

Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers. 1999. xxxviii + 960 pp. Cloth. \$120.00/£70.00.

This is the second edition, “extensively revised” according to the title page, of a work that has already become a standard in the world of biblical scholarship. As the first edition, published in 1995, was not reviewed in this journal, we take the opportunity to comment on the volume itself and on the revised edition.

This dictionary (or *DDD*, as it is referred to in the secondary literature) includes entries on “all the gods and demons whose names are found in the Bible” (p. xv). The editors’ definition of “gods and demons” is broad in the extreme. They have included entries as follows: (1) gods mentioned by name in the Bible (e.g., Baal, Asherah); (2) gods not referred to independently, but appearing as theophoric elements in anthroponyms and toponyms (e.g., Anat, Shemesh); (3) deities occurring in the text but not in their capacity as gods (e.g., Ugaritic Yarikh = Hebrew common noun *yārēah*, listed under “Moon”); (4) gods whose presence in the Bible is questionable although scholars past and present have attempted to find references to them (e.g., Osiris); and (5) humans to whom later tradition attached divine or semi-divine status (e.g., Jesus, Mary, Elijah).

The result of such an inclusive approach is a massive tome with more than 400 entries. About one-fourth of the entries were authored by the three editors, while the remaining three-fourths were provided by an array of about 100 additional contributors. For those already in possession of the first edition of *DDD*, it should be noted that the second edition “contains some thirty new entries, a host of additions and corrections to articles from the first edition, and important bibliographic updates” (p. xix).

Each entry is divided into four sections. Section I gives the name of the god, its etymology, and a brief survey of the evidence. Section II is devoted to the nature of the deity or demon in its home culture (Egypt, Babylonia, Canaan, Greece, etc.). Section III surveys the biblical evidence in detail. Section IV presents bibliographic references.

Both the quantity and quality of scholarship contained in the pages of this volume are remarkable. The editors are major scholars in their own right, and they obtained the services of leading scholars in Europe, North America, and Israel to assist them. Extremely valuable is the wealth of material in the area of *Forschungsgeschichte*, not just in the bibliography, but throughout the entry, as different scholars’ positions are described and played off one another.

Inevitably, in a work such as this, any individual scholar will disagree with small points here and there or will wish to supplement the discussion. I present here a sampling of comments.

Pp. 28–32: J. Assmann contributes a clear and concise article on Amun. He notes that this deity occurs in Jeremiah’s oracle against Egypt (46:25) and in the expression No-Amon (Nah 3:8) to refer to Thebes. He does not note the possibility that Amun also may occur in garbled fashion in Prov 22:19, if the words היום אף אתה (senseless in their present context [or in any context perhaps]) are a corruption of Amenemopet (Egyptian *imn-m-ipt*), the author of the “30” (see v. 20) which served as the prototype of Prov 22:17–24:22. I no longer recall whether I heard or read this suggestion from someone else, or whether it is original with me; in any event, I am unable to find any statement in print proposing the above. (Note: The very first sentence of this entry [p. 28] incorrectly writes *ḥmn* for what should be *imn*, the proper transliteration of the name in Egyptian, with “reed,” and not “vulture,” as the first consonant.)

Pp. 154–56: W. Herrmann does a fine job in presenting the well-known material concerning Baal Zebub (viz., Ugaritic *zbl bʿl*), but then adds, “Consequently, Masoretic *bʿl zbwb* in 2 Kings 1:2–3.6.16 is to be emended to *bʿl zbwʿl* which is to be rendered ‘Baal the Prince’” (p. 155). I agree that the latter is the original form of the name, but I also assume that already in antiquity the Israelite author of 2 Kings 1, in an attempt to mock the deity consulted by Ahaziah, consciously altered the name to Baal Zebub “Baal the Fly,” “Lord of the Flies,” *vel sim*. Accordingly, MT is not to be emended.

Pp. 282–85: In the first sentence of the entry on Elijah, C. Houtman repeats the common opinion that *ʿēliyyāhū* means “Yahweh is God.” But as J. Blau showed recently (Blau 1996–1997: 187), the name must mean “Yahweh is my strength” (note the *šere* under the *ʿaleph*, suggesting a long /e:/ vowel and thus the root *ʿyl* for the first element of this name; as opposed to the *ḥataf segol* in cases where the theophoric element El, with short /e/ vowel, is to be understood, e.g., *ʿēlišāʿ* “Elisha.”

Pp. 593–98: C. Houtman, not surprisingly, devotes most of his article on Moses to the postbiblical traditions that elevated the status of this ancient Israelite hero. Nowhere does he state that already in the Bible Moses receives a promotion to the level of deity. I refer to Exod 4:16, 7:1, in which Moses appears as a god, no doubt because he is being primed for a summit conference with Pharaoh. Since the latter was understood to be divine by the Egyptians, so the former must achieve that status. Note that Aaron receives a parallel promotion, from the level of priest to the level of prophet. Though the text never describes the demotion of the two brothers to their proper positions (Moses as prophet, Aaron as priest), one must assume that these are temporary promotions. The ascription of divinity to a human being runs counter to all of ancient Israel’s teachings, and yet the exigency of the moment—Moses before Pharaoh—demanded this elevation. In short, as elsewhere in the Bible, the literary overrides the theological.¹

¹See Rendsburg in press.

Pp. 668–69: M. Heerma van Voss notes that Ptaḥ is present in the toponym *ma^cyan mē neptōaḥ* “Spring of Merneptah.” He does not include in the discussion, however, the term *naptūḥîm* in Gen 10:13, to be derived from Egyptian *n³ pth* “those of Ptaḥ,” that is, the Memphites, or those of Middle Egypt, in contrast to the next two terms (in the next verse, v. 14), the first of which *patrūsîm* represents the Upper Egyptians (cf. Egyptian *p³ t³ rsy* “the south land”), and the second of which *kaslūḥîm* represents the Deltans, even though no etymology is forthcoming, since this is the land whence the Philistines went forth (that is, after their repulsion from the Delta by Rameses III in 1175 B.C.E.).²

Pp. 749–53: E. A. Knauf is correct that “a convincing etymology [of Shadday] has until now not been offered” (p. 749), but I am afraid that his attempt to explain Shadday from *šāde^h* “the (uncultivated) field” > “the wilderness,” and thus to understand El Shadday as “a god of the wilderness” will not convince many. I do not understand the following statement from Knauf: “In Judaeen (and hence, Biblical) Hebrew, El Shadday is a ‘loanword’ from Israelite; otherwise, one would expect *šāday (note that the initial š predates the Masoretic pointing system as evidence by puns in Gen 49:25, Isa 13:6, Joel 1:15)” (p. 750). Is Knauf implying that the *šin-šin* distinction existed only in Judahite Hebrew and not in Israelian Hebrew? In what way do the puns in the cited verses demonstrate the point? And in any case, this suggestion ignores the fact that *šadday* has a *dagesh* in the *dalet*. I have no wisdom to convey on the etymology of Shadday, but I cannot accept Knauf’s proposal. (In addition, correct *ḥayit* on p. 750 to *ḥayyat*.)

As stated at the outset, the first edition of this volume already has become a standard reference in the field of biblical studies. The expanded second edition will make the work even more useful for scholars. One can agree with the publisher’s blurb on the jacket cover: “Unique in subject matter and comprehensive in coverage, this volume will long serve as an indispensable resource tool for scholars and students from a broad range of disciplines.”

Gary A. Rendsburg
Cornell University
gar4@cornell.edu

²See Rendsburg 1987: 89–96, especially pp. 91–92. For a different opinion, see Muchiki 1999: 231–32, and the bibliography cited there.

REFERENCES

- Blau, J.
1996– Issues in Biblical Phonetics and Morphology.
1997 *Leshonenu* 60: 181–89 (Hebrew).

- Muchiki, Y.
1999 *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*. SBL Dissertation Series 173. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
Rendsburg, G. A.
1987 Gen 10:13–14: An Authentic Hebrew Tradition Concerning the Origin of the Philistines. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 13: 89–96.
In press Moses as Equal to Pharaoh. *Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion*, eds. T. J. Lewis and G. Beckman. New Haven: Yale University.

***Realia Dei: Essays in Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation in Honor of Edward F. Campbell, Jr. at His Retirement*, edited by Prescott H. Williams, Jr. and Theodore Hiebert. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999. xii + 270 pp., 16 figures. Cloth. \$49.95.**

This festschrift contains 15 essays on archaeological and biblical topics. All articles but one are original to this volume (two are from posthumous contributors; one of these is a slightly revised republication). The book contains an appreciation of Edward Campbell by Prescott Williams, and a bibliography of his publications compiled by Elvire and Earle Hilgert.

Several essays in this *mélange* are purely biblical. This review will focus, however, on the archaeological contributions. A listing of the biblical essays will be included at the end of this review to demonstrate the range of topics in this truly eclectic volume.

Drawing on preserved examples of inscriptions and on the biblical record, M. D. Coogan assesses the development of literacy in his essay, “Literacy and the Formation of Biblical Literature.” While acknowledging the vagaries of material survival and chance discovery, Coogan suggests that the increasing number of inscriptions found reasonably reflects the proportions of actual writing in Israel and Judah in the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C.E. Scattered passages from Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomistic History, the Pentateuch, and First Isaiah suggest that either in the time of their writing or in the times that they represent (as in Isaiah or Jeremiah), literacy had become assumed for various segments of society. A comparison with Homeric work in Greece would seem to indicate that literacy was becoming somewhat common as early as the eighth century. Coogan suggests that the need to preserve some of the writings of the classical prophets in formats to be read by the public may reflect the burgeoning of literacy in Israel and Judah in the mid-eighth century B.C.E.

F. M. Cross’s contribution is the publication of “A Bulla of Hezekiah, King of Judah.” The bulla under discussion is from a private collection, one of two known bullae of