

Sounds of War: Historical, Chronological and Literary Implications of
Military Vocabulary in Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17

Paul N. Nikkel

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for Doctor of Philosophy

University of Sheffield
Department of Biblical Studies

September 2007

Sounds of War: Historical, Chronological and Literary Implications of Military
Vocabulary in Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17

Paul N. Nikkel

ABSTRACT

The trend in linguistic studies in the mid-to-late 20th century has been towards establishing early dates of composition for an archaic layer of Biblical Hebrew attested in the Masoretic Text. The diachronic linguistic, historical and literary theories supporting this dating have resulted in a tripartite typology of biblical texts that continues to have significant influence in contemporary biblical scholarship. I propose that, (a) the linguistic typologies supporting this division are methodologically unsound and should be abandoned, and (b) specific forms of linguistic evidence can provide historical, chronological and literary implications.

I base my methodology on the theoretical position that lexemes as signifiers may hold inherent historical or chronological information and certain lexical bodies correlate to extra-biblical historical evidence. I apply this presumption and a framework to an examination of the military lexical corpus in three commonly disputed passages: Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17.

Clear implications can be drawn from the examination of military vocabulary. They include: (a) the typological inaccuracy of the diachronic division of Biblical Hebrew, (b) an Assyrian military background in the 8th century BCE or later for the Song of the Sea, (c) the lexical correspondence between the Song of Deborah, Chronicles and prophetic texts, (d) the use of archaizing as a literary device, (e) the literary consequences of David's military position, and (f) discrete lexical patterns of military vocabulary in the Deuteronomic History.

The results of the study call for a wider examination of specific lexical corpi in the Masoretic Text and provide a basis for further historical, socio-historical, and literary studies of military and warfare in the Hebrew Bible.

1. An introduction to the scope and purpose of the thesis	4
I. A critique of current diachronic models and the creation of an alternative linguistic ... methodology	7
1. The development of linguistic methodologies in Biblical Studies	7
i. A brief historical overview of methodological development	7
ii. Current scholarly debate over linguistic typologies	11
2. Confronting challenges in creating and interpreting linguistic typologies	17
a. Three major difficulties with creating linguistic typologies.....	17
i. The priority of lexicographical or morpho-syntactical evidence.....	17
ii. Scarcity of linguistic data for Biblical Hebrew	20
iii. Problems of redaction and text-history.....	22
b. Three major difficulties with typological interpretation	24
i. Linguistic typologies do not have a <i>terminus ad quem</i>	24
ii. Dialect and diglossia: Two alternative causes of linguistic variation	28
iii. The difference between linguistic change and diffusion.....	30
c. Challenges to establishing external linguistic hooks into the MT.....	32
i. Extra-biblical evidence is a poor control for typologies.....	33
ii. Limits of influence from foreign languages	36
3. The argument for an alternative linguistic methodology	42
a. Necessary elements of a meaningful linguistic methodology	43
b. Building on traditional methodology to examine linguistic data	44
i. The presumptions of this methodology	45
ii. The theoretical relationship between lexemes and history	47
iii. Selecting lexical bodies and the framework for their examination	52
II. The examination of military lexemes in Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17	56
1. The military vocabulary of 1 Samuel 17.....	56
a. Background of 1 Samuel 17 in history and scholarship.....	56
i. Historical and literary background	56
ii. Linguistic and chronological background	59
b. Examination of military vocabulary in 1 Samuel 17.....	61
i. הרב	61
ii. קובע - כובע.....	62
iii. שריון - סריון	65
iv. צנה	68
v. מד	88
vi. מקל	92
vii. קלע	94
viii. מצחה	100
ix. חנית	102
x. כידון	106
xi. נשא צנה - נשא כלים - נער	109
xii. איש הבנים.....	114
c. Review of military lexemes and trends	117
i. Function, cognates and loanwords.....	117
ii. Patterns of distribution and usage.....	118
iii. Lexical replacement, semantic shift	119
iv. Literary context and genre	121

v. Historical and chronological implications	126
2. The military vocabulary of Judges 5 (Song of Deborah).....	131
a. The background of Judges 5 in history and scholarship.....	131
i. The historical and literary background	131
ii. The linguistic and chronological background	133
b. The examination of military vocabulary in Judges 5	138
i. פרע	138
ii. חקק	143
iii. פרזון	146
iv. רזן	150
v. אדיר	152
vi. גבורים	153
vii. מגן	157
viii. שר	162
ix. רמח	164
c. A review of military lexemes and trends in Judges 5.....	169
i. Function, cognates and loanwords.....	170
ii. Patterns of distribution and usage.....	171
iii. Lexical replacement, semantic shift	172
iv. Literary context and genre	173
v. Historical and chronological implications	175
3. The military vocabulary of Exodus 15.....	177
a. The background of Exodus 15 in history and scholarship	177
i. The historical and literary background	177
ii. The linguistic and chronological background	180
b. The examination of military vocabulary in Exodus 15	182
i. איש מלחמה	182
ii. מרכבה	184
iii. רכב	189
iv. חיל	192
v. שלישי	194
vi. אריק חרב	197
vii. פרשים	199
c. A review of military lexemes and trends in Exodus 15.....	210
i. Function, cognates and loanwords.....	210
ii. Patterns of distribution and usage.....	211
iii. Lexical replacement, semantic shift	212
iv. Literary context and genre	213
v. Historical and chronological implications	215
III. Historical, chronological and literary conclusions of the lexical examination	218
1. The literary implications drawn from the lexical examinations	218
a. The sparsity of military vocabulary in the MT.....	218
b. The literary and thematic associations with prophetic literature.....	221
c. The pattern of lexical distribution in DtrH shared source material	223
d. The use of archaizing as a literary device	227
2. The historical implications of the lexical examination	230

a. The lack of historical integrity in the literary setting	230
b. The historical background of the texts	233
c. The evidence of foreign loanwords and military contact	235
3. The chronological implications of the lexical examination	238
a. The inaccuracy of traditional diachronic typologies	238
b. The relationship of the lexical body to eighth-century or later warfare.....	240
4. A concluding summary and overview of further research areas.....	241
a. Top-line findings and the main points of the thesis	241
b. Implications of the thesis and the possibilities of further research	242
IV. Appendix I: Attestations of the "horseman" in the material evidence of the ancient Near East	245
1. The Assyrians.....	246
2. The Persians	251
3. The Egyptians	256
V. Bibliography	260

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABH	Archaic Biblical Hebrew
AHw	Wolfram von Soden and Bruno Meissner, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965)
ANE	Ancient Near East
BDB	Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907)
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BRL	Kurt Galling, <i>Biblisches Reallexikon</i> (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977)
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> (Chicago: The Institute, 1956-)
DISO	C.F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer (eds.), <i>Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest</i> (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965)
DtrH	Deuteronomistic History
EBH	Early Biblical Hebrew
IH	Israelian Hebrew
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> (3 vols.; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962-64)
KTU	M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartin, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Shamra Ibn Hani and Other Places</i> (ALASP, 8; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995)
KB	Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson and Johann Jakob Stamm (eds.), <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Leiden: Brill, 1994)
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
SBH	Standard Biblical Hebrew

1. An introduction to the scope and purpose of the thesis

The trend in linguistic studies in the mid-to-late 20th century has been towards establishing early dates of composition and historicity for an ancient layer of Hebrew attested in the biblical texts. This movement has been primarily based on the linguistic evidence from Ugarit and the establishment of a diachronic theory for Biblical Hebrew. This diachronic theory identifies three types of Hebrew in the final form texts: Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH), and Late Hebrew (LBH). The convergence of this linguistic diachronic typology with the diachronic archaeological and historical scholarship of the mid-20th century has resulted in an ubiquitous historical and chronological categorisation of texts in the Hebrew Bible which continues to pervade much of the literary and historical assumptions of biblical scholarship today.

The purpose of the thesis is to establish and test an alternative framework for the examination of historical, chronological and literary implications of Hebrew lexemes attested in the MT (Masoretic Text). I will propose that discrete lexical bodies, such as the military terminology that I will examine, may provide implicit information which reflects the historical, chronological and literary background of the text. I reject the common diachronic typologies, which, although laudable in their objective claims, I consider to be methodologically unsound and unusable for the historical, chronological or literary investigation of the texts.

The thesis will: (a) dispute the methodological basis of the diachronic typologies, (b) justify an alternative framework for extracting historical, chronological and literary implications from the linguistic evidence contained in the MT and (c) apply this alternative framework to three passages with disputed historical, chronological and literary backgrounds in biblical scholarship: Exodus 15, Judges 5, 1 Samuel 17.

Part I of the thesis will contain an extended critique of current diachronic methodology in Biblical Studies. The length of this critique is necessitated by the need to provide a thorough analysis of its weaknesses before undertaking the lexical studies of military terminology, where many recurrent issues dealt with in this critique would otherwise surface and result in redundancy. The length and attention given to the critique should not give the impression that the chronological implications of the linguistic evidence are being given priority over the literary or historical dimensions. This methodological critique is also a necessary basis for the establishment of an alternative framework which comprises the balance of Part I. The application of this framework to Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17, and the final conclusion will form the main sections of Part II.

The critique of current diachronic typologies in Part I will begin with a brief historical overview of linguistic scholarship in biblical studies followed by an introduction to the current scholarship on linguistic analysis of Biblical Hebrew and its historical and chronological conclusions. The diachronic methodology, as popularised by Avi Hurvitz, will be introduced along with the basic critiques of this position and its main typological categories.

Following this outline of current methodology the thesis will examine the fundamental presumptions and framework of the diachronic typologies, both as a critique of the diachronic methodology and as an attempt to identify theoretical points on which to build the following alternative framework. The diachronic methodology will be criticised in two main areas: the creation of typologies (lexicographical or syntactical priority, scarcity of linguistic data, redactional ambiguity) and the interpretation of typologies (linguistic imitation, alternative factors of variation, linguistic change and diffusion).

The final section of this critique will examine the primary sources for establishing external chronological hooks into the biblical texts. These external sources of data include the re-

relationship of inscriptions and Biblical Hebrew and the influence of foreign languages (Persian, Aramaic, Ugaritic).

The thesis will then move to the theoretical discussion of establishing an alternative framework to the diachronic typologies which addresses the weakness of that methodology while continuing to utilise the linguistic data available in the biblical texts. The discussion will open by reviewing the major problems with the diachronic typologies and question whether any chronological or historical information can be established using linguistic data.

A proposal for an alternative methodology will then be outlined, beginning with the methodological presumptions and a defence of using specific lexicographic data particularly in terms of its theoretical relationship to history. The closing section on the proposed methodology will explain the selection of military lexemes as a relevant lexical body, the selection of texts for study, and the practical framework to be used for lexical examination.

Part II of the thesis will apply this proposed methodology to the selected texts of Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17. The military lexemes of each of these passages will be examined according to the practical framework proposed in the preceding Part I, namely five areas: (a) function, cognates and loanwords, (b) patterns of distribution and usage, (c) lexical replacement or semantic shift, (d) literary context and genre and (e) historical and chronological implications. Each passage will be examined in an individual chapter comprised of an introductory section concerning the historical, literary, linguistic and chronological background to the text, the lexical examination of the military vocabulary and finally a review of the military lexemes and historical, literary and chronological trends.

The closing section of Part II will contain the thesis conclusion which will discuss any larger historical, chronological or literary themes which emerge from the application of the proposed methodology against the military lexemes contained within the selected texts.

I. A critique of current diachronic models and the creation of an alternative linguistic methodology

1. The development of linguistic methodologies in Biblical Studies

(i) A brief historical overview of methodological development

The interest in an historical-comparative approach to linguistics and the ensuing development of a typological and diachronic linguistic theory, particularly in the field of Biblical studies, is a relatively recent phenomenon.¹ Within the larger context of the development of academic Biblical studies this is probably less of a unique trend; many of the same principles which gave birth to the historical-comparative and diachronic approach in Hebrew linguistics parallel the wider development of borrowed social-scientific and other academic methodology in literary critical, source critical, form critical and all the other elements which have comprised Biblical studies in the recent past.²

In the longer history of Biblical and Semitic studies linguistic theory has only recently made an impact on studying the Hebrew of the Biblical texts. In the Middle Ages and earlier there was an interest in philological studies, mainly in the form of comparison with Arabic and Aramaic texts to expand the understanding of the Hebrew lexicon.³ Although this indicates an

-
1. M.F. Rooker provides a brief history of the diachronic study of Hebrew in: Mark F Rooker, "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 199-214. This is republished as the second chapter in: Mark F Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 90 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1990), 23-33.
 2. The social discordance caused by the rise of critical methodologies can be seen in the extensive preface by S.R. Driver in: S. R Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891). Much of the preface is devoted to an explanation of why a critical methodology does not have to threaten the traditional faith of Christians. The vocabulary of the opposing groups is split between the 'critics' and the 'traditional side' or 'conservative'. The same traditional opposition to critical textual methodology was the same impediment to the study of Hebrew as a language in transition and changed by surrounding linguistic influences.
 3. J. H. Hospers, "A Hundred Years of Semitic Comparative Linguistics," *Studia Biblica Et Semitica: Theodor Christiano Vriezen* (Wageningen: 1956), 141. James Barr, "Linguistic Literature, Hebrew," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 16 (1971): 1352-1401.

awareness of the relationship between the languages there was no formal theory or development of a framework for understanding this similarity. This philological interest persisted through the 16th and 17th centuries with an interest in cognates and parallels mostly drawn from the known Arabic and Aramaic sources.⁴

M. Rooker considers the lack of a wider historical-comparative development to be due to the common belief that Hebrew was a sacred language, a *Philologia Sacra*, and thus considered to be a monolithic mother language of all languages.⁵ This foundational belief in a static primary tongue negated any possible theories of comparative development or any internal development of Hebrew displayed in the textual evidence.

The study of Hebrew linguistics remained occupied with elucidation until the beginning of the 19th century when Gesenius published his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*.⁶ This is the first indication of a wider interest in the chronological and historical consequences of Hebrew linguistic study.⁷ Around the turn of the 20th century scholars such as D.S.

4. Ibid., 1394. James Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 76. W. Chomsky, "How the Study of Hebrew Grammar Began and Developed," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 35 (1944): 300.

5. Rooker, "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew", 202-203, 205. Cf. Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine; Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.-IV Century C. E. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, vol. 18 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 53. E. Y. Kutscher, "Mishnaic Hebrew," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 16 (1972): 1592.

6. Wilhelm Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift. Eine philologisch-historisch Einleitung in die Sprachlehren und Wörterbücher der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1815).

7. Rooker, "Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel", 27. Martin Ehrensverd, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology*, ed. Ian Young (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 164.

Margoliouth,⁸ Leo Metmann⁹ and S.R. Driver¹⁰ widened the scope of inquiry by developing theories which prised apart the Biblical Hebrew into chronologically distinct layers. Arno Kropat built on these chronological layers with the publication of *Syntax des Autors Chronik*¹¹ in 1909 which analysed the linguistic features of the Chronicler through comparison with the books of Samuel/Kings. Kropat's study was the first to fully exploit chronological conclusions to explain linguistic variation.

The historical-comparative and diachronic approach to Hebrew linguistics received a large influx of data from the discovery of the cuneiform tablets from Ugarit in 1929,¹² and the subsequent discovery and publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls¹³ in 1947 and following. These archaeologically dated texts provided chronological points from which to tie linguistic theories and evidence and yielded large amounts of data for comparative studies.

In the nineteen-seventies two works appeared which established the foundations of the diachronic approach to Hebrew linguistics. R. Polzin published *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward*

-
8. D. Margoliouth, "Language of the Old Testament," in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: 1900).
 9. Leo Metmann, *Die hebräische sprache: ihre Geschichte und lexikalische Entwicklung seit Abschluss des Kanons: Und der grammatischer Bau des Verbuns in der Gegenwart* (Jerusalem: A.M. Luncz, 1904), 5.
 10. Driver, "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament". S. R Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*, Clarendon Press Series (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892). S. R Driver, "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist," *Journal of Philology* 11 (1882): 201-236.
 11. Arno Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen; Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1909).
 12. Mark S. Smith, *A Bibliography of Ugaritic Grammar and Biblical Hebrew Grammar in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, Research Archives, 2004).
 13. For an extensive bibliography refer to: Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990). Florentino García Martínez and Donald W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95: Arranged By Author With Citation and Subject Indexes*, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, vol. 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

*an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*¹⁴ which built on Kropat's study of the Chronicler, and further defined linguistic features which formed a typology to identify the writings of the Chronicler and Late Biblical Hebrew. Hurvitz published *Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms*¹⁵ in 1972. This was the beginning of his extensive research and publications on the typology of Standard Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew and the chronological implications of these typologies.

The study of Hebrew diachronic linguistic theory in the remainder of the 20th century has been dominated by Hurvitz and those who follow his typological chronology.¹⁶ Hurvitz's position has generally not been challenged by those publishing on diachronic linguistics. However, the trend in the latter half of the 20th century towards late dating of the Biblical texts has resulted in Hurvitz's position being strongly threatened on methodological grounds.¹⁷ Although many of the dissenting scholars do not publish directly on linguistic theory, they have questioned the methodological soundness of Hurvitz's approach and whether the framework can provide objective chronological conclusions.¹⁸

-
14. Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Missoula, Mont: Published by Scholars Press for the Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976).
 15. Avi Hurvitz, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972).
 16. For a bibliography of Hurvitz see the extensive list of publications in: Ian Young, *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 338-340. It should also be noted that M. Rooker and R. L. Bergey completed their dissertation work under Hurvitz.
 17. E. A. Knauf, "War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?," *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 3 (1990): 11-23. F. H. Cryer, "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel," in *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period*, ed. K. Jeppesen, K. Nielsen, and B. Rosendal (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994). Philip R Davies, "In Search of 'Ancient Israel'," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 148 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 102-105. V. DeCaen, "Hebrew Linguistics and Biblical Criticism: A Minimalist Approach," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3 (2001): article 6. J. F. Elwolde, "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held At Leiden University*, ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde (Leiden: Brill, 1997). See also the following discussion on 'revisionists' and late dating.
 18. Philip R. Davies, "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and

(ii) Current scholarly debate over linguistic typologies

The current discussion in dating has been brought to a head by the objective claims of diachronic linguistic analysis as typified and popularised by Hurvitz. The chronological results of this methodology have been amplified by their discordance with the move towards late dating by revisionist scholars.¹⁹ The discussion is divided into several fronts: accuracy and provision of linguistic data; alternate typologies and accuracy of existing typologies; methodological questions and chronological ramifications of the typologies.

Discussion concerning the accuracy of diachronic typologies is primarily limited to those who agree with a form of diachronic methodology. Their work is concerned with further expanding theories and linguistic data. Notable examples include G. Rendsburg's continuing work on Israelian²⁰ or Northern Hebrew dialect markers and F. Polak's linguistic analysis of oral and written prose. R. Rezetko provides a criticism of the diachronic methodology on the basis of linguistic data, working within the framework to analyse the accuracy of linguistic data used to construct typologies.²¹ The diachronic typologies, as well as the works of Hill and Rooker, have also been criticised by M. Ehrensverd. He considers the typological similarity of SBH to be closer to the linguistic profile of Haggai, Zechariah and other post-exilic prophetic works than

Common Sense," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003).

19. This same type of conflation can be seen in archaeology with the disputes which have grown out of re-dating theories. In some ways the division is humorously between those who hold to a traditional dating through new methods (i.e. Hurvitz) and those who propose a revisionist dating through traditional methods (i.e. Davies).
20. *Israelian* is Rendsburg's term for 'members of the kingdom of Israel'. Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux," 105.
21. Robert Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 218-220. Rezetko provides examples of widely varying dating in biblical chronology (i.e. method is fundamentally flawed if results are so wildly variant).

pre-exilic inscriptions, and thus, according to chronology, the SBH typology should be placed within the post-exilic period.²²

(1) The increasing scholarly criticism of diachronic methodology

The methodological integrity of the diachronic method for dating Hebrew texts, particularly that as exemplified by Hurvitz's work, has been criticised steadily by scholars. As noted previously the discussion has unfortunately been conflated with the revisionist positions regarding the history of ancient Israel. Although relevant, this has imbued any dialogue with other supposed implications and bias.

The methodological presumptions of Hurvitz's position have been criticised indirectly and directly by P.R. Davies.²³ He argues that in order to establish a typological chronology two essential elements are needed: first, a body of independently dated samples of Biblical Hebrew must exist and second, Biblical Hebrew must represent a single linguistic tradition.²⁴ In regards to Hurvitz's specific diachronic methodology, Davies identifies four basic assumptions necessary to the methodology: (a) that a single homogeneous Hebrew existed at any one time, (b) that a typology (in this case SBH/LBH) couldn't be reproduced at another chronological point, (c) that the influence of Aramaic produced a sudden change in Biblical Hebrew, and lastly, (d) that there is no distinction between written and spoken language.²⁵ These presumptions

22. Ehrensward, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 175, 187. Ehrensward also quotes from Hurvitz and Rabin saying it shows CBH. He uses his analysis of SBH in these books to demonstrate that current typologies are a better match than pre-exilic inscriptions and therefore we should date all SBH to post-exilic. See overview and bibliography in: Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period : Belief and Practice From the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 15-19.

23. Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 102-105.

24. *Ibid.*, 151.

25. *Ibid.*, 154.

are each criticised by Davies: (a) evidence from Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran show different forms of Hebrew produced at the same chronological point which indicates there is no uniformity of Hebrew usage; (b) there is no method for spotting accurate reproduction without external dating—typologies are particularly useless as by definition they map similarity—and that CBH in Haggai shows other typologies could be reproduced; (c) a sudden change in Judaeian Hebrew due to Aramaic assumes linguistic uniformity; (d) the question should be whether CBH could have survived as a written language in the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

The broadest criticism of Hurvitz's diachronic methodology is the linguistic-literary circularity engaged in by its presumptions and conclusions.²⁶ R. Rezetko, for example, agrees that linguistic arguments and data should be given priority in dating biblical texts, however, the current methodology is too circular to result in the objective conclusions it claims.

I agree with Hurvitz that language should be given primary consideration for the dating of biblical texts, but I do not share his confidence that the dating enterprise has in fact been carried out effectively on this basis owing to literary-linguistic circularity. Hurvitz correctly asserts that certain books of the Bible were written during the (exilic or) post-exilic period (e.g. Chronicles), but he *assumes* that others *were not* written then (e.g. Samuel). Or to rephrase this, he correctly asserts that certain books of the Bible are "non-chronologically problematic texts" (e.g. Chronicles *is not* pre-exilic), but he *assumes* as well that other books *are also* "non-chronologically problematic texts" (e.g. Samuel *is* pre-exilic).²⁷

This circularity in dating between texts which are presumed to be pre-exilic or post-exilic results in a typology which obviously supports the presumption; if a typology is constructed

26. A. Graeme Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 9-10. J. Blenkinsopp, "An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 509-510. Cryer, "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel," 198. Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 101. A. J. C. Verheij, *Verbs and Numbers: A Study of the Frequencies of the Hebrew Verbal Tense Forms in the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 5-6. J. Wesselius, "The Language of the Hebrew Bible Contrasted With the Language of the Ben Sira Manuscripts and of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held At Leiden University*, ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 341.

27. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 240.

from a relative body of evidence and applied back onto that body it will logically support the initial evidence. External data and controls, either data from theoretical linguistics that universally evidence language development or external chronological data contained within the textual data itself is necessary to escape the circularity that will otherwise result from a closed data pool.

(2) A negligible difference between current diachronic typologies

The diachronic method, although new in its claims of objectivity, is also largely dependent on the classic bipartite or tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew into Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). The tripartite division is generally attributed to Kutscher²⁸ however, as early as the 19th century Gesenius had divided Biblical Hebrew into an earlier pre-exilic form and a later post-exilic one. This typology underpins most chronological discussion, and even scholars such as P.R. Davies acknowledge the dual typologies.²⁹

This division of Biblical Hebrew is increasingly questioned, both in terms of whether the typologies are accurate but also whether they should be interpreted in terms of chronology. The bipartite division requires a presumption of a continuous homogeneous language which underwent a rapid transition period into a distinguishable form.

The difference between SBH and LBH is admittedly slight—Gesenius first acknowledged, "the language (to judge from its consonantal formation) remains...apart from slight

28. Edward Yechezkel Kutscher and Raphael Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1982), 12.

29. Davies, "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense," 152.

changes in form and differences of style...at about the same stage of development."³⁰ and Ehrensward remarks in 2003, ""What we have, then, are two types of BH, very similar but not indistinguishable. One represents a typologically earlier stage of the language than the other. As for syntax, we do not find significant traits that are found exclusively in one group—the differences are differences in frequency."³¹—and the point of transition happens to be the exile, it may be that the division of Biblical Hebrew, to pre-exilic and post-exilic chronological typologies, is a conclusion borne of convenience rather than evidence. As remarked by Rezetko the linguistic-literary circularity produces results borne from its own presumptions and the chronological partition point of the exile may be a parallel phenomenon of literary-historical presumptions feeding into and back from the linguistic typologies.³² Ehrensward writes, "A further conclusion to be drawn from this study regards the choice of the exile as the great turning point in the history of the Hebrew language. In light of the evidence presented here, such a choice must from a linguistic viewpoint be said to be an arbitrary one."³³

The chronological division between the SBH and LBH typologies is thus questioned both on the basis of its circularity, its presumptions and the results of the linguistic data. Scholars who accept a bipartite division Biblical Hebrew do not necessarily follow this division to a chronological relationship between the two divisions. J. Naudé writes, "BH reflects sporadic representations of the language, from different places and times, and does not represent a single language which developed over time; BH reflects different dialects that existed together and

30. Wilhelm Gesenius, Emil Roediger, and Benjamin Davies, *Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar* (London: S. Bagster and sons, 1846), 10.

31. Ehrensward, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," 172. 'what we have are not-so-common EBH syntactic traits that (except for narrative weqatal) are more common in LBH (or vice versa).' Cf. Tal Goldfajn, *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*, Oxford Theological Monographs, vol. (Oxford New York: Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1998), 136.

32. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles".

33. Ehrensward, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," 188.

fought for hegemony. In the First Temple period the dialect in Jerusalem prevailed. BH thus does not represent a rectilinear historical development."³⁴ Ehrensward also argues there is not necessarily a chronological development between the linguistic layers of Biblical Hebrew,³⁵ while Rezetko considers any linguistic difference to be due to non-chronological factors of "dialect, diglossia, and editorial and scribal activity".³⁶ Following a study of vocabulary in the Hebrew Bible and Mishnah, J. Elwolde damningly states that the LBH typology is either "innocuous" if a terminological convenience, "innocuous and trivial" if representing the three percent lexical variation, or, simply "unsound" if representing a discrete diachronic phase.³⁷

Young follows this reasoning to its conclusion, "If SBH could be used after the exile, and LBH before the exile, is it at all possible, given the current state of our knowledge of ancient Hebrew, to date the language of any part of biblical literature?".³⁸ If there is a bipartite division of Biblical Hebrew, and if it is not attributed to chronological factors, then the discussion must question whether it is possible to use linguistic typologies in any evaluation of biblical dating. If it is possible to establish linguistic typologies, then what challenges confront these typologies and how can they be addressed and controlled.

34. J. Naudé, "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 206.

35. Martin Ehrensward, *Studies in the Syntax and the Dating of Biblical Hebrew* (University of Aarhus, 2000), 59-68.

36. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 222.

37. Elwolde, "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah," 51-52.

38. Young, "Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology", 313.

2. Confronting challenges in creating and interpreting linguistic typologies

The central issue arising out of this review of the current discussion on diachronic typologies is the conflation between typology and chronology. The linguistic accuracy of the ABH/SBH/LBH distinctions is not as problematic as the assumption that this represents chronological change. However, the core of the diachronic methodology, as well as any wider linguistic analysis of Biblical Hebrew, is in establishing discrete linguistic typologies. As an understanding of typology is fundamental to the lexical analysis of the thesis, the following two sections will discuss the methodology behind the creation of linguistic typologies and the interpretation of these typologies, with a view towards understanding the weaknesses and limitations of any intra-textual linguistic typology.

(a) Three major difficulties with creating linguistic typologies

(i) The priority of lexicographical or morpho-syntactical evidence

The primary consideration when constructing a purely linguistic typology is the data considered relevant for the typology and the measure of difference. Modern linguistic theory does not offer any broadly accepted empirical method for identifying universal traits of linguistic development. Theories, such as the simplification of language, have been shown to be grossly simplistic and not reflective of the widely disparate development paths observed in language.³⁹ Simply put, there is no way to observe a universal chronological linguistic indicator, language does not follow a predictable linear path. The method for determining diachronic typologies is to evaluate a large enough pool of linguistic data which is already chronologically

39. Edward Sapir, *Language, an Introduction to the Study of Speech* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and company, 1921), 183. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 245. David Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 83, 95.

dated—if enough chronological data is already present in this pool, then unknown data, which fits this established typology, can be chronologically positioned.

The data relevant for constructing a diachronic typology is generally considered to be syntactical with a lesser consideration for lexicographical change.⁴⁰ This is the position of general linguistic theorists⁴¹ and is also recognised occasionally within biblical studies.⁴² R. Polzin draws this conclusion out of his morpho-syntactical study of transitional Biblical Hebrew, "What the following study shows is that style and vocabulary (lexicographic analysis) is almost useless in establishing the chronological status of P."⁴³ However, despite the requests of several scholars, syntactical diachronic analysis is often ignored in favour of lexicographical.⁴⁴

Within the Biblical Hebrew found in the Masoretic text there is little syntactical variation, which makes a syntactical typology difficult to construct. M. Ehrensvärd examined the syntactical typologies constructed to support the SBH/LBH division and found only two examples of syntactic traits claimed to be characteristic of one group and not found at all in the other.⁴⁵ The linguistic data compiled from the verbal syntax across SBH and LBH is similar and

40. Syntactical: meaning the development in morphology and syntax, or grammar, of the language. Lexicographical: meaning development in the lexemes or vocabulary of the language.

41. Jean Aitchison, *Language Change: Progress Or Decay*, Cambridge Approaches to Linguistics, vol. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 16. Anthony Arlotto, *Introduction to Historical Linguistics* (Washington, D.C: University Press of America, 1981), 184. N. V. Smith and Deirdre Wilson, *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979), 209. Theodora Bynon, *Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 216. Crystal, "The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language", 330. R. L. Trask, *Language Change*, Language Workbooks, vol. (London: Routledge, 1994), 72; R. L. Trask, *Historical Linguistics* (London: Arnold Distributed in the USA by St. Martin's Press, 1996), 17, 309.

42. Exceptions include Hurvitz who uses primarily lexicographical and Polak who does stylistic analysis, i.e. "style is more than the writer".

43. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 16.

44. See bibliography in Note 88 in: Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 245.

45. Ehrensvärd, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," 167.

generally is only a difference of frequency; the nominal syntax also shows only a few differences.⁴⁶ Although it appears that there is little syntactical variation within Biblical Hebrew this may be the result of much study focussing on lexicographical variation rather than syntactical.⁴⁷

Therefore, the creation of a diachronic typology should rely on syntactical linguistic data rather than simply lexicographical data. However, while this conclusion may be accurate for the development of a theoretical diachronic typology, it does not necessarily apply to other typologies. The lexicographical data changes more rapidly, is borrowed more often, and is generally the most unstable part of any language.⁴⁸ This instability in the lexicographical information may, in fact, be a better indication of style, authorship and foreign influence than the morpho-syntactical data. It may be more difficult for an author or community to develop an individually discrete syntax, thus, the lexicographical layer may unconsciously betray individual or community lexical preferences as well as provide evidence of contemporary borrowing within a small frame of time. There is a stability in grammar, yet a flexibility in the lexicon, which allows for brief chronological windows and localised variation.

The instability of the lexical body as compared to the morpho-syntactical layer thus provides a better reflection of outside influence and individual authorship due to the very instability that makes it a poor choice for larger linguistic diachronic typologies. Among the lexical body, common nouns are the most frequently borrowed class of words, they move freely from one

46. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 222. Even Rendsburg rejects fifteen of Polzin's nineteen features as indications of LBH. Gary Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003).

47. Hurvitz for example: Avi Hurvitz, "The Chronological Significance of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew," *Israel Exploration Journal* 18 (1968): 230-240. Rooker defends lexicographical method in: Rooker, "Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel", 58-59.

48. Aitchison, *Language Change: Progress Or Decay*, 16. Arlotto, *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*, 184.

language or grammar to another with little affect on the grammar or syntax of the borrowing language.⁴⁹

(ii) Scarcity of linguistic data for Biblical Hebrew

The difficulty of creating a linguistic typology is further complicated as the body of Biblical Hebrew data from which it must draw is resoundingly small.⁵⁰ The lexemes of Biblical Hebrew are limited to around 8000⁵¹ which has caused some scholars to dispute the status of Biblical Hebrew as a language or consider it fragmentary at most.

Although earlier scholars raised the problem of the fragmentary nature of Biblical Hebrew,⁵² E. Ullendorff popularised the extreme conclusion that Biblical Hebrew is no more than a linguistic fragment, an important and extensive but not a fully developed and integrated spoken language.⁵³ The fragmentary nature of Biblical Hebrew has been addressed also by E.A. Knauf who labelled it as an artificial *Bildungssprache* composed of several non-standard dialects.⁵⁴ In

49. Ibid., 187, 187, 193. E. Haugen, "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," *Language* 26 (1972): 210-231. Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), ch 25-27 Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974).

50. For the purposes of this thesis we will consider the body of Biblical Hebrew literature to be contained by the Hebrew Bible and not extend the definition to 'Classical' Hebrew (as proposed by Elwolde, "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah," 17-55.) which may include the Hebrew Bible, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew epigraphic material and Sirach.

51. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 1447. For comparison an adult speaker is said to use 20,000 to 30,000 words or more if the speaker is educated. Also for comparison, Milton is said to use 8000 words in his poems which is comparable to attestations of Biblical Hebrew. Bloomfield, "Language", 277.

52. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, 224-227. Charles Fox Burney, *The Book of Judges, With Introduction and Notes, and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, With an Introduction and Appendix*, *The Library of Biblical Studies*, vol. (New York: KTAV Pub. House, 1970), 171.

53. Edward Ullendorff, "Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?," in *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language? Studies in Semitic Languages and Civilizations*, ed. Edward Ullendorff (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977).

54. Knauf, "War 'Biblich-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?".

his study, he contrasted the epigraphic material with the Biblical Hebrew, illustrating the difference and the fragmentary relationship and concluding that Biblical Hebrew is not a "linguistic slice" of a contemporary living language but merely the language of an exilic/post-exilic literary corpus. A recent continuation of this research has been R. North who designates Biblical Hebrew as a "cultic Esperanto", and argues that most exegetes hold the view that only in the era of Ezra was the Pentateuch through Kings formed.⁵⁵ M. Eskhult opposes this movement arguing that although the word stock preserved is not large enough to represent a living language its "fragmentary character *per se* does not mean that it is unlikely to represent the living language of Israelite society."⁵⁶

The question of whether Biblical Hebrew represents a living language is important to developing a diachronic theory, as if the language preserved in the texts is not representative of a language which is developing chronologically, the typologies it produces will not be reflective of any larger chronology. However, in simple terms of producing data for a typology the incredibly small sample size means that any typology may be accurate within the confines it creates because there is no greater data to provide a check and balance.

The current division of SBH and LBH provides a disturbing example of how little data is used to create a typology which is supposed to be representative of large chronological shifts within Biblical Hebrew. The commonly accepted view is that the post-exilic corpus is comprised of Jonah, Haggai-Malachi, Ruth-Qoheleth and Esther-Chronicles,⁵⁷ yet these books statistically make up less than one-fifth of the entire Biblical Hebrew corpus. Within this LBH division, Chronicles alone provides nearly one-half of the bulk. If one considers the possibility the

55. R. North, "Could Hebrew have been a Cultic Esperanto?," *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 12 (1999): 202-217.

56. Young, *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, 9.

57. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 244.

Chronicler was a single school, or even single scribe, nearly the majority of what is called LBH could be no more than localised idiosyncrasies.

The limitations of the available data mean that any typology must stand tentatively under the large possibility of unknown contradicting evidence. This seems an obvious truism for all theories, however, when the data set is of such an extreme limitation it must be carefully considered, particularly when arguments of occurrence and non-occurrence are used as evidence of linguistic typology.⁵⁸ The typologies of Biblical Hebrew are built on a limited amount of attestation, rather than extensively documented evidence, and any typological conclusions and arguments must be tempered by the seriously limited nature of these attestations.

(iii) Problems of redaction and text-history

The limited amount of Biblical Hebrew attestations combined with the lack of an externally datable textual history means the reliability of the available literary body is further undermined due to its probable, yet ultimately unverifiable, redaction history.⁵⁹ The scholarship of the 19th and 20th century has been obsessed with untangling the threads of redaction through various literary-critical and text-critical methods, however, most typologies of Biblical Hebrew rely on the final form Masoretic text.

58. Prior to discover of DSS it was commonly accepted that Hebrew was a non-living language that only educated classes knew through study. E. Goodspeed, "The Original Language of the Gospels," in *Contemporary Thinking About Jesus*, ed. T. S. Kepler (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1944), 59.

59. For reference to redaction history and relationship of writer/scribe/copyist/text: Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press Van Gorcum, 1992). E. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible," in *Sha'arei Talmon : Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon, Michael A. Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992). M. O. Wise, "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls From Qumran," in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, ed. T. Muraoka (Louvain: Peeters, 1992).

The deep history of the Masoretic text is obscure and objectively determining its redaction layers is impossible without more data. I. Young states that orthography indicates no MT text was final form earlier than the Persian period⁶⁰ which, if accurate, would mean that any linguistic typology must consider that the characteristics displayed are not necessarily any earlier than this period. This corruption of primary data provides the crux of the dilemma for any linguistic typology drawn primarily from Biblical Hebrew as found in the Masoretic text—without any external controls on this variable it is impossible to accurately qualify any typology arising from the data. The layers of redaction in a text could be untangled through the use of a linguistic typology, however, this typology must come from external sources which are historically dated and then applied against the problematic text. The creation of typology from a chronologically confused source cannot provide primary data for a typology to apply back against that text.⁶¹

The problem is further complicated as texts are not necessarily equivalent to the spoken language contemporary to the development of those texts.⁶² Even if redactional integrity is assumed the original text is not necessarily reflective of the contemporary language used by the author.⁶³ The assumption is critical to applying any linguistic typology to a chronological framework; if the written language does not reflect the contemporary spoken language then its

60. Ian Young, "Notes on the Language of 4qcantb," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52 (2001): 130.

61. This problem of circularity is only intensified when presumptions enter the text at the point of assembling data for even informal linguistic typologies. See S.R. Driver's comment on Deut 33.2 'But *לֹא* 'law' is a Persian word...it is next to impossible that it can have been used in Heb[rew] when this Blessing was written.' S. R Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), 393.

62. As I. Young notes this is a text-critical assumption, 'The attempt to date books on the basis of their language proceeds, whether knowingly or not, from a text-critical assumption. This is that the language of the text under consideration has a relationship with the language used at the time of the composition of that text.' Young, *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, 312.

63. Whatever that author may have spoken! This doesn't even take into account linguistic diversity and dialectal variety which is discussed in a following section.

chronological consequences are reduced markedly from providing a proof of composition date to providing a *terminus a quo*.⁶⁴

(b) Three major difficulties with typological interpretation

As discussed, the creation of linguistic typologies based on the MT evidence is problematic and does not necessarily represent full evidence of Hebrew linguistic development. Any typology which is relying on intra-textual comparison is going to be severely limited in its objectivity due to the sparse amount of data, the rarity of morpho-syntactical comparison texts, and the complicated textual history of the MT.

The second problematic area of linguistic typologies is how these typologies are interpreted. The prior review of current discussion on diachronic methodology stated that the diachronic typologies conflate typology with chronology. This conflation is an interpretation of linguistic typologies and there may be alternate interpretations which explain the same typological phenomenon. The following section will review three problematic areas for the interpretation of linguistic typology, particularly in light of the diachronic explanation.

(i) Linguistic typologies do not have a *terminus ad quem*

The difficulty in establishing a composition date based on a linguistic typology is that this interpretation requires that each typology exists in a chronologically distinct layer and that this typology is fully and universally replaced by its successor. Using the example of the SBH and LBH typologies, this would require that the SBH tradition was fully eclipsed by the LBH

64. This is why in some ways it is always going to be easier to late date texts with academic integrity as opposed to proving an early date which contradicts the chronological *terminus a quo*. Of course the standard critical response is to appeal to the redaction history of the text which, however, diminishes any objective chronology of the text. The evidence for literary languages outliving common spoken usage is extensive both in the ancient world (Sumerian, Akkadian) and medieval (Greek, Latin) and modern (Classic Arabic).

tradition without exception.⁶⁵ In this case, post-exilic or LBH scribes did not, or could not, write SBH.

The question of whether scribes *did not* continue writing SBH, or *could not* write SBH, is an important point. If the scribes could not, and were thus attempting to imitate SBH with LBH, the SBH typology would achieve some chronological integrity, as the inability of post-exilic scribes to write SBH provides a *terminus ad quem* for SBH in the exilic period. If LBH scribes were innovators rather than imitators and building on the SBH tradition, then it leaves the possibility that they also wrote in SBH which is indistinguishable from the standard SBH corpus. This continuance eliminates any SBH *terminus ad quem*, leaving the possibility of late dating any SBH text.

The diachronic interpretation of the typologies thus relies on the inability of post-exilic scribes to replicate an earlier typology. F. Polak disagrees with the theory of replication, stating that the replication of SBH would require an intense familiarity with a large corpus of SBH thus implicitly necessitating the existence of this large body.⁶⁶ Hurvitz also vehemently denies the possibility of replication of earlier typologies, writing, "it would be a gross error to assume that the post-exilic authors, whose writing habits are openly recorded in the LBH corpus, were able to accurately reproduce the outdated style of classical/Standard BH without slips betraying their own linguistic background".⁶⁷ Other scholars have studied the linguistic profile of LBH to

65. This necessity of abrupt and total replacement is part of the motivation for assigning a transition period in the exile as it provides a rough rationale for why the pre-exilic linguistic tradition altered so drastically and utterly.

66. Frank Polak, "Style is More Than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture, and the Distinction Between Written and Oral Narrative," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 99-100. Admittedly not a straight-forward statement as this takes the form of a Socratic dialogue between Philo, Craylus and Hermogenes.

67. Avi Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," in *Congress Volume, Oslo 1998*, ed. A. Lemaire and M. Saebø (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), 154.

demonstrate it displays a deteriorating form of SBH, indicating that later scribes were unable to replicate this earlier form.⁶⁸

The standard response to these arguments is to demonstrate that there is sufficient evidence from external evidence, namely linguistic development of other languages, which indicates that earlier typologies can, not only be reproduced by later authors, but also that chronologically earlier typologies can co-exist along with chronologically later typologies.⁶⁹ The example of modern Arabic authors who wrote in pure classical Arabic is often given.⁷⁰ This is also paralleled in the ancient Near East where scribes used Sumerian as a literary and scribal language long after it ceased to be commonly spoken.⁷¹

-
68. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 74. Chaim Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century," in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, ed. Shemuel Safrai and M Stern, *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum*. V. 1 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 1014. Avi Hurvitz, "Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew—The Case of 'Semantic Change' in Post-Exilic Writings," in *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics*, ed. T. Muraoka (Leuven: Peeters, 1995). Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," 154-157. J. Naveh and J. C. Greenfield, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D Davies, Louis Finkelstein, William Horbury, John Sturdy, and Steven T Katz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 120-121.
69. Also, P.R. Davies points out the logical fallacy in identifying whether an author can replicate an earlier typology using the typological evidence of that text. 'It is sometimes claimed that scribes of a "post-classical" period attempting to reproduce "classical" Hebrew give themselves away by making errors. but such a claim cannot be proven, since if any scribes were successful in avoiding errors, how would we know? And if they knew the language well enough not to make errors, can we say that the language was already dead, or that the scribe was writing in a "post-classical" age?' Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 104.
70. Blau gives an example of Arabic authors who wrote in late period in pure classical style. J. Blau, "The Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew in Light of Arabic Diglossia and Middle Arabic," *Leshonenu* 60 (1997): 28.
71. Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (Bethesda, Md: CDL Press, 1993). W. G. Lambert, "Literary Style in First Millennium Mesopotamia," in *Essays in Memory of E.A. Speiser*, ed. E. Bender (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1968). Oppenheim describes the discrepancy between spoken language and literary language in all phases of Mesopotamian history. Also he remarks, 'the intelligentsia, on the other hand, also shunned Aramaic words, having created for themselves the image of a direct continuation of the native civilization'. A. Leo Oppenheim, *Letters From Mesopotamia: Official Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets From Two Millennia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 48.

There is also evidence within the Biblical Hebrew corpus that SBH was replicated by post-exilic scribes. As noted by Ehrensverd, "some prophetic books show that both semi-poetic and narrative EBH was in use after the exile. Hence, at least some post-exilic writers knew how to write EBH".⁷² The replication of SBH by post-exilic authors is disputed on the grounds that it only occurs in this prophetic literature and thus is an imitation of genre, however, this still endows the post-exilic author with the ability to compose literature within the structures of an earlier linguistic typology.

The evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran also shows that it was possible for many linguistic typologies to exist, and even more importantly to be produced, within the same chronological period.⁷³ The question of how Qumran Hebrew fits into a diachronic framework is debated, however, whatever its linguistic profile, it is important that Qumran provides evidence of various linguistic typologies produced, edited and collected co-currently.

The conflation of typology and chronology is not a necessary interpretation of typologies and further this confuses any texts which display a transition between typologies. Ezekiel and the prophetic layer has been considered to be transitional texts between SBH and LBH,⁷⁴ however, this transition should primarily be understood to be a typological transition, and not necessarily a chronological transition. In these cases, the interpretation of the linguistic typology must be independent of the typology itself.⁷⁵ In a chronological framework there is no reason

72. Ehrensverd, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," 166. Also, "In sum, at least some post-exilic writers knew how to write just as good EBH as that of Genesis-2 Kings. And it is important to note that these post-exilic prophetic texts only partly consist of the semi-poetic, oracular prose. As is usual in prophetic books, parts of the texts are common narrative." Ibid., 185.

73. "Among the Dead Sea Scrolls are roughly contemporary kinds of Hebrew which are typologically quite different; we have a Hebrew that is close to 'classical' (CD), an apparently living dialect (that of IQS), and also what is sometimes called 'Tannaitic Hebrew' (4QMMT; the Copper Scroll also contains terms otherwise known only from Tannaitic)." Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 103.

74. Rooker, "Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel".

75. Davies, "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common

that various linguistic typologies, even with diachronic attributes, cannot exist together and be employed in the same chronological period.⁷⁶ The establishment of discrete chronological frameworks cannot be drawn from a typology unless there are external chronological indications to which typologies can be mapped. Even in this case the possibility exists that a later period is replicating the typology of an earlier period.

(ii) Dialect and diglossia: Two alternative causes of linguistic variation

As argued by Davies⁷⁷ the conflation of typology and chronology relies on the data of a single monolithic tradition.⁷⁸ The primary difficulty with this reliance is that language is in constant flux even within communities. The ambiguities of this flux are further amplified as the MT provides the only major attestation of Biblical Hebrew, leaving little recourse to controlling variables such as diglossia or dialectal variations. As noted, a typology may be an accurate reflection of data however the interpretation of this typology does not have to be chronological,⁷⁹ particularly when the variations of diglossia and dialect are evident in most languages as common causes of typological variation. The examination of dialectal diversity in the biblical text

Sense," 159.

76. Ian Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 278.

77. Davies, "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense," 151.. Cf: Gary Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2002). Y. J. Yoo, "Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Hosea" (Cornell University, 1999).

78. Or the ability to identify discrete layers of the text which correspond to monolithic traditions.

79. Rezetko notes, 'The study of the language of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles should make more space for the socio-linguistic factors of dialect and diglossia, both of which at times have proven to account for linguistic diversity more adequately than does the notion of chronological stratification' Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 241.

has been explored by several scholars as an interpretation of lexical variation,⁸⁰ but not always as a counterpoint to a chronological interpretation.⁸¹

G. Rendsburg has written prolifically on the subject of dialect in Biblical Hebrew in an attempt to clearly delineate a Northern or Israelian Hebrew typology and a methodology for identifying these features in other texts.⁸² Unfortunately, an attempt to extract a typology of dialect from the Biblical text encounters the same problems of circularity as those of a typological chronology, mainly that an attempt to identify northern dialect features relies on presuming certain texts are already known to be northern. Naudé further criticises the efforts to methodologically extract dialect from texts stating, "Although Rendsburg's view is correct in the sense of allowing two grammars to exist side by side, his view excludes the possibility of more than two grammars and complicates the explanation of inter-relation between innovation and diffusion in QH."⁸³ Young cautions against the attempt to construct dialectal typologies (including his own) within the context of extra-biblical inscriptions, noting that of the few distinctive northern forms evidenced in inscriptions none of these appear in the biblical texts. Even traditionally

80. Gary Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1990). Knauf, "War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?". Ian Young, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*, *Forschungen zum alten Testament* 5 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993).

81. R. Wright even uses the northern dialectal variation as explanation for some apparently LBH features in SBH texts. Richard M. Wright, "Further Evidence for North Israelite Contributions to Late Biblical Hebrew," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003).

82. Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology," Rendsburg, "Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings". Rendsburg, "Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms". Rendsburg wasn't the first to explore the northern dialect, cf. Cyrus H. Gordon, "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew," *Israel Exploration Journal* 5 (1955): 85-88.

83. Naudé, "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion," 207.

northern texts like Hosea do not attest these extra-biblical dialect markers, indicating that they may have undergone heavy editing.⁸⁴

Although the effort to distinguish specific dialectal markers is fraught with methodological difficulties, it demonstrates that dialectal variation destabilises the monolithic linguistic tradition of the MT.⁸⁵ In many cases dialect and diglossia provide a better interpretation of linguistic features than a diachronic explanation.⁸⁶

(iii) The difference between linguistic change and diffusion

Recently increased discussion on the theory and vocabulary of historical linguistics amongst biblical scholars has helped to further define the frameworks for interpreting typologies and the results of data gleaned from these.⁸⁷ J. Naudé emphasises the difference between diffusion and change in language using developments in historical linguistics⁸⁸ noting that change is the different grammar constructed by each generation, or transmission of grammar,⁸⁹

84. Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," 311.

85. There is not a uniform Hebrew at any one time: J. A. Naudé, "Diachronic Syntax and Language Change: The Case of Qumran Hebrew," *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 18 (2000): 1-14. J. A. Naudé, "Qumran Hebrew Syntax in the Perspective of a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26 (2000): 105-132. Young, "Notes on the Language of 4qcantb".

86. Rezetko looks at 16 features of late BH for which the conventional diachronic explanation is inadequate. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles". He concludes, 'In contrast to the publications just given, I hold the view that many distinctive linguistic features of Chronicles and other "late" BH compositions are stylistic idiosyncrasies devoid of any diachronic value or are explicable by (strictly speaking) non-chronological factors such as dialect, diglossia, and editorial and scribal activity.'

87. Naudé, "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion," 196-197. Qualified by reference to the output of a single individual for the purposes of this paper. The better word is 'grammar' and is the grammar of an individual during their lifetime.

88. Naudé builds on Hale to explain the notion language, change, diffusion. Ibid.

89. According to Naudé, change is the process of passing a grammar from one generation or person to the next. This transmission is imperfect. The construction of a grammar is based on the inputs one receives from many sources. Many speakers have multiple grammars to generate different linguistic styles or registers, idiolects, local dialects and standard speech. Ibid., 198.

and that diffusion is the spread of change from some speakers to others.⁹⁰ The factors which influence language change such as noise in the transmission channel and presentation of data will result in imperfect grammar transmission, however the process of spreading this grammar, diffusion, is generally due to social factors such as socio-economic status, ethnicity, age and gender.⁹¹

The distinction is important for the interpretation of linguistic data, particularly when it is assembled into a diachronic explanation, because the attributive factors for change or diffusion are markedly different.⁹² According to this distinction, factors used as data for historical linguistics in diachronic explanations may be better suited to socio-linguistics. For example, Naudé reviews the arguments of Aramaic influence as a cause of linguistic change in Biblical Hebrew, concluding, "Aramaic influence is not a cause of language change...The diffusion of Aramaic loan forms is due to the prestige factor of speaking Aramaic by the educated classes."⁹³

The distinction between change and diffusion demonstrates the impossibility of a monolithic Biblical Hebrew; as change occurs at the level of grammar there is no universal language. Also, typologies cannot be mapped diachronically; diffusion occurs in temporal periods, but not universally. Multiple grammars also co-exist and are used in variable situations or environments. According to this distinction of language diffusion and change, differences in typology

90. 'The notion diffusion refers to the spread (implementation/transmission) of change W from some speakers to others, which naturally, does take time. In the case of change, there has been imperfect transmission of some feature of the grammar.' XYZ = XYW is change compared to XYZ + XYW = XYW which is diffusion. Ibid., 199.

91. Ibid., 199.

92. Ibid., 200.

93. Naudé remarks, 'A strict distinction between change and diffusion allows for a segregation of the properties which must be attributed to two very differently constrained domains, namely, historical linguistics and socio-linguistics respectively.' Ibid., 204.

can only indicate "to what extent a certain language change of a certain EBH/LBH speaker had already become diffused."⁹⁴

(c) Challenges with establishing external linguistic hooks into the MT

The problems of creating linguistic typologies, combined with the problems of interpreting these typologies, has emphasised the importance of a methodology which incorporates extra-textual data. Without external controls the typologies will, logically, validate themselves. This necessity of external data in order to establish extra-textual "hooks" has not been ignored by those who work on diachronic methodologies.⁹⁵ However, it should be emphasised, the need for external chronological controls is not limited to refuting diachronic typologies, it is a necessity for any type of chronological or historical enquiry into the texts.

The primary means by which scholars have attempted to establish extra-textual chronological and historical points in Biblical Hebrew has been through the evidence from extra-biblical inscription and attested influence from other languages. Attestations of influence are generally socio-linguistic arguments which attempt to find linguistic reflections of neighbouring, ruling, or influential cultures in the attested Biblical Hebrew. The following review of this extra-biblical evidence, and cautions regarding its usage, will discuss the relevance of extra-biblical inscriptions and foreign languages, including Persian, Aramaic, and Ugaritic.

94. Ibid., 205.

95. "Non-biblical sources...provide us with the external control required in any attempt to detect and identify diachronic developments within BH." Avi Hurvitz, "The Historical Quest for 'Ancient Israel' and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations," *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 307.

(i) Extra-biblical evidence is a poor control for typologies

The extra-biblical inscriptional evidence is singularly the most important source of external chronological data for Biblical Hebrew.⁹⁶ Unlike the MT, they provide a synchronic fragment of linguistic data within an archaeological context.⁹⁷ The diachronic methodologies rely on establishing a chronological parallel to SBH using the extra-biblical inscriptions as comparative data. Hurvitz comments, "there is a far-reaching linguistic uniformity underlying both the pre-exilic inscriptions and the literary biblical texts written in Classical BH".⁹⁸ He also notes elsewhere, "the linguistic features proper to LBH are not found in the (admittedly rather limited corpus of) pre-exilic inscriptions, but by and large they are prevalent in post-Biblical Hebrew. In the pre-exilic inscriptions...there are found, on the contrary, distinctive features indicative of SBH."⁹⁹

96. Biblical Hebrew in this context perhaps more appropriately termed 'Ancient Hebrew' or part of that body of Hebrew that occurs before MH, as obviously the extra-biblical inscriptions are not properly 'Biblical Hebrew'. For primary texts and bibliographies refer to the publications of extra-biblical Hebrew inscriptions: Johannes Renz and Wolfgang Röllig, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995). Andreas Schüle, *Die Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften: ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, vol. 270 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000). J. Naveh, "Hebrew and Aramaic Inscriptions," in *Excavations At the City of David*, ed. Yigal Shiloh and Donald T. Ariel, Publications of the Institute of Archaeology, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984). Sandra Landis Gogel, *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*, Resources for Biblical Study 23 (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1998). R. Deutsch and M. Heltzer, *Forty New Ancient West Semitic Inscriptions* (Tel Aviv/Jaffa: Archaeological Center, 1994). R. Deutsch and M. Heltzer, *New Epigraphic Evidence from the Biblical Period* (Tel Aviv/Jaffa: Archaeological Center, 1995).

97. Issues of various disputed archaeological dating aside.

98. Hurvitz, "The Historical Quest for 'Ancient Israel' and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations", 308. Also, "an increasing number of Hebrew epigraphical inscriptions—dated to the pre-exilic period—which largely conform to the linguistic profile of Classical BH." Avi Hurvitz, "The Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics for the Historical Study of Ancient Israel," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997*, ed. Ron Margolin (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999), 30.

99. *Ibid.*, 36-37.

The importance of the extra-biblical inscriptions is central to the discussion of establishing any external hooks into the text, but the comparative use of inscriptional evidence for establishing a linguistic typology must be cautioned. The inscriptional evidence is of limited value for diachronic typologies, particularly for illuminating the pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew, as the majority of the inscriptions are dated 625-586 B.C.E. and non-existent after the sixth century.¹⁰⁰ The inscriptions are also a different genre from biblical texts with a focus on administrative and official issues such as rations. Lastly, there is an extremely limited corpus of inscriptions which compares to only 1% of the volume of the MT.¹⁰¹ Despite these problems, several scholars have claimed that the pre-exilic inscriptions are linguistically linked with SBH, providing evidence for a chronological grounding of SBH texts in the pre-exilic period.¹⁰²

This typological conclusion has been firmly derided in many publications, on both linguistic and methodological grounds. Knauf and Young have both shown that, despite these claims, the inscriptional evidence does not constitute a linguistic uniformity either with themselves or with Biblical Hebrew.¹⁰³ Further, despite scholars from Albright¹⁰⁴ to Ehrensward¹⁰⁵

100. Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," 282. Also, Naveh and Greenfield, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period," 122. If there are no inscriptions from this period how do we know that the same Hebrew as found in pre-exilic inscriptions did not continue through to the third century? A *terminus ad quem* due to lack of evidence is not particularly reassuring when a linguistic *terminus ad quem* is conjectured from that same point.

101. David J. A. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993). I:28.

102. Martin Ehrensward, "Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 11 (1997): 29-40. Harry Torczyner and Olga Tufnell, *Lachish* (Tell Ed Duweir) (London, New York: Published for the Trustees of the late Sir Henry Wellcome by Oxford University Press, 1938), 17. Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century," 1012. Hurvitz, "Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms", 177-179; Hurvitz, "The Historical Quest for "Ancient Israel" and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations", 307-310.

103. Young, "Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew". Knauf, "War 'Biblich-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?".

104. W. F. Albright, "A Reexamination of the Lachish Letters," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 73 (1939): 20-21.

105. Ehrensward, "Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew". It should be noted that Ehrensward has rescinded this position regarding the diachronic relationship between SBH and LBH

claiming that associations between the inscriptional evidence and LBH are rare or non-existent, Young demonstrated that linguistic links to LBH are not difficult to find.¹⁰⁶ This indicates that the linguistic information from inscriptional evidence is not exclusively in favour of either SBH or LBH typologies. Oddly, this lack of correlation results in methodological instability for those using pre-exilic inscriptions to establish a pre-exilic SBH typology: as SBH is more similar to LBH than inscriptional Hebrew it should be dated as post-exilic (as LBH texts internally hold a post-exilic *terminus a quo*). The typological association of SBH and inscriptions also introduces a chronological problem as the majority of inscriptions are dated to the same period as LBH transitional texts, such as Ezekiel. According to a diachronic typology this means LBH indications should be attested in the inscriptional evidence.¹⁰⁷

The inscriptional evidence is best understood to be an independent corpus of important ancillary linguistic data¹⁰⁸ rather than a corpus relevant to BH linguistic typologies. The difference in basic linguistic data is wildly variant from the MT which reduces any comparative utility to a minimum.¹⁰⁹ Young illustrates this clearly,

Thus for the majority of the suggested linguistic contrasts, SBH vs. LBH, the inscriptions provide no evidence at all. Even such a common linguistic item as the 1st sg. independent pronoun, where the form אנכי is said to die out in LBH in favour of אני (Rooker 1990a:72-74; cf. Wright 1998: 132-37) is only clearly attested in the inscriptional corpus once (אני, Arad 88.1; Gogel 1998:153).¹¹⁰

since this 1997 publication.

106. Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," 292-299.

107. Ibid., 282.

108. Young dubs it 'Official Hebrew' as compared to 'Literary Hebrew'. Young, "Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew", 103-113.

109. Sarfatti gives examples of unique inscriptional lexemes that don't appear in BH or with a different meaning. G. B. Sarfatti, "Hebrew Inscriptions of the First Temple Period: A Survey and Some Linguistic Comments," *Maarav* 3 (1982): 55-83.

110. Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," 282.

The inscriptional evidence is immensely important for any linguistic investigation of Hebrew due to its chronological dating and the provision of linguistic data external to the biblical literature, however, its use as comparative linguistic evidence for dating Biblical Hebrew typologies is extremely limited.¹¹¹

(ii) Limits of influence from foreign languages

The second area of external chronological data has traditionally come from examining the MT for lexical and syntactical markers of influence from foreign languages. This often fits into a socio-linguistic theory of cultural influence and borrowing. The classic methodology is to establish evidence for a late date by displaying Aramaic or Persian influence in a text, and establish an early date by showing similarity to Ugaritic/Canaanite texts.

Foreign linguistic influence is generally established through the occurrence of loanwords in the text. Presumably, common nouns would be the most common evidence of linguistic influence as they are the most borrowed type of lexeme,¹¹² however, many studies of Biblical Hebrew, particularly when referring to *Aramaisms*, refer often to Aramaic verbal roots.¹¹³ There are three linguistic types of loanwords considered to be chronologically significant in Biblical Hebrew: Persian, Aramaic and Ugaritic/Canaanite. This excludes Akkadian and Egyptian as both are extremely difficult to place within a narrow chronological period of influence.¹¹⁴

111. The inscriptional evidence is perhaps most useful as a chronological and methodological check against the SBH/LBH typologies and associated chronological conjectures.

112. Arlotto, *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*, 184.

113. For example, Mats Eskhult, *The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Texts*, in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 14-15.

114. Egyptian loanwords are quite rare in the biblical text and due to the proximity and long chronological influence they are quite elusive to date. See Muchiki's study of Egyptian loanwords in Northwest Semitic for recent information on the Egyptian linguistic connections. Yoshiyuki Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (Atlanta, Ga: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999). Akkadian is also chronologically vague as although it was the *lingua franca* of the Late

(1) Persian

Persian loanwords are the easiest linguistic loanword to identify in Biblical Hebrew, as the languages do not share a common Semitic root, unlike Aramaic and Ugaritic. These loanwords are generally associated with Persian influence in the post-exilic period as the Achaemenid empire (559-330 B.C.E.) exerted political and military control over the Levant and Mesopotamia. Although Persian was never used as a language across the Achaemenid empire, the influence of native speakers would have been transmitted through Imperial Aramaic which was the *lingua franca* of the empire.¹¹⁵

The majority of Persian loanwords are concentrated in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel, and appear in scattered occurrences elsewhere. It should also be emphasised that clearly Persian loanwords do not appear at all in the Pentateuch.¹¹⁶ Due to this demarcation, Persian loanwords have been considered as strong indications of late dating, and their absence in the Pentateuch as evidence of a pre-exilic compositional dating.¹¹⁷

Bronze Age the majority of loanwords in Biblical Hebrew are concentrated in post-exilic texts, raising doubts of its chronological significance (and doubts about using loanwords to date in general). Paul V Mankowski, Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew, *Harvard Semitic Studies* 47 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000). Hittite also is not considered here but has very brief occurrences in Biblical Hebrew. Chaim Rabin, "Hittite Words in Hebrew," *Orientalis* 32 (1963): 113-139.

115. Frederick E Greenspahn, *An Introduction to Aramaic, Resources for Biblical Study*, vol. 46 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 6. John Makujina, "Dismemberment in Dan 2:5 and 329 as an Old Persian Idiom, 'To be Made into Parts'," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119 (1999): 309. John Makujina, *Old Persian Calques in the Aramaic of Daniel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 2001).

116. Eskhult, "The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Texts", 23. Considering Deuteronomy seems to be dated later and later this does not seem to support the existence or lack of loanwords as a chronological marker!

117. *Ibid.*, 23.

Although it is probable that the heavy Persian usage in clearly post-exilic texts, such as Esther or Daniel, supports their post-exilic dating and reflects the linguistic milieu of the time, it is difficult to argue that absence of Persian loanwords indicates an early dating. The problem is, of course, not peculiar to Persian loanwords, the same problem arises with using any diachronic typology. The problematic nature of this typological application is corroborated by the absence of any Persian loanwords in post-exilic texts Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.¹¹⁸ Young proposes that Persian loanwords could even be suggested in SBH texts¹¹⁹ and even argues that Persian loanwords could possibly have entered the Hebrew lexicon earlier than the sixth century which would minimise their chronological value.¹²⁰

(2) Aramaic

The presence of Aramaic influence in Biblical Hebrew is vast and the source of most loanwords—disputed or not—in the biblical text. Although Aramaic influence is not questioned, the extent of its "foreign" influence is questionable. Aramaic shares its Semitic roots with Hebrew, thus there are extensive similarities without conjecturing linguistic influence or borrowing. Chronologically, the possibility of influence spans from the eighth to fourth centuries B.C.E. as forms of Aramaic were the *lingua franca* of the Assyrian and Persian empires. Despite this, Aramaisms have traditionally been interpreted as indications of late dating in Biblical Hebrew.

118.C. L. Seow, "Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qoheleth," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 649.

119."More surprisingly, Persian loanwords can be suggested in SBH texts, such as פרוורים ('precincts [?]) in 2 Kgs 23.11 (Ellenbogen 1962:137-38; KB, III: 962), or פלדות ('steel') in Nah. 2.4(KB, III:929). One wonders if more might be suggested if it was not presupposed that EBH is pre-Persian era?" Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," 284.

120.Young raises the possibility that Assyrian deportations would have settled 'Iranians' in the region of Judah by the late eighth century. *Ibid.*, 285.

The use of Aramaisms to establish a late dating has been referred to frequently in the prior discussion on diachronic typologies. Scholars such as Hurvitz are uncomfortably in the position of arguing for increased Aramaic influence as a motivator for late linguistic change,¹²¹ yet also accounting for the presence of Aramaisms throughout the MT.¹²² Due to this conflict, Hurvitz does not consider the presence of Aramaisms as exclusively indicating a late date, writing, "the existence of 'Aramaisms' is not in itself proof of lateness."¹²³ However, in order to maintain the diachronic position, Hurvitz must also demonstrate the Aramaisms in late texts are evidence of late Aramaic influence. This distinction necessitates a methodology for identifying late Aramaisms as opposed to early or shared roots.¹²⁴

An appeal to a more nuanced research on Aramaisms is common among scholars today,¹²⁵ however, the soundness of a methodological division of Aramaisms into demonstrable *early* and *late* types is questionable.¹²⁶ There is a strong circularity between a presupposition of

121. Polzin, although creating a diachronic typology, sees differences in LBH due to natural evolution of language not Aramaic influence.

122. Hurvitz believes that lexicographical differences are good indicators in distinguishing pre-exilic from post-exilic Hebrew, he is particularly attentive to Aramaic words that might be found in post-exilic Hebrew. Hurvitz, "The Chronological Significance of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew", 234-240.

123. Avi Hurvitz, Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible, in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 33. Cf. Hurvitz, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms*, 30-31.

124. Hurvitz, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible", 34-35.

125. For example in criticism of Wagner's work that fails to acknowledge new research and sources. M. Wagner, *Die Lexikalischen und Grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966). Cf. J. C. Greenfield, "Review of Wagner 1966," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 232-234. Avi Hurvitz, "Review of Wagner 1966," *Israel Exploration Journal* 19 (1969): 182-183. S. Morag, "Review of Wagner 1966," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92 (1972): 298-300.

126. Hurvitz: "If one finds a lexeme which appears in biblical sources considered to be early and also in those considered to be late, but in the late sources a change occurs in its meaning, 'behavior', etc.—then one should check the Aramaic. If a parallel to this phenomenon may be shown to exist in Aramaic, there is ground to suspect that Aramaic is the cause [for the change attested in the Hebrew]." See also support by Rendsburg: Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly

late texts and the occurrence of so-called *late* Aramaisms.¹²⁷ Certainly it appears that Hurvitz's exception list for chronologically significant Aramaisms, dubbing them "Aramaic-like features", is conveniently flexible towards those which appear in presumably SBH texts.¹²⁸ According to this, an Aramaism in Exodus 15 is not an indication of late date, but rather an "Archaism", meaning a previous Hebrew term similar to Aramaic which fell out of use in later Hebrew.¹²⁹

Although the linguistic relationship and interplay between Hebrew and Aramaic is one area where the MT could provide a wealth of data with intensive research, the large chronological window of possible influence means any diachronic conclusions will be very difficult to establish, and any chronological conclusions are certain to be coloured by existing chronological presuppositions.¹³⁰ As Eskhult notes, the stronger lexical conclusions must be drawn from less similar languages such as Persian.¹³¹

UNIVERSITY
OF SHEFFIELD
LIBRARY

Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology," 104-107.

127.Eskhult: 'there is a concurrence between the time factor and the borrowings, so that late words occur in those texts where they are, so to speak, supposed to be found.' and, 'one must be aware of the fact that the assumed (late) date of a certain text affects the discussion concerning possible Aramaisms.' Eskhult considers Persian and Trans-Aramaic Akkadian to be better chronological indicators. Eskhult, "The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Texts", 23.

128.Hurvitz identifies four groups of Aramaisms which he does not consider valid for marking a late date. (1) Archaisms which reflect early adoption that fell out of use (2) linguistic elements restricted to popular speech/idioms in specific geographical areas. For example Northern dialect ('In other words, 'Aramaisms' do not have to be taken as compelling proof of chronological lateness in biblical writings which may have originated in northern Israel') (3) texts describing foreign characters and/or events connected to a non-Israelite background. i.e. literary device; (4) those found in wisdom literature. Hurvitz, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible", 31-32.

129.Ibid., 29-30.

130.For example how should the stray verse of full Aramaic in Jeremiah 10.11 be interpreted? Does it indicate early familiarity with Aramaic or a late dating of the text?

131.Eskhult, "The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Texts", 23.

(3) Ugaritic

Ugaritic has traditionally been used in contrast to Aramaic, that is to establish early dating rather than late. This is particularly evident in work on early Hebrew poetry where the "Ugaritic" or "Canaanite" language of the text is used to justify an ancient textual tradition.¹³² The Ugaritic texts from Ras Shamra date between the 14th and 12th centuries B.C.E., and display strong similarities in cultural content and poetic style with the biblical texts.¹³³ This similarity has encouraged many scholars, particularly in the mid-20th century, to argue an early date for comparatively similar passages.¹³⁴ This propensity to comparative dating based on Ugaritic style and linguistics is particularly common in the Albright/Cross school.¹³⁵

Although the chronological window for Ugaritic evidence is quite set with a definite end point in the 12th century B.C.E., it does not necessarily follow that any biblical text with similarity to Ugaritic literature can claim a date in the second millennium. In regards to claims of Ugaritic compositional similarity based on word pairs, J.C. Greenfield notes,

Word pairs are found throughout the Hebrew Bible, in the Aramaic Book of Daniel, and in later literature too. Thus "laughter/joy" and "reach/come" found in the Ba'al epic, also occur in Ecclesiastes 2:2 and Daniel 7:13, respectively. Other word pairs in the Hebrew Bible are not known from Ugaritic, but since word pairs

132. Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 1997). Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic; Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973). David Noel Freedman, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry* (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

133. Mark S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 55 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 36. Mark S. Smith, *Untold Stories: The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001).

134. See works by Cross and Freedman noted above.

135. For example, D.N. Freedman comments on the Ugaritic/Patriarchal connection, "If, therefore, the correspondence in various themes between the Ugaritic poems and the Patriarchal stories suggests a common era of composition, or occurrence, then the period is not the 14th century, but the first half of the second millennium." D. F. Freedman, "The Chronology of Israel and the Ancient Near East," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. George Ernest Wright (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), 205.

are also known from Akkadian and Arabic, it is clear that this is a constitutive element of Semitic poetry.¹³⁶

As cautioned in earlier sections, the correspondence in typological forms does not necessarily lead to a chronological correspondence. This inconsistency between arguments of typology—in this case a Ugaritic type—and external chronology has also been demonstrated as erroneous by C.H. Gordon's examples of Ugaritic parallels limited to post-exilic prose,¹³⁷ and W.G.E. Watson's study of archaic elements in Chronicles (which resulted in a 14 page list of parallels between Chronicles and Northwest Semitic texts, including Ugaritic).¹³⁸ The typological form evidenced by Ugaritic literature, whether in style, language or morphology does not necessarily lead to a chronological correlation.

3. The argument for an alternative linguistic methodology

The methodological conclusion following on this discussion of creating linguistic typologies, interpreting these typologies, and establishing external linguistic hooks into the text, is that the current diachronic methodology is not suitable for establishing a meaningful examination of linguistic evidence in the MT. Further, I believe that the preceding methodological discussion demonstrates the inaccurate presumptions behind many of the historical, chronological, and literary interpretations present within current linguistic Biblical Studies. This conclusion is

136.J. C. Greenfield, "The Hebrew Bible and Canaanite Literature," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 551. Also, "some scholars have compared the 'song of the Sea' and the Ugaritic Ba'al epic in great detail, seeking a 'deep structural' connection. But these efforts seem exaggerated. The receding of the Reed Sea, the 'turning back' of the river Jordan (as in Psalm 114), and the various references to the drying of the sea/river are later reflexes of the myth historicized and used as part of either the prophetic repertoire or the liturgy.'Ibid., 557-558.

137.Gordon, "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew". Cyrus H. Gordon, "The Origin of the Jews in Elephantine," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 14 (1955): 56-58.

138.G. E. Watson, "Archaic Elements in the Language of Chronicles," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 191-207.

not radical, as indicated by the noted scholarship from those such as Davies, Young, and Rezetko, however, a thorough review of the fundamental theoretical issues has been lacking.¹³⁹

This conclusion shows that the current methodology for creating a diachronic typology of Biblical Hebrew is a fruitless endeavour. The complaints from diachronic practitioners, such as G. Rendsburg,¹⁴⁰ that others do not engage with the linguistic evidence, is both currently incorrect¹⁴¹ and possibly disingenuous—if one disagrees with another's methodology it is a fruitless endeavour to engage with the results.

(a) Necessary elements of a meaningful linguistic methodology

As the methodological and linguistic basis of diachronic typologies drawn from the biblical literature have been demonstrated to be unsound and not capable of producing meaningful conclusions, the following question must be whether the necessary death of diachronic typology restricts the methodological ability to examine linguistic evidence for historical, chronological and literary implications.

It should be emphasised that the weakness of the diachronic typology was not only that the underlying presumptions were critically flawed, but also that the conclusions could not account for anomalies or contradicting evidence without undermining the fundamental typology itself. A chronological methodology for approaching the biblical text must therefore possess the

139. The most thorough effort to methodologically confront the prevailing diachronic typologies is in an excellent edited volume by I. Young which brings together essays by major scholars from both sides of the diachronic debate. Part II of this volume is the most concentrated critique of diachronic typologies available. Young, "Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology".

140. Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology," 106.

141. Both Rezetko and Young criticise the diachronic typologies through their own methodological presumptions: Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles". Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions".

ability to be flexible without being arbitrary. This is necessitated by the multiple variables that affect the historical and chronological integrity of the linguistic evidence.

A methodological approach must be sensitive to the data which it is to process without conforming to that data. A methodology of diachronic typology may work well with Middle English texts, but this is due to the immense and diverse wealth of precisely dated texts, and the accompanying philological information, including orthographical, phonological, paleographical, lexical, morphological and syntactical characteristics. A linguistic methodology applied to the biblical literature must accommodate the small size of the extant corpus and the even smaller amount of comparative external linguistic data.

Further, a methodological approach should respond to the criticisms of the diachronic typologies, namely that the methodology accounts for variation and disparity of linguistic data by considering a range of literary and linguistic factors, such as style, authorship, genre, redaction, diglossia and dialect. A methodology should also incorporate external data as a control, whether the linguistic data from extra-biblical texts and inscriptions, or internally attested external references and loanwords. In short, there must be an external hook that corresponds with internal typologies.

Again, these methodological statements and cautions are not new nor revolutionary, they are a rejection of the diachronic methodology, an acknowledgement of the linguistic limitations, and a return to traditional dating methodology which factors in wider literary criteria.

(b) Building on traditional methodology to examine linguistic data

In light of the methodological discussion, I propose to continue the use of traditional methodology in an examination of the linguistic data by maintaining a sensitivity towards literary and linguistic factors of linguistic variation. However, I will build on this methodology by selecting linguistic data for examination according to its possibility of inherent chronological

characteristics. The nature of the MT as a closed corpus creates a situation where any analysis of linguistic data must carefully qualify the primary data characteristics and acknowledge the limitations of this data. The purpose of this historical-linguistic approach is to (a) extract any historical, chronological, and literary information from the data, (b) construct possible literary relationships according to trends the data exhibits and (c) examine any historical and literary aspects of the text related to the linguistic data. The following section will discuss the presumptions of the methodology, the selection of data and the process of examining this data.

(i) The presumptions of this methodology

The notable presumptions of this methodological approach are: (a) literary, linguistic, and chronological factors may account for linguistic variation, (b) a textual *terminus ad quem* cannot be established, however a *terminus a quo* is possible, (c) the classic tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew into ABH/SBH/LBH may be a typological distinction, but not a chronological distinction, (d) lexemes may hold inherent chronological information.

The initial presumption that literary, linguistic and chronological factors can contribute to linguistic variation has been extensively discussed, particularly as a criticism of diachronic typology. Literary factors such as authorship, community, style, genre, and archaism can affect a change in the linguistic evidence, both in the morpho-syntactical and lexical data. Linguistic factors such as dialect and diglossia are fundamental considerations for any historical-linguist and each comprise large areas of research in the field of linguistics; this effect of linguistic factors is probably the largest factor in linguistic variation. Linguistic change and diffusion of change over a chronological period is also a major factor of linguistic variation, however, it cannot be considered to be the exclusive factor when examining variation.

Second, it is presumed that a textual *terminus ad quem* cannot be determined, however, a probable *terminus a quo* can be determined for a text. This presumption is borne out of the ini-

tial presumption—if other factors can result in linguistic variation, then an exclusively chronological explanation cannot be presumed. A text may exhibit characteristics of an established chronological typology, yet the variation may be due to literary factors such as archaism (an early typology is imitated for literary purposes), or linguistic factors such as dialect (an earlier linguistic form is preserved in one geographical location—for example Appalachian English).¹⁴² Thus, while a text or typology may provide chronological characteristics which indicate the earliest possible date, the *terminus a quo*, it is not possible to establish the latest possible date, a *terminus ad quem*, for a linguistic typology. The possibilities of literary and linguistic variation prevent establishing a *terminus ad quem* based solely on the linguistic typology.¹⁴³

Third, the classic tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew into ABH/SBH/LBH is considered to be a possible typological distinction, but not a necessary chronological distinction. Although there is debate on the issue of whether the tripartite or bipartite division is accurate, scholars do continue to use this linguistic distinction. Although the diachronic nomenclature carries chronological inferences, the fundamental typological distinction does not necessarily carry chronological implications. The ABH/SBH/LBH typologies, if accurate, may provide evidence of linguistic variation due to literary or linguistic factors—this argument is based on the initial presumption combined with the second presumption. This third presumption means that the entire corpus of Biblical Hebrew will not initially be considered diachronically in this study.

Finally, it is presumed that lexemes may hold inherent chronological or historical information; this presumption establishes the criteria for selecting relevant linguistic data when

142. William D. O'Grady, Michael Dobrovolsky, and Mark Aronoff, *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989). Margaret Warner Morley, *The Carolina Mountains* (Fairview, N.C: Historical Images, 2006), 171-181. Charles Carpenter, "Remnants of Archaic English in West Virginia," *West Virginia Review* 12 (1934): 77-95.

143. This difficulty was discussed in the earlier section in terms of whether LBH scribes could have written SBH.

examining the texts. This presumption is the boldest and probably most contentious of the group and deserves an extended rationale.

(ii) The theoretical relationship between lexemes and history

Generally the basis for linguistic studies is primarily with morpho-syntactical linguistic data. This reflects the hierarchy of modern linguistics, where the morpho-syntactical level is considered the most resilient and stable layer, as compared particularly with lexical characteristics which are prone to rapid change and idiosyncrasies, in both communities and individual grammars. However, the importance of this morpho-syntactical level is due to the general interest in diachronic linguistics and theories of language change. As noted, the linguistic evidence in the biblical literature is not suitable for establishing diachronic typologies as there is not enough external chronological controls on the typologies. This is not to diminish the study of morpho-syntactical elements and typologies in Biblical Hebrew but to caution the application of this information for diachronic study within the biblical text.

The use of a morpho-syntactical study is therefore limited, in the case of the MT, to either providing data for a synchronic linguistic study of the closed corpus, which may explain linguistic rules of syntax and grammar within the corpus, or a comparative linguistic study with the syntax of related extra-biblical linguistic evidence. The interest of this thesis, however, is to identify any inherent chronological or historical information held in the linguistic evidence, thus the morpho-syntactical layer is not particularly promising as a primary source.

The lexical layer of linguistics is generally derided as too inconsistent and prone to variability from diglossia, style, dialect, class, foreign language, prestige, aesthetic preference, genre, taboo and other factors to provide solid information for a linguistic study. As noted though, this is generally borne from the purpose of constructing diachronic or theoretical studies in which the morpho-syntactical layer is the most relative and indicative of structural language

change. However, when questioning inherent chronological or historical value, the lexical layer assumes an importance and depth unrelated to its placement in the hierarchy of structural or generative linguistics. The key theoretical relationship becomes that between the structuralist *signifier* and *signified*, which provide a theoretical link between language and history. The lexemes in the linguistic evidence are the signifier of an interpreted signified, holding a theoretical relationship between the linguistic evidence and a historical reality. Although a typology based on syntax does not hold inherent chronological or historical data (unless external data is available we do not know what to attribute any syntactical typology to), lexemes can contain inherent chronological or historical data due to their relationship with the signified. Syntax, according to its theoretical nature, is abstracted from the level of signified/signifier, but lexemes are by nature associated with the signified and thus the surrounding milieu of the author. A lexeme thus theoretically relates to the signified and to the author's interpreted concept of surrounding reality.

This relationship between lexeme and signified, the semantic meaning, is certainly not uniform. It must be cautioned that the relationship is theoretical and only exists at the point of an individual grammar. According to linguistic theories which demonstrate language is continually in a state of transition, the semantic meaning is not monolithic, but is undergoing change which affects the semantic meaning rather than the grammatical function. This is called semantic shift.¹⁴⁴ Semantic shift can be useful for identifying social, historical and cultural changes, as these often motivate semantic modification and the obsolescence of old meaning.¹⁴⁵

144. Bloomfield, "Language", 425.

145. "A change of meaning may imply a connection between practical things and thereby throw light on the life of older times." Ibid., 428.

However, establishing this shift in chronological terms is extremely difficult, as it is dependent on a large body of dated attestations which map the development and critical point of shift.¹⁴⁶

Thus, the body of lexemes is continually in transition, with new lexemes created and other lexemes becoming obsolete. These lexemes also experience shifts in the semantic meaning, all of which occur as changes in generational grammars.¹⁴⁷ While it must be cautioned that investigation of new, obsolescent and obsolete lexemes, particularly in Biblical Hebrew, is based on attestation and not comprehensive linguistic evidence, it may also be proposed that the patterns of attestation, within parameters, can reflect historical and social changes in the world of the author. This association between lexical variation and the surrounding world of the grammar is remarked on by L. Bloomfield,

For the most part, fluctuation does not depend upon formal features, but upon meaning, and accordingly escapes a purely linguistic investigation. The changes which are always going on in the practical life of a community, are bound to affect the relative frequencies of speech-forms. The introduction of railways, street-cars, and motor-cars has lessened the frequency of many terms relating to horses, wagons, and harness, and increased that of terms relating to machinery...A new object or practice which gains in vogue, carries a speech-form, old or new, into increased frequency; examples are many in modern life, such as the terms of motoring, flying, and wireless. If the practical situation ceases to exist, the forms which are used in this situation are bound to become less common and may die out. There terms of falconry, for instance, have suffered this fate.¹⁴⁸

The attestation of lexical variation can provide information on historical and social change which is not evident in the morpho-syntactical layer; reflections of change in that which

146."It remained for a modern scholar, H. Sperber, to point out that extensions of meaning are by no means to be taken for granted, and that the first step toward understanding them must be to find, if we can, the context in which the new meaning first appears." Ibid., 440. In the case of Biblical Hebrew in particular this is not possible because records won't include critical location point.

147."The first student, probably, to see that semantic change consists of expansion and obsolescence, was Hermann Paul. Paul saw that the meaning of a form in the habit of any speaker, is merely the result of the utterances in which he has heard it." Ibid., 431.

148.Ibid., 399-400. It is also interesting to note that this, written in 1921, already sounds archaic and the semantic shift in the technical words has been immense. The average Western English speaker would not refer to motor-cars or street-cars; wireless has experienced a semantic shift in this decade to mean 802.11b connections rather than radio transmissions.

is signified may be reflected in the signifier. Patterns of attestation may provide evidences of lexemes passing in or out of favour, but many changes in the lexical body will occur in only the semantic form, which may be difficult to identify in a limited corpus. The difference between a lexical shift to a new meaning according to some shift in reality, and a semantic shift must also be defined. Again, L. Bloomfield notes this difference,

The shift into a new meaning is intelligible when it merely reproduces a shift in the practical world. A form like *ship* or *hat* or *hose* designates a shifting series of objects because changes in the practical world. If cattle were used as a medium of exchange, the word *fee* 'cattle' would naturally be used in the meaning 'money' and if one wrote with a goose-feather, the word for 'feather' would naturally be used of this writing-implement. At this point, however, there has been no shift in the lexical structure of the language. This comes only when a learned loan-word *pen* is distinct from feather, or when *fee* on the one hand is no longer used of cattle and, on the other hand, loses ground in the domain of 'money' until it retains only the specialized value of "sum of money paid for a service or privilege."¹⁴⁹

The identification of semantic shift is thus greatly dependent on a close study of the context relevant to the particular lexeme. The accepted methodology for examining semantic shift is similar to Hurvitz's method for identifying Aramaisms, namely, the literary evidence must contain a context in which the lexical form can be applied to both new and old meaning—the obsolescence of old contexts will then show the new semantic value as the central meaning.¹⁵⁰ The continued existence of contexts with marginal meanings,¹⁵¹ often that of the obsolescent meaning, is generally attested in linguistic evidence. An examination of semantic shifts thus seeks to establish a new central meaning which is not necessarily exclusive.

The difficulty inherent in any lexical examination is that lexical patterns, and even semantic shifts, can be due to several factors and are based on attestation of a language, not the

149.Ibid., 436.

150.Ibid., 440.

151.L. Bloomfield gives the example of board as one which exists with many marginal meanings. For example, the marginal *room and board* where board reflects an older semantic meaning of meals related to *table*. Ibid., 437.

language itself. The limits of attestation in the case of Biblical Hebrew is quite severe. Arguments of frequency, particularly absence, must be tempered by an acknowledgement to the limited attestations of BH available. The frequency of lexical forms is subject to "superficial" variation and fluctuation according to practical circumstances; the example used by Bloomfield is that English lexemes such as *thimble* or *stove* may not be attested in long stretches of speech yet these forms will be immediately used by everyone when the context is appropriate.¹⁵² Thus, while any argument of frequency or semantic meaning must initially acknowledge the limits of attestation, it should also carefully examine the context opportunity of the literary body in order to establish whether it is reasonable to expect certain lexical usage.

Further factors such as genre, prestige, foreign influence, style, dialect and diglossia will also contribute to lexical variation and should be considered as possible contributing factors along with practical changes.¹⁵³ Thus, while many of these external factors can contribute to lexical variation in linguistic evidence, it is still important to initially examine the lexical body for patterns, themes of usage, and semantic shift, and then construct probable theories which explain these phenomenon. As the purpose of the thesis is to examine the lexical layer for historical and chronological information, it is important that the linguistic data which is examined is clearly defined and selected in order to produce a closed lexical body of examination.

152. *Ibid.*, 277.

153. "The most powerful force of all in fluctuation works quite outside the linguist's reach: the speaker favors the forms which he has heard from certain other speakers who, for some reason of prestige, influence his habits of speech." *Ibid.*, 403.

(iii) Selecting lexical bodies and the framework for their examination

(1) The rationale for military lexemes as a relevant lexical body

The discussion of lexical significance concludes that the selection of linguistic data for the this thesis must be initially based in the lexical layer. Second, as the study is primarily interested in extracting historical or chronological data, the simplest type of lexeme will be the common noun. As discussed, the common noun is extremely volatile and according to the relationship between signified and signifier it should have the greatest possibility of reflecting items of a historical nature that may occur within short chronological windows.

In order to keep the study to a manageable amount of lexemes, the study will be limited both in terms of texts and the nature of lexemes. Based on the presumption that lexemes can hold inherent chronological or historical information, the study will be interested in military lexemes. A military lexeme is considered to be a term with a direct association with the material evidence of warfare (armour, armaments, fortifications), the social structure of the military (titles of leadership, divisions, roles), or other categories which display a military association.¹⁵⁴

The purpose is to question whether this lexical body displays any inherent chronological, historical, or literary information. Military lexemes in particular are selected as: (a) texts of a military nature are among the most commonly attested genre in the comparative ancient Near East literary corpus, which means there is a wealth of linguistic cognates and comparative usage; (b) dated archaeological evidence, both in the form of reliefs, inscriptions, and objects, is rich with military items and campaigns; (c) the subject of warfare and other military themes is extremely common in the biblical text; (d) due to the reactive nature of military technology there is a continuous and often rapid development of certain technologies which are contained within an attested chronological window; (e) due to the reactive and resource dependent nature

154.If this connection is ambiguous it will be noted in the lexical study.

of military technology, it is often possible to find influence of foreign military technology on the domestic development of technology; (f) foreign objects and concepts are often incorporated into a lexical body as a loanword—many military technologies are borrowed, imported or learned from other cultures—which makes the military lexical body a potential hotspot for relevant loanwords; (g) the military, along with trade, was the primary point of interaction with foreign and neighbouring cultures, whether in conflict or conscription—this raises the possibility of the lexical body reflecting this influence and interaction.¹⁵⁵

The nature of the military lexemes within the wider body of literary and archaeological evidence should therefore counter many of the weaknesses possible in a lexical study. These checks against possible variables are: (a) contextual opportunity is evident in the genre and subject of both the biblical literature and the comparative ANE evidence—this reduces the chance of variation due to lack of attestation opportunity; (b) the dynamic nature of military technology means opportunity for semantic shift, new lexemes and obsolescence of old lexemes is increased; (c) foreign influence may be observed through the large comparative body; (d) archaeological evidence in the form of inscribed reliefs in particular can directly associate signifier and signified; (e) trends in archaeological evidence may corroborate semantic shifts or lexical changes; (f) development in military technology provides possible chronological hooks for lexical information.

155. By way of example, this may be compared to a study of familial lexemes, which although important for socio-historical research, may provide scant information which can also be found in archaeological or epigraphic information. A great example on why external checks are needed is found in S. Rimmon-Kenan's monograph on narrative fiction, where he notes that the transition of names in *War and Peace* (Napoleon occurs as Napoleon, Bonaparte, Buonaparte) indicates a focalisation shift. I would be surprised if the same disparity wasn't diachronically defined in Biblical Studies. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge, 2002), 82-83.

(2) Selecting relevant military texts for examination

Following this theoretical framework for the linguistic study of military lexemes, and the presumption that the MT should not be divided along SBH/LBH typologies during the examination phase of research, three passages will be selected from the biblical literature. The military lexemes will be extracted from these passages to be examined individually and then in comparison with the larger MT and extra-biblical corpus. The three passages to be examined are: Song of the Sea (Exodus 15), Song of Deborah (Judges 5), and the David/Goliath narrative (1 Samuel 17). These passages have been selected as they all exhibit elements or trends which should contribute to a thorough study including: (a) a high concentration of military vocabulary, (b) military in subject and context, (c) discreet units of text with a fairly clear beginning and end of passage, (d) a lack of scholarly consensus regarding their chronology,¹⁵⁶ (e) variable in genre,¹⁵⁷ (f) a complicated source history and redaction history.¹⁵⁸

(3) The outline of a practical examination framework

The military lexemes will be evaluated individually within a fairly traditional framework¹⁵⁹ which will examine them according to the following five areas. (a) Function. What does the lexeme typically mean, how is it used, what are its grammatical occurrences? (b) Distribution. Where does it occur throughout the biblical and extra-biblical text, are there trends of grouping or patterns of usage? (c) Lexical replacement and semantic shift. Does the lexeme dis-

156. Which should make any research results useful despite their individual conclusions.

157. Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah are poetry and 1 Samuel 17 is narrative, this provides a small control against lexical variation due to genre.

158. Which provides an interesting context for any conclusions such as patterns of usage or semantic shift.

159. For example: Davies, "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense," 150. Also, 'data...should be examined in terms of distribution, function, replacement in synoptic passages and modernization in later versions of the bible.' Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence From Samuel-Kings and Chronicles", 222.

play any changes in meaning, how are these grouped, are there equivalent lexemes, are there mutual patterns with these equivalents? (d) Literary context. Does the context inform the lexeme, are there patterns in genre and distribution, are there literary associations with the lexeme, does the context affect the semantic meaning or is it related to any semantic shift? (e) Historical and chronological implications. Does the lexeme carry any inherent chronological or historical implications, is there evidence of foreign influence in the lexeme, is the lexeme associated with any historical event, culture or a archaeological evidence?

II. The examination of military lexemes in Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17

1. The military vocabulary of 1 Samuel 17

(a) Background of 1 Samuel 17 in history and scholarship

The narrative of David and Goliath contains a dense concentration of military terminology within a strong narrative structure. The text itself is difficult for any historical or textual reconstruction as there are extensive discrepancies between the MT and LXX, as well as between the various LXX manuscripts.¹⁶⁰ The narrative of the text also divides chapter 17 and the very beginning of 18 out of the regular flow of the text. The most obvious and well-referenced example of this is Saul's non-recognition of David, his shield-bearer according to chapter 16, after the slaying of Goliath.¹⁶¹ Regardless of these textual and redaction difficulties, the text employs a wealth of military vocabulary; from the panoply of Goliath and David to the description of the battle layout and personnel, there is a wide range of technical military terms.

(i) Historical and literary background

The narrative of David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17 is almost universally considered to be an interwoven account drawing on several sources of varying literary traditions.¹⁶² Indeed it may even be a rare occurrence where some of the various traditions can be found in the MT text, such as the accounts of Elhanan and Benaiah and their battles with similar giants. The tex-

160. Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*, *Orbis Biblicus Et Orientalis* 57 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1984).

161. P. K. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation* (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1980).

162. The 'traditional' position is to consider the errors to be evidence of intermingled literary strands. There is also a position that the text is the work of a single author using several earlier sources, but writing rather than simply redacting. Giovanni Garbini, *Myth and History in the Bible*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 362 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 72-78.

tual correspondence with their weaponry (the חנית כמנור ארגים) and enemy (always a giant, sometimes identified as Philistine) indicates that the various accounts shared some linguistic source or cultural memory.

The relationship of these seemingly related accounts and the 1 Samuel 17 narrative is disputed. Some scholars prefer to see them as post-Davidic popular corruptions,¹⁶³ while others consider them to be fragments of the original narrative source.¹⁶⁴ Within the narrative P. K. McCarter proposes a redaction history comprised of four steps; an original historical narrative of David's success in battle against the Philistines is displaced by a popular legend about his victory over a Philistine champion, coloured with details from the Elhanan narrative and "heavy-handedly" interpolated into manuscripts undergoing their organic textual redaction.¹⁶⁵

The complicated redaction history of the text leaves little room for an encompassing historical background. Scholars have noted anachronistic errors such as the mention of David bringing Goliath's head to Jerusalem, although at this point in the text David had not taken Jerusalem and it was still a Jebusite city.¹⁶⁶ The setting of the root narrative, namely the battle between David and Goliath, has also been considered anachronistic as single combat was not at-

163. Samuel Rolles Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel: With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions, and Facsimiles of Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890), 354.

164. Azzan Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory," *Vetus Testamentum* 54 (2004): 377.

165. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation*, 298.

166. Peter R Ackroyd, *The First Book of Samuel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), 146.

tested until Greek literature;¹⁶⁷ this has been disputed by some scholars who attempt to find an ancient Near Eastern parallel in the Egyptian account of Sinuhe.¹⁶⁸

The armour of Goliath has also attracted attention by scholars attempting to determine the historical background of the narrative according to this depiction of Goliath. Y. Yadin considered the armour indicative of 10th century Philistine or Aegaen warriors of the early Iron Age.¹⁶⁹ Similarly T. Dothan and L. Stager have considered Goliath to be historically depicted as an Achaean warrior.¹⁷⁰ This historical depiction has been disputed by I. Finkelstein and A. Yadin, who interpret the armament within a Greek historical context. Finkelstein in particular considers it to be the collective memory of Saite Greek mercenaries. Other scholars prefer to consider the description in purely literary terms, emphasising the power of Goliath and not indicative of any particular period.¹⁷¹

167. The Homeric influence could only be eighth century or later. Othniel Margalith, *The Sea Peoples in the Bible* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994), 55-56. M. West discusses this theory in detail and with bibliography. M. L. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 214, 370, 376. The Greek parallel is often noted as the early Heracles/Antaeus single combat, see: Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 9.183-4 and Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 4.597-660. Cf. Yves Bonnefoy, *Roman and European Mythologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 166.

168. Ackroyd, *The First Book of Samuel*, 138. Sinuhe single combat. "My arrow pierced his neck. He cried out and fell on his nose; I felled him with his own battle-axe and uttered my battle cry over his back." Cf. H. A. Hoffner, "A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 220-225. Roland de Vaux, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 129-132. West, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, 215-216. Also, Hoffner attempted to find a Hittite parallel, see: Hoffner, "A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions".

169. Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), 265.

170. Trude Krakauer Dothan, *The Philistines and Their Material Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 20. Lawrence E. Stager and Paula Wapnish, *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems* (Washington, D.C: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991), 17.

171. K. Gallig, "Goliath und seine Rustung," *Vetus Testamentum Supplemental Series* 15 (1966): 150-169. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation*, 292. A. Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. J. Neusner, B. A. Levine, and Ernest Frerichs (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 132. André Caquot and Philippe de Robert, *Les livres de Samuel* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994), 203.

The literary genre is undisputedly narrative, although a cultic background has been proposed for the account. Grønbaek proposes a cultic function where the story was dramatically represented at the Jerusalem temple as part of New Year's festivities. Hertzberg likewise argues for an original cultic setting for this story, mostly based on the mention of an "assembly" in verse 47.¹⁷²

(ii) Linguistic and chronological background

Although earlier literary critics supposed the Samuel material to contain narrative strands identified with the Yahwist or Elohist sources, this was reconsidered by Noth's seminal work in the late 20th century which assigned Samuel as a part of the Deuteronomistic History from Deuteronomy through Kings.¹⁷³ This final redactor was considered by Noth to be assembling extensive sources and adding only rare comments. Since Noth's theory has been popularised the date of this redaction has been pushed later. Currently the earliest redaction date is considered to be in the exile (post-586 B.C.E), although several scholars date it well into the Persian period.¹⁷⁴

Finkelstein considers the narrative to be composed at the earliest in the late monarchy and most likely in the late seventh century B.C.E. when the collective memory transposed Greek mercenaries upon an older oral tradition. However, J. van Seters argues that the narrative of David's succession was composed after the Deuteronomistic History and is dependent upon it, giving the narrative a late date.¹⁷⁵

172.H. W. Hertzberg, "Mizpa," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 47 (1929): 161-196.

173.Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 54-57.

174.For review of DtrH: Thomas Römer and Albert de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (Dh): History of Research and Debated Issues," in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*, ed. Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

175.John van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of*

Due to the difficulty in identifying the narrative strands and redaction history it seems that few scholars have bothered to analyse the text on purely linguistic grounds. A. Rofé provides one of the few linguistic studies and identifies several late characteristics, including plene orthography, late vocabulary and syntactic markers corresponding to rabbinic Hebrew. Based on these observations, he concluded that the compositional date was "probably in the late Persian period."¹⁷⁶ Rofé's linguistic observations have been criticised by Finkelstein, who considers the linguistic characteristics to be indicative of differences in dialect or register and not diachronic change.¹⁷⁷

Any possibility of assigning a compositional date to the narrative is further complicated by the available sources, as the 1 Samuel 17 chapter itself is attested with wide variety in the two main sources, the MT and LXX. The various attestations of the LXX also contain several variant narratives. The general consensus on the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew sources is that the LXX attests an earlier version while the MT has been redacted at a later point with several emendations and additions.¹⁷⁸

Biblical History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 317-321.

176. Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," 134.

177. Israel Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2002): 143 n. 16.

178. Emmanuel Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985). Emmanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Differences Between Mt and the LXX," in *Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy (Fribourg, Suisse Göttingen: Éditions universitaires Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). Cf. G. Auld and Craig Ho, "The Making of David and Goliath," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56 (1992): 19-39. J. Lust et al., "The Story of David and Goliath," in *Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Venture* (Fribourg: University Press and Vandenhoeck, 1973). For the relationship between LXX and 4QSam see: George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990), *Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series*, vol. 33 (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1992), 216.

(b) Examination of military vocabulary in 1 Samuel 17

The armaments associated with David in 1 Samuel 17 are חרב (sword), מד (garment/armour), מקל (stick/rod), and קלע (sling). Of these items only the מקל and קלע are among David's personal weaponry. The other items are only briefly mentioned when Saul unsuccessfully attempts to clothe David in his armour. The text describes the panoply of Goliath as composed of כידון (scimitar), צנה (shield?), מצחה (greaves), כובע (helmet), שריון קשקשים (scaled corselet), and חנית (javelin). Of these terms only חנית is found regularly throughout the Hebrew Bible, with the remainder of the terms either unique to the narrative or occurring few times elsewhere. The description איש הבנים is given to Goliath on his introduction and is unique within the MT. Lastly, David is referred to as a נער in 1 Samuel 17, and a נשא כלים prior to this chapter; Goliath is accompanied on the battlefield with a נשא צנה which is also a unique usage.

(i) חרב

חרב is an extremely common lexeme throughout the MT and is defined as a *sword* or *knife*. The term is attested in several cognates with only minor semantic variance; Ugaritic, Samaritan, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaean all use the same basic lexeme to mean *dagger/sword*.¹⁷⁹ Arabic attests the lexeme *ḥarb* for *war* and *ḥarbat* for *lance*.¹⁸⁰ Akkadian also contains a marginal meaning for *harbu* as *plough*.¹⁸¹ KB lists two specialised meanings for חרב within Biblical Hebrew: *stone-mason's chisel* as attested in Exod. 20.25 and *crowbar* in Ezek. 26.9. The same consonantal form within Biblical Hebrew also means *to be desolate* or *to devastate*. This may be semantically related to the sword as that which lays waste or makes desolate.

179.BRL 129ff, 472ff. KB sub חרב.

180.F. W. Schwarzlose, *Die Waffen der alten Araber* (Leipzig: 1886), 213. Wolf Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958), 22.

181. AHW sub *harbu*.

חרב appears 410 times in the MT as the term *sword*, and is found in every biblical book, excluding Obadiah, Jonah, Habakkuk, Ruth and Ecclesiastes. The largest number is found in Ezekiel where it occurs 102 times. Jeremiah follows with 81 occurrences. The Qumran manuscripts also commonly use the lexeme, with 101 occurrences with the use of *sword*. חרב is not found within extra-biblical Hebrew inscriptions but is found in KAI 214, 215 and 222, all Aramaic inscriptions from the eighth century B.C.E.

Throughout the MT the only lexeme used consistently for *sword* is חרב. There are occasional uses of other Hebrew terms for *knife* (תער, מקצעה, מזמרה, מחלף, מאכלת, שכין, מקצעה), but they are inconsistently used or not used in a military context.

As noted the term, חרב, is used widely in several cognates and at all chronological points which does not offer any information for historical or chronological consequences. It can simply be considered as a generic term for any short sword or dagger.

(ii) קובע - כובע

קובע is a standard term used in the MT specifically for a military helmet; this contrasts with other cognate languages, such as Syriac and Arabic, which use a related term as a generic head cover or hat (and indeed also in modern Hebrew).¹⁸² The MT contains two different consonantal forms, one of which begins with כ and the other with ק. Jewish Aramaic also attests the variable spelling, but uses the term for the head covering of a priest.¹⁸³ Egyptian Aramaic uses the term as a *turban*.¹⁸⁴ The lexeme is generally considered to be a foreign loanword which accounts for its variant spellings and difficult etymology.¹⁸⁵ The common consensus is that it

182.S. Fraenkel, *Die Aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden: 1886), 54.

183.KB sub כובע.

184.J. Hoftijzer et al., *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 115.

185.E. A. Speiser, "On Some Articles of Armor and Their Names," *Journal of the American Oriental*

stems from the Hittite *kupah(h)i*.¹⁸⁶ KB, however, notes in the gloss for קובע that the Greek *κύμβαχος* (dome, crown, top of helmet) is a more likely loan source.¹⁸⁷

Within the MT the lexeme appears as כובע six times (1 Sam. 17.5; Isa. 59.17; Jer. 46.4; Ezek. 27.10, 38.5; 2 Chron. 26.14) and twice as קובע (1 Sam. 17.38; Ezek. 23.24). All of these occurrences are found within explicitly military contexts and with other military terms. The כ/קובע occurs twice within the David/Goliath narrative and, oddly, changes form between ק and כ between each occurrence. The one pattern of usage which occurs is the military lexeme שריון (breastplate) is found along with כובע in all verses except for the three in Ezekiel. The lexeme does not appear in the Qumran manuscripts nor in any extra-biblical inscriptional evidence. Within Qumran texts it is possible that 1QM 6.15 refers to a helmet with the term בתי ראשים. There is an occurrence of the Greek *περικεφαλαία* in 1 Mac. 6.35, which is the term used consistently throughout the LXX in parallel with the Hebrew כובע, and which may indicate an occurrence of the Hebrew lexeme in the posited Hebrew original of Maccabees. The parallel שריון may also be conjectured as the parallel Greek *ἀλυσιδωτοῖς* (made of chain, chainmail) which also occurs in 1 Mac. 6.35.

The כ/קובע lexeme is the only term used within the MT for a military helmet and is the only type of occurrence for the lexeme, thus there is no lexical replacement or semantic shift within the MT text. The odd absence of the lexeme or an alternative (other than the one occurrence of בתי ראשים) among Qumran and extra-biblical literature makes it difficult to assign any particular meaning to the absence of the lexeme, as there seems to be no replacement or alternative term used.

Society 70 (1950): 47.

186. Edward Sapir, "Hebrew 'Helmet' a Loan-Word and Its Bearing on Indo-European Phonology," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 57 (1937): 73-77.

187. KB refers to BRL2 146.

In 1 Samuel 17 the lexeme is used for both David and Goliath, the first occurrence while describing the armour of Goliath and noting his קובע נחשת על ראשו ושריון קשקשים (bronze helmet on his head and scaled breastplate) while the second occurrence in 1 Sam. 17.38 parallels this sequence with ונתן קובע נחשת על ראשו וילבש אתו שריון (and put a helmet of bronze on his head and dressed him in a breastplate). As noted previously, the first occurrence with Goliath uses the קובע form while the second uses קובע. The morphology and grammar of the second sentence where Saul places the helmet and breastplate on David has been noted as extremely odd grammar: the construct chain begins with *wayyiqtol*, uses *weqatal* for נתן and then switches back to *wayyiqtol*.¹⁸⁸ G. Rendsburg considers this a symptom of a literary device used to indicate Saul's confusion and lack of ability ('saul clothed David in his body-suit, then he even placed a bronze helmet on his head, and he clothed him with a breastplate.')¹⁸⁹ which provides a neat literary solution to a grammatical problem. It is also possible that the literary function is to parallel the introduction of Goliath on the battlefield with his קובע and שריון as the word order is the same, including the detail of קובע נחשת על ראשו (compare to 1 Sam. 17.5 - קובע נחשת על ראשו). This strong parallel emphasises David's rejection of meeting Goliath on equal terms—equipped with the same protection—and Saul's insistence on this armour.

The קובע of both Goliath and David is noted as being bronze, as are all of Goliath's other weapons in the MT. Within the historical context, bronze helmets in a multitude of variations occur throughout the Greek and Asiatic ancient Near East;¹⁹⁰ there is nothing in the 1 Samuel 17 text that would distinguish the bronze קובע as peculiar to any attested panoply.

188. McCarter, *1 Samuel: A New Translation*, 288. C. H. J. Van der Merwe, "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 28.

189. Gary Rendsburg, "Confused Language as a Deliberate Literary Device in Biblical Hebrew Narrative," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 2 (1999).

190. Tamás Dezsö, *Near Eastern Helmets of the Iron Age* (Oxford, England: J. and E. Hedges, 2001).

(iii) שריון - סריון

שריון/סריון is another example of a foreign loanword in Biblical Hebrew with alternate consonantal forms and alternating use of plene spelling. The lexeme is defined as a piece of armour, most likely *breastplate*, *body-armour* or *chain-mail*. Both the occasional plene spelling and variable sibilant is found in Jewish Aramaic; the lexeme also appears in Syriac *šeryānā*, Akkadian *sari(y)am*, *sir(i)yam* (coat of mail for warriors and horses),¹⁹¹ Hittite *šarian(n)i*,¹⁹² and originally Hurrian *sarian(ni)* which also attested the variable sibilant according to KB. Egyptian also attests the lexeme as a foreign loanword evidenced by the consonantal shift, *tryn*.¹⁹³

The שריון/סריון lexeme is more commonly attested in the MT in the שריון form (1 Sam. 17.5, 17.38; 1 Kgs 22.34; Isa. 59.17; Neh. 4.10; 2 Chron. 18.33, 26.14) than the alternate סריון which is only attested in Jeremiah (Jer. 46.4, 51.3). There is also possible reading of סרין in Job 41.5 (בכפל רסנו מי יבוא - in double of his *bridle/breastplate* who can come); this may be amended to סרין instead of רסן. The lexeme appears only once in a fragmentary Qumran Aramaic text 4Q202 1 II, 26, which refers to making ש[נה] ד[י] ושר[י]ן ד[י] נה[ש].

The only alternate term within the MT for a breastplate is חשן (24x in Exodus and once in Leviticus), which is used for a priestly garment to which various precious stones were affixed. This lexeme is attested in the same semantic form at Qumran, but only when quoting the Exodus texts. The terms are sufficiently distinct in semantic range to avoid any suggestion of lexical replacement.

191.AHw sub *sari(y)am*.

192.Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1952), 342a.

193.Geoffrey E. Freeman, F. T. Miosi, and Adolf Erman, *Neuägyptische Grammatik* (Toronto: Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities, 1973), 5.

As noted in the previous examination of *קובע/קובע* these lexemes often occur together with *שריון/סריון* in the MT. It is difficult to assign any historical importance to this phenomenon as both terms are foreign loanwords and possibly from the same Hittite source. It is possible that the imagery alluded to may be indicative of specific armour or a historical point at which this foreign combination was popular.

Two other occurrences within the MT provide some additional information about the *שריון/סריון*. In 1 Sam. 17.5 the first reference to Goliath's armour, *שריון קשקשים*, is unique in the MT. E. A. Speiser, drawing a strong relationship with the Hurrian cognates,¹⁹⁴ would have the *שריון* alone indicate a tunic of scaled armor as compared to a solid breastplate. It is difficult to support the meaning of *scaled breastplate* in all occurrences of *שריון/סריון*. However in 1 Sam. 17.5 this is explicitly indicated with the use of *קשקשים*, which is used six other times in the MT for the scales of a fish (Lev. 11.9, 11.10, 11.12; Deut. 14.9, 14.10; Ezek. 29.4). The second occurrence which provides some additional information on the *שריון/סריון* is the 1 Kgs 22.34/2 Chron. 18.33 parallel passage where an archer strikes Ahab *בין השריון ובין הדבקים* (between the joints? and the breastplate).¹⁹⁵ The use of *דבק* complicates the passage as it appears to be describing a point on the armour at a level of detail which is extremely rare in the MT. The *דבק* as a substantive noun is uncommon in the MT and only appears within a military context as a plural noun in this parallel passage. Outside of this occurrence there is one attestation in Isa. 41.7 that refers to a blacksmith pounding with a hammer (*ואמר לדבק טוב הוא* - and says of the joint it is good).¹⁹⁶ The lexeme is found as a verb commonly throughout the MT meaning *to adhere* and

194. Speiser, "On Some Articles of Armor and Their Names".

195. Y. Yadin refers to this verse with an illustration from the chariot of Thutmose IV, which shows a chariot driver in a small chariot wearing what appears to be a full body coat of scaled armour—an arrow is stuck in his shoulder/back/arm. Yadin considers this proof of "how an arrow fired from a composite bow could pierce the weak point of the coat of mail at the joint of the sleeve to the garment." Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*,

196. The occurrence of *דבק* in Ezek 29.4 which contains both this lexeme as well as *קשקש* in a non-

thus the definition of the substantive form is *a join*. An alternate definition in the military context, as mentioned by KB, is an appendage or joined piece to the main breastplate.¹⁹⁷

In a historical context, if the Hurrian origin of שריון is accepted, there is a strong parallel also between the *kur-zi-me-tu* construct noun, indicating scale (snake) armour and the Hebrew קשקשים construct noun, indicating scale (fish) armour. This may indicate the Hebrew use of קשקש was an attempt to incorporate the Hurrian description.¹⁹⁸ Scale armour is widely attested in the ancient Near East and is considered to be of Asiatic origin. There is also evidence, albeit scant, from the Mycenaean Shaft-Grave era of bronze discs perforated for attachment to a backing of some material for use in armour.¹⁹⁹ The scale corslet only appears to become common in the Grecian world in the late Archaic period (6th and 5th centuries B.C.E.). This was probably influenced heavily by their contact with the Persians, who commonly wore the scale corslet.²⁰⁰ Within Palestine specifically, J. Waldbaum's study of the bronze to iron transition period found bronze armour scales within the 12th, 11th and 10th centuries B.C.E. However, iron armour scales only began appearing in the 10th century B.C.E.²⁰¹

military context but perhaps playing on the military associations of the terms?

197. Hans Bonnet, *Die Waffen der Völker des Alten Orients* (Gütersloh: Prisma-Verlag, 1977), 213. BRL 340f, 346 :: alt. straps, belts.

198. Although Hurrian lexemes may have been adopted by Hittite and Assyrian cultures it is also notable that Urartu spoke a form of Hurrian which later would have been in contact with the Assyrians and Medians, at least in warfare.

199. Anthony M Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1967), 18. Christian Zervos, *L'art de la Crète néolithique et minoenne* (Paris: Éditions cahiers d'art, 1956), fig. 695.

200. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*, 91.

201. Jane C Waldbaum, *From Bronze to Iron: The Transition From the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in the Eastern Mediterranean*, *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* 54 (Göteborg: P. Aström, 1978), 40.

(iv) צנה

צנה is an extremely difficult lexeme and among the most enigmatic terms for weaponry in the MT. The etymology of the word points towards a meaning as an offensive weapon. Conversely, the usage in the MT and the Septuagint (LXX) have a tendency to describe it as a defensive weapon. Thus it is almost unequivocally translated as a shield of some type.²⁰² Due to this ambiguity of semantic range, replacement, and usage the following section is much lengthier than other word studies. It is divided into three sections: cognates and usage; analysis of possible signified objects and semantic incongruence with the MT pairings as well as Greek parallels.

The צנה lexeme is related to the root צן/צונן which is the root of several words including צן, *thorn* or *barb*; צנה, *hook* or *barb*, *coolness* or *large shield*; צנין, *thorn* or *prick*. KB divides צנה into two definitions of *coolness*, *cold* and *shield* or *protective covering of shields*. צן and its plurals צנימ and צנות are covered in a separate entry. KB reviews each of the three MT occurrences, Prov. 22.5, Job 5.5 and Amos 4.2, in separate entries due to uncertainty whether these plural references even concern the same word.²⁰³ The Job 5.5 צנימ plural is defined as *thorns* or alternatively *barbs*, meaning *thorn thicket*. The second צנימ in Prov. 22.5 is defined as *thorns*, *hooks for fishing*, or *hunting basket*. צנות in Amos 4.2 is the most variant definition with four offered: *prickles or hooks*, *fishing hooks*; *rope*, *cord*;²⁰⁴ *plural of shield or basket*. KB closes this entry with the statement, "of these suggestions the first (and perhaps the second) are the most likely, but hardly the other two (c and d)." All of the possible meanings are related to the semantic range of *prick* or *thorn*, as the use of "coolness" in Prov. 25.13 can be translated as the "prick of

202.Cf. RSV for an example of translation in the text.

203.Eduard König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Wiesbaden: M. Sändig, 1969), 390b. Wilhelm Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona* (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1971), 161.

204.From Akkadian *šinnitu* as a (rare) phonetic variant of *šerretu* 'nose-rope'.

snow" (כצנת שלג ביום קציר). Similarly, the one occurrence in Sirach 43.20 (MS B only - the Masada MS does not attest the term at the beginning of 43.20), צינת רוח צפון ישיב can be read as "The *piercing* north wind blows".

KB lists Akkadian *šinnatum* as a cognate for צנה with the definition of *lance* and Babylonian *šinnatum* as found in the Mari documents as *shield*. This distinction is curious, as this is not the conclusion reached by G. Dossin in his commentary on the relevant Mari text; in the comments he remarks, "Il est donc certain désormais que ce mot n'a rien à voir avec l'instrument de musique *šinnatum* (or *šinnitum*); il s'en distingue aussi, d'ailleurs, par son déterminatif habituel qui est *GI* (au lieu de *GIŠ*) et qui doit désigner, nous fait remarquer M. Dossin, le bois de la lance. Mais l'absence de ce déterminatif dans notre texte (comme dans ARM, I, no 62, 1.20") permet d'écarter la lecture *gizinnatum* suggérée dans CAD".²⁰⁵

The primary text for this commentary is Letter 62 in *Archives Royale de Mari* (ARM) XII, which is translated in the series into French, "Au sujet des lances (?) / dont tu m'as écrit en ces termes : / [Ici], il n'y a pas de lances (?), / 'on apprendra aux....et aux forgerons à faire des lances (?) / fixe et qu'ils fabriquent des lances (?)." Dossin translates *šinnatum* as lance which seems reasonable in the context of a forger manufacturing metal objects. As noted, the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (CAD) follows this distinction of the determinative and defines *gizinnatum* as "the metal object used for both agricultural and military purposes" and then muses that perhaps it can be related to the Western Semitic ḥaššinnu which in turn appears in the MT as גרזן meaning "ax".²⁰⁶

Within the Qumran corpus, צנה is only found once in 4Q437 2 I, 5. The sentence echoes the usage in MT Psalms as it refers to חסדיך לי צנה סביב "your kindness is a צנה around me". Sim-

205. Georges Dossin, *Archives royales de Mari*, 13 (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1946), 165-166.

206. CAD sub *gizinnatum*.

ilar to some of the comparable usage in Psalms, the term could be used figuratively to indicate *protection* rather than literally to refer to a weapon. However, if a literal weapon is indicated, then it would be preferable to translate it as *shield*, although the occurrence in the singular makes any literal translation clumsy.

Although the texts do not agree on a firm definition, it is probable that the nuance of *hook* or *thorn* is held within the various attestations of the צן root in the MT. Either a hook or a thorn carries connotations of a sharp edge, which can act as either an aggressive edge in the instance of a hook, or a defensive edge in the case of the thorn bush. The difference here lies less with the make up of a thorn than the way in which it is used. In the same way, the Assyrian cognate *šinnatum* could conceivably be an aggressive weapon in the case of a lance thrust. It could also be construed as defensive in the case of phalanx action with clustered lances, providing a defensive barrier not unlike a thorn bush.²⁰⁷ The definition of the Hebrew צנה fits well with the Akkadian cognates and supports reading the צנה as an offensive weapon of some type, probably with a sharpened tip or edge that would draw on the linguistic association with a thorn.

Despite this probable linguistic relationship, צנה is consistently translated as shield and defined as such within the Hebrew lexicons. It is difficult to reconstruct exactly why this definition has been adopted; however, the problematic issue from which it appears to sprout is that צנה often appears in a word pair with an offensive weapon,²⁰⁸ commonly רמח, and is most often translated in Greek as θῦρεός which quite definitely means shield.²⁰⁹ However, if the Greek parallels, which are problematic in any case, are put aside, the MT text can support a definition of the צנה as an offensive weapon. This follows the meaning outlined in the study of cognates and

207. Obviously the reference to a phalanx is anachronistic but the point remains the same.

208. With חנית 1 Sam. 17.7, 12.35; with מגן Jer. 46.3, Ezek. 23.24, 38.4, 39.9, Ps. 35.2; with סחרה Ps. 91.4; with רמח 1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25, 2 Chron. 11.12, 14.7, 25.5.

209. Liddell and Scott sub θῦρεός.

the MT attestations. Of the eighteen times צנה occurs in the MT it appears alone five times²¹⁰ and with מגן five times;²¹¹ of the remaining eight occurrences two are with חנית,²¹² five with רמה,²¹³ and once with סהרה²¹⁴ which is a *hapax legemonon*.²¹⁵

The examination of רמה as a military lexeme, discussed in the previous chapter, comes to bear here as well. All of the pairings of רמה with צנה occur only in 1 and 2 Chronicles and only domestically (Gadites, Naphtali, Solomon, Asa, Benjamin, Judah). In fact, except for 1 Chron. 12.35, every occurrence of צנה in Chronicles is paired with רמה (1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25; 2 Chron 11.12, 14.7, 25.5). The reverse is also true, as רמה appears every time in Chronicles together with צנה. One exception occurs in 2 Chron. 26.14, where מגן seems to have been used instead in a lengthy list of weapons. Outside of Chronicles, צנה either appears alone (1 Sam. 17.41, 1 Kgs 10.16, Ezek. 26.8, Ps. 5.13, 2 Chron. 9.15) or with a defensive weapon such as the shield (Jer. 46.3; Ezek. 23.24, 38.4, 39.9; Ps. 35.2). The only exception is 1 Sam. 17.7 in the Goliath narrative, where it appears with חנית. The significance of this will be discussed in a later section. In contrast with the Chronicles passages, the qualities or property of צנה are either attributed to the Lord in the three Psalms passages (Ps. 5.13, 35.2, 91.4), to Solomon in the problematic passage in 1 Kgs 10.16, or to foreigners in the remaining passages (1 Sam. 17.7,

210.1 Sam. 17.41, 1 Kgs 10.16, Ezek. 26.8, Ps. 5.13, 2 Chron. 9.15.

211.Jer. 46.3; Ezek. 23.24, 38.4, 39.9; Ps. 35.2.

212.1 Sam. 17.7, 12.35.

213.1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25, 2 Chron. 11.12, 14.7, 25.5.

214.Ps. 91.4.

215.For a interpretation of the term as an offensive weapon, rather than generic term for protection, see P. Abrahams, "Hébreu-Soherah / Akkadien-Sahirum," *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utiles* 1 (1991): 20-21. "Il y a donc de fortes chances pour que la séquence sinnah/soherah du vers 4 définisse aussi une panoplie et que le soherah soit une arme. A ce propos, un rapprochement avec l'adjectif sahirum, employé pour décrire le 'retour' des bras de l'arc-gis illuru/tilpanum permettrait d'identifier le soherah à un arc."

17.41 [Goliath/Philistines], Ezek. 23.24 [Neo-Babylonians], Ezek. 26.8 [Nebuchadrezzar], Ezek. 38.4 [Gog], Ezek. 39.9 [Gog and Magog], Jer. 46.3 [Egyptians or Nebuchadrezzar]).²¹⁶

There is a tendency to look for definitions in military word pairs that create a complement of offensive and defensive arms.²¹⁷ In this case, however, it would be as awkward to define **צנה** offensively as defensively. As noted above, **צנה** appears seven times with an offensive weapon, either javelin or spear, or five times with a defensive weapon, the shield. However, the **מגן** pairings are not as explicit or constant in their literary form as the **צנה/רמה** pairings, which seems to have led to an interpretation of the spear paired with what must be a shield.

In consideration of the textual patterns, the Hebrew root and Assyrian cognates, it is necessary to correct the previous definition of **צנה** as a large shield in all MT occurrences. This can be done by continuing in the tradition of previous translators, understanding the term as a shield but with a narrower definition of spiked shield or spiked buckler. Conversely, it can be corrected by breaking entirely from this and doing a reverse turn by following the Assyrian cognate, *šinnatum*. This has been defined by G. Dossin and the CAD as *lance*. A new proposal may be translating **צנה** as *axe (specifically narrow-bladed or flat axe)*. In order to do either of the latter two, the uses in the MT text of the book of Chronicles will need to be considered separately along with the Greek parallels.

(1) Alternative definitions of **צנה**

a) **צנה** as lance

When **צנה** is considered an offensive weapon, the preferred rendering is *lance*. The term *lance* will be used in this discussion as opposed to *spear*, not in order to draw any particular dis-

216. The relationship between **צנה** and the neo-Babylonians should be noted but also cautioned. It is found only within the Ezekiel passages except for the one Jeremiah 46.3 reference which is most probably referring to Nebuchadrezzar's army but possibly also the Egyptians.

217. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, 2.

tion, but because it is favoured by the Assyrian lexicons. The *lance* has been the traditional definition for the Assyrian *šinnatum*²¹⁸ and is also mentioned in some of the Hebrew lexicons as an alternative.²¹⁹ The argument from cognates and etymology reviewed in the section above supports reading the צנה as an offensive weapon.

The archaeological evidence for lances or spears is wide and varied in all periods. Although much can be conjectured about the size of spears through the weight and size of the remaining heads, a detailed survey of this material is not particularly useful as the term in question does not carry any meaning to distinguish itself as a particular style or size of spear. It is sufficient in this case to note the large ratio of spears among military finds.²²⁰ Reliefs corroborate the importance of the spear across the wider Ancient Near East panoply. The Assyrian panoply at all times contain the spear as a standard military arm and this continues on into the Persian era.²²¹

Within the MT attestations, Jer. 46.3 and Ezek. 38.4 particularly favour the definition of צנה as a lance. In both cases, the weapon in question is part of the panoply of the horseman. From the limited evidence of Assyrian reliefs, the lance is the most common weapon in the horseman's panoply with the bow as a lesser alternative; none are depicted with an axe.²²² It is favourable to define the horseman's צנה as a lance rather than an axe.

218.Cf. CAD and AHw.

219.Cf. KB, BDB sub חנית and sub רמח.

220.Waldbaum, *From Bronze to Iron: The Transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in the Eastern Mediterranean*. Sarel Shalev, *Swords and Daggers in Late Bronze Age Canaan* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004).

221.The spear and bow along with the small sword comprise the standard warrior panoply on almost all Assyrian reliefs. Often unengaged warriors are shown with a spear while holding a bow in hand. Generally when fighting the weapons are used independently, often with warriors operating in pairs; one with the lance and shield and the other with the bow.

222.Cf. Sculptures etc.

The difficulty with defining צנה as *lance* however, is its pairing with רמה and חנית in several MT passages. חנית is quite certainly defined as *javelin* and רמה as a *large spear*.²²³ Obviously both of these terms have a strong similarity to צנה if defined as *lance*. If pairing of weapons as a description of the basic warrior panoply is considered an argument in the definition of the צנה, then the similarity of definitions between the terms is a problem; it is doubtful the warriors panoply would be described as a spear and spear/lance/javelin, rather than a spear and shield. In defense of defining צנה as *lance* within this argument, the pairing of צנה with חנית could be understood as contrasting the חנית as a throwing spear with the צנה as a thrusting lance. Here it is difficult to make a similar distinction with the רמה, which is a large spear. To reiterate, basing a definition on the criteria of pairing is weak as terms are not necessarily used exclusively. Further, parallel repetition is a strong linguistic style in the MT texts and can be a valid reason to duplicate elements with slightly different terms.²²⁴ Therefore, the arguments based on pairing alone are not substantial enough to discourage a definition of צנה as *lance*.

b) צנה as axe

Defining צנה as *axe* is a new option that provides a sound alternative to *lance*, while maintaining the offensive and militaristic qualities and adding further nuance to several of the occurrences in the MT. The cognate and etymological arguments mentioned in the previous *lance* discussion are equally applicable here. It should also be reiterated that the CAD discussion on *šinnatu A* refers to a Mari occurrence with the *GI* determinative as a "metal object used for both agricultural and military purposes".²²⁵

223. Refer to the study of Song of Deborah and the examination of רמה.

224. Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 115-159.

225. Jean Bottéro and André Finet, *Répertoire analytique des tomes à V, Archives royales de Mari. XV* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1954), 270.

The flat axe or even the narrow-blade axe would fit this definition. Not only does its shape and sharp edge mirror a thorn, but the flat axe in particular was used as much for domestic purposes as military.²²⁶ The flat axe varied from smaller examples, which are much the same as a chisel, to larger multi-purpose items; G. Philip notes that these could be resharpened as adzes.²²⁷

Philip's study of weapon pairings in Early and Middle Bronze Age grave deposits points to the fenestrated axe being paired often with the spear and dagger, while the narrow-bladed axe is only found in the Middle Bronze II.²²⁸ In the Late Bronze Age axes become much less common in grave contexts, but those found are only of the shaft-hole type rather than narrow-bladed.²²⁹ In the Iron Age various types of axe continue to be found in Palestine, though not within grave deposits.²³⁰ This absence of the axe within grave deposits in the Iron Age may indicate a former symbolic function. Perhaps military and leadership overtones in the Bronze Age are lost in the Iron Age as the axe is relegated to a simple domestic and agricultural tool.

Although in the Iron Age it is probable that the narrow-bladed axe ceased to be commonly used as a military arm,²³¹ it continued to appear as a functional tool in the military con-

226. Philip will not even cover the flat-axe as it is too domestic. Graham Philip, *Metal Weapons of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages in Syria-Palestine*, Bar International Series 526 (Oxford: B.A.R., 1989), 1.

227. *Ibid.*, 2.

228. Examples of the narrow-bladed axe in MB II contexts are Ras Shamra where his Type 4 narrow-bladed axe is found with large spears and a number of small daggers, or Tel el-Dab'a, Megiddo, Ginosar and Khirbet Kufin. *Ibid.*, 70.

229. *Ibid.*, 217.

230. A narrow-blade/pick (Ashdod 10th century B.C.E.), a pick axe (Har Adir 12th century B.C.E.), an axe or adze blade (Tel Amal 10th century B.C.E.), a socketed pick (Tell el-Far'ah North 10th century B.C.E.), and an adze or axehead as well as a socketed axe or pick (Tel Jemmeh 10th century B.C.E.). Paula M. McNutt, *The Forging of Israel: Iron Technology, Symbolism and Tradition in Ancient Society*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 108 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 164-187.

231. Philip, *Metal Weapons of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages in Syria-Palestine*.

text of the siege. The reliefs from the palaces of Ashurbanipal and Senncherib as well as the bronze reliefs on the gates of Shalmaneser depict Assyrian forces besieging various cities. On several of these reliefs men are shown breaking down the city walls with hand tools, which appear to be sturdy daggers or, in some cases, possibly flat axes.²³²

This usage could be reflected in Jeremiah and Ezekiel where צנה is used in the context of an attacking army. Ezekiel 26.8 explicitly describes the scene of a siege and the downfall of the besieged city, בנותיך בשדה בחרב יהרג ונתן עליך דיק ושפך עליך סללה והקים עליך צנה. The RSV translates this, "He will slay with the sword your daughters on the mainland; he will set up a siege wall against you, and throw up a mound against you, and raise a roof of shields against you." The Hebrew in the final clause, והקים עליך צנה, is not nearly so clear and the RSV translation is certainly problematic. The clause would be better read as, *and bring against you the צנה*, aligning it with the Greek parallel, καὶ περίστασιν ὄπλων καὶ τὰς λόγχας αὐτοῦ ἀπέναντί σου δώσει (*bring a crisis of weapon and spear*). The pick-axe definition also works particularly well with the parallelism occurring in 26.9, ומחי קבלו יתן בחמותיך ומגדלתיך יתן בחרבותיו (He will direct the shock of his battering rams against your walls, and with his axes he will break down your towers. RSV). As a result of building a siege ramp (throwing up a mound) comes the shock

232.L. W King and E. A. Wallis Budge, *Bronze Reliefs From the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825* (London: Printed by order of the Trustees, 1915). Plate XXI. Richard David Barnett, *Sculptures From the North Palace of Ashurbanipal At Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)* (London: British Museum Publications Ltd. for the Trustees of the British Museum, 1976). BM 124931-2, BM 124928. Fragment (A) - Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 21.6. Richard David Barnett et al., *Sculptures From the Southwest Palace of Sennacherib At Nineveh* (London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Press, 1998). 240a (s10). These men are depicted as holding a shield above their heads with one hand to protect themselves from any attack by defenders on the city walls and chipping or prying with the tool held in their other hand. From the north palace of Ashurbanipal there is a unique scene depicting the sack of the Elamite city of Hamanu, where five men are shown breaking down the walls of the defeated and burning city. Three of these men wield pick-axes and the remaining two use long narrow implements to break apart the walls. Barnett, *Sculptures From the North Palace of Ashurbanipal At Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. BM 124919

of the battering ram, and as a result of bringing the צנה against the city comes the breaking down of the towers with the sword.

However, defining צנה as a form of axe, such as *pick-axe*, does raise other problems. Leaving aside the pairing of רמח and צנה in Chronicles, we encounter problems in the remainder of the uses. The major problem is that, although the axe is not a commonly attested military weapon in the Iron Age, it appears only in a military context in the Hebrew bible. The texts where it appears are dated to the late seventh - early sixth century at the earliest (Jer. 46.3 for example). In the biblical texts, צנה appears to be part of the common military panoply. Conversely, the axe most probably was not; though, as discussed above, it must have been an implement that carried connotations of destruction.

c) צנה as horned buckler

Following the traditional definition of צנה as a shield, another option is to understand the shield as an offensive weapon and not a purely defensive piece of armament. Returning to the Assyrian relief evidence, there are occurrences in the reliefs of Ashurnasirpal and Shalmaneser of a buckler-type weapon used in an offensive manner. This weapon is used along with a knife both in the assault of besieged cities and in hand to hand combat. The buckler depicted in the earlier reliefs explicitly shows multiple pointed bumps or spikes protruding from the face of the buckler.²³³ In the Shalmaneser bronze reliefs (858-824) the Assyrian soldiers are shown advancing on a besieged city with spiked bucklers extended in front of them, brandishing a knife in the other hand.²³⁴ There are also earlier reliefs from the period of Ashurnasirpal (885-860) which feature a similar shield, though the spiked protrusions are not so apparent.

233. King and Budge, *Bronze Reliefs From the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825.* Plate VIII. Possibly in frontal relief in LXXIV?

234. *Ibid.* Plate XXI, Plate VIII, Plate XL, LXXIV.

However, the shape of the buckler remains the same and they are depicted in hand to hand combat where the buckler is used to pin down an enemy while a knife delivers the fatal blow.²³⁵ This method of fighting with a spiked buckler and knife or short sword was current again in medieval warfare, where the buckler had a single, large, protruding spike.²³⁶

There is also a single relief that depicts a mounted horseman carrying a spiked buckler.²³⁷ This may correspond with the mentions in Jer. 46.3 and Ezek. 38.4 where the צנה is associated with mounted warriors. However, it is impossible to tell from the relief whether this is a cavalry horseman or infantry member riding from one location to another.²³⁸ The relief shows a chariot followed by three horsemen, the first without an apparent weapon, the second with a bow in its case and the third hoisting a sword as well as carrying a spiked buckler on his back. The grouping of these three horsemen together seems to indicate a dedicated military unit. However, the difficulty is that the relief also displays the rider solo, riding one horse with another horse at its side. This may indicate a stylistic rendering rather than realistic which makes an interpretation of the unit increasingly problematic.

The Jeremiah and Ezekiel passages refer to the panoply of a cavalry horseman, a distinct military unit, rather than an infantry man being transported on horseback. If the Shalmaneser relief is indeed depicting a group of cavalry here, then the spiked buckler would be part of the cavalry panoply. However, if the relief is interpreted as infantry men being transported on

235.E. A. Wallis Budge, *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum : Reign of Ashur-Nasir-Pal, 885-860 B.C* (London: Printed by order of the Trustees, 1914). Plate XXIII. Compare: King and Budge, *Bronze Reliefs From the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825*. Plate LVI, Plate XLII.

236.Jeremy Black, *European Warfare, 1453-1815* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 39.

237.King and Budge, *Bronze Reliefs From the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825*. Plate LVII

238.The rider in the relief has the buckler slung on his back in a transport position, rather than in an active position. This perhaps indicates infantry men on the move, rather than cavalry.

horseback, it does not support reading the spiked buckler as part of the Assyrian cavalry panoply.

The advantages of interpreting צנה as a spiked buckler are that it offers the flexibility of being both a defensive and offensive weapon. This allows it to fit into any of the MT contexts, paired or alone. It also maintains ties to the linguistic cognates and roots. Hebrew words such as צן, thorn or barb and צנים, thorn thicket could be reflected in the spiky front of the shield as well as in the way the shield snares its targets on its spikes in the Assyrian reliefs.

The difficulty with this interpretation is the chronological disparity between the Assyrian reliefs dated to Shalmaneser (858-824) and Ashurnasirpal (885-860). These are dated far earlier than the composition of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, which explicitly mention the Neo-Babylonian king Nebuchadrezzar who reigned 605-562 B.C.E. Reliefs from the Neo-Babylonian period which reflect the warfare practices of the day do not exist. It is possible that the use of a spiked buckler continued beyond the evidence we have into the Neo-Babylonian period; as noted previously, the practice does surface again in medieval periods, so it is possible there was similar usage in the Neo-Babylonian period.

The second difficulty with the definition of צנה as a spiked buckler is that this weapon is used with the knife or short sword both in the Assyrian reliefs and in the medieval period. However, the MT only mentions the צנה in approximate association with חרב once in Ezek. 38.4:

ושובבתיך ונתתי חחים בלחיך והוצאתי אותך ואת כל חילך סוסים ופרשים לבשי מכלול כלם קהל רב צנה ומגן
תפשי הרבות כלם

"and I will turn you about, and put hooks into your jaws, and I will bring you forth, and all your army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed in full armor, a great company, all of them with buckler and shield, wielding swords."

Although **הרב** is mentioned as part of the warrior panoply along with **צנה** it does not appear paired with **צנה**; instead **צנה** is paired with **מגן** and **הרב** is mentioned separately. It would be difficult to read an Assyrian or medieval buckler and sword pairing here, not only because **הרב** is not paired explicitly but because **צנה** is paired with **מגן**!

Neither a shield nor a spear make a reasonable companion to the spiked buckler. From the pictorial evidence available, the spiked buckler was not a weapon that was used independently. It is consistently depicted with a short thrusting weapon. This makes it difficult to reconcile the **צנה** pairings with **מגן** as well as the five biblical passages (1 Sam. 17.41, 1 Kgs 10.16, Ezek. 26.8, Ps. 5.13, 2 Chron. 9.15) where **צנה** appears alone.

(2) Difficulties with **צנה in parallel texts**

a) The LXX Greek parallels to MT Hebrew

The Greek renderings of **צנה** in the LXX vary wildly outside of Chronicles. The obvious difficulty with using the LXX renderings in order to shed light on the Hebrew terms is that the source history and redaction history of the LXX is fraught with uncertainty. Associating the Greek as a translation of the MT text is extremely suspect; it is generally assumed that the LXX and MT are more often working from common or related sources than the LXX drawing directly from the MT. Therefore it is doubtful that there exists any direct relationship between the MT **צנה** and the LXX terms; without a direct relationship it cannot be assumed that a Greek term is in fact attempting to translate **צנה**.

However, the lure of looking for related patterns within the LXX is strong. In order to crudely sort out LXX passages with a high probability of alternate or variant sources, it is worth dividing occurrences up into parallels where the sentence structure exactly mirrors the MT, and parallels where the sentence structure differs. This depends on the presumption that, in the case of a similar source, the MT and LXX passages would bear strong structural and grammatical

similarities. A variant source would result in structural and grammatical differences. However, due to a multitude of reasons why a redactor would alter the source text, the parallel passages are probably the only fruitful selection to attempt conclusions from.

The verses that match across the MT and LXX are 1 Sam. 17.7 (ὄπλον), Jer. 46.3 (ἀσπίδας), Ezek. 39.9 (κοντὸς), Ps. 5.13 (ὄπλω), Ps. 35.2 (θυρεοῦ), 1 Chron. 12.9 (θῦρεός), 1 Chron. 12.25 (θῦρεός), 1 Chron. 12.35 (θῦρεός), 2 Chron. 11.12 (θῦρεός), 2 Chron. 14.7 (θῦρεός) and 2 Chron. 25.5 (θῦρεός). The immediate observation is not only that the Greek translator of Chronicles rendered the underlying Hebrew text consistently avoiding paraphrase, but also that **נצ** is consistently translated with the same Greek term, **θῦρεός**, meaning *shield*. The only exception in the Greek translation of Chronicles is 2 Chron. 9.15, which varies with the MT equivalent. However, even here **נצ** is translated with **θῦρεός**.²³⁹

Elsewhere, the Greek translators of Samuel, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in which **נצ** occurs a single time, chose to render it differently than the translator of Chronicles. The translator of Psalms rendered the term differently in one of the two uses in that collection. It is possible that this discrepancy indicates the Greek translator of Chronicles had a familiarity with the term or a strong cultural expectation of typical weapons pairing compared to the translators of the other books. However, far too many variables exist to draw any conclusions from this discrepancy other than that the definition of the MT term was not standardised.

Although four different Greek words are used in these passages, three of them, **θῦρεός**, **ὄπλον** and **ἀσπίδας** can carry the connotations of a shield. This leaves only **κοντὸς** as a com-

239. The attestation in 2 Chronicles 14.7 provides an interesting context; it opens by mentioning Asa's army had 300,000 Judaeans bearing **נצ** and spear and then 280,000 Benjaminites bearing the **גמ** and drawing the bow. The LXX attests **θυρεοὺς καὶ δόρατα** for the Judaeans and **πελτασταὶ καὶ τοξόται** for the Benjaminites. This may indicate the **נצ** and **רמח** as the heavy armed force and the **גמ** **אש** and bowmen as the lightly armed force.

plete variant. ὄπλον, used in 1 Sam. 17.7 and Ps. 5.13, can be aligned with θύρεός as it is a generic term for weapons or armament, either defensive or offensive.

Likewise, the ἀσπίδας of Jer. 46.3 is defined as a *shield*, similar to θύρεός, but has some further chronological ramifications. The possibly related ἀσπίδισκος of Exodus is most probably a small breastplate cum shield [ref to Assyrian breastplates like small round shields] and doesn't bear discussion here. The root of ἀσπίδας, ἀσπις, means both shield and asp. It appears as shield throughout the LXX parallels to the MT text (1 Sam. 17.6, 17.45; 1 Chron. 5.18; 2 Chron. 9.16; Job 15.26, 41.15; Jer. 46.3), but interestingly it is more strongly represented in several later books (Jdt. 9.7; 1 Macc. 6.39, 14.24, 15.18, 15.20; 2 Macc. 5.3, 15.11; Wis. 5.19; Sir. 29.13, Sir. 37.5). This Hellenistic bias is in contrast to θύρεός and ὄπλον. θύρεός occurs only in LXX parallels to MT passages and ὄπλον is divided evenly between these MT parallels and apocryphal/deuterocanonical books. The use of ἀσπις in translation may indicate a strong Hellenistic presence in these passages with an anachronistic retrojection of Hellenistic terms into the LXX translation. As already noted, this may be due to confusion over the definition of הַיָּסָד.

Finally κοντὸς in Ezek. 39.9 is the odd choice among these Greek terms as it means the shaft of a spear. The only other occurrence of κοντὸς in the LXX is within 1 Sam. 17.7 where the κοντὸς of Goliath is compared to the infamous weaver's beam. This is a confusing choice of terms and the rarity of the term makes the choice more baffling. The LXX passage parallels the MT perfectly down to the word and order of terms within the list, so it does appear that κοντὸς is a deliberate translation. While still leaving room for any number of scenarios, it is possible that the choice is a literary one where the term is supposed to resonate with the Goliath story.

The renderings which presume a different underlying source text for a given verse or perhaps a paraphrasing are 1 Kgs 10.16 (δόρατα), Ezek. 23.24 (θυροῖ), Ezek. 26.8 (ὄπλων - λόγχας), Ezek. 38.4 (πέλται), Ps. 91.4 (ὄπλω), 2 Chron. 9.15 (θύρεός). The definitions of

θῦρεός and ὄπλον have been discussed in the previous paragraphs. δόρυ certainly means a large spear in Greek, but there is likely confusion or differing sources in the LXX passage as the parallel passage in 2 Chron. 9.15 uses θῦρεός instead of δόρυ. πέλις is defined as a light shield and is a very common Greek word. The most famous use of πέλις is by the πελταστής, a lightly armed division popular in the Greek armies.²⁴⁰ Curiously, the LXX use of πέλις is restricted to the book of Ezekiel (Ezek. 23.24, 27.10, 38.4, 38.5, 39.9), although πελταστής is used in 2 Chron. 14.7 and 17.7. Lastly, λόγχη is defined as a spear and appears within the LXX in 1 Sam. 17.7; Neh. 4.13, 4.16, 4.21; 2 Macc. 5.2, 15.11; Job 16.13, 41.26; Ezek. 26.8, 39.9. Although the Ezek. 26.8 passage is variant, the ending line seems to closely parallel the MT and thus place λόγχη as the parallel to נִצַּח, supporting a reading of נִצַּח here as *lance*.

However, as noted, these terms are all within passages which are variant between the Hebrew and Greek attestations. As there are too many unaccountable variables, it is not worth attempting to establish relationships between the Hebrew and Greek texts. Overall, it can be noted that there is no definite pattern which correlates to variant and non-variant passages. The Greek terms are spread fairly equally among the two groups, with θῦρεός and ὄπλον being the most common and a few wild variants in both groups.

(3) Pairing of נִצַּח in Chronicles

The distinction between the occurrences of נִצַּח in Chronicles and those outside is noteworthy and deserves comment. When compared to occurrences outside of Chronicles, these passages exhibit strong patterns both in the pairing of נִצַּח as well as in the LXX translation. Within Chronicles, נִצַּח is paired with חַמַּת with only one exception; in 1 Chron. 12.35, it appears along-

240. Jan G. P. Best, *Thracian Peltasts and Their Influence on Greek Warfare*, Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society 1 (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1969).

side חנית.²⁴¹ This is in sharp contrast to the occurrences outside of Chronicles where צנה forms word pairs with a variety of terms or appears without any pairing. The standardisation of צנה in Chronicles is strengthened by the Greek usage of θῦρεός in every LXX parallel. Again, this is in contrast to the LXX parallels outside of Chronicles where several Greek terms are variably used. Thus, a standard רמה/צנה and θῦρεός/δόρυ word pair is observable throughout Chronicles both in the MT and LXX. Both θῦρεός, *shield*, and δόρυ, *spear*, are clearly defined words in Greek—there is no doubt or ambiguity in meaning in either case.

רמה is also a well-defined term in Hebrew, representing a spear. It is worth examining how it occurs in the MT and in the Qumran texts. רמה is consistently paired with מגן in its four appearances in the Qumran corpus. All contexts imply it was a fighting weapon.²⁴² In 4Q372 f 19, 2 and 4Q373 1ab, 3, a man six and a half cubits tall and two cubits wide wields a רמה כארז, "spear like a cedar".²⁴³ In 1QM 6.15 and 5.12 the רמה is referred to as being eight cubits long, while in 1QM 5.6-7, it is seven cubits. Thus, it is clear that the weapon in question had a long shaft.

In each of these Qumran occurrences the רמה is paired with a מגן. 1QM 5.6 describes the מגן as two and a half cubits high and a cubit and a half wide, which would make it an oval or possibly a figure-eight shield like a peltai with the sides cut out. 1QM 9.12 describes the מגני as three cubits long. 1QM 6.15 does not give a description of the shield size but does describe it as a round shield. 4Q372 19, 2 also does not mention an exact height but in the fragmentary area notes that it was כמגדל "like a tower".

241. In 2 Chron. 9.15 it appears without any word pair but this falls within the problem of the 1 Kings/2 Chronicles parallel passages which have been discussed separately.

242. 1QM 5.6-7, 6.15, 9.12; 4Q372 19, 2.

243. This would run against Yadin's interpretation of Goliath's spear being a javelin, rather than comparing it to a substantial piece of wood. It is also of interest that the רמה like a cedar is not a חנית.

The Qumran use of רמח paired with מגן is consistent both in the pairing as well as in the descriptions applied to the terms. The Qumran רמח is a long spear or lance between seven and eight cubits long. The רמח is paired with the מגן, which is two and half to three cubits high and is probably oval in shape. The texts use רמח invariably for a very long, hand-held spear in contrast to חנית, which was explicitly a javelin or throwing spear. The pairing of long spears and tall shields is reminiscent of Greek or Assyrian formations.²⁴⁴ The strongly structured pairing of רמח and מגן in the Qumran texts is probably reflecting the common Hellenistic panoply of the peltasts or later thureophoroi.²⁴⁵

The רמח and מגן pair is much less common in the Hebrew text. רמח occurs solo (Num. 25.7, Neh. 4.15), as the צנח word pair in Chronicles (1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25; 2 Chron. 11.12, 14.7, 25.5), paired with חרב (1 Kgs 18.28, Joel 4.10), סריני and כובע (Jer. 46.4), קשת and חרב (Neh. 4.7) and among an assortment of weapons in Ezek. 39.9, Neh. 4.10 and 2 Chron. 26.14. There is additionally an explicit linking with a shield, מגן, in Judg. 5.8 in the Song of Deborah. This should be distinguished from Neh. 4.10 and Ezek. 39.9, which list groups of weapons that include the מגן but do not explicitly pair it with the רמח.

The MT text of Chronicles appears to use צנח in the same way that מגן is used in the Qumran corpus. In Qumran texts the רמח is invariably paired with מגן. In the book of Chronicles it is paired, apart from one exception, with צנח. The standardised Qumran pairing considered against the standardised pairing within Chronicles indicates that the Chronicles צנח can be understood as a shield pair with the רמח. This conclusion is also supported by the consistent LXX

244. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. Plate 54. Barnett, *Sculptures From the North Palace of Ashurbanipal At Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. BM124919 + 134386.

245. Best, *Thracian Peltasts and Their Influence on Greek Warfare*. The peltast began to die out in the third century B.C.E., which may indicate a preference for the thureophoroi identification. The thureophoroi carried a large oval shield, thrusting spear, javelin and sword. This would also fit with the LXX Chronicles use of θυρεος as the pairing with רמח. Indeed, 1 Chron. 12.25 explicitly identifies the Judaeans as thureophoroi: υἱοὶ Ἰουδα θυρεοφόροι καὶ δορατοφόροι. The δορατοφόροι are actually spear-bearing cavalry.

translation of θῦρεός in Chronicles, which fits the physical description of the Qumran מגן. Therefore, it is likely that צנה in Chronicles should be understood as the θῦρεός described in Qumran texts and paired there exclusively with רמה.

(4) Literary and historical implications

The uses of צנה in 1 Sam. 17.7 and 17.41 warrant special consideration as they exhibit familiarity with the meaning of צנה employed consistently in Chronicles. This association is particularly meaningful when a division is made between the occurrences of צנה in Chronicles and those outside of it. Furthermore, in both 1 Samuel passages the term is part of the technical compound נשא צנה, *one who bears the צנה*, or, *צנה bearer*; this phrase is found only twice elsewhere, in 1 Chron. 12.25 and 2 Chron. 14.7.

The צנה in 1 Samuel is described as part of the panoply of Goliath. The difficulty is whether the צנה here should be defined as lance, as in the occurrences outside of Chronicles, or whether the passage bears familiarity with the Chronicles definition of צנה as *shield*.

The remainder of Goliath's panoply includes a כובע (helmet), שריו (coat of mail), מצח (greaves), כידון (scimitar) and חנית (spear). The text makes a particular point about describing Goliath's spear, even giving the weight of the spear head. וחץ [ו] [עץ] חניתו כמנור ארגים ולהבת חניתו. "And the shaft of his spear was like a weavers beam and the head of his spear six hundred sheqels of iron". While it is possible Goliath carried another spear or lance as well as a חנית and did not have a shield at all, it seems more logical to understand the נשא צנה as a shield bearer; this is also consistent with the Chronicles definition and usage of the נשא צנה, both of which occur within the רמה/צנה word pair.

The difficulty that arises is the רמה/צנה pattern in Chronicles. Goliath's spear in 1 Samuel 17 would be a רמה. However, it is a חנית, thus breaking down the neat pairing which is the hallmark of Chronicles. The explanation may be that the phrase חנית כמנור ארגים is a stock

phrase, at least in this type of pericope, as it occurs without variation in its four Hebrew Bible appearances (1 Sam. 17.7; 2 Sam. 21.19; 1 Chron. 11.23; 1 Chron. 20.5). The stability of this detail among so many variants in all four occurrences indicates that it either resonated strongly as a narrative element or provided some essential detail central to this story type.

The association of חנית with רמח does occur in 4Q372 19, 2-3, as discussed in the examination of חנית here. Although fragmentary, the passage may be reflecting or using the Goliath tradition when referring to a giant man with a spear like a tree (רמח כארז) and shield like a tower. This may indicate the image displayed in 1 Samuel 17 is of a substantial spear and not a light-weight javelin; this conclusion does assume that there is a relationship of tradition or type between the MT and Qumran occurrences as well as ignoring other variables which might have led to the vocabulary difference in 4Q372 19, 2-3. In support of the possible רמח/חנית interchangeability in 1 Samuel 17 is the צנה and חנית pair in 1 Chron. 12.35. This is the only occurrence in Chronicles where צנה is not paired with רמח and indicates that the exchange of חנית and רמח is not entirely anomalous to the Chronicles pairing pattern.

The occurrence of צנה in 1 Samuel 17 strongly parallels the use of the term in Chronicles, which carries a very different meaning than the use in other books—namely the identification of a large shield rather than a lance or spear. This means that in the passage נשא צנה should be interpreted as the shield-bearer and not a lance-bearer. This interpretation raises narrative questions about why the נשא צנה disappears from the text once the narrative shifts to David throwing his stones.

Historically, the pattern of usage and definition of the צנה as a shield in 1 Samuel 17 relates the text closely to the Chronicles usage of the term as well as the Qumran depiction of a standard panoply consisting of a spear and large shield. It is difficult to assign any particular historical period to this particular panoply as it was quite common at many chronological points.

(v) מַד

The lexeme מַד occurs twice in the David/Goliath narrative in 1 Sam. 17.38 and 17.39; each of these are in the context of Saul equipping David with his fighting armour. The substantive form attested here is related to the verbal form מָדַד which means *measure*. This substantive form occurs in the masculine מַד and the feminine מֵדָה. BDB defines the substantive as a *measure/apportionment* or a *garment* for fighting men or priests. KB defines it generally as a *gown* or *robe*. Cognate languages evidence similar usage of related terms; Jewish Babylonian Aramaic uses מְדָא for a *robe of honour*—this is similar to the Qumran use of the phrase מֵדַת הַדָּרוֹ (robe of honour). Punic, Egyptian Aramaic and Ugaritic also attest related lexemes.²⁴⁶

Within the MT there is limited usage of the term within this semantic range. Ps. 109.18 refers to a generic garment; Lev 6.3 refers to the garment of the priest (וּלְבַשׁ הַכֹּהֵן מְדוּ בַד); a form in Judg. 5.10 may refer to carpets or linens. Psalm 133.2 also has an anomalous form (מֵדוֹת) which may refer to a priestly robe. There are seven occurrences within a military context: Judg. 3.16 refers to Ehud strapping a dagger under his מַד; 1 Sam. 4.12 refers to a military runner's garments; 2 Sam. 20.8 refers to Joab's garment and strapped dagger; 1 Sam 17.38-39 refers to David putting on Saul's garment; 1 Sam. 18.4 refers to Jonathan taking off his garment, bow and sword; 2 Sam. 10.4 and the parallel 1 Chron. 19.4 use the form מְדוּ for the garments of David's messengers to Hanun of Ammon.

There are several patterns of distribution associated with the military occurrences of מַד which indicate it was probably a specific part of a military outfit and associated with a certain armament style. In three MT passages the מַד is mentioned with a detailed description of girding

246. Hoftijzer et al., *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, 142. Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, *Analecta Orientalia* 38 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967), §19:1423. Joseph Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967), 1516.

Historically, the description of the מַד as a protective garment either worn alone or under additional armour is accurate; the use of linen as protective armour is well attested in the ancient Near East and in the Greek world as well—perhaps most notably as a description of the Assyrian troops of Xerxes during the Persian wars.²⁴⁹ The linen corselet is also described in *Cyropaedia* 6.4.2 as part of the panoply of originally Assyrian Abradatas. The strong military context of the majority of MT occurrences certainly support this definition of מַד as a military corselet. Also, although the Lev 6.10 occurrence is in the context of a priestly garment and the LXX doesn't use the parallel military *μανδύας* (the priest puts on a *χιτῶνα λινοῦν*), the description of a linen מַד is aligned with the military usage of a linen defensive garment.

In the literary context of the narrative the use of both the מַד and שָׂרִיִּון in the description of Saul dressing David for battle appears redundant. It is possible that the combined use of a linen corselet underneath a metal corselet was observed on the battlefield,²⁵⁰ however, none of the other MT passages describe the מַד combined with a שָׂרִיִּון or another form of protective armour. Finally, it should be noted that the purpose of the linen corselet was to provide protection while still providing maximum mobility and breathability for light armoured infantry; combining a linen corselet with a scaled corselet annuls this purpose.

In light of the fantastic character of the text, it may be possible that these extreme and incongruent defensive measures Saul attempts with David highlight the hyperbole regarding

249. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*, 18. Shaft-Grave V -linen fragment fourteen layers thick from corselet? *Ibid.*, 90. "This was old enough to appear in the *Iliad*, where Ajax the lesser and Amphion are both 'linen-corsleted' (I., 529, 830); and indeed it may have been used by the Mycenaeans of the Shaft-grave period, as we have seen (p.18). Linen in multiple layers, quilted together, has a long history as a defensive material and should not be underrated. At the beginning of the sixth century, the corslets mentioned by Alcaeus in his list of armour (64) are of linen; later in the century the Egyptian Pharaoh Amasis dedicated an elaborate and famous example at Lindos and sent another to Sparta; in the Persian Wars we find it worn by the Assyrian troops of Xerxes."

250. In the Middle Ages it was common to wear both linen corslets and a coat of mail over top. This combination was said to even stop crossbow bolts and arrows from English long bows where a coat of mail alone would not protect you.

Goliath's weaponry as well as the dire situation facing David.²⁵¹ Not only is David faced with the intimidating weaponry of Goliath, he is trussed up with double corslets to the point where he cannot walk (דוד אל שאול לא אוכל ללכת באלה).

The literary implications of David putting on the *מג* can also be associated with the office of priest, as found in the Lev. 6.10 passage. If the casting off of Saul's armour can be read as a rejection of the kingship, so, too, can the casting off of the *מג* be read as a rejection of a priesthood passed down from Saul.²⁵² The nuance of this reading is complicated by what spiritual role Saul is considered to hold. The narrative relevant to Saul is certainly concerned with his spiritual leadership but not necessarily in a positive way, as in 1 Sam. 13.8-14 where Saul offers sacrifices rather than waiting for the priests. In a less direct sense, the attempt to pass on the *מג* may be foreshadowing the coming reign of David as a spiritual leader in much the same way as his kingly leadership is foreshadowed here.

מקל (vi)

מקל is attested eighteen times in sixteen MT verses with a literal meaning of a *rod* or *stick*. It is used in a range of contexts, several of which imbue it with additional mystic or military nuance. Oddly, related lexemes are not found in cognate languages and KB notes the etymology as uncertain with the closest possible parallel being the Arabic and Ge'ez verb *bql* meaning *to sprout*. The term also appears substantively in Akkadian as *baqlu*.²⁵³ The lexeme does not occur in any of the Qumran sectarian manuscripts.

251. Somewhat akin to packing the barrel with pillows before going over Niagara Falls.

252. Smith's early commentary on Samuel came to a similar but opposite conclusion considering the passing on of the *מג*: 'There seems no way of interpreting this language except to suppose that the author makes Saul recognize David's superior worth and virtually abdicate to him by clothing him in the kingly garment.' H. P. Smith, *The Books of Samuel*, ed. G. F. Moore, International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).

253. AHW. 105a.

Within the MT the eighteen occurrences are distributed seven times in Genesis (Gen .30.37, 30.38, 30.39, 30.41, 32.11), three times in Zechariah (Zech. 11.7, 11.10, 11.14), twice in Jeremiah (Jer. 1.11, 48.17), twice in 1 Samuel (1 Sam. 17.40, 17.43) and once in Exod. 12.11, Num. 22.27, Ezek. 39.9 and Hos. 4.12. These eighteen occurrences are used in a variety of contexts, with the military context being quite marginal (only Ezek. 39.9 and the 1 Samuel 17 occurrences have a military context). The other uses are as a breeding influencer in Genesis 30, as a staff (Gen. 32.11, Exod. 12.11, Jer. 48.17, Zech. 11, Jer. 1.11), as Balaam's stick when he beats his ass (Num. 22.27) and as a divine aid (Hos. 4.12); the last two contexts are not exclusive to the meaning of a staff.

Although the מקל is clearly understood to be a functional rod or staff and must have been used also in military situations, the contexts noted above show that it also carries strong associations of divination or mystical power. Gen 30.37-41 describes Jacob placing peeled מקל in front of the flocks when they bred thus influencing the offsprings' colour; in Num. 22.7 Balaam strikes his ass with his מקל after which the ass begins to speak; Hos. 4.12 explicitly describes the מקל as a tool for divination, "My people inquire of a thing of wood, and their staff gives them oracles (RSV)," (עמי בעצו ישאל ומקלו יגיד לו); Jer. 1.11 and 48.17 mention the מקל in a vision, as well as Zech. 11.7, 11.10 and 11.14 where the מקל symbolises covenant and union. Out of the eighteen attestations, eight have a usage as a tool of divination or mystical power and a further five are used as vision objects.

The only example of semantic shift or marginal meaning is between this normative usage of the מקל as a generic stick/staff/rod, and the military meaning in Ezek. 39.9 and 1 Samuel 17. This marginal meaning is supported by the construct מקל יד in Ezekiel as one of a group of weapons to be burned—this construct is paralleled by the similar grouping of these nouns in 1

Sam. 17.40 which refers to David approaching Goliath with מקלו בידו. This מקל יד is easily read as a military weapon, a handpike of crude make.²⁵⁴

The historical implications of this study are slim as the use of a basic staff in fighting is not particularly rare or descriptive. It is interesting that Ezek. 39.9 includes מקל יד in an otherwise specific list of military weaponry, which indicates the lexeme may have represented a particular type of *hand stick* at this time. The term is too generic to assign any particular historically known weapon.

The literary implications of the study increase when both the military and mystical properties of מקל are considered. When David approaches Goliath with his מקלו בידו, his military arsenal is not just his sling but he also carries a fighting stick in the other hand, if the marginal meaning from Ezekiel is followed.²⁵⁵ This basic panoply contrasts with the immediately preceding panoply of Saul in 1 Sam. 17.39 which was rejected by David. The literary use of מקל is not simply to illustrate a weapon, but to imbue the narrative with a further layer of divine battle and mystical power in the hands of David. The מקל occurs so often as an item with divine or mystic power that it must be used in 1 Samuel 17 as a device which plays on the marginal military meanings, the possible use by shepherds as a weapon and the use of the item as mystical item in other narratives and visions.

254. Certainly the staff of a shepherd could serve multiple uses of animal prod, walking stick and offensive weapon

255. There is an interesting reference in Strabo's *Geography* regarding single combat and a spear: "But they who engage in single combat do not use the sword only, but a spear also held in the hand," as the poet describes it, "He wounded him with a polished spear, pointed with brass, and unbraced his limbs." Strabo, *Geography*, Book X, Chapter I.13.

(vii) קלע

קלע occurs in the MT in two main semantic forms, verbally as *to sling* or *to carve* and substantively as *sling* or *sail/curtain/net*. KB notes cognates for *sling/slinger* in Jewish Aramaic, Phoenician *ql'* (slinger, sling-maker),²⁵⁶ Syriac *qalla'* (to hurl with a sling) and substantively in Ethiopic *maqla'*,²⁵⁷ Arabic *miqla'*, Syriac *qel'a*. The semantic range of *to carve* may be paralleled by the use of the lexeme in Jewish Aramaic for *to weave/plait* and in Syriac the substantive form *qa'ilta*, woodcarving, is attested; however, the Jewish Aramaic usage is more aligned with the substantive meaning of *curtain*. The use of the term substantively for *sail/curtain/net* is attested in Jewish Aramaic קלעא (sail) and Arabic *qil'* (sail). Ugaritic attests an apparent cognate *ql'* which is used to represent a shield²⁵⁸ and may represent a similar semantic range here to the *sail/curtain/net* meaning; however this meaning is disputed by some who prefer to align the Ugaritic lexeme with the *sling*.²⁵⁹

The lexeme is attested thirty times in the MT with the meaning of *curtain/net* as the most common usage attested fifteen times mainly in Exodus (Exod. 27.9, 27.11, 27.12, 27.14, 27.15, 35.17, 38.9, 38.12, 38.14, 38.15, 38.16, 38.18, 39.40) and twice in Numbers (Num. 3.26, 4.26). The meaning of *to carve* is limited to four attestations in 1 Kings chapter six (1 Kgs 6.29, 6.32, 6.34, 6.35). The usage of most interest here, the military form of *sling*, is found either sub-

256. Hoftijzer et al., Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, 259. Zellig Sabbetai Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language, American Oriental Series, vol. 8 (New Haven, Conn: American Oriental society, 1936), 143.

257. August Dillmann and Werner Munzinger, Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae cum indice Latino (Lipsiae: T.O. Weigel, 1865), 414b.

258. Benno Landsberger, "Akkadisch aspu='Schleuder,' assukku = 'Schleuderstein,' *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18 (1957/1958): 379. A. Rainey, "Observations on Ugaritic Grammar," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3 (1971): 172. Loren R. Fisher, F. Brent Knutson, and Donn F. Morgan, Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts From Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible, *Analecta Orientalia*, vol. 49 (Rome: Pontificium institutum biblicum, 1972), 99.

259. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook. Aistleitner, Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. Fisher, Knutson, and Morgan, Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts From Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible, 334.

stantively or as a verb five times in 1 Samuel (Sam. 17.40, 17.49, 17.50, 25.29 twice), and once in Judg. 20.16, Jer. 10.18, Zech. 9.15, Job 41.20 and 2 Chron. 26.14.

Outside of the MT the lexeme is found three times in Qumran evidence with the meaning of *sling*; 1QM 8.1 refers to *slingmen* (אנשי הקלע) and 2Q22 1:2 and the parallel 4Q373 1a+b, 7 refer to קלעי מזור (slings of ambush) along with bows (קשת). There are no attestations in extra-biblical inscriptions.

The obvious semantic pattern is between the Exodus/Numbers use of the consonantal form as a *curtain/net* and 1 Kings *to carve* as compared to the military reference of a sling in the other occurrences. The use of the lexeme for a *sling* can be divided into several sub-patterns; (a) the common substantive phrase אבני קלע (sling-stones) used in 2 Chron. 26.14, Job 41.20, Zech. 9.15; (b) a verbal form with a military use (קלע באבן) in Judg. 20.16; (c) a verbal form with a figurative use in 1 Sam. 25.29 (sling away your enemies lives) and Jer. 10.18 (sling away those who dwell in the land); (d) the simple substantive form in 1 Samuel 17 and 1 Sam. 25.29 (קלע); (e) the plural *slingers* in 2 Kgs 3.25. The use of the term in 1 Samuel 17 is thus fairly limited in the MT. Only the use in 1 Sam. 25.29 refers to the *sling* as a military item, although 1 Kgs 3.25 does refer to *slingers* which connotes the military item also. This usage is similar to the context and use of the term in the Qumran manuscripts.

The semantic shift between the קלע as *curtain/sail/net* and *sling* becomes more interesting when compared to the Homeric mention of the sling. The term is extremely uncommon in the Homeric writings and is mentioned explicitly only once in the *Iliad* XIII:599-600 in what appears to be a gloss, "This then great-souled Agenor drew forth from his hand, and bound the hand with a strip of twisted sheep's wool, [600] even a sling that his squire carried for him, the shepherd of the host."²⁶⁰ Another reference in XIII:716 also refers to "twisted sheep's wool" as a

260.Homer and A. T Murray, *The Iliad* (London New York: W. Heinemann G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1924).

weapon although it doesn't explicitly use the Greek term σφενδονη which is used in the former verse.²⁶¹ This reference to the sling as twisted wool bears a strong similarity to the semantic relation between the קלע as a term for a sling as well as a *curtain/net* and the Jewish Aramaic meaning of *to weave/plait*. Following this reasoning there is probably a strong semantic relationship between the Jewish Aramaic meaning in particular which is the root meaning with related forms in the woven tapestry of the temple (Exodus and Numbers usage) and the sling (1 Samuel).

Historically the sling is attested across the ancient Near East with Egyptians, Assyrians and Mycaenaens all bearing evidence of its use in reliefs.²⁶² The reliefs generally picture the sling used in siege situations and was used for raining large stones on the enemy positions. Within Greek and Roman literature the invention of the sling is attributed variously to the Phoenicians by Pliny,²⁶³ the Baleares by Vegetius and the Aetolians by Strabo. The description of the Balearic fighter by Strabo should also be noted for its similarity to the depiction of David in 1 Samuel 17,

They are spoken of as the best of slingers. And this art they have practised assiduously, so it is said, ever since the Phoenicians took possession of the islands...but the people used to go forth to their fights without a girdle on—with only a goat-skin, wrapped round the arm, or with a javelin that had been hardened in the fire (though in rare cases it was also pointed with a small iron tip), and with three slings worn round the head, of black-tufted rush...or of hair or of sinews: the sling with the long straps for the shots at short range, and the medium sling for the medium shots.²⁶⁴

261.σφενδονη is the Greek word used in the LXX in 1 Sam. 17.40, 25.29, 2 Chron. 26.14, Prov. 26.8, Zech. 9.15 as well as Jdt. 9.7, 1 Macc. 6.51 and Sir. 47.4.

262.Famous siege-scene on the silver bowl: Walter Leaf, *A Companion to the Iliad, for English Readers* (London and New York: Macmillan and co, 1892), 572.

263.Pliny, *Natural History*, VII.26.

264.Horace Leonard Jones and John Robert Sitlington Sterrett, *Strabo. The Geography of Strabo* (London New York: W. Heinemann G. P. Putnam's sons, 1917). III.5.1

The sling was well-known for its greater range as compared to other missiles including the javelin and bow. This is mentioned several times in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, for example where the Greek javelins cannot reach the Persian slingers²⁶⁵ and later when the enlisted Rhodians outrange the Persian bows with their slings—it is also remarked that the Rhodians greater sling range was due to using lead bullets rather than the large Persian stones.²⁶⁶ The most interesting and relevant example of the greater range of a sling is in Strabo's *Geography* where he relates the story of Pyraechmes the Aetolian who wins the land of the Aetolians as a result of single combat with Degmenus the Epeians after the opposing armies had reached a stalemate. Strabo remarks that Degmenus was lightly armed with a bow thinking he would overcome a heavily-armed opponent at distance, however Pyraechmes armed himself with a sling and a bag of stones after he noticed his opponents ruse and killed his opponent due to the longer range.²⁶⁷

The accuracy of some fabled slingers is noted by Livy who remarks that the inhabitants of three northern Peloponessus cities could not only wound the heads of enemies but they were also accurate enough to wound "any part of the face at which they might aim".²⁶⁸ That the sling

265.Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 3.3.7.

266.Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.4.16.

267.Strabo, *Geography*, VIII.3.33. "And it was found that the two forces were evenly matched, Pyraechmes the Aetolian and Degmenus the Epeians, in accordance with an ancient custom of the Greeks, advanced to single combat. Degmenus was lightly armed with a bow, thinking that he would easily overcome a heavy-armed opponent at long range, but Pyraechmes armed himself with a sling and a bag of stones, after he had noticed his opponent's ruse (as it happened, the sling had only recently been invented by the Aetolians); and since the sling had longer range, Degmenus fell, and the Aetolians drove out the Epeians and took possession of the land; and they also assumed the superintendence, then in the hands of the Achaeans, of the temple at Olympia." Also in Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 5.4.1-2 and Polyaeus, *Stratagems*, V.48.

268.Livy, *History of Rome*, trans. Evan T. Sage, Loeb Classical Library, vol. 313 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936). 38.29.3-8. "A hundred slingers were recruited from Aegium and Patrae and Dymae. These peoples were trained from boyhood, in accordance with a tradition of the race, in hurling with a sling at the open sea the round stones which, mingled with sand, generally strew the coasts. In consequence they use this weapon at longer range, with greater accuracy, and with more powerful effect than the Balearic slinger. Moreover, the sling is not composed of a single strap, like those of the Baleares and other peoples, but the bullet-carrier is triple, strengthened with numerous seams, that the missile may not fly out at random, from the pliancy of the strap at the moment of discharge, but seated firmly while being whirled, may be shot out as if from a bow-string. Having been trained to shoot through rings of moderate circumference from long distances, they would

could also cause serious penetrative damage can be inferred from the ancient medical writer Celsus who recorded instructions on removing the leaden or rock sling-bullets.²⁶⁹

Despite the damage that the sling was able to cause, its great range and the stories attributed to some who practised with it, the sling was not widely respected in Greek texts as an appropriate arm for a hero. Xenophon explicitly records this with the words of Cyrus regarding the Lydians, "And of those who had been made subjects he required all who were unarmed to practise with the sling, for he considered this weapon to be the one most fitting for a slave."²⁷⁰ The text remarks that part of the rationale for this action was that all the slingers in the world would be no match for a handful of well-armed men in hand-to-hand combat. The lack of references to the sling in the Homeric epics has been attributed to the sling being the weapon of despised light-armed infantry rather than heroes.²⁷¹

The historical parallels to the depiction of David as a slinger in 1 Samuel 17 are thus surprisingly resonant although it is not advisable to draw any direct correlation between the occurrences in Greek texts and the MT. Both the collective imagery of the Balearic slinger going to fight without a girdle, only a fire hardened stick and a sling as weapons, and the ruse of Pyracchmes sling and the fabled accuracy of certain Peloponnese slingers provides a rich literary background for 1 Samuel 17. The ancient slinger—although not a heroic figure—certainly carried many mythical qualities of skill, ruse and simplicity.

wound not merely the heads of their enemies but any part of the face at which they might have aimed."

269. Celsus, *On Medicine*, 7.5. "There is a third type of weapon that sometimes needs to be removed, a leaden bullet or rock or something similar, which breaking through the skin lodges inside in one piece. In all of these cases, the wound needs to be opened a bit wider, and what is inside must be extracted with pincers along the same pathway by which it entered."

270. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 7.4.15.

271. Leaf, *A Companion to the Iliad, for English Readers*, 13.600.

The literary implications for the David/Goliath narrative are thus more interesting to speculate on than any questionable historical correlation. Strabo's account of the Pyraechmes legend remarks on Degmenus ruse of winning the single combat by using a bow rather than close-range weapons, this ruse is countered by Pyraechmes who cleverly arms himself with a sling and stones and thus fells his opponent using the sling's greater range. This account read against the depiction of David adds nuance to the narrative as David comes forth with his *מקל*, a typical single-combat weapon according to Strabo ("They, too, who engage in single combat, are first introduced as using missile spears, and then having recourse to swords. But they who engage in single combat do not use the sword only, but a spear also held in the hand"),²⁷² and possibly hiding his sling in the other hand. The narrative explicitly notes Goliath as seeing David's *מקל*, famously stating "Am I a dog that you come against me with sticks?"²⁷³ Within this context, David is the trickster, employing a ruse in order to defeat Goliath; his victory over Goliath is thus not miraculous at all, nor is it in the classic heroic style of Homer, but rather that of an underhanded trickster.

The reputation of slingers as lightweight fighters, as a disreputable position as in *Anabasis* and their lack of mention in the Homeric epics also colours David's rejection of Saul's armour and his depiction in the narrative. The sling is simply not a heroic weapon in Greek literary tradition and as Xenophon wrote it was also not a respected position in the army. Despite David's felling of Goliath, he is not depicted as a traditional hero and the text may even be subversively undermining the beginning of his accession over Saul by rendering his battle as a result of trickery on the part of a dishonourable and simple slinger.

272. Strabo, *Geography*, 10.1.13.

273. The 2 Sam. 23.21 occurrence, which roughly parallels the Goliath account, has Benaiah go down with only a club (*דבס*) and no mention of a sling. The MT 1 Sam. 17.43 only mentions David coming against him with sticks however the LXX attests sticks and stones.

מצחה (viii)

The **מצחה** occurrence in 1 Sam. 17.6 is the only attestation of this particular form within the MT. Morphologically the lexeme is the feminine form of **מצח** which is defined as *brow* or *forehead*. However, in this occurrence it is understood to be representing *shins* or in a military context, *greaves*.²⁷⁴ The verse explicitly clarifies this meaning stating, **ומצחת נחשת על רגליו** (and foreheads of bronze on his feet/legs); this clarification may be understood as an attempt to reduce any ambiguity, however it does follow the same pattern as the description of the helmet in 1 Sam. 17.5, **וכובע נחשת על ראשו** (and helmet of bronze on his head). The related **מצח** form is attested in Jewish Aramaic for *brow* but there are no further parallels or related lexemes in cognate languages. The LXX parallel to the 1 Sam. 17.6 occurrence is the Greek word for greave, **κατημύς**, from the Greek **κατημη** which is the part between the knee and the ankle;²⁷⁵ as with the Hebrew lexeme this is the only occurrence of the term in the LXX.

The **מצח**, *brow*, lexeme occurs thirteen times in ten MT verses (Exod. 28.38; 1 Sam. 17.49; Isa. 48.4; Jer. 3.3; Ezek. 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 9.4; 2 Chron. 26.19, 26.20) as well as once in Qumran CD 19.12 (which is referring to Ezek. 9.4). The MT occurrence in 1 Sam. 17.49 refers to David striking Goliath in the **מצח** with a stone and thus killing him.

The **מצח** is used consistently in the MT occurrences as a figure of speech to indicate stubbornness or sinful rebellion. Isaiah 48.4 provides a good example with the phrase, **מדעתי כי**, **"קשה אתה וגיד ברזל ערפק ובצחק נחשה"** (I know how stubborn you are, a neck of iron sinew and a forehead of bronze). Ezekiel consistently uses **מצח** with **חזק**—such as **חזקי מצח** in Ezek. 3.7—to represent stubbornness and resistance to the Lord. When **מצח** is not used in this figurative phrase it is used within a mystical or covenant form: Ezek. 9.4 mentions marking the **מצח** of those who

274. Galling, "Goliath und seine Rustung", 163.

275. Liddell & Scott sub **κατημη**.

moan and groan; in 2 Chron. 26.19-20 Uzziah is struck by the Lord with a plague and leprosy breaks out on his **כִּצְחָ**; lastly Exod. 28.38 states, **הָיָה עַל מִצְחַ אַהֲרֹן** (It shall be on Aaron's forehead) as part of the commitment of Aaron to priestly duties.

The anomaly of the 1 Sam. 17.6 usage of **מִצְחָה** for greaves combined with the occurrence of **כִּצְחָ** as *forehead* within the same narrative has led some scholars, such as A. Deem to suggest that David hit Goliath in the knee/greave rather than the forehead.²⁷⁶ Although Deem's theory would explain the repeat killing of Goliath in verse 50 and 51, it is doubtful that the text would definitively use the alternate form to describe greaves in 17.6 and then use the comparatively well-attested **כִּצְחָ** in 17.49 to describe the point of impact. It is more reasonable to suppose that the **כִּצְחָ** lexeme in 17.49 does refer to Goliath's forehead and not his knees and this alternate interpretation is not found in any early commentators or midrash which consistently mention the impact point as Goliath's forehead.

The unique use of this term, although odd as the greaves are an early and common piece of military armour, is probably due to the effort of the writer to describe Goliath as equipped with full armour over his entire body (the text makes a note of body parts - head, legs, breast, shoulders), although there may be a purposeful literary play between the **מִצְחָה** and the **כִּצְחָ**. The physical contrast between the giant Goliath and the boy David may play into an expectation contrast; David kills Goliath by striking his **כִּצְחָ**, not the first mentioned **מִצְחָה** where he appeared weakest and accessible—the legs being the only part little David could reach—but on the surprising **כִּצְחָ**, forehead.

276. Ariella Deem, "And the Stone Sank into his Forehead. A Note on 1 Samuel XVII 49," *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 349-351. Deem refers to a passage from the *Testament of Judah* iii 1.14 (part of the apocryphal *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) where Judah kills the King of Hazor by smiting him upon the greaves, dragging him down and killing him. It is interesting that the passage then continues to describe Judah wrapping his garment around his hand and slinging stones to kill four others.

Whether this literary play is fanciful, the narrative use of מצח certainly echoes the other MT attestations. As noted, the lexeme is generally used as part of a figurative phrase to indicate stubbornness and rebellion to the Lord as well as the spot for a mystical mark. The striking of Goliath in the מצח plays with these other uses. Goliath's מצחת נחשת (bronze foreheads) on his legs resonate with the כצדך נחשה (your bronze forehead) of the stubborn listener in Isa. 48.4, as well as the other verses with "hard heads" representative of those who do not listen to prophecy or warnings of the Lord. The association between this figurative use and the failure of Goliath to listen to David's warnings is clear. Likewise, the penetrating stone of David as a mark on the forehead of Goliath certainly conjures associations with the Ezek. 9.4 and 2 Chron. 26.19-20 occurrences of מצח.

הגית (ix)

הגית is a common term in the MT for a *spear* or *javelin*. KB notes that the Hebrew lexeme is an Egyptian loanword from the Egyptian *hmyt*.²⁷⁷ Although the term is a clearly defined loanword it is not mentioned by KB as occurring in any other related languages outside of the Hebrew common usage.

Within the MT the lexeme is mainly attested in the books of Samuel with thirty of the forty-eight occurrences within 1 Samuel or 2 Samuel (twenty-one in 1 Samuel and nine in 2 Samuel);²⁷⁸ eight times in Chronicles (1 Chron. 11.11, 11.20, 11.23, 12.35, 20.5; 2 Chron. 23.9); three times in Psalms (Ps. 35.3, 46.10, 57.5); twice in Job (Job 39.23, 41.18); and once in 2 Kgs 11.10, Isa. 2.4, Mic. 4.3, Nah. 3.3 and Hab. 3.11. The distribution has strong representation in passages with a shared source or inter-textuality; all of the Chronicles occurrences except 1

277. Freeman, Miosi, and Erman, *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, sub *hmyt*.

278. 1 Sam. 13.19, 13.22, 17.7, 17.45, 17.47, 18.10, 18.11, 19.9, 19.10, 20.33, 21.9, 22.6, 26.7, 26.8, 26.11, 26.12, 26.16, 26.22; 2 Sam 1.6, 2.23, 21.19, 23.7, 23.18, 23.21.

Chron. 12.35 are parallel with the 2 Samuel and 2 Kings occurrences;²⁷⁹ the Isaiah and Micah verses are also parallel and lastly 1 Sam. 18.10-11 and 19.9-10 are parallel to each other.

The lexeme is not used in any extra-biblical inscriptions, however it appears seven times in the Qumran manuscripts (1QM 6.2, 6.5, 11.2; 1QH^a 10.28, 13.12; 2Q23 1, 5; 4Q169 3_4 II, 4). 1QH^a 13.12 uses a similar phrase (כחרב שניהם ומתלעותם כהנית חדה) - like a sword their teeth and their fangs like a sharp javelin) to Ps. 57.5 (שניהם חנית וחצים ולשונם חרב חדה) - their teeth javelins and arrows and tongues a sharp sword) when referring to figuratively to lions. Of the remainder, 4Q169 3_4 II, 4 is quoting Nah. 3.3 and 2Q23 1, 5 is too fragmentary to be of use; the others use the term consistently as a weapon of warfare.

The term is used consistently throughout the MT in a military context for a spear or javelin; the sole figurative use is in Ps. 57.5. The main points of lexical replacement would be with רבצ which is discussed in the Song of Deborah. Other similarly attested lexemes in the MT include קץ (reed/javelin - 2 Sam. 21.16 only);²⁸⁰ שריה (javelin/arrow head - Job 41.18 only); מסע (spear - Job 41.18 only). שריה and מסע both occur alongside חנית in Job 41.18, but exhibit no lexical replacement. The one area where lexical replacement may be identified is 2 Sam. 23.8 which is parallel to 1 Chron. 11.11. The Chronicles occurrence describes one of David's military leaders: "Jashobeam son of Hachmoni head of the thirty/three he aroused the javelin upon three hundred slain one time - הוא עורר את חניתו על שלש מאות - הלל בפנים אהת". This is echoed in 2 Sam. 23.8, although it differs slightly in the numbers, name, and weaponry. This is due to a confused syntax and corruption as compared to the expected usage found in 1 Chron. 11.11: "Josheb Bashebbeth Tahchemoni head of the third he ? ? upon

279.1 Chron. 11.11::2 Sam. 23.8; 1 Chron. 11.20::2 Sam. 23.18; 1 Chron. 11.23::2 Sam 23.21; 1 Chron. 20.5::2 Sam 21.19; 2 Chron. 23.9::2 Kgs 11.10.

280.Spear, lance (with bamboo as the shaft), tube, reed, duct. Hans Wehr, Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1952) 794a.

ישב בשבת תחכמני ראש השלשי הוא עדינו העצנו [ה][עצני] על שבעה מאות - eight hundred slain one time - "הלל בפעם אחד [אחת:] ס". As noted, the differences such as the name is certainly due to corruption, however the passage then reads fairly smoothly until הוא עדינו העצנו instead of את חניתו הוא עורר את חניתו. The initial עדינו instead of עורר is easily attributable to an inability to properly identify the letters (dalet, nun, resh, vav are all easily mistaken depending on the clarity of source), but the subsequent העצנו is not similar to חנית. Neither of these 2 Sam. 23.8 lexemes appear elsewhere in the MT, however העצנו may be related to עצ which is a term for tree or wood and would thus be semantically related to the חנית. Although there is a clear case of lexical replacement in this passage, the corrupted nature of the text and lack of information on the 2 Samuel lexeme prevents any information from being extrapolated.

The use and description of חנית in the texts provide some information on historical usage and association. 1 Samuel 18.10 uses the verb טול (to hurl) to describe Saul's actions when he attempts to kill David with the חנית which would correspond with the חנית as primarily a throwing javelin rather than thrusting spear. The phrase ברק חנית (lightning javelin) also supports understanding the term as a throwing javelin; this phrase is also used for an inscription on battle darts (זרקות מלהמה) in IQM 6.2.

The most puzzling, yet explicit, description however is the 1 Sam. 17.7 description of Goliath's חנית. The verse describes Goliath's weapon as וחץ [ו] [עץ] חניתו כמנור ארגים and the arrow/wood of his javelin was like a מנור ארגים (commonly translated "weavers beam"). This מנור ארגים is another anomaly in the 1 Samuel 17 passage. The term only appears in four MT passages which appear to be parallel (1 Sam. 17.7; 2 Sam. 21.19; 1 Chron. 20.5, 11.23) and is the only military term from the description of Goliath's panoply that remains constant across all these accounts.²⁸¹

281. There is another possible parallel passage in 2 Sam. 21:16 אשר בילידי הרפה' וישבו בנב [ו] [ישבי בנב] - 'and Ishbi-Benob from the children
ומשקל קינו שלש מאות משקל נחשת והוא הגור הדסה ויאמר להבות את חזד

Y. Yadin explained the simile as describing a specific type of weapon, the throwing loop javelin, rather than the size or weight of weapon.²⁸² His justification begins from Arabic cognates which are identified with the heddle rod of the loom rather than a supporting beam. The identification of the **מנור ארגים** with the heddle rod is then used to define this as a type of **הגית**, specifically the looped throwing javelin. This identification is supported on the basis of the row of loops on a heddle rod bearing similarity to the finger loop on the looped throwing javelin. However, this identification is muddled by the very odd yet seemingly parallel 4Q372 19, 2-3 which fragmentarily describes a man six and a half cubits high with a spear like a cedar and shield like a tower.

[- -] תו [- -] אמות וחצי קומתו

[ושתיים - -] רמח כארו א [- -] מגן כמגדל. הקל ברגל - -]

In this passage, which seems to reflect the same story tradition or type as the four in the MT, the giant wields a **רמח כארו** rather than a **חנית כמנור ארגים**. The difficulty this poses for Yadin's interpretation is that his argument grows from identifying the **מנור** as equivalent to the Arabic cognate which is used for a heddle rod. However, if the Qumran type is associated with the four MT story types, then the phrase should be understood as describing the heft of the javelin rather than the type of the javelin. Yadin assumes the **מנור** is a highly specific word for a diminutive heddle rod, yet one would then suppose the writers of 4Q372 19, 2-3, much closer to the source (if indeed they are drawing from the same source), would not have interpreted it as

of the Rephah, the weight of his spear three hundred bronze weights and girded new and he said to kill David'. The parallel of the giant threatening to kill David while carrying a heavy spear is similar to the other passages. It is interesting that along with the variation in details that the spear does not follow the common simile and also uses the term **קן**, which does not occur elsewhere in the MT as a spear and means a *reed, tube*. The Arabic cognate *qanat* does mean *spear* or *lance*. Cf. Hans Bauer, Pontus Leander, and Paul Kahle, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1962), 457.

282. Supported by Ackroyd in his commentary. Ackroyd, *The First Book of Samuel*, 138.

describing the size. The difference in vocabulary may also be attributed to other factors, but it does indicate that early in the tradition the giant's classic weapon, the spear, was notable due to its size and weight rather than its type.

(x) כידון

The כידון occurs a handful of times in the MT and provides an interesting example of how little information the MT provides for much of the military vocabulary and how drastically the definition can change when further information comes to the light. Traditionally כידון was defined as a javelin, distinct from the חנית, but roughly the same item;²⁸³ thus in 1 Sam. 17.6 Goliath's "javelin" hung between his shoulders. However, this definition has been firmly overturned since the discovery of 1QM:5-7 and 10-13. In these passages the weapon is described in detail as a type of sword or edged weapon, probably a scimitar of sorts.²⁸⁴ The text describes the כידון as formed of a straight piece of blade rising out of the handle which, halfway up, snakes into semi-circular blade sharpened on the edge.²⁸⁵

Strangely, despite this detailed information from the Qumran manuscripts, the various parallels in the LXX are as ambiguous as the current English translations, rendering כידון as no less than six different Greek words in seven total verses.²⁸⁶ G. Molin remarks that the LXX

283. Hans Bardtke, "Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955): 401-420. Also previous editions of BDB defined it as *dart* or *javelin*.

284. Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 290. G. Molin, "What is Kidon?," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956): 334-337. K. G. Kuhn, "Beitrage zum Verstandnis der Kriegerrolle von Qumran," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 81 (1956): 25ff. J. Carmignac, "Precisions apportees au vocabulaire de l'Hebreu biblique par la guerre des fils de lumiere contre les fils de tenebres," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 345-365. Galling, "Goliath und seine Rustung", 165ff.

285. Molin, "What is Kidon?".

286. Josh. 8.18 γαίω; 1 Sam. 17.6, 17.45, ἄσπις; Jer. 6.23 ζιβύνην; Jer. 27.42 ἐγγειρῖδιον [found 6 times in LXX. once in Bar. 6.13. once in Exod. 20.25, and 3x in Ezek. 21.8, 21.9 and 21.10. All of the MT matching passages use hrb/sword being drawn from a תרען/sheath); Job 39.23 μάχαιρα; Job 41.21 πυρφόρου (fire bearing weapon. only reference in LXX).

translators use foreign words (Germanic and Thracian) to handle the term as this foreign weapon could not be described by a genuine Greek word,²⁸⁷ however the Greek words used are not consistent at all: γάσῳ (spear); ἄσπις (small shield); ζιβύνην (spear); ἐγχειρίδιον (knife); μάχαιρα (sword); and πυρφόρου (torch? fire-weapon?) which negates Molin's theory as there is no consistent attempt at translation and more likely indicates variation in sources or extensive liberty in translation. That the meaning was uncertain as early in the fourth century C.E. is affirmed by the Latin Vulgate which uses *clypeus*, a round shield, to translate several of the כִּידֹן occurrences.

Although KB notes that the etymology of the lexeme is unknown, a scimitar-type sword is almost without doubt related to the weaponry of the asiatic ancient Near East.²⁸⁸ The scimitar is strongly associated with Egypt and many Egyptian reliefs and iconography depict the warrior and gods with a scimitar. M. Heltzer finds a cognate in the Akkadian *katinnu*,²⁸⁹ which is not attested in Assyria or Babylonia but in peripheral cuneiform areas such as Nuzi, Alalakh and El-Amarn". Heltzer agrees with Laroche in assigning the term a Hurrian origin. This *katinnu* is mentioned in Emar 6/3 45 from the temple of Ba'al at Tell Meskene, where it is the weapon of Iskur (Ba'al). The identification of the scimitar sword as a divine weapon continues into the neo-Babylonian period, where Ishtar is symbolised by the scimitar.²⁹⁰

כִּידֹן occurs nine times in the MT in eight verses (Josh. 8.18, 8.26; 1 Sam. 17.6, 17.45; Jer. 6.23, 50.42; Job 39.23, 41.21) and five times in the Qumran manuscripts (1QM 5.7, 5.11,

287.Ibid.

288.Use continues to Hellenistic times. Cf. Plate 48, figure 6 in Erich Boehringer, *Altertümer von Pergamon* (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1800).

289.M. Heltzer, "Akkadian *Katinnu* and Hebrew *Kidon*, Sword," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 41 (1989): 65-68.

290.Kristian Kristiansen and Thomas B. Larsson, *The Rise of Bronze Age Society: Travels, Transmissions and Transformations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 68.

5.12, 5.14, 6.5). The usage is consistently within a military context both in the MT and 1QM and is fairly evenly distributed between poetic and narrative genre. The כידון is paired with מגן in 1QM 6.5, רמח and מגן in the main 1QM passage, חנית in Job 39.23, and קשת in Jer. 50.42 and 6.23; however there are no consistent pairing patterns. Outside of the MT there is an attestation of כידון in the reference to Josh. 8.18 in Sir. 46.2 (MS B only).²⁹¹

The literary implications of the כידון in 1 Samuel 17 are fairly limited as it appears only twice in the chapter: once in the introduction of Goliath and summation of his armament and the second time when David sums up Goliath's armament (בחרב ובהנית ובכידון). The כידון plays no further role in the narrative unless it is supposed that the חרב David uses to behead Goliath is the כידון—this would be the logical conclusion from the initial introduction of Goliath. No mention of a חרב is made at that point, however v 45 mentions both the חרב and כידון together. The multiple discrepancies and corruption of the text caution any conclusions based on pairing or occurrence, but it may be conjectured that there is a literary relationship between the כידון initially introduced and the final sword used to kill Goliath. This interpretation takes on additional literary significance when the continuing MT tradition of the sword of Goliath is associated with the symbolism of the scimitar as a divine weapon in the ancient Near East. The כידון of Goliath may play into the nature of the battle as a divine battle and Goliath's כידון as a divine weapon whose power continues to effect the David narrative. 1 Sam. 17.54 notes that David put the weapons of Goliath in his tent and the sword appears again in the shrine at Nob where it is "wrapped in a garment behind the ephod". At Nob the priest Ahimelech and David remark, "אין אחרת זולתה בזה" - there is no other except for this and David said there is nothing like it"²⁹²

291. מה נהדר הנטותו יד - בהניפו כידון על עיר. 291.

292. The legend of David's sword clearly persisted in many forms and an odd reference is even made in the Arthurian Tales "'Sir,' said she, 'since it is so that this knight ought to pass all other knights of chivalry, which have been before him, and also that shall come after him, moreover I shall tell you,'

Historically, the practice of slinging the scimitar sword across the back, or in the case of Goliath, between the shoulders, is attested on reliefs from Palmyra where the sword is shown carried on a strap across the shoulder.²⁹³ The description of the כידון within the panoply of Goliath is almost assuredly more literary than historical and the occurrence of a slung sword on the back does not lend the text any firm chronological hook.

נשא צנה - נשא כלים - נער (xi)

David is referred to as נער four times in the chapter 17 narrative, three times by Saul in direct discourse (1 Sam. 17.33, 55, 58) and once by the narrator from the perspective of the Philistine (1 Sam. 17.42). In 1 Sam 16.21 he is also referred to by the narrator as the נשא כלים of Saul. The נער is a generic term for *youth* or *boy* but also carries a military or social nuance in several MT passages, with the more specialised meaning of *servant* or *assistant*. The lexeme is common in related languages such as Ugaritic *n'rm* (son, servant, member of professional guild)²⁹⁴ and Phoenician.²⁹⁵

The MT contains approximately 256 occurrences of נער in 236 verses which makes it an extremely common lexeme. The notable areas of distribution are in the books of Samuel and Kings which contain 121 occurrences between them; surprisingly the books of Chronicles only attest five occurrences of נער. Other areas with an above average distribution include Genesis

said she, 'ye shall go into our Lord's temple, whereas is King David's sword, your father, the which is the marvelliest and the sharpest that ever was taken in any knight's hand.'" Thomas Malory et al., *The Arthurian Tales, the Greatest of Romances Which Recount the Noble and Valorous Deeds of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table* (London: Norma Society, 1906), 205. Jellinek's *Midrash Golyat* also infers this tradition stating that 'the sword of David (probably Goliath's) had miraculous powers.' Adolf Jellinek, *Bet Ha-Midrash* (6 v. in 2: 1967), 140-141.

293. Carmignac, "Precisions apportees au vocabulaire de l'Hebreu biblique par la guerre des fils de lumiere contre les fils de tenebres", 358.

294. J. Macdonald and B. Cutler, "Identification of the Ma'ar in the Ugaritic Texts," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976): 27-35.

295. Hoftijzer et al., *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, 181.

(27x), Judges (24x), Job (10x) and Nehemiah (11x). The Qumran manuscripts contain thirty-one occurrences, all with the meaning of *youth* or *servant*. Within extra-biblical inscriptions the term is used in Arad 15.4, 110.1 and 110.2 to mean *servant* or *steward of*, and in Phoenician KAI24 1:12 to mean *from youth*.²⁹⁶

The military usage of נער is limited mainly to Judges, the books of Samuel and 1 Kings as well as single references in Joshua and Chronicles and possible usage in Nehemiah.²⁹⁷ The most explicit usage of the נער as a military attendant with an active military role is in Judges and Samuel; Samuel in particular indicates that the נער is to be understood as a military assistant as it blurs the נער with the נשא כלי.²⁹⁸ In 1 Samuel 14.1 and 14.6 the text refers to Jonathan's נער נשא כלי (servant his arms-bearer) and subsequently in 14.7-17 uses נשא כלי alone when referring to the arms-bearer. 2 Samuel 18.15 also uses this distinctive phrase in plural form, נערים נשאי כלי (servants arms-bearers of Joab), which indicates that נער is a general term for a servant or assistant which may include the נשא כלי—an explicitly military assistant. Judges 9.54 also uses this exact phrase as Abimelech calls for his נער נשא כלי to kill him.

The נשא כלי is a specialised term for an arms-bearer that is very limited in use within the MT, and does not appear in the Qumran manuscripts. The distribution occurs in a very tight pattern: five uses in 1 Samuel 14 for Jonathan's arms-bearer, who helps attack a group of Philistines; 1 Samuel 16.21 when Saul makes David his arms-bearer; three times in the story of Saul's death in both the 1 Chronicles and 1 Samuel parallels; 2 Sam. 23:37/1 Chron. 11.39 make

296.P. Swiggers, "Notes on the Phoenician Inscription of Kilamuwa," *Revista degli studi orientali* 55 (1981): 1-4. D. Sperling, "Kai24 Re-Examined," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20 (1988): 323-337. T. Collins, "The Kilamuwa Inscription - a Phoenician Poem," *Die Welt des Orients* 6 (1971): 183-188.

297.Josh. 6.23; Judg. 7.10, 7.11, 8.14, 8.20, 9.54; 1 Sam. 14.1, 14.6, 17.33?, 17.42, 17.55, 17.58, 20.21, 20.35, 20.36, 20.37, 20.38, 20.39, 20.40, 20.41, 26.22, 30.13, 30.17; 2 Sam. 1.5, 1.6, 1.13, 1.15, 2.14, 4.12, 13.28, 13.29, 13.34, 18.15, 19.18, 20.11; 1 Kgs 20.14, 20.15, 20.17, 20.19; Neh. 4.10?, 4.16 and 13.19 (as guards?); 1 Chron. 12.29, 2 Chron. 13.7?

298.This interpretation of נער is also supported by an article by J. Macdonald which determines the נער to be a well born man with prestige, often in a military context, that can be translated as squire.

mention of Joab's arms-bearer; lastly in 2 Sam. 18.15 for Joab's arms-bearers who kill Absalom. There is one other occurrence in Isa. 52.11 where the *נשאי כלי יהוה* are mentioned. The context is not a military narrative like all other occurrences, although the following verse in 52.12 and rough context do carry military overtones.²⁹⁹

The third term related to this position is *נשא צנה* (one who bears the shield), which occurs only in 1 Sam. 17.7 and 17.41 in reference to Goliath's "shield bearer". This phrase is used in the same type of military context as *נער* and *נשא כלי*, which indicates that it operates in roughly the same position of a military attendant.

Historically, this position of a military attendant as exemplified in the MT by the *נער* *כלים*, and *נשא הצנה* fulfilled an important function in ancient Near East military organizations. V. Hurowitz traced the function and role of the *נשא כלים* within the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near Eastern literature and concluded that the *נשא כלים* can be thought of as the squire or military assistant of his superior, who functions as the one who dispatches enemies on the battlefield.³⁰⁰ The ancient Near East literature refers to the attendant of Nabu-bel-shumate and Nabu-bel-shumate himself running each other through with daggers in fear of Assurbanipal.³⁰¹ This function is paralleled in the MT representation of the *נער* and the *נשא כלי* within a military context. The *נער* is mentioned specifically as killing off the enemy or commanded to kill the enemy in Judg. 8.20; 2 Sam. 1.15, 4.12, 13.28 and 18.15. Likewise the *נשא כלי* consistently performs the role of killing the enemy or commanded to kill his master: 1 Sam. 14.1-17 tells of

299.H. Barstad uses the occurrence of the term to justify a military understanding of Yahweh's *כלים* in Isaiah and a context of holy war. Hans M Barstad, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: 'Exilic' Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55*, Serie B--Skifter, vol. 102 (Oslo: Novus, 1997), 69-70.

300.Hurowitz, Victor. "The Biblical Arms Bearer (Nose' Kelim)." Paper presented at *Society of Biblical Literature*, Philadelphia, 20 November 2004.

301.Maximilian Streck and Assurbanipal, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen könige bis zum untergange Niniveh's* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1918), 60-63. Col. VII 28-47.

Jonathan and his **נשא כלי** who carry out a killing raid on the Philistines, with the text explicitly stating, "ונשא כליו ממותת אחריו" - and the arms-bearer put them to death behind him"; 2 Sam. 18.15 the arms-bearers of Joab kill Absalom; lastly the most famous example is 1 Chron. 10.4-6/1 Sam. 31.4-5 where Saul asks his arms-bearer to kill him.³⁰²

The literary implications for the David/Goliath narrative are substantial as the information on the role of the **נער/נשא כלי** projects an expectation of David's social position and expected military role. This provides an interesting framework in which David as **נער** is contrasted against his master Saul, the parallel **נער/נשא צנה** of Goliath, and the role and function of the **נער** in the ancient Near Eastern milieu. As David is described as a **נער**, indeed even the **נער** of Saul, it adds an interesting complexity to the military engagement and dynamics of the passage.³⁰³

The first point of contrast is reading David as the **נער** of Saul against the **נשא הצנה** of Goliath. Reading David as parallel to Goliath's nameless assistant means that the accompanying parallel dictates Saul as the required combatant against Goliath. Saul should be the representative warrior going forth to meet Goliath at the battle line, with his **נער** providing support and possibly dispatching the enemy once he has been mortally wounded. However, the expected role of the **נער** and master is reversed in the Saul/David relationship, with David going out to battle and Saul equipping him in battle garb, which is the role of the **נער**. This reversed dichoto-

302. This is also supported in extra-biblical literature with the death of Nab-bēl-umti by his *kizu* in the annals of Ashurbanipal. Cf. *Ibid.*, 60-63. Col. VII 28-47. Daniel David Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 312. CAD K 478b s.v. *kiz*.

303. If we understand David's role as a **נשא כלים** then several other literary nuances come into play. The **נשא כלים** not only fatally finishes enemies on the battlefield that have been wounded by their master but also the parallels in the biblical text have the **נשא כלים** mortally dispatching their master. If we consider Saul as the master of David we have a foreshadowing of David killing Saul. After all, Saul must make way for the succession of David. However this foreshadowing is continually flummoxed with David's refusal to play out his role (cutting the cloth of Saul and so forth). We can also read this into Saul's final death where the **נשא כלים** is called upon to fulfill his duties but refuses, again the reflection of David not only in the role but in the refusal to play it through. The tragic character of Saul as read by Exum and others can be read with the refusal of Saul's **נשא כלים** to play even their roles in the narrative; Saul should have died nobly at the hands of his **נשא כלים** not one but many times, instead he is forced to become his own **נשא כלים**.

my is of interest in that the relationship of נער and master is mostly based on power and prestige. Certainly, it brings many other dynamics to the forefront, the reversal of roles foreshadows the succession of David and establishes the story as a narrative foundation in the ascension of David over Saul. However, the narrative complicates the dichotomy by having David reject the succession implied in the wearing of Saul's armour.

David enters the battle with Goliath in an ambiguous position, caught between his role as a נער to Saul and the narrative implication that Saul is now acting as David's נער. This friction plays with the traditional role of the נער as designated by Hurowitz, following on B. Halpern's assertion that the narrative can be read with David as the invulnerable rather than Goliath.³⁰⁴ When David takes to the field the narrative insinuates that he is there to finish off an opponent already conquered—this is the role of the נער in other biblical attestations and ANE parallels. David enters the battle to finish off or dispatch the doomed Goliath, the duplicate ending where David kills Goliath for the final time. Taking his sword and finalizing the death by removing Goliath's head also echoes his role as נער.

The historical and literary role of the נער/נשא כלי/נשא צנה thus provides an interesting perspective on the expected position of David within the narrative and the ambiguity of the relationship between David, Saul and Goliath. The final death of Saul when he asks his נשא כלי to kill him yet the נשא כלי refuses to do so is surely playing on the literary relationship between Saul's previous נשא כלי—David—and David's ירא מאד of Saul despite his persecution (or perhaps because of it) and his own refusal to kill Saul in 1 Samuel 24.³⁰⁵

304. Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001), 13.

305. The literary interplay with the ambiguous positions can extend further with connections between Goliath and Saul. David goes to battle as נער to kill Goliath and Saul requests his נשא כלי to kill him in chapter 31, albeit unsuccessfully. David kills Goliath, takes his head to Jerusalem and the weapons in his tent (although the sword later shows up in the temple at Nob). Saul, although not killed at the hands of his נשא כלי has his head cut off and his armour placed in the temple of Ashtaroah by the Philistines. The Sirach 47.4 reference, "In his youth did he not kill a giant, and take away the

איש הבנים (xii)

איש הבנים is possibly a technical phrase unique to the David/Goliath narrative, occurring only in 1 Sam. 17.4 and 17.23; both of these verses are in the context of the narrative introducing Goliath as he comes forward from the Philistine camp/battle line. The phrase literally means the *man of the between* and was originally interpreted by de Vaux as carrying the specific meaning of a champion.³⁰⁶ This has been questioned by many commentators since then, who prefer to understand it as referring to a member of the light infantry or at least someone who fights in between the battle lines.³⁰⁷ KB continues to refer to the phrase as *champion, single-fighter* while BDB notes it as the *space between two armies*. A. Yadin considered the "man of the in-between" to be a borrowing from the Greek term μεταίχμιον (the space between armies as they encamp facing each other), thus the "man of the μεταίχμιον." This meaning was also proposed earlier by S. R. Driver and A. Rofé.³⁰⁸ Morris in the early Samuel commentary disputes this interpretation, stating that there would be no purpose for the dual formation (בנים) rather than singular if it were to mean "man of the in-between"—as there is only one "between", not

people's disgrace" echoes the killing of Goliath but also the confusing death and negative literary portrayal of Saul. Did David not only take away the people's disgrace with the death of Goliath but also through his usurpation of Saul's reign?

306. Roland de Vaux, "Single Combat in the Old Testament," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright (Garden City: Doubleday, 1971), 124-125.

307. McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation*, 291. Carmignac, "Precisions apportees au vocabulaire de l'Hebreu biblique par la guerre des fils de lumiere contre les fils de tenebres". Carmignac provides a nicely detailed discussion of the nuances of the term noting that it does not carry any particular arms or armour, is distinct from the cavalry, is not mentioned within the camp but only in a battle setting and is not mentioned as a distinct corps (לגל).

308. Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory", 381. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, 139. Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," Rofé refers to Otto Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1842), 66.

two.³⁰⁹ He notes the early Targum tradition in which Goliath is interpreted as *one born of mixed-race* as the son of Samson and Orpah, although surely this is a much later tradition.³¹⁰

The LXX does not parallel 1 Sam. 17.23 but uses the phrase ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς (strong man) for the 17.4 occurrence. This phrase is used seventeen times in LXX passages corresponding to the MT and covers a range of Hebrew terms: אנשי חיל (Exod. 18.21, 18.25; Judg. 20.44, 2.46; 1 Chron. 10.12, 11.22; Nah. 2.4), איש גבורי החיל (Josh. 8.3; Ruth 2.1; 1 Sam. 9.1, 14.52, 1 Chron. 26.31); אנשים (Exod. 17.9), איש בחור (1 Chron. 13.3, 13.17) and בני חיל (2 Chron. 28.6). The nuance derived from the parallel Hebrew terms for the Greek is a warrior of standing, a man of renown, a mighty warrior. There is also a nuance of selection which is attested in the use of the verb בחר in Exod. 17.9, 18.25, Josh. 8.3 and the phrase איש בחור in 2 Chron. 13.3 and 13.17.

The איש הבנים would thus appear to be a generic super-warrior or renowned warrior according to the Greek parallel. However, although the Hebrew phrase is not attested to elsewhere the plural form is commonly used in the Qumran 1QM manuscript as well as several fragments of 4Q491. In these attestations the phrase appears to be a discreet term for a unit of the army—most probably the infantry. The 1QM use is eerily similar to the 1 Sam. 17.4 and 17.23 use of

309. "The Hebrew is generally interpreted as the man of the interspace between two armies. But the space between two armies is not two spaces... There is therefore no reason for the dual. It is doubtful whether Josephus can be cited for this interpretation, though he describes Goliath as standing between the two armies... Earlier Jewish tradition is represented by the Latin and a fragmentary Targum according to which the words mean *one born of mixed race*—the Targum add that he was the son of Samson and of Orpah the Moabitess." Smith, *The Books of Samuel*, 154.

310. An alternative explanation of איש הבנים as an intermediary or even mercenary has not been explored as thoroughly by commentators. Although the LXX makes this interpretation difficult by referring to the position as merely a "strong man", the definition is possible and would support theories of understanding the depiction of Goliath as an anachronistic outsider rather than an early Philistine hero. The איש הבנים would then literally be the man inbetween, the intermediary between two extremes, which is the role a mercenary plays in warfare. A mercenary belongs to neither side or ideological extreme but merely follows where he is paid (or coerced) to go. This interpretation would also accord with Finkelstein's desire to consider the depiction of Goliath as related to Greek or Lydian mercenaries in the Egyptian army (as discussed in the historical conclusions of this chapter).

איש הבנים: eight of the thirteen Qumran attestations (1QM 3.1, 3.7, 6.9, 6.12, 7.17, 9.3, 16.4 and 4Q491 f11ii:2) use the verb יצא (to go out) when describing the action of the אנשי הבנים which is the same verb used 1 Sam. 17.4 to introduce Goliath (יצא איש הבנים). The other point of correspondence with the Qumran usage is the eight occurrences (1QM 3.7, 6.9, 7.17, 9.3, 16.4, 17.12, 4Q491 1_3, 12, 4Q491 1_3, 13) of the term מערכה (battle line) in the thirteen Qumran passages; this same term is used almost exclusively (one exception in 1 Chron. 12.39) in 1 Samuel and of the fifteen total occurrences ten are in 1 Samuel 17.³¹¹ The lexeme is extremely common in Qumran literature with ninety occurrences in seventy verses; only ten of these ninety Qumran occurrences are outside of 1QM or 4Q491. The tight concentration of these terms, the מערכה, איש הבנים, and the יצא in 1 Samuel 17 thus correspond very strongly with the military language and usage in 1QM and 4Q491.

The chronological implications of this distribution indicate that this lexeme and the corresponding concentration of other heavily attested Qumran terms in 1 Samuel 17 are lexemes popular with the 1QM and 4Q491 communities and probably influenced strongly by the contemporary warfare of the time. Also, if the Greek term μεταίχμιον is considered as the influence for the construction and meaning of the Hebrew איש הבנים, it would give this usage a chronological association to the sixth century B.C.E. or later when Greek influence was beginning to grow on the Levantine coast. The 1QM usage of the term may indicate a later date than the sixth century B.C.E. for the usage of the term.

311.1 Sam. 4.2, 4.12, 4.16, 17.8, 17.10, 17.20, 17.22, 17.23, 17.26, 17.36, 17.45, 17.48, 23.3; 1 Chr 12.39.

(c) Review of military lexemes and trends

(i) Function, cognates and loanwords

The military vocabulary of 1 Samuel 17 attests several lexemes which either have strong cognates in related Semitic languages or are probable loanwords. כובע/קובע is possibly a Hittite loan-word, although KB notes a Greek origin is a more likely loan source. שריון/סריון occurs as a cognate in Akkadian, Syriac and Hittite, though it is probably a Hurrian loanword; its Egyptian form evidences a consonantal shift typical of foreign loanwords. Likewise כידון may relate to the Akkadian *katinnu*, but this is only in peripheral areas which were culturally Hurrian and thus may also have a Hurrian origin. The צנה also evidences an Akkadian connection with the Akkadian *ṣinnatum*. קלע is attested in Jewish Aramiac and Phoenician within the same semantic range of *slinger* and other languages as a *sail* or *curtain*; נער also attests a Phoenician usage as well as Ugaritic. חנית is the only Egyptian loanword attested. Neither מקל or מצחה attest a similar cognate in related languages and מד is a common lexeme throughout Semitic languages for a religious garment or robe of distinction.

The linguistic background to the military vocabulary is thus quite disparate. Rough distinction can be made between the armour of Goliath which is of Hurrian, Akkadian, Greek and Egyptian origin, whereas the items related to David either have no foreign connection (מד and מקל) or a Phoenician cognate (קלע and נער).

A slight trend can be seen with two of the terms attested in Hurrian or Akkadian in peripheral areas. The שריון/סריון is attested in Akkadian but is probably a Hurrian loan-word; כידון is also attested in Akkadian as *katinnu*, but only in peripherally Hurrian areas. The ambiguous Hebrew צנה also has the Akkadian *ṣinnatum* as a cognate.

(ii) Patterns of distribution and usage

The patterns of distribution of the lexical military body from 1 Samuel 17 indicate a preference for vocabulary which is often distinctively used only in Samuel or with a high concentration of attestations in Samuel. Of the twelve lexemes, only הרב can really be considered to be a widely used generic term for weaponry with no noticeable patterns of usage and distribution. Although not widely attested or concentrated in the MT (Joshua, Samuel, Jeremiah, Job), כידון occurs several times in 1QM as an offensive weapon.

The נער is commonly used in the MT, but is highly concentrated in Samuel and Kings—with slightly over half of the 236 MT attestations occurring in these books (other high concentrations are Genesis [27x], Judges [24x], Job [10x] and Nehemiah [11x]). Oddly, despite this high concentration in Samuel and Kings, Chronicles only attests the lexeme five times and none of these attestations occur in shared source passages. The common pattern is that נער is not attested in the shared passages of Chronicles and Samuel/Kings. This is interesting due to the extremely high occurrence within Samuel/Kings in particular.

The lexical items unique to the 1 Samuel 17 narrative include נשא and מצחה, איש הבנים occurs only once in the MT here, although the phrase is commonly attested in 1QM. נשא צנה and the semantically related נשא כלי are not attested in any extra-biblical texts, but נשא כלי does appear elsewhere in Samuel and twice in Chronicles shared source passages.

מד, מקל, קלע and חנית are all terms heavily concentrated in Samuel. מד occurs in a military context only in Samuel, 1 Chron. 19.4—which is a shared source passage—and once in Judges. מקל is used in a military context only in Ezek. 39.9 and in this narrative. קלע is commonly used as meaning a *sling* in Samuel and only rarely in the remainder of the MT; Qumran attests the same meaning three times. Lastly, חנית is found in either Samuel or shared source mate-

rial in Chronicles for thirty-eight of its forty-eight attestations. The remaining attestations are in Psalms (3x), 2 Kgs 11.10, Isa. 2.4, Mic. 4.3, Nah. 3.3 and Hab. 3.11.

כובע/קובע and שריון/סריון occur together in all MT occurrences of כובע except for three in Ezekiel. This pairing may indicate some shared source or cultural influence as they are both loanwords. The distribution is widely spread throughout the MT, but with כובע/קובע attested in 1 Sam. 17.5; Isa. 59.17; Jer. 46.4; Ezek. 27.10, 38.5; 2 Chron. 26.14 and שריון/סריון attested in 1 Sam. 17.5, 17.38; 1 Kgs 22.34; Isa. 59.17; Jer. 46.4, 51.3; Neh. 4.10; 2 Chron. 18.33, 26.14.

The ambiguity of meaning affects the distribution patterns of צנה. But, regardless of the semantic range, it is only attested in Samuel, Kings, Ezekiel, Psalms and Chronicles. The pairing pattern with the רמח is unique to the Chronicles occurrences and may be inferred in the occurrence of Goliath's חנית which would associate the Samuel distribution with the Chronicles passages.

(iii) Lexical replacement, semantic shift

The David/Goliath narrative contained in 1 Samuel 17 actually attests several terms that have an identifiable semantic shift throughout the MT text. The terms with a variance in semantic form throughout the MT are מקל, קלע and צנה. The terms with other lexical or semantic variations are כ/קובע, מצחה and חנית.

The כובע/קובע occurs twice within 1 Samuel 17 and oddly changes its consonantal formation between each occurrence. In 1 Sam. 17.5 it occurs as כובע and in 1 Sam. 17.38 it appears as קובע. The consonantal variation probably occurs because the term is a foreign loanword (either Hittite or Greek)—yet it is odd to vary within such a short narrative. Presumably the root of this variation would be in the redaction history of the text, but there are no extra-biblical attesta-

tions which would support any theories regarding geographical or chronological preferences for the consonantal form.

מצחה is a presumably marginal meaning or created lexeme for the greaves of Goliath in 1 Sam. 17.6. The lexeme is the feminine form of the more common מצח, meaning forehead. The semantic form is representative of an armoured "forehead" on ones shins rather than the body part itself. Again, as the term occurs only here in the MT and not within any other textual evidence, it becomes impossible to conjecture upon any historical semantic shift or marginal meanings.

The חנית offers the only possible evidence of lexical replacement between its MT occurrence in 2 Sam. 23.8 and 1 Chron. 11.11, which are shared source passages. The two passages parallel each other closely until they disperse with Chronicles attesting הוא עדינו העצנו rather than Samuel's הוא עורר את חניתו. The Chronicles version is certainly corrupted as it makes little sense, but the עצ rather than a חנית is plausible as representative of a javelin and would represent a lexical alternative to חנית. As חנית is strongly represented in the Samuel material and only once in Chronicles outside of shared source material (1 Chron. 12.35), this would be typical of the Chronicles military vocabulary.

As noted, 1 Samuel 17 also attests three military terms which display distinct semantic shifts or marginal meanings throughout the MT. מקל is used throughout the MT as a *rod/stick* but has a distinct military context in Ezek. 39.9, which indicates that it was also a lexeme with a military association at some points or within some cultural contexts. This same military association is reflected in David's use of the מקל as a military weapon in 1 Samuel 17 and represents the only other military context for the term in the MT.

David's other weapon in the narrative is the קלע which is also a marginal military meaning in the MT, though it is attested also in Qumran sectarian texts with the same meaning

of *sling*. Three meanings are attested in the MT: the *curtain/net* in Exodus and Numbers, *to carve* in Kings and *sling* in Samuel and Judg. 20.16, Jer. 10.18, Zech. 9.15, Job 41.20 and 2 Chron. 26.14. Several of these occurrences are in the verbal form and not necessarily within a military context—only Samuel and 1 Kgs 3.25 use the term as a military weapon or military corps. As the study noted, the Homeric mentions of a sling indicate it was made of "twisted sheep's wool" and thus provides a point of correspondence with the semantic shift evident in the MT between a woven/twisted curtain to a military sling made of twisted wool. The Jewish Aramaic cognates in particular mean *weave/plait* and are even closer to this core meaning of *sling* than the MT alternatives.

Lastly, the *צנה* is strongly indicative of a core semantic shift between a defensive shield and the offensive spear. The meaning of *shield* is limited to Chronicles and the mention of Goliath's *נשא צנה* in 1 Samuel 17. The remaining MT occurrences are either assigned the meaning of a *spear* or are ambiguous in context. As the Akkadian *šinnatum* provides a likely cognate for the Hebrew *צנה*, it is possible this variance is not a semantic shift within a community but representative of varying semantic forms among different communities—one that is more influenced by the Assyrian military and its accompanying vocabulary. This theoretical basis for the semantic variation would thus align the 1 Samuel 17 occurrences with the Chronicles text and related military vocabulary rather than the possibly Assyrian influenced occurrences in the remainder of the MT.

(iv) Literary context and genre

The main literary implications of the vocabulary are: creating an archaic background to the text, the clothing of David in Saul's armour as a literary device, the military interpretation of David as an invulnerable warrior, and the mystical and divine elements of the battle.

The determination of archaizing or the production of an archaic literary background to a text is generally quite difficult in most literary contexts, though in the narrative examined here the description of Goliath's armour appears to be markedly archaic. The text is particularly careful to note in 1 Sam. 17.5-7 that the weapons of Goliath were made of *נְחָשׁ*, *copper* or *copper with tin* (commonly known as *bronze*). The chronological difficulty with bronze weaponry is that it disappears early on due to the advantages of iron³¹² and it can be confidently said that most functional armour and weaponry of bronze was not common beyond the ninth century B.C.E.—in decorative or votive armour it existed for longer as its greater malleability enabled finer and more detailed flourishes.³¹³ It is doubtful that this detail alone is thus indicative of an early narrative setting as iron is also noted for the spearhead.³¹⁴ As the mention of the iron spearhead in 1 Samuel 17 suggests a later date, the most probable explanation for this stress on bronze in the narrative was that it provided a simple method of archaizing the narrative. An important parallel to this incongruent description may be found in the Homeric epics, where bronze weaponry provides the most consistent example of archaizing across the texts; the

312. Particularly in regards to keeping an edge on offensive weaponry. Also iron held the advantage of being a lighter metal than the common bronze alloy. Defensive armour exists in a bronze form in some capacity for much longer as the defensive armours were often elaborately worked and bronze was much more malleable and resilient and thus easier to create these types of designs. Also, the spear but is often made of bronze as the advantages of decoration and lack of corrosion outweigh any advantages of iron. Finally, it has been noted that there was a resurgence of bronze spearheads in the 6th and 5th centuries in some areas of Greece possibly due to the desire for decorative effect; it is doubtful these would have been meant for little else than dedication at sanctuary sites however. There are various exceptions to this including arrow heads which were commonly cast from bronze due to their transient nature and need for easy mass manufacturing. Anthony M. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons, From the End of the Bronze Age to 600 B.C* (Edinburgh: University Press, 1964), 91.

313. Oscar White Muscarella, *Bronze and Iron: Ancient Near Eastern Artifacts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: The Museum, 1988), 320.

314. Snodgrass explicitly mentions that the spearhead did not transition from bronze to iron as early as the sword. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. Cf. James King Brock, *Fortetsa: Early Greek Tombs Near Knossos* (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), 22, 202. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons, From the End of the Bronze Age to 600 B.C*, 116, 120-2, 263 note 1. If the situation was reversed and Goliath was described with an iron panoply except for a bronze spearhead, the argument could be made this was representative of a ninth-seventh century B.C.E. transition period.

Homeric narrator equipped the heroes with all bronze weaponry while consistently designating cooking utensils and other household objects as composed of iron. This emphasis on Goliath's bronze armour, with a brief mention of iron, may closely parallel this same discontinuity as found in the Homeric narratives, perhaps in order to imbue the story with ancient characteristics as it describes a past battle of fabulous renown.

The clothing of David in the armour of Saul has been recognised as a foreshadowing of David's usurping the throne and the downfall of Saul, but the military vocabulary provides additional literary cues to the power dynamic between David and Saul and the relationship of David to two other murdering tricksters, Joab and Ehud.

The narrative where Saul clothes David in his armour is slightly awkward and thus has been interpreted as either corrupted or using confused grammar to indicate the inept military abilities of Saul.³¹⁵ As noted in the discussion of כֹּבֵעַ, there is a strong parallel between the literary portrayal of David assuming his armour and the description of Goliath's armour in his introduction. It is likely that this emphasises David's rejection of meeting Goliath on equal terms—equipped with the same protection—and Saul's insistence on this armour. The literary parallels to Greek depictions of Balearic slingers in particular also resonate with David's rejection of the armour as not suited to the basic panoply of these simple yet deadly fighters. The strongest literary implication is the clothing of David in Saul's מַג. This description provides a powerful thematic parallel to Jonathan's stripping of his מַג and offering it to David in 1 Sam. 18.4 as a symbol of their bond and David's subsequent success in every battle in 1 Sam. 18.5. Indeed, the parallel is so strong that either it represents a conflation of literary strands or an direct interplay contrasting the acceptance of Jonathan's bond and the rejection of Saul's. Further, as noted in the examination of the מַג, it is a term potent with cult symbolism as the priestly gar-

315.Rendsburg, "Confused Language as a Deliberate Literary Deceit in Biblical Hebrew Narrative".

ment referred to in Lev. 6.3. The rejection of Saul's *מָד* thus also carries literary significance as David is symbolically casting off the "priestly" line of Saul which has already been corrupted by his mishandling of the sacrifice in 1 Sam. 13.8-14.

The *מָד* is also used with the detail of a dagger (*חָרֶב*) girded (*תָּגַר*) in Judg. 3.16 and 2 Sam. 20.8. As the *מָד* is rarely attested (seven times) in the MT, the detailed description of this strapped dagger is notable. Judges 3.16 is the story of Ehud who straps his *חָרֶב* under his *מָד* and to his thigh before killing Eglon with the hidden *חָרֶב*; in 2 Sam 20.8 Joab straps his *חָרֶב* over his *מָד* and to his thigh and steps forward to kill Amasa by surprise when greeting him. In both of these stories the strapped *חָרֶב* and the *מָד* are notable details parallel with the depiction of David clothed in Saul's armour. The text thus places David in the role of the trickster murdering through deceit or hidden means, and indeed this is exactly how David kills Goliath with his sling hidden in hand. The literary interpretation of Ehud's trickery by L. Klein further colours the underlying themes of associating David with the Ehud and Joab accounts of trickery. Klein writes that the irony of Ehud's narrative is that as an agent of divine power Ehud's lack of military ability is insignificant, but his practice of deception and trickery indicates an unwillingness to rely on Yahweh, thus Ehud achieves the goal of freedom from oppression but ironically only by negating the higher goal of contact with Yahweh.³¹⁶ Transposed on to the David/Goliath narrative we see David claiming to go to battle under the might of Yahweh yet still relying on his trickery of the unseen sling and his skill to win the battle. According to Klein's reading of Ehud, the irony of David's victory is the freedom from Philistine oppression and the ascendance of David's line, but at the cost of not truly relying on Yahweh. This theme obviously accords with the later actions and decisions of David as king.

316. Lillian R Klein, *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges* (Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1988), 46.

The military role of David and Saul is also affected by Saul dressing David in his armour. David is introduced as Saul's נער/נשא כלי who is responsible, supposedly not only for carrying Saul's armour and fitting him, but also, according to the lexical study, responsible for dispatching Saul's enemies on the battlefield after they have been mortally wounded by Saul. The depiction of Saul clothing David in his armour is not only derogatory towards Saul and his cowardly adoption of this subservient role but also it foreshadows David's victory on the battlefield as one who is to finish off an opponent already conquered.

The literary play with military terminology and expectations continues with the מצחה of Goliath and מקל of David. The מצחה here is literally a *forehead of bronze* on Goliath's legs. As noted earlier, this term is unique within the Hebrew Bible and Qumran texts and perhaps this uniqueness can be explained by literary purposes in this text. There is an ambiguous interplay in the meaning between forehead as the location of Goliath's ultimate fatal weakness and the term used for an item of armour covering his leg, which is one of the only points on Goliath's body open to David, assuming he is small in stature.

Goliath's taunt in 1 Sam. 17.43, "Am I a dog, that you come to me with sticks?" (הכלב), may indicate that he recognized only the מקל as David's weapon and not the sling. This reading would play into the ambiguity about Goliath's מצחה; if David is only armed with a מקל the striking point of opportunity would be the lower area of Goliath's body, namely the legs protected by the מצחה. Instead, David uses his sling thus far hidden in his hand (קלעו בידו) to press an advantage hitherto unseen and strikes Goliath in the מצח, right where he was not looking. As noted above, the literary theme of defeating the enemy through surprise and deceit may also be reflected when David straps a sword on the outside of his מד, resonating strongly with the stories of Ehud and Joab, where the same language is used to set up a situation

in which they slay their enemies with cunning and surprise, delivering a quick death to both their targets.³¹⁷

The military vocabulary also imbues the text with several mystical and divine elements. The *מקל* has several non-military connotations in the MT, including divination³¹⁸ and a symbol of office.³¹⁹ Both of these nuances could be read along with the military use of the *מקל*. There is, of course, an element of the supernatural when David strikes down Goliath, which could be associated with divination or magical arts. The symbol of office is an obvious and strong association for any reader coming to this story, aware that this is the beginning of David's ascendance to the throne and the line of Judah.

This aspect of the supernatural or divine battle is extended with the identification of Goliath's *כידון* as a divine weapon; this adds further nuance as Goliath carries the symbolic weapon of a divine being. This supernatural reading also reflects further into David's panoply of *מג* which carries divine association as the term for the garment of priests. If the scimitar of Goliath resonates with a neo-Babylonian deity, so too does David's *מג* carry nuances of a priestly garment and his *מקל* an other-worldly power.

(v) Historical and chronological implications

The rich nature of the military vocabulary in 1 Samuel 17 has resulted in speculation in various publications as to the historical identity of Goliath.³²⁰ The most recent study of Goliath

317. The spilling of bowels doesn't find a parallel in the Goliath story unlike the two other pericopes but the immediate and final death of Goliath bears resemblance to Ehud and Joab's speedy dispatches. Ehud adds an extra element of surprise to his story by strapping the sword under his *מג*, but the sword is strapped over the *מג* by both David and Joab.

318. Gen. 30.37-39, Num. 22.27, Hos. 4.12.

319. Jer. 48.17, Zech. 11.7-14.

320. Recently: Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective". Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory".

within a historical context has been I. Finkelstein's, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective" which interpreted Goliath as an anachronistic memory of a Greek hoplite from the late Iron II Age. Finkelstein sees the panoply of Goliath as perfectly fitting the armament of Greek hoplites of the seventh to the fifth centuries B.C.E. and associates these hoplites with the Greek mercenaries serving in the Egyptian army of Psammetichus I (664-610 B.C.E.).³²¹ The connection between the Deuteronomistic Historian and the Greek mercenaries is established by identifying the *kittim* of the Arad ostraca as Greek mercenaries in the Egyptian army, thus making Arad and the Beer-sheba valley a place of contact between Judahites and Greek hoplites.

Despite the clever thesis it is difficult to determine such an exact dating for the narrative background. Although the armament of Goliath can be read as hoplite it is much too general a panoply to distinguish it as exclusively hoplite. Indeed the one distinctive feature of the hoplite, namely the *hoplon* shield, does not seem to be indicated by the description of Goliath entering the battle. Further, not only is Goliath lacking the distinctive *hoplon*, he does not carry a shield at all. 1 Samuel 17.7 completes the description of Goliath's armour stating, "And the shaft of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and his spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron; and

321. *Men of bronze* are mentioned in Herodotus, *Histories*, Book II, Chapter 152. These were apparently sent by the Lydian Gyges (680-682 B.C.E.) but are referred to as Ionian and Carian which were neighbouring regions to Lydia. Finkelstein refers to these in his section on *seren* as related to *tyrannos* in order to establish a linguistic link to the seventh century B.C.E for the term. Oddly, he does not make this same connection when discussing Goliath's armour preferring to label it as 'hoplite' and referring to the *kittim* as Greek or Cypriot mercenaries. The weaknesses of Finkelstein's position, as demonstrated in the discussion, is that it does not account for clearly Asiatic elements in Goliath's panoply. Shifting the consideration back to Lydia may account for the Asiatic armour as well as the presence of possible Hittite lexemes which would accord geographically with Lydia. On the edge of flirting with the ridiculous is the mythical figure of Gyges (Γύγης) the founder of Lydia and the LXX parallel used occasionally for Hebrew רפאים, רפאים τῶν γιγάντων, the sons of giants or the sons of corrupted Gyges. See also an article by F. Willeson which disputes the reading of the MT as "son of the Rephaim" but rather claims the Hebrew ילד הרפאים means the 'corps of the scimitar' as a description of a specialised Philistine fighting corps. The argument seems speculative and has not been pursued further by other scholars, however it does provide some lateral thought on what the רפאים may mean. F. Willeson, "The Philistine Corps of the Scimitar From Gath," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 3 (1958): 327-335.

his shield-bearer went before him."³²² As Finkelstein admits lightly, "shield-bearers are not mentioned in texts or shown in vase-paintings in relation to seventh-fifth-century hoplites."³²³ Yet the shield-bearer is a standard motif on Assyrian and Persian reliefs, where the large shield is carried forward in front of an armed warrior, generally an archer. The *hoplon* is distinctive not only by its large size, which would fit with the description in 1 Samuel 17, but its truly unique feature consisted of an arm-band and handle on the rim of the shield that allowed the warrior to manoeuvre the large shield while leaving one arm free to fight and the other hand to hold spears or extra weapons.³²⁴

The narrative also explicitly mentions the breastplate of Goliath as a שריון קשקשים, meaning a breastplate of scales. As discussed earlier, this type of armour is not distinctively Hellenic or typical of hoplites and is more commonly associated with Asiatic warriors for whom it was a standard piece of armour. In the late Archaic period (fifth century B.C.E.), scaled armour becomes more common among the Greeks—but this is probably due to interaction with Persian military.

Finally, Greek hoplites certainly were not associated with the scimitar in any evidence from texts or reliefs. The scimitar is very much an Asiatic weapon, favoured as an arm of Ishtar and other ancient Near Eastern deities in reliefs. Neither the שריון (scaled corselet), צנה (shield), חנית (javelin) nor the כידון (scimitar) can be considered as indicative of a hoplite panoply. This leaves only the כובע (helmet) and מצחקה (greaves) among Goliath's armament as possible hoplite armament.

322.J. K. Anderson, "Hoplite Weapons and Offensive Arms," in *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, ed. Victor Davis Hanson (London: Routledge, 1991).

323.Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective", 145-146.

324.Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*, 53.

As discussed in the examination, כִּוְבַע is a fairly standard term for a head covering dispersed throughout the MT and although Sapir finds a Hittite origin for the term it cannot be presumed that it is associated with a Asiatic style of helmet rather than Greek.³²⁵ As the term is a general one, there is nothing distinctive in its use that would either support or argue against the hoplite identification. However, it should be noted that narrative-historical deductions such as S. McKenzie's,³²⁶ are desperately conjectural and dependent on a story which displays little concern with the theoretical aspects of killing a giant with a small stone.³²⁷

Though the helmet itself is not distinctive as hoplite or non-hoplite, bronze greaves are typical of a Greek hoplite armour after the eighth century B.C.E.³²⁸ Asiatic warriors, by contrast, generally used hardened leather greaves. Identifying the greaves as an element of the hoplite panoply, however, hinges on their material of composition being bronze rather than leather. This is a tenuous position when, as mentioned above, the literary motif of Goliath's armour favours bronze. If the narrative is archaized by identifying armaments as bronze it is difficult to argue that the greaves are described as bronze in order to describe Goliath as a hoplite rather than simply fitting into the archaising theme of the narrative.

Following this consideration of Goliath's panoply, Finkelstein's argument that Goliath represents a fifth-seventh-century Greek hoplite appears to be tenuous at best. The panoply of Goliath is simply too vague to represent any specific influence; it could be argued that his

325.Sapir, "Hebrew 'Helmet' a Loan-Word and its Bearing on Indo-European Phonology".

326.That Goliath's helmet was Assyrian style (conical without a nose guard) instead of Greek (with vertical nose guard), as, if it was the latter David could not have hit Goliath between the eyes.

327.Steven L McKenzie, *King David: A Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 75.

328.Robert Drews, *The End of the Bronze Age: Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe Ca. 1200 B.C* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), 177. Drews comments on bronze greaves noting they come into use in the 12th century and then disappear from Greece and do not come back until the end of the eighth century. "Although Goliath was said to have worn bronze greaves, they were never popular in the Near East. Nor do they seem to have been worn in temperate Europe before they appear in Greece."

panoply is representative of Persian, Assyrian or even Egyptian armed warriors. However, the melange of military items as well as the possible Aegean references may favour a later dating rather than a 10th century composition.

The lexical body however does carry patterns of distribution and usage which associate it more closely with the 1QM and other late Qumran texts rather than the typical MT vocabulary. The קלע and the צנה both follow patterns of usage similar to late usage in Qumran military texts. The clearest correspondence however is with the unique איש הבנים in 1 Sam. 17.4, which is not used anywhere in the MT but is commonly found in 1QM as a descriptive term for the infantry which draws up on the battle line.

The inherent chronological indications of the military vocabulary and its patterns of usage, along with the literary depiction of battle and romantic portrayal of David as a simple slinger resonate strongly with a late date of final redaction—possibly influenced by popular Greek histories of Balearic and Peloponnese slingers. However, the complex redaction and literary history of the narrative makes any firm dating tenuous, as the text surely attests several variant sources with variant chronological points of composition.³²⁹ The indications of a late date for some of the narrative elements does discourage any attempt to use the text as a historical source of Philistine or indeed Levantine military customs at any particular chronological point. Y. Yadin's boast of the passage as "one of the most important documents for an understanding of Philistine armaments...at the beginning of the Davidic period" is not historically sound nor is it a recommended basis for further scholarly investigation.³³⁰

329. The relationship of military vocabulary in 1 Samuel 17 and 1 Maccabees 3 should also be noted. The description of Judas Maccabeus (and he wore armour like a hero) is scattered with references to the 1 Samuel 17 narrative and the depiction of David. Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 154.

330. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, 265.

2. The military vocabulary of Judges 5 (Song of Deborah)

(a) The background of Judges 5 in history and scholarship

The Song of Deborah contained within Judges 5 provides an accessible and delimited text for an examination of military vocabulary. The short length of the song and the unique vocabulary make a dense concentration of military terms rare within the MT. The high concentration of military lexemes, the military focus of the passages, and the contentious dating history of the song make the passage a good candidate for a thorough study of the military lexical body. The question of dating, its poetic nature, the oddity of a female warrior hero in biblical literature and attempts to use the passage for historical reconstruction of early Israel have been the main areas of focus for biblical studies in historical commentary and research.

(i) The historical and literary background

The song occurs after a narrative account of a battle between Barak and Sisera in Judges 4 where Barak routs Sisera's army and Jael kills Sisera in her tent. The song repeats the preceding battle in a poetic form and slightly differs by attributing the battle to Deborah instead of Barak. It is considered that the song would have existed independently, and was inserted into the prose narrative by the author.³³¹ The song is considered a literary example of a victory hymn³³² or a war ballad adapted for liturgical use by the addition of hymnic elements.³³³ A. Globe considered the song a mixed genre of part ballad and part hymn which he considered to

331. Cuthbert Aikman Simpson, *Composition of the Book of Judges* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 17. Simpson refers to Budde, Eissfeldt and attributes the song to E.

332. Robert G. Boling, *Judges* (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1975), 103.

333. J. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah," *Biblica* 42 (1961): 61-76. and Barnabas Lindars, "Deborah's Song: Women in the Old Testament," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65 (1983): 158-175.

be the rule, not the exception, of early Hebrew poetry.³³⁴ Alberto Soggin also attributed the song to a mixed literary genre as a heroic poem surrounded with liturgical elements.³³⁵

The function of the song is attributed to various factors. B. Webb considers it as a tribute to those tribes which came to the help of Yahweh, while rebuking those who did not and highlighting the victorious deeds of Yahweh as Israel's champion.³³⁶ Similarly, T. Schneider considers it as focusing on the battle itself and praising the deity.³³⁷ Soggin corresponds with Webb and notes its purpose was to arouse among the audience a sense of identification with the tribes that responded while condemning those who stayed at home.³³⁸ L. Klein differs from this common view with the suggestion that the song and narrative are recalling an earlier motif of Israel's propensity to forget the covenant with Yahweh in its eagerness for land.³³⁹ The song is commonly placed within a cultic setting or covenant renewal festival.³⁴⁰

The suggested historical background of the song is varied and often influenced by the literary setting. An often attributed background is within the context of the oppression of the

334. Alexander Globe, "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 493-512.

335. J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 96.

336. Barry G. Webb, *The Book of the Judges: An Integrated Reading*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, vol. 46 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 144.

337. Tammi Schneider, *Judges* (Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 2000), 97.

338. Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*.

339. Klein, *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges*, 47.

340. Artur Weiser, "Das Deborahlied: eine gattungs- und traditions-geschichtliche Studie," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 71 (1959): 67-97. The song will have been used in the context of the worship of the tribal league, also Vandier d'Abbadie, "Benjamin. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Geschichte eines israelitischen Stammes," *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1963): 51. John Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (London: Nelson, 1967). Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (København: Gad, 1967), 138. and Walter Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 92. Beyerlin and Bentzen think specifically for the covenant renewal festival. Blenkinsopp considers it an early war ballad secondarily adapted to the situation of the Yahweh cultus. Blenkinsopp, "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah".

people as a cause for war.³⁴¹ Soggin attributes this oppression to a coalition of Philistines and Canaanites as enemies of Israel.³⁴² A. D. H. Mayes agrees with the context of Philistines against Israel and places the battle before 1 Samuel 4 with the Philistines attacking after their defeat on the plain of Esdraelon.³⁴³ The widest deviation from this historical background is found in an article by Giovanni Garbini. He saw in the poem a correspondence between Barak, Jael, Sisera and Cretan mythology, placing the poem within an Aegaen background transposed onto a divine battle between Yahweh and Canaanite/Philistine deities (Dagon is identified as Zeus Kretogenes).³⁴⁴

(ii) The linguistic and chronological background

The song is often considered to be one of the earliest texts in the Hebrew bible; its dating thought to be so secure that it is taken as a simple fact in many commentaries. Soggin's commentary on Judges states, "The study of the song of Deborah, one of the earliest pieces of heroic poetry in the Old Testament".³⁴⁵ Carol Meyers confidently writes in *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*, "The poetry in Judges 5 is archaic, and virtually all scholars maintain that it dates to the 12th century B.C.E."³⁴⁶ This early dating and association of the song with

341. Klein, *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges*, 44.

342. Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*, 98.

343. A. D. H. Mayes, "The Historical Context of the Battle Against Sisera," *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 353-360. A. D. H. Mayes, *Israel in the Period of the Judges* (Naperville, Ill: A. R. Allenson, 1974).

344. G. Garbini, "Il Cantico Di Debora," *Parola del Passato* 178 (1978): 5-31. Referenced in Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*, 99. An interesting correspondence along the same line of enquiry may be found in the myths of the Babylonian Deluge where Ramman the storm-god has a female counterpart named *Dibbarra*, the goddess of Pestilence. J. Thackeray drew this line of correspondence to the Habakkuk 3 song but, as far as I know, no parallel has been drawn to Judges 5 which is commonly associated with Habakkuk 3. H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921), 51-52.

345. Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*, 92.

346. Leo G Perdue, *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 68.

an archaic early history stems from the Albright school and its heavy emphasis in the mid-twentieth century of associating biblical texts with the newly discovered Ugaritic writings.³⁴⁷

The poetic nature of the song, and the dense and obscure vocabulary and parallels with the Ugaritic literature led to a common identification of the song as an example of archaic Biblical Hebrew and a glimpse into Israel's ancient past.³⁴⁸

However, the early dating of the song was not a casual certainty prior to the mid-twentieth century. Vernes writing in 1889 concluded,

On the contrary, though the prose story is late and exhibits numerous inconsistencies, it is drawn from older sources, and is infinitely superior to the poem. ... Vague and inaccurate phrases such as "new gods" (v.8), "the kings of Canaan" (v.19), "the times of Jael" (v.6), point to a date remote from the events. ... The poem must, therefore be later than the latest stratum of Jos. "If the prose narrative is not older than the 5th cent. B.C., the song put into the mouth of the prophetess-judge may without hesitation be dated a century or a century and a half later."³⁴⁹

Seinecke also considered the song to be a post-exilic composition stating, "The language exhibits Aramaisms and other marks of late date, especially the relative ω ; the style is ar-

347. W. F. Albright, "Some Additional Notes on the Song of Deborah," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 11 (1922): 284-285. W. F. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 62 (1936): 26-31. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, 100, 122. Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, 9-14. W. F. Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 68)," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950-51): 1-39. W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," ed. H. H. Rowley, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1946).

348. Boling, *Judges*, 106. 'These same verses display patterns of repetitive parallelism that are closely comparable to Ugaritic epic forms and mark the song as archaic.' Schneider, *Judges*, 85. 'Many of the words which appear in it are otherwise unknown or difficult to translate because the forms are so archaic.' Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*, 80. 'the Song of Deborah has been considered by the majority of scholars to be the earliest text in the Hebrew Bible; it is rich in archaic terms and expressions, and does not seem yet to know of the institution of the monarchy in Israel, although the people are already settled in the land of Canaan.' P. C. Craigie, "Deborah and Anat: A Study of Poetic Imagery (Judges 5)," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90 (1978): 374-381. P. C. Craigie, "Song of Deborah and the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 253-265. P. C. Craigie, "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah," *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 349-353. P. C. Craigie, "Parallel Word Pairs in the Song of Deborah," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 15-22. M. D. Coogan, "Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 143-165.

349. Maurice M. Vernes, "Le cantique de Debora," *Revue des études juives* 24 (1892): 52-67. Maurice Vernes, *Précis d'histoire juive depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque Persane* (Paris: 1889), 110.

tificial; v.10, for example, is "a frigid conceit of post-exilic times," reminding us of the beginning of Ps I. Finally, the names of Barak, Lapidoth, and perhaps Deborah have an unhistorical ring".³⁵⁰ The early Moore commentary disagreed vehemently with these chronological conclusions, arguing that based on the lack of anachronism and the "atmospheric perspective" of the narrative, the song is "the oldest extant monument of Hebrew literature, and the only contemporaneous monument of Hebrew history before the foundation of the kingdom".³⁵¹

The identification of the song as an archaic relic of poetry from the Late Bronze Age or Early Iron transition period has been questioned recently by other scholars who put the linguistic and literary background in the monarchic era, 8th to 10th centuries B.C.E.³⁵² L. Stager researched the archaeological, social and ecological background of the song, determining it did not necessarily display such an archaic early date.³⁵³ The similarities to Ugaritic texts, which is the foundation of Albright's dating,³⁵⁴ has also been disputed by others such as J. Kugel³⁵⁵ who demonstrates that the linguistic parallels are not unique and not dependent on Ugaritic poetic texts.³⁵⁶ Garbini's oft-quoted linguistic examination puts the Hebrew as late as the 8th century

350.L. Chr. F. W. Seinecke, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Göttingen: 1876), 243-245.

351.George Foot Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1910), 131-133.

352.Garbini and Soggin both place the song as monarchic: Garbini, "Il Cantico di Debora". Soggin, *Judges, a Commentary*, 93. Cf Lawrence E. Stager, "Archaeology, Ecology and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah," *Vetus Testamentum Supplemental Series* 20 (1988): 221-234. M. Floyd, "Oral Tradition as a Problematic Factor in the Historical Interpretation of Poems in the Law and the Prophets" (Claremont Graduate School, 1980).

353.Stager, "Archaeology, Ecology and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah".

354.Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology", 26-31. Alexander Globe, "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5, 4-5," *Biblica* 55 (1974): 168-178.

355.James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).

356.Thomas L Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written and Archaeological Sources*, *Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 19. "To assert that Ugaritic analogies to the song of Deborah help us date the biblical song early not only flies in the face of even closer parallels in the psalms but also ignores the proven durability of motifs, plot lines

B.C.E. and no earlier than the 10th.³⁵⁷ The dating of the song has been pushed even later by M. Waltisberg, who dates the song to the Persian period based primarily on his analysis of Aramaisms in the text.³⁵⁸

The arguments that support chronological conclusions are either based on linguistic typology (Ugaritic parallels and archaic vocabulary) or aesthetic impressions based on the "immediacy" of the song.³⁵⁹ As noted, linguistic arguments for an early date from Albright³⁶⁰ and Globe³⁶¹ attempted to establish a compositional date by comparing features of Ugaritic texts, such as the repetition of words and forms of vocabulary.³⁶² However, later scholars have debated the relative similarity of these features, as well as demonstrating that their existence in the text certainly does not preclude a late dating.³⁶³

Compounding these studies is the difficulty the poem poses in even simple translation. In his commentary Soggin notes, "of a total of 30 verses, a full 22 have at least one word, often the key word, which can only be translated in a purely conjectural way; furthermore vv2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21, 22 and 26 are not completely comprehensible. This makes up about a quarter of the

and literary narrative traditions across millennia in the ancient Near East."

357. Garbini, "Il Cantico di Debora".

358. Michael Waltisberg, "Zum Alter der Sprache des Deboraliedes Ri 5," *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12 (1999): 218-232.

359. Lindars, "Deborah's Song: Women in the Old Testament", 213.

360. Albright, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology".

361. Globe, "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5, 4-5".

362. Boling, Judges, 106.

363. An example of refutation of an early dating based on linguistics or Ugaritic similarities is Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. Penar points out the occurrence of 'Ugaritic' typologies in late texts such as Sirach. Tadeusz Penar, *Northwest Semitic Philology and the Hebrew Fragments of Ben Sira* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975).

whole song.³⁶⁴ Considering the Septuagint's difficulty with translating some of these words, this linguistic obscurity is often interpreted to indicate an early dating.³⁶⁵

Other linguistic studies have placed the dating of Judges 5 much later. James Barr notes in his study of plene and full spellings in the MT that the Song of Deborah exhibits regular use of plene spellings which is not in accordance with an early date.³⁶⁶ Frederick Greenspahn has written several times of the Aramaisms present in the Song of Deborah, particularly the Aramaic plural form of מדין in Judg. 5.10 and the Aramaic verb תנה in Judg. 5.11 instead of the Hebrew שנה.³⁶⁷ Waltisberg extended this study of Aramaisms in the song to propose a Persian date for the text.³⁶⁸ This conclusion has been dismissed by G. Rendsburg who argues these Aramaic parallels are "Aramaic-like features which were part of the Israelian dialect; they are not evidence of late date, but rather are further examples of traits shared by IH³⁶⁹ and Aramaic".³⁷⁰ Garbini's extensive evaluation of the song of Deborah is one of the more thorough traditional linguistic studies. It concludes that the song evidences a phase of Hebrew earlier than eighth century classical Hebrew, but later than the Gezer calendar Hebrew from the end of the tenth century.³⁷¹ This reliance on diachronic dating, particularly when limited to a single piece of extra-biblical

364.Soggin, Judges, a Commentary.

365.See the discussion of פרע and פרוון in this lexical study.

366.James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1989), 37-38.

367.Greenspahn, *An Introduction to Aramaic*, 2. Cf. John Kaltner and Steven L McKenzie, *Beyond Babel: A Handbook for Biblical Hebrew and Related Languages, Resources for Biblical Study*, vol. 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 101. Cf. Hurvitz, "The Chronological Significance of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew". Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*, 6.

368.Waltisberg, "Zum Alter der Sprache des Deboraliedes Ri 5".

369.Israelian Hebrew. Rendsburg's term for the northern dialect.

370.Rendsburg, "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology," 122.

371.Garbini, "Il Canticum di Debora".

evidence (which has a disputed chronology itself), is prone to the limitations as discussed in the introduction of this thesis.³⁷²

(b) The examination of military vocabulary in Judges 5

The dating and historical background of the song is thus widely disputed, and it is doubtful that either a purely linguistic or historical study will be able to establish a generally acceptable date. The following examination of the military vocabulary within Judges 5 will follow the practical methodological framework laid out in Part I. It will also question whether the military lexemes can provide any further chronological or historical information which may feed into or reflect on this debate. The military vocabulary of the poem will be examined to determine whether it exhibits characteristics resonant with an archaic form of the text or a late dating.

There are nine lexemes found within the song which are strongly identified as military lexemes: פרע, חקק, פרזון, רזן, אדיר, מגן, גבורים, שר, and רמח. This is a high concentration of military lexemes in the biblical texts, although one may suspect that a higher amount of strong military vocabulary should be found in a song devoted to the celebration and description of battle.

(i) פרע

The word פרע is notoriously ambiguous, which makes it difficult to identify the exact function or meaning in Judg. 5.2, בפרע פרעות בישראל בהתנדב עם ברכו יהוה. KB provides a range of meanings mainly incorporating the base definitions: *to expose, to let the hair grow freely; to pay*. Most of the meanings hold a common thread of loosing, whether physically (as with hair),³⁷³ or in neglect or lacking restraint. The definition of *to pay* appears to be a less common marginal meaning—probably semantically related with the idea of "unrestrained" money—and

372. Refer to the introductory section, 'Three major difficulties with creating linguistic typologies', and, 'The limits of typological correspondence between Biblical Hebrew and inscriptional evidence'.

373. W. F. Albright, "The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 51 (1922): 69ff. Inclines to 'For that locks streamed long in Israel'.

appears in later texts such as the Samaritan Pentateuch, Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Old South Arabian.³⁷⁴ The LXX equivalent of Judg. 5.2 uses ἄρχηγος (prince), but the use of פרע as *prince* would be unique in this passage outside of reference to the Egyptian Pharaoh in Genesis 41 and 36. There is a later Arabic cognate, *fara"ā*, meaning to *overtop, excel* which resonates with the definition of the term as *prince, leader*. KB references a Ugaritic cognate which may mean *the one in first place* which is used to refer to the first wife or princess of a ruler. Old Persian also attests a possible cognate, although this is not referenced by any lexicons, as the prefix *fra-* (before, forth) is combined with verbs, nouns or phrasal adjectives to create lexemes such as *fratama* (foremost), *fraθara* (superior) and *framātar* (master, lord).³⁷⁵

Within the MT there are 23 occurrences of פרע in various contexts; most of the contexts refer to the loosing of hair or exposing the hair of the head. The distribution of usage and meaning is: (a) three in the Genesis Joseph narrative (41.45; 41.50; 46.20) are used in the construct פרע פוטי which refers to the "priest of On"; (b) Exod. 5.4, 32.25; Prov. 29.18 are used in the sense of casting off restraint (Exod. 32.25 uses the term to describe the Israelites' mistake of creating the golden calf); (c) three occurrences in Lev. (10.6, 13.45, 21.10), twice in Num. (5.18, 6.5) and Ezek. 44.20 all refer to the term in reference to hair (long hair, loosing hair presumably from binding it or tying it up); (d) once in Ezek. 24.14, and five times in Prov. (1.25, 4.15, 8.33, 13.18, 15.32), פרע is used in reference to ignoring or neglecting counsel; (e) 2 Chron. 28.19 mentions Ahaz "הפריע ביהודה", understood negatively as Ahaz neglecting Israel. The final occurrence in Deut. 32.42, is the most relevant as the consonantal form is the only MT

374.KB sub פרע.

375.Roland G Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*, American Oriental Series, vol. 33 (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1954). The lexicon also notes the adverb *fravata*, 'forward, downward' and the North Persian phrase? *fārōd fārō* which is a phonetic mirror of the Hebrew פרע פרעות in Judges 5.2. The Persian lexeme is also attested as an Aramaic loanword in the Elephantine texts as פרתרך the later Persian title for a provincial governor. A. Crowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), xxix.

occurrence identical to one in Judg. 5.2 and is also the only one in a military context. It is notable that Deuteronomy 32 is generally considered to be an example of archaic Hebrew poetry along with Judges 5. Deuteronomy 32.42 reads:

אשכיר חצי מדם וחרבי תאכל בשר מדם חלל ושביה מראש פרעות אויב

The usage is also ambiguous in this case. As part of the construct chain, however, it is related to both "head" and "enemy", and would follow the Arabic and Ugaritic leadership cognate better than the "long-haired/locks" definition; "from the head of the leaders of the enemy". The construct may also be an adjectival construct³⁷⁶ and thus may be "from the loosed/neglected/freed/exposed heads of the enemy". It is tempting to read "loosed" as "severed" in this passage as it would read: "I will make my arrows drunk from blood and my sword will eat flesh from the blood of slain and captive, from the severed head of the enemy". However, the ambiguity is great both in grammar and semantics, which makes any conclusion uncertain.

Within the Qumran sectarian literature, פרע occurs nine times (CD VIII, 8; XIX, 21; 1QS VI, 26; 4Q171 1_10 I, 15; 4Q182 1, 3; 4Q266 3 IV, 6; 4Q266 10 II, 4; 4Q270 4, 5; 4Q415 2 II, 4. The CD occurrences use it in the phrase ויפרעו ביד רמה, which is translated as "threw off all restraint",³⁷⁷ and refers negatively to someone following sin or wicked customs. This phrase is also used in 4Q182 1, 3; and reconstructed in 4Q266 3 IV, 6 (which is probably a copy of CD 8.8). From the other fragments only 4Q415 2 II, 4. is useful and states similarly, "lest they neglect the holy covenant." 1QS 6.26 also uses the verb negatively for someone who "rejects the instruction of his friend."

376. The RSV translation 'long-haired heads of the enemy' follows this.

377. Literally is along the lines of 'uncovered with a high hand'.

The Judg. 5.2 occurrence is equally vague, and the use of פָּרַע for both subject and verb only compounds the difficulty of interpretation. Commentators such as John Gray³⁷⁸ and Charles Burney³⁷⁹ have followed the use of פָּרַע within the framework of long-hair or loosening bound hair to place the phrase in a pre-battle ritual of dedication.³⁸⁰ B. Lindars also notes another option based on the Aramaic usage of the root to mean *unloosing* in the sense of a payment of a debt. This results in something closer to the Peshitta's "for the vengeance taken in Israel". However, neither of these interpretations account for the probable (although not necessary) parallelism between the first half of the verse and "בהתנדב עם ברכו יהוה" in the second half. If these are parallel then it would seem that פָּרַע should carry its otherwise attested meaning of lacking restraint or loosing which is semantically related to נָדַב, *to freely offer*, forming a clean semantic parallel between the two parts of the sentence.

If the פָּרַע verb is thus related to lacking restraint, or acting without restraint,³⁸¹ and the פָּרַע noun is read as *leader*, this would also parallel the following verse in Judg. 5.9 which repeats the נָדַב verb with הִקָּק, possibly a term of leadership, as the subject.³⁸² The definition of

378.Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth.

379.Burney, The Book of Judges.

380.This definition is interesting as it brings many religious or ritual nuances to the fore. Hair was extremely symbolic in the ancient Near East. There is a very interesting passage in the Roman *Banquet of Trimalchio* from *Satyricon* (early first century C.E.) in which the dinner guest laments the decline of religion, 'What ever is to happen if neither the gods nor man take pity on this town? ... In the old days the mothers in their best robes used to climb the hill with bare feet and loose hair, pure in spirit, and pray Jupiter to send rain' If the Judges 5.2 verse was read in line of 'loosing hair' it would provide a very similar parallel to this 'good old faithful days' lament. The loosing of hair in the context of a wild man is a theme in the ANE, see Gregory Mobley, "The Wild Man in the Bible and in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 218-222. For Assyrian dress and hair stereotypes of surrounding cultures see Markus Wäfler, *Nicht-Assyrer neuassyrischer Darstellungen, Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, vol. 26 (Kevelaer Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker Neukirchener Verlag, 1975).

381.Janzen's extensive study of the context of the various attestations resulted in this conclusion taken to an abstracted level with the term connoting the flouting or rebellion against structures foundational to live-giving order. J. Gerald Janzen, "The Root Pr' in Judges V 2 and Deuteronomy XXXII 42," *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 393-406.

382.This is the parallel reasoning also used by B. Lindars in defining the term as one of leadership. Barnabas Lindars and A. D. H Mayes, *Judges 1-5: A New Translation and Commentary* (Edinburgh:

פרעות as a leadership term would fulfill both this occurrence in Judg. 5.2 as well as Deut. 32.42, and may be the best interpretation until more attestations come to light from Hebrew or cognate languages. This definition must be cautioned, however, as defining פרעות as a *leader* represents a semantic shift or marginal meaning that does not follow the other attestations in the biblical text; particularly considering the verbal form is not complimentary to leadership, as used to indicate a loosening, neglect or lack of restraint.

Regardless of the precise definition, the distribution pattern should be noted as it runs only throughout the Pentateuch, twice in Ezekiel, six times in Proverbs and once in 2 Chronicles. As it may evidence semantic shift, this distribution may be further fragmented however that would rely on stronger support for the marginal meanings.

The historical or chronological implications of the lexeme are thus quite weak, not because of opportunity but rather due to uncertainty of meaning. The Qumran attestations point to the verb form as a negative term for neglect or lack of restraint semantically similar to the Exod. 5.4, 32.25 and Prov. 29.18 use as casting off restraint. If the lexeme is understood as associated with unbound hair in battle it would provide an interesting historical glimpse of military custom, however this is far from certain and it is fruitless to build historical insight on speculation alone.³⁸³ The term interpreted as *leader* may indicate a marginal meaning similar to Ugaritic or Arabic that is not attested elsewhere in the MT. As both occurrences in a military context display the same ambiguity, it is possible that the context is the reason for an attestation of margin-

T&T Clark, 1995), 227.

383. Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 276. 'That the leaders took the lead ... after LXXA but this is not the natural translation of the Hebrew, the only justification being that the possible cognate of the words translated "took the lead" means "to be lofty" ... might refer to a renewal of vows ... long hair might symbolize a reversion to desert conditions' Cf. Boling, Judges, 107. Chaim Rabin also offers a historical interpretation in the sense of volunteering for war rather than a muster: 'present themselves,' Heb. *hitnaddeb*, 'to go to war in answer to a call'. Chaim Rabin, "Judges V, 2 and the 'Ideology' of Deborah's War," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 6 (1955): 125-134. Cf. P. C. Craigie, "A Note on Judges V 2," *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 399.

al meaning rather than the identification of both Judg. 5.2 and Deuteronomy 32 as archaic passages.

(ii) חקק

חקק occurs in Judg. 5.9 and 5.14 as a title of status or function (לבי לחוקקי ישראל המתנדבים) (מני מכיר ירדו מחקקים בעם). The use of חקק as a title is fairly rare with the root predominantly used as a verb to mean *inscribe, engrave, decree*. Both KB and BDB, however, define the term as a title when occurring in the *po"el* form. KB refers to Judg. 5.14 as an example of *commander, ruler* and BDB defines *prescriber (of laws) or commander*. This use can also be found in Isa. 33.22, "כי יהוה שפטנו יהוה מחקקנו", and possibly in Ps. 60.7 and 108.8. This verbal form and leadership title is semantically related to חק, which means a statute or decree.

חקק is attested with a similar core meaning, *to hollow out, engrave*, in Jewish Aramaic as well as Phoenician; KB also lists ḥaqqā, *to make furrows*, and ḥaqq, *duty or obligation*, as Arabic cognates. The lexeme thus appears throughout many related languages with very little variation in its major semantic meaning as well as some marginal meanings (both the physical engrave and the abstracted laws or duties). There seems to be a history of semantic shift occurring along "one who inscribes (physically)", through the meaning of *duty* or *law* to the one who prescribes this—the difference between one doing the action to the one giving the action.

Within the biblical text there are nineteen attestations of חקק in five related semantic forms: (a) to engrave or mark (Num. 21.18?; Isa. 22.16, 30.8, 49.16; Ezek. 4.1, 23.14; Job 19.23; Prov. 8.27, 8.29) (b) an implement or sign of office (Gen. 49.10; Ps. 60.9, 108.9) (c) the abstracted law/decreed/judgement (Prov. 31.5) (d) a judge or one who deals with the abstract form (Judg. 5.9, 5.14; Isa. 10.1, 33.22, Deut. 33.22) and (e) to judge (Prov. 8.15). Proverbs 8.27 and 8.29 are referring to the distant past and the formation of the limits of the *deep*, which may be related to the verb function as found in Prov. 8.15. In the Prov. 8.27 and 8.29 occurrences,

however, the verb does carry the nuance of limits (drawing a circle of the sea and foundations of the earth) and the parallel noun in Prov. 8.29 is חק (בשמו לים חקו).

The use of חקק as a title or description of position is limited to Judg. 5.9 (חוקקי ישראל), 5.14 (מחקקים), Isa. 10.1 (חקקים) and 33.22 (מחקק), Deut. 33.22 (מחקק). Judg. 5.9 carries a parallel sentence to Judg. 5.2, particularly the second half of the verse. The occurrence in Judg. 5.14 is paralleled internally with משכים בשבט ספר, which would seem to carry a similar role—or perhaps, if considered closer to the Prov 8.15 form, they were those who wrote down what the חקק judged.³⁸⁴ Isa. 10.1 combines both the position and the action, החקקים חקקי און, in a negative warning. Finally, Isa. 33.22 uses the lexeme in a descriptive list for Yahweh, "יהוה שפטנו יהוה" "מחקקנו יהוה מלכנו".

There is an interesting semantic shift attested in the MT between the action of physically engraving (Isa. 22.16 and 30.8) and the substantive position (Judg. 5.9, 5.14; Isa. 10.1, 33.22). In addition, the verbal form as found in Prov. 8.15 has become an abstracted "to judge" rather than "to engrave/mark/inscribe".³⁸⁵ This does not necessarily imply a chronological evolution, as semantic shift can occur in dialect or from other factors. It is interesting to refer to the occurrences of חקק in the Qumran evidence, as it provides a dated point of commentary, particularly on a midrash of the Num 21.18 passage.

CD 6.1-6.11 contains a midrash on the history of Israel and the wanderings in the desert related to the contemporary community. The passage from Num. 21.18 is interwoven as an ex-

384. Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 286. "Those who bear the marshal's staff. The Hebrew verb משך in this context is probably cognate with Arabic masaka 'to grasp, hold;' Here ספר is also genuine but in the sense which it has in 2 kg 25.19 where it denotes the scribe who was connected with conscription."

385. The shift between engraving in rock (Is 22.16) and on a brick (Ezek 4.1) to the writing or painting—i.e. non-penetrative? methods—is also interesting, such as on a book (Is 30.8), on hands (Is. 49.16), on a wall in colour (Ezek 23.14); particularly Is 30.8 which has כתבה על לוח but ועל ספר חקה, the reverse would seem expected.

planation of Moses and Aaron establishing the law of the community and returning to covenant with Yahweh. CD 6.7-8 elucidates, והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר אמר ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו (and the מחוקק is the interpreter of Law which Isaiah said brings out a tool for his work). The use of Num. 21.18 appears to play on the semantic shift between an implement used to carve and the giving of law or judgement. Whether this was a common interpretation and the Num. 21.18 occurrence of מחוקק³⁸⁶ is a later emendation for a more common implement is irrelevant to the semantic play which indicates the Qumran association of חקק as related to the giving/judgement/decree of law. In comparison to this, 1QH^a, the Hodayot, uses חקק in verbal form to relate engraving or permanently marking. However, the verb חרת is attested throughout 1QM, 1QS and several 4Q fragments almost exclusively with חוק, which indicates an obsolescence of חקק to describe engraving in preference for חרת — though חוק retains its semantic core of *law, statute*. This obsolescence of חקק to describe engraving, in preference for חרת, supports seeing the semantic shift away from the act of engraving towards the law or decree which was engraved. This law or decree then related to the person who sat in judgement on these decrees or who pronounced decrees.³⁸⁷ The only occurrence of חרת in the MT is Exod. 32.16, והמכתב מכתב אלהים הוא, —"and the writing was Yahweh's writing engraved on the tablets". This is interesting in the framework of this semantic hypotheses as it would place this verse in a later period, similar with the Qumran usage of חרת.

The discussion above indicates that the term is not specifically military in nature although it appears in Judges 5 with that context. However, it is not generally attested within a military context in any other attestations and should be considered as a social position of leadership in the song. The interpretative consequence of this definition is related the ambiguous defi-

386. מחוקק in Num. 21.28 but not too much should be read into plene spellings.

387. There is also the verb פתח attested in the MT which appears to exclusively refer to engraving on stones, seals, wall carvings and fine metals. This may contrast then between engraving for decorative purposes and engraving for writing.

tion of פרע, which forms the parallel position with חוקקי ישראל in Judg. 5.9. As this the חקק is not a military position, rather one of judgement and decrees, it does not necessarily require a military nuance in the פרע attestation; a covenantal or law related nuance would fit better.

The chronological nuances are difficult to extract, although there appears to be evidence of a semantic shift away from the probable historic root in carving/engraving. This seems related to the shift from the process of preserving decrees and law on tablets, to the position of one who announced these decrees or judged according to them. Whether this shift of meaning relates to the discontinuation of engraving on tablets due to technological advances in writing³⁸⁸ or if there was a shift in core semantic meaning as the lexeme began to signify the position or decree itself is impossible to decide. However the semantic shift does allow the attestations to be grouped according to the marginal or core meanings. This indicates that the occurrence in Judg. 5.9 and 5.14 are probably not early due to their substantive use of the lexeme.

(iii) פרזון

The common form of פרז is פרזי which occurs 25 times in the MT (Gen. 13.7, 15.20, 34.30; Exod. 3.8, 3.17, 23.23, 33.21, 34.11; Deut. 3.5, 7.1, 20.17; Josh. 3.10, 9.1, 11.3, 12.8, 17.15, 24.11; Judg. 1.4, 1.5, 3.5; 1 Sam. 6.18; 1 Kgs 9.20; Ezra 9.1; Neh. 9.8; 2 Chron. 8.7) and is understood as the name of a people group (phonetically translated as Perizzites) or more loosely, *resident of the open country*. The פרזי are often listed in the text along with the Canaanites as the pre-Israelite inhabitants of the land. A second variation, פרזות, occurs in Ezek. 38.11, Zech. 2.8, Esther 9.19 and is defined as *open country/unwalled village/countryside* (KB/BDB); this may also be a more accurate rendering of the 1 Sam. 6.18 and Deut. 3.5 פרזי occurrences.³⁸⁹

388. This may be read into the variation in materials in the MT as the old methods would have died out yet the term shifted that which it signified.

389. Particularly Deut 3.5 which contrasts the walled cities (ערים בצרות חומה גבהה ולתים ובריה) with the ערי הפרוז. Cf. Simpson, *Composition of the Book of Judges*, 94. Simpson notes, "Moore and Burney emend פרזון to פרזות hamlets. Budde et al retain פרזון and render *the peasantry ceased in Israel*. This

פרזי is attested to twice in the Qumran Temple Scroll (11QT 2.3, 62.15), both of which use the term within the traditional list of people groups living in the land of Canaan on the arrival of Israel.

Judges 5.7 and 5.11 along with Hab. 3.14 contain an anomalous variation of the פרז root. In Judg. 5.7 it occurs as פרוזון, in 5.11 פרזנו and in Hab. 3.14 פרזו. The meaning of these פרז variations are disputed, with KB listing three options, *peasants*, *leader/warrior* and *iron*. It would be difficult and probably unnecessary to read *iron* into the Judges occurrences as *peasants* or *leader/warrior* seem to be more suited to the context.³⁹⁰ Within the consideration of literary context the definition of *warrior* fits very well with both the Judges passages and also the war-like Habakkuk passage. This definition is followed by Albright,³⁹¹ Robert Boling³⁹² and P. C. Craigie³⁹³ while G. R. Driver prefers *champions* and Soggin uses *leaders*.

The Arabic cognates noted by KB carry the nuance of separation or distinction. For example, *faraza* "to separate, muster", *farz* "depression between two hills"; these are also noted by Gesenius.³⁹⁴ KB also notes Driver's association of the form as the passive participle of the

however adds little if anything to what has been said in vs 5."

390.Cf. J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Hildesheim: Gg. Olms, 1967). Barth notes in §193 collective ending -on. Cf. Craigie, "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah". Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 279. "Hebrew *hadelu perazon*, treating the latter word as a collective singular, but possibly *perazim* should be read in strict agreement with the verb, or *perazot* (open villages) as in Ezek 38.11; Zech 2.4; Est 9.19 ... LXX however suggests the reading *rozenim* (rulers) the chief scribal variant being a dittography of ך, which closely resembles פ in the proto-hebraic script."

391.W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths*, Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, vol. 7 (London: Athlone Press, 1968), 49. Cites Papyrus Anastasi 1, 23, line 4.

392.Boling, Judges, 109. *warriors*. Heb. *perazon* not 'villagers'.

393.Craigie, "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah", 350.

394.Cf. G. R. Driver, "Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938): 397.

verb פרו (sic?)³⁹⁵ which he notes as meaning to *be isolated* or *separate*.³⁹⁶ This would fit with the definition of פרוון as those living in the countryside or isolated from the cities. There is also the possibility of creativity in identifying an Aramaic influence in the Judg. 5.7 attestation in the form פרוון, which could show a ז-ד shift from פרד, and the Aramaic ון- plural ending which would support the meaning of separation.

Notably, the LXX parallel to Judg. 5.7 transliterates the term as φραζων. This indicates that the translator did not necessarily understand the term, or did not have an equivalent Greek term which held the same meaning, and presumed most readers would understand the usage. Outside of Judg. 5.7 φραζων is not used. In Judg. 5.11 there is no parallel term and in Habakkuk δυναστῶν is used which means *leader, official*.

The Judg. 5.9 and 5.11 occurrences are probably best interpreted as villagers or some form of separated people while still providing a military nuance. A marginal meaning of *leader* is difficult to support as this is not attested anywhere else, not even in cognates. Considering the nuances of the Arabic cognate, it is possible to extend a possible marginal meaning of mustered troops, or troops drawn from the countryside. This perspective would accord with military musters which conscripted from the general population when necessary. It also supports the nuance of separation or distinction, as the פרו would be those separated from the populace for military duties. This definition would avoid the difficulties of *leader* while still providing a military nuance for the Judg. 5.9, 5.11 and Habakkuk occurrences. Judges 5.9 would thus read, "The muster/military force ceased in Israel, it ceased until you arose Deborah". Judges 5.11 would

395.G. R. Driver, "Problems in Judges Newly Discussed," *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 8 (1962-63): 8. Needs to be checked as פרו doesn't appear to be a verb although פרד contains this exact meaning. Most likely פרד.

396.Albright, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 68)".

also support this idea of conscription or mustering of a force that then marched down to the gates.

The Judges and Habakkuk usage, although more obscure, is semantically closer to the *פרוז* attestations in Ezek. 28.11, Zech 2.8 and Est. 9.19, rather than the *פרזי* occurrences which seem to be indicative of a people grouping. However, the usage is too poorly attested and too variant in form to draw any clean lines of semantic grouping or shift between *פרזי* and the others.

The historical context or usage of *פרז* are, once again, very difficult to place—mainly due to the limited attestations within the MT. Comparison between the Judges usage and the vision poem in Habakkuk 3 is interesting due to the literary context of this chapter, which is often considered to be an archaic, or archaizing text. The composition date of Habakkuk is debated with various claims spanning between the late seventh century to as late as the fourth century.³⁹⁷ It seems quite likely, however, that the vision psalm in the closing chapter of Habakkuk is an example of archaizing as noted by D.A. Robertson.³⁹⁸ M. Floyd refers to this work noting, "The antique grammatical forms do not occur in a concentration heavy enough to necessitate the poem's antiquity. It is possible that they are the result of archaizing literary diction rather than the remnant of genuinely early Hebrew."³⁹⁹ If this *פרוז* occurrence in Habakkuk 3.14 is considered to be within a passage intent on archaizing, this may reflect on its use in Judges 5 also. Interestingly, the only occurrences of this form are found within passages identified as archaic in their literary style.

397. Richard Duane Patterson, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1991). C.C. Torrey famously gave the book a fourth century provenance.

398. David A. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (Missoula: Published by Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on Form Criticism, 1972).

399. Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets, The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*, vol. 22 (Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000), 159.

(iv) רִזֹן

רִזֹן is relatively uncommon in the MT with seven occurrences (Judg 5.3, Isa. 40.23, Hab. 1.10, Ps. 2.2, Prov. 8.15, 14.28, 31.4). The lexeme is well defined with both Lisowsky and BDB defining it as *high official, prince, potentate*; KB notes *dignitary* when in the qal form. Several cognates are also noted, KB adds the Phoenician neo-Punic cognate רִזֹנִים with the definition of *dignitary* or *prince*. Arabic also has the cognate *razuna* which means to be *weighty, firm, reliable in judgement*.

Outside of the MT רִזֹן appears in Sirach 44.4 and three times in the Qumran corpus. The Qumran attestations indicate an almost exclusive preference for רַשׁ when signifying *prince*. This indicates רִזֹן was not the preferred term or not applicable. This preference is also demonstrated by the distribution as רִזֹן occurs only in 1QHab 4:1 (a usage of Hab. 1.10), 4Q174 3, 18 (using Ps 2.2), and 1Q39 10, 2 which is entirely fragmentary and useless for establishing any context.

רִזֹן occurs in parallel with מֶלֶךְ in all MT occurrences except Isa. 40.23 where it is paired with שֹׁפֵט. B. Lindars remarks on this re-occurring word-pair, "It is thus a purely poetic word, without distinctive application, used only for the needs of parallelism".⁴⁰⁰ This is a questionable conclusion as poetic pairing occurs repeatedly throughout the MT without devaluing the meaning or application of other well-known terms. Certainly רִזֹן is used consistently within poetic texts in parallel, but this reflects more on its similarity with מֶלֶךְ than its lack of meaning. However, the observation that it occurs consistently in poetic parallel across Judges, Isaiah, Habakkuk, Psalms and Proverbs is notable for establishing a common literary use across these texts.

400. Lindars and Mayes, *Judges 1-5: A New Translation and Commentary*, 228.

The phrase **וּאִם מֶלֶךְ בְּמַלְכֵם וְרִזְן בְּרִזְנֵם** occurs in KAI26 CIV:13/AIII:12, which is a Phoenician inscription from the Hittite fortress at Karatepe.⁴⁰¹ This indicates that the parallelism was common at least as early as the 8th-7th century B.C.E. dating of the inscriptions.⁴⁰² The lexeme also appears in Punic KAI 145.5 as epithet for a deity *rzn ymm* which is "prince of the sea", "prince of days" or "prince of antiquity".⁴⁰³

The use of **רִזְן** as a word pair or parallel with **מֶלֶךְ** appears to be consistent in all attestations, and doesn't appear to evidence any wider usage or any semantic shift. The attestations indicate the lexeme may have carried archaic resonance as it is attested at least in the 8th century, but not later within Hebrew texts such as the Qumran evidence. However, as the neo-Punic and Sirach attestations show, it may have had a continued use in later dialect or cognate languages. The sparsity of attestation makes it difficult to assign any particular historical value to the lexeme, other than to note the distribution of consistent usage through Judges, Habakkuk, Psalms and Proverbs.

401. M. L. Barré, "A Note on Rs't in the Karatepe Inscription," *Journal of the Ancient Near East Society* 13 (1981): 1-3. M. L. Barré, "An Analysis of the Royal Blessing in the Karatepe Inscription," *Maarav* 3/2 (1982): 177-194. A. M. Honeyman, "Epigraphic Discoveries At Karatepe," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 81 (1949): 21-39. R. T. O'Callaghan, "The Great Phoenician Portal Inscription From Karatepe," *Orientalia* 18 (1949): 173-205. D. Ussishkin, "The Date of the Neo-Hittite Enclosure in Karatepe," *Anatolian Studies* 19 (1969): 121-137. I. J. Winter, "On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and Their Context," *Anatolian Studies* 29 (1979): 115-151. K. L. Younger Jr., "The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada. An Integrated Reading," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 48 (1998): 11-47.

402. Cf. A. Demsky, "Mesopotamian and Canaanite Literary Traditions in the Ahiiram Curse Formula," *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978): 8. E. Y. Kutscher and Claus Wilcke, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 68, 125f. Dennis Pardee, "Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Vol. 3. Phoenician Inscriptions Including Inscriptions in the Mixed Dialect of Arslan Tash," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46 (1987): 142.

403. See references quoted in Hoftijzer et al., *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, 1065.

(v) אָדִיר

Forms of אָדִיר are common throughout the poetic texts in the HB with 27 occurrences in 25 verses (Exod. 5.10; Judg. 5.13, 5.25; 1 Sam. 4.8; Isa. 10.34, 33.21; Jer. 14.3, 25.34, 25.35, 25.36, 30.21; Ezek. 17.23, 32.18; Nah. 2.6, 3.18; Zech. 11.2; Ps. 8.2, 8.10, 16.3, 76.5, 93.4, 136.18; Neh. 3.5, 10.30; 2 Chron. 23.20). BDB defines the adjectival form as *majestic*. This form is used with various objects such as sea, ship, tree, vine as well as figuratively with kings, nations, gods; the substantive form is defined as *majestic one*. KB follows the same distinction between adjectival and substantive usage with the following occurrences noted as substantive use: Judg. 5.13, 5.25; Jer. 14.3, Ps. 6.3, Neh. 3.5, 10.30, 2 Chron. 23.20, defined as *prominent people*; Jer. 25.34, 35, 36 as *shepherds* and Nah. 2.6 and 3.18 as *officers*. Jenni-Westermann notes that the adjectival usage is relatively frequent in Ugaritic texts and Phoenician-Punic and states that the nominative formation and usage in Hebrew indicates an archaic or archaizing word.⁴⁰⁴

In the Qumran sectarian manuscripts אָדִיר occurs 21 times, 1QM 17:6; 1QM 19:1; 1QH^a 10:37; 1QH^a 13:9; 1QH^a 16:20; 4Q161 8 10, 2; 4Q161 8 10,7; 4Q177 14, 2; 4Q285 7, 2; 4Q301 2b, 2; 4Q365 6a II + 6c, 5; 4Q370 1 I, 4; 4Q372 1, 29; 4Q374 2 II, 6; 4Q385b 1, 4; 4Q428 3, 4; 4Q429 1 I, 1; 4Q460 8, 5; 4Q460 8, 6; 4Q492 1, 1; 11Q14 1 I, 10. Of these attestations ten appear to be used in an adjectival sense,⁴⁰⁵ three are uncertain,⁴⁰⁶ and the remaining eight are used substantively.⁴⁰⁷

404. Refers to Gulkowitsch, Lazar Gulkowitsch, *Die Bildung von Abstraktbegriffen in der hebraischen Sprachgeschichte* (Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1931).

405. 1QM 17.6; 1QH^a 16.20; 4Q161 f8_10:2; 4Q161 f8_10:7; 4Q285 f7:2; 4Q365 f6aII+6c:5; 4Q370 f1:4; 4Q372 f1:29; 4Q460 f8:5; 11Q14 f1:10.

406. 4Q385b f1:4; 4Q428 f3:4; 4Q460 f8:6.

407. 1QM 19.1; 1QH^a 10.37; 13.9; 4Q177 f14:2; 4Q301 f2b:2; 4Q374 f2ii:6; 4Q429 f1:1; 4Q492 f1:1.

Within the MT, אדיר is attested most regularly in poetic texts. The few prose occurrences are limited to 1 Sam. 4.8, Nehemiah and 2 Chronicles. Apart from 1 Sam. 4.8, these take a substantive form rather than an adjectival one which may be attributable to genre, as poetry makes greater use of adjectives than prose.

Although אדיר evidences the dual adjectival and substantive use this is not indicative of any semantic shift or lexical replacement. The distribution of form throughout the MT and Qumran attestations indicate there was not a shift from adjectival usage to substantive in the texts.

As the attestations of אדיר span from Ugaritic texts through to Qumran sectarian manuscripts, the lexeme does not carry any particular chronological implication based on usage. The semantic meaning of the lexeme itself carries some historical indications exhibited in the related lexeme אדרת, *mantle* or *robe*, which is presumably related to the position of the אדיר wearing robes of *office*. The term is used most often in the Elijah/Elisha narratives in the books of Kings. In these occurrences it takes on a magical power, as it used to split the Jordan in 2 Kgs 2.14 and 2.8. Jonah 3.6 explicitly ties the garment to the king of Ninevah as he removes his אדרת and puts on sackcloth.

גבורים (vi)

גבורים is a substantive variation of the גבר root which is extremely common throughout the MT. The גבר root as an adjective is defined as *to be superior, manly, vigorous, strong, mighty*. It is attested in all branches of Semitic languages according to Jenni-Westermann, but is not used consistently across all branches. Akkadian attests only the verb *gapaṣu* (to be superi-

or) and verbal adjective *gapru* (superior).⁴⁰⁸ Phoenician has only the substantive *gbr* (man).⁴⁰⁹ In Aramaic the root is used frequently both in the verbal and substantive form as *gbr* (man).⁴¹⁰ It is also attested in Biblical Aramaic with twenty-one occurrences in Daniel. The Arabic cognate *jabbar* means *omnipotent, giant, Orion* according to KB. The intensive form גבור which occurs in Judg. 5 carries a semantic nuance of a "strong man" and is defined with a military meaning by KB—*military hero, champion, warrior*.

גבור is found in its various forms 352 times in the biblical texts; the intensive form גבור occurs 160 times and almost all of these carry a military nuance, or occur within a military context. The plural גבורים occurs 67 times (1x Genesis, 1x Joshua, 2x Judges, 1x 1 Samuel, 15x 2 Samuel, 2x 1 Kings, 1x 2 Kings, 3x Isaiah, 11x Jeremiah, 4x Ezekiel, 1x Hosea, 4x Joel, 1x Amos, 1x Obadiah, 1x Nahum, 1x Zechariah, 1x Proverbs, 2x Song of Songs, 1x Ecclesiastes, 1x Ezra, 1x Nehemiah, 9x 1 Chronicles and 2x 2 Chronicles);⁴¹¹ the singular form is not as common with 36 occurrences (1x Genesis, 1x 1 Samuel, 1x 2 Samuel, 3x Isaiah, 6x Jeremiah, 1x Ezekiel, 1x Amos, 2x Zephaniah, 1x Zechariah, 11x Psalms, 1x Job, 1x Proverbs, 1x Ruth, 1x Daniel, 2x 1 Chronicles and 1x 2 Chronicles).⁴¹² The other type of occurrence is in the plural or

408. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig Baltimore London: J. C. Hinrichs The John Hopkins Press Luzac, 1896), 281.

409. KAI no. 24.8; no. 30.2.

410. KAI no. 223B.19.

411. Gen 6.4 (nephilim); Josh 10.2; Judges 5.13, 5.23; 1Sam 2.4 (with bow); 2Sam 1.19, 2Sam 1.21 (with shield); 1.22, 1.25, 1.27, 10.7, 16.6, 17.8, 20.7, 22.26, 23.8, 23.9, 23.16, 23.17, 23.22 (all with mythic David men), 1Kings 1.8, 1.10, 2Kings 24.16; Is 5.22 (figuratively), 13.3, 21.17 (with bow); Jer 5.16 (with quiver), 26.21, 46.5, 46.9, 48.14, 48.41, 49.22, 50.36, 51.30, 51.56 (with bows), 51.57; Ezek 32.12 (with sword), 32.21, 32.27 (with 'weapons of war'), 39.18; Hos 10.13; Joel 2.7, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11; Amos 2.16; Obad 9; Nah 2.4 (with shield); Zech 9.13 (with sword); Prov 21.22; Song 3.7, 4.4 (with quiver); Eccl 9.11; Ezra 7.28 (with mlk counselors etc); Neh 3.16 (house of warriors); 1Chr 11.11, 11.12, 11.19, 11.24, 12.1, 12.4, 19.8, 28.1, 29.24 (with שרים); 2Chr 13.3, 32.3 (with שרים).

412. Gen 10.8; 1Sam 14.52, 2Sam 17.10; Is 3.2, 42.13, 49.24; Jer 9.22 (figuratively), 14.9, 20.11, 46.6, 46.12, 50.9 (with arrows), Ezek 39.20; Amos 2.14; Zeph 1.14, 3.17; Zech 10.7; Psa 19.6, 24.8, 33.16, 45.4, 52.3, 78.65 (not really military), 89.20, 103.20, 112.2, 120.4 (with arrows), 127.4 (with arrows); Job 16.14; Prov 16.32; Ruth 2.1 (maybe not military?); Dan 11.3; 1Chr 1.10, 27.6; 2Chr 28.7.

singular phrase גבור חיל which is attested 39 times mainly in the books of Kings, Chronicles and Samuel, but also four times in Joshua, twice in Judges and once in Nehemiah.⁴¹³ The heaviest concentrations of this form are thus in the books of Samuel, Jeremiah and Chronicles with scatterings throughout many prophetic books, Psalms and Proverbs, and only three occurrences in the Pentateuch (Gen. 6.4, 10.8 and 10.9). Within Judges the lexeme only appears twice in 5.13 and 5.23 and then once more in Judg. 6.12 when the angel of the Lord appears to Gideon and states, "אליו יהוה עמך גבור החיל".

Within the Qumran sectarian manuscripts גבור is extremely common with eighty-five occurrences; the majority are in the plural form and the גבור חיל phrase is used seven times.⁴¹⁴ The term appears to be also used in KAI 309 1.12 (Aramaic neo-Assyrian inscription) when referring to the deity Hadad in an imprecatory warning, הודד גבר, which may mean "Hadad the warrior". No other inscriptional evidence intimates a military connotation.⁴¹⁵

The core meaning evidenced in the biblical texts and related Semitic languages is the idea of *superiority, strength or might*. This is evidenced in marginal meanings, such as the verb used to indicate greatness (Gen. 7.18-20 where it is used to indicate rising floodwaters), as a title of greatness/distinction (Isa. 24.2 used for a woman, Gen. 27.29 used for a man), or, as rele-

413.(pl) Josh 1.14, 6.2, 8.3, 10.7; 2Kings 15.20, 24.14; Neh 11.14; 1Chr 5.24, 7.2, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, 7.11, 7.40, 8.40, 9.13, 11.26, 12.9 (znh and rmh), 12.22, 12.26, 12.29, 12.31, 26.6, 26.31; 2Chr 14.7, 17.13, 17.14, 26.12; (sg) Judges 6.12, 11.1; 1Sam 9.1, 16.18, 17.51 (of Goliath), 1Kings 11.28, 5.1; 1Chr 28.1; 2Chr 17.16, 17.17, 25.6, 32.21.

414.CD 2:17, 1QM 10:6, 1QM 11:1, 4Q266 f2ii:17, 4Q270 f1i:2, 4Q299 f10:2, 11QT 57:9.

415.F. Anderson and D. F. Freedman, "The Orthography of the Aramaic Portion of the Tell Fekherye Bilingual," in *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F. C. Fensham*, ed. U. Classen, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988). J. C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, "Notes on the Curse Formula of the Tell Fekherye Inscription," *Revue biblique* 92 (1985): 47-59. J. C. Greenfield and A. Shaffer, "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue From Tell Fekherye," *Iraq* 45 (1983): 115. Edward Lipiński, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, vol. 57 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 19-72. Naveh, "Hebrew and Aramaic Inscriptions," J. Naveh, "Proto-Canaanite, Archaic Greek, and the Script of the Aramaic Text on the Tell Fakhariyah Statue," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of F. M. Cross*, ed. P. D. Miller and S. D. McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

vant here, in the military sense of a warrior. There is no particular trend of meaning through the biblical texts as both the גבר and intensive גבור forms are distributed and used fairly commonly throughout the texts, although it does appear that the military meaning of גנור is most common in Kings, Chronicles and Jeremiah.

The גבור lexeme is found most often in either the narrative texts, such as Chronicles, or the more poetic texts such as Jeremiah and Isaiah. The term is often used for fabulous characters such as David's legendary "three warriors" (שלושה הגברים) - particularly in 1 Chronicles 11 and 2 Samuel 23), Goliath (1 Sam. 17.51) and the Nephalim (Gen. 6.4). 1QM 11.1 also refers to Goliath as a גבור חיל. This usage may indicate that the term was associated with an earlier "classical" age. In the same way, the use of the term "knights" today brings up associations of the past as well as the romantic idealisation of the time.

The historical and chronological implications are few for this term; warriors are not unique to any particular point in time. However, the marginal meaning of a military hero or warrior may be indicative of a specialised class of warriors rather than the average civilian warrior. If so, this would indicate a higher social specialisation and organisation necessary to maintain and produce a dedicated warrior class.⁴¹⁶ This meaning of a specialised section may be seen in the reference to the ראשי הגבורים (heads of the warriors) in 1 Chron. 11.10, where they are noted as those who supported David in the establishment of his kingdom. 2 Samuel 10.17 also refers to David sending out Joab and כל הצבא הגברים (all the army of warriors), which would fit with the definition of גבורים as a dedicated or specialised warrior class.

Within the biblical attestations the גבור is identified along with the bow (1 Sam. 2.4; Isa. 21.17; Jer. 51.56), arrows (Jer. 50.9; Ps. 120.4, 127.4) or quiver (Jer. 5.16; Song 4.4) eight

416. Boling, Judges, 111. "Knights. Those adult males prosperous enough to equip themselves for warfare. There were so few of them in Israel as to elicit special comment when they appear (or fail to!)."

times. In contrast it is mentioned only twice with a מגן (shield) in 2 Sam. 1.21 and Nah. 2.4, twice with the חרב (sword) in Ezek. 32.12 and Zech. 9.13, and once with the צנה ורמח (probably shield and spear) in 1 Chron. 12.9. This may tenuously indicate that the bow was associated with the גבורים or may simply imply that the bow was a common weapon when the fighting military was referred to.

The occurrence of גבורים in Judges thus follows the pattern of usage throughout the MT. This pattern doesn't offer any particular indicative historical or chronological indications, except that it is represented throughout most of the biblical text with a predominance in Chronicles, Kings, Samuel, Jeremiah, Isaiah and Psalms.

מגן (vii)

מגן is clearly defined as *shield*. It bears both a literal and also figurative use, either of a military shield or often in poetic passages such as Psalms in a figurative sense. For example, Ps. 33.20 uses the shield metaphor to describe safety and passive protection, "נפשנו חכחה ליהוה עזרנו", "ומגנו הוא". It is attested in Ugaritic,⁴¹⁷ Phoenician,⁴¹⁸ and Syriac.⁴¹⁹ Within the biblical texts it also is used to describe the hide of a crocodile in Job 41.7, and seems to be used in the context of non-military tribute or treasure in Chronicles and Kings (2 Chron. 32.27, 9.16, 12.9; 1 Kgs 10.17, 14.2). This same meaning of a decorative or tributary function may be understood in Song 4.4 and Ezek. 27.10-11.

The use of מגן for decorative or tributary items is likely related to the marginal meaning as noted in KB, which is to *hand over or surrender* or *to give as a gift*. This is related to several

417. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 597.

418. Hoftijzer et al., Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, 593.

419. Carl Brockelmann and Theodor Nöldeke, Lexicon Syriacum (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1895), 122b.

cognates including Ugaritic *to request gifts*,⁴²⁰ Phoenician *to present/offer*,⁴²¹ as well as later Hebrew such as Jewish Aramaic, Samaritan and Syriac as *an unearned gift*.⁴²² It is also related to Akkadian *magannu*, meaning *gift*, which stems originally from Sanskrit.⁴²³ This semantic form can also be observed clearly in Hos. 11.8 and 4.18 and as noted is almost certainly related to the use of מגן for items of tribute in Kings and Chronicles.

Within the MT מגן is attested sixty-six times, which makes it a well attested lexeme—although perhaps not as common as would be supposed for such a generic and basic military lexeme. The distribution is concentrated in the books of Kings (4x 1 Kings, 1x 2 Kings), Chronicles (1x 1 Chronicles, 10x 2 Chronicles), Psalms (19x), 2 Samuel (5x) and Ezekiel (5x). Genesis, Jeremiah, Hosea and Job have two occurrences each, Isaiah three and one each in Deuteronomy, Judges, Nahum, Song of Songs and Nehemiah.⁴²⁴

As noted above, the two occurrences in Hosea both use מגן in the semantic form of a gift, this is also found verbally in Gen. 14.20, אשר מגן צריך בידך (which delivered your foes into your hand) and Prov. 4.9, עטרת תפארת תמגנך (a beautiful crown she will give to you). This semantic form is presumably related to the attestations in the MT which use the lexeme in the context of a tributary item or treasury item. This is explicitly found 2 Chron. 32.27: "ואצרות עשה לו" (and he made for him treasures for silver and

420. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 1419.

421. Hoftijzer et al., Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, 593.

422. KB sub מגן.

423. Wolfram von Soden and Bruno Meissner, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965), 574b.

424. Gen 14:20; 15:1; Deut 33:29; Judg 5:8; 2Sam 1:21; 22:3, 31, 36; 1Kings 10:17; 14:26-27; 2Kings 19:32; Is 21:5; 22:6; 37:33; Jer 46:3, 9; Ezek 23:24; 27:10; 38:4-5; 39:9; Nah 2:4; Psa 3:4; 7:11; 18:3, 31, 36; 28:7; 33:20; 35:2; 47:10; 59:12; 76:4; 84:10, 12; 89:19; 115:9-11; 119:114; 144:2; Job 15:26; 41:7; Prov 2:7; 4:9; 6:11; 24:34; 30:5; Song 4:4; Neh 4:10; 1Chr 5:18; 2Chr 9:16; 12:9-10; 14:7; 17:17; 23:9; 26:14; 32:5, 27; Hos 11:8; 4:18.

gold and precious stones and spices and shields and all desirable things). The same idea of a tributary or treasury item may be found in 1 Kgs. 10.17, 14.26, 14.27; Ezek. 27.10; Song 4.4; 2 Chron. 9.16, 12.9, 12.10, 23.9. The gold shields are mentioned in 1 Kgs 10.17::2 Chron. 9.16 as made by Solomon.⁴²⁵ The 1 Kings occurrence in 14.26-27 and the parallel in 2 Chron. 12.9-10 then mentions Shishak carrying away Solomon's shields of gold as treasures; Rehoboam then makes bronze shields in replacement.⁴²⁶ 2 Chron. 23.9 is more opaque and mentions Jehoiada who gives the מגן, חנית, and שלט of David which were kept in the בית האלהים—this is comparative to the בית יהוה where the treasures mentioned earlier were stored.

The use of מגן as a treasury item is not entirely divorced from the military nuance as can be seen in 2 Chron. 23.9 where Jehoiada distributes the items to the force guarding the king—there is an associated military idea in this action. The explicit military use of מגן is found in scattered references in the biblical text: Judg. 5.8 (with רמח); 2 Sam. 1.21 (with שמן), 2 Kgs. 19.32 (siege?), Isa. 21.5 (משחו מגן), Isa. 22.6 (ערה מגן), Isa. 37.33 (siege?), Jer. 46.3 (with צנה), Jer. 46.9, Ezek. 23.24, Ezek. 38.4, Ezek. 38.5 (with כובע), Ezek. 39.9 (with צנה), Nah. 2.4 (made red), Ps. 35.2 (with צנה), Ps. 76.4 (with קשת and חרב), Job 15.26 (עבי גבי מגני), Prov. 6.11, Prov. 23.34, Neh. 4.10 (with רמח), 1 Chron. 5.18 (with חרב), 2 Chron. 14.7 (with קשת), 2 Chron. 17.17 (with קשת), 2 Chron. 26.14, and 2 Chron. 32.5. The use of מגן with the semantic nuance of a protective cover or shield, but in a figurative sense, is mostly found in Psalms but also once in Proverbs, Genesis, Deuteronomy and three times in 2 Samuel 22.⁴²⁷

425. However, as noted by G. Garbini the LXX and Josephus (*Antiquities* 7.104 and 8.259) attest a different history stating that these were the gold shields taken from the hands of the servants of Hadadezer. This variant history is also attested in 2 Samuel 8.7 where the MT states that David took the gold items of Hadadezer's servants to Jerusalem. This is expanded in reverse in the LXX which adds that these are the ones taken by Shishak of Egypt when he comes up in the days of Rehoboam son of Solomon. Garbini, *Myth and History in the Bible*, 78-79.

426. Notably the Aramaic documents from Elephantine do not mention gold as a currency or valuable item and only silver. This even takes the form of a gloss. Crowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, XXXI.

427. Gen 15.1, Deut 33.29, 2 Sam 22.3, 2 Sam 22.31, 2 Sam 22.36., Ps 3.4, 7.11, 18.3, 18.31, 18.36, 28.7,

Proverbs 6.11 and 24.34 exhibit a unique use of מגן within the phrase איש מגן, which only occurs in these two separate passages. The LXX translates this phrase as ἀγαθὸς δρομεύς (good runner). This is only used three times in the LXX, once in Amos 2.14 for the Hebrew גבור and once in Job 9.25 for רץ. The other use together with גבור indicates that the military meaning is probably carried in the Proverbs occurrences as well—this association between running, rushing, fleet of foot and the warrior can also be seen with the verbs often accompanying גבור.

The Qumran sectarian manuscripts contain 23 attestations of מגן. Three are too fragmentary to glean much information from, but of the remaining occurrences all except three are used in a military context, denoting the shield as an item of armour. 1QM 18.13 uses the lexeme in verbal form to connote the idea of "delivering" as found in Hosea and Proverbs. 1QH^a 14.30 describes מגן דלתי as a form of protection. In 4Q403 1 I, 25 the word is used figuratively for laws. In these texts מגן is paired with רמה, חנית and כידן.

The word appears twice in Northwest Semitic inscriptional evidence, once at Karatepe in the KAI 26 inscription and once in the Old Aramaic KAI 222 dating to the eighth century B.C.E.⁴²⁸ KAI 26 uses the lexeme in a statement by Azitawadda, where he boasts of adding מגן על מגן and increasing the size of his land.⁴²⁹ The context here may support the semantic form of tributary or treasure as attested to in the Kings/Chronicles occurrences. KAI 222 is probably best translated "ולמ[ג]ן אהבד אית כתר ואית מלכ" (and deliver destruction to KTK and its king), fitting most closely to the Hosea and Proverbs semantic form.

33.20, 47.10, 59.12, 84.10, 84.12, 89.19, 115.9, 115.10, 115.11, 119.114, 144.2; Prov 2.7, 30.5

428.A. Dupont-Sommer and J. Starcky, "Une inscription araméenne inédite de Sfiré," *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 13 (1956): 23-41. A. Dupont-Sommer and J. Starcky, "Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré (stèles I and II)," *Mémoires présentées par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 15 (1960): 1-155. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, *Biblica et Orientalia* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967). André Lemaire and J.-M. Durand, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré et l'Assyrie de Shamshi-Ilu*, *Hautes études orientales*, vol. 20 (Genève: Droz, 1984).

429.KAI 26 CI:12, KAI 26 BI:4 and KAI 26 AI:7.

There is little doubt that the מגן lexeme underwent several semantic shifts which resulted in the multiple meanings of *gift, shield, to deliver, treasure* and *protection*. However the linguistic evidence is too scant for the construction of any map of semantic change. The inscriptional and Qumran evidence show that several meanings existed at broadly differing chronological points, which negates any effort to assign a diachronic motivation behind the shift in usage.

The MT is surprisingly rich in extra details associated with the מגן—extra notes such as the mention of "anointing the shield" in Isa. 2.15 and 2 Sam. 1.21 indicate that the מגן referred to here was probably made of hardened leather kept from cracking and drying through the application of fat or oil. Nahum 2.4 mentions the מגן גבריהו מאדום (shield of his warriors made red) which may reflect a colouring applied to the shields, though the verse is using the theme of fire repeatedly and may simply be a poetic note. Job 15.26 describes the shield as בעבי גבי מגניו (thick browed/mounded shield). The Qumran attestations describe the מגן in detail with 1QM 5.6 giving instructions for an elaborately decorated bronze shield that is two-and-a-half cubits high and one-and-a-half cubits wide. 1QM 6.15 describes the shield as מגני עגלה (round/circle shield).

מגן occurs only once in the Song of Deborah in 5.8 and is paired in this occurrence with רמח, a spear. The consequences of this pairing are discussed in the following examination of רמח, however it is worth noting here that this pairing is regularly found in the Qumran sectarian manuscripts, but only found twice in the MT (2 Chron. 26.14; Judg. 5.8).⁴³⁰

The inherent implications of the מגן lexeme are therefore quite difficult to identify. Although it provides historical information through the associative details, these do not bear any exclusive chronological implications. The usage of leather or metal shields is too varied and

430. Boling connects this phrase to the professional military men (supposedly גבורים). Boling, *Judges*, 110. "*Neither shield nor spear*. The larger context of the oath of allegiance (vv. 2 and 9) indicates that the particle 'im is here the emphatic negative. the Israelites were not armed with aristocratic weapons; shields and spears belonged to professional military men. The paucity of weapons is also alluded to in connection with Saul and Jonathan (I Sam 13.22)."

widespread to support these. The distribution and pairing patterns of מגן, however, indicate that the term is not necessarily early. The pairing patterns are in fact most familiar with the late Qumran usage pattern.

שר (viii)

Judges 5.15 uses the lexeme שר when referring to the tribes who came to the support of Deborah (דברה) (and leaders of Issachar with Deborah"); this is in parallel with the משכים בשבת ספר and חקקים in Judg. 5.14. שר is an extremely common lexeme in the MT. It is defined as *chief, ruler, official, captain, prince* and many other leadership variants, all which indicate a person of prestige, standing or power. The term is widely attested in cognate languages including Phoenician שר,⁴³¹ Ugaritic *šr*,⁴³² Akkadian *šarru(m)*,⁴³³ and also in Egyptian *šr*.⁴³⁴

שר occurs 425 times in the MT within a wide range of contexts and is unattested in only nine books: Leviticus, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Malachi and Ruth. The highest densities of שר are in Chronicles (98x), Nehemiah (17x), Daniel (18x), Esther (15x), Jeremiah (60x) and Kings (50x). The term is also widely attested in the Qumran manuscripts with 115 occurrences. It appears frequently in extra-biblical Hebrew inscriptions as well (אדני-שר in Arad 26.2 and Mouss. 2.2; jar inscription לשר ער in KAjr 5.1; 6.1; 7.1; 8.1; שר הצבא in Lachish 3.14; fragmentary in Lachish 6.4, 6.5; שר in MHsh 1.1, 1.12), once in the wider Northwest Se-

431. Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), 14:17.

432. Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín, *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Alter Orient und Altes Testament*, vol. 24 (Kevelaer Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker Neukirchener Verlag, 1976), 23:22.

433. Soden and Meissner, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, 1188.

434. Freeman, Miosi, and Erman, *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, 4:188.

mitic inscriptions at KAI286 1.2-3, and in a 7th century B.C.E. Phoenician inscription from Tel Mique, which refers to the שר עקרנ (prince of Ekron).⁴³⁵

The ambiguity and semantic range of שר makes it difficult to identify any semantic shift throughout the attestations; it is too difficult to identify when the term may be indicative of a purely social position or military position, particularly considering the two were probably often interrelated. Phrases such as שר צבא (leader of the army) are more explicit and easier to map (3x Genesis, 1x Deuteronomy, 2x Joshua, 2x Judges, 7x Samuel, 5x Kings, 2x 1 Chronicles), but are not common enough to support any particular usage pattern. The occurrence in Judges 5.15 mentions שרי ביששכר, which may be either military or social; elsewhere in the MT the leader/s of Issachar are referred to as נשיא (Num. 2.5, 7.18, 34.26) and ראש (1 Chron. 12.33) both of which are often social titles but similarly ambiguous. 1 Chronicles 12.33 seems to be familiar with the role of Issachar in the Song of Deborah when it refers to ומבני יששכר יודעי בינה לעתים לדעת מה יעשה ישראל (and from the sons of Issachar those who knew understanding of times, to know what Israel should do).

Despite the frequent attestations of שר there are no findings either historical or chronological to draw from the occurrence of שר in Judg. 5.15. The lexeme is very common in both biblical and extra-biblical attestations and occurs continuously through a large chronological window. As noted, there may be a familiarity between the mention of Issachar in 1 Chron. 12.33 and the role of Issachar as supporting Deborah in the Song, but this contributes little to any historical or chronological understanding.

435.A. Demsky, "A Royal Inscription From Ekron," *Israel Exploration Journal* 47 (1998): 1-16. S. Gitin, "Cultic Inscriptions Found in Ekron," *Biblical Archaeology* 53 (1990): 232. S. Gitin, Trudy Dothan, and J. Naveh, "A Royal Dedicatory Inscription From Ekron," *Israel Exploration Journal* 48 (1997): 118. A. Rainey, "Following Up on the Ekron and Mesha Inscriptions," *Israel Exploration Journal* 50 (2000): 116-117.

(ix) רמח

The occurrence of רמח in Judg. 5.8 provides another military lexeme which is not particularly well attested in the MT. The term is defined as a primary noun by BDB and KB with the meaning of *spear* or *lance*; there is no verbal form and it is not used in anything other than an explicitly military context. Related terms are widely attested in cognates with the same meaning: רמחא in Babylonian Aramaic, Ugaritic *mrḥ*,⁴³⁶ Syriac *rumḥa*, Mandaean *rumuḥ*,⁴³⁷ South Arabian *rmḥ*,⁴³⁸ Ethiopic including Ge'ez and Amharic *ramḥ*⁴³⁹ and Arabic *rumḥ*. All of these cognates carry the same meaning of *lance*; the only cognate which differs slightly is Tigrinia *remḥ*. This is a late form of the term, used for a staff of Muslim priests which was wood with an iron tip or made entirely of iron.⁴⁴⁰ The Arabic *rumḥ*, although generally used as *lance*, also has marginal meanings of a *spit* or *stake*. The meaning of *lance* is thus widely attested in the cognates and the usage within the MT certainly supports this equivalent meaning.

436. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 1547. Godfrey Rolles Driver and John C. L. Gibson, Canaanite Myths and Legends (Edinburgh: Clark, 1978), 152. André Caquot, Maurice Sznycer, and Andrée Herdner, Textes ougaritiques: introduction, traduction, commentaire (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974), 134.

437. E. S. Drower and Rudolf Macuch, A Mandaic Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 430.

438. A. F. L. Beeston, Sabaic Dictionary (Louvain-la-Neuve Beyrouth: Editions Peeters Librairie du Liban, 1982), 117.

439. Dillmann and Munzinger, Lexicon linguae Aethiopiae cum indice Latino, 275.

440. Enno Littmann, Zigeuner-Arabisch, Wortschatz und Grammatik (Bonn, Leipzig: K. Schroeder, 1920), 147.

רמח occurs fifteen times in the MT, 3x in Nehemiah,⁴⁴¹ 6x in Chronicles⁴⁴² and once each in Joel,⁴⁴³ Ezekiel,⁴⁴⁴ Jeremiah,⁴⁴⁵ 1 Kings,⁴⁴⁶ Judges⁴⁴⁷ and Numbers.⁴⁴⁸ The term occurs consistently within a military context and most often in narrative, with only four occurrences in poetic or prophetic passages (Judg. 5.8, Jer. 46.4, Joel 4.10, Ezek. 39.9).

רמח is consistently paired with מגן in its four appearances in 1QM (5.6, 5.7, 6.15, 9.12) as well as 4Q372 19, 2. The Qumran sectarian manuscripts also contain a possible fragmentary solo mention in 4Q223_224 2 IV, 14 and 4Q390 2 II, 8, a fragmentary equivalent of 4Q372 19, 2 in 4Q373 1a+b, 3 and a fragmentary parallel with הרב in 4Q381 78, 3. 4Q372 19, 2 refers to a man six and a half cubits tall and two cubits wide wielding a רמח כארז "spear like a cedar".⁴⁴⁹ In 1QM 6.15 and 5.12 the רמח is referred to as being eight cubits long, while in 1QM 5.6-7, it is seven cubits. It is clear that the weapon in these occurrences had a long shaft which agrees with the definition of a lance. In each of these Qumran occurrences the רמח is paired with a מגן. 1QM 5.6 describes the מגן as two and a half cubits high and a cubit and a half wide, which would make it an oval or possibly a figure-eight shield like the Greek *peltai*.⁴⁵⁰ 1QM 9.12 describes the מגני המגדלות as three cubits long. 1QM 6.15 does not give a description of the shield size but

441.Neh. 4.7, 4.10, 4.15.

442.1Chr 12.9, 12.25; 2Chr 11.12, 14.7, 25.5, 26.14.

443.Joel 4.10.

444.Ezek 39.9.

445.Jer 46.4.

446.1 Kings 18.28.

447.Judges 5.8.

448.Num 25.7.

449.This would run against Yadin's interpretation of Goliath's spear being a javelin rather than comparing it to a substantial piece of wood. It is also of interest that the רמח like a cedar is not a הנית.

450.Snodgrass, Arms and Armour of the Greeks, 78-29.

does describe it as a round shield. 4Q372 19, 2 also does not mention an exact height, but in the fragmentary area notes that it was כמגדל "like a tower". The pairing of רמח and מגן in the Qumran attestations is thus depicted as a long lance used together with a large oval shield.

The רמח and מגן pair is not typical in the MT with רמח appearing alone (Num. 25.7, Neh. 4.15), with צנה as a word pair in Chronicles (1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25; 2 Chron. 11.12, 14.7, 25.5), paired with חרב (1 Kgs. 18.28, Joel 4.10) or סריני and כובע (Jer. 46.4), קשת and חרב (Neh. 4.7) and among an assortment of weapons in Ezek. 39.9, Neh. 4.10 and 2 Chron 26.14. The only explicit pairing with מגן is in Judg. 5.8. This should be distinguished from Neh. 4.10 and Ezek. 39.9 which list groups of weapons that include the מגן but do not explicitly pair it with the רמח.

It should be noted that all of the pairings of רמח and צנה are extremely localised and exhibit complimentary pairing; they occur only in 1 and 2 Chronicles and only domestically (Gadites, Naphtali, Solomon, Asa, Benjamin, Judah). Also, except for 1 Chron. 12.35, every occurrence of צנה in Chronicles is paired with רמח (1 Chron. 12.9, 12.25, 2 Chron. 11.12, 14.7, 25.5). The reverse is also true, as רמח appears every time in Chronicles together with צנה except for 2 Chr 26.14 where מגן is used in a lengthy list of weapons.

As רמח only occurs fifteen times in the MT it is difficult to establish any patterns of semantic shift or lexical replacement. However, despite this caution, Joel 4.10 displays an interesting lexical switch using רמח in a passage which is paralleled directly in Mic. 4.3 and Isa. 2.4. The verse as found in Joel 4.10 reads: כתו אתיכם להרבות ומזמרתים לחלש יאמר גבור אני - "Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears; let the weak say, I am a warrior" (RSV). The parallel version in Mic. 4.3 reads: וכתו חרבתיהם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות - "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks" (RSV). Finally, the parallel Isa. 2.4: וכתו חרבותם לאתים וחניתותיהם למזמרות - "and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks" (RSV). Other than the clear morphological and grammatical differences—which are beyond the scope of this thesis—the

vocabulary of the Joel passage differs from the Micah and Isaiah parallels only in its use of רמה rather than חנית. In all three passages there are five main elements in the common phrase, the verb כחח, to *beat, crush* and the four nouns אֵת, *plowshares*, חרב, *swords*, מזמרה, *pruning-hooks* and חנית/רמה, *spears*. The five elements all retain the same words in the parallel Micah and Isaiah passages. In the Joel parallel, however, the one noun meaning spear has been changed to the רמה and the element order of the nouns has been reversed.

The Joel 4.10 parallel passage thus displays an interesting lexical replacement; all of the passages maintain the essential five elements, except for Joel 4.10 which has reversed the word order of the noun pairs and changed to a synonym of one noun. The word order is a literary device as the Joel passage reflects off of the Micah and Isaiah passages, but the usage of רמה in lieu of חנית does not appear to have any literary function.⁴⁵¹

The historical implications of רמה come primarily from the Qumran attestations where it exhibits strong pairing as well as associated information. The Qumran use of רמה paired with מגן is consistent both in the pairing as well as in the descriptions applied to the terms. The רמה is described as a long spear or lance between seven and eight cubits long paired with the מגן which is two and half to three cubits high and probably oval in shape. The texts use רמה invariably for a very long, hand-held spear in contrast to the חנית which was explicitly a javelin or throwing spear. This pairing of a long spear and tall shields is reminiscent of Greek or Assyrian formations⁴⁵² although not exclusive to those. It is tempting to historically identify the strongly struc-

451. חנית is a common term in the MT occurring some 48 times, 30x in Samuel, once in Kings, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, 3x in Psalms, twice in Job, and 8x in Chronicles. It is generally defined as *javelin* or *spear* and often it seems to compare as a throwing javelin in contrast to a thrusting spear such as the רמה; this does not appear to be a necessary meaning of it though and it probably mean a generic spear as well. There does not appear to be any functional distinction or literary motivation in this text other than a preference for רמה over חנית.

452. Ibid. Plate 54. Barnett, *Sculptures From the North Palace of Ashurbanipal At Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. BM124919 + 134386.

tured pairing of רמח and מגן particularly in the IQM text as reflecting the common Hellenistic panoply of the peltasts.⁴⁵³

Within a chronological framework the רמח exhibits strong pairing patterns within Chronicles and the Qumran manuscripts. As noted, within Chronicles רמח and צנה are paired in every occurrence. The one exception occurs within a larger group of weapons. This consistent pairing is similar to the Qumran attestations which display a constant רמח/מגן word pair. The strongest implication drawn from this is that within the MT the only pairing with רמח and מגן is in Judg. 5.8. Thus, the Judg. 5.8 occurrence exhibits the most familiarity among MT attestations with the consistent Qumran רמח/מגן. Without regarding pairing patterns, רמח is most heavily distributed in Nehemiah and Chronicles and only once in Numbers, Judges, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Joel. The lexeme is not found in the Pentateuch outside of the one occurrence in Numbers and only twice (once in Judg. 5.8 and once in 1 Kgs 18.28) in the heavy military contexts of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings.

As noted above, רמח also appears to exhibit a lexical replacement in Joel 4.10 where the parallel passages use the lexeme instead of the parallel attestation of חנית. As with all biblical texts, the dating and relationship of the passages in Joel, Isaiah and Micah is debated. However, the Joel parallel is generally dated later than the Isaiah and Micah attestations.⁴⁵⁴ As the text is

453. Snodgrass, *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*, 78-79.

454. The passages in question are particularly difficult to work with in Isaiah and Micah as there is considerable debate over their dating. The ideology of these verses is often viewed as indicative of Zionist ideology which is often dated quite late. Otto Kaiser debates whether the Zionist ideology could be created in the exilic or post-exilic ideology present in these verses of Isaiah and Micah. Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972). Others, such as Sweeney and Williamson debate a date as late as the maccabean period or congruent with Second Isaiah. Brevard Childs states that, 'Evidence for the priority of either Isaiah or Micah is inconclusive [...] It is possible that the passage predated both prophets and was accommodated by each collection in a slightly different form. [...] Although the redactional age of the composition remains contested, the material of the passage is clearly ancient even with mythopoetic roots which has been encompassed with old Hebrew pilgrimage traditions.' Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001). D.R. Hillers supports this early dating arguing, 'A history of Zion theology whereby Micah 4.1-4 would fit only in an exilic or post-exilic phase is only one possible writing of that history. Recent restudy of this question, especially by J.J.M. Roberts has

quite clearly playing with the passages in the reversal of word order and meaning it indicates a familiarity with these texts and their context. The preference for רמח in the later Joel passage thus fits with the density of רמח usage in later texts such as Chronicles and Nehemiah and indicates it may be a term preferred or more common among later military vocabulary.

According to this study, the lexeme רמח as found in Judg. 5.8 is anomalous within Judges but also within much of the MT, even though the term is widely found in cognate languages. The strongest association is with texts such as 1QM and the MT distribution strongly favours Nehemiah and Chronicles.

(c) A review of military lexemes and trends in Judges 5

The immediate question looming over the Judges 5 text is whether this study of military lexemes contributes any information or reflects on the continuing debate over the historical and chronological background of the song. As reviewed in the introduction of this chapter, it is assumed by a number of twentieth-century commentators that the chapter containing the Song of Deborah is an example of the earliest literary strands in the Hebrew Bible. However, an early date cannot be established according to the study of military lexemes. Although the military vocabulary attested is not particularly indicative of an early date, several of the terms display patterns of usage that are not typical for the surrounding book. Particularly in the divide between

made it probable that the major elements of the Zion tradition were developed long before the eighth century under the United Monarchy.' Delbert R. Hillers, Paul D. Hanson, and Loren R. Fisher, *Micah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984). Cf. J. M. Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 329-334. Depending on which side of the debate the date falls, there may not be a large chronological gap between the passages of Micah/Isaiah and Joel. However, what is important here is the relative dating of the passages and wherever the Micah and Isaiah passages are dated they still fall earlier than the occurrence in Joel. H.W. Wolff remarks in his commentary, "For the exhortation to forge farming and vinedressing implements into weapons of war is clearly intended as contrast to Is 2.4 and Mi 4.3. Only if we did not see Joel continually occupied with the appropriation of prophetic traditions could we find here 'a proverbial expression ... used in its original sense.'" Hans Walter Wolff and S. Dean McBride, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

the Deuteronomic History and "late" biblical texts, the terms as a whole more commonly relate to the so-called later texts than the pre-exilic corpus.

(i) Function, cognates and loanwords

A review of the function and cognates of the military lexemes demonstrates that while several of the terms are certainly obscure or odd (פרען, פרען), others exhibit patterns of late use or late cognates such as רזן. This term has limited use or obscure use in the MT but does have cognates in Phoenician neo-Punic. פרו, although an obscure attestation, is found in this grammatical form only in Judges 5 and the poetic vision of Habakkuk 3—which is often thought to be an example of late dated archaizing, possibly as late as the fourth century B.C.E. Likewise, אדיר is found in Judges 5 in substantive form as *nobles*, which is found elsewhere only in Jeremiah, Psalms, Nehemiah and Chronicles. This genre span reduces the possibility of distribution simply due to poetic genre.. All of the terms are attested to in cognate texts: occurrences of חקק appear in late Jewish Aramaic, Phoenician and Arabic, גבורים is attested in most cognate languages but generally not in the military sense as it occurs in the biblical text; שר, רמח, מגן are all common in cognates as well. None of the terms appears clearly as a loanword from a neighbouring language.

The function, cognates and loanwords of the military lexemes in Judges 5 do not indicate any particularly chronological or historical period. With this in mind, it can be decided that they do not belong to any particular early or late stratum nor bear any direct associative relationship with a chronological period in other cognate languages.

(ii) Patterns of distribution and usage

There are several strong patterns of distribution within this lexical group of military vocabulary in Judges 5. These patterns provide the most interesting contribution to the linguistic

composition of the song within the wider context of Judges and the entire Biblical Hebrew corpus.

The strongest lexical pattern is the occurrence of רמח paired with מגן in Judg. 5.8. This is strongly associated with the רמח/מגן word pairing in 1QM but also the resilient צנה pairing group in the MT. The רמח/צנה word-pair is extremely strong, particularly in Chronicles as well as three occurrences in Nehemiah and once each in Joel, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Kings, Numbers and Judges. The רמח/מגן word pair occurs in Qumran 1QM and 4Q372 where every רמח occurrence is paired with מגן, establishing a strong pairing which is attested in the MT only in Judges 5. The רמח/מגן is thus reflective of the Chronicles/Nehemiah pairing pattern and directly associated with the later military pairing as found in 1QM.

If the military lexical body is considered as a whole, it forms a distinct pattern; seven of the nine terms אדיר, מגן, רמח, חקק, פרזון, פרע and רזן do not appear anywhere else in Judges outside of chapter five. Further, except for פרע, these terms do not appear in a military usage or context outside of Judges 5 anywhere from Genesis to Judges. The single exception is the occurrence of רמח in Numbers 25.7 where Phinehas, son of Eleazar, drives a רמח through the "איש" and the Midianite woman. פרע occurs in Deut. 32.42 in an ambiguous context, but is notable since it is often considered to be an equivalent example of ancient Hebrew poetry. Outside of the classical bipartite Biblical Hebrew division this phenomenon does not necessarily indicate anything about the dating of the song but it does indicate that the military vocabulary of Judges 5 is not commonly shared across these books. It should be emphasised that Joshua and Judges are texts which make much narrative use of warfare. Thus it is not for lack of opportunity that these particular bits of military vocabulary are isolated in Judges 5. The meaning of this lexical isolation is difficult to evaluate, but it is clear that the lexical body of military terms in the song is more common in prophetic books such as Jeremiah and military narrative in Chronicles.

(iii) Lexical replacement, semantic shift

Lexical replacement or semantic shift in the text can be seen in several of the terms within the Judges 5 military lexical body with terms that display semantic variation either with marginal meanings or evidencing semantic narrowing or expansion. These lexemes with the largest evidence of semantic shift include חקק, גבור, פרז, מגן and רמח.

חקק appears to evidence semantic shift between the various meanings of *to engrave, decree, judge*; the use of חקק as a title or leadership term, as in Judges 5, appears twice in Judges 5, twice in Isaiah and once in Deuteronomy. The פרז root as found in Judg. 5.7 and 5.11 is found again in this form only in Hab. 3.14 and possibly has the same semantic form. This meaning of *villagers* is semantically closer to the use of פרזות in Ezekiel, Zechariah and Esther. גבור varies between substantive and adjectival form with the military meaning appearing most often in Kings, Chronicles and Jeremiah. מגן displays a semantic shift between a narrow meaning for a specific item for defensive purposes (a shield), tributary or treasury items, or the figurative use as protection. The military use of מגן occurs more than once in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, Proverbs and Chronicles and also appears once in Judges, 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Nahum, Job and Nehemiah. The occurrence of רמח paired with מגן in the passage is a strong example of lexical replacement as a variation on the more common רמח/צנה word pair. As discussed in the patterns of distribution section, the common רמח/צנה word pair is found throughout Chronicles, Nehemiah, Joel, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Kings, Numbers and Judges. However, there is a replacement evidenced in Qumran where מגן/רמח becomes the normative pair and רמח/צנה is no longer attested.

פרע is too difficult to assign any semantic shift as its usage in Judges 5 is ambiguous and the consonantal form is not well-attested. As noted in its close examination, the closest parallel of usage, context and form is in Deuteronomy 32, which is similarly ambiguous but also

considered to be in the same genre of archaic poetry. רִזּוֹן, שָׁר and אֲדִיר are not informative on any patterns of semantic shift or lexical replacement.

The general semantic range of the Judges 5 military lexemes is often closely related to the usage in prophetic works, particularly Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel and also occasionally the narratives, particularly of Chronicles. However, referring to the previous section on lexical distribution this association of semantic range may be skewed, as it follows much of the basic distribution patterns of the lexemes. The odd lack of many basic military lexemes in much of the biblical text, particularly the Pentateuch and Joshua, will be discussed in the following section on literary context.

(iv) Literary context and genre

The literary genre has traditionally been considered to be poetic and there is little indication that the military vocabulary is affected by this. The lexical items are distributed throughout poetic and narrative biblical literature which seems to indicate they are not strongly identified with either genre.

The song is often considered as *archaic poetry*. This designation warrants discussion as the nature of the lexical evidence is often used as the source of this designation. As a full lexical survey was not taken, the evaluation must be based on the military lexical body alone. The military lexemes examined do exhibit odd characteristics, obtuse definition and sparsity of attestation in several circumstances. However, that a lexeme is poorly attested or in an odd form does not necessarily result in an archaic judgement—the obvious question is whether versification and archaising may also affect a similar phenomenon. The occurrence of odd and obscure lexemes would be expected within poetry, particularly if archaising attempts were being made.

There is however, nothing inherent in the military lexemes of Judges 5 to identify a vocabulary dramatically different than the poetry of Jeremiah, Ezekiel or Isaiah—all of which evidence many similarities in the lexical body and semantic range.

The examination of מג in particular exhibits an interesting point on the relationship of distribution and literary context or genre. The term is ubiquitous in many biblical books and it is the basic lexical item for a basic piece of military armour, the shield. Yet this term occurs only three times in the Pentateuch, although none of these with the military semantic range. Further, the term does not appear at all in Joshua and only once in Judges, both of which are certainly books with a focus on military action. The distribution is interesting as it is not an example of lexical replacement—these books do not mention a "shield" with any lexeme—there is simply a lack of any common military lexemes within these works even though the context provides opportunity. The exception to this as noted in the section on distribution is Judges 5 which displays this high concentration of military lexemes normative in Kings, Chronicles, Ezekiel and Jeremiah.

Therefore, it may be assumed that the military vocabulary of Judges 5 is not a result of a genre we can designate "archaic poetry" but belongs instead to the same poetic genre used in the major prophetic books.

(v) Historical and chronological implications

As the review indicates, there are several results from the examination that have typological consequences as well as chronological. The lexemes themselves do not display any inherent chronological or historical value, however there are several strong patterns of usage which reflects on the discussion of chronology and history in the poem. The patterns of the military vocabulary are also quite interesting when evaluated within the diachronic SBH/LBH typologies.

The examination of the military vocabulary demonstrates two main points of consideration: first, the military vocabulary of Judges 5 is not indicative of an early dating either in any inherent chronological value or in accordance with the tripartite divisions of Biblical Hebrew used to justify an early date. Several of the terms used are either commonly used in typologically later texts, or, although rare in the MT, are well attested in late cognate languages. The military vocabulary as a lexical body is also distinct from the remainder of Judges. Secondly, the dense concentration of this specific military vocabulary is not normative in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges. The narratives of Joshua and Judges are highly focussed on warfare, so it is not for lack of opportunity that these terms of military vocabulary are absent.

Within the framework of a diachronic tripartite division, the military vocabulary exhibits many similarities with LBH texts such as Chronicles and Nehemiah which indicates that this typological distinction is not useful for evaluating the chronology of the military lexical body in Judges 5. The lexical body displays strong correspondence with both SBH and LBH typologies, which also indicates that the tripartite division which creates a division for ABH does not appear to be accurate either.

This incongruity of distribution with the military lexical body does not inherently support a late dating either. However, other studies which have examined the composition, content, form and linguistics found in the Song of Deborah and concluded a late dating was feasible. However, the distribution of the military vocabulary, considered together with other scholarly studies mentioned in the introductory background, indicate it is possible that the early dating of the song can be considered speculative and that the song may rather exhibit traits of a late dated archaising text.

The study of military vocabulary in Judg 5 does not support an archaic date, and in fact points in the opposite direction. Admittedly, the song contains problematic and difficult vocabulary, parsing and structure, but the military lexemes separated from the text and taken as a

whole do not indicate an archaic dating for the text and display many points of correspondence with late biblical texts. The traditional early dating of Judges 5 should therefore be considered cautiously, if not wholly reconsidered. B. Lindars notes in his *Judges 1-5* commentary, "the vividness and immediacy of the poem have been responsible for the widespread opinion that it was composed very shortly after the victory, so that it ranks as one of the oldest monuments of Hebrew literature."⁴⁵⁵ Unfortunately, for those who chose to date the poem with this criteria, vividness and immediacy are qualities of a gifted writer, not of archaic resonance.

455. Lindars and Mayes, *Judges 1-5: A New Translation and Commentary*, 213.

3. The military vocabulary of Exodus 15

(a) The background of Exodus 15 in history and scholarship

Exodus 15 is well-known as containing the commonly named Song of the Sea or Song of Moses as well as the brief Song of Miriam. The Song of the Sea runs through verses 1-17, with a brief narrative in vv 19-20. The single verse Song of Miriam is contained in v 21. Verses 22-27 break the flow of the narrative and song with a continuation of the wilderness narrative. The poetic sections of 1-17 and 21 have a clear beginning which marks the start of the song: "אוּזָהוּהוּ - then sang Moses and the sons of Israel this song to Yahweh" in 15.1 and "וַתִּשַׁח מִרְיָם - and sang to them Miriam" in 15.21. The primary subject and theme of the song is the encounter between the military forces of Pharaoh at the sea and Yahweh's decimation of these forces. Similar to the Song of Deborah in Judges 5, the song in chapter 15 parallels a previous narrative version of this encounter in chapter 14—this similarity in form and context has led to an association between the Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah as belonging to the same archaic literary history and form, as noted in the previous chapter.

(i) The historical and literary background

The Song of the Sea follows a more thorough description of Yahweh's destruction of Pharaoh's military in the sea, but does not vary from the main narrative points. The placement of the song after the narrative and the introduction of Moses and Israel singing to the Lord has resulted in scholars drawing similar conclusions about the literary form of the Song of Deborah. The song has been described as a hymn of praise or thanksgiving to Yahweh for deliverance,⁴⁵⁶

456. Johannes Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture*, South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, vol. 28 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 737. Georg Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: eine Analyse von Ex 1-15* (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964), 112-113. Mark Rozelaar, "The Song of the Sea (Exodus XV, 1b-18)," *Vetus Testamentum* 2 (1952): 225-228. John D. W. Watts, "The Song of the Sea: Ex. XV," *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957): 371-380. Terence E. Fretheim, *Exodus* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991), 161. H. Schmidt, "Das Meerlied. Ex. 15:2-19," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 (1937): 59-66.

and as a victory song⁴⁵⁷—an ode of triumph and a liturgy.⁴⁵⁸ Again, as with the Song of Deborah, its literary form has caused some to associate it with cultic and liturgical ceremonies, most often ascribed specifically to Passover.⁴⁵⁹

The historical background to the song is traditionally considered to be the event of the Exodus itself and the deliverance of Israel from Pharaoh's military. The lack of current discussion regarding the historical background and setting of the song is surprising. The historicity of the Exodus account has been widely questioned to the point where many scholars would not assume the account to be historically viable. The contrast between the historical presumption in the mid-twentieth century and the end of twentieth century scholarship is obvious in the blanket statement by J. Bright in 1960, "There can really be little doubt that ancestors of Israel had been slaves in Egypt and had escaped in some marvellous way. Almost no one today would question it,"⁴⁶⁰ and N. P. Lemche in 1996, "it has been shown that the biblical texts which deal with the earliest history of Israel (or better its 'pre-' or 'proto-history') and with Western Asian and Egypt in the pre-Israelite period were not composed as historical sources but must be regarded as literary fictions."⁴⁶¹

457. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 121-123. Freedman, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry, 187-195*. Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1967), 173.

458. James Muilenburg, "A Liturgy on the Triumphs of Yahweh," *Studia Biblica et Semitica* (Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1966).

459. Martin Noth, *Exodus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), 121. John I Durham, *Understanding the Basic Themes of Exodus* (Dallas: Word Pub, 1990), 203. Durham considers it to be cultic and linked to Passover liturgy.

460. John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), 110. Cf. Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1900), 55. Note 1: 'The fact that the inhabitants of Philistia and Canaan are described in the same terms as Edom and Moab, is an unquestionable proof that this song was composed at a time when the command to exterminate the Canaanites had not yet been given, and the boundary of the territory to be captured by the Israelites was not yet fixed; in other words, that it was sung by Moses and the Israelites after the passage through the Red Sea.'

461. Quoted in Graham Davies, "Was There an Exodus?," in *In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel*, ed. John Day, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* (London: T&T Clark, 2004). Cf.

Those who would consider the Exodus from Egypt, similar to that depicted in the biblical text, to be a historical event debate the exact chronology of this event. The main chronological theories since the rise of Egyptology in the late eighteenth century all consider the Exodus to have occurred in the mid to late 2nd millennium B.C.E. The earliest theory, by C. R. Lepsius, places the XIXth Dynasty Pharaoh Ramses II as the pharaoh of the Israelite oppression and Merneptah the pharaoh of the exodus (13th c. B.C.E.); Lefébure's subsequent theory adjusted this to XVIIIth Dynasty Thutmose III and Amenhotep II (15th century B.C.E.); this early dating was then challenged by Albright who eventually settled on a mid 13th century date under Ramses II.⁴⁶²

(ii) The linguistic and chronological background

The Song of the Sea and Song of Miriam in Exodus 15 are often considered to be an example of ABH and part of the earliest literary layers in the MT. The songs are often considered within the same chronological period and literary construction as the Song of Deborah in

William Dever, "Is There Any Archaeological Evidence for the Exodus?," in *Exodus: The Egyptian Evidence*, ed. Ernest Frerichs and Leonard H. Lesko (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 81. "Not only is there no archaeological evidence for an exodus, there is no need to posit such an event.... I regard the historicity of the Exodus as a dead issue." Also, Thomas L. Thompson, *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, vol. 55 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). "A historical folk tradition...popular folklore and folk history of the time...It is generally acknowledged by scholars that the traditions about Israel's sojourn in Egypt and the exodus of the Israelites are legendary and epic in nature." Niels Peter Lemche, *Ancient Israel : A New History of Israelite Society*, *The Biblical Seminar*, vol. 5 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1988).

462. John J. Bimson, *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, vol. 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1978), 18-22. This 13th century date is the period most commonly held by those who consider the Exodus to be a historical event. Millar Burrows, *What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archeology for Biblical Studies* (New Haven, Conn: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941). Jack Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past: The Archeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946). Freedman, *The Chronology of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Kenneth A. Kitchen and T. C. Mitchell, "Chronology of the Old Testament," in *New Bible Dictionary*, ed. I. H. Marshall, J. I. Packer, and D. J. Wiseman (Leicester: IVP, 1962). Bright, *A History of Israel*.

Judges 5. Due to this association it is perhaps not surprising that the history of chronological scholarship has followed a similar pattern as the Song of Deborah.

Although in the mid-nineteenth century an early dating was prominent,⁴⁶³ by the turn of the twentieth century the song was considered to be an example of late Hebrew poetry.⁴⁶⁴ A. Bender dated the song to around 450 B.C.E. largely on the basis of artificial antiquating and supposed Aramaisms.⁴⁶⁵ P. Haupt, though disagreeing with Bender's analysis of Aramaisms, dated the Song even later to approximately 350 B.C.E.⁴⁶⁶ As with the Song of Deborah, this late dating was revised in the mid-twentieth century particularly by the Albright/Cross school. They followed the parallels in Ugaritic texts to assign an early date at least before the tenth century B.C.E. and more probably to the thirteenth-eleventh centuries B.C.E.⁴⁶⁷ This early dating, proposed by Cross in particular, became the accepted chronological period for the composition of the song with most commentators since Albright considering the song to have been written shortly after the "event" itself.⁴⁶⁸

463. Keil and Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, 55.

464. A. H. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus, With Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen & co, 1908), 88. "A further reason for assigning vv.2-18 to a late date is supplied by the style and vocabulary. (a) The style is the reverse of archaic....Further, there are several instances of what is known as 'synthetic parallelism,' which marks the most elevated style of poetry....There is none of the rugged obscurity which marks early poems such as those in Gen. xlix., Dt. xxxiii, Jud. v."

465. A. Bender, "Das Lied Exodus 15," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 23 (1903): 47.

466. P. Haupt, "Moses Song of Triumph," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 20 (1904): 153-154.

467. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity; Monotheism and the Historical Process* (Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1957), 14. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Song of Miriam," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19 (1955): 237-250. F. M. Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *Journal for Theology and the Church* 5 (1968): 1-25. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*.

468. Freedman, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, 176-178. Durham, *Understanding the Basic Themes of Exodus*, 209. "The oldest elements of the composite may certainly be dated, insofar as basic narrative and perhaps also rhetorical terms are concerned, very close to the time of the event itself." Brevard S. Childs, *Exodus* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1974), 245. "Far from being a description totally independent of the prose account, the poetic tradition of Ex 15 shares its basic features. How is this common tradition to be explained? Some older scholars argued that Ex 15 is a very late poem which has combined features of J and P. However the linguistic arguments against this hypothesis seem

As noted, the move in biblical scholarship away from considering the Exodus account as historically accurate has rippled into the chronological presumptions of those who considered the song to be written shortly after the "event" as a song of victory. The dating of the song has thus begun to move away from a pre-monarchic setting to monarchic or even post-exilic setting,⁴⁶⁹ but conclusions of early dating persist.⁴⁷⁰

The general argument for an early dating is based on the linguistic profile as evidencing similarity to Ugaritic texts, archaic vocabulary and archaic linguistic style and grammar.⁴⁷¹ Cross and Freedman observed that the tenses operate in a way more closely related to Ugaritic poetry than to ordinary Hebrew poetry,⁴⁷² which contributed to their chronological conclusion.⁴⁷³ D. A. Robertson also considered the linguistic evidence to be archaic,⁴⁷⁴ whereas L. R. Fisher based his linguistic argument on the phraseology exhibiting similarity to the Ugaritic Baal myth.⁴⁷⁵ A variant on the linguistic typology is A. S. Yahuda who considered the language to be similar to stock Egyptian formal phrases and expressions.⁴⁷⁶

decisive....The evidence for determining an absolute dating of the poem remains contested although older arguments for post-exilic such as Bender have collapsed." R. E. Clements, *Exodus*, Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 90. "This triumphal song of thanksgiving for the deliverance at the Red Sea is certainly the oldest written record of the event which the Old Testament has preserved. It is usually ascribed to the J source but the song itself is undoubtedly older than the source and has simply been incorporated into it." Davies, "Was There an Exodus?," 26. 'Psalm 114 could be a quite early Judaeen psalm, and the Song of Moses in Exod 15.1-17 (of which more later) is best viewed as a Jerusalem psalm from the early monarchy.'

469.C. Houtman, *Exodus, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament*. (Kampen: Kok, 1993), 242.

470.William Henry Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 565.

471.Cf. Davies, "Was There an Exodus?," 31. Davies considers both Ugaritic morphology and also an interpreted reference to the Jerusalem sanctuary as pointing to a date in the early monarchy.

472.Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam".

473.Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, ch 2.

474.Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*, 155.

475.L. R. Fisher, "Creation At Ugarit and in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 313-324.

476.A. S. Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch in Its Relation to Egyptian* (London: Oxford

The linguistic arguments from those who date the text to a later period are mainly based on the possible influence of Aramaic,⁴⁷⁷ the lack of correlation to Ugaritic as compared to Psalms⁴⁷⁸ and markers of archaizing and late vocabulary.⁴⁷⁹

(b) The examination of military vocabulary in Exodus 15

(i) איש מלחמה

Exodus 15.3 refers to Yahweh as an איש מלחמה (יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה שמו). The phrase is defined literally as a *man of war* and there is no area for lexical ambiguity in this straight-forward definition. KB refers to the usage as *warrior* or in plural form as *fighting men* and notes E. Junge who designates the usage as *professional warriors* or *conscripts*.⁴⁸⁰ The phrase is the same type of construct as אנשי חיל (men of strength/renown) or גברי חיל (warriors of strength/renown).

איש מלחמה occurs twenty times in the MT. However, the only other occurrence other than Exod. 15.3 which is used as descriptive of Yahweh is Isa. 4.:13.⁴⁸¹ The variant with the def-

University Press, 1933), 79f.

477. Bender, "Das Lied Exodus 15".

478. S. Mowinckel, "Psalm Criticism Between 1900 and 1935: Ugarit and Psalm Exegesis," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 13-33. R. Tournay, "Recherches sur la chronologie des psaumes," *Revue biblique* 65 (1958): 335-357.

479. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus*, 88. "A further reason for assigning vv.2-18 to a late date is supplied by the style and vocabulary. (a) The style is the reverse of archaic....Further, there are several instances of what is known as 'synthetic parallelism,' which marks the most elevated style of poetry....There is none of the rugged obscurity which marks early poems such as those in Gen. xlix., Dt. xxxiii, Jud. v. (b) The vocabulary points to a late date. The song contains numerous words and expressions which are found in Jeremiah, Ezekiel and some of the later Psalms, but which are almost or entirely absent from earlier writings." Noth, *Exodus; a Commentary*, 123. "The great 'Red Sea Hymn' in 15.1-19 is a relatively late piece; we cannot give a more accurate indication of the time at which it was composed." S. Mowinckel, "Drive and/Or Ride in O.T.," *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 278-299. Mowinckel would have horse and chariot as an anachronism.

480. Ehrhard Junge, "Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia," *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament* 4 (1937): 69ff. Noted as professional soldiers or conscripts.

481. Exod. 15.3; Josh. 17.1; Judg. 20.17; 1 Sam. 16.18, 17.33; 2 Sam. 8.10, 17.8; Isa. 3.2, 41.12, 42.13; Jer. 50.30; Ezek. 27.10, 27.27, 39.20; Joel 2.7; 1 Chron. 12.39, 18.10, 28.3; 2 Chron. 8.9, 17.13.

inite article occurs twenty-one times in the MT, but only in the plural form אנשי המלחמה—it is not used as a description for Yahweh.⁴⁸² The two variants are also attested in Qumran texts with the form אנשי מלחמה occurring in 1QM 2.7, 1QM 9.5, 1QH^a 15.25, 1QH^a 17.22, 11QT 57.6 and the form אנשי המלחמה in CD 20.14; 11QT 58.7, 58.8, 58.16.

There is no notable distinction in the text between the literally similar constructs אנשי חיל or גברי חיל. The phrase גברי חיל does has greater usage in Chronicles as compared to other texts. Twenty-five of the thirty-two occurrences of the phrase are found within the books of Chronicles.⁴⁸³

There is however an explicit example of lexical replacement in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which replaces the Exod. 15.3 occurrence of איש מלחמה with גיבור במלחמה. This use of the preposition in this phrase (גיבור במלחמה) is unique. It is probably best understood as indicating a state or position—the *war* qualifying the state of the *man*. The other corresponding passages of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the MT איש מלחמה are unchanged. The phrase גבורים המלחמה occurs in the MT Eccl. 9.11, and without the definite article in MT Ps. 24.8 and 2 Chron. 13.3. The same phrase גבורי מלחמות occurs in 1QH^a 14:36 and 4Q169 3_4 III, 11. The plural form with the definite article occurs in 1QM 12.17. Notably, there is also an attestation of amended גבור [מה] in 1QM 12.9 used within the context of אדוני/אל, going out to battle against the enemy. This is the closest lexical parallel to the example in the Samaritan Pentateuch and within the same type of military context.

The LXX parallel to Exod. 15.3 also avoids using the "man of war" epithet. Instead it demurs with translating the line as κύριος συντρ(βων πολέμους κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῶ) (literally -

482.Num. 31.28, 31.49; Deut. 2.14, 2.16; Josh. 5.4, 5.6, 6.3, 10.24; 1 Sam. 18.5; 1 Kgs 9.22; 2 Kgs 25.4, 25.19; Jer. 38.4, 39.4, 41.3, 41.16, 49.16, 49.26, 51.32, 52.7, 52.25; Joel 4.9.

483.Judg 11.1; 1 Sam 9.1, 16.18; 1 Kgs 11.28; 2 Kgs 5.1; Ruth 2.1; Neh 11.14; 1 Chr 5.24, 7.2, 7.5, 7.7, 7.9, 7.11, 7.40, 8.40, 9.13, 12.22, 12.26, 12.29, 12.31, 26.6, 26.31, 28.1; 2 Chr 13.3, 14.7, 17.13, 17.14, 17.16, 17.17, 25.6, 16.12, 32.21.

the Lord breaker/annihilator to war, the Lord is his name). The phrase συντρ(βων πολέμους can be translated as "to make an end to war".⁴⁸⁴ The same parallel is found for the only other occurrence of the Hebrew epithet in Isa. 42.13. Durham notes the change in the Greek parallel and decides that איש מלחמה is an "authentic epithet the translators of LXX found too embarrassing to keep and so altered".⁴⁸⁵

The occurrence of the phrase within Exod. 15.3 and its association with the only other occurrence as a divine epithet in Isaiah aligns the Exodus 15 verse with the prophetic poetry and genre of Isaiah. The similarity between the epithet איש מלחמה and the common military-coloured יהוה צבאות is also obvious. The common use of יהוה צבאות in prophetic texts (almost all uses are in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi) and occasionally in Samuel/Chronicles/Kings resonates with the military epithet and poetic form of Exodus 15.

(ii) מרכבה

מרכבה, commonly defined as *chariot*, occurs often in this lexical form in the MT and once within the Song of the Sea in Exod. 15.4. The related רכב, a more generic term meaning *mount* or *rider*, is occasionally interpreted as *chariot* within the MT and also occurs in Exod. 15.1, 15.19 and 15.21. The רכב lexeme occasionally contains the meaning of *chariot*, however, due to ambiguity in its range of meaning it will be discussed separately from מרכבה.

484.J. Lust et al., A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992). sub συντρ(βων.

485.Durham, Understanding the Basic Themes of Exodus, 206.

מרכבה, the feminine form of מרכב, is defined clearly as a *chariot* in the MT.⁴⁸⁶ The lexeme has several cognates including Ugaritic *mrkbt*,⁴⁸⁷ Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaean.⁴⁸⁸ A marginal meaning found in cognates, but not found in the MT, is *ship* as attested in Arabic *markab* and Akkadian *narkabtu*.⁴⁸⁹ KB notes the form as developing into Egyptian *mrkbt* presumably as a foreign loanword.⁴⁹⁰ The similar masculine form of the lexeme is defined as *saddle* in the MT and Arabic, but also occurs with the secondary meaning of *ship* in Arabic.

The masculine form מרכב, which only appears three times in the MT (Lev. 15.9, 1 Kgs 5.6 and Song 3.10), appears to follow this marginal meaning of *saddle* or *seat*. The Leviticus verse is in the context of defilement from one with a "discharge" and any מרכב אשר ירכב (seats which are ridden) are unclean. The Song of Songs verse likewise is explicitly the seat as it describes the seat part of a אפריון (litter/sedan chair). The 1 Kgs 5.6 occurrence is more difficult as the 2 Chron. 9.25 parallel attests סוסים ומרכבות rather than למרכבו סוסים. It is possible the 1 Kings lexical form is simply incorrect. It is also possible, in keeping with the other מרכב contexts, that it is *horses for saddling* (although *horses for his chariot* makes better grammatical sense).

The lexeme appears as מרכבה forty-four times in forty-one MT verses. The highest number of occurrences is in Kings (10x)⁴⁹¹ and Chronicles (7x).⁴⁹² Other than these books the distribution is fairly even. The lexeme appears twice in Genesis (Gen. 41.43, 46.29), twice in Exodus (Exod. 14.25, 15.4), twice in Joshua (Josh. 11.6, 11.9), twice in Judges (Judg. 4.15, 5.28), twice

486.KB sub מרכבה. BDB sub מרכבה.

487.Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 2331.

488.Drower and Macuch, A Mandaic Dictionary, 254.

489.Soden and Meissner, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch, 747. Armas Salonen, Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1951), 19, 44.

490.Freeman, Miosi, and Erman, Neuägyptische Grammatik, 584.

491.1 Kgs 7.33, 10.29, 12.18, 20.33, 22.35; 2 Kgs 5.21, 5.26, 9.27, 10.15, 23.11.

492.1 Chron. 28.18; 2 Chron. 1.17, 9.25, 10.18, 14.8, 18.34, 35.24.

in 1 Samuel (1 Sam. 8.11, 15.1), twice in Micah (Mic 1.13, 5.9), three times in Isaiah (Isa. 2.7, 22.18, 66.15), thrice in Zechariah (Zech. 6.1, 6.2, 6.3); once in Jer. 4.13, Joel 2.5, Nah. 3.2, Hab 3.8, Hag. 2.22 and Song 6.12. Within the Qumran sectarian manuscripts, the מרכבה lexeme occurs several times as representative of the Ark or holy item of the דביר (sanctum/chamber), or as the heavenly chariots of Ezekiel's vision. The exceptions are 1QM 11.10, referring to the Exodus event, [חן] כשלישי מרכבותיו בים סוף, and 4Q169 3_4 II, 3 which quotes Nah. 3.2.

The distribution through Kings and Chronicles is interesting; of all the מרכבה occurrences used for *chariot* (1 Chron. 28.18 is an exception to this usage as discussed below), only 2 Chron. 14.8 is not paralleled within the books of Kings.⁴⁹³ Of the parallels there is no lexical shift except possibly in 1 Kgs 10.26 (equivalent to 2 Chron. 9.25). 2 Chron. 9.25 attests:

ויהי לשלמה ארבעת אלפים אריות סוסים ומרכבות ושנים עשר אלף פרשים ויניחם בערי הרכב ועם המלך בירושלם

1 Kings 10.26 parallels this exactly in the second half. The first half, however, is variant with "solomon gathered riders and horsemen and he had 1400 riders (and 12000 horsemen) - יאסף" rather than "שלמה רכב ופרשים ויהי לו אלף וארבע מאות רכב horses and chariots (and 12000 horsemen)". Considering the second half of the verse is exactly parallel it is possible that the source was corrupted—the variance between four-thousand and one-thousand-four-hundred may indicate this—however the reading in Kings appears simpler and within the internal parallel of the sentence (gathered riders and horsemen::had riders and horsemen).

Although the term is used consistently for a *chariot* or wheeled vehicle in the MT, it also shifts to represent the Ark of the Covenant. As noted, this meaning is explicit in the Qumran sectarian manuscripts where this is the only use of מרכבה other than when quoting from the

493.2 Chron. 1.17::1 Kgs 10.29; 2 Chron. 9.25::1 Kgs 10.26; 2 Chron. 10.18::Kgs 12.18; 2 Chron. 18.34::1 Kgs 22.35; 2 Chron. 35.24::2 Kgs 23.30.

MT. The usage can be found twice in the MT. First, obliquely in 1 Kgs 7.33 when construction of the Ark is discussed, and the wheels are mentioned as being like the wheels of a chariot. Secondly, in 1 Chron. 28.18 explicitly, which mentions the gold for the form of the chariot's cherubim. This is parallel with the Qumran use and context of מרכבה along with the כרוכי.

Historically, the chariot is well-attested both in archaeology, literature and reliefs throughout the ancient Near East. The use of the wheeled vehicle goes back to at least the third millennium B.C.E.⁴⁹⁴ However this was generally a domestic use. The use of the chariot as part of the military corps only came later at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.E.⁴⁹⁵ The accounts of the battle of Qadesh in 1300 B.C.E. contain lists of the military corps with a high emphasis on the chariotry corps, which was popularly used at this time by the Egyptians and Hittites. The Hittite coalition is noted as using three-man chariots with a driver, shield-bearer and spearman.⁴⁹⁶ The Egyptian chariot, as evidenced by New Kingdom (16th to 11th centuries B.C.E.) reliefs, wall-paintings and in archaeological finds, was a light, shallow vehicle large enough for two to stand abreast. A long bowcase, quivers and javelins were often hung on the side.⁴⁹⁷ The material evidence of chariots from the Egyptian Late Period (late 8th to 4th century) is non-existent apart from a small handful of reliefs.⁴⁹⁸ The largest body of evidence for chariots

494.M. A Littauer and J. H Crouwel, "Kampfwagen B. Archäologisch," in *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 28.

495.M. A Littauer and J. H Crouwel, "The Origin of the True Chariot," in *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 45. Littauer and Crouwel note that although some evidence indicates the chariot possibly originated in the steppe area of northern Kazakhstan in 2000-1800 B.C.E. they dispute this and consider an Anatolian origin in the early 2nd millennium B.C.E. Even in later periods their opinion is that the chariot was an adjunct of the greater military of Egyptian or Hittite empire and not a prime role as Robert Drews suggests.

496.Littauer and Crouwel, "Kampfwagen B. Archäologisch," 32.

497.M. A Littauer and J. H Crouwel, "An Egyptian Wheel in Brooklyn," in *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 306-307.

498.Ibid., 306-307. "They consist of three faience relief vases, a scarab, some stone reliefs, and a drawing on stone."

and their use in the ancient Near East is from the Assyrian reliefs, which provide detailed imagery and depiction of use through the first millennium. The ninth century Assyrian chariot was small and light with a shield hung on the back.⁴⁹⁹ This small two-man chariot was declining in use through the eighth century B.C.E., being replaced by mounted troops which began to appear in the ninth century. The chariot thus grew in size to carry three or four men.⁵⁰⁰ These eighth and seventh century chariots were used primarily as firing platforms for archers. Under Ashurbanipal archers are seen shooting from chariots together with slingers on foot and mounted bowmen.⁵⁰¹ During the period of the Achaemenid empire the chariot's role is diminished. Its use as a mobile firing platform disappears, with the function generally as a one driver platform launched against enemies.⁵⁰²

The common use of the chariot throughout the second and first millennium B.C.E. provides a broad chronological period for the appearance of chariots as a military arm within texts. The mention of the chariot in connection with the Egyptians in Exod. 15 is in accordance with the material evidence from Egypt throughout the New Kingdom and until the Late Period when the material evidence disappears. This roughly corresponds with the evidence from Assyria which also exhibits a decreased use of chariotry from the seventh century B.C.E. as the cavalry takes over much of the traditional military functions of the chariotry.

499.M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crouwel, "New Light on the Assyrian Chariot," in *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 252.

500.Littauer and Crouwel, "An Egyptian Wheel in Brooklyn," 309.

501.Littauer and Crouwel, "Kampfwagen B. Archäologisch," 35.

502.M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crouwel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 152.

(iii) רכב

רכב is extremely common in the MT and unfortunately quite varied in the semantic range attested. The root meaning is *to ride* or *to mount*. This is also the primary meaning in other Semitic languages such as Ugaritic (*rkb*)⁵⁰³ or Akkadian (*rakabu*).⁵⁰⁴ Within the MT however the lexeme is also widely used to mean *chariot/chariot troop* or a *rider/horseman*. Here the distinction between a rider as a horseman or charioteer is notoriously vague and only apparent occasionally through the surrounding context.⁵⁰⁵ Jenni-Westermann remarks that the verbal root רכב can be described as *to move forward on*, with the mode of transport being secondary (although commonly animals in the MT and also ships in the wider Semitic usage).

רכב occurs some 214 times in a variety of forms throughout the MT. KB divides the usage as seventy-eight times as a verb for *to mount or ride*, thirteen times as a place name, 120 times as *chariot/upper millstone* and only three times as *horseman/driver*. This distinction of *horseman/driver* from *chariot* is probably inaccurate, depending on the interpretation of the lexeme in context. Jenni-Westermann agrees with the breakdown noting the attestations as: verb 78x and noun 119x concentrated primarily in 2 Kings (19x), 1 Kings (16x), 2 Chronicles (14x), Isaiah (11x), Exodus (10x) and Judges (9x).

The lexeme occurs three times in Exod. 15.1, 15.19 and 15.21. The phrase סוס ורכבו רמה בים (horse and his rider thrown in the sea) is used in 15.1 and 15.21; Exod. 15.19 attests the variant phrase בא סוס פרעה ברכבו ובפרשיו בים (horse of Pharaoh with his rider and with his horse-

503. Aistleitner, Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache, no. 2511. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, no. 2331

504. KB sub רכב. AHw 944f. DISO 279f. Cf. Edward Ullendorff, "The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography," *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 194. Edward Ullendorff, "Ugaritic Studies Within Their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46 (1963/1964): 243.

505. M. Weippert, "Heiligen Krieges im alten Israel," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1972): 460-493. Mowinckel, "Drive and/Or Ride in O.T.". Referring to Jeremiah 51.21, Childs considers the lexeme to be a rider rather than chariot although possibly a rider in a chariot. Childs, *Exodus, a Commentary*, 242.

men went into the sea). Whether the phrase is referring to the "horse and charioteer" or "horse and horseman" when it refers to "rider" is difficult to determine purely on the syntax, particularly as the horseman is referenced explicitly with פרשים elsewhere (discussed below). This would leave only the מרכבה of Exod. 15.4 as describing chariotry as a military arm of the Egyptians.

There is uncertainty as to the meaning of the root *to ride*. One would suspect that the form סוס ורכבו (horse and his rider literally) refers to the rider of the horse. However the phrase has been amended, primarily by S. Mowinckel, to mean "horse and his chariot" with the explicit meaning of a battle chariot.⁵⁰⁶ Martin Noth considers the phrase to mean "horse and chariot soldier",⁵⁰⁷ while Childs translates "horse and driver".⁵⁰⁸

The phrase סוס ורכב is not limited to Exodus 15, occurring also in Deut. 20.1, Josh. 11.4, 1 Kgs (20.1, 20.25), 2 Kgs (6.14, 6.15, 6.17), Jer. 51.21, Ezek. 39.20 and Hag. 2.22. 1 Kings 20.1 mentions Ben-hadad of Aram. 2 Kings 6 is a narrative account of the Arameans attacking and being divinely duped by Elisha. The dating of the Ben-hadad references is disputed in particular as the term is most likely a patronymic title and not the personal name of the leader. The dating of the kings of Aram, however, is often placed between the tenth to eighth centuries B.C.E.⁵⁰⁹

The phrase occurs twice in the Temple Scroll from Qumran in the instructional material for the military defense of Israel. 11QT 58.7 mentions ואם מלך ורכב וסוס ועם רב (and if a king and רכב and סוס and many people) and 11QT 61.13 also refers to an enemy army as וראיתה סוס ורכב

506.Mowinckel, "Drive and/Or Ride in O.T.", 284. Cf. M. Löhr, "Ägyptische Reiterei im AT?," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 31 (1928): 924.

507.Noth, *Exodus; a Commentary*, 95. Frank Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel*, *Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament*, vol. 32 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969).

508.Childs, *Exodus, a Commentary*, 240, 242.

509.Wayne Thomas Pitard, *Ancient Damascus: A Historical Study of the Syrian City-State From Earliest Times Until Its Fall to the Assyrians in 732 B.C.E* (Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1987).

(iv) חיל

חיל occurs once in Exod. 15.4 in the sentence, "מרכבת פרעה וחילו ירה בים" - the chariots of Pharaoh and his army he threw in the sea." חיל is a common MT lexeme occurring some 317 times in the MT with two main distinctive meanings: *to be in labour/to writhe/tremble* and *power/strength/army*. Marginal meanings of an *outer rampart* (2 Sam. 20.15; 1 Kgs 21.23; Isa. 26.1, Obad. 20; Nah. 3.8; Ps. 48.14, 122.7; Lam. 2.8) and *agony* (Exod. 15.4; Jer, 6.24, 22.23, 50.43; Mic. 4.9; Ps. 48.7) also occur. The main use of the lexeme is within the semantic range of *strength/wealth/army*.⁵¹¹ KB notes several related languages with similar semantic range, including Jewish Aramaic for collective *armed forces* and *strength*; Ugaritic *ḥl, army*;⁵¹² Arabic *ḥail, horses/cavalry/power/goat-herd*; Akkadian *ellatu, strength/family/armed force*.

The lexeme occurs commonly in Qumran texts with some fifty-six occurrences distributed widely through many of the texts.⁵¹³ חיל is also attested in extra-biblical inscriptions, once in the extremely fragmentary Arad 24.3 which lacks a proper context, and in Northwest Semitic inscriptions KAI 27 1:27 (Phoenician/Aramaic 7th B.C.E.),⁵¹⁴ three occurrences in KAI 222 A2:28, A2:31, A2:32 (Old Aramaic 750 B.C.E.)⁵¹⁵ and twice in KAI 266 1:3, 1:7 (Imperial Aramaic 605 B.C.E.).⁵¹⁶ Although KAI 27 is fragmentary it is probably an imprecatory or magical

511.KB sub חיל.

512.Aistleitner, Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache, 927.

513.CD 2:17; 1QS^a 1:28; 1QpHab 9:7; 1QM 1:1-2, 13; 2:8; 6:6, 13; 10:6; 11:1, 5, 7; 12:11, 14; 15:2, 7; 17:4, 13; 18:1; 19:3, 6, 10; 1QH^a 18:17, 26; 4Q161 1, 3; 4Q169 3_4 I, 10; 3_4 III, 10-11; 3_4 IV, 1; 4Q170 1_2, 1; 4Q174 6 7, 5; 4Q175 1, 19; 4Q266 2 II, 17; 4Q270 1 I, 2; 4Q281e 1, 5; 4Q287 5, 8; 4Q299 10, 2; 4Q364 25a_c, 2; 4Q365 6a I, 7; 4Q381 48, 9; 4Q382 31, 3; 4Q385a 17a_e II, 5; 4Q393 3, 8; 4Q424 3, 8; 4Q458 2 II, 3; 4Q460 8, 3; 4Q471 1, 7; 4Q481a 2, 6; 4Q491 11 I, 10; 4Q492 1, 3, 6, 9; 11QT 57, 9; 58, 17.

514.W. F. Albright, "An Aramean Magical Text in Hebrew From the Seventh Century B.C.," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 76 (1939): 5-11. Yitzhak Avishur, "The Second Amulet Incantation From Arslan Tash," in *Phoenician Inscriptions and the Bible*, ed. Yitzhak Avishur (Tel Aviv-Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications, 2000).

515.Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*.

516.Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Letter of King Adon to the Egyptian Pharaoh," *Biblica* 46 (1965):

text; KAI 222 is similarly a treaty type text with imprecatory sections. KAI 266, commonly known as the Saqqâra text, is a letter from Adon, a Semitic ruler, to Pharaoh Neco II asking for Egyptian military aid against the Babylonians (למשלח חיל - to send an army). The term is also popular in the Aramaic texts at Elephantine where the Judaeen community even refers to itself as the חילא יהודיא.⁵¹⁷ The previous discussion on רכב also provided an example of the lexeme used in the Aramaic translation of the Behistun inscription.

As noted the lexeme is very common throughout the MT and extra-biblical texts which reduces any ability to map trends of usage or function. The dated extra-biblical texts indicate that the lexeme was used in both Hebrew and Aramaic/Phoenician texts in the 6th-7th centuries B.C.E. This provides a slight amount of chronological information, indicating the lexeme was widely used in the ancient Near East. The KAI 266 text also provides firm chronological grounding for the use of the term in the context of the Egyptian and Babylonian conflict of the sixth century B.C.E.

שליש (v)

שליש in Exod. 15.4 provides an attestation of a probable Assyrian loanword for either a specialised military position or distinguished social position. The lexeme generally means *one-third* as a fraction or unit of measure, however it is also used in the MT as a descriptive title for an *adjutant* to the king, or as a title or description of a military position. The Hebrew שליש has been linked with several foreign terms including the Hittite adjective *sălliš* (great, mighty)⁵¹⁸ and

41-55. H. L. Ginsburg, "An Aramaic Contemporary of the Lachish Letters," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 111 (1948): 24-27.

517. Crowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, xv.

518. Herbert Donner, "Der Freund des Königs," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 275. Crowley indicated the Hebrew might be related to Hittite military title. A. E. Cowley, "A Hittite

Egyptian verb *srs* (to command a contingent of soldiers)⁵¹⁹. The most obvious and similar corresponding term, however, would be the Akkadian *tašlīšu*, a specific term for the *third man in a chariot*. This is attested in Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian sources.⁵²⁰ KB notes that the Hebrew lexeme follows the nominal pattern *qātīl*, distinguishing it from the Akkadian lexeme, which follows the pattern *qatīl* and thus is perhaps "an independent and unilateral development of the word in Hebrew".⁵²¹ Although an independent development is a possibility, the Hebrew שליש evidences similar function, meaning, context and root. Thus it seems more probable that it is either a direct loanword or parallel translation of the Akkadian term.

The function and use of the term in the MT indicates it was both a specific military term connected with the chariotry, a title of social distinction, or a blend of the two. The term is used seventeen times in the MT within this semantic range (Exod. 14.7, 15.4; 2 Sam. 23.8; 1 Kgs 9.22; 2 Kgs 7.2, 7.17, 7.19, 9.25, 10.25, 15.25; Ezek. 23.15, 23.23; Prov. 22.20?; 1 Chron. 11.11, 12.19; 2 Chron. 8.9). Although none of the occurrences explicitly place the שליש within the chariot, four verses mention the chariot in the same verse (Exod. 14.7, 15.4; 1 Kgs 9.22::2 Chr 8.9).

Though the lexeme appears commonly in the MT as a social position, this wouldn't necessarily be distinct from the military position. However it is probable that semantic shift could occur between a military position of leadership to a more generic social position.⁵²² 1 Kgs

Word in Hebrew," *Journal of Theological Studies* 21 (1920): 326.

519.P. C. Craigie, "An Egyptian Expression in the Song of the Sea: Exodus Xv.4," *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 83-86.

520.AHw. 1339a. Cf. Armas Salonen, *Hippologica Accadica* (Helsinki: 1955), 213-218.

521.Donner, "Der Freund des Königs", 277. Martin Noth, *Könige*, *Biblischer Kommentar*, vol. 9 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964), 217.

522.B. A. Mastin argues that the lexeme in Biblical Hebrew never means the "third man in a chariot" but only an officer of high rank. It should however be distinguished that a social position or generic leadership title would likely arise out of a historical use and adapt to the socialised meaning. B. A. Mastin, "Was the Salis the Third Man in the Chariot?," *Supplement to Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1979):

9.22::2 Chron. 8.9 attests this blurring of military and social positions when remarking that Solomon did not make slaves of the Israelites, but rather made them אנשי המלחמה ועבדיו ושריו (men of war, servants, officers, שליט, officers of chariots and horsemen). 2 Kgs 7.2 and 7.17 explicitly note the שליט as an adjutant or assistant position below the king, ויען השליט אשר למלך נשען על ידו (and answered the שליט which the king leaned upon his arm).⁵²³ The most descriptive passages are Ezek. 23.15 and 23.23. Ezek. 23.15 describes the כשדיים (Chaldeans) with belts girded on their loins, with long turbans, the image of שליט, all of them looking like sons of Babylon, Chaldeans. Ezekiel 23.23 again refers to the sons of Babylon and Chaldeans, בחורי חמד פחות ומגנים כלם שלשים (desirable young men, governors, state officials, all of them שליט); although these titles are social positions the passage then continues to describe them as a military contingent "all riding on horses / and they will come against you with chariots and wheels, an assembly of people with spears and shields and helmets". This passage in Ezek. 23.23 further aligns the שליט as equivalent or a loan from Assyrian *tašlišu*, as it appears

125-154. The debate over the identification of the שליט has been motivated by a historical desire to identify the שלשים of David, often translated as the Three or the Thirty. Oddly, the discussion seems to generally dismiss the relationship to the Akkadian cognate in preference of a purely social meaning. Again, as noted, the semantic shift of lexemes from a previous context into a new context is common among lexemes and historically the shift away from chariotry in Assyrian surely meant the 'third man' was a short-lived military position. This move to a social position may also be evidenced in the Northwest Semitic inscriptions as DNSI refers to a variation of *rab slsy* in CIS i 6012. DNSI also defines *šlyt* as evidenced in Official Aramaic at Saqqara (605 B.C.E.) 'third, third in rank, captain'. Cf. J. B. Segal and H. S. Smith, *Aramaic Texts From North Saqqâra, With Some Fragments in Phoenician, Texts From Excavations, 6th Memoir* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), 76.3. The likely explanation is that the biblical texts exhibit a purely social or generic military use of שליט due to a compositional point after the decline of three-man chariotry in the ancient Near East. Interestingly, the Akkadian *tašlišu* attests a similar vocalic progression as the Hebrew with the change to *taššalīšu* in Late Babylonian. For discussion on the שליט as related to David's של see: Donald G. Schley, "The Salisim: Officers or Special Three-Man Squads," *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990): 321-326. Nadav Na'aman, "The List of David's Officers (Salisim)," *Vetus Testamentum* 38 (1988): 71-79. Marc Vervenne, "Hebrew Salis - Ugaritic *šlyt*," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19 (1987): 355-373. This acknowledgement of the social position of the שליט makes a tenth-century dating of Samuel/Kings awkward. This is evidenced by P. Bordreuil's scrabbling to justify a social semantic form in the biblical text, although the wider historical development of a three-man chariot is only beginning to appear at this time. Pierre Bordreuil, "A Note on the Seal of Peqah the Armor-Bearer, Future King of Israel," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49 (1986): 54-55.

523. Similar to the 'right hand man' in contemporary colloquial English.

here with כָּנַן and פָּחָה which are both clear Assyrian loanwords for titles of social distinction.⁵²⁴

וַתַּעַשׂ לָהֶם כַּפְּרֵעוֹה וְכַשְׁלִישֵׁי מַרְכָּבוֹתָיו בַּיָּם סוּן[ף] - and you will do to them like Pharaoh and his officers of chariots in the Red Sea". The occurrence is in the context of the Lord striking down the enemies and "hordes of Belial" as he had done in the times of the מִלְחָמוֹת יָדֶיךָ (wars of your hands).

The term appears most commonly in the MT within the Samuel, Kings and Chronicles narratives and the remainder of occurrences in poetic/prophetic literature (Exodus and Ezekiel). Thus it does not appear to be a purely poetic or narrative lexeme.

The occurrence of שְׁלִישׁ within the Exodus narrative and further within the Qumran reference to that narrative indicate that it was probably part of the original form, and not an MT emendation. This attestation carries strong historical and chronological implications if it is associated with the Assyrian *tašlišu*. As discussed in the analysis of the מַרְכָּבָה, linguistic considerations aside, there is no evidence of the Egyptian chariot carrying a three-man crew. Rather, the material evidence for Egyptian chariots indicates they were light and fast two-man vehicles. The Assyrian evidence, however, attests the three- and four-man chariot crew from the eighth century as the maneuverable role of the chariot was increasingly taken over by the horsemen. The mention of the שְׁלִישׁ in Exod. 15, when considered as equivalent to the Assyrian *tašlišu*, not only indicates Assyrian military linguistic influence of the eighth century B.C.E. or later, but also does not reflect the Egyptian chariotry at any point in its historical development.⁵²⁵

524.KB sub פָּחָה and sub כָּנַן. The distribution in the MT also indicates this with כָּנַן attested in Nehemiah (9x), Ezra (1x), Daniel (5x), Ezekiel (3x), Jeremiah (3x) and Isaiah (1x). פָּחָה has a wider distribution in Nehemiah (8x), Ezra (7x), Daniel (4x), Haggai (4x), Esther (3x), Jeremiah (3x), Ezekiel (3x), 1 Kings (2x), 2 Kings (1x), Isaiah (1x), Malachi (1x) and 2 Chronicles (1x).

525.Bender argued Egyptian chariots carried only two men and the meaning implied indicated a Palestinian (Hittite) custom. Bender, "Das Lied Exodus 15", 19.

אריק הרב (vi)

הרב occurs in Exod. 15.9 as the only lexical item for a military arm or armour within this passage. The full discussion and background on this common MT lexeme can be found in chapter one of the thesis, Song of Deborah, sub הרב.

The lexeme is used in this passage with the phrase אריק חרבי (I will pour/unsheath my sword). It occurs in the same *hif'il* form but perfect in Ezek. 28.7 and 30.11 (הריקו חרבותם). Ezekiel 5.2, 5.12 and 12.14 exhibit a related phrase וחרב אריק אחריהם, which occurs without variation in these three verses. Leviticus 26.33 has a combination of these two patterns, והריקתי וחרב אחריכם. This is closest in function to the Ezek. 5.2, 5.12 and 12.14 usage pattern rather than that of Exod. 15.9. Other than Ezek. 30.11 and 5.2, all of the occurrences are spoken by the Lord or attributed to his direct speech.

The contextual and literary correlation between the Exod. 15.9 use of the expression אריק חרבי and the similar usage in Ezek. 28.7 and 30.11 is extremely strong—exhibiting both themes and discourse parallels to Exodus 15. Ezekiel 28.7 is part of a longer passage of judgement against Tyre:

לכן כה אמר אדני יהוה יען תתך את לבבך כלב אלהים:

לכן הנני מביא עליך זרים עריצי גוים והריקו חרבותם על יפי חכמתך וחללו יפעתך

"Therefore says the Lord God because you have set your mind like the mind of God / therefore behold I will bring to you strangers of a ruthless nation and they will pour out their swords on your beauty of wisdom and strike down your splendour."

The second passage in Ezek. 30.11 is of stronger correspondence with the Exodus 15 theme as the passage directly prophesies the punishment of Egypt through Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon. Ezekiel 30.10-11 attests:

כה אמר אדני יהוה והשבתי את המון מצרים ביד נבוכדראצר מלך בבל:

הוא ועמו אתו עריצי גוים מובאים לשחת הארץ והריקו חרבותם על מצרים ומלאו את הארץ חלל

"Thus says the Lord God, I will put an end to the wealth (army?) of Egypt by the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon / He and his people with him, a ruthless nation will be brought to destroy the land and they will pour out their swords upon Egypt and they will fill the land with the slain."

The literary and thematic correspondence between this passage and Exodus 15 is obvious; both deal with divine punishment directly inflicted by Yahweh upon the Egyptians. The main thematic difference would be that Exodus 15 is placed in a narrative of delivering the Israelites, whereas Ezek. 30.11 is within the context of divine punishment upon foreign nations. The cross-over between the two themes is certainly related, as the punishment of other nations is tied to the deliverance or execution of justice for Yahweh and the House of Israel.

The chronological implications of this inter-textuality will need to be discussed within the larger framework of other military vocabulary in Exodus 15. The corresponding themes and imagery is strong enough to indicate that there is a degree of inter-textuality between these passages, however the remainder of information needs to be considered together in order to establish any possible relationship.

פרשים (vii)

The פרשים, from פָּרַשׁ, is commonly defined as *horsemen* and occasionally as a *team of horses/steed*.⁵²⁶ While BDB notes a marginal use of פָּרַשׁ as a less common synonym of סוּס, KB

526. BDB sub פָּרַשׁ II. Hiph. pierce, sting. (cf. As. *parussu*, staff (which pierces); Aram. (ox-goad). KB sub פָּרַשׁ. Jeremy A. Black, A. R. George, and J. N. Postgate, *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999). sub *parussu* (a sharp stick)jB; <Sum. In the 8th campaign letter Sargon says he and his cavalry "plunged into his midst like a furious javelin". F Thureau-Dangin, *Tablettes chaldéennes inédites* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1897). Line 133.

proposes that the פרשים are the team of horses attached to the chariot as reflected particularly in passages in Exodus, Kings and Samuel. Mowinckel is cited as stating this is the only meaning for פרשים in the entire Hebrew Bible. Lisowsky notes *horses for riding*, rather than chariot horses, as a secondary meaning for the פרש.⁵²⁷

The primary definition of the verb form of פרש is *to separate, to distinguish*,⁵²⁸ and *to make distinct*⁵²⁹. Gesenius proposes an association with the Akkadian term for horseman, *pethalli*, meaning literally *crotch opener*⁵³⁰ by creating a Hebrew etymology based on "separating the legs" to ride.⁵³¹ Although this etymology may be attractive, it fails to acknowledge the Akkadian cognate *parasu* which carries the related meaning, *to cut (off); decide* and *to pick out, select, person, animal, grain*.⁵³² The direct cognates to the Hebrew פרש as horsemen is Jewish Aramaic, Old Aramaic, Egyptian Aramaic, Mandaean,⁵³³ Syriac *parrāšā* (horseman), Tigrean *fāres* and Arabic *faras* (horse), *fāris* (horseman).⁵³⁴ The corresponding lexical form and semantic range in Semitic languages thus appears to be limited to Aramaic and later Aramaic derivatives.⁵³⁵

527.Lisowsky sub פרש.

528.KB sub פרש.

529.BDB sub פרש.

530.AHW sub *pethallu*. *petu* + *hallu* meaning 'open' + 'thighs'.

531.Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm Gesenius and Edward Robinson, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Including the Biblical Chaldee* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1883).

532.Black, George, and Postgate, *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. sub *parasu(m)* I.

533.Drower and Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary*, 363a.

534.KB sub פרש.

535.O. R. Gurney disputes a proposed Hittite origin put forward by Sayce. O. R. Gurney, *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly* (1937): 194f.

פרש with the semantic range of *horse/horseman* is attested fifty-one times in the MT. The most dense groupings are found in the books of Exodus (7x), Samuel (5x), Kings (11x), Chronicles (9x), Isaiah (7x) and Ezekiel (6x). The term appears one time in Hosea, Joel, Nahum, Habakkuk, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Joshua and Jeremiah, respectively. Almost exactly half of the uses are in narrative discourse with another 5 spoken within a narrative as direct discourse. The remaining occurrences are used in poetic discourse or poetic prophecy.

פרש is found in an explicit battle setting 25 times,⁵³⁶ and in parallel with other military terminology or in a military context another seven times.⁵³⁷ A common mention of the פרשים is within lists of tribute from captured nations or lists of power and wealth such as paragraphs detailing the achievements of Solomon.⁵³⁸ Outside of these two settings the פרשים are found in four verses as positions of prestige;⁵³⁹ in Joel 2.4 as a metaphor for locusts; Gen. 50.9 possibly as part of funerary procession; 2 Kgs 2.12 and 13.14 as figurative speech for Elisha and Elijah on their passing;⁵⁴⁰ in an indeterminate status in Isa. 21.7 and 21.9 where it speaks of the fall of Babylon, and in a passage in Ezek. 27.14 which speaks of the livestock trade of Beth-Togarmah.

In 34 of the 51 occurrences the פרשים are either paired explicitly or paralleled within a sentence or passage with the רכב. The occurrences where the chariot is not mentioned are found

536.Exod. 14.9, 14.17, 14.23, 14.26, 14.28; Josh. 24.6; 1 Sam. 8.11, 13.5; 2 Sam. 1.6, 8.4, 10.18; 1 Kgs 20.20; Isa. 22.6; Jer. 4.29, 46.4; Ezek. 38.4; Hos. 1.7; Nah. 3.3; Hab. 1.8; Dan. 11.40; Ezra 8.22; Neh. 2.9; 1 Chron. 19.6; 2 Chron. 12.3, 16.8.

537.Exod. 15.19; 1 Kgs 1.5; 2 Kgs 18.24; Isa. 31.1, 36.9; Ezek. 26.7, 26.10.

538.1 Kgs 4.26, 9.19, 10.26; 2 Kgs 13.7; 1 Chron. 18.4; 2 Chron. 1.14, 8.6, 9.25.

539.1 Kgs 9.22, Isa. 22.7; Ezek. 23.6, 23.12.

540.2 Kgs 2.12, 13.14.

almost exclusively in Isaiah,⁵⁴¹ Ezekiel,⁵⁴² Ezra,⁵⁴³ Nehemiah⁵⁴⁴ and the minor prophets⁵⁴⁵ with only a few in Kings and Samuel.⁵⁴⁶ The typical word pair of פרשים/רכב is primarily based in Exodus, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles.

The lexeme is used also within 1QM as a term for the cavalry in the descriptions of the battle arrangement (1QM 6.8, 6.9, 6.11, 6.14, 12.9, 19.1).⁵⁴⁷ The description of the army in 1QM includes the cavalry and the regular infantry without mention of chariots, as would be expected from a late text when chariotry had ceased to operate as a significant military corps. The occurrences of the lexical pairing in 4Q365 6a I, 7 and 4Q365 6b, 3 are referring to the Exodus text.

Within extra-biblical inscriptions פרש is attested in the famous Tel Dan (KAI 310) inscription (Old Aramaic - 8th-9th B.C.E.).⁵⁴⁸ The inscription lines 1:6-1:7 read, וַאֲקַתְלִימֵלְכָנִי [כ]ן [·] (and I killed seventy kings they captured? thousands of רכב and thousands of פרש). This formulae of רכב and פרש in a tributary or booty list is similar to the lists attributed to Solomon in Kings and Chronicles. KAI 202 (Old Aramaic - 8th century B.C.E.), from present-day Tel Afis, also attests this pairing in line B:2 יִלְרַכְבּוּ [ו]ן לַפְרָשׁ. Unfor-

541. Isa. 21.7, 21.9.

542. Ezek. 23.6, 23.12, 26.10, 38.4.

543. Ezra 8.22.

544. Neh. 2.9.

545. Nah. 3.3, Hab. 1.8, Joel 2.4, Hos. 1.7.

546. 2 Sam. 1.6, 8.4; 1 Kgs 9.22, 20.20.

547. Also in 4Q491 1, 3:3.

548. A. Biran and J. Naveh, "The Tel Dan Inscription," *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1995): 1-18. B. Halpern, "The Stele From Dan: Epigraphic and Historical Considerations," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 296 (1994): 63-80. T. Muraoka, "Linguistic Notes on the Aramaic Inscription From Tel Dan," *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1995): 19-21. V. Sasson, "The Old Aramaic Inscription From Tel Dan: Philological, Literary and Historical Aspects," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 40 (1995): 11-30.

tunately the line and immediate context is fragmentary, however, the larger context is of Baalshamyn promising to destroy the assembled armies of Aram.⁵⁴⁹

The semantic range between *horse* and *horseman* in the MT and some cognates makes it difficult to clearly identify the particular meaning at any point in the text without referring to the context. As KB notes, the purely philological evidence is not clear; the plural form vocalised on the nominal *qattāl* makes it difficult to distinguish *qatal* (generally defined as *horse*) from *qattāl* (generally defined as *horseman*).⁵⁵⁰ In the same fashion as רכב there is ambiguity in the precise definition, which must be inferred from the context; while Jer. 4.29 (מקול פרש ורמה קשת) - at the shout of horsemen and bowmen) clearly indicates cavalry and not simply horses, Ezek. 27.14 seems to mean horses and not horsemen (מבית תוגרמה סוסים ופרשים ופרדים נתנו עזבוניך) - from Beth Togarmah horses and פרשים and mules they traded your wares).

As noted previously the majority of MT verses mention פרש together with רכב, either directly (רכב ופרש) or within the same sentence. The occurrence of פרש with רכב also occurs in Exod. 15.19, which is the focus of this study: "כי בא סוס פרעה ברכבו ובפרשיו בים" - for went the horse of Pharaoh and his רכב and his פרשי in the sea." This pairing together with the flexibility in the meaning of רכב, particularly in the case of Exodus 15, has encouraged proposals such as Mowinckel's interpretation of פרשים in the MT exclusively meaning a pair of horses for the chariot.

However, although the meaning is often ambiguous in cases (horses of Pharaoh and his *chariot* and his *horseman*? or horses of Pharaoh and his *chariot* and his *chariot horses*?), Mowinckel's statement that all occurrences of פרש in the MT are representative of a *horse team* is im-

549.A. Lemaire, "La stèle araméenne de Bar-Hadad," *Orientalia* 53 (1984): 337-349. A. Millard, "Alphabetic Inscriptions on Ivories from Nimrud," *Iraq* 24 (1962): 41-51. A. Millard, "The Inscription of Zakkur, King of Hamath," in *The Context of Scripture*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

550.KB sub פרש.

probable; the alternative interpretation of *driver* or *charioteer* is also questionable as the text often seems clear in identifying the פרשים as distinct from the רכב. 1 Kings 9.19 and 2 Chron. 8.6 assign the פרשים to a separate city than the רכב when mentioning the wealth of Solomon (פרשי ערי - cities of רכב and ערי הרכב ואת ערי הפרשים). In addition to this, 1 Kings 9.22 lists the פרשים along with the שרי רכבו (heads of chariots) as a separate position (שריו ושלשיו ושרי) (פרשי - chiefs of his רכב and שלישי - chiefs of his פרשי). 1 Kings 13.7 also infers this distinction, as it mentions that Jehoahaz was left with only fifty פרשים and ten רכב. The proportion cannot mean fifty chariot drivers and ten chariots, or fifty chariot horses and ten chariots, when the meaning of fifty cavalry and ten chariots is simple and proportionally accurate. Finally, Ezek. 23.6 states, פרשים רכבי סוסים (horsemen mounted on horses), which cannot be any clearer in defining the פרש as horsemen and not charioteers or chariot horses.

This distinction then would carry to Exod. 15.19 where the סוס (horse) appears before the mention of "his" (presumably Pharaoh) רכב and פרש.⁵¹ Mowinckel's "team of horses" thus becomes superfluous and does not maintain a narrative flow in these verses as the text would mention the team of horses, the horses and the chariots. The LXX supports this conclusion with the parallel ἵππος Φαραω σὺν ἄρμασιν καὶ ἀναβάταις (horse of Pharaoh and his chariots and riders).

Although Mowinckel's proposal of *team of horses* for the Exodus 15 occurrence of פרש is doubtful, ambiguity exists in the interpretation of the *horseman* as the driver of a chariot or a rider of a horse. The most probable interpretation for the attestations in Exodus 15 is to consider the פרש as *horsemen* or *cavalry*, due to the LXX parallels, as well as the larger MT patterns of usage when referring to the רכב ופרש.

⁵¹Exodus 14.9: 'כל סוס פרעה ופרשיו'; Exodus 14.23: 'כל סוס רכב פרעה ופרשיו'.

Although the ἀναβάται lexeme used in Exod. 15.19 can mean *charioteer*, *rider* or *mounted messenger* (similar to the flexible רכב in MT Hebrew), this parallel Greek lexeme is less common than the frequent Greek parallel to the MT פרש, ἵππεύς (horseman). Thus the Greek parallel is generally explicit with using the specific lexeme for *horsemen/cavalry* when in parallel with פרש, indicating that פרש is more likely a *horseman* than a charioteer. Also, within the MT the common lexeme for a charioteer is רכב.

The distribution of the phrase רכב ופרש (this pair only occurs once in reverse in 2 Kgs 13.7 where it clearly means horsemen and chariots), either in a direct pair or a parallel within a sentence, occurs in thirty MT verses and heavily within Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah and Exodus. The phrase is often used when referring to Egypt (Gen. 50.9; Exod. 14.9, 14.17, 14.18, 14.23, 14.26, 14.28, 15.19; Josh. 24.6; Isa. 36.9; 2 Kgs 18.24) and Babylon or Assyria (Isa. 21.7; Ezek. 23.6, 23.12; Dan. 11.40?). In regard to the Exodus 15 occurrence, the most interesting parallel is Ezek. 26.7, which reflects the Exodus formation exactly. Yahweh states that he will bring from the north, king Nebuchadrezzar, king of kings, with horse and רכב and פרש (בסוס וברכב ובפרשים). This is the single exact lexical parallel to the mention in Exodus 15 of פרשו וברכבו.

The distribution of the פרש within Chronicles, Kings and Samuel provides an interesting pattern as all of the Chronicles occurrences of פרש are within the shared narrative (1 Chron. 18.4::2 Sam. 8.4; 1 Chron. 19.6::2 Sam. 10.6; 2 Chron. 1.14::1 Kgs 10.26::2 Chron. 9.25::1 Kgs 5.6; 2 Chron. 8.9::1 Kgs 9.22; 2 Chron. 8.6::1 Kgs 9.19; 2 Chron 16.8::1 Kgs 15; 2 Chron. 12.3::1 Kgs 14). The final two verses listed, 2 Chron. 16.8 and 12.3, are omitted in the parallel Kings narrative. Interestingly in both cases the narrative acknowledges the omission of these verses, stating the other events can be found in the ספר דברי הימים למלכי יהודה. 2 Chronicles 16.8 mentions the Lybians and Cushites as a mighty army with רכב and פרש delivered into the hands of Asa. 2 Chronicles 12.3 also mentions the Lybians, Cushites and Sukkim from Egypt under Shishak with their רכב and פרש attacking Israel in the reign of Rehoboam.

Although all of the Chronicles occurrences are either acknowledged as exempt or shared within Kings/Samuel, the books of Kings contain several verses with no parallel in Chronicles (1 Kgs 1.5 [of Adonijah], 20.20 [of Ben-Hadad of Aram], 2.12 [of Elisha], 13.7 [of Elisha], 13.14 [of Elisha]). The one parallel narrative which is also found in Chronicles, albeit without mention of the פֶּרֶשׁ, is in 2 Kgs 18.24 (the attack of Sennacherib and speech of his representative). This narrative parallels 2 Chronicles 32 and Isaiah 36. In the Kings narrative, the רַב שְׂקָה taunts Hezekiah in Jerusalem that they are relying on Egypt for רֶכֶב וּפָרָשִׁים. This taunt (and wider narrative) is exactly paralleled in Isa. 36.9. The phrase does not occur in 2 Chronicles as the narrative is very different. The speech from the Assyrian is focussed on Hezekiah's claim of divine deliverance from Yahweh against the might of the Assyrians being stronger than the god of any nation. The narrative in Kings demonstrates greater knowledge of the Assyrian terms (רַב שְׂקָה is missing in Chronicles version) and is more detailed than the Chronicles account.

The literary implications of the פֶּרֶשׁ within the MT text are fairly few. The first observation to be made involves the social implications of reading the פָּרָשִׁים through the context of the ἵππῆες of Archaic Greek society and the status of the Persian nobles as horsemen. It is likely that the פָּרָשִׁים of the MT are similarly endowed with privileged status and societal position. The MT provides enough internal evidence to support the social definition of the פָּרָשִׁים as a select social group, both through its literary use of the term and the linguistic base of פָּרָשִׁים. The literary context of the term supports understanding פָּרָשִׁים with the added nuance of a group separate or distinguished as through a high social status.

The פָּרָשִׁים as a distinguished social group is explicit in at least four passages. In Ezek. 23.6 and 23.12 the Assyrians are described as, "warriors clothed in purple, governors and commanders, all of them desirable young men, פָּרָשִׁים riding on horses". 2 Chron. 8.9 and the parallel passage in 1 Kgs 9.22 mention the subjugation of foreigners as slaves for Israel, "But of the

people of Israel Solomon made no slaves for his work; they were soldiers, and his officers, ושרי, "רכבו ופרשיו".⁵⁵² Further the Solomonic lists of power and building prowess can be further nuanced by understanding the פרשים as not only requiring great wealth and bestowing power but also being indicative of vast prestige and culture.⁵⁵³

The MT references to the פרשים provide some historical background to the texts as the lexeme is fairly common and includes details about the weapons, armour or function of the פרש. Although the phrase רכב ופרש seems to often be used as a stock literary motif, a hendiadys for describing the military force other than the infantry, it is presumably based on the historical background of the writer in which the military was composed primarily of chariots and horsemen.

Eighteen of the MT verses provide ancillary information on the פרש. Five of these occurrences mention the פרש pursuing (καταδιώκω/רדף) a victim.⁵⁵⁴ Joel contains a simile stating, "Their appearance is like the appearance of horses and like פרשים they pursue". Habakkuk 1.8 mentions the horsemen of Babylon who "gallop forward and fly like an eagle for prey".⁵⁵⁵ This language and context of pursuit is familiar to the function of horsemen targeting broken or fleeing infantry formations.⁵⁵⁶

552. Depending on how you interpret 1 Kgs 2.12, Elisha's lamentation at the ascension of Elijah could be added to this list, 'My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and its פרשים'. If this scene is symbolic of Elisha and Elijah then the פרשים as a distinguished social class is easily read from the association.

553. 1 Kgs 4.26, 1 Kgs 9.19, 1 Kgs 10.26, 2 Chron. 1.14, 2 Chron. 8.6, 2 Chron. 9.25.

554. Exod. 14.9, Exod. 14.23, Josh. 24.6, 1 Kgs 21.20, Joel 2.4.

555. This is interesting as the Hittite word *piddalli* related to the Akkadian *pethalli* functions as an adjective meaning *swift*, and said of eagles. "Go and [summon] for me the sw[ift]eagle. They went and [summoned] the swi[ft] eagle." KUB 33.80:6-7.' Hans Gustav Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner, *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980), sub *piddalli*.

556. This theme can be observed repeatedly in the Assyrian battle reliefs from Sargon's palace in Khorsabad, the Balawat bronzes or Ashurnasirpal's palace in Nimrud. The theme can also be seen explicitly in literary tradition such as Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* 4.3, where the Hyrcanians and Medes pursue the fleeing enemy to plunder and kill, and also in 7.1.28 where the cavalry is noted as

Passages containing details on the panoply associated with the פרשים are few. Nahum 3.3 portrays a cavalry engaged in a forward advance with חרב (swords) and חנית (javelin).⁵⁵⁷ Only two other passages describe the panoply of the horsemen with any further details. Jeremiah 46.4 mentions the horsemen mounting and taking their stations with כובע (helmet), רמח (spear) and סריון (breastplate).⁵⁵⁸ Ezekiel 38.4 refers to the ambiguous צנה, מגן (shield) and חרב (sword);⁵⁵⁹ the LXX includes the breastplate, πέλται (light shield), helmet and sword.⁵⁶⁰ The panoply attested in these occurrences would appear to be most similar to the later horsemen of the Persian period with their armour, shield (yet lack of bow) and organized charges.⁵⁶¹ The text, however, is generally too ambiguous with the details to provide any positive identification of the standard horseman panoply.

Another passage which may be compared against the historical ancient Near East is Isa. 21.7-9, which contains two mentions of the פרשים. Yet these mentions occur in such an ambiguous fashion as to leave uncertainty over the proper translation. The text speaks of the fall of Babylon and tells the watchman to watch for "horsemen in pairs" (וראה רכב צמד פרשים).⁵⁶² If translated as such it resonates with the Assyrian reliefs' portrayal of horsemen operating together in pairs, either as a steward and bowman or a mounted spearman and bowman together.⁵⁶³

targeting and killing those who escape the initial onslaught and chariots. It should be emphasised here that this language is not indicative of chariot corps whose function would not be to pursue or chase down enemy as they were simply too bulky and clumsy.

557. חרב/ῥομφαλας; חנית/ἄκων. The Greek is generically of weapons or armour and doesn't mention spears specifically.

558. Helmets: כובע/περικεφαλαίαι. Spear: רמח/δόρατα. Mail-Breastplate: סריון/θώρακας.

559. צנה. Shield: מגן. Sword: חרב.

560. Breastplate: θώρακας. Light shield: πέλται. Helmet: περικεφαλαίαι. Sword: μάχαιραι.

561. Refer to Appendix I notes on the Persian cavalry.

562. Is. 21.7, 'וראה רכב צמד פרשים רכב חמור'. Is. 21.9, 'והנה זה בא רכב איש צמד פרשים'.

563. Cf. former section on Assyrian cavalry. The dating and even the setting of this passage are not certain. Scholars such as Procksch, Eichrodt, Clements, Wildberger assign it to the sixth century around 540 with the events associated with Cyrus and the fall of the Neo-Babylonian empire. The

The only other mention of riders in pairs (פרשים צמדים) rather than פרשים can be found in 2 Kgs 9.25 where Jehu reminds his aide (שלשה) of when they rode paired behind Ahab. This little sentence is notable not only because it refers to this practice of riding in pairs, but also because the word used for Jehu's aide is שלשה, which is amended to the more probable שלשו. This title, as discussed above, is likely a loan word from the Assyrian term for one member of the chariot crew, *taslisu* (third man).⁵⁶⁴ This שלישי was a post 9th century addition to the Assyrian chariot.⁵⁶⁵ In an Assyrian framework, Bidkar the שלשה would be the steward who was paired with the mounted Jehu.⁵⁶⁶

Although פרשים is used in the MT mostly to describe the military divisions of foreigners, fourteen of the occurrences reference an Israelite/Judahite cavalry. All of these occurrences, apart from one which speaks of the prospective king in Samuel, are found in the books of Kings and Chronicles. This use of פרש in reference to domestic military is interesting when compared to one of the only references to Israel's military from an extra-biblical source. The Assyrian royal inscriptions indicate that when Shalmeneser III took spoil after the battle of Qarqar he took only chariotry, and no cavalry, from Ahab of Samaria.⁵⁶⁷ In Sargon's royal inscriptions Samaria

other option, originally presented by Cobb and Barnes a hundred years ago, was recently revived by Erlandsson, Hayes and Irvine. It relates the passage to various Assyrian campaigns against the Babylonian chieftain, Merodach-baladan, in the eighth century B.C.E., or a focus on Sargon II's conquest of Babylon in 710. Finally Macintosh argues that it can best be described as a palimpsest that reflects in both an original eighth century level and a subsequent sixth-century reinterpretation.

564. Jack Sasson, ed., *Ancient Mesopotamian Military Organization*, Civilizations of the Ancient Near East, vol. 1 (New York: Hendricksons, 2000), 420.

565. D. J. Wiseman, "The Assyrians," in *Warfare in the Ancient World*, ed. John Hackett (New York: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1989), 42.

566. It is also possible that *riding paired* refers to a chariot with Jehu, Bidkar and Ahab. Even so this falls in line with Littauer, Crouwel et al. and their evolution of chariotry into cavalry along with the vocabulary. See also Dalley's explanation on the flexible meaning of *rab urate*.

567. Damascus: 1200 chariots 1200 cavalry 20 000 infantry. Hamath 700 chariots, 700 cavalry, 10 000 infantry. Israel 2000 chariots, 10 000 infantry. Que 500 infantry. Musri; 1000 infantry. Irqatana: 10 chariots, 10 000 infantry. Arpad 200 infantry. Usanata: 200 infantry. Shian 30 chariotry 10 000 infantry. The Arabs of Gindubu: 1000 camel riders. Ammon: 1000...infantry.

is unique in contributing only chariotry and no cavalry, in contrast to its northern neighbours Hamath and Carchemesh.⁵⁶⁸ Thus, although the MT attributes cavalry to Solomon, Adonijah and Jehoahaz, the extra-biblical evidence does not attest a cavalry corps within the military force of Israel or Samaria. This lack of a cavalry and trained horsemen may also be reflected in the 2 Kgs 18.23::Isa. 36.8 taunt by the Assyrian (ועתה התערב נא את אדני המלך אשור ואתנה לך) רב שקה Assyrian (Now, please make this wager with my lord the king of Assyria, I'll give you two thousand horses if you are able to put riders on them). The context of the taunt plays on Judah not having the ability to field horsemen, even if they had the horses.

These observations on the historical reflections within the MT text, the historical use of the cavalry and chariot within the ancient Near East, and the occurrence of the פרש in Exodus 15 provide a strong chronological frame of reference for the Exodus 15 passage. The account of the flight of Israel from Egypt in Exodus 14-15 provides the highest frequency of פרשים in the Hebrew Bible (7 occurrences in Exod. 14.9, 14.17, 14.18, 14.23, 14.26, 14.28 and 15.19). The account is structured as a classic military scenario of flight and pursuit. In chapter 14 the military setting is heightened by the use of battle vocabulary, including chariotry and the verb *καταδιώκω* in the LXX and רדף in the MT, which characteristically describes the military pursuit of fleeing armies and combatants.⁵⁶⁹

This textual emphasis on a pursuing Egyptian military force consisting of chariotry and horsemen is not representative of a historical background anytime before the ninth-tenth centuries B.C.E.⁵⁷⁰ The military description of a division of horsemen within the military structure

568.S. Dalley considers this evidence enough for considering the Samarian *rab urate* of the Nimrud Horse Lists to be charioteers and not horsemen. Stephanie Dalley, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II," *Iraq* 47 (1985): 31-48.

569.BDB sub רדף. Cf. *Cyropaedia* for necessity of mounted troops in order to catch fleeing combatants. Also the *Anabasis* for info on one night march to put enough ground between forces.

570.As noted in the introduction conventional dating would place the Exodus in the 15th or 13th centuries B.C.E. For a detailed historical investigation of the emergence of cavalry in the ancient

of a pursuit force is indicative of a cavalry division that only appeared much later historically than the intended setting of this narrative.⁵⁷¹ Further, there is no material evidence to suggest that the Egyptian military at any chronological point would have contained any substantial numbers of mounted men, and certainly not a core military division of mounted horsemen operating as cavalry.⁵⁷²

(c) A review of military lexemes and trends in Exodus 15

(i) Function, cognates and loanwords

The military lexical body in Exodus 15 does not attest any particularly difficult or obscure lexemes. All of the terms are well attested throughout the MT and several have cognates and attestations in extra-biblical literature: מרכבה has Ugaritic, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac and Mandaean cognates and is later borrowed into Egyptian *mrkbt*; רכב is attested in Ugaritic and Akkadian; חיל also in Ugaritic, Arabic, Jewish Aramaic, Phoenician and Akkadian; שליש most likely identified with Akkadian *tašlišu*; חרב in Ugaritic, Samaritan, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaean; and פרש in Jewish Aramaic, Old Aramaic, Egyptian Aramaic, Mandaean, Syriac and Arabic. The military vocabulary thus seems common throughout the ancient Near East but particularly to the Mesopotamian region, as only מרכבה is attested as a loanword in Egypt.

The one probable loanword in the military vocabulary is the Hebrew שליש which corresponds both in the lexical form, semantic range, usage and context with the Akkadian *tašlišu*.

Near East refer to Appendix I.

571. Intended as far as traditional biblical interpreters would place it within the second millennium B.C.E. What the authors actually intended is a different and probably unknown variable.

572. Even the existence of a chariot division is doubtful at this point in Egyptian history. Outside of a few individual protocols the Egyptian chariotry is not considered to be a distinct and separate arm of the military in Eighteenth Dynasty textual sources. Alan Richard Schulman, *Military Rank, Title, and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom*, *Münchner Ägyptologische Studien*, vol. 6 (Berlin: B. Hessling, 1964), 14.

The MT attests the term both within a military context but also as a title of social distinction or function (as adjutant to the king).

(ii) Patterns of distribution and usage

The patterns of distribution and usage of the military vocabulary in Exodus 15 bear several strong connections to the prophetic books of Ezekiel and Isaiah and also to the narrative books of Kings and Chronicles in particular.

איש מלחמה as a description for Yahweh occurs only here in Exod. 15.3 and in Isa. 42:13. **מרכבה** is a common lexeme and appears throughout the MT, though the highest density of use occurs in Kings and Chronicles. Likewise, **רכב** is an extremely common term in the MT, however the repeated usage in Exodus 15 within the pairing **סוס ורכב** narrows the distribution to once in Deuteronomy, Joshua, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Haggai respectively, and four times in the books of Kings. The phrase also occurs twice in 11QT's description of military battle plans, clearly referencing Deut. 20.1, which itself echoes Exodus 15 (..when you go to war against your enemy and see **סוס ורכב** and many people, have no fear, for the lord your god is with you who brought you out of Egypt). **שליש** attests a very clear pattern of distribution, with occurrences in Exodus 14-15, Samuel, Kings, Ezekiel and Chronicles. **פרש** also exhibits a strong pattern along this distribution with the majority of occurrences in Exodus 14-15, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah and Ezekiel with only one occurrence each in Hosea, Joel, Nahum, Habakkuk, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Joshua and Jeremiah; the lexeme also appears in KAI 310 (Tel Dan inscription). Lastly, the phrase **אריק חרבי** in Exod. 15.9 only appears in this form in Ezek. 28.8 and 30.11, with variants in Ezek. 5.2, 5.12, and 12.14.

The vocabulary is thus strongly related to Ezekiel, Isaiah, Kings and Chronicles in particular. The contexts and uses of **איש מלחמה**, **שליש** and **אריק חרבי** all display this pattern of distribution clearly. Although relatively common in the MT, several of the lexemes exhibit reduced at-

testation in Qumran sectarian manuscripts—though they continue to be used when referencing to known biblical passages.

(iii) Lexical replacement, semantic shift

Several of the terms in the body of military vocabulary evidence semantic variance in their MT or extra-biblical attestations. מרכב is used commonly outside of the MT for a *saddle* or *seat*, yet this usage is only found three times in the MT (Lev. 15.9, 1 Kgs 5.6 and Song 3.10) and the main meaning of *chariot* is generally used. Within Qumran sectarian manuscripts, the מרכבה is representative of the Ark or item of the holy sanctum. This seems to indicate a semantic shift from the use as chariot/wheeled vehicle through to the holy item itself. 1 Kgs 7.33 may represent this semantic development as it compares the wheels of the Ark to being like the wheels of a chariot. The only MT occurrence with the semantic range found in Qumran is 1 Chron. 28.18, which mentions the gold for the form of the chariot cherubim.

The שליש, although likely a historical military function tied to the three-man chariot, transfers the inherent meaning of a military adjutant to a social setting as the lexeme comes to mean a societal function as a leader or adjutant to the king; this can be noted in 2 Kgs 7.2 and 7.17. Also, Ezekiel 23 describes the Chaldean leaders and the sons of Babylon as שליש, סגן and פחה, all Assyrian or Babylonian titles of social position and leadership.

רכב also has a range of semantic forms, although it would be difficult to assign any particular diachronic shift in usage. It is likely the generic meaning of *mount* or *move forward* provided a broad enough base to support parallel semantic development. This is also the case with פרש: while Jer. 4.29 clearly uses the lexeme to represent cavalry, Ezek. 27.14 would seem to mean horses and not horsemen.

The unique example of clear lexical replacement in the Exodus 15 military vocabulary is found in the attestation of איש מלחמה in Exod. 15.3, which is replaced by גיבור במלחמה in the

Samaritan Pentateuch. This is a unique construction in the MT; the closest form of this occurs in Eccl. 9.11, or extra-biblically in 1QM 12.9 which attests a גבור המלח[מה] within the context of אדוני/אל going out to battle against the enemy.

(iv) Literary context and genre

According to the results of the study of military vocabulary, the literary context and genre of Exodus 15 is distinctly associated with the context and genre of the prophetic passages in Ezekiel and Isaiah. The military lexemes are either associated with these prophetic texts through distribution, or through their function and context. As noted above, איש מלחמה is found only in Isaiah and Exod. 15.3 as descriptive of Yahweh and shows similarity to the military-coloured יהוה צבאות found commonly in prophetic texts (almost all uses are found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi).

The phrase אריק חרב not only attests a strong distribution pattern in Exodus 15.9 and Ezekiel, but the context and setting of the Ezekiel passages corresponds with the exodus narrative. Ezekiel 30.11 in particular prophesies the punishment of Egypt through Nebuchadrezzer king of Babylon; the divine punishment of Egypt through Babylon paralleling the divine destruction of Egypt in the exodus. This theme of punishment of nations and the execution of justice through the power of Yahweh alone is clearly at the forefront of both texts. This association between Nebuchadrezzer of Babylon and the punishment of Egypt is also found in Ezek. 26.7. This is the only passage outside of Exodus 15 to use the same phrase ובפרשים וברכב ובפרשים as a description of a military force when describing Yahweh bringing Nebuchadrezzer down from the north to punish Egypt.

The passages discussed from Ezekiel consistently display correspondence with the exodus account and the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15. The passages speak of bringing Egypt to Sheol, of covering Egypt in the depths of the earth. Ezekiel 32.16 even begins a lament with

these words, *this is a lament and it will be lamented by the daughters of the nations*, (קינה היא וקונגוה בנות הגוים) and then continues with the destruction of Egypt to the depths of the earth in the pit. Ezekiel 31.15 does not contain an introduction to the song similar to 32.16, but parallels Exodus 15 more closely. Mentioning the destruction of Egypt, the text states, *I closed over it the deep and held the rivers and all the great sea* (כסתי עליו את תהום ואמנע נהרותיה ויכלאו מים רבים).

The strong literary correspondence between Exodus 15 and the prophetic passages of Ezekiel indicate a level of inter-textuality or some shared poetic history. This literary relationship was noted in the beginning of the twentieth century by A. H. McNeile. McNeile disputed the evidence of Aramaisms for dating the text as late as the fifth century B.C.E., stating that, "the content, style and language of the song are best explained by supposing that a writer of the exile draws encouragement from the ancient deliverance of his people, and looks forward with certainty to seeing the people of Yahweh once again brought in to the mountain of His inheritance and to the sanctuary which His hands had established."⁵⁷³ This reference point of the exodus as a basis of deliverance from Babylon is found often in Isaiah where the exodus commonly provides a background for the return out of Babylon.⁵⁷⁴

(v) Historical and chronological implications

The study of military vocabulary in Exodus 15 resulted in several lexemes with inherent chronological and historical implications. The patterns of distribution and usage as well as the literary context and genre indicate the vocabulary is similar to that used in the prophetic writings of Ezekiel and Isaiah and also within the narratives of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. Several of the associated passages, particularly in Ezekiel, clearly have a *terminus ad quem* in the

573. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus, With Introduction and Notes*, 89.

574. Isa. 43.16, 43.18, 48.21, 51.9-11, 52.4,5, 63.11-14

Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian era as they reference Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.E) as well as Nebuchadnezzar (630-562 B.C.E.).

The Exodus 15 text contains two points of chronological and historical evidence not based solely on the literary and lexical correspondence: the portrayal of the Egyptian military force as using the cavalry as a major military arm and the use of the *שליש* military loanword.

As noted in the historical discussion of *פרש* contained in Appendix I and referenced in the *פרש* examination, the emergence of cavalry as a military corps in the ancient Near East only begins to appear at the very end of the eighth century B.C.E. These first attestations of the cavalry as a distinct military corps occurs in the material evidence of Sennacherib's reign. According to the Assyrian reliefs, this military corps is only fully established as an independent cavalry in the seventh centuries B.C.E. under Ashurbanipal (631-627 B.C.E.) where it operates together with chariotry and foot soldiers. However, by the end of the seventh century B.C.E. the cavalry had taken over most of the chariotry's role as a mobile fighting unit. This period of combined use of chariotry and cavalry seems most reflective of the Exodus 15 account, which places a strong emphasis on the cavalry as a functioning military arm of the Egyptians.

Historically, the association of cavalry with the Egyptian military is not in accordance with the material evidence from Egypt.⁵⁷⁵ It is not likely that Egypt ever fielded a significant military force of mounted horsemen as an integral part of their military. Further, the inscriptions of Shalmeneser III (859-824 B.C.E.) regarding the battle of Qarqar and the inscriptions of Sargon (722-705 B.C.E.) do not attribute any cavalry to the regions of Israel or Samaria. This

575.Cf. Appendix I and the study of cavalry through the ancient Near East. Commentators such as Keil and Delitzsch are clearly mistaken when they state: 'According to ver. 9, the army raised by Pharaoh consisted of chariot horses (*סוס ורכב*) riding horses (*פרשים* lit. runners 1 Kings v.6), and *חיל*, the men belonging to them. War chariots and cavalry were always the leading force of the Egyptians (cf. Isa. xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 9).' The influence of Assyrian and their conquest of Egypt may have resulted in cavalry troops stationed in Egypt. However, the Egyptians did not field a domestic cavalry corps as an integral part of their military. Keil and Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, 44.

makes it doubtful the military description of the Egyptian force was transposed from the domestic military forces of Israel/Samaria in the eighth-ninth centuries B.C.E.

Thus the MT text of Exodus 15 could be understood as the result of inadvertent anachronisms and historical inaccuracies by an author familiar with mounted warfare as practiced by the Assyrians or neo-Babylonians. In this case, the author wrote the horsemen into a historical situation where they were not used, and among the Egyptians which never used the cavalry as a major military arm. This combined with the central role of the chariots and horsemen in the narrative, as well as the narrative structure of mounted pursuit, indicates a late date for the military aspects of the text—at the earliest ,eighth century B.C.E. when mounted warfare becomes increasingly common across the ancient Near East.⁵⁷⁶

This chronological window may be narrowed further when considering the literary and lexical correspondence with the prophetic texts, particularly Ezekiel. As demonstrated, Ezekiel shows strong literary, lexical and thematic correspondence with the Exodus 15 passage. The use of the Assyrian loanword שליש in particular indicates an association with the military or social vocabulary of Assyria. These points of correspondence with both chronology and history indicate that Exodus 15 is most probably a product of the eighth-sixth centuries B.C.E. and is familiar with Assyrian vocabulary and the general military milieu.

576. Other studies support a late dating of this text, for example D. V. Edelman's study of the literary tradition in the Song of Miriam, suggests, "the battle in question would have had to have taken place either in the 10th century, sometime between the 8th-6th centuries, or in the 5-4th centuries B.C.E." Irene Shirun-Grumach, ed., *The Creation of Exodus 14-15*, Agypten Und Altes Testament, vol. 40 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1998). As mentioned in a previous footnote, textual and linguistic evidence indicates that even the chariotry of 18th Dynasty Egypt was not considered to be a distinctive arm of the military. Perhaps the most interesting textual parallel to later Assyrian military structure is the mention of Pharaoh appointing a שליש, third man, to the chariots in Exodus 14.7. Although this term occurs again in the Hebrew bible it bears an uncanny resemblance here to the Assyrian term for one member of the chariot crew, *taslisu* (third man). Dalley, "Ancient Mesopotamian Military Organization".

As the introduction to the chapter outlined, the Song of the Sea was commonly thought of as a late first millennium composition until the rise of Cross and Freedman's theories and their association of the song with early Ugaritic poetry.⁵⁷⁷ However, the military vocabulary does not accord with this early dating. It is doubtful that the Song or exodus account in its current MT form is an example of early Hebrew poetry. The combined weight of the literary associations, the lexical patterns of distribution, the military loanword, and the depiction of the Egyptian military demonstrate a historical background highly coloured by the military and literary style of the Assyrian eighth to sixth centuries B.C.E.

577. Indeed even Cross/Freedman admitted this: "Of course, it remains possible to see these elements as conscious archaizing such as is found II Isaiah. however, the overall consistency of the linguistic phenomenon would rather point to genuine archaic elements." Cross and Freedman, "The Song of Miriam", 246. Albright also notes the phrase 'inhabitants of Philistia' as an anachronism. Stephen Pisano, *Additions Or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1949), 233. Also, Mowinckel notes that even his interpretation of the horse and chariot would be an anachronism. Mowinckel, "Drive and/Or Ride in O.T."

III. Historical, chronological and literary conclusions of the lexical examination

The examination of the military vocabulary contained in Exodus 15, Judges 5 and 1 Samuel 17 has resulted in several larger trends which affect the introductory questions of historical, chronological and literary implications of military vocabulary. As each chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the results of the examination on its own lexical body there is no need to repeat the individual lexical conclusions here. The interest of the conclusion is to return to the initial three main themes of historical, chronological and literary implications, and examine the results of the lexical examinations against these themes, tying together any larger macro level observations.

1. The literary implications drawn from the lexical examinations

The literary examination of military vocabulary in the selected passages resulted in four notable issues with implications across more than one passage. These four areas to be addressed are: sparsity of military vocabulary in the biblical texts, lexical association between the Song of Deborah and Song of the Sea and prophetic literature, patterns of distribution and usage in the DtrH shared source material, and the occurrence of archaising as a literary device.

(a) The sparsity of military vocabulary in the MT

A common observation through the lexical studies was the general rarity of any military lexeme that was not semantically generic. The **נער**, **הרב** and **מגן** are thus attested commonly as the semantic range is suitably broad enough to cover a multitude of situations. However, a term such as **קלע**, the slinger, is so rare that it only occurs substantively as *sling* or *slinger* three times in the MT (as *sling-stone* a further four times). Yet this sparsity of specialised military lexemes does not reflect the wider ancient Near Eastern milieu where slingers are commonly attested on

reliefs and the sling-stones commonly found in archaeological excavations. Other presumably common lexemes which are not widely attested in the MT include the *ק/כובע* (helmet) appearing eight times, the *ש/סריון* (breastplate) nine times, and the *מצחה* (greave) which appeared only once.

The general military vocabulary of the MT is thus incredibly small and non-descriptive despite no lack of contextual opportunity—there is a consistent military context throughout Joshua, Judges, Kings, Samuel and Chronicles. Surprisingly, the genre of these latter books, as supposedly historical accounts of the establishment of the kingdoms, does not provide any higher concentration of military vocabulary or detail than a prophetic book such as Ezekiel. This similarity of military vocabulary will be questioned below, but it is worth noting here that the genre of the so-called Deuteronomic History does not appear to have any positive effect on the range, number or quality of military vocabulary contained within.

As noted in the introductory discussion on assembling linguistic evidence, the lexical body of the MT and its attested variations is incredibly small. It is comprised of only 8000 lexemes, as compared to the 20,000 to 30,000 of a normal adult speaker. Again, as cautioned in the introduction, a lexeme may be commonly known but only attested if the opportunity exists—as in the example of "thimble"—however, as mentioned, a military setting is common through much of the biblical narrative; opportunity enough, one would suppose, to employ a range of military lexemes when narrating military situations.

The common observation regarding the MT's lack of interest in details—and corresponding lack of descriptive lexemes—is that the MT authors were interested in the wider scope. They used a broader lens when writing history,⁵⁷⁸ unlike the Homeric narrative type of

578. This biblical 'history' is oddly presumed to be the collective stylistic invention of what must have been a disparate group of authors, texts and sources. It seems improbable that such a disparate group of authors, over such a period of time and geography would collectively stumble across the 'broad lens' of history.

close, detailed and thorough descriptions. Is it possible, however, that the difference in literary style has less to do with the fragmentary authorship, and more to do with the information and sources available to these authors? If much of the MT narrative regarding history and military was composed from oral sources or common legends, would a detailed military lexical body accompany this?⁵⁷⁹ Intuitively it seems improbable that an oral history or collective memory would preserve unknown lexemes without altering them, adding an interpretative gloss, or abandoning them altogether. However, it seems probable that redactors, or those compiling textual sources, would attempt to preserve lexical information even if not understood. The David/Goliath narrative and its variants appear to attest at least two examples of this preservation: the apparent gloss for the *hapax legomenon* ילקוט (כלי רעם) in 1 Sam. 17:40⁵⁸⁰, and 2 Sam. 21:19's attempt to rationalise the מנור ארגים in the corrupted shared source with 1 Chron. 20:5.⁵⁸¹ If it is presumed that unique lexical details would have been preserved in textual sources, it is probable that the lack of military lexemes in narrative such as Joshua or Judges indicate that the authors were not drawing on earlier, more descriptive texts when composing these narratives.

The examination of the Song of Deborah in Judges 5 provided a stark example of this basic lack of military vocabulary in Joshua, Judges and the Pentateuch. Of the nine military lexemes in Judges 5 only four were attested elsewhere in these books. Of those four, two were only attested in one other occurrence! One of these terms is רמח, a spear, which occurs only twice in

579. Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective", 132. For example in his article on the depiction of Philistines in the MT, Finkelstein argues that the DtrH would not have been completed until 'late monarchic' at earliest. So, if anything is older than that it must be oral history. The question is, do lexemes get passed on in oral history as compared to textual sources. Collective memory may remember themes, but perhaps not terms? The idea of collective memory is potentially a more fruitful avenue of scholarship rather than attempting to discover discrete oral sources. However identifying what is accurate, rather than popular history, is problematic.

580. Hans Joachim Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. XVII 1-XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta," *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 409.

581. ויך אלחנן בן יעור [יעיר] את לחמי אחי גלית הגתי compared to ויך אלחנן בן יערי ארגים בית הלחמי את גלית הגתי. Neither is necessarily more accurate than the other, they both seem confused about what exactly is going on.

all of the Pentateuch, Joshua and Judges (Judg. 5:8 and Num. 25:7) with no other term for *spear* occurring as a lexical replacement. It is nothing short of bizarre that the *spear*, a basic weapon of the ancient Near East, is mentioned only twice in the stories of the Patriarchs, Israel's time in Egypt, the Exodus, the military conquest of Canaan and the entire Judges cycle.

The lack of a consistent or detailed military vocabulary throughout the MT thus raises questions about the literary sources available and the lexical body familiar to an author writing a text without any historical sources.

(b) The literary and thematic associations with prophetic literature

The theme of Yahweh as a divine power exercised through military leaders occurs throughout all three examined passages. The depiction of Yahweh as a divine warrior has been a common focus of scholarly writing; many scholars struggle with the descriptions of divinely sanctioned war and a militant Yahweh.⁵⁸² As noted in the introduction, the theological issue of holy war and Yahweh the warrior are not of interest to this thesis, and are considered to be mainly rhetorical vehicles for the expression of ideology or social messages.⁵⁸³ However, the relationship of these themes of oppression, exile, gaining land, divine protection and the divine annihilation of foreigners between Exodus 15, Judges 5, 1 Samuel 17 and prophetic texts is of interest.

582. von Rad's *Holy War in Ancient Israel* is the seminal text. Gerhard von Rad and Marva J. Dawn, *Holy War in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1991). Pages 135-136 contain an annotated bibliography by Judith E. Sanderson for further enquiry. For a comparative discussion see: van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, 240.

583. Oddly it appears that scholars concerned with the divine mandate of Yahweh in the biblical text seem less concerned with the divine mandate expressed by contemporary politicians. For example, the message of George W. Bush to Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas, as reported by *Ha'aretz*: "God told me to strike at al Qaeda and I struck them, and then he instructed me to strike at Saddam Hussein, which I did." Al Kamen, "George W. Bush and the G-Word," *The Washington Post*, October 14 2005. One wonders how similar the situation would have been in the ancient Near East where the language of the divine merely couched more practical and base motivations and ideology.

The interesting conclusion from the study of Exodus 15 was not only that it shares these literary themes with prophetic texts, but that the imagery, specific exodus event, and the lexical body was strikingly similar to the prophetic book of Ezekiel in particular. The lexical body of Exodus 15 was also common with Samuel/Kings/Chronicles, which indicates that the similarity is not simply a matter of shared poetic genre between the Song of the Sea and Ezekiel. Further, the presence of Assyrian loanwords and military influence in the Exodus 15 passage suggests that the Ezekiel and Isaiah points of correspondence are not simply a matter of exilic authors referring back to an early textual source as a basis of hope for their own emancipation. If the Song of the Sea account of the exodus is in fact exilic, at the earliest, it intimates that the authors of Ezekiel were not referring to a historical textual source. Rather, it indicates that they were sculpting the event into their own ideological account, supporting a return from "exile" and a divine mandate. In military terms, the use of the exodus account also provides a historic account of military success even when the people are unarmed, untrained and in the face of a large military power.

The examination of the military vocabulary in Exodus 15 and its lexical correspondence with prophetic texts, Ezekiel in particular, help to interpret the exodus in parallel with the ideology of a community either in exile, returning to the land from exile, or justifying their claim to the land in face of military threat.⁵⁸⁴

584. It is beyond the remit of this thesis to examine each of these possibilities fully. It is enough to state here that the results of this thesis indicate Exodus 15 should not be read as an ancient source text but rather together with the ideology of the prophetic books. Although many scholars still read the Babylonian exile as the historical background of prophetic works, this is not a necessity. The possibility of prophetic texts as a domestic product is also feasible. Cf. Barstad, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: 'Exilic' Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55". In this case the Exodus 15 account would more likely be an ideological tool which supported a historical ethnic claim to the land, as well as providing moral support for a popular military defence in the face of larger and well-equipped forces. The parallels to the Maccabean texts in the Jewish revolt, as well as the ideological role of biblical texts in the modern formation of Israel, are obvious.

(c) The pattern of lexical distribution in DtrH shared source material

The examination of military lexemes in the three passages also identified an interesting pattern of lexical use throughout the DtrH shared source passages. The relationship of the shared source material in Samuel/Kings/Chronicles has invited competing theories; traditionally the Chronicles versions were considered to draw upon Samuel/Kings as a source. However, more recently this hierarchical theory has been questioned, most notably by G. Auld. He hypothesises a common shared source interpreted independently by the authors of Samuel/Kings/Chronicles.⁵⁸⁵

The strongest pattern in the shared source material is evidenced in the lexemes attested only in Samuel/Kings and the shared Chronicles passages. There are five main lexemes which exhibit this strong pattern of distribution: מרכבה and פרש, מד, נשא כלי, חניית.

חניית occurs in forty separate MT verses, twenty-four of these verses are within Samuel, one in Kings and six in Chronicles. The single חניית occurrence in 2 Kgs 11:10 is parallel with 2 Chron. 23:9. Apart from 1 Chron. 12:35, all of the Chronicles occurrences are parallel with passages in Samuel. The single Chronicles occurrence, which does not have a shared passage in Samuel/Kings, also contains the only attestation of צנה not paired with רמח in Chronicles (instead וחניית צנה).

נשא כלי occurs thirteen times in Samuel and only three times in Chronicles, all of these in direct parallel passages with Samuel. The only attestation outside of Samuel and this shared source is Judg. 9:54 when Abimelech asks his נשא כלי to kill him. This reads in parallel to the

585. This theory has been most fully developed in the monograph, *Kings Without Privilege*. Auld hypothesises that Chronicles does not draw upon Kings as a source, but rather that the two 'histories' share a common source written after the fall of Jerusalem. Auld, *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*.

death of Saul on Mount Gilboa (the same term is used for Saul's armour-bearer in 1 Sam. 31:4, 5, 6).

The use of **מד** in a military context only occurs in six verses in Samuel, and in the parallel 1 Chron. 19:4::2 Sam. 10:4 passage.

The **מרכבה** and **פרש** patterns are slightly more complex but meaningful in their similarity and exceptions. The **פרש** follows this pattern of Chronicles attestations only in the shared source material,⁵⁸⁶ however the 2 Chron. 16:8 and 12:3 attestations of **פרש**, although in parallel with accounts in 1 Kings 15 and 14, are a much larger expanded versions of the Kings material. The omission of this material is noted in both 1 Kings 15 and 14 where the narrative states other events can be found in **ספר דברי הימים למלכי יהודה** (book of the things of the days of the kings of Judah).⁵⁸⁷ The material in Chronicles shares a common theme in that both passages mention the Lybians and Cushites as a mighty army with **רכב** and **פרש** delivered into the hands of Asa in 2 Chron. 16:8, and attacking Israel in the reign of Rehoboam in 2 Chron. 12:3.

The **מרכבה** follows closely in the pattern of **פרש**. There are twelve occurrences in Samuel/Kings and only six occurrences in Chronicles, of which four are direct parallels, one indirect and one which breaks the larger pattern with no attested parallel.⁵⁸⁸ Again, as with **פרש** the indirect parallel attested in 2 Chron. 35:24 is an expanded version of the narrative parallel, 2 Kgs 23:30. The version in Chronicles describes Josiah shot with an arrow and his servants taking him out of his **מרכבה** and "mounting" him on a second chariot to bring him back to

586.1 Chron. 18:4::2 Sam. 8:4; 1 Chron. 19:6::2 Sam. 10:6; 2 Chron. 1:14::1 Kgs 10:26::2 Chron. 9:25::1 Kgs 5:6; 2 Chron. 8:9::1 Kgs 9:22; 2 Chron. 8:6::1 Kgs 9:19; 2 Chron. 16:8::1 Kgs 15; 2 Chron. 12:3::1 Kgs 14.

587. The meaning of this reference and the possibility of the historical text existing should be tempered by a similar reference in Ezra 4:15 to a 'book of the records of your fathers' which seems to be entirely fictional. van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, 294.

588. The occurrence in 2 Chron. 14:8 with no parallel in Samuel/Kings does mention the Cushites, however this is a weak connection.

Jerusalem. Yet the account in Kings—two condensed verses compared to five in Chronicles—only mentions the servants "mounting" Josiah from Megiddo to Jerusalem. Again, the Kings account echoes the common refrain that the other events of Josiah's reign are mentioned in the ספר דברי הימים למלכי יהודה.

The pattern of distribution noted here thus indicates a select military lexical body used by the Samuel/Kings authors, and also within the shared source material of Samuel/Kings/Chronicles, but not independently in Chronicles. The main deviations in the Chronicles attestations of פרש and מרכבה occur in expanded accounts of a shared narrative with a note in the abbreviated Kings narrative. There is one deviation from this larger pattern in 1 Chron. 14.8 which mentions מרכבה without any parallel in Samuel/Kings, and a second deviation in 1 Chron. 12.35 which mentions חנית with no parallel. However, the 1 Chron. 12.35 verse is also the only exception to the rule of the strong Chronicles צנה/רמח pairing.

Chronicles also exhibits a reverse phenomenon with lexical items only attested in Chronicles and not in the Samuel/Kings narratives. This distribution can be found with אדיר, which exhibits lexical replacement with the Kings parallel, and רמח/צנה which exhibit this distribution pattern both independently and as a pair. רמח occurs six times in Chronicles, five of these times as a word pair with צנה.⁵⁸⁹ The lexeme is used only once in Samuel/Kings in 1 Kgs 18.28, where the prophets of Ba'al slash themselves with swords and רמח in a ritual to light the altar. Oddly, although Nehemiah attests רמח three times, it does not exhibit this same pairing and does not attest צנה at all, though the רמח/מגן word pair occurs in Neh. 4.10.⁵⁹⁰ 2 Chron. 25.5 has a shared narrative parallel in 2 Kings 14, however the Chronicles narrative is much larger than the

589.2 Chron. 26.14 is the exception where it is paired with מגן.

590.This parallels the 2 Chron. 26.14 attestation of רמח which is the only Chronicles occurrence not paired with צנה. Also, the passages are similar as Uzziah distributes מגן, רמח, כובע, שריון, קשת and עבני עבני and Nehemiah mentions רמח, מגן, קשת and שריון.

2 Kings version with an exact verse parallel unattested, and a focus on Amaziah's battles against the Edomites.

As noted, the **צנה** forms a common word pair with **רמה** throughout the Chronicles occurrences. The lexeme occurs seven times: five of these occurrences as the word pair, once paired with **חנייה** and once in shared source passage (2 Chron. 9.15). The pairing with **חנייה** has been flagged as an odd passage as this verse, 1 Chron. 12.35, is also the only occurrence of **חנייה** in a Chronicles non-shared source passage. The only occurrence of **צנה** within a shared source passage is 2 Chronicles 9.15 which is exactly mirrored in 1 Kgs 10.16, in the account of Solomon's wealth (he made **צנה** and **מגן** of beaten gold).

The final example of Chronicles lexical preference is in the single attestation of **אדיר** in 2 Chron. 23.20, which is a parallel to 2 Kgs 11.19. However, two of the lexical items differ between the two verses. The version in 2 Kgs states, **ויקח את שרי המאות ואת הכרי ואת הרצים ואת כל עם הארץ** (he took the officers of the hundreds and the Cari?⁵⁹¹ and the runners/guards and all the people of the land), however, 2 Chronicles attests a variant **ויקח את שרי המאות ואת האדירים ואת המושלים בעם ואת כל עם הארץ** (and he took the officers of the hundreds and the nobles and the rulers and all the people). The use of **אדיר** in this context appears to be an instance of lexical preference by the author, which is rare according to the preceding lexical study—the study indicated the Chronicles author did not adjust vocabulary, even when it was not otherwise attested in Chronicles. However, the substantive occurrence of **אדיר** in Nehemiah, and never in Samuel/Kings, indicates it was not a popular lexeme in the shared source.

591. Another widely disputed lexeme. Attributed possibly to Carians as known from Herodotus. However, they seem to have been referred to as *Karkiya* or *Karkisa* in Hittite letters and *krk* Phoenician which makes this identification difficult. It is worth noting their identification as Egyptians in the army of Psammetichus (men of bronze) in Herodotus 2.152. In old Persian the lexeme *kāra* is attested as meaning 'people, army', which may also provide some information for identifying the lexeme in Biblical Hebrew. Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*.

The distribution of lexical use throughout the DtrH and shared source passages indicates that there was a specific and delimited military vocabulary in use among discrete units of the attested texts. The vocabulary of Samuel/Kings is much more similar to the military vocabulary found in the shared Chronicles material. However, the existence of this vocabulary within expanded Chronicles narratives, where the Samuel/Kings text explicitly excuses itself from the source, indicates that Chronicles is not solely dependent on Samuel/Kings for its source narrative. Also, this indicates that this phenomenon of lexical distribution is not simply the result of Chronicles attesting "lost" portions of Samuel/Kings.

(d) The use of archaizing as a literary device

The introductory background of each chapter noted that each of the examined passages has either been considered to be archaic or archaizing by previous scholars. Exodus 15 and Judges 5 were considered to exhibit signs of archaizing by late nineteenth century scholars, and were subsequently dubbed archaic by mid-twentieth century linguistic studies. Although the composition date of the David/Goliath narrative has been disputed, it is clearly not archaic. It does, however, display anachronisms such as the closing mention of Jerusalem, and, as suggested in this thesis, indications of archaizing with the consistent labelling of Goliath's armour as *bronze*.

The use of archaizing as a literary device has the greatest consequences for the Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah. They have been consistently labelled as examples of archaic Biblical Hebrew and as some of the earliest textual evidence in the MT. However, the study of the military vocabulary indicates there is nothing archaic nor unique about the lexical body that would support this archaic composition date. As this conclusion is at odds with several linguis-

tic studies of the morpho-syntactical evidence, the use of archaizing as a literary device is of interest.⁵⁹²

There is a tradition of archaizing within the ancient Near Eastern literature from Egyptian and Assyrian to Hellenistic Jewish writings.⁵⁹³ The Egyptian twenty-fifth dynasty Shabaka Stone is a well-known example of archaizing used by the ascendent Nubians to legitimise their dynasty.⁵⁹⁴ The twenty-fifth dynasty is often associated with archaizing with The Tale of King Neferkare and General Sasetem as other examples of archaic compositions with ideological functions.⁵⁹⁵ Archaizing in paintings and reliefs—as well as the revival of archaic cults, priest-hoods and titles—is also a hallmark of the Saite dynasty anxious to appear as restoring the glories of the Old Kingdom.⁵⁹⁶ Archaizing in Mesopotamia was no less popular with numerous examples in Assyrian and Babylonian texts and reliefs. In the neo-Assyrian period there was a repertoire of deities and demons developed in reliefs; newer creations were imbued with archaizing features to support their supposed antiquity.⁵⁹⁷ The neo-Babylonian scribes under Nebuchadnezzar seem to have had fascination or ideological interest with the Old Babylonian kingdom. These scribes mimicked the old lapidary script, and used archaic language and

592. The linguistic aspects of this will be discussed in the following section with other chronological implications. At this point it is the literary aspects of archaizing that the discussion is interested in.

593. van Seters provides a brief discussion of ancient Near East archaizing trends in the chapter titled 'The use of the past as propaganda' in: van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*, 172-181.

594. E. Junge, "Zur Fehldatierung des Sog. Denkmals memphitischer Theologie oder der Beitrag der ägyptischen Theologie zur Geistesgeschichte der Spätzeit," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 29 (1973): 195-204.

595. For a background of Egyptian archaizing in the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty see Peter der Manuelian, *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1994).

596. J. D. Fage and Roland Anthony Oliver, *The Cambridge History of Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 91. Cf. Nicolas Grimal, "Bibliothèques et propagande royale à l'époque éthiopienne," in *Livre du centenaire, 1880-1980*, ed. J. Vercoutter (Le Caire: IFAO, 1980).

597. Erich Ebeling et al., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin und Leipzig: W. de Gruyter & Co, 1928), 262.

orthographies.⁵⁹⁸ Within Jewish tradition, the book of 1 Maccabees is rife with archaising features, as it is assumed to be written in a form of archaising Biblical Hebrew during the late Hellenistic period.⁵⁹⁹ Although the original Hebrew text of Maccabees is lost, archaising features can be found in biblical toponyms and gentilics no longer common at the late date of composition.⁶⁰⁰

According to these examples, archaising can play a literary—and ideological—function of validation and legitimation by creating associations between the current period and a glorious historical or mythical past which resonates among readers. The Saite and Nubite Egyptian kingdoms archaised using the typology and linguistics of the Old Kingdom, neo-Babylonian scribes wrote about themselves in the language, script and style of the Old Babylonian kingdom, the nationalistic Jews of the Hellenistic period used the language and style of religious Hebrew texts. Within this wider ancient Near Eastern context of archaised texts, particularly during periods of class establishment or flux, it would not be unexpected to find the same phenomenon within the foundational Hebrew texts. It may even seem naïve to expect these texts to be evidence of archaic sources, rather than evidence of the same archaising trends found in other parallel literature.⁶⁰¹

598.J. N. Postgate, *Early Mesopotamia: Society and Economy At the Dawn of History* (London: Routledge, 1994), 69. Bill T. Arnold, *Who Were the Babylonians* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 97.

599. Another example is the 11QpaleoLev which is written in the paleo-Hebrew script in the Qumran period long after it had been out of use. David Noel Freedman, K. A. Mathews, and Richard S. Hanson, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11qpalaeolev)* (Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research Distributed by Eisenbrauns, 1985).

600.D.M. Goodblatt notes the use of the defunct Philistia, Ammonites, Kittim, and Canaan. David M. Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 176. Cf. Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids*, 169.

601. The current academic research on the dating, composition and redaction of medieval texts provides a deep pool of data for comparative study. The primary material is consistently attested, which provides a large amount of data for establishing an external chronology. The 11th to 12th century is the most important period for diachronic confusion and archaising. A recent summary of work in this area is Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, eds., *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, vol. 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). Cf. M. B. Parkes, *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation,*

2. The historical implications of the lexical examination

The second area of investigation examined the lexical body for historical implications. The results of chapter conclusions demonstrated three common themes arising from the lexical examination: (a) the texts do not exhibit historical integrity in the context of their literary setting (b) the plausible historical background of the texts is the eighth century B.C.E. or later, and (c) the existence of foreign military loanwords indicates a cultural milieu influenced by Assyrian or later military dominance in the texts of Judges 5 and Exodus 15, and a probable Hellenistic literary influence in 1 Samuel 17.⁶⁰²

(a) The lack of historical integrity in the literary setting

The most certain historical implication to result from the study of military vocabulary in the selected passages is that they do not display any historical integrity in terms of correspondence between the historical depiction of warfare and the compositional dating common throughout the late twentieth century. The early dating proposed by Cross and Freedman for the Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah does not accord with the military vocabulary and thematic or literary characteristics of the texts. The obvious friction here is the chronological background of the texts post-Cross/Freedman, and not necessarily the historical background of the texts; indeed, the contrast assumes that the texts do in fact reflect some accuracy in the military details and lexemes.

and Dissemination of Medieval Texts (London: Hambledon Press, 1991). M. B. Parkes, "Archaising Hands in English Manuscripts," in *Books and Collectors 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson*, ed. James P. Carley, Colin G. C. Tite, and Andrew G. Watson, The British Library Studies in the History of the Book (London: British Library, 1997).

602. Note, Hellenistic, not Greek. This could also be Lydian, but the late Lydian culture would have been mostly Assyrian/Persian or Greek influenced in any case.

The question of historical integrity, particularly in the case of Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah, is thus a question of whether these poetic bodies can be relied upon to communicate, perhaps unwittingly, information on the historical milieu of the author. The results of the lexical study appear to provide a positive answer, yet only from an external perspective. The texts studied do not appear to exhibit any internal interest in accurately describing a past historical situation. Thus, attempting to extract historical military information within the historical framework provided by the author is fraught with errors and anachronism. The historical setting of the text should therefore not provide the point at which the historical information of the text is applied; the military description in the Song of Deborah is not an accurate description of the military in the "days of Shamgar of Anath" but likely a reflection of the military milieu of the author, or of the source texts, if they existed.

This conclusion of historical inaccuracy is supported by the internal evidence of the texts. This indicates the authors or redactors were not obsessively interested in accurate chronology or history. The study of military lexemes in the David/Goliath narrative indicated that the lexical body itself was not consistent with any particular historical point, and that the military description was more likely motivated by literary or thematic considerations. The anachronisms within the text itself (such as David bringing Goliath's head to Jerusalem) also indicate that the primary concern of that author/redactor was not to ensure a consistent historical account. The subsequent Jewish tradition of interpretation also displays a lack of concern for historical integrity, with the Targum tradition describing Goliath as the son of Orpah.⁶⁰³

The linguistic typology of Judges 5 and Exodus 15 may thus associate the writings as a type of poetry or related linguistic morpho-syntactic forms. They cannot, however, be consid-

603. Yalk. ii. 125. This is seemingly based on the equation of הרפה to ערפה. Does it not seem odd that subsequent tradition explicitly and casually places these characters in new situations with new historical details and obvious anachronisms, yet the default scholarly position is to consider the biblical texts themselves as a 'pure' history?

ered as writings contemporary with the literary setting or as texts containing early historical evidence. M. Bowra stated the obvious decades ago, concluding,

Heroic poetry, then, seems to be on the whole a poor substitute for history. Though it contains real persons and real events, it often connects them in unreal relations and may even add unreal persons and unreal events... This means that, except in a few exceptional cases, we have no right to approach heroic poetry as if it were a record of fact...It does not record truthfully what happened, but it shows what men believed and felt.⁶⁰⁴

The question of whether the texts contain real persons and real events is also doubtful. Conceding this point, however, it is clear that the studied texts cannot be considered as historical windows into the literary setting they have been given by the author, though the study has demonstrated that the texts can carry historical information concurrent with some other historical point. The two recent papers by A. Yadin and Finkelstein examining 1 Samuel 17, with the purpose of establishing historical evidence due to collective memory, provide a good theoretical basis for mining the text for historical data. But, they fail to fully discuss how collective memory is informed and created, and the consequences this has for historical enquiry.⁶⁰⁵ The study of military lexemes in 1 Samuel 17 indicated the collective memory may have been strongly influenced by legends and stories from Greek authors.

The results of the lexical study of the military vocabulary indicate that the texts do not contain historical information correspondent to the literary setting; the texts do not display this type of historical integrity. This suggests that a historical approach, starting from the text as descriptive of the claimed setting, will only result in forcing Hellenistic armament into 11th century B.C.E. Philistia.

604.C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* (London: Macmillan, 1952), 535. Quoted by Michael David Coogan, *Stories From Ancient Canaan* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978).

605.Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory". Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective".

(b) The historical background of the texts

Though the examined texts should not be considered as maintaining any historical integrity in terms of their literary setting, the study indicated that the military lexical body does contain inherent historical information. This information may inform the historical background of the texts themselves. As noted previously, the innate difficulty of this statement is the ambiguity regarding the sources of this historical information and their relationship to the redacted text. Finkelstein and Yadin have argued that collective memory provided historical information for the literary details of the texts—for example, Finkelstein argues that the depiction of Goliath is a result of a memory of Greek mercenaries in the service of Psammetichus I in the seventh century B.C.E.

The motivation for considering collective memory as a source of historical information is to extend the historical accuracy of the texts earlier into the first millennium B.C.E. Finkelstein notes that until the eighth century B.C.E. Jerusalem was an insignificant settlement and that Judah was only sparsely inhabited. This indicates a poor infrastructure for wide-spread literacy or historical writing. If no primary written sources are earlier than the eighth century, then any pre-eighth century events could only be considered historically accurate if the collective memory and oral traditions accurately preserved historical information.⁶⁰⁶

Finkelstein's dependence on an oral history providing a historical background to the texts, borne out of the rise of literacy in eighth century Judah, however, seems improbable in light of the lexical studies. The study of military lexemes in the selected passages did not indicate any early collective memory but rather a military milieu grounded at the earliest in the eighth century Assyrian military.⁶⁰⁷ It therefore seems quite doubtful that an oral history or col-

606.Ibid., 132.

607.This is most explicitly demonstrated in Exodus 15. The eighth century is the early dating, but, due to the continued influence of Assyrian military across the ancient Near East, the dating could be much

lective memory provided any accurate military details for any substantial duration. The portrayal of the military in the selected passages, particularly Exodus 15, is clearly not representative of the Egyptian military corps, and exhibits a basic lack of knowledge about early Egyptian military corps. According to this reasoning, the probable sources for the military lexical body and basic military information would be either the cultural and military milieu of the author's setting, or reference texts available to the author.

The question of sources for military or specialist knowledge becomes more relevant when considering the historical setting of scribes and archivists. Would the literary scribes have had access to personnel or an environment in which they were enabled to learn specific military terminology?⁶⁰⁸ If a scribe was a member of the court operating from a historical centre (such as Ninevah) it seems doubtful that they would have had first-hand knowledge of military matters or interaction with the basic soldiers of their day, other than the booty and tribute lists. The lack of information on the social make-up and function of scribes makes this a difficult question to explore. Perhaps this lack of first-hand knowledge explains the political rather than realistic portrayal of military events in Assyrian records as well as the Hebrew texts. The shift in Greek writing towards experiential accounts or "embedded reporting" may have provided this direct contact, which enabled the highly descriptive narratives of Greek warfare. This shift may even be a product of increased popular literacy, leading to a demand for engaging narrative rather than political records.

later.

608. There is a multitude of attestation, both textual and epigraphic, that indicates administrative scribes did accompany military operations. However, these scribes were generally record-keeping scribes which recorded booty lists, divisions and movements. It is doubtful the scribes who composed literary works, rather than administrative tasks, would have engaged in this rote, dangerous and difficult work. This is an area, however, which I have not researched fully and I suspect detailed primary evidence may not be available.

(c) The evidence of foreign loanwords and military contact

The relationship of military lexemes to other languages also provides basic information relevant to historical enquiry. The attestation of foreign loanwords in the lexical body of texts indicates a point of contact with the foreign language either directly or indirectly. The common points of interaction are in direct cultural exchange along peripheral areas, the exchange of population through migratory and political movement, and the distribution of literary texts.⁶⁰⁹ Lexemes often travel through indirect means also, most commonly through trade and exchange of goods. Goods often maintain their introductory lexeme, particularly when they are non-domestic. The adoption of words for vino-culture in Germanic languages under the influence of Roman trade is an oft-quoted example of this lexical adoption of foreign lexemes for non-domestic produce.⁶¹⁰ The lexical flow is often not bi-directional, however, and the adoption of foreign lexemes is not certain in all circumstances. The lexical influence is often related to political or social structure with the dominant culture; It exerts greater linguistic influence on the lesser.⁶¹¹ In the realm of Biblical Hebrew the influence of Aramaic and adoption of Aramaic lexical items and morpho-syntactic patterns is quite evident, while the influence of Hebrew on the Aramaic of Assyria, Neo-Babylon or Persia is non-existent, or extremely minor in the case of Judeans in Elephantine.⁶¹² It should be cautioned that, although social and political power struc-

609. The distribution of texts is the most speculative, yet the distribution of the Behistun inscription indicates that some texts were widely distributed and read. The question of distribution, however, is secondary to the question of influence and diffusion in the grammars of readers.

610. Sapir, *Language, an Introduction to the Study of Speech*, 206.

611. *Ibid.*, 205.

612. Papyri 30, dubbed *Petition to the governor of Judaea* is noted by Crowley as possibly written by someone with Hebrew as a first-language and evidences several Hebraisms. Other than this, Crowley states the texts are mostly devoid of Hebraisms or any indications that the garrison at Elephantine used Hebrew as a daily language. See Crowley's comments in: Crowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 118-120.

tures may make lexical adoption attractive, there are several forms of linguistic resistance which can prevent wide-spread influence of one language upon another.⁶¹³

The difficulty of identifying foreign influence in Biblical Hebrew is exacerbated by the first millennium's continuity of Aramaic as the *lingua franca* in the ancient Near East. The language was used officially and politically as the communication language of Assyrians, Neo-Babylonians and Persians, providing little opportunity to map the chronological linguistic impact of the various cultures. The close linguistic relationship between Hebrew and Aramaic as Semitic languages makes it difficult to clearly distinguish what elements are attributable to foreign influence, dialect, diglossia and diachronic development.

Despite these difficulties, the study of military lexemes provided several examples of borrowed lexical items, primarily from Assyrian sources. The single Egyptian loanword in the examined passages was חגית, providing an interesting insight on the influence of Egyptian military on the lexical body of these passages. This lack of Egyptian influence in the military lexical body corresponds with the general lack of knowledge of Egyptian military displayed in Exodus 15. This ignorance may indicate that the author of these texts was not under a strong influence of Egyptian military vocabulary, or that there was some level of resistance to the borrowing of Egyptian lexical items when referring to military situations. Considering the general waning of Egyptian military influence in the later first millennium B.C.E. and consistent influence from the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Persian military, it is probable that the Egyptian military simply had little influence on the Hebrew language at the point of textual composition.

613. The influence of English upon other languages in the twentieth century has been minor compared to the relative past influence of French upon English. The effects of cultural nationalism in the twentieth century may have increased the psychological resistance to borrowing from new sources, and thus minimised the political and military influence of English speaking nations. Sapir, Language, an Introduction to the Study of Speech, 208-209.

The exposure of Hebrew to foreign military vocabulary would assumedly occur in the interaction with the foreigners as they campaigned in Judaea, Israel, Phoenicia and the surrounding area.⁶¹⁴ There is also evidence that Judaeans in particular served in the army of Sennacherib; this is displayed in the reliefs at Ninevah (705-681 B.C.E.) where soldiers in the Assyrian bodyguard are depicted as wearing the same garb as the defenders of Lachish.⁶¹⁵ Further evidence of Judaeans soldiers in foreign employ is obviously derived from the garrison at Elephantine.

Although this indicates an obvious point of interaction between cultures, the experience of Judaeans in a foreign military force and their ensuing familiarity with the foreign military lexemes does not necessarily result in these lexemes occurring within the biblical texts; the soldier is an unlikely scribe. The strongest point of influence would assumedly be found in textual material familiar to the scribal communities who produced the biblical texts. The presence of military lexemes in extra-biblical texts was commented on throughout the lexical examinations and demonstrated several points of correspondence.⁶¹⁶

The body of military lexemes in the studied passages indicates a point of influence from the Assyrian or subsequent cultures (Neo-Babylonian/Persian), and not from the Egyptians to the South.⁶¹⁷ The historical points of contact evidenced in extra-biblical literature indicate that Judaeans did serve in foreign militaries, but also that the foreign texts may have influenced the

614. Although, would a population actually learn the foreign military lexemes of an enemy? It seems more likely that lexical borrowing would occur from exposure during military duty in the foreign military or through texts.

615. Julian Reade, *Assyrian Sculpture* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983), 71.

616. The common vocabulary of the Behistun inscription and Exodus 15 is an interesting example of a shared lexical body as well as literary theme.

617. This may be a chronological indication rather than geographical, as after the 671 B.C.E. conquest of Egypt by Assyria and the subsequent 525 B.C.E. Persian domination, the Egyptian military and military lexical body would have been highly influenced by these foreign cultures.

biblical texts. Extra-biblical texts contain several of the terms which are attested in Biblical Hebrew, thus providing a concrete point of influence for the borrowing of foreign military lexemes.

3. The chronological implications of the lexical examination

The introduction to the individual studies demonstrated a common pattern of historical scholarship among all the examined texts. The chronological trend common across the three is a disputed late dating in late nineteenth century scholarship, moving towards a much earlier relative date in the mid-twentieth century. In the case of Song of Deborah and Song of the Sea, the move towards a much earlier date—as much as a millennium earlier—was supported by the newly discovered Ugaritic texts, and the supposed similarities in the literary style and poetic structure of these texts. The date of 1 Samuel 17 also experienced this shift in chronology, with a movement towards an early composition in the 11th-10th century B.C.E. The rise of diachronic typologies of Biblical Hebrew provided support for this chronological shift by establishing a tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew into Archaic Biblical Hebrew (Song of Deborah, Song of the Sea), Standard Biblical Hebrew (1 Samuel 17) and Late Biblical Hebrew (not attested in any of the selected texts).

(a) The inaccuracy of traditional diachronic typologies

The study of military lexemes in the selected texts indicated that the traditional tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew is not accurate, and is even likely to be misleading as a diachronic typology of Biblical Hebrew. The study examined two main textual bodies generally considered to be indicative of Archaic Biblical Hebrew—the Song of Deborah and the Song of the Sea—and concluded that the military lexemes contained within bore either inherent historical and chronological information, or patterns of distribution and usage incompatible with an early com-

position date. The study of the David/Goliath narrative supported this conclusion. It indicated that the military lexemes and literary context is not concurrent with a pre-monarchic compositional setting, which is discordant with the placement of Samuel within the Standard Biblical Hebrew corpus.

The results of the study are in conflict with the traditional diachronic typologies, even without considering the implicit historical and chronological results suggested in the conclusions of this study. The pattern of distribution of these lexical items is consistently at odds with the tripartite division of Biblical Hebrew, with no consistent accordance across the examples of Archaic Biblical Hebrew. In fact, the patterns of distribution and usage in Song of Deborah and Song of the Sea indicated strong parallels and associations with exilic or post-exilic texts, such as Ezekiel and Chronicles. The evidence of lexicographical patterns is one of the main factors for traditional diachronic typologies, yet the independently discreet lexical body of military terms was markedly in conflict with these traditional patterns. Thus, purely on the grounds of evidence consistent with Hurvitz's diachronic method, it must be argued that either these lexical patterns indicate that terms may have a long and variable lifespan (thus eroding any basis for establishing a lexical diachronic typology), or that they are periodic, and thus more closely related to exilic and post-exilic linguistic profiles. Either of these conclusions debunks the traditional separation of Biblical Hebrew into three chronological typologies.

The literary implications and conclusions as a result of the lexical study also indicate that literary and historical elements may have a large effect on the language and lexical body used in a particular text. Hurvitz states that only the primary linguistic data should be used to construct a typology and that other literary characteristics should not be given precedence,⁶¹⁸

618."As far as dating texts is concerned...it is precisely the evidence of language which must take precedence over historical and theological arguments.'...the antiquity of a given corpus - in any language, at any period of time- ought to be established, in the first place, by the linguistic profile of its texts." Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the

however, it seems obvious from the lexical study that literary themes and devices, such as archaizing, probably play a major role in the linguistic profile of a text.⁶¹⁹

(b) The relationship of the lexical body to eighth-century or later warfare

Although the lexical study demonstrated the inaccuracy of traditional diachronic typologies, the purpose as stated in the introduction was to move beyond an intra-textual typology and examine the lexical body for any inherent chronological indications.

The strongest inherent chronological implication to emerge from the lexical study of military vocabulary was the evidence of the פָּרָשׁ as a military corps in the Song of the Sea and use of שָׁלִיֵּשׁ as military or social title. The study of the פָּרָשׁ within the historical, textual and archaeological context of the ancient Near East clearly indicated that the emergence of the horse-men as a distinct arm of the military is limited to eighth century or later, with the full deployment occurring in the seventh century B.C.E. with the Assyrian cavalry of Ashurbanipal. The use of the פָּרָשׁ in describing the military of the pursuing Egyptians in Exodus 15 thus carries an inherent compositional *terminus a quo* in the eighth century B.C.E. The use of שָׁלִיֵּשׁ as a title of leadership also accords with this dating; this term is likely related to Akkadian *tašlišu* attested in Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian sources. These inherent cues, combined with linguistic and literary patterns in common with prophetic texts mentioning Sennacherib and Nebuchadrezzar, support this *terminus a quo* in the eighth-sixth centuries B.C.E.

Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," 144.

619. It seems disingenuous that the diachronic methodology is often presented as objective in nature, yet the results appear incredibly similar to the literary setting of the text. Is it probable that this objective typology would produce results exactly inline with the claimed chronological sequence of the biblical texts? Further, it seems the diachronic typologies are less interested in the Hebrew as a language than the application of this framework to a history of Israel.

The study also demonstrated the lack of archaic military vocabulary or, more accurately, the presence of regularly attested military vocabulary in the Song of Deborah. The lexical body was composed of commonly attested military lexemes with only two indeterminate terms; several of the lexemes were even closely aligned in usage and context with so-called late biblical texts, such as Chronicles. If the Song of Deborah was dated to the 12th century B.C.E. or earlier, almost eight centuries before the probable dating of various other biblical texts, we would certainly expect to encounter a markedly different military vocabulary. This is, of course, an argument from silence. However, texts such as 2 Sam. 21:16, with its odd sentence structure and use of קין and תגור חדשה, indicate drastically different military vocabulary did exist even within parallel narrative traditions (in this case David/Goliath).

4. A concluding summary and overview of further research areas

(a) Top-line findings and the main points of the thesis

In many ways the conclusions of this thesis are neither radical nor shocking. The dating of Song of the Sea and Song of Deborah to the exilic period or later was the default chronological point over a hundred years ago. The lasting impact of the redating of these texts, led by Cross and Freedman in the mid-twentieth century, however, has persisted for decades longer than the cumulative weight of the research which has disputed this dating. The study of the military lexical body, beginning from the lexemes and working out based on their function, cognates, distribution, context and semantic shift, has indicated that the inherent chronological and historical information of this lexical body does not support an early pre-eighth century B.C.E. dating. Further, the examination of these lexemes has indicated that the traditional diachronic typologies of Biblical Hebrew are fundamentally flawed, rendering them ineffective for establishing the compositional date of the texts.

The study and methodology demonstrates a process of lexical study which avoids interacting with the results of traditional diachronic typologies and their methodological restrictions which prevent putting the texts into a larger historical and chronological context. Diachronic theories have been found to restrict the richness and depth of chronological and historical information held in the texts; the typological limitation of language into a monolithic chronology loses much of what may actually be important and indicative, such as the redaction history, the complexity of geography, and social factors in the composition and language of texts. These influences on the linguistic profile are more interesting as they may provide historical information rather than simply assembling a linguistic typology.

Lastly, it is hoped that the historical, chronological and literary implications revealed by the study provide valuable information to the wider scholarly study of the ancient Near East and the biblical texts in particular.

(b) Implications of the thesis and the possibilities of further research

The results of the study have raised several avenues of further research. These avenues expand the results of the current research and extend the historical, chronological and literary implications of further linguistic research.

The primary and obvious priority of this research is to widen the study of military lexemes across the entire corpus of Biblical Hebrew as well as extra-biblical sources. The use of military phrases and historical implications of lexemes for military positions, units, weapons and armour should be fully investigated. The study of military lexemes within the MT has highlighted important patterns of distribution and usage, particularly within the shared source texts of Samuel/Kings/Chronicles; these texts should be more fully examined in light of these findings in order to establish whether more patterns of distribution and usage among military lex-

emes is evident. Further, the possible effect of these lexemes on the source and relationship of these books should be questioned.

The examination of military lexemes also raised questions on the genre of the biblical texts and their relationship to other ancient Near Eastern texts with a primary focus on military campaigns and themes. The absence of military vocabulary in Joshua in particular was observed on the periphery of the lexical study and should be examined further, particularly in relationship to the military vocabulary and form of other ancient Near Eastern texts.

The use of archaizing as a literary device was also emphasised in the study. The use of archaizing is common throughout the ancient Near East due to ideological and political motivations in literary works. The presumption of an honest and monolithic linguistic text which underlies diachronic typologies is severely undermined when considerations of archaizing and deliberate linguistic manipulation are considered as possible and, indeed, probable in the context of political legitimisation in the ancient Near East. The study of archaizing as a literary device is scant within biblical studies, however, and little scholarship exists on linguistic or literary cues to identify possible archaizing. The question is particularly relevant for any study of common nouns in a historical lexical body. Do archaizing texts generally imitate archaic grammar, morphology and syntax in comparison to common nouns which have passed from use?⁶²⁰ Is anachronistic lexical replacement common? Is there a tendency towards using generic descriptions rather than detailed lexemes? These questions are particularly suited to comparative linguistic study among ancient Near Eastern archaizing texts, but are possibly also relevant in a wider chronological and linguistic framework.

620. A modern example of this was a front-page headline in a free daily London paper (Metro). "Tarantino exclusive: One movie flop does not depression make, but woe betide the movie maker who's a flop in bed." *Metro*, London. September 17, 2007. The syntax and grammar is obviously archaic (in a mangled way) but the lexeme *movie* is clearly not. The semantic form of *flop* also attests a modern setting.

A thorough examination of the military vocabulary and context of the biblical texts would provide the basis for further in-depth studies of warfare. Warfare was an integral and shaping force in ancient societies with wide-ranging effects. There is a mutual relationship between warfare and agriculture, marriage, nomadism, population size, status and role of women, internal economics, and societal structure.⁶²¹

Lastly, the study of military lexemes also raises the possibility of further studies among other collections of discreet lexical bodies with possible historical, literary and chronological implications. Surprisingly, there are few examples of complete lexical studies within biblical scholarship though they are common in other disciplines.⁶²² Possible lexical bodies include agricultural implements, clothing, tools, social titles and economic vocabulary.

621. For a bibliography and discussion of all these research points see: Brian Ferguson, "A Paradigm for the Study of War and Society," in *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, the Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Nathan Stewart Rosenstein, Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1999).

622. Cf. Green's seminal work: Dennis Howard Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

IV. Appendix I: Attestations of the 'horseman' in the material evidence of the ancient Near East

The mounted warrior begins to appear in the archaeological evidence of the ancient Near East only at the very close of the second millennium and even here very rarely. Earlier than this there is some evidence of mounted persons, but their lack of any armoured protection, or even weapons is best seen as an indication that they depict mounted messengers rather than forces for military engagement.⁶²³ An oft-referenced example from the tenth century, is a basalt orthostat from the palace of Kapara at Tell Halaf.⁶²⁴ It shows a mounted rider with a pointed helmet, round, bossed shield, and an indeterminate object in the other hand—possibly a weapon of sorts. Although the helmet and shield may indicate a military position, the slight stick-like object grasped in the raised hand does not appear to be a weapon, such as a club or mace. Further Tafel 150, D.2b clearly shows it is not a spear as it does not extend past the bottom of the hand. It is likely that the item depicted is not an offensive weapon, but rather a symbol of office or a whip.⁶²⁵ The lack of an offensive weapon combined with a defensive panoply of shield and helmet indicates that the depicted rider is not outfitted for any aggressive military action, and thus

623. "It may be noted here that an active role of riding in warfare is indubitably documented only in the earlier 1st millennium B.C. A few Ur texts possibly refer to mounted officials or couriers" Littauer and Crowel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*, 45-46. Reference to early riders and note one possible military context on an Akkadian seal.

624. Johannes Friedrich et al., *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf: Keilschrifttexte und aramäische Urkunden aus einer assyrischen Provinzhauptstadt* (Berlin: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1940). Tafel 25, A 3.32; Tafel 26, A3.33; Tafel 150 D.2b.

625. The whip is a common feature of charioteers so it may be expected to appear on early depictions of mounted riders. The angle of the rider's arm in the Tel Halaf depiction is similar to the uplifted arm of charioteers preparing to whip their draught team however inverted so as to strike the front wither or neck rather than a downward motion to strike a pulling horse. Rainer Michael Boehmer, *Die Entwicklung der Glyptik während der Akkad-Zeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965). Fig. 14a. Wolfram Nagel, *Der mesopotamische Streitwagen und seine Entwicklung im ostmediterranen Bereich*, *Berliner Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte*, vol. 10 (Berlin: Hessling, 1966). Fig. 12. Cf. Littauer and Crowel's analysis of Marie-Therese Barrelet's reconstruction of the Vulture Stela (Early Dynastic 2500B.C.E.) where they discuss the depicted diagonal line as a goad rather than a spear. M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crowel, "The Vulture Stele and an Early Type of Two-Wheeled Vehicle," *Journal for Near Eastern Studies* 32 (1973):.

is probably in a passive role of a mounted official or messenger. Although this depicted rider may have acted in a military engagement and required defensive armor, he would not have been using the horse as a fighting platform. This example is typical of the unarmed mounted rider found depicted before the 1st millennium B.C.E.⁶²⁶

1. The Assyrians

The first well-evidenced and widespread use of mounted soldiers in military engagement is found among the Assyrians. Reliefs on Ashurnasirpal's palace at Nimrud dated 883-859 B.C.E depict pairs of horsemen riding together.⁶²⁷ In relief 9a one is armed with a sword and has a round shield slung on his back. He is drawing the bow. The accompanying horseman rides beside him and holds the reins of both horses. There are no weapons or armour apparent on the second horseman, but he is also mostly hidden in the relief so it is possible that these details are obscured by the front rider. The second depiction of a mounted pair is on relief 16b.⁶²⁸ There are two pairs of horsemen in this relief, and it appears to portray enemy forces mounted on horseback that are pursued by the chariot of Ashurnasirpal. The bowmen of both pairs sit twisted backward. The rear bowman has his arm up in a suppliant gesture, while the forward bowman shoots his bow backwards towards the foe in what can anachronistically be called the Parthian

626. For a chronological tracing of the early evidence for mounted riders see again Littauer and Crouwel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*.

627. Richard David Barnett and Leri Glynne Davies, *A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories: With Other Examples of Ancient Near Eastern Ivories in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1975). No. 9a. There are a few other points of interest in this relief, namely the beardless face of the leading mounted bowman and his horse's brilliantly displayed breastplate incorporating the figure of a face. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, 385. See also the unprovenanced ivory plaque on the same page from 9th century. It depicts a pair of riders, the bowman again with an unshaven face, the accompanying rider with beard and holding reins clearly as well as whipping behind with a short curved whip or goad.

628. Barnett and Davies, *A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories: With Other Examples of Ancient Near Eastern Ivories in the British Museum*, no. 16b. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, 382.

shot.⁶²⁹ The accompanying horseman in the rear pair is armed with a shield and long spear, he does not appear to control the reins as the bowman is holding his own rein along with his bow. The accompanying horseman in the front is partially missing, but the top end of his spear is visible; it is impossible to tell whether he is holding the bowman's reins.⁶³⁰ This same theme of paired riders, with one rider still appearing to hold the other's reins, can also be found on the gates of Shalmeneser III dated 858-824 B.C.E.⁶³¹ Reliefs from the palace of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.E.) at Khorsabad also depict pairs of mounted warriors occasionally with bows and quivers on their backs fighting alongside the chariots or engaging with isolated foot soldiers.⁶³² Unlike

629. The 'Parthian shot' is a term made famous by early Greek historians such as Herodotus. It describes a style of fighting where the cavalry shoots their bows backwards toward the enemy while running away on horseback. In reliefs the horse is depicted as facing away from the enemy with the rider twisted at the torso and facing the rear of the horse. The bow is drawn with the arrow pointing toward the rear. This style of fighting was unique to the mounted warrior and was very effective against unmounted ground troops as offensive action could continue to be carried out even while increasing the distance between the enemy. Often the cavalry would harass the enemy troops by continually attacking and fleeing in this manner.

630. Of interest in this relief is the three legs apparent on the horse pairs. Other reliefs in this series show the horse pairs with two legs showing, one leg per horse. The fact that these three visible legs are matched with the three visible legs of the three horse chariot team questions the representation of the paired horsemen as an accurate depiction of military methods or a stylistic motif.

631. King and Budge, *Bronze Reliefs From the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825*. Plate XLVIII, LXXII. There are also a few examples of spearman, bowman pairs in Plate VII and clearly in Plate XXXVIII.

632. Pauline Albenda, *The Palace of Sargon, King of Assyria: Monumental Wall Reliefs At Dur-Sharrukin, From Original Drawings Made At the Time of Their Discovery in 1843-1844 by Botta and Flandin* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1986). Also, Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*, 416-417. Many of the plates show examples of horsemen including Hall II, Plate 9-12, 17-21; Gate B-I; Hall V, Plate 3-4; Hall XIII, Plate 6-7. [Pl. 88 Flandin. Room 7 slab 10 (three riders in a row, first with long long spear, second with whip and third with nothing but sword that the others have too.)][Pl. 94 Flandin. room 5, slabs 3-2. pair of horsemen close one with upraised spear held horizontally, far one with quirt backwards and down. Possibly the far one has an upraised spear to but difficult to see. Close rider unshaven. Repeated in Pl. 95 Flandin, Room 5, slabs 5-4.][Pl.101 Flandin. room 5, two slabs unnumbered (25-24).same theme no faces to tell if shaven][Pl.111 Flandin Room 2 slabs 2-3. Single rider with spear following chariot][Pl. 113 Flandin. Room 2, slabs 8-9. Single riders in advance of chariot, no blankets or riding apparel, two riders but riding apart. looks like they are pursued by the Assyrians. Again in Pl. 117 Flandin. Room 2, slabs 11-12][Pl.102. Flandin Room 5, slab 1 in door O. single riders with horizontal spear held low. wearing lace up boots? and mail leggings.][Pl 120 Flandin Room 2, slabs 16-17. two riders both with beards, leggings and boots. One has upraised spear held at downward angle, the far rider has spear held lower and at slight downward angle.][P. 130 Flandin. Room 2 slab 4 in door B and slab 1 in Door B. Single rider depicted as bowman with beard but two horses Heads shown. Leggings and boots.][Pl 134 Flandin. Room 13 slabs 6-7 three single riders following the

the earlier reliefs, these horsemen, although carrying a bow, are always using a spear, generally with an overarm motion, and both horsemen seem to be engaging, even though they still continue to be depicted in pairs. There are also a few occurrences of independent horsemen fighting from horseback with a spear.

In their seminal study, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*, Littauer and Crowel map the evolution of the mounted warrior in Assyria.⁶³³ They claim that in the 9th century Assyrian mounted troops are depicted in pairs operating side-by-side, one rider is a warrior and the other a squire holding reins of both horses. They attribute this peculiar arrangement to the traditional Assyrian depictions in art of a chariot carrying a warrior and driver, which artists then transposed to the newly introduced use of mounted horses in warfare.⁶³⁴ In the 8th century under Tiglath-Pileser III, 744-727 B.C.E., riders are depicted in a much more natural and effective state, seated near the withers rather than far back on the horse's loins, and although operating in pairs each rider appears to be reining his own horse.⁶³⁵ Mounted warriors begin operating independently under Sargon II, although there are still depictions of riders in pairs.⁶³⁶ Finally under Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.E.) and Ashurbanipal (631-627 B.C.E.) the mounted military rider operates independently or possibly in formation.⁶³⁷ Reliefs dated to

chariot. All have bow cases, swords at side, front one has a spear. Spearman has no leagings/boots but both of the others do. All have beards].

633.Littauer and Crowel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*.

634.Ibid., 135.

635.Ibid., 135. Mentions, Richard David Barnett and Margarete Falkner, *The Sculptures of Assur-Nasir-Apli II, 883-859 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser III, 745-727 B.C. And Esarhaddon, 681-669 B.C., From the Central and South-West Palaces At Nimrud* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962). Plates XIII-IV, LXIV-V, LXVI-II.

636.Littauer and Crowel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*, 135. E. Flandin and Botta, *Monuments De Nineveh* (Paris: 1849-1850). Plates. 64, 66, 67, 87, 88, 99, 108, 112.

637.Barnett, *Sculptures From the North Palace of Ashurbanipal At Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. Room C, Slab 15, 16 Pl. IX. Single horsemen riding three in a row hunting lions. the two front ones carry bows held facing downwards by the string. wearing greaves (shin guards) and shaven. Rear horseman has a

Ashurbanipal illustrate the mounted warriors operating alongside chariot-mounted archers as well as foot archers and slingers.⁶³⁸

Both texts and reliefs indicate that in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.E. Assyrian horseman are no longer found paired with mounted attendants and have replaced the chariot as the largest mobile portion of the Assyrian battle array⁶³⁹. Both indicate that the bow and lance continue to be used by horsemen and spearman on horseback are used to pursue broken armies, harrying and attacking the fleeing enemy at close range where archers were less effective and vulnerable to close quarter counter attacks.⁶⁴⁰ Although much is speculation when reconstructing tactics from reliefs, it is probable that the chariot and horseman worked in concert on the flanks of enemy formations with the chariot breaking up formations on the weak ends of formations while the high mobility of the horsemen could dispatch of the scattered foot soldiers. The horse does not provide an effective platform for an archer to shoot accurately at a distant target. The development of mounted lancers engaged in picking off dispersed infantry indicates a more effective use of horsemen.

whip/quirt. Also a horse blanket is evident with long tassles on the back. Also again in Slabs 23-28 Plate X. Both of these are the royal lion hunt with the king? in front spearing lions and also with bowmen in his chariot. In both series the horsemen appear behind the many lions the king has killed and beside the cage where the lions are released from...possibly herding towards the king? They are wearing mail leggings as well as boots with a form of laces possibly up the front of the boot or it could be further protection. Room F Slabs 1-2 there is a horseman operating alongside a chariot. Horseman has a bow, beard, greaves and is alone. Room F slab 15, two horsemen with spears, very long lengthwise blankets in front of a chariot with four men in it, assaulting a city. Room H, Slab 7-10, Plate XXIII. This is a scene of Elamites hastening to the battle, there are chariots piled up with four or three warriors seated on them, bowmen on foot and spearmen on horseback, some of the spearmen have bows too. Four of the five horsemen are looking backwards at the troops with a beckoning motion (arm raised pointing back). Room M, Slab 7, Plate XXXIV. Mounted horsemen, assaulting a city in the mountains. the horsemen are lined up behind ground bowmen and spearmen. The horsemen are using either a spear or a bow although a few are equipped with both. Behind the top horsemen is a slinger.

638.Ibid. Plates XXXIV, LCIX. Archibald Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sinacherib* (The Hague, Holland: M. Nijhoff, 1912). Plates 16. Refer also pls. 12: below, 17-18, 19-20 and 92.

639.Dalley, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II", 37.

640.See earlier footnote regarding the depiction of horsemen on reliefs in the palace of Ashurbanipal.

In a description of the decisive battle of the eighth campaign of Sargon II in 714 B.C.E., Ursa of Urartu and Metatti of Sikirtu drew up their battle line in a narrow pass of the mountains. The main attack by Sargon was headed by the Assyrian cavalry. Sargon says quite explicitly that the Assyrian forces wrought havoc upon the enemy by arrows and javelins.⁶⁴¹ It is worth noting that the text indicates the main objective of the Assyrian mounted archers seems to have been to immobilise the enemy chariotry by shooting down the horses rather than the men. "His noblemen, counselors who stand before him, I shattered their arms in the battle; them and their horses I captured. 260 of his royal kin (who were) his officers, governors and cavalry, I captured and broke down their resistance (lit., battle). Him I shut up in his crowded camp and cut down (decimated) from under him his draft horses with arrow and javelin. To save his life he abandoned his chariot, mounted a mare and fled before his army".⁶⁴²

The mounted horseman is referred to as *pethallu* or *sa pethalli*. In Hittite and Middle Babylonian texts, 1400-1000 B.C.E., these terms generally refer to mounted messengers rather than mounted fighting men; however from the early ninth century on the term begins to refer to mounted warriors with increasing frequency.⁶⁴³ By the time of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.E.) a specialized word for messenger, *kallapu*, is found in the texts distinguishing such mounted riders

641.'ina ussi mulmulli'. From 'Assur Father of the Gods'. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, 73-99. Thureau-Dangin, "Tablettes chaldéennes inédites". See reference also in H. W. F. Saggs, "Assyrian Warfare in the Sargonid Period," *Iraq* 25 (1963): 148-151.

642.A very interesting note occurs at the close of this text in paragraph 177. '1 charioteer, 2 cavalymen, 3 sappers, were killed:-(these) heroes (lit., men of highest words)' A footnote in Luckenbill's translation notes, 'The same enumeration of the dead is found at the end of a 'letter' of Esarhaddon, paragraph 592 f. These letters to the god are to be regarded as part of a ceremony in commemoration of those who died in battle. The '1 charioteer, 2 cavalymen, and 3 sappers' are the 'unknown' heroes'. According to Thureau-Dangin's text this is 1 "narkabti" 2 "pit-hal-lim" and 3 "kal-la-ba-a-ni". "kal-la-ba-a-ni" is the plural of "kallabu". It is interesting that the pithalli are still textually depicted in pairs at this late date. Certainly the occurrence of "narkabti" does not allow us to consider them charioteers and "kallabu" likewise prevents a translation as messenger. Textually this appears to be a strong delineation between the various groups of horsemen. Of course it is also interesting that foot soldiers are not mentioned if it is indeed a list of the 'unknown heroes'.

643.AHw sub *pethallu*.

from the mounted warrior.⁶⁴⁴ In the Horse Lists and other cuneiform texts from Nimrud at the beginning of the 8th century B.C.E. the term *rab urâte* "officer of teams" is used to designate a commanding officer of chariots or horsemen. This dual use may indicate that there was a transition period in which the cavalry was emerging from the ranks of the chariotry and, as such, was not a distinct military division.⁶⁴⁵

2. The Persians

In a famous description of Persian customs Herodotus states, "The Persians teach their sons, between the ages of five and twenty, only three things: to ride, use a bow, and speak the truth".⁶⁴⁶ Despite this poetic reputation, the Persian cavalry was apparently only established during the reign of Cyrus the Great (549-529 B.C.E.), according to Xenophon.⁶⁴⁷ In his *Cyropaedia* he explains the origins of the Persian cavalry as a response to their inability to pursue the routed enemy, thus completing their victory and scavenging the greatest amount of victory spoils.⁶⁴⁸

644. Stephanie Dalley and J. N. Postgate, *The Tablets From Fort Shalmaneser, Cuneiform Texts From Nimrud*, vol. 3 (London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1984), 34. Also, Armas Salonen, *Hippologica Accadica* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1955), 221. Also refer to the *Assur Father of the Gods* text in Luckenbill's *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylon* where the final verse refers to the 'unknown heroes' of battle mentioning both the pithalli and the kappalu independently.

645. Dalley, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II", 36. Dalley and Postgate, *The Tablets From Fort Shalmaneser*", 32 "Study of the Horse Lists and associated texts from Sargon's reign has shown that the profession *rab urate* 'commander of teams' can refer both to chariotry and to cavalry officers. Therefore from this term alone it is not possible to say whether the Samarian unit consisted of both cavalry and chariotry, or of only one or other. At first sight it seems mystifying that the title should not distinguish between cavalry and chariotry. However, an ambiguity such as this must surely arise from the historical development of equestrian units."

646. Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.136.

647. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.3.

648. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.3.4-6. "Friends, we all appreciate, I am sure, that if we could but make our own the good fortune that is now dawning upon us, great blessings would come to all the Persians and above all, as is reasonable, to us by whom they are secured. But I fail to see how we are to establish a valid claim to the spoil if we cannot gain it by our own strength; and this we cannot do, unless the Persians have cavalry of their own. [5] Just think of it,' he went on; 'we Persians have arms with which, it seems, we go into close quarters and put the enemy to flight; and then when we have routed them, how could we without horses capture or kill horsemen or bowmen or targeteers in

Even if Xenophon's etiology may be fanciful or flawed, the conquest of Hyrcania and the successful revolt against the Medes by Cyrus the Great probably lead to the inclusion of foreign cavalry in his army, as well as the domestic adoption of their cavalry knowledge and techniques. The creation of a Persian mounted elite had strong military as well as social implications. This is apparent in Xenophon's story where after the establishment of a cavalry Cyrus' second command is to order that all the Persian nobles should ride everywhere and it should be considered a disgrace for them to be seen on foot. To make the decree a reality, his third pronouncement orders the distribution of horses and the wealth necessary to support them among the equals.⁶⁴⁹

The historical accuracy of details concerning the arms and function of the Persian cavalry is difficult to establish since the majority of details come from Greek writers rather than Persian ones. As the Greek interaction with the Persians was almost exclusively due to military encounters, it is probable that the details in contemporary written accounts would be accurate, but the later histories are often suspect.⁶⁵⁰ Xenophon describes the cavalry of Cyrus the Great (576-529 B.C.E.) equipping themselves, "with many fine coats....fine corslets and helmets. The horses, likewise, they armed with forehead-pieces and breastplates; the single horses with thigh-

their flight? And what bowmen or spearmen or horsemen would be afraid to come up and inflict loss upon us, when they are perfectly sure that they are in no more danger of being harmed by us than by the trees growing yonder?"

649. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.3.22-23. Again, this may simply be an exaggerated etiology, but the story would reflect the social position of the horsemen at the time of Xenophon's writing.

650. For example, as noted by N. Sekunda, it is probable that Xenophon's description of Cyrus the Great's cavalry was directly drawn from his own experience with the forces of Cyrus the Younger. Nick Sekunda, *The Persian Army 560-330 BCE* (London: Osprey Publishing, 1992), 25. Cf. for more information on evaluating Herodotus' reliability as a source. O. Kimball Armayor, "Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 108 (1978): 1. P. Rahe states that Herodotus' description of the arms and armor of the Persians is generally in accord with the archaeological evidence, however his observations on the Persian's subjects is questionable. Paul Rahe, "The Military Situation in Western Asia on the Eve of Cunjaxa," *American Journal of Philology* 101 (1980): 79.

pieces".⁶⁵¹ In *Anabasis*,⁶⁵² Xenophon describes the cavalry of Cyrus the Younger (circa 424-401) as horsemen, "armed with breastplates and thigh-pieces and, all of them except Cyrus, with helmets....And all their horses had frontlets and breast-pieces; and the men carried, besides their other weapons, Greek sabres".⁶⁵³ Herodotus says that the horsemen of Xerxes (reigned 485-465) went to battle wearing, like the foot-soldiers, iron scaled tunics and armed with a "short spear, a bow of uncommon size, and arrows of reed".⁶⁵⁴ They also wore helmets fashioned of brass or steel.⁶⁵⁵ The weaponry of the Persians is also mentioned often by Aeschylus (approximately 472 B.C.E.), as he sings repeatedly of the Persian bow and spear, although this is not explicitly mounted warriors.⁶⁵⁶ These various texts agree that the basic offensive weaponry of the Persian horseman was the bow and light spear.⁶⁵⁷

The later Achaemenid horseman appears to use the same offensive weaponry, but adds a shield, as well as heavier defensive armour. In 367-5 B.C.E., Xenophon recommends a new piece of heavy armour, called the arm, that is to protect, "the shoulder, the arm, the elbow, and the part that holds the reins".⁶⁵⁸ An example of this may be seen on a coin of Datames⁶⁵⁹ circa 370-368 B.C.E. which features a seated officer possibly wearing these arm guards as well as

651.Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 6.4.1. The same features found also in 7.1.2.

652. Written sometime near the beginning of the 4th century B.C.E.

653.Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 1.8.6-7.

654.Herodotus, *Histories*, 7.61.

655.Herodotus, *Histories*, 7.84.

656.Aeschylus, *The Persians*. Particularly in Scene I, Chorus. "Prance under them; steel bows and shafts their arms, / Dreadful to see, and terrible in fight," "Leads against Greece; whether his arrowy shower / Shot from the strong-braced bow, or the huge spear."

657.The primacy of the javelin or light spear is mentioned in *Anabasis*, 1.8.3 where Cyrus leaps down from his chariot, puts on his breastplate and mounts his horse taking spears in his hands.

658.Xenophon, *On Horsemanship*, 12.5.

659.*Revue des études anciennes* 5 (1903): 247-248.

trousers covered with iron scales.⁶⁶⁰ An administrative document dated to 421-22 B.C.E. provides further illumination of the standard cavalry panoply, listing the items that a Jew, Gadallama, requests in order to equip a horseman as: "a horse with groom, harness, and an iron (unknown), and a helmet, leather breastplate, shield, 120 arrows, an iron attachment for the shield, two spears and ration money".⁶⁶¹ After their defeat at the Battle of Issus in 333 B.C.E., the Persian cavalry probably increased its protective armour and abandoned the multiple javelins for a single lance wielded with both hands. Diodorus Siculus comments that Darius fashioned "swords and lances much longer than his earlier types".⁶⁶² A Chorasmian terracotta flask, recovered from a late 4th or early 3rd century B.C.E. tomb at the Khorezm city of Koy-Krylgan-Kala in modern Uzbekistan, depicts a lightly armed cavalryman thrusting a two-handed cataphract lance.⁶⁶³

The function of the horsemen is expanded by the Persians to engage in combat directly with other mounted troops. The general function of the cavalry in the ancient Near East was to harass the enemy and when the lines had broken to pursue the fleeing combatants. When the infantry formation falls apart, individual soldiers are extremely vulnerable and most casualties are incurred at this point. In *Hellenics* 3.4.13, Xenophon records a small battle involving Persian and Greek horsemen who happen to crest the same hill while on respective reconnaissance missions. The following engagement results in a clear victory for the armoured Persians.

And when the two squadrons saw one another, not so much as four plethra apart, at first both halted, the Greek horsemen being drawn up four deep like a phalanx, and the barbarians with a front of not more than twelve, but many men deep. Then, however, the barbarians charged. When they came to a hand-to-hand encounter, all

660. The Assyrian horsemen also appeared to wear trousers of iron scales. These can easily be seen in the various plates from Ashurbanipal's palace referenced early in this paper.

661. UCP 9/3 276. Cf. Matthew W. Stolper, "Fifth Century Nippur: Texts of the Murasus and From Their Surroundings," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 53 (2001): 83-132.

662. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historia*, 17.53.1.

663. R. Ghirshman, "La Selle En Iran," *Iranica Antiqua* 10 (1973): 94-107.

of the Greeks who struck anyone broke their spears, while the barbarians, being armed with javelins of cornel-wood, speedily killed twelve men and two horses.⁶⁶⁴

This text provides an interesting depiction of a cavalry-on-cavalry engagement, although it is questionable whether the ineptitude of the Greeks is due to superior Persian armour, which breaks the spears, superior Persian weaponry, which penetrates the Greek armour, or superior Persian tactics in using cornel-wood javelins instead of spears. It is also worth noting that the horsemen are operating in units, drawn up with at least four men deep, and not independently.

Though this does portray the cavalry regiment in formation, it continues to be in pursuit and not as a kind of battering ram to smash through enemy lines.⁶⁶⁵ The well-trained infantry or hoplite force in formation is impenetrable to cavalry charges and would only be vulnerable along its flanks or when the formation is broken. Even if drawn up in a column, a well armoured cavalry would not penetrate the phalanx formation without substantial casualties, if at all.⁶⁶⁶ A strong example of this is in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* where Abradatas plunges successfully into the Egyptian phalanx followed by his close charioteers. The Egyptians in the path cannot move as the sides hold firm and are killed by the charging chariots. However, Abradatas and his accompanying men are thrown from their chariots as they bounce over the bodies and arms and are killed by the surrounding Egyptians.⁶⁶⁷

664.Xenophon, *Hellenics*, 3.4.13-14. This area was part of the Achaemenid empire under Cyrus the Great in the 6th century and later gained independence in the 4th century B.C.E.

665.Nick Sekunda, *The Persians* (London: Osprey Publishing, 1992), 93.

666.A. D. H. Bivar, "Cavalry Equipment and Tactic on the Euphrates Frontier," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (192): 273. Rahe, "The Military Situation in Western Asia on the Eve of Cunjasa", 79, 86.

667.Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 7.1.30-31.

3. The Egyptians

Mounted riders appear in Egyptian reliefs as early as the Eighteenth dynasty (1570-1293 B.C.E.), with textual references to a "commander of horses"⁶⁶⁸ in the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty. The role and function of these mounted riders is uncertain as they do not seem to be organized units fighting from mounted horses. The earliest known example of a figure on horseback is found in a glazed steatite plaque bearing a cartouche of Thutmose III.⁶⁶⁹ However, this dating is uncertain as many scarabs and seals bearing this cartouche are of a later date, which casts doubt on the reliability of this cartouche as a certain dating indicator.⁶⁷⁰ The late Eighteenth Dynasty provides a few scattered examples of mounted riders: a limestone ostrakon featuring Thutmose IV and a mounted divinity;⁶⁷¹ a limestone relief of a horseman and infantry;⁶⁷² a fragment of a limestone relief with the top of a horseman and front quarter of the horse;⁶⁷³ a painted wooden statuette of a mounted rider,⁶⁷⁴ the side-panel of a toy chariot with a

668. However, A. R. Schulman writes that the 'officer of horses' was a generic title used to indicate a position of command in the chariotry without indicating a specific rank. Alan Richard Schulman, "The Egyptian Chariotry: A Reexamination," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 2 (1963): 95.

669. Metropolitan Museum of Art. Acc. No. 05.3.263. Published in John Ward and F. L. Griffith, *The Sacred Beetle: A Popular Treatise on Egyptian Scarabs in Art and History* (London: J. Murray, 1902).

670. W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders With Names, Illustrated By the Egyptian Collection in University College, London* (London: School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1917).

671. W. M. Flinders Petrie and Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Six Temples At Thebes*. 1896 (London: B. Quaritch, 1897). Plate 9.

672. Bologna Museum, Acc. No. 1889.

673. Royal Scottish Museum, Acc. No. 1955.81. Published in Alan Richard Schulman, "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 16 (1957): 263.

674. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Acc. No. 15.2.3. Published in Herbert Eustis Winlock, *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes* (New York: Macmillan, 1947). Plate 22.

painted horseman;⁶⁷⁵ a bronze battle-axe with the figure of a horseman cut out;⁶⁷⁶ an unknown cast bronze object, possibly a razor, with the handle in the form of a elongated horse and rider;⁶⁷⁷ and a terra cotta statuette of a mounted rider.⁶⁷⁸ None of the mounted riders carry a weapon except for the mounted deity. This lack of a military panoply of even the simplest kind, combined with the position of the riders at the extreme back of the horse,⁶⁷⁹ indicates a function as mounted messengers or scouts rather than warriors fighting from horseback. Interpreting these Eighteenth Dynasty representations as messengers or scouts is supported by Nineteenth Dynasty reliefs of the battle of Kadesh, where four examples of Egyptian horsemen are found.⁶⁸⁰ Two of the representations on the Abu Simbel reliefs and one on the Luxor relief are specifically identified in accompanying hieroglyphic inscriptions as "scout". In each instance the riders carry a quiver or bow.

Moving into the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Dynasty (1293-1073 B.C.E.), there are several more examples of mounted horsemen: two limestone ostraca each with a painted

675. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Acc. No. 55.167.3. Published in Nora Scott, "Recent Additions to the Egyptian Collection," *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 15 (1956): 87.

676. British Museum, Acc. No. 36,766. Published in Hall, "The Oldest Representation of Horsemanship (?): An Egyptian Axe in the British Museum," *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology of the University of Liverpool* 18 (1931): 3-5. Plate I.

677. British Museum, Acc. No. 36, 314. Published in Schulman, "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom", 263.

678. Oriental Institute Museum, Acc. No. 19433. Published in *Ibid.*, 263.

679. The most effective position for riding an equid is to distribute the weight over the front withers. The location of the equid kidneys and the relative weakness of the spine discourage any intensive riding while sitting further back on the equid. Also, as equids bear approximately 65% of their weight on the forelimbs in order to effectively maneuver at speed this ratio must be maintained by sitting over the centre of gravity found at the withers. If a rider fails to position themselves over the natural centre of gravity the maneuverability of the equid will be severely impaired and the rider has a great risk of becoming unseated. This is in contrast to the common practice of riding a donkey seated over the hindquarters due simply to their lack of withers and casual pace.

680. Walter Wreszinski, *Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914). Plate 64 for Luxor. Plate 169 for Abu Simbel.

horseman from Deir el Medineh;⁶⁸¹ a painted horseman again on a limestone ostrakon from the area of Luxor;⁶⁸² a bas relief from the reign of Seti I at Karnak featuring 4 riders, 2 of them carry a bow case while one of the remaining riders sits side saddle in a long robe;⁶⁸³ a bas relief from the reign of Ramses II with a rider seated side saddle holding the bow and reins in one hand, a crop in the other and the bow case slung on the back;⁶⁸⁴ and another bas relief again from the reign of Ramses II depicting three riders, all carry crops and two have a bow case on their back.⁶⁸⁵

Despite these early depictions of horse mounted riders it is doubtful that the Egyptian military in the New Kingdom included an organised or distinct arm of mounted warriors.⁶⁸⁶ The known examples of mounted riders indicate the horse was not ridden in an aggressive or efficient fashion with the riders seated too far back to engage in effective mounted warfare. Although it is possible that this style of riding depicted may have arisen from the artist's familiari-

681. Cairo Museum, Cat. No. 2159. Published in Vandier d'Abbadie and Annie Gasse, *Catalogue des ostraca figurés de Deir el Médineh* (Le Caire: Impr. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1936). Plate 19. N. de G. Davies, "Egyptian Drawings on Limestone Flakes," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 4 (1917): 234-240. Plate 51.

682. Schulman, "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom". Figure 7.

683. Catherine Rommelaere, *Les chevaux du nouvel empire égyptien: origines, races, harnachement* (Bruxelles: Connaissance de l'Égypte Ancienne, 1991), 113.

684. *Ibid.*, 113.

685. *Ibid.*, 113.

686. Rommelaere comments, "Ainsi, depuis le regne de Thoutmosis IV jusqu'aux environs de la 20th dynastie, on releve quarante-deux representations de cavaliers. Si l'on compare ce chiffre aux centaines de figurations de chars qui sillonnent l'art égyptien depuis le debut de la 18 dynastie, on pourrtaite evidemment considerer qu'en regard des attelages, la place accordee aux cavaliers etait peu importante. c'est sans doute ce qui incita certains auteurs a declarer que le cheval n'etait monte que tres exceptionnellement. Mais ce qui semble plus exceptionnel encore, c'est que l'Égypte, pays ou l'armee ne possedait pas de cavalerie proprement dite et ou l'equitation etait plutot considerée comme une pratique degradante, fournisse malgré tout plus d'une quarantaine de prerepresentations de cette sorte, figurees sur bas-reliefs, ostraca, stautueetes ou scarabees. c'est pourquoi on peut sans doute conclure que, malgré le peu d'experience des Égyptiens en matiere d'equitation, le coursier monte acquit neanmoins unde certaine importance dans la vallee du Nil, sans que l'on puisse au juste deviner queelles raisons pousserent les artistes a lui consacrer tant d'attention." *Ibid.*, 113.

ty with ridden donkey's rather than horses and thus does not reflect the reality of horse riding, the lack of familiarity is just as telling regarding the relative rarity of mounted equids. The independent and isolated nature of the riders does not indicate a distinct division but at best a peripheral role.

V. Bibliography

- Abrahami, P. "Hébreu-Soherah / Akkadien-Sahirum." *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 1 (1991): 20-21.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. *The First Book of Samuel*. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Aistleitner, Joseph. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.
- Aitchison, Jean. *Language Change: Progress Or Decay*. Cambridge Approaches to Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Albenda, Pauline. *The Palace of Sargon, King of Assyria: Monumental Wall Reliefs At Dur-Sharrukin, From Original Drawings Made at the Time of Their Discovery in 1843-1844 by Botta and Flandin*. Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations, 1986.
- Albright, W. F. "Some Additional Notes on the Song of Deborah." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 11 (1922): 284-285.
- _____. "The Earliest Forms of Hebrew Verse." *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 51 (1922): 69ff.
- _____. "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 62 (1936): 26-31.
- _____. "A Reexamination of the Lachish Letters." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 73 (1939): 16-21.
- _____. "An Aramean Magical Text in Hebrew from the Seventh Century B.C." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 76 (1939): 5-11.
- _____. "The Psalm of Habakkuk." ed. H. H. Rowley, 1-18. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1946.
- _____. "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric Poems (Psalm 68)." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950): 1-39.
- _____. *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1957.
- _____. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths*. Vol. 7. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, London: Athlone Press, 1968.
- Anderson, F., and D. F. Freedman. "The Orthography of the Aramaic Portion of the Tell Fekherye Bilingual." In *Text and Context: Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F. C. Fensham*, ed. U. Classen, 9-49. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Anderson, J. K. "Hoplite Weapons and Offensive Arms." In *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, ed. Victor Davis Hanson, 15-37. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Arlotto, Anthony. *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Washington, D.C: University Press of America, 1981.
- Armayer, O. Kimball. "Herodotus: Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 108 (1978): 1-9.
- Arnold, Bill T. *Who Were the Babylonians*. Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Auld, A. Graeme. *Kings Without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Auld, G., and Craig Ho. "The Making of David and Goliath." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56 (1992): 19-39.
- Avishur, Yitzhak. "The Second Amulet Incantation from Arslan Tash." In *Phoenician Inscriptions and the Bible*, ed. Yitzhak Avishur, 225-243. Tel Aviv-Jaffa: Archaeological Center Publications, 2000.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bardtke, Hans. "Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80

- (1955): 401-420.
- Barnett, Richard David. *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. London: British Museum Publications Ltd. for the Trustees of the British Museum, 1976.
- Barnett, Richard David, Erika Bleibtreu, Geoffrey Turner, and Dominique Collon. *Sculptures from the Southwest Palace of Sennacherib At Nineveh*. London: Published for the Trustees of the British Museum by British Museum Press, 1998.
- Barnett, Richard David, and Leri Glynn Davies. *A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories: With Other Examples of Ancient Near Eastern Ivories in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1975.
- Barnett, Richard David, and Margarete Falkner. *The Sculptures of Assur-Nasir-Apli II, 883-859 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser III, 745-727 B.C. And Esarhaddon, 681-669 B.C., from the Central and South-West Palaces At Nimrud*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962.
- Barr, James. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- _____. "Linguistic Literature, Hebrew." *Encyclopedia Judaica* 16 (1971): 1352-1401.
- _____. *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Published for the British Academy by the Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Barré, M. L. "A Note on Rs't in the Karatepe Inscription." *Journal of the Ancient Near East Society* 13 (1981): 1-3.
- _____. "An Analysis of the Royal Blessing in the Karatepe Inscription." *Maarav* 3/2 (1982): 177-194.
- Barstad, Hans M. *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: 'Exilic' Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55*. Vol. 102. Serie B-Skrifter, Oslo: Novus, 1997.
- Barth, J. *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*. Hildesheim: Gg. Olms, 1967.
- Bauer, Hans, Pontus Leander, and Paul Kahle. *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962.
- Beeston, A. F. L. *Sabaic Dictionary: English, French, Arabic*. Publication of the University of Sanaa, Louvain-la-Neuve Beyrouth: Editions Peeters Librairie du Liban, 1982.
- Bender, A. "Das Lied Exodus 15." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 23 (1903): 1-48.
- Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. København: Gad, 1967.
- Best, Jan G. P. *Thracian Peltasts and Their Influence on Greek Warfare*. Vol. 1. Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society, Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1969.
- Beyerlin, Walter. *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.
- Bimson, John J. *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*. Vol. 5. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1978.
- Biran, A., and J. Naveh. "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan." *Israel Exploration Journal* 43 (1993): 81-98.
- _____. "The Tel Dan Inscription." *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1995): 1-18.
- Bivar, A. D. H. "Cavalry Equipment and Tactic on the Euphrates Frontier." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (192): 273-291.
- Black, Jeremy. *European Warfare, 1453-1815*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Black, Jeremy A., A. R. George, and J. N. Postgate. *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- Blau, J. "The Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew in Light of Arabic Diglossia and Middle Arabic." *Leshonenu* 60 (1997): 21-32.
- Blenkinsopp, J. "An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 495-518.
- _____. "Ballad Style and Psalm Style in the Song of Deborah." *Biblica* 42 (1961): 61-76.

- Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Boehmer, Rainer Michael. *Die Entwicklung der Glyptik während der Akkad-Zeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965.
- Boehringer, Erich. *Altertümer von Pergamon*. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1800.
- Boling, Robert G. *Judges*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1975.
- Bonnefoy, Yves. *Roman and European Mythologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Bonnet, Hans. *Die Waffen der Völker des Alten Orients*. Gütersloh: Prisma-Verlag, 1977.
- Bordreuil, Pierre. "A Note on the Seal of Peqah the Armor-Bearer, Future King of Israel." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49 (1986): 54-55.
- Bottéro, Jean, and André Finet. *Répertoire analytique des tomes à V*. Vol. XV. Archives royales de Mari, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1954.
- Bowra, C. M. *Heroic Poetry*. London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Westminster Aids to the Study of the Scriptures, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Brock, James King. *Fortetsa: Early Greek Tombs Near Knossos*. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Brockelmann, Carl, and Theodor Nöldeke. *Lexicon Syriacum*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1895.
- Brooke, George J., and Barnabas Lindars. *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Vol. 33. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis. *Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum: Reign of Ashur-Nasir-Pal, 885-860 B.C.* London: Printed by order of the Trustees, 1914.
- Burney, Charles Fox. *The Book of Judges*. The Library of Biblical Studies, New York: KTAV Pub. House, 1970.
- Burrows, Millar. *What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archeology for Biblical Studies*. New Haven, Conn: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941.
- Bynon, Theodora. *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Caird, G. B. "Homoeophony in the Septuagint." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly, W.D. Davies and R. Scroggs, 74-88. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Caquot, André, and Philippe de Robert. *Les livres de Samuel*. Vol. 6. Commentaire de l'ancien testament, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994.
- Caquot, André, Maurice Sznycer, and Andrée Herdner. *Textes ougaritiques: introduction, traduction, commentaire*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1974.
- Carmignac, J. "Precisions apportées au vocabulaire de l'Hebreu biblique par la guerre des fils de lumiere contre les fils de tenebres." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 345-365.
- Carpenter, Charles. "Remnants of Archaic English in West Virginia." *West Virginia Review* 12 (1934): 77-95.
- Cassuto, Umberto. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1967.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Exodus*. The Old Testament Library, London: S.C.M. Press, 1974.
- _____. *Isaiah*. The Old Testament Library, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Chomsky, W. "How the Study of Hebrew Grammar Began and Developed." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 35 (1944): 281-301.
- Clements, R. E. *Exodus*. Cambridge Bible Commentary, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Clines, David J. A. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

- Collins, T. "The Kilamuwa Inscription - A Phoenician Poem." *Die Welt des Orients* 6 (1971): 183-188.
- Coogan, M. D. "Structural and Literary Analysis of the Song of Deborah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 143-165.
- Coogan, Michael David. *Stories from Ancient Canaan*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Cowley, A. E. "A Hittite Word in Hebrew." *Journal of Theological Studies* 21 (1920): 326.
- Craigie, P. C. "A Note on Judges V 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 397-399.
- _____. "Song of Deborah and the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 253-265.
- _____. "An Egyptian Expression in the Song of the Sea: Exodus XV.4." *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 83-86.
- _____. "Some Further Notes on the Song of Deborah." *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 349-353.
- _____. "Parallel Word Pairs in the Song of Deborah." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 15-22.
- _____. "Deborah and Anat: A Study of Poetic Imagery (Judges 5)." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90 (1978): 374-381.
- Cross, F. M. "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth." *Journal for Theology and the Church* 5 (1968): 1-25.
- Cross, F. M., and D. N. Freedman. "The Song of Miriam." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19 (1955): 237-250.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cross, Frank Moore, and David Noel Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. The Biblical Resource Series, Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub, 1997.
- Crowley, A. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Crüsemann, Frank. *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel*. Vol. 32. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Cryer, F. H. "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel." In *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period*, ed. K. Jeppesen, K. Nielsen, and B. Rosendal, 185-198. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994.
- Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- d'Abbadie, Vandier. "Benjamin. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Geschichte eines israelitischen Stammes." *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1963): 51.
- d'Abbadie, Vandier, and Annie Gasse. *Catalogue des ostraca figurés de Deir el Médineh*. Le Caire: Impr. de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1936.
- Dalley, Stephanie. "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II." *Iraq* 47 (1985): 31-48.
- _____, ed. *Ancient Mesopotamian Military Organization*. Vol. 1, Civilizations of the Ancient Near East. New York: Hendricksons, 2000.
- Dalley, Stephanie, and J. N. Postgate. *The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser*. Vol. 3. Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud, London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1984.
- Davies, Graham. "Was There an Exodus?" In *In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel*, ed. John Day, 23-40. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Davies, N. de G. "Egyptian Drawings on Limestone Flakes." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 4 (1917): 234-240.
- Davies, Philip R. *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*. Vol. 148. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

- Davies, Philip R. "Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 150-163. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- de Vaux, Roland. "Single Combat in the Old Testament." In *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright, 122-135. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- DeCaen, V. "Hebrew Linguistics and Biblical Criticism: A Minimalist Approach." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3 (2001): article 6.
- Deem, Ariella. "And the Stone Sank Into His Forehead. A Note on 1 Samuel XVII 49." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 349-351.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*. Leipzig Baltimore London: J. C. Hinrichs The John Hopkins Press Luzac, 1896.
- Demsky, A. "Mesopotamian and Canaanite Literary Traditions in the Ahiqar Curse Formula." *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978): 7-11.
- _____. "A Royal Inscription from Ekron." *Israel Exploration Journal* 47 (1998): 1-16.
- Demsky, B. I. "On Reading Ancient Inscriptions: The Monumental Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan." *Journal of the Ancient Near East Society* 23 (1995): 29-33.
- der Manuelian, Peter. *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism of the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty*. Studies in Egyptology, London: Kegan Paul International, 1994.
- Deutsch, R., and M. Heltzer. *Forty New Ancient West Semitic Inscriptions*. Tel Aviv/Jaffa: Archaeological Center, 1994.
- _____. *New Epigraphic Evidence from the Biblical Period*. Tel Aviv/Jaffa: Archaeological Center, 1995.
- Dever, William. "Is There Any Archaeological Evidence for the Exodus?" In *Exodus: The Egyptian Evidence*, ed. Ernest Frerichs, and Leonard H. Lesko, 67-86. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Dezsö, Tamás. *Near Eastern Helmets of the Iron Age*. Vol. 992. Bar International Series, Oxford, England: J. and E. Hedges, 2001.
- Dietrich, Manfred, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*. Vol. 24. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Kevelaer Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker Neukirchener Verlag, 1976.
- Dillmann, August, and Werner Munzinger. *Lexicon linguae Aethiopiae cum indice Latino*. Lipsiae: T.O. Weigel, 1865.
- Donner, Herbert. "Der Freund Des Königs." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 269-277.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.
- Dossin, Georges. *Archives royales de Mari*. Vol. 13. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1946.
- Dothan, Trude Krakauer. *The Philistines and Their Material Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Drews, Robert. *The End of the Bronze Age: Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Driver, G. R. "Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938): 393-405.
- _____. "Problems in Judges Newly Discussed." *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 8 (1962): 8.
- Driver, Godfrey Rolles, and John C. L. Gibson. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1978.
- Driver, S. R. "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist." *Journal of Philology* 11 (1882): 201-236.
- _____. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891.

- _____. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. Clarendon Press Series, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
- _____. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. Vol. 3. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Driver, Samuel Rolles. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel: With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions, and Facsimiles of Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.
- Drower, E. S., and Rudolf Macuch. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., and J. Starcky. "Une inscription araméenne inédite de Sfiré." *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 13 (1956): 23-41.
- _____. "Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré (stèles I and II)." *Mémoires présentées par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 15 (1960): 1-155.
- Durham, John I. *Understanding the Basic Themes of Exodus*. Dallas: Word Pub, 1990.
- Ebeling, Erich, Bruno Meissner, Ernst Weidner, Wolfram von Soden, and Dietz Otto Edzard. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. Berlin und Leipzig: W. de Gruyter & Co, 1928.
- Irene Shirun-Grumach, ed. *The Creation of Exodus 14-15*. Vol. 40, Agypten und Altes Testament. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1998.
- Ehrensverd, Martin. "Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 11 (1997): 29-40.
- _____. "Studies in the Syntax and the Dating of Biblical Hebrew." University of Aarhus, 2000.
- _____. "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology*, ed. Ian Young, 164-188. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Elwolde, J. F. "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah." In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held At Leiden University*, ed. T. Muraoka, and J. F. Elwolde, 17-55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Eskhult, Mats. "The Importance of Loanwords for Dating Biblical Texts." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 150-163. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Fage, J. D., and Roland Anthony Oliver. *The Cambridge History of Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Ferguson, Brian. "A Paradigm for the Study of War and Society." In *War and Society in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, the Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub, and Nathan Stewart Rosenstein, 389-437. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1999.
- Finegan, Jack. *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- Finkelstein, Israel. "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late Monarchic Perspective." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (2002): 131-167.
- Fisher, L. R. "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965): 313-324.
- Fisher, Loren R., F. Brent Knutson, and Donn F. Morgan. *Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 49. Analecta Orientalia, Rome: Pontificum institutum biblicum, 1972.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic Letter of King Adon to the Egyptian Pharaoh." *Biblica* 46 (1965): 41-55.
- _____. *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Biblica Et Orientalia, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

- Flandin, E., and Botta. *Monuments de Nineveh*. Paris: 1849.
- Floyd, M. "Oral Tradition as a Problematic Factor in the Historical Interpretation of Poems in the Law and the Prophets." Claremont Graduate School, 1980.
- Floyd, Michael H. *Minor Prophets*. Vol. 22. *The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*, Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: eine Analyse von Ex 1-15*. Berlin: A.Töpelmann, 1964.
- Foster, Benjamin R. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. Bethesda, Md: CDL Press, 1993.
- Fraenkel, S. *Die Aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*. Leiden: 1886.
- Freedman, D. F. "The Chronology of Israel and the Ancient Near East." In *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. George Ernest Wright, 203-228. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.
- Freedman, David Noel. *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry*. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- Freedman, David Noel, K. A. Mathews, and Richard S. Hanson. *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11qpaaleolev)*. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1985.
- Freeman, Geoffrey E., F. T. Miosi, and Adolf Erman. *Neuägyptische Grammatik*. Toronto: Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities, 1973.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *Exodus*. Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991.
- Friedrich, Johannes. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1952.
- Friedrich, Johannes, G. Rudolf Meyer, Arthur Ungnad, and Ernst F. Weidner. *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf: Keilschrifttexte und aramäische Urkunden aus einer assyrischen Provinzhauptstadt*. Berlin: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers, 1940.
- Galling, K. "Goliath und seine Rustung." *Vetus Testamentum Supplemental Series* 15 (1966): 150-169.
- Garbini, G. "Il Cantico di Debora." *Parola del Passato* 178 (1978): 5-31.
- Garbini, Giovanni. *Myth and History in the Bible*. Vol. 362. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Donald W. Parry. *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95: Arranged By Author With Citation and Subject Indexes*. Vol. 19. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Gesenius, Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm, and Edward Robinson. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Including the Biblical Chaldee*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1883.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift. Eine philologisch-historisch Einleitung in die Sprachlehren und Wörterbücher der hebräischen Sprache*. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1815.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Roediger, and Benjamin Davies. *Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar*. London: S. Bagster and sons, 1846.
- Ghirshman, R. "La selle en Iran." *Iranica Antiqua* 10 (1973): 94-107.
- Ginsburg, H. L. "An Aramaic Contemporary of the Lachish Letters." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 111 (1948): 24-27.
- Gitin, S. "Cultic Inscriptions Found in Ekron." *Biblical Archaeology* 53 (1990): 232.
- Gitin, S., Trudy Dothan, and J. Naveh. "A Royal Dedicatory Inscription from Ekron." *Israel Exploration Journal* 48 (1997): 118.
- Globe, Alexander. "The Literary Structure and Unity of the Song of Deborah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 493-512.
- _____. "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5, 4-5." *Biblica* 55 (1974): 168-178.
- Gogel, Sandra Landis. *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Vol. 23. *Resources for Biblical*

- Study, Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Goldfajn, Tal. *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Oxford Theological Monographs, Oxford New York: Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Goodblatt, David M. *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Goodspeed, E. "The Original Language of the Gospels." In *Contemporary Thinking About Jesus*, ed. T. S. Kepler, 58-63. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1944.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "North Israelite Influence on Postexilic Hebrew." *Israel Exploration Journal* 5 (1955): 85-88.
- _____. "The Origin of the Jews in Elephantine." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 14 (1955): 56-58.
- _____. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Vol. 38. Analecta Orientalia, Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Gray, John. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Green, Dennis Howard. *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Greenfield, J. C. "Review of Wagner 1966." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 232-234.
- _____. "The Hebrew Bible and Canaanite Literature." In *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter, and Frank Kermode, 545-560. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Greenfield, J. C., and A. Shaffer. "Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye." *Iraq* 45 (1983): 115.
- _____. "Notes on the Curse Formula of the Tell Feherye Inscription." *Revue biblique* 92 (1985): 47-59.
- Greenspahn, Frederick E. *An Introduction to Aramaic*. Vol. 46. Resources for Biblical Study, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Grimal, Nicolas. "Bibliothèques et propagande royale à l'époque éthiopienne." In *Livre du centenaire, 1880-1980*, ed. J Vercoutter, 37-48. Le Caire: IFAO, 1980.
- Gulkowitsch, Lazar. *Die Bildung von Abstraktbegriffen in der hebraischen Sprachgeschichte*. Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1931.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav, and Harry A. Hoffner. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980.
- Hall. "The Oldest Representation of Horsemanship (?): An Egyptian Axe in the British Museum." *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology of the University of Liverpool* 18 (1931): 3-5.
- Halpern, B. "The Stele from Dan: Epigraphic and Historical Considerations." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 296 (1994): 63-80.
- Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*. The Bible in its World, Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- Harris, Zellig Sabbetai. *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*. Vol. 8. American Oriental Series, New Haven, Conn: American Oriental Society, 1936.
- Haugen, E. "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing." *Language* 26 (1972): 210-231.
- Haupt, P. "Moses Song of Triumph." *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 20 (1904): 149-172.
- Heltzer, M. "Akkadian Katinnu and Hebrew Kidon, Sword." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 41 (1989): 65-68.
- Hertzberg, H. W. "Mizpa." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 47 (1929): 161-196.

- Hillers, Delbert R., Paul D. Hanson, and Loren R. Fisher. *Micah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hoffner, H. A. "A Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 220-225.
- Hoftijzer, J., K. Jongeling, Richard C. Steiner, A. Mosak Moshavi, Bezalel Porten, and Charles-F. Jean. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Homer, and A. T Murray. *The Iliad*. Vol. 170. The Loeb Classical Library, London: W. Heinemann, 1924.
- Honeyman, A. M. "Epigraphic Discoveries at Karatepe." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 81 (1949): 21-39.
- Hospers, J. H. "A Hundred Years of Semitic Comparative Linguistics." 138-151. Wagnerningen: 1956.
- Houtman, C. *Exodus*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament, Kampen: Kok, 1993.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "The Chronological Significance of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew." *Israel Exploration Journal* 18 (1968): 230-240.
- _____. "Review of Wagner 1966." *Israel Exploration Journal* 19 (1969): 182-183.
- _____. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms*. Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972.
- _____. "Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew—The Case of 'Semantic Change' in Post-Exilic Writings." In *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics*, ed. T. Muraoka, 1-10. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- _____. "The Historical Quest for 'Ancient Israel' and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations." *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 301-313.
- _____. "The Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics for the Historical Study of Ancient Israel." In *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997*, ed. Ron Margolin, 21-33. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999.
- _____. "Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew." In *Congress Volume, Oslo 1998*, ed. A. Lemaire, and M. Saebø, 143-160. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.
- _____. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology*, ed. Ian Young, 164-188. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. "The Root Pr' in Judges V 2 and Deuteronomy XXXII 42." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 393-406.
- Jellinek, Adolf. *Bet Ha-Midrash*. 6 v. in 2: 1967.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Jones, Horace Leonard, and John Robert Sitlington Sterrett. *Strabo. The Geography of Strabo*. London New York: W. Heinemann G. P. Putnam's sons, 1917.
- Junge, E. "Zur Fehldatierung des Sog. Denkmals memphitischer Theologie oder der Beitrag der ägyptischen Theologie zur Geistesgeschichte der Spätzeit." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologisches Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 29 (1973): 195-204.
- Junge, Ehrhard. "Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia." *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament* 4 (1937): 28-93.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- Kaltner, John, and Steven L McKenzie. *Beyond Babel: A Handbook for Biblical Hebrew and Related Languages*. Vol. 42. Resources for Biblical Study, Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Kamen, Al. "George W. Bush and the G-Word." *The Washington Post*, October 14 2005, A17.

- Keil, Carl Friedrich, and Franz Delitzsch. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1900.
- Kent, Roland G. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. Vol. 33. American Oriental Series, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1954.
- King, L. W., and E. A. Wallis Budge. *Bronze Reliefs from the Gates of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, B.C. 860-825*. London: Printed by order of the Trustees, 1915.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A., and T. C. Mitchell. "Chronology of the Old Testament." In *New Bible Dictionary*, ed. I. H. Marshall, J. I. Packer, and D. J. Wiseman, Leicester: IVP, 1962.
- Klein, Lillian R. *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges*. Vol. 14. Bible and Literature Series, Sheffield, England: Almond Press, 1988.
- Knauf, E. A. "War 'Biblich-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?" *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 3 (1990): 11-23.
- König, Eduard. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Wiesbaden: M. Sändig, 1969.
- Kristiansen, Kristian, and Thomas B. Larsson. *The Rise of Bronze Age Society: Travels, Transmissions and Transformations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kropat, Arno. *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1909.
- Kugel, James L. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Kuhn, K. G. "Beiträge zum Verständnis der Kriegesrolle von Qumran." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 81 (1956): 25ff.
- Kutscher, E. Y., and Claus Wilcke. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 68, 125f.
- Kutscher, E. Y. "Mishnaic Hebrew." *Encyclopedia Judaica* 16 (1972): 260.
- Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel, and Raphael Kutscher. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1982.
- Lambert, W. G. "Literary Style in First Millennium Mesopotamia." In *Essays in Memory of E.A. Speiser*, ed. E. Bender, 123-132. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1968.
- Landsberger, Benno. "Akkadisch aspu=Schleuder, assukku = Schleuderstein." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18 (1957): 378ff.
- Leaf, Walter. *A Companion to the Iliad, for English Readers*. London and New York: Macmillan and co, 1892.
- Lemaire, A. "La stèle araméenne de Bar-Hadad." *Orientalia* 53 (1984): 337-349.
- Lemaire, André, and J.-M. Durand. *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré et l'assyrie de Shamshi-Ilu*. Vol. 20. Hautes études orientales, Genève: Droz, 1984.
- Lemche, Niels Peter. *Ancient Israel: A New History of Israelite Society*. Vol. 5. The Biblical Seminar, Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B. C. E.-IV Century C. E.* Vol. 18. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Deborah's Song: Women in the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 65 (1983): 158-175.
- Lindars, Barnabas, and A. D. H. Mayes. *Judges 1-5: A New Translation and Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.
- Lipiński, Edward. *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics*. Vol. 57. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.
- Littauer, M. A., and J. H. Crowel. "An Egyptian Wheel in Brooklyn." In *Selected Writings on*

- Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing, 296-313. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- _____. "New Light on the Assyrian Chariot." In *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing, 246-257. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- _____. "The Origin of the True Chariot." In *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing, 45-52. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- _____. "Kampfwagen B. Archäologisch." In *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. Peter Raulwing, 26-38. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Littauer, M. A., and J. H. Crouwel. "The Vulture Stele and an Early Type of Two-Wheeled Vehicle." *Journal for Near Eastern Studies* 32 (1973):
- _____. *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Littmann, Enno. *Zigeuner-Arabisch, Wortschatz und Grammatik der arabischen Bestandteile in den morgenländischen Zigeunersprachen*. Bonn, Leipzig: K. Schroeder, 1920.
- Livy. *History of Rome*. Translated by Evan T. Sage. Vol. 313. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Löhr, M. "Ägyptische Reiterei im AT?" *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 31 (1928): 924.
- Luckenbill, Daniel David. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Lust, J., D. Barthélemy, D. W. Gooding, and Emmanuel Tov. *The Story of David and Goliath. Textual and Literary Criticism. Papers of a Joint Venture*. Fribourg: University Press and Vandenhoeck, 1973.
- Lust, J., Erik Eynikel, K. Hauspie, and G. Chamberlain. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
- Macdonald, J., and B. Cutler. "Identification of the Ma'ar in the Ugaritic Texts." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976): 27-35.
- Makujina, John. "Dismemberment in Dan 2:5 and 3:29 as an Old Persian Idiom, 'To be Made into Parts'." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119 (1999): 309.
- _____. *Old Persian Calques in the Aramaic of Daniel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, 2001.
- Malory, Thomas, Ernest Rhys, Rasmus Björn Anderson, and James W. Buel. *The Arthurian Tales, The Greatest of Romances which Recount the Noble and Valorous Deeds of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table*. London: Norma Society, 1906.
- Mankowski, Paul V. *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*. Vol. 47. Harvard Semitic Studies, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Margalith, Othniel. *The Sea Peoples in the Bible*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994.
- Margoliouth, D. "Language of the Old Testament." In *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, 26-31. Edinburgh: 1900.
- Mastin, B. A. "Was the Salis the Third Man in the Chariot?" *Supplement to Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1979): 125-154.
- Mayes, A. D. H. "The Historical Context of the Battle Against Sisera." *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969): 353-360.
- _____. *Israel in the Period of the Judges*. Studies in Biblical Theology, Naperville, Ill: A. R. Allenson, 1974.
- McCarter, P. K. *I Samuel: A New Translation*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1980.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *King David: A Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- McNeile, A. H. *The Book of Exodus, With Introduction and Notes*. London: Methuen & Co, 1908.
- McNutt, Paula M. *The Forging of Israel: Iron Technology, Symbolism and Tradition in Ancient Society*. Vol. 108. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament the Social World of Biblical Antiquity, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

- Metmann, Leo. *Die hebräische sprache: ihre Geschichte und lexikalische Entwicklung seit Abschluss des Kanons*. Jerusalem: A.M. Luncz, 1904.
- Millard, A. "Alphabetic Inscriptions on Ivories from Nimrud." *Iraq* 24 (1962): 41-51.
- _____. "The Inscription of Zakkur, King of Hamath." In *The Context of Scripture*, ed. W. W. Hallo, and K. Lawson Younger, 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Mobley, Gregory. "The Wild Man in the Bible and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 218-222.
- Molin, G. "What is Kidon?" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956): 334-337.
- Moore, George Foot. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1910.
- Morag, S. "Review of Wagner 1966." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92 (1972): 298-300.
- Morley, Margaret Warner. *The Carolina Mountains*. Fairview, N.C: Historical Images, 2006.
- Mowinckel, S. "Psalm Criticism Between 1900 and 1935: Ugarit and Psalm Exegesis." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 13-33.
- _____. "Drive and/Or Ride in O.T." *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 278-299.
- Muchiki, Yoshiyuki. *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*. Atlanta, Ga: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
- Muilenburg, James. "A Liturgy on the Triumphs of Yahweh." 233-251. Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1966.
- Muraoka, T. "Linguistic Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan." *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1995): 19-21.
- Muscarella, Oscar White. *Bronze and Iron: Ancient Near Eastern Artifacts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: The Museum, 1988.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "The List of David's Officers (Salisim)." *Vetus Testamentum* 38 (1988): 71-79.
- Nagel, Wolfram. *Der mesopotamische Streitwagen und seine Entwicklung im ostmediterranen Bereich*. Vol. 10. Berliner Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Berlin: Hessling, 1966.
- Naudé, J. "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 189-214. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Naudé, J. A. "Diachronic Syntax and Language Change: The Case of Qumran Hebrew." *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 18 (2000): 1-14.
- _____. "Qumran Hebrew Syntax in the Perspective of a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26 (2000): 105-132.
- Naveh, J. "Hebrew and Aramaic Inscriptions." In *Excavations At the City of David*, ed. Yigal Shiloh, and Donald T. Ariel, 1-14. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984.
- _____. "Proto-Canaanite, Archaic Greek, and the Script of the Aramaic Text on the Tell Fakhariyah Statue." In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of F. M. Cross*, ed. P. D. Miller, and S. D. McBride, 101-113. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Naveh, J., and J. C. Greenfield. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period." In *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. W. D Davies, Louis Finkelstein, William Horbury, John Sturdy, and Steven T Katz, 115-129. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- North, R. "Could Hebrew Have Been a Cultic Esperanto?" *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 12 (1999): 202-217.
- Noth, Martin. *Exodus: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
- _____. *Könige*. Vol. 9. Biblischer Kommentar, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1964.
- _____. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

- O'Callaghan, R. T. "The Great Phoenician Portal Inscription from Karatepe." *Orientalia* 18 (1949): 173-205.
- O'Grady, William D., Michael Dobrovolsky, and Mark Aronoff. *Contemporary Linguistics : An Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Letters from Mesopotamia: Official Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets from Two Millennia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Pardee, Dennis. "Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Vol. 3. Phoenician Inscriptions Including Inscriptions in the Mixed Dialect of Arslan Tash." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46 (1987): 137-142.
- Parkes, M. B. *Scribes, Scripts, and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation, and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*. London: Hambledon Press, 1991.
- _____. "Archaising Hands in English Manuscripts." In *Books and Collectors 1200-1700: Essays Presented to Andrew Watson*, ed. James P. Carley, Colin G. C. Tite, and Andrew G. Watson, 101-141. London: British Library, 1997.
- Paterson, Archibald. *Assyrian Sculptures: Palace of Sinacherib*. The Hague, Holland: M. Nijhoff, 1912.
- Patterson, Richard Duane. *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah*. The Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary, Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.
- Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel, Its Life and Culture*. Vol. 28. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Penar, Tadeusz. *Northwest Semitic Philology and the Hebrew Fragments of Ben Sira*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975.
- Perdue, Leo G. *The Blackwell Companion to the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders. *Scarabs and Cylinders With Names, Illustrated By the Egyptian Collection in University College, London*. London: School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1917.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders, and Wilhelm Spiegelberg. *Six Temples At Thebes*. 1896. London: B. Quaritch, 1897.
- Philip, Graham. *Metal Weapons of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages in Syria-Palestine*. Vol. 526. Bar International Series, Oxford: B.A.R., 1989.
- Pisano, Stephen. *Additions Or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. Vol. 57. Orbis Biblicus Et Orientalis, Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1984.
- Pitard, Wayne Thomas. *Ancient Damascus: A Historical Study of the Syrian City-State from Earliest Times Until Its Fall to the Assyrians in 732 B.C.E.* Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Polak, Frank. "Style is More Than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture, and the Distinction Between Written and Oral Narrative." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 38-103. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Missoula, Mont: Published by Scholars Press for the Harvard Semitic Museum, 1976.
- Postgate, J. N. *Early Mesopotamia: Society and Economy At the Dawn of History*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Propp, William Henry. *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Rabin, Chaim. "Judges V. 2 and the 'Ideology' of Deborah's War." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 6 (1955): 125-134.
- _____. "Hittite Words in Hebrew." *Orientalis* 32 (1963): 113-139.
- _____. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century." In *The Jewish People in the First*

- Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, ed. Shemuel Safrai, and M Stern, 1007-1039. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974.
- Rad, Gerhard von, and Marva J. Dawn. *Holy War in Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1991.
- Rahe, Paul. "The Military Situation in Western Asia on the Eve of Cunjaja." *American Journal of Philology* 101 (1980): 79-96.
- Rainey, A. "Observations on Ugaritic Grammar." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3 (1971): 151-172.
- _____. "Following Up on the Ekron and Mesha Inscriptions." *Israel Exploration Journal* 50 (2000): 116-117.
- Reade, Julian. *Assyrian Sculpture*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Rendsburg, Gary. *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1990.
- _____. "Confused Language as a Deliberate Literary Deceit in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 2 (1999).
- _____. *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2002.
- _____. "Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 104-128. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Renz, Johannes, and Wolfgang Röllig. *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995.
- Rezetko, Robert. "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 104-128. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 329-334.
- Robertson, David A. *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. Missoula: Published by Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on Form Criticism, 1972.
- Rofé, A. "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology." In *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. J. Neusner, B. A. Levine, and Ernest Frerichs, 117-151. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Römer, Thomas, and Albert de Pury. "Deuteronomistic Historiography (Dh): History of Research and Debated Issues." In *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*, ed. Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, and Jean-Daniel Macchi, 24-142. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rommelaere, Catherine. *Les chevaux du nouvel empire égyptien: origines, races, harnachement*. Bruxelles: Connaissance de l'Égypte Ancienne, 1991.
- Rooker, Mark F. "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 199-214.
- _____. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel*. Vol. 90. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Rozelaar, Mark. "The Song of the Sea (Exodus XV, 1b-18)." *Vetus Testamentum* 2 (1952): 221-218.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona*. Vol. 13. Kommentar zum Alten Testament, Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1971.
- Saggs, H. W. F. "Assyrian Warfare in the Sargonid Period." *Iraq* 25 (1963): 148-151.
- Salonen, Armas. *Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1951.
- _____. *Hippologica Accadica*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1955.

- Sapir, Edward. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921.
- _____. "Hebrew 'Helmet' a Loan-Word and its Bearing on Indo-European Phonology." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 57 (1937): 73-77.
- Sarfatti, G. B. "Hebrew Inscriptions of the First Temple Period: A Survey and Some Linguistic Comments." *Maarav* 3 (1982): 55-83.
- Sasson, V. "The Old Aramaic Inscription from Tel Dan: Philological, Literary and Historical Aspects." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 40 (1995): 11-30.
- Schley, Donald G. "The Salisim: Officers Or Special Three-Man Squads." *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990): 321-326.
- Schmidt, H. "Das Meerlied. Ex. 15:2-19." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 (1937): 59-66.
- Schneider, Tammi. *Judges*. Berit Olam, Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Schüle, Andreas. *Die Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften: ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen*. Vol. 270. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- Schulman, Alan Richard. "Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 16 (1957): 263-271.
- _____. "The Egyptian Chariotry: A Reexamination." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 2 (1963): 75-98.
- _____. *Military Rank, Title, and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom*. Vol. 6. Münchner Ägyptologische Studien, Berlin: B. Hessling, 1964.
- Schwarzlose, F. W. *Die Waffen der alten Araber*. Leipzig: 1886.
- Scott, Nora. "Recent Additions to the Egyptian Collection." *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 15 (1956): 87.
- Segal, J. B., and H. S. Smith. *Aramaic Texts from North Saqqâra, With Some Fragments in Phoenician*. Texts from Excavations, 6th Memoir, London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.
- Seinecke, L. Chr. F. W. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Göttingen: 1876.
- Sekunda, Nick. *The Persian Army 560-330 BCE*. London: Osprey Publishing, 1992.
- _____. *The Persians*. London: Osprey Publishing, 1992.
- Seow, C. L. "Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qoheleth." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 643-666.
- Shalev, Sarel. *Swords and Daggers in Late Bronze Age Canaan*. Vol. 13. Prähistorische Bronzefunde, Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.
- Simpson, Cuthbert Aikman. *Composition of the Book of Judges*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.
- Smith, H. P. *The Books of Samuel*. International Critical Commentary, ed. G. F. Moore. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. Vol. 55. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- _____. *Untold Stories: The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001.
- _____. *A Bibliography of Ugaritic Grammar and Biblical Hebrew Grammar in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, Research Archives, 2004.
- Smith, N. V., and Deirdre Wilson. *Modern Linguistics: The Results of Chomsky's Revolution*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979.
- Snodgrass, Anthony M. *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Snodgrass, Anthony M. *Early Greek Armour and Weapons, From the End of the Bronze Age to 600 B.C.* Edinburgh: University Press, 1964.
- Soden, Wolfram von, and Bruno Meissner. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden:

- Harrassowitz, 1965.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges, a Commentary*. The Old Testament Library, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Speiser, E. A. "On Some Articles of Armor and Their Names." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70 (1950): 47-49.
- Sperling, D. "KAI 24 Re-Examined." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20 (1988): 323-337.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "Archaeology, Ecology and Social History: Background Themes to the Song of Deborah." *Vetus Testamentum Supplemental Series* 20 (1988): 221-234.
- Stager, Lawrence E., and Paula Wapnish. *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems*. Washington, D.C: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991.
- Stoebe, Hans Joachim. "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. XVII 1-XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 397-413.
- Stolper, Matthew W. "Fifth Century Nippur: Texts of the Murasus and from Their Surroundings." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 53 (2001): 83-132.
- Streck, Maximilian, and Assurbanipal. *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Ninivehs*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1918.
- Mary Swan, and Elaine M. Treharne, eds. *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*. Vol. 30, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Swiggers, P. "Notes on the Phoenician Inscription of Kilamuwa." *Revista degli studi orientali* 55 (1981): 1-4.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Thenius, Otto. *Die Bücher Samuels*. Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1842.
- Thompson, Thomas L. *Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written and Archaeological Sources*. Vol. 4. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East, Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Thompson, Thomas L. *The Origin Tradition of Ancient Israel*. Vol. 55. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. *Tablettes chaldéennes inédites*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1897.
- Torczyner, Harry, and Olga Tufnell. *Lachish (Tell ed Duweir)*. London, New York: Published for the Trustees of the late Sir Henry Wellcome by Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Tournay, R. "Recherches sur la chronologie des psaumes." *Revue biblique* 65 (1958): 335-357.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis Assen/Maastricht: Fortress Press Van Gorcum, 1992.
- Tov, Emmanuel. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay, 97-130. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Nature of the Differences Between MT and the LXX." In *Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy, 19-46. Fribourg, Suisse Göttingen: Éditions universitaires Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Trask, R. L. *Language Change*. Language Workbooks, London: Routledge, 1994.
- _____. *Historical Linguistics*. London: Arnold Distributed in the USA by St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Ullendorff, Edward. "The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 190-198.
- _____. "Ugaritic Studies Within Their Semitic and Eastern Mediterranean Setting." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46 (1963): 236-249.
- _____. "Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?" In *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language? Studies in Semitic Languages and Civilizations*, ed. Edward Ullendorff, 3-17. Wiesbaden:

- Harrassowitz, 1977.
- Ulrich, E. "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible." In *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon, Michael A. Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields, 267-291. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Ussishkin, D. "The Date of the Neo-Hittite Enclosure in Karatepe." *Anatolian Studies* 19 (1969): 121-137.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen, 13-49. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994.
- van Seters, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Vaux, Roland de. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972.
- Verheij, A. J. C. *Verbs and Numbers: A Study of the Frequencies of the Hebrew Verbal Tense Forms in the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990.
- Vernes, Maurice. *Précis d'histoire juive depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque persane*. Paris: 1889.
- Vernes, Maurice M. "Le cantique de Debora." *Revue des études juives* 24 (1892): 52-67.
- Vervenne, Marc. "Hebrew *salis* - Ugaritic *tlt*." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19 (1987): 355-373.
- Wäfler, Markus. *Nicht-Assyrer neuassyrischer Darstellungen*. Vol. 26. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Kevelaer Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon und Bercker Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- Wagner, M. *Die Lexikalischen und Grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.
- Waldbaum, Jane C. *From Bronze to Iron : The Transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age in the Eastern Mediterranean*. Vol. 54. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, Göteborg: P. Aström, 1978.
- Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Waltisberg, Michael. "Zum Alter der Sprache des Deboraliedes Ri 5." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12 (1999): 218-232.
- Ward, John, and F. L. Griffith. *The Sacred Beetle: A Popular Treatise on Egyptian Scarabs in Art and History*. London: J. Murray, 1902.
- Watson, G. E. "Archaic Elements in the Language of Chronicles." *Biblica* 53 (1972): 191-207.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. T & T Clark Biblical Languages, London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Watts, John D. W. "The Song of the Sea: Ex. XV." *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957): 371-380.
- Webb, Barry G. *The Book of the Judges: An Integrated Reading*. Vol. 46. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Wehr, Hans. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1952.
- Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.
- Weippert, M. "Heiligen Krieges im alten Israel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1972): 460-493.
- Weiser, Artur. "Das Deboralied: eine gattungs- und traditions-geschichtliche Studie." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 71 (1959): 67-97.
- Wesselius, J. "The Language of the Hebrew Bible Contrasted With the Language of the Ben Sira Manuscripts and of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held At Leiden University*, ed. T. Muraoka, and J. F. Elwolde, 338-345. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- West, M. L. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*.

- Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Willesen, F. "The Philistine Corps of the Scimitar from Gath." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 3 (1958): 327-335.
- Winlock, Herbert Eustis. *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- Winter, I. J. "On the Problems of Karatepe: The Reliefs and Their Context." *Anatolian Studies* 29 (1979): 115-151.
- Wise, M. O. "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran." In *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, ed. T. Muraoka, 124-167. Louvain: Peeters, 1992.
- Wiseman, D. J. "The Assyrians." In *Warfare in the Ancient World*, ed. John Hackett, 36-53. New York: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1989.
- Wolff, Hans Walter, and S. Dean McBride. *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Wreszinski, Walter. *Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914.
- Wright, Richard M. "Further Evidence for North Israelite Contributions to Late Biblical Hebrew." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 129-149. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Yadin, Azzan. "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory." *Vetus Testamentum* 54 (2004): 373-395.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- _____. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Yahuda, A. S. *The Language of the Pentateuch in Its Relation to Egyptian*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Yoo, Y. J. "Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Hosea." Cornell University, 1999.
- Young, Ian. *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. Vol. 5. *Forschungen Zum Alten Testament*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.
- _____. "Notes on the Language of 4qcantb." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52 (2001): 122-131.
- _____. *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Vol. 369. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*, London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- _____. "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, 276-311. London: T & T Clark International, 2003.
- Younger Jr., K. L. "The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada. An Integrated Reading." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 48 (1998): 11-47.
- Zervos, Christian. *L'art de la Crète néolithique et minoenne*. Paris: Éditions cahiers d'art, 1956.