblet* she brought cream. 5:27a Between her legs *he drank*, he fell to sleep. 5:26 She stretched her hand to the tent-pin, her right hand to the workmen's hammer. She hammered Sisera, battered his head, shattered and pierced his neck. 5:27b Between her legs *half-conscious* he fell; *motionless, powerless*, there he fell slain.

X. ANXIETY IN SISERA'S COURT: 5:28–30

5:28 Through the window she peered—but (only) *emptiness!* The mother of Sisera *inquired* (at) the lattice: "Why tarries his chariot's arrival? Why so late the sound of his chariotry?" 5:29 *The clairvoyants among her damsels divined*. Indeed, *her soothsayer reported* to her: 5:30 "*The victors have forded (the water)*; they are dividing the spoil—a wench or two for the head of the hero — spoil of dyed cloth for Sisera, spoil of the best cloth, an embroidered cloth or two for the spoiler's neckerchiefs."

XI. POETIC CONCLUSION: 5:31a

5:31a Thus may all the enemies of Yahweh perish. (May) His lovers (be) like the rising of the sun because of His power.

XII. PROSE EPILOGUE: 5:31b

5:31b And the land was at peace for forty years.

_____

* This is the translation of Thomas McDaniel, published in *Deborah Never Sang: A Philological Study of the Song of Deborah* (*Judges Chapter V*), *with English Translation and Comments*. Jerusalem: Makor, 1983, 402 pages.
[BS 1305.3 M3 1983].