

The “Held Method” for Comparative Semitic Philology¹

CHAIM COHEN

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Professor Moshe Held מ״ר, my beloved teacher in whose memory the present collection of studies has been written, was a very methodical scholar who, however, addressed the formal issue of methodology very little in his published works.² His philological method, which was heavily influenced by his great teacher B. Landsberger in Assyriological research,³ is truly Held’s greatest lasting scholarly contribution.⁴ The “Held method,” as described below, is valid for comparative philological research in all the ancient Semitic languages.

On only one occasion in his published works did Held actually treat methodology.⁵ The five methodological principles that he formulated, however, were not intended for comparative Semitic philology as such, but rather to guide his own attempt at writing a Ugaritic lexicon, a project he unfortunately never completed.⁶ These five principles will each be discussed and exemplified below, after which two

1 This study is based on several different oral presentations of this material by the present author, the most significant of which were as an invited lecture at Bar-Ilan University, sponsored by the Hebrew Language Department and the Institute for Assyriology (2 September 1984) and as part of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies at Mount Scopus, Jerusalem (11 August 1985). The “Held method” was also briefly discussed in the eulogy that I wrote in Held’s memory in *Shnaton* 9 (1985, published 1987), 7–8 [in Hebrew]. Finally, an application of the “Held method” was the basis of the method I proposed for dealing with Biblical *hapax legomena* in my work, *Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic* (Missoula, 1978), 22–26, 29–32 [hereafter, *BHL*]. Note that the term “philology” is being used here as interchangeable with “lexicography” (Held himself used them interchangeably). Under no circumstances would Held have agreed to label his method with only one of these terms and allow those who use the old exclusively etymological method to have a monopoly on the other term (see W. W. Hallo, “Biblical Abominations and Sumerian Taboos,” *Essays in Memory of Moshe Held = JQR* 76 [1985], 21–22). I personally prefer the term philology because it has more of an overall textual connotation, and Held excelled in the determination of a word’s meaning based on its usage in individual texts.

2 Held’s complete bibliography may now be found in three different publications: W. W. Hallo, *PAAJR* 52 (1985), 7–8; C. Cohen, *Beer-Sheva* 3 (1988), 13–15; and in the present volume, pages vii–viii.

3 For a convenient listing of Landsberger’s bibliography and an index to his Akkadian and Sumerian lexicographical contributions, see *JCS* 26 (1974), 183–94; *JCS* 27 (1975), 3–129. A definitive description of Landsberger’s method has yet to be written.

4 See the eulogy I wrote in Held’s memory in *Shnaton* 9 (1985, published 1987), 7–8 [in Hebrew].

5 M. Held, “*mḥs* / **mḥš* in Ugaritic and Other Semitic Languages,” *JAOS* 79 (1959), 169.

6 M. Held, “Studies in Ugaritic Lexicography and Poetic Style” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1957). This dissertation included only a sample (letters *k*, *l*, *m*) of Held’s projected Ugaritic lexicon.

additional principles will be presented in more extensive detail, each together with several examples,⁷ thus completing the seven principles of the "Held method" for comparative Semitic philology.⁸

Principle One: "Special stress on disclosing the meaning of words by means of the inductive method rather than the use of the etymological one." Held insisted on an absolute distinction between usage and etymology; and with regard to comparative Semitic philology, between semantic equivalence and etymological equivalence. To this day, many scholars still attempt to solve philological problems according to the *unproven assumption that etymological equivalents must somehow be also related semantically*. If one were to sufficiently exercise one's imaginative ingenuity together with one's twentieth century logic, one would surely arrive at the original "basic" meaning.⁹ Held's claim was that etymological equivalents were often *unrelated seman-*

7 Here it should be noted at the outset that no attempt has been made to provide extensive bibliographical annotation for the many examples that have been cited in this study. Since this is a methodological paper, it was deemed much more crucial to present a plethora of examples, many of which have already been published by Held, the present author, or other members of the Held school. Several of the unpublished examples are taken from studies of the present author, currently in press. The few remaining unpublished examples will be dealt with in detail by the present author in the near future.

8 One more principle should be added here, which might best be numbered principle zero. Held was always adamant in his insistence that *all internal Biblical evidence must first be examined exhaustively before even beginning the philological investigation of the comparative Semitic evidence for the word in question*. A good illustration of the importance of this principle is the following article of David Marcus, a former Held student, concerning the meaning of the idiom בֵּין יָדַיִם (Zech. 13:6): D. Marcus, "Ugaritic *bn ydm*: 'Chest' or 'Back'?" in Y. Avishur, ed., *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on His Seventieth Birthday* (Jerusalem, 1978), English Volume, 111-18. Marcus shows that the key to understanding whether this idiom refers to the chest or the back is *not* the comparative Ugaritic evidence (*ktp* // *bn ydm*; *KTU* 1.2:IV:14-15, 16-17; see already the note of H. L. Ginsberg in *ANET*, 131, n. 9), which is inconclusive, but is rather the internal Biblical evidence of the usage of the BH semantic equivalent בֵּין זְרוּעָיו, which according to the context of 2 Kgs. 9:23-24 must refer to the back rather than the chest.

9 This unproven assumption is the basis for many of the examples discussed in J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1968). Thus, for example, on p. 290, Barr discusses G. R. Driver's suggested explanation for the use of the verb נָחַר in Lev. 11:21 in the *qittel* conjugation with the meaning "to hop (said of an insect)." Driver claims the following: "There can be no objection to connecting *n-t-r* as applied to locusts with *tarr* as applied to light horses; and the underlying idea by which verbs of rending or tearing asunder are linked to verbs denoting trotting quickly or prancing or hopping seems to be that of separation from the ground, whereby the beast appears to be now touching the earth and now suspended in mid-air"; G. R. Driver, "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," in H. H. Rowley, ed., *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* [= *T. H. Robinson Festschrift*] (Edinburgh, 1950), 70-72). To this, Barr responds that Driver's method "is logical rather than linguistic . . ." (p. 290) and proceeds to outline how "semantic transfers" take place according to "modern semantic studies." Now all this may be theoretically interesting, but it does not produce a practical method in place of Driver's "logical" method. The issue of "semantic transfer" in philology can only be dealt with practically on the basis of *precedent*. Thus, the following question must be asked: Is the verb *ntr*, "to tear, rend asunder," or any of its semantic equivalents in the ancient Semitic languages ever used of insects with the meaning "to hop" or the like? If there is such a precedent, then the suggested meaning may be accepted (providing it fits contextually). If no such precedent is found, then the suggested meaning must be rejected. Any reasonable explanation based on "modern semantic studies" may help us *understand* the particular semantic development, but will not determine the *acceptability* of the suggested meaning. Finally, it should be noted that the comparison between BH נָחַר and Akk. *nutturū/šutturū*, "to break-up, demolish," is completely acceptable with respect to וַיִּתֵּר גְּרָמִים in Hab. 3:6 because of the Akk. usage of [] *māṭāti unattar* " . . . destroys the lands" and *māḥāzīšun ušattir* "(the king) . . . demolished their cult-cities" (as documented in *CAD*, N/2, 117).

ically and would "go their own way" in individual Semitic languages.¹⁰ Therefore, the demonstration of etymological equivalence between two terms did not grant the demonstrator the right to force semantic equivalence upon them as well. Thus, each word might have completely distinct etymological and semantic equivalents in each or any of the other Semitic languages.

Two brief examples will suffice: (1) In Held's own celebrated case of BH מַחֵץ, "to strike," the etymological and semantic equivalents in all the other Semitic languages are always one and the same term except for Arabic, where the etymological equivalent is *maḥaḍa* meaning "to churn (milk by shaking)" and the semantic equivalent is *ḍaraba*, "to strike."¹¹ (2) The Akkadian etymological equivalent of BH עָבַר, "to cross, pass," is undoubtedly *ebēru*, which is limited, however, to the meaning "to cross (water)" usually with "river," "canal" or "sea" as direct object.¹² Akkadian *ebēru* is therefore *not* the semantic equivalent of BH עָבַר.¹³ The Akkadian semantic equivalent of BH עָבַר is *etēqu*, "to pass along, . . . to pass by, to elapse, to pass through, to cross, to transgress, to go beyond or exceed. . . ."¹⁴ The BH etymological equivalent of *etēqu* is the poetic verb עָתַק the usage of which will be referred to when discussing the next principle below.

Principle Two: "Clear-cut distinction between the archaic language of the epics and the language of the ritual and economic texts." Held is referring here to the distinction between everyday language and special poetic language. In other words, we often find that a particular concept is usually expressed in a regular everyday way, but on occasion it will be couched in a much more poetic way. Furthermore, what is poetic in later Semitic languages may be everyday language in the earlier Semitic languages. Thus in BH the pairs צֶאֱן וּבָקָר, "small cattle and large cattle," כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב, "silver and gold," and אָכַל וְשָׁתָה, "eat and drink," are the regular everyday pairs, each

10 Here Held, applying Landsberger's method for Assyriological studies, actually went considerably further than his other teacher, W. F. Albright, who claimed the following: "Words change their meaning through use to such an extent that the etymological method of fixing significance is only employed as a last resort, where other evidence is inadequate"; *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (New York, 1957), 46, as cited by Held, "*mḥš/*mḥš*," 169, n. 5. If no semantic evidence was available to determine the meaning of a particular word, Held preferred to leave the word untranslated (" . . .") rather than resort to etymologizing.

11 Held, "*mḥš/*mḥš*," 169-76. Note that Arabic *maḥaḍa*, "to churn (milk)," is not at all semantically related to BH מַחֵץ since "the process of churning (milk) in primitive cultures does not involve beating but rather shaking = Akk. *māṣu* synonymous with Heb. **māš* (Prov. 30:33)"; *ibid.*, 171 and nn. 44, 45]. For Held's most recent (posthumous) detailed study of the interdialectal equivalents Arabic *maḥaḍa*; BH מַחֵץ; Akk. *māṣu*, *nāṣu* all meaning "to churn" and "to shake," see M. Held, "Marginal Notes to the Biblical Lexicon," in A. Kort and S. Morschauer, eds., *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1985), 100-3.

12 *CAD*, E, 10-13. I also mentioned this example in the eulogy I wrote in Held's memory; *Shnaton* 9 (1985; appeared 1987), 7-8 [in Hebrew].

13 Contrast most recently M. O'Connor, "Northwest Semitic Designations for Elective Social Affinities," *JANES* 18 (1986; appeared 1988), 79, n. 72: "Akk. *ebēru* 'to cross water, extend beyond' is cognate to BH עָבַר." I would apply the label "cognate" only to terms that are both etymologically and semantically equivalent. Concerning many of the other issues discussed in O'Connor's article, contrast *BHL*, 139-40, n. 78A and the bibliography listed there; add especially M. Held, "Studies in Biblical Lexicography in the Light of Akkadian," *Eretz-Israel* 16 (1982), 78-79, 84-85 [in Hebrew], which is diametrically opposed to pages 79-80 of O'Connor's article.

14 *CAD*, E, 384-95.

occurring a very large number of times.¹⁵ The corresponding more poetic pairs **אלפים || צאן**, “small cattle // large cattle,” **כסף || חרוץ**, “silver // gold,” and **לחם || שתה**, “eat // drink,” are much rarer, occurring only five, six, and two times respectively.¹⁶ Yet these three rare poetic pairs in BH appear to be regular everyday language in the earlier Semitic languages. The pairs *ṣēnu alpu* and *kaspu hurāṣu* are the norm in both Akkadian¹⁷ and Ugaritic,¹⁸ and *lḥm || šty* (or *šqy* or *ššqy*) is most common in Ugaritic.¹⁹ The same is true of the BH roots **מחץ** and **עתק**, both of which have already been mentioned.²⁰ As Held has shown, while the stem *mḥṣ* is the everyday term for “to strike” in Ugaritic, Akkadian (*mahāṣu*), and Aramaic (**מחא**), BH **מחץ** is the poetic term while **הכה** is the everyday term.²¹ This then is also the relationship between the poetic verb **עתק** and its everyday counterpart **עבר**.²²

Principle Three: “Emphasis on poetic usage and parallelism.” One of the major clues in determining the semantic range of an unclear term is its use in parallelistic structure. The underlying assumption is that words in parallelism are most often related semantically in one way or another. Therefore, the set of words which occur in parallelism with the term in question will both individually and collectively supply

15 **כסף וזהב**: e.g., Gen. 12:16; 13:5; 20:14; 21:27; 24:35; **כסף וזהב**: e.g., Gen. 24:35; Num. 22:18; 24:13; Deut. 7:25; 8:13; 17:17; 29:16; **אכל ושתה**: e.g., Gen. 24:54; 26:30; Exod. 24:11; Judg. 9:27; 19:4, 21; Jer. 22:15.

16 **אלפים || צאן**: Deut. 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51; Ps. 8:8 (hendiadys). Note that in all the above passages except for Ps. 8:8, the order is reversed probably due to metrical considerations. Compare also Ps. 144:13–14 where this pair may have been originally present but is no longer extant in MT. **כסף || חרוץ**: Zech. 9:3; Ps. 68:14; Prov. 3:14; 8:10, 19 (perhaps rd. **חרוץ נבחר || כסף נבחר**; cf. 1 Kgs. 10:18 [|| **זהב טהור** in 2 Chr. 9:17]); 16:16. The order is reversed in Prov. 8:19; 16:16. **לחם || שתה**: Prov. 4:17; 9:5.

17 For *ṣēnu alpu* and *kaspu hurāṣu* in Akkadian, see, e.g., the many passages listed in *CAD*, S, 129–30 (meaning 2b) and *CAD*, K, 246 (meanings 2' and 4') respectively.

18 For Ugaritic *alp || šin* and *ksp || hrṣ*, see the passages listed in M. Dahood, “Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs,” *Ras Shamra Parallels I* (Rome, 1972), 113–14 (#43) and 234–35 (#301–2) respectively and the bibliography cited there for each of these pairs.

19 See the passages listed in Dahood, “Ugaritic-Hebrew Parallel Pairs,” 251–52 (##334–35) and the bibliography cited there. Add M. Held, “The Action-Result (Factitive-Passive) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic,” *JBL* 84 (1965), 280–81, n. 45.

20 See the discussion concerning principle one above.

21 Held, “*mḥṣ*/**mḥṣ*,” 169.

22 The semantic range of the poetic BH root **עתק** (= Akk. *etēqu*) is basically the same as that of the daily language BH root **עבר** “to pass through.” I intend to deal with this issue in detail in a future study. For now, the following remarks will have to suffice: a) The usage of this root in all of its nine verbal attestations may be divided into two basic meanings: I. “move or pass through, proceed (intransitive)” in the *qal* (Job 14:18; 18:4) and “transfer (both transitive and intransitive), transport (from one place to another)” in the *hiqṭil* (Gen. 12:8; 26:22; Prov. 25:1; Job 9:5; 32:16); II. “live on, go by (said of life), become advanced of age and/or feeble (intransitive)” in the *qal* (Ps. 6:8; Job 21:7). Cf. also the adjective **עתיק**, “old, antiquated,” (1 Chr. 4:22). b) With respect to Prov. 25:1, it has been suggested by H. L. Ginsberg that this verse reflects the northern, Israelian origin of Proverbs. Ginsberg maintains that Hezekiah collected the literary remains of the Northern Kingdom after the destruction of Israel by Assyria in 722/1 B.C.E. Thus, the usage of **העתיקו** here implies “either importing into Judah or depositing in a library”; *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York, 1982), 36–38 and especially n. 53. Ginsberg’s suggestion is philologically supported by the conclusions concerning the usage of the verbal root **עתק** presented here. Furthermore, the following Akkadian usage of *etēqu* with respect to the transfer of documents serves as a clear precedent for this interpretation: *ina panika luṣētiqūma u atā urkatam alik* “let them transfer (the documents) ahead of you and you (yourself) depart later on”; *TCL* 4, 10:11 (for this passage and other relevant passages, see *CAD*, E, 390–92). Thus, **העתיקו** in Prov. 25:1 must be translated “transferred” or “transported” instead of the usual translation “copied,” which is now seen to be philologically unjustifiable.

invaluable semantic evidence. In fact, Held often considered such evidence as absolutely decisive in determining the meaning of the term in question.²³ I dealt with this issue in my work on Biblical *hapax legomena*²⁴ so I will mention here only such pairs as *ירא* || *שחע*, "to fear // be afraid" (Isa. 41:10, 23),²⁵ *כוס* || *קבעת*, "cup // chalice" (Isa. 51:17, 22),²⁶ and *ינק* || *מצץ*, "draw // suck" (Isa. 66:11).²⁷ With respect to such pairs, Held often noted that the second term (the "B-word") was usually the rarer of the two terms²⁸ and that in many cases (the above three and others such as *בהו* || *תהו*, "unformed // void,"²⁹ and *אוב* || *ידעוני*, "ghost // familiar spirit"³⁰), the second term would occur only together with the first, while the first term often occurred independently.

Principle Four: "Strict attention to the principle of interdialectal distribution." The principle of interdialectal distribution has often been considered the hallmark of the Held approach, and in many ways it is indeed the showpiece of the method. It is here especially where "dictionary knowledge" of a language does not suffice. In order to determine what term is regularly used in each of the Semitic languages for a particular concept, one must be familiar with the textual resources of all the Semitic languages and must also be able to utilize the various tools which provide evidence for such distributions: multilingual texts and lexicographical lists, the glosses of the El-Amarna tablets, the Arabic *tafsir* of Saadiah Gaon, and the Aramaic *targumim* together with the *Peshiṭta*. Above all, one must be aware of corresponding idiomatic phrases *even when such correspondence involves only semantic and non-etymological equivalents*.

23 A very large number of such cases may be found throughout Held's twenty published articles and his dissertation. See especially M. Held, "Studies in Biblical Homonyms in the Light of Akkadian," *JANES* 3 (1970-71), 46-55; idem, "Pits and Pitfalls in Akkadian and Biblical Hebrew," *JANES* 5 (1973), 173-90; idem, "Hebrew *maḡal*: A Study in Lexical Parallelism," *JANES* 6 (1974), 107-16.

24 See in general *BHL*, 22-26, 29-32.

25 *BHL*, 44, 81-83.

26 *BHL*, 45-46, 85-87.

27 *BHL*, 46, 87-89.

28 Held, "Studies in Ugaritic Lexicography," 5-8. The original idea seems to have been first succinctly stated in H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible," *BA* 8 (1945), 55-56. See also R. G. Boling, "'Synonymous' Parallelism in the Psalms," *JSS* 5 (1960), 221-55; W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (New York, 1969), 31; *BHL*, 22 and 29, n. 27. Contrast the nihilistic attitude towards this issue in J. L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry* (New Haven, 1981), 287-88.

29 The B-word *בהו* occurs only three times in BH, twice in hendiadys (Gen. 1:2; Jer. 4:23) and once in parallelism (Isa. 34:11), in each case following the A-word *תהו*. The latter term occurs additionally in Deut. 32:10 (|| *מדבר*, "desert"; cf. Ps. 107:40; Job 6:18; 12:24), Isa. 40:17, 23 (|| *איך*, "nothingness"), Isa. 49:4 (*לתהו*), *ההבל*, "for nothing"), Job 26:7 (|| *בלימה*, "nothing"), in other creation contexts (Isa. 45:18-19), in court terminology (Isa. 29:21; 59:4), as describing a ruined city (Isa. 24:10) and in reference to worthless idols (1 Sam. 12:21; Isa. 41:29; cf. Isa. 44:9). One final case of *תהו* may be found in Isa. 5:6, where the philologically impossible *בתה* should be emended to *בתהו*. This emendation is supported by IQIS^a, where the final *ו* of *בתהו* has been appended to the next word as a conjunction (*ולא* instead of MT *לא*). The entire clause should be translated "and I shall turn it into wasteland." This usage of *בתהו* should be compared to Deut. 32:10; Ps. 107:40; Job 12:24 as discussed above. The emended text *ואשייתהו בתהו* should be understood literally as "I shall put it into a state of being wasteland" (with *beth essentiae*) but idiomatically translated as "I shall turn it into wasteland." This interpretation of Isa. 5:6 in its larger context has several Biblical parallels, especially Jer. 22:6 and Hos. 2:5. (I discussed this matter in detail at a conference on "Translations of the Hebrew Bible Past and Present and Modern Biblical Philology" held at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, on April 12, 1989.)

30 *BHL*, 73, n. 144.

In Held's twenty published articles, he presented us with some sixty-four interdialectal distributions.³¹ Among the most notable were "to kill a donkey foal" and "road" and its B-words." The interdialectal distribution of "to kill a donkey foal" is Akkadian *mūra(m) dāku(m)/šagāšu(m)*; Mari *ḥayaram qatālum*; Ugaritic *mḥs ʿr*; BH עיר עיר; Aramaic-Syriac עיל עיל קטל; Arabic *qatala jaḥšan*. "It is clear that neither the substantive *ḥayarum* (*ayarum*) nor the verb *qatālum/šūqtulum* are Akkadian. Rather they belong to the West Semitic stratum of the Mari dialect. . . . The occurrence of the verb *qatālum* in so early a literature as the Mari letters speaks volumes on the fallibility of using the so-called 'Aramaisms' in the Hebrew Bible as a criterion for dating a Biblical text."³² The interdialectal distribution of "road" and its B-words" is as follows: Akkadian *ḥarrānu (girru) // urḫu // alaktu // tūdu*; Ugaritic *ntb // X*; Phoenician *drk // X*; BH מעגל || נתיר || אורח || דרך; Aramaic-Syriac אורחא || הלכתא || אורחא || שבילא ||; Arabic *ṭarīq // sabīl // sikkā // maslak*. This distribution is corroborated by the idiom "the king's highway": Akkadian *ḥarrān šarri (girri šarri)*; BH דרך דרך המלך; Aramaic-Syriac אורח מלכא; Arabic *ṭarīq al-jadda (al-malik)*.³³

Principle Five: "Classification of each word under its appropriate category. . . ." It is essential to separate out technical terms and to avoid comparisons between technical and non-technical terms (even if they seem to be etymologically related). Ancient technical terms derive from many diverse areas: e.g., mathematics, astronomy, astrology, cult, diplomatic relations, administration, medicine, and law.³⁴ Furthermore, many terms have both a general meaning and a technical one. The general meaning of BH and Ugaritic *dwk/dkk* and Akkadian *duququ* is "to break, crush," while the technical meaning of all three is "to pulverize, pound (ingredients together in a mortar)."³⁵ Held made use of this principle in order to reject E. A. Speiser's interpretation of Gen. 30:20 הפעם יזבלני אישי, which Speiser translated "this time my husband will bring me presents,"³⁶ based on Akkadian *zubullā zabālu*, "to bring marriage gifts."³⁷ Held rightly noted that "*zubullū* in Akkadian never denotes a 'present' as such, but rather is restricted to the marriage gifts brought into the house of the bride for the marriage banquet."³⁸ Thus, *zubullū* is a technical term meaning "marriage gifts," while the regular Akkadian terms for "present" are *qīštu* and *šeriktu*.³⁹

The following two principles, six and seven, were not formulated by Held himself, but, in my opinion, certainly reflect his approach and should be considered a final integral part of the "Held method."

Principle Six: The parallel usage in a parallel context as a check on all etymological comparisons to determine if the two terms are also semantically equivalent. If

31 See the Appendix at the end of this study.

32 M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," *BASOR* 200 (1970), 34 and n. 11.

33 Held, "Hebrew *ma'gal*," 107, n. 4.

34 Note that there exists an entire ancient Near Eastern literary genre of "professional instruction literature" consisting of a very large corpus of texts all based on highly technical vocabulary. For the present, see C. Cohen and D. Sivan, *The Ugaritic Hippriatic Texts: A Critical Edition* (New Haven, 1983), 1-2 and the bibliography referred to there.

35 Cohen and Sivan, *Ugaritic Hippriatic Texts*, 13-14.

36 E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, NY, 1964), 229, 231.

37 *CAD*, Z, 152-53; *AHW*, 1536a.

38 M. Held, "The root *zbl/sbl* in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *JAOS* 88 (1968), 90.

39 *Ibid.*, 91 and n. 20.

they are not, then it is doubtful whether the comparison should be pursued from a philological⁴⁰ point of view.

Example 1: The oft suggested etymology for BH שר, "officer, high official," namely Akkadian *šarru*, "king," is a case in point. This etymology is far from certain, and in any case it is highly questionable whether it leads to any worthwhile philological conclusions even should it turn out to be correct.⁴¹ שר and *šarru* are certainly distinct semantically, there being no parallel usage in parallel contexts between these two words. On the other hand, a semantic comparison between BH שר and BH רב, "officer, high official," yields such equivalences as שר המשקים vs. רבשקה⁴²; שר הטבחים vs. רב טבחים⁴³; and the phrase שרי מלך בבל vs. רבי (ה)מלך (בבל),⁴⁴ both meaning "officers of the king (of Babylon)." The etymology of BH רב (= Akkadian *rab-*) from Akkadian *rabû*, "great," is generally accepted,⁴⁶ and BH רבשקה is itself derived from Akkadian *rab-šāqê*.⁴⁷ Thus, the semantic comparison between BH שר and BH רב is of much greater philological import than the uncertain etymological comparison between BH שר and Akkadian *šarru*, "king."⁴⁸

Example 2: W. G. E. Watson has recently claimed that the phrase ככלילות עינים (Prov. 23:29) "is in no way related to Akkadian *ekēlu* 'to be dark' . . . and probably means 'shadowy' or perhaps 'lustreless'."⁴⁹ He also discusses the other occurrence of this root in Gen. 49:12 and translates the phrase מין עינים מין as "Darker(?) are his eyes than wine." Now it is clear that the two contextual elements that are present in the two Biblical occurrences of this root are *darkness of the eyes* and *wine*. The semantic relationship between BH חכלילי and Akkadian *ekēlu*, "to be dark," (they surely may be etymologically related assuming a root *ḫkl*)⁵⁰ is then dependent upon whether or not *ekēlu* is attested with similar usage. While *ekēlu* is indeed attested with

40 This is one of the true distinctions between linguistics and philology. Etymological equivalents which are not also semantic equivalents do not help us arrive at a better contextual understanding of the word in question. Therefore, while they are surely important for the study of the general linguistic and phonological structure of the language concerned, they are irrelevant philologically.

41 Contrast K. L. Barker, *JBL* 99 (1980), 126–27.

42 שר המשקים (Gen. 40:2, 9, 20, 21, 23; 41:9) vs. רבשקה (2 Kgs. 18:17, 19, 26, 27, 28, 37; 19:4, 8; Isa. 36:2, 4, 11, 12, 13, 22; 37:4, 8).

43 שר הטבחים (Gen. 37:36; 39:1; 40:3, 4; 41:10, 12) vs. רב טבחים (2 Kgs. 25:8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20; Jer. 39:9, 10, 11, 13; 40:1, 2, 5; 41:10; 43:6; 52:12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 26, 30).

44 Jer. 38:17, 18, 22; 39:3.

45 Jer. 39:13; 41:1.

46 E.g. *AHw.*, 933a, 938a. For a somewhat different opinion, cf. S. A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Chicago, 1974), 87. While Kaufman does derive Akkadian *rabû*, "officer," and its plural form *rabûti*, "officers," from *rabû*, "great," he contends that "the construct form *rab-* 'chief' is almost certainly of Amorite origin."

47 *AHw.*, 1182a. In general, see also C. Cohen, "Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical *rab-šāqê*," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1983), 32–48.

48 Even in Lam. 1:1, I would prefer to analyze במרינות שרתי בגוים רבתי as parallel expressions within a single tri-cola (according to the Masoretic division) and translate the whole phrase as follows: "The mistress among the nations, the princess among the states, has become tributary." For details, see C. Cohen, "The 'Widowed' City," *JANES* 5 (1973), 80–81, n. 57d. Here, too, it is the parallelism שרתי || רבתי that is the crucial factor in determining the meaning of שרתי, rather than the possible etymological connection between שרתי and Akkadian *šarratu(m)* "queen."

49 W. G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry—A Guide to Its Techniques* (Sheffield, 1984), 28.

50 The phonetic change a > e (e.g., **akālu* > *ekēlu*) takes place when the 3 reflects one of the following three laryngeals missing in Akkadian: /^c/, /ǧ/, /ḥ/. See, e.g., *GAG* §§ 9a, 23b; and S. Moscati, ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1964), 41–42.

īnu, “eye,”⁵¹ and other related substantives such as *panū*, “face,”⁵² both contextual elements, darkness of eyes and wine, find their closest parallel in the following Akkadian text utilizing the more common verb *ṣalāmu*,⁵³ synonym of *ekēlu*, “to be dark”: *ṣēr karānu ṣanīš ša ēnāšu ṣalmū ša[nīš . . .] ṣanīš ša mašakšu ana karānu mašlu* “(it is called) ‘wine-snake’ either because its eyes are black, or [. . .], or because its skin is (colored) like wine.”⁵⁴ Since the semantic range of such verbs as *ṣalāmu* and *ekēlu* is indeed similar to that of BH חכלילי, there is no reason whatever to reject the suggested comparison.

Example 3: The BH term טבור occurs only in the phrase טבור הארץ and as a general term for “navel” in LH and Late Aramaic. S. Talmon has recently claimed in several articles concerning the expression טבור הארץ “navel of the earth” (Judg. 9:37; Ezek. 38:12) that the various etymologies suggested for the BH טבור are untenable and that the word is “etymologically obscure.”⁵⁵ He therefore questioned the translation “navel of the earth,” admitting only that “in Mishnaic and later Hebrew it does mean ‘navel’ but this meaning cannot be confirmed for Biblical Hebrew, which usually uses שר as the term for ‘navel’ or ‘umbilical cord’ (Ezek. 16:4; Cant. 7:3; Prov. 3:8 [*sic* !]).”⁵⁶ He translated the phrase טבור הארץ contextually as “secure place” or “plateau” (without determining a specific meaning for the term טבור), maintaining that all the suggested mythological parallels based on the LXX translation *ómphalos*, identifying Mount Gerizim in Judg. 9:37 and Jerusalem in Ezek. 38:12 as the cosmic “center of

51 *TTC* 27, 31 as cited in *AHw.*, 193b.

52 See the texts listed in *CAD*, E, 64b (section b2') and *AHw.*, 194a.

53 *CAD*, S, 70-71; *AHw.*, 1076.

54 Tablet Funck 2:13-14 (= Landsberger, *Fauna*, 52:13-14). For the different “colors” of wine in antiquity and the relevant terminology from various sources in comparison with Gen. 49:11, see the following articles: A. Demsky, “Dark-Wine from Judah,” *IEJ* 22 (1972), 233-34; S. M. Paul, “Classifications of Wine in Mesopotamian and Rabbinic Sources,” *IEJ* 25 (1975), 42-44; C. Cohen and A. Demsky, “חכלילי מין עינים,” *Encyclopaedia 'olam Hatanakh: Genesis* (Ramat-Gan, 1982), 250 [in Hebrew]; note that this article, to which the present author's contribution was the presentation of the parallel Akkadian text also presented here, was mistakenly attributed to A. Demsky alone.

55 S. Talmon, *Tarbiz* 45 (1976), 163-77 [in Hebrew]; idem, *TDOT* 3: 438; idem, “The ‘Navel of the Earth’ and the Comparative Method,” *Scripture in History and Theology* [= J. C. Rylaarsdam Festschrift] (Pittsburgh, 1977), 243-68; idem, “The ‘Comparative Method’ in Biblical Interpretation—Principles and Problems,” *SVT* 29 (1977), 347-51.

56 *TDOT* 3: 438. Note that לש(א)רך, “for your body,” must be read in Prov. 3:8 || לעצמותך, “for your bones.” The much more radical emendation לבשרך (e.g., *BHS*) is completely gratuitous. The following note on this issue by M. Held in his still unpublished monograph on Proverbs 1-9 deserves to be quoted in its entirety as an excellent illustration of the “Held method”: “. . . the reading לש(א)רך is to be preferred on the following grounds: (1) the substantive שאר is rare (17 times in the Heb. Bible) and poetic, while בשר is exceedingly common (266 times in the Heb. Bible) and daily language—the poetic term is surely called for in our poetic text, Prov. 4:22 notwithstanding; (2) orthographically, the reading לש(א)רך is hardly an emendation, involving only the phenomenon of defective writing, well known in such similar cases as שלתך for שאלתך (1 Sam. 1:17); שאריתך for שרתך (Jer. 15:11); ראמים for רמים (Ps. 22:22) and the like; (3) it is on all counts recognized that the LXX σῶμα could represent either בשר or שאר—this, however, must surely be true of the Syriac לבסרך as well, since שאר is not attested in Aramaic/Syriac (only Ugaritic and Heb. know both substantives for “flesh,” Akk. and Phoen. knowing only *sīru*—שאר, and Aram./Syr. only בשר; Arabic goes its own way with *lahmu*); (4) while the pair עצמותך || בשר is well attested in Bib. Heb. (e.g., Prov. 14:30; Ps. 38:4; Job 10:11; 33:21; Lam. 3:4), the more poetic one עצמותך || שאר is not entirely wanting, as is evident from Mic. 3:3; note also the substantive שאר alongside בשר in Prov. 5:11 (cf. Ps. 73:26) and the pair שאר || נפש in Prov. 11:17 alongside the more common בשר || נפש (e.g., Ps. 63:2; Job 13:14; 14:22).”

the earth" or of "mankind," are nothing but "inferences based on later Greek and Jewish ideas that merged with the literal and symbolic significance of mountains as heights."⁵⁷

Now, although I definitely agree with Talmon that the phrase טבור הארץ in BH is devoid of any mythological association, the "Held method" clearly dictates that Talmon is incorrect concerning the specific meaning of טבור, "navel," and the literal meaning of טבור הארץ, which is indeed "the navel of the earth." As noted by D. Sperling (a former Held student), "Old Babylonian omen texts describe an invasion as a penetration to the 'navel of the enemy's land' (*abunnat māi nakrim*: YOS X.33, iii, 41; cf. 34:15). All that is described is an incursion which has passed through the outer defenses into the center. Needless to say, we learn nothing of the victim's cosmology. . . . To ancient speakers of Hebrew, and related Semitic languages, the earth had . . . a face (Gen. 11:9), a mouth (Num. 16:32), hands (Gen. 34:21). . . . Note that Judah has a neck (Isa. 8:8). In none of these cases should we infer that a mythology underlies the personification."⁵⁸ Thus, Akkadian *abunnat māti*, "navel of the earth,"⁵⁹ is the exact semantic equivalent of BH טבור הארץ. Just as the former is a geographical designation used in military contexts, so is the latter. Likewise, just as Akkadian *abunnat māti* is devoid of any mythological association, so is BH טבור הארץ. Talmon was correct in claiming that the etymological method leads us nowhere in this case. It was left to Sperling, however, making proper use of the "Held method," to conclusively demonstrate the correct meaning of this word and phrase.

Principle Seven: The identical semantic development of semantically equivalent terms even if they are etymologically distinct. This principle has been discussed recently by E. L. Greenstein (a former Held student).⁶⁰ Here it must be stressed that a logical explanation for the semantic development is absolutely unnecessary and may even lead to drawing incorrect conclusions. In the case of the BH verb *לאך, "to send,"⁶¹ and the noun מלאכה, "work," as semantically equivalent to Akkadian *šapāru* and the noun *šipru* with the same meanings, it is clear that in both instances there is an identical semantic development from a root meaning "to send" developing to a nominal form meaning "work." The rationale behind this semantic development is totally irrelevant to the fact that the precedent exists and could therefore theoretically occur in any Semitic language with respect to roots meaning "to send."

57 TDOT 3: 438.

58 D. Sperling, "Navel of the Earth," *IDB Supp.* (Nashville, 1976), 621–23 (quote is from 622–23). Note that Talmon became aware of this article only after completing his own research calling it a "careful entry," but apparently not fully understanding its implications with respect to his own conclusions. See Talmon, "The Navel of the Earth," 268, n. 25.

59 See also *CAD*, A/1, 89–90.

60 E. L. Greenstein, "Trans-Semitic Idiomatic Equivalency and the Derivation of Hebrew *m^lkh*," *UF* 11 (1979), 329–36. Note that one of the several fine examples brought by Greenstein in BH לדרוש מיד/לבקש = Akkadian *ina qāti bu'ū*, "to hold responsible," for which see also in more detail S. M. Paul, "Unrecognized Biblical Legal Idioms in the Light of Comparative Akkadian Expressions," *RB* 86 (1979), 237–39. The comparison of BH מלאכה-לאך with Akkadian *šapāru-šipru* was made without elaboration by M. H. Lichtenstein (another former Held student) in *JANES* 4 (1972), 109, n. 92 (reference courtesy E. Greenstein).

61 The root לאך, "to send," does not occur as a verb in the MT. It does, however, occur in Ugaritic, where the verb *l'k*, "to send," is the interdialectal equivalent of BH שלח and Akkadian *šapāru*.

Example 1: According to Held,⁶² the interdialectal distribution of the concept “to be sick” is as follows: Akkadian *marāṣu*; Ugaritic *mṛṣ*; BH חלה (poetic: נמרץ); Aramaic *mera*;⁶³ Arabic *marīḏa*. The Akkadian verbal adjective from this root is *marṣu* with two distinct meanings, “sick” and “severe.”⁶⁴ The second meaning represents a semantic development and occurs in Akkadian with respect to curses, words, deeds, prices, diseases, transgressions, etc.⁶⁴ In BH, this same root occurs in the phrase קללה נמרצת (1 Kgs. 2:8) = Akkadian *arratu/erretu maruṣtu/maruṣtu*, “a severe curse.”⁶⁵ However, not only with respect to the root מרץ is this semantic development attested. The same semantic development occurs with respect to the BH root חלה, “to be sick,” in the phrase רעה חולה (Qoh. 5:12, 15), which alternates with רעה רבה (Qoh. 2:21; 6:1), “a grievous evil.”⁶⁶ The same meaning for BH חלה occurs also in the phrases נחלה מכותי / מכתך / מכתך (Jer. 10:19; 30:12; Nah. 3:19) meaning “my/your wound is grievous.” Note also מכה נחלה מאד (Jer. 14:17), “a very severe wound,” and the ellipsis in Isa. 17:11: נחלה (מכה) ביום = ביום נחלה, “on the day of the grievous (blow).” Finally, note that the same semantic development takes place in English with respect to the term “sore,” e.g. “he was sore afraid.” Thus, קללה נמרצת, רעה חולה, and מכה נחלה may all be explained according to this semantic development, which now provides a precedent for all verbs in the Semitic languages meaning “to be sick.”

Example 2: Semantic equivalents in different Semitic languages often appear in parallel idioms and phrases. When the idiom or phrase consists of more than one element and reflects the influence of one language upon the other, the components may well be a mixture of cognates (including loan-words) and semantic equivalents. One example of this phenomenon is the well-known comparison between Ugaritic . . . *ltn bṭn brḥ* . . . *bṭn ʿqltn* (KTU 1.5:1:1–2, 27–29) and BH לויִתן נחש ברה . . . לויִתן נחש עקלהִון (Isa. 27:1), which may both be translated “Leviathan, the elusive serpent, (Leviathan), the twisting serpent.”⁶⁷ It is my opinion that the same phenomenon may have also occurred in Ps. 29:10: ה' למבול ישב וישב ה' מלך לעולם. The term מבול, “Flood,” outside of the Biblical flood story and besides Ps. 29:10 is used in BH⁶⁹ only

62 Held, “The Root *zbl/sbl*,” 93.

63 CAD, M/1, 291–95.

64 See e.g. the passages quoted in CAD, M/1, 294–95. Here it should be historically noted that long ago P. Haupt, using the old etymological approach, concluded that this second meaning of *marṣu* (which he translated “arduous”) “must be connected with Arab. *raṣama* ‘enter a defile.’” Thus, according to Haupt, *marṣu* “arduous” is derived from a separate root and is not at all connected to *marṣu* “sick”; see P. Haupt, “Ass. *marṣu* ‘sick’ and *marṣu* ‘arduous,’” *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 10/2 (1927), 271–73. Comparing Haupt’s treatment of this issue to that suggested here clearly demonstrates the many obvious advantages of the Held approach in this case.

65 For this comparison in light of the phonological change (through partial assimilation) *št > št*, e.g., **maruṣtu > maruṣtu* “severe,” see Held, “*mḥṣ*/**mḥš*,” 173 and n. 82; cf. R. Borger, *Bi.Or.* (1957), 190, n. 1. Note also the cases of the substantive *maruṣtu*, “hardship, difficulty,” used adjectivally (cf. CAD, M/1, 318, meaning e).

66 Contrast the “etymological” interpretation of רעה חולה as “a singular evil,” based on Arabic *ḥalā*; see Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 326 (#127).

67 See, e.g., A. Cooper, “Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts,” *Ras Shamra Parallels 3* (Rome, 1981), 388–91 with the extensive bibliography on p. 389.

68 My full study on Ps. 29:10 (ה' למבול ישב) is soon to be published in Hebrew in *Leshonenu*. The present discussion is based mainly on the English summary to be published together with that article.

69 מבול, “Flood,” occurs twelve times in addition to Ps. 29:10: *usage A*—(מי ה)מבול, “(the waters of the Flood)” (Gen. 6:17; 7:6, 7, 10, 17; 9:11 [twice], 15); *usage B*—אחר המבול, “after the Flood” (Gen. 9:28; 10:1, 32; 11:1).

in order to indicate a point in time of world history according to the phrase אחר המבול, "after the (Noahide) Flood."⁷⁰ It would therefore not be surprising if למבול in Ps. 29:10 were to exhibit the same kind of chronological usage. Such a usage is just what is required according to the parallelistic structure of Ps. 29:10. For a corollary of principle three of the Held approach (see above) is that elements standing for both clauses must occur in the first clause, not the second.⁷¹ Therefore, the temporal term לעולם, "forever," in the second clause must have a temporal term parallel to it in the first clause. The only term in the first clause which could be understood adverbially as a time-phrase is למבול. The interpretation being suggested here is to translate למבול "before the Flood,"⁷² based on a comparison with Akkadian *lām abūbi*, "before the Flood."⁷³ Akkadian *abūbu*, "flood," the exact semantic equivalent of BH מבול, has a more extensive usage including not only *arki abūbi*, "after the Flood,"⁷⁴ (= BH אחר המבול), but also *lām abūbi*, "before the Flood." The latter phrase is often used idiomatically meaning "from time immemorial,"⁷⁵ a meaning which admirably fits למבול in Ps. 29:10.

This Akkadian idiom is used to refer to the entire period before the cataclysmic Flood according to the Mesopotamian tradition. During this early period, the tenets of all basic cultural and technical knowledge were handed down to mankind.⁷⁶ The appropriateness of this idiom for the specific context of Ps. 29:10 is clearly demonstrated by the following two contexts in which the idiom *lām abūbi* is used with respect to kingship: (1) In a Late Babylonian incantation, the first antediluvian king is addressed as follows:⁷⁷ *EN Alulu šarru ša lām abūbu* "Alulu, king from before the Flood." (2) In a bilingual text, apparently referring to the claim of Nebuchadrezzar I (ca. 1125–1104 B.C.E.) to be descended from the seventh antediluvian king, Enmeduranki, we read as follows:⁷⁸ *līpu rūqu ša šarrūl[i z]ēru našru ša lām abūbi* "Distant

70 Note that in the twelve occurrences cited in the previous note, there is never a need to specify which flood is being indicated (contrast Isa. 54:9). Since מבול, "Flood," in these twelve verses can refer only to the Noahide Flood, it seems reasonable to assume that this is true in the thirteenth case, Ps. 29:10, as well (notwithstanding its unique status as the only occurrence outside of Gen. 6–11, the only occurrence in Biblical poetry, the only occurrence associated with Divine kingship, and, morphologically, the only occurrence of למבול).

71 E. L. Greenstein, "Two Variations of Grammatical Parallelism in Canaanite Poetry and Their Psycholinguistic Background," *JANES* 6 (1974), 87–96.

72 For a survey of the many other interpretations that have been suggested together with detailed discussion justifying their rejection, consult my forthcoming study of Ps. 29:10 (see n. 68 above).

73 I was first made aware of this suggestion through a comment made by Prof. David Sperling in Professor Held's class at Columbia University some twenty years ago! To the best of my knowledge, this suggestion has never before been published. I referred to it in my lecture at the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies at Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, on August 11, 1985. I would here like to thank Prof. Stephen Lieberman for discussing this interpretation with me and helping me to arrive at my present understanding, which is reflected here and in my more detailed Hebrew study (see n. 68 above).

74 *SR* 44 i 20 as quoted in *CAD*, A/1, 78.

75 See especially the passages discussed by W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-ḥašīs* (Oxford, 1969), 18–19, 25–27. For further extensive bibliography and detailed discussion, see n. 30 of my forthcoming study of Ps. 29:10 (see n. 68 above).

76 See the discussion in Lambert and Millard, *Atra-ḥašīs*, 18–19, 25–27, 134–37 and the further extensive bibliography referred to in the previous note.

77 BM 45686 = 81–7–6, 91:19. See Lambert and Millard, *Atra-ḥašīs*, 18, 27.

78 *JCS* 21 (1967), 128:8. See Lambert and Millard, *Atra-ḥašīs*, 18, 26. On this text and the relationship between Nebuchadrezzar I and Enmeduranki, see W. G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967), 126–38.

scion of kingship, seed preserved from before the Flood.” Thus, in conclusion, למבול in Ps. 29:10 is to be identified with Akkadian *lām abūbi*, “before the Flood,” either by assuming the rare intrusion of a loan-word preposition (Akkadian *lām* “before”)⁷⁹ in BH for the specific instance of this semantically equivalent idiom; or through the assumed expansion of the semantic range of the preposition ל⁸⁰ in BH, again just for this specific idiom. The resultant translation of Ps. 29:10 in either case is as follows: “The Lord has reigned before the Flood, the Lord reigns as King forever.”⁸¹

Appendix: A Conceptual Index to M. Held’s
Sixty-Four Published Interdialectal Distributions in the Semitic Languages

- a. All interdialectal distributions have been included that are specifically labelled as such or that specify at least three different Semitic languages where the semantic equivalents concerned are derived from at least two different Semitic roots.
- b. The original order of the languages for each distribution has been preserved here. The languages are cited according to the following abbreviations: Ak (= Akkadian); Am (= Amarna); Arb (= Arabic); Arm (= Aramaic); BH (= Biblical Hebrew); LH (= Late Hebrew); Mb (= Moabite); Mr (= Mari); Ph (= Phoenician); Pu (= Punic); Sy (= Syriac); Ug (= Ugaritic).
- c. Cross-references have been included whenever either the Semitic terms involved are translated with more than one possible meaning, or the one stated meaning consists of more than one element.
- d. Held’s twenty published articles have been cited according to the publication number within the Held bibliography published in the present volume (see pages vii–viii).
- e. The index has been arranged in a strict alphabetical order except for the words “to,” “to be,” and “the” which have been disregarded. Those entries which were originally published in articles 19 and 21 (written in Modern Hebrew) have been translated by the present author for the purpose of inclusion in this index.

79 While למבול in Ps. 29:10 would then be the only case of Akkadian *lām*, “before,” occurring as a loanword in BH, it should be noted that this Akkadian preposition also occurs only once in the Amarna letters (EA 147:22). Likewise, Akkadian *abūbu*, “Flood,” occurs only once as a loanword in BH as part of the place-name תל אביב in Ezek. 3:15 (= Akkadian *til abūbi*, “mound of the Flood [debris]”; see most recently M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* [Garden City, NY, 1983], 71).

80 The prepositional prefix ל does occur in BH meaning “at (the time of)” and “until (the time of).” For the former, see, e.g., לרוח היום, “at the breezy time of the day” (Gen. 3:8); לעת ערב, “at the time of evening” (Gen. 8:11). For the latter, see, e.g., וְלֹא יִלֵּן לְבָקֶר, “shall not be left lying until morning” (Exod. 34:25); וְלֹא יִלֵּן . . . לְבָקֶר, “shall not be left lying until morning” (Deut. 16:4); compare עַד בֶּקֶר . . . וְלֹא יִלֵּן, “shall not be left lying until morning” (Exod. 23:18). Note also that in some instances the form לְמוֹעֵד must be translated “at the time of” (e.g., Gen. 17:21; 18:14; 21:2), while in other instances the correct rendering is “until the time of” (e.g., 1 Sam. 13:8; cf. also Dan. 11:35).

81 According to the present interpretation, Ps. 29:10 should be understood as a sort of ancient version of the famous poetic LH prayer that is part of both the daily liturgy (including Shabbat) and that of the High Holydays: ה' מלך ה' מלך ה' ימלך לעולם ועד “The Lord is King; the Lord was King; the Lord will reign as King forever.” This prayer is based on such Biblical verses as Exod. 15:18; Ps. 10:16; and 1 Chr. 16:31. The usage of למבול in Ps. 29:10 as a means of dating the advent of Divine Kingship “from time immemorial” is reminiscent of the similar labelling of the most ancient Talmudic traditions as מסיני “Halakha (dating back) to Moses from (the Revelation at) Sinai.” On this usage, see also the bibliography in n. 38 of the forthcoming study of Ps. 29:10 (see n. 68 above).

adversary	see 41.	"opponent, adversary . . ."	
annihilate	see 11.	"destroy, annihilate"	
1. "armpit"		Ak, BH, LH, Arm-Sy, Arb	21:108, n23
to arrive at	see 43.	"to reach, to arrive at"	
2. "ask for life"		Ug, BH, Ak	9:273; 278, n29
3. "bear // give birth"		BH, Ak, Ug, Arm-Sy, Arb	12:78, n61
bow	see 56.	"string of a bow"	
4. "brick-mold"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:72, n17
bricks	see 37.	"to make bricks"	
to chase away/out	see 14.	"drive/chase away/out"	
check	see 55.	"to strike the cheek"	
5. "conceive // give birth"		BH, Ak, Ug, Arm, Arb	12:78, n63
6. "consume like a locust"		Arm, Ak, BH	10:400a
7. "consume, put an end to"		BH, Arb, Amr, Arm, LH, Ak, Ug	10:400a
consumed	see 38.	"the money is consumed"	
8. "corvee basket"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:72, n17
9. "to count"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	9:280, n35
10. "to deport // to settle"		Ak, BH, Ph	18:56
depressed	see 36.	"low // depressed"	
11. "destroy, annihilate"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	16:113, n67
dominion	see 33.	"kingship // dominion"	
donkey foal	see 31.	"to kill a donkey foal"	
12. "to drain"		BH, Ak, Arm-Sy, Arb	20:99-100
13. "to draw (milk)"		BH, Ak, Ug, Arm-Sy, Arb	20:98
14. "drive/chase away/out"		Ak, Ug, Mb, BH, Arm, Arb	11:93, n67
dung	see 16.	"excrement, dung"	
15. "early-late"		Ak, BH, LH, Arm	17:236, n62
east	see 44.	"rising of the sun (i.e. east)"	
enigmatic utterance	see 63.	"to utter an enigmatic utterance . . ."	
16. "excrement, dung"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	10:397, n21
17. "to extinguish fire"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	9:276-277, n19
18. "far be it, God forbid"		Ak, BH, Arb	6:20b-21b
19. "to fight, wage battle"		Ak, Ug, BH, Mb, Arm, Arb	5:172a
20. "to finish work"		Arm, Ak, BH	10:400b
21. "fire // flames"		Ak, Ug, BH	9:277, n21
fire	see also 17.	"to extinguish fire"	
flames	see 21.	"fire // flames"	
22. "to flay, to skin"		Ak, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	18:56, n30
23. "forehead"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	21:108, n25
24. "fuller"		Ak, Ug, Ph, BH, Arm, Arb	5:175, n111
gaze [triumphantly] upon	see 26.	"gloat over . . ."	
25. "gift, present"		Ak, Ug, Ph, Pu, BH, Arm, Arb	11:91a
give birth	see 3.	"bear // give birth";	
	see also 5.	"conceive // give birth"	
26. "gloat over (=gaze [triumphantly] upon)"		Mb, Bh, Arm, Ug	14:51, n31
God forbid	see 18.	"far be it, God forbid"	
27. "to guard // to watch"		BH, Ak, Ug, Arm-Sy, Arb	14:48, n5
head	see 52.	"to smash the head"	
highway	see 32.	"the king's highway"	
28. "hunger // thirst"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:74, n34
29. "hungry // thirsty"		Ug, Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:74, n34
30. "to kill // to slay"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	5:170a
31. "to kill a donkey foal"		Mr, Ak, Ug, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	13:34, n11
32. "the king's highway"		Ak, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	16:107, n4

33. "kingship // dominion"		Ug, Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:71, n10
late	see 15.	"early-late"	
34. "lettuce"		Ak, Arm-Sy, Arb, Ug, LH	13:40
life	see 2.	"ask for life"	
locust	see 6.	"consume like a locust"	
35. "to look for, to seek"		Ak, Ug, Ph, BH	17:233
36. "low // depressed"		Ug, Ak, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	15:189-190
37. "to make bricks"		Ug, Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	9:277, n25
38. "the money is consumed"		Arm, Am, BH	10:400ab
39. "mountain peak"		Arb, BH, Arm-Sy, Ak	16:109, n16
netherworld	see 42.	"pit/netherworld" and its idioms	
40. "number"		Ak, Ug, Ph, BH, Arm, Arb	9:280, n35
41. "opponent, adversary (='one who rises up')"		Ak, Ug, BH	18:55, n22
peak	see 39.	"mountain peak"	
42. "pit/netherworld" and its idioms		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Sy, Arb	15:173, 175- 176, nn2-7, 22-25, 27, 34
present	see 25.	"gift, present"	
put an end to	see 7.	"consume, put an end to"	
43. "to reach, arrive at"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	8:289, n1; 12:74, n32
riddle	see 63.	"to utter an enigmatic utterance (i.e. riddle)"	
rise up	see 41.	"opponent, adversary (='one who rises up')"	
44. "rising of the sun (='east')"		Arm, Ak, Am, Ug, Ph, BH, Arb	18:58, n48
45. "road" and its B-words and idioms		Ak, Ug, Ph, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	16:107, n4; 16:110, nn28- 29, 31-39
46. "to run"		Ug, Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	12:75, n36
to seek	see 35.	'to look for, to seek'	
47. "setting of the sun (='west')"		Ak, Ug, Ph, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	18:58, n50
to settle	see 10.	"to deport, to settle"	
48. "she-goat"		Ak, Mr, BH, Pu, Arm-Sy, Arb	13:40, n85
49. "Shepherd's Staff" (name of plant)		Ak, Arm, Arb	5:169, n7
50. "to be sick"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	11:93b
51. "sickness"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	11:93b
to skin	see 22.	"to flay, to skin"	
to slay	see 30.	"to kill, to slay"	
52. "to smash the head"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb, Ug	5:170a
staff	see 49. see also 53.	"Shepherd's Staff (name of plant)" "stick, staff"	
53. "stick, staff"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	5:169, n7
54. "to strike"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	5:169b
55. "to strike the cheek"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	5:169b
56. "string of a bow"		Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	10:404ab
57. "succeed to the throne"		Ak, BH, Ph, Arm, Mb, Arb	21:120, n101
sun	see 44. see also 47.	"rising of the sun (='east')" "setting of the sun (='west')"	
58. "sweat"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	21:107, n23
59. "sweetness of voice"		Ug, BH, Ak	16:108, n8
60. "table"		Ak, Ug, BH, Arm, Arb	8:289, n4
61. "temple (of the head)"		Ak, BH, Arm-Sy, Arb	21:108, n25
thirst	see 28.	"hunger // thirst"	
thirsty	see 29.	"hungry // thirsty"	

62. "thunder (= 'give forth/ cast forth the voice')"	BH, Ug, Ak	16:108, n8
63. "to utter an enigmatic utterance (=riddle)"	Ak, BH, Arm, Arb	20:96
voice	see 59.	"sweetness of voice"
wage battle	see also 62.	"thunder (= 'give forth . . . the voice')"
to watch	see 19.	"to fight, wage battle"
64. "weaver"	see 27	"to guard // to watch"
west	see 47.	Ak, Ug, Ph, Pu, Arm, Arb
		5:176ab
		"setting of the sun (= 'west')"