20

שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק *šemen turaq* (Song 1:3)

Gary A. Rendsburg and Ian Young

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY / UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

The first two poetic lines of Song of Songs (following the superscription) read as follows in the Masoretic Text (MT):

2 יִשָּׁקֵ֙נִי֙ מִנְּשִׁיק֣וֹת פִּ֔יהוּ כִּֽי־טוֹבִ֥ים דֹּדֶ֖יךָ מִיָּֽיִן׃

3 לְרֵ֙יחַ֙ שְׁמָנֶ֣יךָ טוֹבִ֔ים שֶׁ֤מֶן תּוּרַק֙ שְׁמֶ֔ךָ עַל־כֵּ֖ן עֲלָמ֥וֹת אֲהֵבֽוּךָ׃

> 2 May he kiss me with the kisses of his mouth,
>
> for your love is better than wine.
>
> 3 To the scent of your good oils,
>
> *turaq* oil is your name;
>
> therefore the maidens love you.[1]

The meaning of the expression שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק in v. 3 continues to elude scholars. Although the ancient versions, and more recently, the Qumran text 6Q6 = 6QCant have informed scholarly proposals in regard to the phrase, they are in fact of little help in understanding the meaning of the MT. In fact, the ancient witnesses are usually understood to reflect a variant text, as opposed to presenting an interpretation of the text which emerged as

---

1. For this translation, see Noegel and Rendsburg, *Solomon's Vineyard*, 189.

the MT.[2] Thus, the LXX μύρον ἐκκενωθὲν 'perfume poured out'[3] (lit. 'myrrh poured out'), the other Greek versions, Aquila and Origen's Quinta, ἔλαιον ἐκχεόμενον 'olive-oil poured out', and the Vulgate *oleum effusum* 'oil poured out'[4] are all understood as reflecting the graphically similar Hebrew word מוּרק, the *Hophʻal* participle of the root ר-י-ק 'empty', hence 'poured out'.[5] The Peshitta's rendering משחא דמורא 'oil of myrrh' represents either yet another *Vorlage*, without the word in question, or an interpretation of the MT form as referring to a specific type of oil. Even further away from the MT, the corresponding part of the verse in 6QCant has been restored as מר̇]קחת מורקה['an aromatic mixture poured out'.[6]

In this article our aim is not to discover the "original text" of this passage,[7] but simply to clarify what the MT offers at this point. Therefore, while it is obviously interesting, and important, that שֶׁמֶן תּוּרק was not present in all ancient texts of the Song of Songs, this observation is not relevant to our attempt to elucidate the MT reading, unless it can be demonstrated that the MT is an obvious error for one of the other readings. We shall argue in what follows that it is better to view the MT phrase שֶׁמֶן תּוּרק as a meaningful reading rather than as an error.

While there is no need to rehearse all of the many emendations and explanations offered for this phrase here,[8] a representative sampling follows

2. For a succinct presentation of the textual evidence, with commentary, see Dirksen, "Canticles," 11, 56*.

3. Thus the rendering in *NETS*, 662.

4. The highly paraphrastic Targum is also often considered to reflect this reading: "and your Holy Name was heard in all the earth, for it is choicer than the oil of anointment which is anointed (מתרבא) on the heads of kings and priests." For discussion, see Alexander, *Targum to Canticles*, 79–80.

5. Alternatively, these versions present an interpretation of the MT as a noun formed with *taw* from the same verbal root, literally 'oil of pouring out'.

6. Baillet, "Cantique des Cantiques," 113; cf. Dirksen, "Canticles," 56*.

7. Rendsburg tends to view the MT as close to the original text that left the pen of the author (see, for example, Rendsburg, *Psalms*, 16–17); whereas Young tends to see the MT as just one of the important late witnesses to the biblical text and usually puts the words "original text" in quotes (Rezetko and Young, *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, esp. 71–77).

8. We also do not mention the specific proposers of these suggested solutions, though we may direct the interested reader to the following summaries: Pope, *Song of Songs*, 300; Murphy, *The Song of Songs*, 125; Fox, *The Song of Songs*, 98; Garrett, *Song of Songs*, 125; Dirksen, "Canticles," 56*; Fishbane, *Song of Songs*, 29, 226. See also the dictionaries, Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 6:1241; and *DCH*, 8:616, 758. For a detailed attempt to elucidate our word by an anonymous medieval Karaite grammarian writing in Judeo-Persian, see Khan, *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts*, 258–61, 304–5. For the most thorough treatment, with an albeit unacceptable (in our estimation) solution, see

below. As we shall see, the evidence of the versions informs some of the proposals suggested by modern scholars, though in some instances commentators have proceeded independently. Not all of the proposals surveyed here are, therefore, directly relevant to our narrower focus on the explanation of the MT. Nevertheless, it is important to get a grasp on the range of proposals, including their strengths and weaknesses. Here, then, the representative sampling of proposals, as promised above:

a. תּוּרַק is the 3rd fem. sg. *Hophʿal* prefix-conjugation form of the root ק-י-ר 'empty', hence 'emptied' or 'poured out', in line with the Greek and Latin readings mentioned above.[9] This understanding, however, creates a grammatical incongruence, since שֶׁמֶן 'oil' is masculine, whereas the proposed תּוּרַק 'poured out' is feminine.[10] While lack of gender agreement occurs sporadically in the Bible,[11] one should be careful not to introduce another instance into the text unnecessarily.

b. תּוּרַק should be emended to מוּרַק 'poured out', the *Hophʿal* participle of the aforementioned root, once more in line with the LXX and Vulgate renderings. This solves the lack of gender agreement mentioned above, though one must admit that *taw* and *mem* do not look alike in either the paleo-Hebrew script

---

Stoop – van Paridon, *The Song of Songs*, 28–30, 37–38.

9. The sense is that oil when decanted releases its scent, as noted by Rashi and Yosef Qimḥi, among others. Unless otherwise indicated, the comments of the medieval Jewish commentators cited in this footnote and the following one are accessed via Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot ha-Keter: Ḥameš Megillot*, 4–7. For earlier rabbinic understandings of the word, based on the meaning 'poured out', and midrashic extrapolations therefrom, see Green, *Aroma of Righteousness*, 150–56.

10. As observed already by the aforementioned anonymous Karaite scholar, for which see Khan, *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts*, 258–9; and by several rabbinical commentators, such as Tobiah ben Eliezer (Leqaḥ Ṭov) and Isaiah di Trani (Rid), for which see Fishbane, *Song of Songs*, 29, 226, nn. 42–43. The efforts by both Isaiah di Trani and Abraham ibn Ezra to resolve the difficulty are, as one would expect from their pens, ingenious. The former considered תּוּרַק to be of the same *mišqal* as תּוֹשָׁב 'resident', the difference in the first vowel notwithstanding, with a nod to David Qimḥi, *Sefer ha-Šorašim*. The latter called attention to passages such as 2 Sam 17:12, Prov 2:18, Qoh 4:4, in which common masculine nouns appear to be treated as feminine.

11. See Rendsburg, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*, 69–83. Note, however, that in almost all cases, it is the masculine form which replaces the feminine form; see, e.g., pp. 77–78 for a list of feminine nouns followed by masculine attributes (adjective or participle). In fact, we know of no instance in the Bible where a masculine noun is followed by feminine attribute (other than Gen 32:9, 1 Kgs 19:4K, which involve the numeral '1'), as would be required by this understanding of שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק 'oil poured out'.

or the later square Hebrew script. Therefore it is unlikely that the MT reading is simply an erroneous version of the other. Instead, it must be treated as a reading in its own right, and an attempt must be made to explain it as meaningful. In addition, and this is relevant for both of these proposals, as Michael Fox observed, "but the oil's being poured out would not enhance the praiseworthiness of the boy's name."[12]

c. תּוּרַק should be emended to תַּמְרוּק 'cosmetics', especially since such are associated with women (Esth 2:3, 2:9, 2:12). To our mind, however, facile emendation in such drastic measure (introducing a *mem* and reversing the order of *waw-resh* to *resh-waw*) is uncalled for, especially if one can make sense of the current text.

d. The proposed restoration of 6Q6 = 6QCant 1:3 מֹ[קחת 'perfume', mentioned above, should be read.[13] Note, however, that this also entails deleting the word שמן, since the previous line ends with the phrase שמנים טובים (end of line 2), and then one reads מֹ[(start of line 3). It seems best to take this as simply a different text to the MT. It also should be noted, with Roland Murphy, "but it is quite difficult to discern support for the reading in the published photograph."[14] Regardless of the reading, this Qumran recension should be explained on its own merits—but to our mind it is not relevant to the elucidation of the MT.

e. תּוּרַק is to be derived from the root י-ר-ק, whence various nouns related to 'green, herbage, vegetation' are constructed, based on the fact that olive oil typically has a green hue. The quality of olive oil, however, is not determined by its color, but rather by other means and factors.

f. תּוּרַק is to be understood as a place name (thus already Tamakh = R. Abraham ben Isaac ha-Levi [Spain, d. 1393]). While naturally this is possible, we have no further evidence

---

12. Fox, *The Song of Songs*, 98. Perhaps, though, the reference is to the attractive scent released by the pouring of the oil, for which see above, n. 9.

13. Again, for the text and discussion, see Baillet, "Cantique des Cantiques," 113.

14. Murphy, *The Song of Songs*, 125. Upon inspecting the photograph published at the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library website (http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284841), we concur with Murphy's assessment.

for such a toponym, amongst the hundreds of such proper
nouns in the Bible and cognate literature.

The best step forward, in our estimation, was taken by Marvin Pope, who, in
his magisterial Anchor Bible commentary in 1977, pointed to the following
line from a Ugaritic administrative text (*CAT/KTU* 3.13, line 20), within a
list of commodities:[15]

> w . ṯn . irpm . w . ṯn . trqm

'and two (measures of) *irpm* and two (measures of) *trqm*'

The word *irp* almost undoubtedly means 'wine' (or refers to a specific
type of wine), based on the Egyptian word *irp* 'wine'.[16] In parallel with this
word, to quote Pope, "it seems likely that *trq* is a term for some type of high
grade cosmetic oil, as suggested also by the context of its occurrence in the
Song of Songs."[17] Note, incidentally, that the word *šmn* 'oil', with reference to
ordinary oil presumably, also occurs in said Ugaritic text (lines 3 and 5, and
perhaps to be restored in line 9 as well).[18]

We accept Pope's interpretation of both the Ugaritic document and
Song 1:3, but this only raises the question: what, then, is the etymology of
the word *trq* / תּוּרַק ? Unrecognized until now is the presence of this root in
the Karatepe inscription.[19] Azitawada boasts:

---

15. In earlier editions of *CAT/KTU*, the text was given the designation 4.123, and
thus it is cited, accordingly, in earlier studies. The third (and most recent) edition of
CAT/KTU (see pp. 235–6), however, has reclassified and hence has renumbered the
text, so that it now bears the designation 3.13.

16. See Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, 366, §19.371. For other suggestions, see *DULAT*
1:105.

17. Pope, *Song of Songs*, 300. For a similar comment, see Noegel and Rendsburg,
Solomon's Vineyard, 189, n. b. For the most detailed study building upon Pope's dis-
covery, see Loretz, "Die ugaritisch-hebräische Gefäßbezeichung" – per the title of his
article, note that Loretz considered *trq* to refer to a type of vessel, one that contained
high-quality oil (see also next note).

18. For a presentation and translation of the text, see McGeough and Smith, *Ugarit-
ic Economic Texts*, 378–9. Note that these scholars also (see previous note) understand
both *irpm* and *trqm* as types of vessels. See similarly *DULAT* 2:879. The text receives
brief mention in Heltzer, "Olive Growing and Olive Oil in Ugarit," 81, but the key word
trqm is not discussed.

19. Or to be more accurate, quite obviously, experts have understood that the root
ת-ר-ק occurs in the Karatepe inscription, and they have discerned the meaning from
the context (see anon), but no one has connected this verb to the form תּוּרַק in Song 1:3
(see further anon).

Version A, col. 1, line 9: ותרק אנך כל הרע אש כן בארץ

'and I crushed all the evil which was in the land'

Version C, col. 1, lines 15–16: [ות]רקת כל הרע אש כן בארץ

'and I crushed all the evil which was in the land'

(The two versions read essentially the same; the only difference is the use of the infinitive absolute plus independent pronoun to express the past in Version A vs. the use of the 1st com. sg. suffix-conjugation verb in Version C.)

The verb ת-ר-ק occurs only here within the Phoenician corpus, and no one has proposed a certain etymology.[20] Its meaning, accordingly, must be derived mainly from the context, though there is a certain amount of consensus nonetheless. In fact, already the earliest interpreters of the Karatepe inscription were able to ascertain the meaning of the root ק-ר-ת. A. M. Honeyman rendered the word 'crushed',[21] with an eye to the byform ט-ר-ק, "which is known from later Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic; translate 'pound, beat, crush.'"[22] Albrecht Alt left an ellipsis in his translation, but then proposed either 'ausrotten' or 'ausleeren' in his commentary, deduced primarily from context.[23] Dupont-Sommer rendered the word as 'détruire', with a nod to Aramaic ת-ר-ך 'drive out' (cf. Targum Onqelos to Gen 3:23) and Akkadian *tarāku* 'beat, strike' (on the issue of the *k/q* interchange, see below).[24]

More recent editions of the Karatepe inscription have, for the most part, repeated the interpretations of the earliest scholars who studied the text. François Bron also rendered the word 'détruire', and very helpfully included a summary of other early attempts.[25] J. C. L. Gibson translated

20. The parallel Hieroglyphic Luwian text is not a direct word-for-word counterpart of the Phoenician text, and thus it cannot always settle the question of the meaning of a Phoenician lexeme. Nevertheless, its evidence is potentially relevant. Unfortunately, the Hieroglyphic Luwian text is unclear at this point. One text (Hu) is broken, while the other (Ho) uses an unknown logogram. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, 50, 60, gives the rendering '[remov]ed' with the square brackets indicating the broken or unclear text. He has conjectured the meaning 'removed' in the Hieroglyphic Luwian text based on the preservation of the preverb *ARHA* 'away' and (at least in Ho) the ablative case of the word 'land'. The authors would like to thank Craig Melchert (UCLA) for his expert advice on the Hieroglyphic Luwian text.

21. Honeyman, "Epigraphic Discoveries at Karatepe," 26, 32.

22. Ibid. For Arabic *ṭ-r-q* 'beat, strike', see Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 1846. For Aramaic (JBA) *ṭ-r-q* 'bite, sting', see *CAL*, s.v. *ṭ-r-q*. The suggested Hebrew form is limited to a single attestation (according to *Ma'agarim*), to wit, b. B. Qam. 115b, though the meaning there appears to be 'stir, mix'.

23. Alt, "Die phönikischen Inschriften von Karatepe," 274, 281.

24. Dupont-Sommer, "Etude du texte phénicien: Des inscriptions de Karatepe," 122. For the Akkadian, see *CAD* T, 203–5. For the Aramaic, see *CAL*, s.v. *t-r-k*.

25. Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe*, 53.

the word 'drove out',[26] with the note, "otherwise unknown; perhaps cognate with Akkad. *tarāku* 'to beat, strike' or better Aram. תרד *Pael*, 'drove out' (Targum [Onqelos] Gen. iii 23)."[27] *KAI* suggested 'ausrotten' (?), with the additional comment "vgl. arab. *taraqa*?"[28]—though this Arabic verb is not widely attested.[29] Hans-Peter Müller rendered the word 'zerschlug', with the comment "vgl. akkad. *tarāku(m)* 'schlagen.'"[30] *DNWSI*, in its usual comprehensive manner, surveyed these and many other proposals, with the comments "meaning derived from context . . . uncert. etymology," and with the following verbs all listed as possible options: 'destroy, drive out, strike, smash, remove, take away, crush, break, shatter'.[31] In the most complete treatment of the Karatepe inscription to appear in recent years, K. Lawson Younger rendered the word as 'crushed', with a footnote referring to much of what we have summarized here.[32] Wolfgang Röllig opted for 'extirpated', with the note "probable from the context but the etymology of the verb is uncertain."[33] Finally, the entry in Charles Krahmalkov's dictionary of Phoenician reads: "T-R-Q [?etym] v. *qal* ERADICATE (from context)."[34]

Of all these options, as argued below, we prefer the rendering 'crushed' for Phoenician ת-ר-ק, cognate to the byform represented by the Aramaic and Akkadian roots *t-r-k*, as proposed early on in Karatepe scholarship by Dupont-Sommer and at a later stage by Gibson (again, on the matter of *k/q* interchange, see below). The closest biblical passage, which may be used to substantiate this specific meaning, is Mal 3:21 וְעַסּוֹתֶם רְשָׁעִים 'and you shall crush the wicked', using the verbal root ע-ס-ס 'crush, squeeze'—with a context quite similar to that of the Karatepe inscription, that is, the removal of evil or the wicked from the land. This is the only instance of this verb in Biblical Hebrew, though the root is better known as the basis of the noun עָסִיס 'sweet-wine' (or some such type of wine), due to the fact that grapes are crushed or squeezed in order to produce wine.

This, in turn, brings us back to תּוּרַק, which should be understood as the Qal passive of the selfsame root ת-ר-ק, with cognates in Ugaritic and

---

26. Gibson, *Textbook*, 3:47.

27. Ibid., 3:57. Gibson did not cite Dupont-Sommer (see above, n. 24) explicitly, though clearly he was indebted to his approach.

28. *KAI* 2:40.

29. See Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 304.

30. Müller, "Phönizische historische Inschriften," 641.

31. *DNWSI* 2:1233–4.

32. Younger, "The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada," 15.

33. Röllig, "The Phoenician Inscriptions," 51, 59.

34. Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary,* 498.

Phoenician. The word means 'beaten, crushed', hence the phrase שֶׁמֶן תּוּרָק means 'beaten oil, crushed oil', on par with the more common expression שֶׁמֶן כָּתִית 'beaten oil, crushed oil' (Exod 29:40, Num 28:5, 1 Kgs 5:25; see also Exod 27:20, Lev 24:2). The aforecited Ugaritic *trq*, then, refers to the same high-quality oil, which apparently could be used without the broader noun *šmn* preceding.

Thus far the etymology of תּוּרָק and its Ugaritic and Phoenician congeners; we now turn to the form of the word. Since the Tiberian reading tradition often preserves much older linguistic information, we take seriously the specific form of the word as transmitted by the MT.[35] As indicated above, תּוּרָק 'crushed' is to be understood as the internal passive of the Qal, clear vestiges of which remain in the biblical text.[36] One difficulty emerges, however, for the Qal passive suffix-conjugation is formed with *pataḥ* in the second syllable (see, e.g., Gen 37:33 טֹרַף 'he was torn', along with those forms which are accommodated to the Pu'al, such as Gen 3:23 לֻקַּח 'he was taken'); while the participle of the Qal passive is formed with *qameṣ* (see, e.g., 2 Kgs 2:10 לֻקָּח 'taken'; others are in pause, so that *qameṣ* appears regardless, thus most famously perhaps Exod 3:2 וְהַסְּנֶה אֵינֶנּוּ אֻכָּל 'and the bush was not consumed'; again, these examples are accommodated to the Pu'al). According to these principles, the form תּוּרָק 'crushed' should be a suffix-conjugation form, and not a participle—though naturally one expects the latter form to serve as the attribute following שֶׁמֶן. One may wish to argue that in this particular case, the expected shift of *turaq > turāq* (due to the accented second syllable)[37] did not occur, perhaps due to the presence of the two consonants pronounced deep in the throat (uvular /r/ and velar /q/), though we ourselves find this explanation doubtful.

A better explanation, it seems to us, is to regard the phrase שֶׁמֶן תּוּרָק not as noun + participial attribute, but rather as a bare or asyndetic relative clause, hence, 'oil (which) has been crushed'.[38] The *ṭə'amim* certainly suggest this, since simple noun + adjective combinations in Hebrew *always* constitute a single joined unit, with conjunctive accent on the first element (the noun) and disjunctive accent on the second element (the adjective);

35. On this issue in general, see Morag, "Historical Validity"; and Khan, "Biblical Hebrew."

36. For general discussion, see Joüon-Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 166–8, §58; and Blau, *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew*, 217–8, §4.3.5.1.2–§4.3.5.1.5.

37. See Blau, *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew*, 218, §4.3.5.1.5.

38. We are grateful to Elizabeth Robar (Tyndale House and University of Cambridge) for this suggestion. For more on the subject, see Holmstedt, "The Relative Clause," 107–14; and Holmstedt, "Relative Clause: Biblical Hebrew," 352–3.

thus, for example, Gen 21:8 מִשְׁתֶּה גָדוֹל 'a large feast'; Exod 32:11 בְּכֹחַ גָּדוֹל וּבְיָד חֲזָקָה 'with great power and with a strong hand'; Deut 1:35, 3:25, 4:21 הָאָרֶץ הַטּוֹבָה 'the good land'; 1 Sam 19:5 בְּדָם נָקִי 'against innocent blood'; 2 Sam 23:10 תְּשׁוּעָה גְדוֹלָה 'the great salvation'; Isa 39:2 הַשֶּׁמֶן הַטּוֹב 'the good oil'; etc.[39] Since שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק displays a different combination of *ṭaʿamim*, it should not be considered a noun phrase comprised of noun + adjective, but rather should be parsed per above. For additional instances of noun + null-relative-marker + SC verb, see, e.g., Ps 74:2 זְכֹר עֲדָתְךָ ׀ קָנִיתָ קֶּדֶם 'remember your congregation (which) you created long ago; Lam 1:21 יוֹם־קָרָאתָ 'the day (which) you announced'.

Next we turn to the question of the relationship between *t-r-q* / ת-ר-ק 'crush' in Canaanite and the proposed cognates Akkadian *tarāku* 'beat, strike', Aramaic ת-ר-ךְ 'drive out, divorce'.[40] This requires positing an interchange between the voiceless velar /k/ and its emphatic counterpart /q/. On the one hand, we could quote Pierre Swiggers on the matter, "in my eyes, this root [i.e., *t-r-q*—G.A.R. & I.Y.] must not be merged with the root *trk*."[41] On the other hand, we note that the related roots *t-r-q* / *t-r-k* include the sonorant /r/, so that the postulated interchange may thereby be explained.[42] A close parallel to the same interchange is found in the verb 'kill, slay' throughout Semitic:[43] Hebrew ק-ט-ל *q-ṭ-l*, Old Aramaic ק-ת-ל *q-t-l* (Samalian, Sefire,

---

39. We are exceedingly grateful to Joshua Harper (Africa International University, Nairobi) for conducting the research for us, via the BibleWorks 8.0 program. His investigation determined that *every* instance of simple noun + adjective (even when the noun phrase is definite or when the noun is preceded by a preposition) is marked with conjunctive and disjunctive accents, respectively. The examples listed here are but a few of the many present in the Bible. All possible exceptions which emerged from Dr. Harper's research are explicable: the phrase includes more than one adjective (e.g., Gen 41:6), a prepositional modifier occurs after the adjective (e.g., Amos 2:13), or the adjective is comprised of four syllables and thus bears two accent marks (Deut 10:10, Jer 29:17, Ezek 40:17, Qoh 7:10).

40. For ת-ר-ךְ 'divorce' in post-biblical Hebrew, see t. Giṭ. 4:5, y. Giṭ. 6:5, 48a—information via *Maʾagarim*. We consider any relationship with Arabic *ṭ-r-q* 'beat, strike', Aramaic (JBA) *ṭ-r-q* 'bite, sting', as proposed by Honeyman (see above, n. 21), to be possible, though in this case one needs to posit a /t/-/ṭ/ interchange of the sort represented in the words for 'kill, slay' listed below. Note, incidentally, that the Arabic verb is used mainly for striking with a hammer, while the Aramaic verb has yet a more distant connotation.

41. Swiggers, review of Bron, 338.

42. One also may wish to incorporate Old Akkadian *tarāqu* into the *t-r-q* / *t-r-k* picture, as proposed by Greenstein, review of Bron, 201, though to be sure the evidence for this lexeme is rather slim (see *CAD* T, 207).

43. For the different forms within Aramaic, see *DNWSI* 2:1006–7. For a summary of the cognate evidence throughout Semitic, see Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 5:1162.

etc.) / כ-ט-ל *k-ṭ-l* (Nerab) / ק-ט-ל *q-ṭ-l* (Aḥiqar), and perhaps also כ-ת-ל *k-t-l* (Frahang), Arabic-Sabaic-Geʿez *q-t-l*—and once more we note the presence of the sonorant (in this case /l/) in the root.[44] In sum, we are inclined to accept the relationship of these different verbal roots, as proposed by Dupont-Sommer, Gibson, Müller, et al. (see above).[45]

When Rendsburg sees a rare word (in this case a *hapax legomenon*) in a biblical composition which he considers to be written in Israelian Hebrew (IH),[46] with cognates in Ugaritic and Phoenician, he immediately ponders whether said lexeme is also not a feature of IH. In this case, that conclusion seems inescapable to him: one should consider the root *t-r-q* / ת-ר-ק 'crush', attested once each in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Song of Songs to constitute a nexus between the Phoenic group[47] of Canaanite and northern Hebrew. As such, this item can be added to the list of items collected previously by Rendsburg.[48]

Regardless of the matter raised in the previous paragraph, most importantly for this article generally: the three rare words—one a *hapax legomenon* in the Bible, one attested but once in the Ugaritic corpus, and one attested only once in the more limited Phoenician corpus—all mutually elucidate each other.

Finally, as previous studies have shown, rare words, including *hapax legomena*, frequently are employed by the biblical authors *alliterationis causa*.[49] Hence, when we encounter a word such as תּוּרַק within the phrase שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק 'oil (which) has been crushed', our antennae go up wondering if the sounds of the phrase do not echo the sounds of nearby words. In this particular case, we propose that the poet employed the expression to evoke the sounds of מִנְּשִׁיקוֹת 'with the kisses' in v. 2. Note how the consonants of this word in v. 2, /m/-/n/-/š/-/q/-/t/, resonate with those of the key phrase in

---

44. For additional examples, see Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, 1:122, with most of the examples including the sonorant /r/ within the word.

45. We have decided to limit the discussion to what is presented here, without entering into the larger picture of which of the options may be the "original" root, in which way any assimilation or dissimilation may have occurred, to what effect Geers' Law may be present, etc., etc.

46. On Song of Songs as a northern composition, see Rendsburg, "Israelian Hebrew in the Song of Songs"; Noegel and Rendsburg, *Solomon's Vineyard*, 3–62; and Young, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*, 157–66. For Young's later change to greater caution in regard to Israelian Hebrew, see, for example, the references in Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 193–5.

47. For this term, see Ginsberg, "The Northwest Semitic Languages," 104–6, 108–11.

48. See n. 46 above.

49. See, for example, Rendsburg, "Alliteration in the Exodus Narrative"; Rendsburg, "Alliteration"; and Noegel and Rendsburg, *Solomon's Vineyard*, 63–106.

v. 3, /š/-/m/-/n/-/t/-/r/-/q/. Every consonant in the former set finds its mate in the latter set; or to look at this in the opposite direction, every consonant but /r/ in שֶׁמֶן תּוּרַק is anticipated in מִנְּשִׁיקוֹת in the previous verse. This is what poets do: they use language for the creation of literature.

<p style="text-align:center">↜</p>

The reader will have recognized that the co-authors of this article take divergent positions on several issues. Another of these, not relevant to the present enterprise, is the question of Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) vs. Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). Rendsburg accepts the common interpretation of a diachronic development from the former to the latter, while Young does not consider that the biblical manuscripts in our possession preserve evidence of the language of discrete historical periods. We are able to set aside these differences, however, for the larger goal, to honor our friend and colleague Ziony Zevit, who has done so much to advance the field of Biblical Hebrew philology throughout his distinguished career. As the knowledgeable reader will know further, our honoree has served as a bridge between the two schools mentioned above, through his organization of panels devoted to the question at SBL/NAPH conferences, and through his editing of the published papers in *Hebrew Studies*, vols. 46–47 (2005–2006), to which the two present authors both contributed.[50] It is in the spirit of the SBL/NAPH panels and the resultant *Hebrew Studies* volumes that we jointly offer this essay as a tribute to Ziony Zevit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Philip S. *The Targum of Canticles*. The Aramaic Bible 17A. London: T. & T. Clark, 2003.

Alt, Albrecht. "Die phönikischen Inschriften von Karatepe." *Die Welt des Orients* I/4 (1949) 272–87.

Baillet, Maurice. "Grotte 6: Textes bibliques: Cantique des Cantiques." In *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*, 112–14. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Blau, Joshua. *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 2. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

50. In the former volume, the published papers, including Zevit's comments, appear on pp. 321–76; in the latter volume, the published papers, including Zevit's comments, appear on pp. 83–210. The contributions of the present authors are Young, "Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically"; and Rendsburg, "Aramaic-Like Features in the Pentateuch." For yet a third editiorial effort from the desk of our honoree, see also Miller-Naudé and Zevit, *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, 2 vols. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1908–13.

Bron, François. *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe*. Hautes études orientales 11. Geneva: Droz, 1979.

Cohen, Menaham, ed. *Miqraʾot Gedolot ha-Keter: Ḥameš Megillot*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2012.

Dirksen, P. B. "Canticles." In *Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato: General Introduction and Megilloth: Ruth, Canticles, Qoheleth, Lamentations, Esther*, edited by Adrian Schenker, 11–24, 8*–13*, 26*–28*, 38*–40*, 56*–64*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004.

Dupont-Sommer, André. "Etude du texte phénicien: Des inscriptions de Karatepe." *Oriens* 2 (1949) 121–26.

Fishbane, Michael A. *Song of Songs*. The JPS Bible Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2015.

Fox, Michael V. *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Garrett, Duane. *Song of Songs*. Word Biblical Commentary 23B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004.

Gesenius, Wilhelm et al. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 18th edition, 6 vols. Berlin: Springer, 1987–2010.

Gibson, John C. L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973–1982.

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Northwest Semitic Languages." In *Patriarchs*, edited by Benjamin Mazar, 102–24, 293. World History of the Jewish People. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

Gordon, Cyrus H. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

Green, Deborah A. *The Aroma of Righteousness*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011.

Greenstein, Edward L. Review of Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe*. *JAOS* 102 (1982) 200–01.

Hawkins, John David. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. 1: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000.

Heltzer, Michael. "Olive Growing and Olive Oil in Ugarit." In *Olive Oil in Antiquity: Israel and Neighbouring Countries from the Neolithic to the Early Arab Period*, edited by David Eitam and Michael Heltzer, 77–89. History of the Ancient Near East, Studies 7. Padova: Sargon, 1996.

Holmstedt, Robert D. "The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew: A Linguistic Analysis." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 2002.

———. "Relative Clause: Biblical Hebrew." In *EHLL* 3:350–57.

Honeyman, A. M. "Epigraphic Discoveries at Karatepe." *PEQ* 81 (1949) 21–39.

Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 vols., 1st edition with corrections. Subsidia Biblica 14/1–2. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.

Khan, Geoffrey. "Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic background of Masoretic Text." In *EHLL* 1:304–15.

———. *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts*. Masoretic Studies 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Krahmalkov, Charles. *Phoenician–Punic Dictionary*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 90. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Lane, Edward William. *Arabic–English Lexicon*, 8 vols. With Stanley Lane–Poole. London: Williams & Norgate, 1863–1893.

Loretz, Oswald. "Die ugaritisch-hebräische Gefäßbezeichung trq/twrq in Canticum 1,3: Liebesdichtung in der westsemitischen Wein- und Olivenkultur." *UF* 36 (2004) 283–89.

Maʾagarim = Maʾagarim: Mifʿal ha-Millon ha-Hisṭori la-Lašon ha-ʿIvrit, online at http://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/Pages/PMain.aspx.

McGeough, Kevin M., and Mark S. Smith, *Ugaritic Economic Tablets: Text, Translation and Notes*. ANESSup 32. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Miller–Naudé, Cynthia L., and Ziony Zevit, eds. *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012.

Morag, Shelomo. "On the Historical Validity of the Vocalization of the Hebrew Bible." *JAOS* 94 (1974) 307–15.

Müller, Hans–Peter. "Phönizische historische Inschriften." In *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments*, Band I, Lieferung 6, 638–45. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1985.

Murphy, Roland. *The Song of Songs*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Noegel Scott B., and Gary A. Rendsburg. *Solomon's Vineyard: Literary and Linguistic Studies in the Song of Songs*. SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 1. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009 / Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Pope, Marvin H. *Song of Songs*. AB 7A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.

Rendsburg, Gary A. "Alliteration." In *EHLL* 1:86–87.

———. "Alliteration in the Exodus Narrative." In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by Chaim Cohen et al., 83–100. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

———. "Aramaic-like Features in the Pentateuch." *HS* 47 (2006) 163–76.

———. *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*. American Oriental Series 72. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1990.

———. "Israelian Hebrew in the Song of Songs." In *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Environment: Typological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz, 315–23. Publications of the Institute for Advanced Studies 1. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2006 / Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Rezetko, Robert, and Ian Young. *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew: Steps Toward an Integrated Approach*. Ancient Near East Monographs 9. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Röllig, Wolfgang. "Appendix I: The Phoenician Inscriptions." In Halet Çambel, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. 2: *Karatepe-Aslantaş*, 50–81. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

Stoop – van Paridon, P. W. T. *The Song of Songs: A Philological Analysis of the Hebrew Book* שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים. ANESSup 17. Peeters: Louvain, 2005.

Swiggers, Pierre. Review of Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe*. *BO* 37 (1980) 336–43.

Young, Ian. "Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically." *HS* 46 (2005) 341–51.

———. *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. FAT 5. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.

Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 2 vols. London: Equinox, 2008.

Younger, K. Lawson. "The Phoenician Inscription of Azatiwada: An Integrated Reading." *JSS* 43 (1998) 11–47.

Le-ma'an Ziony:
Essays in Honor of
Ziony Zevit

edited by

FREDERICK E. GREENSPAHN
& GARY A. RENDSBURG