Sopher Mahir: Northwest Semitic Studies Presented to Stanislav Segert. Edited by EDWARD M. COOK. Simultaneously published as *Maarav* 5–6 (1990). Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 1990. Pp. 384. $27.50.

Stanislav Segert has put all Semitists in his debt with his outstanding grammars of three languages of the Northwest Semitic group: Aramaic, Phoenician, and Ugaritic. To repay a portion of that debt, an international group of Segert's students and colleagues has honored him by collecting twenty-one of their essays in this excellent Festschrift.

Edward Cook begins this volume with a beautifully written appreciation of the honoree's life and work. Professor Segert truly deserves the appellation, *sopher mahir*, conferred on him by the editor.

In "À propos de Milkou, Milkart et Milk⁽ᶜ⁾ashtart," Pierre Bordreuil nicely brings together the many references to *mlk* in Ugaritic and Phoenician texts. The issues at hand are the understanding of *mlk* in conjunction with ⁽ᶜ⁾*ttrt/*⁽ᶜ⁾*štrt*, and the relationship of these forms to the Tyrian divine name *mlqrt*.

Giorgio Buccellati's "Cybernetica Mesopotamica" describes the promising U.C.L.A. computer project for the processing of large amounts of data from cuneiform (Akkadian and Eblaite) texts.

In "ᵓĒDAYIN/TOTE-Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek," Randall Buth discusses the use of ᵓ*ĕdayin*, 'then', as a narrative connector in Imperial-Biblical and Qumran Aramaic texts. Buth further notes that Greek *tote* operates in this manner in Matthew, but not in Mark and Luke (the latter following standard Greek practice). "The results from looking at *tote* are that any major Semitic sources for Mark and Luke should be Hebrew . . . and that Matthew is responsible for adding the 'Aramaic' narrative style to his gospel" (p. 47).

Henri Cazelles, "Sur *mdl* à Ugarit, en Is 40,15 et Hab 3,4," surveys the many attempts to elucidate *mdl* in Ugaritic and to find cognates thereto in Hebrew texts.

The editor of the Festschrift presents a very detailed analysis of "The Orthography of Final Unstressed Long Vowels in Old and Imperial Aramaic." Cook argues very persuasively, contra F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, and in agreement with E. Y. Kutscher, that "all the available evidence suggests that final unstressed long vowels in Old and Imperial Aramaic could be, and often were, written defectively" (p. 66). This will explain such spellings as 3m.s. pronominal suffix -*wh* (to be vocalized [-awhī]); 2m.s. pronominal suffix -*k* (to be vocalized [-kā]); 1c.p. pronominal suffix -*n* (to be vocalized [-nā]); 2m.s. perfect ending -*t* (to be vocalized [-tā]); 2m.s. independent pronoun ᵓ*nt* (to be vocalized [ᵓántā]); and other assorted forms.

An article which parallels closely my own current research is James R. Davila's "Qoheleth and Northern Hebrew." The author states, correctly, that M. Dahood went too far in claim-ing the language of Qoheleth to be influenced by Phoenician, and that F. Zimmerman and H. L. Ginsberg are too extreme in their hypothesis that Qoheleth is translated from an Aramaic original. Nevertheless, says Davila, the works of these scholars have valid contributions to make, for it is undeniable that there are links between Qoheleth's language and Phoenician and Aramaic. Davila utilizes much of the data put forward by the aforementioned individuals to argue that Qoheleth is written in a dialect of northern Hebrew. This regional dialect "had more in common with both Phoenician and Aramaic than did Judean Hebrew, since Israel was closer to Phoenicia and Aram" (p. 79). Furthermore, connections between Qoheleth and Mishnaic Hebrew, as detailed by R. Gordis, are also apropos here, since Mishnaic Hebrew is most likely a northern dialect as well. I wholeheartedly endorse Davila's approach, and take this opportunity to call the interested reader's attention to my article: "The Galilean Background of Mishnaic Hebrew," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. L. I. Levine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992), 225–40.

In "The Syntax of Omens in Ugaritic," M. Dietrich and O. Loretz present a detailed analysis of the syntax of *KTU* 1.130+145, *KTU* 1.140, and *KTRIH* 1.14.

Pelio Fronzaroli, "Forms of the Dual in the Texts of Ebla," surveys all the pertinent data relating to dual nouns, pronouns, and verbs in Eblaite. Scholars of Ugaritic especially will be interested in Fronzaroli's calling attention to the existence of a 1st person dual pronominal suffix -*na-a* (variant -*ne-a*), cognate with Ugaritic and Old Egyptian -*ny*.

The importance of the Aleppo Codex is once more illustrated in P. W. Gaebelein's "Psalm 34 and Other Biblical Acrostics: Evidence from the Aleppo Codex." The author notes that this manuscript treats the two parts of Psalm 34 differently, with vv. 2–8 (ᵓ*alef* through *ḥet*, with *waw* missing) written continuously, i.e., no acrostic letter is at the beginning of a line, but with vv. 9–23 (*ṭet* through *taw* plus a final line with an additional *pe*) written with each acrostic letter at the beginning of a line. Gaebelein surmises that this is not an innovative practice of the Masoretes; rather this bipartite division bespeaks two distinct compositions in origin.

In "Phoenician *wšbrt mlṣm* and Job 33:23," the late Stanley Gevirtz argues that these two words from the Karatepe inscription mean "and the assembly of the (divine) intermediaries." The first noun is read as if it were *šbrt*, a variant of Ugaritic *ṣbrt*. The second noun can only mean "(divine) intermediaries," based on the usage of *mēlîṣ* in Job 33:23. In the same verse, the expression ᵓ*eḥād minnî* ᵓ*ālep*, "one of (the) thousand," refers to divine beings, as paralleled in Hittite and Ugaritic texts where *li-im* DINGIR.MEŠ is so used.

Jonas Greenfield's "The 'Cluster' in Biblical Poetry" employs "cluster" as the device by which "the Biblical writer draws from the poetic resources available to him a number of word pairs and standard epithets and uses them to construct a

complex poetic structure" (p. 160). The texts studied are Hos. 13:12; Job 26:7–8; Ps. 18:38–41; 21:3–5; 24:3; 27:4–6; Deut. 32:5–9; and Ezek. 28:2–10.

A very important article is D. M. Gropp's "The Language of the Samaria Papyri: A Preliminary Study." It remains unfortunate that F. M. Cross has been so slow in publishing these texts since their discovery in 1962, but at least Gropp gives us a window to their grammatical contents. His conclusion is that the Samaria papyri are written in an Official Aramaic "virtually identical" (p. 170) with that of the Elephantine papyri.

In "Proto-Semitic: Is the Concept No Longer Valid?," W. S. Lasor gives a useful review of the issues involved and an even more useful presentation of approximately two hundred words (though not identical with the Swadesh list), with cognates in most or all of the individual Semitic languages.

In "From Ugarit to Gades: Mediterranean Veterinary Medicine," Loren R. Mack-Fisher takes us on a fascinating journey through time and space. He suggests that Ugaritic *bṭr* 'veterinarian' is the ultimate source of later Latin *veterinarius*, with Phoenician and Punic as the intermediate step (even though the word *bṭr* itself is not attested in Phoenician-Punic).

Rudolf Macuch's "Some Orthographico-Phonetic Problems of Ancient Aramaic and the Living Aramaic Pronunciations," demonstrates once more how important the modern Semitic languages are to the Semitist who typically studies only ancient texts.

The longest essay in the book is Dennis Pardee's "Structure and Meaning in Hebrew Poetry: The Example of Psalm 23." This short poem is dissected and put back together as Pardee presents a detailed analysis of the psalm's parallelisms (semantic, grammatical, and phonetic) and macrostructure.

In "Jonah, The Runaway Servant," Robert Ratner understands the story of the prophet in the light of ancient Near Eastern (mainly legal) texts dealing with runaway slaves.

In "Some Observations on the Text of the Psalms," Helmer Ringgren gives short notes on the following passages: Ps. 1:7; 8:2–3; 10:10; 30:6; 31:12.

Yona Sabar's "On the Nature of the Oral Translation of the Book of Exodus in the Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Jews of Zakho" is filled with many interesting points of exegesis as practiced by the Jews of Kurdistan. For example, Exod. 6:20 *dôdātô*, generally understood as "his father's sister," is translated by the Jews of Zakho as *brat ʾamôye*, "daughter of his paternal uncle," an interpretation based probably on the common local custom of cousin marriage.

In "A Database Approach to the Analysis of Hebrew Narrative," John H. Sailhamer suggests "some lines along which the personal computer can be used in the study of biblical Hebrew at a level beyond words and phrases" (p. 319), i.e., mainly in the field of syntax.

In "Phoenician *nbš/npš* and its Hebrew Semantic Equivalents," Ziony Zevit reminds us that even in closely related dialects, like words need not necessarily be of like meaning. Zevit contends that whereas in Hebrew, *lēb* is the seat of the intellect and *nepeš* is the seat of emotions, in Phoenician, *lb* is the seat of emotions and *nbš* is the seat of intellect. The latter word (as distinct from *npš*) is attested only once, in the Kilamuwa inscription, line 13. Since this inscription comes from Zinjirli, in an Aramaic-speaking region, and since *nbš* in Aramaic has a wider range of meanings than Hebrew *nepeš*, it is possible that the lone attestation of this Phoenician word is a loanword from Aramaic.

The volume concludes with a complete bibliography of Stanislav Segert's writings; included is a list of twenty-one works currently in press or in manuscript.

<div align="right">GARY A. RENDSBURG</div>

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Le Papyrus de Nesmin: Un Livre des Morts hiéroglyphique de l'époque ptolémaïque. By JACQUES J. CLÈRE. Bibliothèque Générale, vol. X. Cairo: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE, 1987. Pp. viii + 15, 18 plates, $10.

With the death of Jacques Jean Clère on June 5, 1989, Egyptology lost one of its greatest philologists and grammarians. A dedicated student and teacher, J. J. Clère made many and significant contributions to the field, his books and articles appearing regularly over a period of more than sixty years. His works cover a range of topics, among which are philological notes, textual criticism, editions of texts, and historical commentaries that span virtually all of ancient Egyptian history.

One of Professor Clère's particular interests was the Egyptian Book of the Dead. During his stay at The Brooklyn Museum as a Wilbour Fellow in 1967–68, Professor Clère undertook the first systematic study and evaluation of the examples of the Book of the Dead in the Museum's holdings (a challenging undertaking and one that still needs further study). His penultimate publication, *Le Papyrus de Nesmin: Un Livre des Morts hiéroglyphique de l'époque ptolémaïque*, testifies to his abiding interest in this area of Egyptology.[1]

Although a number of important studies on the Egyptian Book of the Dead have appeared in recent years,[2] the dearth of

---

[1] For a complete bibliography of the works of J. J. Clère, see Jean-Louis de Cenival, "Bibliographie de Jacques Jean Clère établie par Jean-Louis de Cenival," *Rd'E* 40 (1989): iii–ix.

[2] To name but three: Irmtraut Munro, *Untersuchungen zu den Totenbuch-Papyri der 18. Dynastie* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1988); H. Milde, *The Vignettes in the Book of*