ENCYCLOPEDIA OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 2
G–O

General Editor
Geoffrey Khan

Associate Editors
Shmuel Bolokzy
Steven E. Fassberg
Gary A. Rendsburg
Aaron D. Rubin
Ora R. Schwarzwald
Tamar Zewi

BRILL

Table of Contents

Categorical subjects are interpreted as referential, and are understood to refer to kinds.

In contrast, singular reference to kinds in object position requires a definite noun-phrase:

(15) אלכסנדר בל המציא את הטלפון
ʾalexander bell hiṃṣi ʾet ha-ṭelefon
Alexander Bell invented the-telephone
'Alexander Bell invented the telephone'.

(16) אלוהים ברא את האדם
ʾelohim bara ʾet ha-ʾadam
God created the-man
'God created man'.

Yet in addition to subject position, indefinite singular reference to kinds in Hebrew can come as the object of a preposition, e.g., -ל *le-* 'to' in (12) above. Moreover, Heller (2002) observes that nouns can also refer to kinds within the Hebrew construct state. When such a structure expresses part-whole relations, a bare annex (the non-head element of the construct state) may refer to kinds. Thus, שן פיל *šen pil* 'ivory' (literally 'tooth of an elephant') is not limited to one tooth of one elephant. Similarly, נוצות טווס *noṣot ṭavas* 'feathers of a peacock' or פרוות שועל *parvat šuʕal* 'furs of a fox' are not limited to feathers or fur coming from only one animal, but rather of the peacock kind, or the fox kind, respectively. Some collocations favor plurals, while others prefer singular nouns for the kind-designating annex, as in חלב עיזים *xalav ʕizim* 'milk of goats' versus חלב פרה *xalav para* 'milk of a cow'.

R E F E R E N C E S

Carlson, Gregory. 1980. *Reference to kinds in English*. New York: Garland Publishing (based on his 1977 PhD dissertation).
Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. "Reference to kinds across languages," *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339–405.
Doron, Edit. 2003. "Bare singular reference to kinds". *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 13:73–90.
Heller, Daphna. 2002. "Possession as a lexical relation: Evidence from the Hebrew Construct State". *WCCFL 21 Proceedings*, ed. by Line Mikkelsen and Christopher Potts, 127–140. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla.
Krifka, Manfred, Francis Jeffry Pelletier, Gregory Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia, and Godehard Link. 1995. "Genericity: An introduction". *The generic book*. ed. by Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffry Pelletier, 1–124. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michael Lubling
(The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Avigail Tsirkin-Sadan
(The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Kinship Terms

The literature preserved in the Hebrew Bible provides a wealth of information about the lexicon of kinship in ancient Israel and early Judaism. The most explicit description of the various kinship units in ancient Israel is found in Josh. 7.16–18. The passage occurs as part of Joshua's search for the member of Israel responsible for taking some of the sacred items to have been devoted to Yahweh following Israel's defeat at the city of Ai. When Joshua calls up the different tribes for questioning about the incident, he proceeds to identify the guilty man, Achan, by calling out his שֵׁבֶט *šēḇeṭ* 'tribe', then his מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan', followed by his בַּיִת *bayiṯ* 'house', and finally all of the גְּבָרִים *gəḇārīm* 'male individuals' within his house. As a result, the story represents an important reflection of the hierarchy of kinship, as well as the relationship between the different kinship units, in ancient Israel.

Josh. 7.16–18 indicates that the basic kinship unit in Ancient Israel was the בַּיִת *bayiṯ* 'house', or as it is known more commonly, by its fuller designation, בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāḇ* lit. 'house of the father', with the sense 'father's household' (see especially the census lists and related material in Num. 1–4, as well as Josh. 22.14, etc.). The term referred to the extended family of a living male ancestor. Thus, the בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' would have included all of the descendants of a particular living male head-of-household, along with others in the collective domicile. This means that the בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' consisted of several smaller nuclear families belonging to the sons of the father, and possibly the father's grandchildren as well, as well as non-affinal individuals, such as servants (see below). That the בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' encompassed three or four generations of a father's male descendants can be inferred from several biblical texts. Most notably, the laws concerning incest in Lev. 18:7–16 have as their cultural referent the three or four generations that may be found in a particular בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāḇ* (McClenney-Sadler 2007:31–49). The specific prohibitions, which are directed toward males, define incest within the bounds of one previous and two succeeding generations. Additionally, the so-called statement of transgenerational punishment in the Hebrew Bible, which promises that God will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the

children to the third and fourth generation, also likely reflects the reality that the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' could incorporate up to three or four generations (Exod. 20.5–6; 34.7; Num. 14.18; Deut. 5.9–10).

Recent archaeological work has given concrete expression to the term בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' reflected in ancient Israelite society. A characteristic feature of domestic dwellings in Iron Age towns is the clustering of several houses sharing walls to form one large compound. Stager (1985:20–22) argued that the clustering of these homes around one original dwelling reflects the development of the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father', comprised of several nuclear families all tracing their lineage back to one male ancestor. The fact that this unit occupied several houses is most likely reflected in the story about the Danite preserved in Judg. 17–18. When the men of Micah's house learn that the Danites had taken the Levite and his cult objects, we read וְהָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר בַּבָּתִּים אֲשֶׁר עִם־בֵּית מִיכָה נִזְעֲקוּ *wə-hā-ʾănāšīm ʾăšer bab-bāttīm ʾăšer ʿim-bēt mīkā̊ nizʿăqū* 'and the men who were in the houses near Micah's house were mustered' (Judg. 18.22) (see Gottwald 1979:316; Stager 1985:23). In fact, in light of recent research, one may wish to adopt the translation 'family household' for בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ*, a term which "incorporates the basic kinship orientation of a multigenerational family while allowing for the various functions of the household—residency, economic production, social activity, cultic practices, and so on" (Meyers 1991:41).

A typical intact בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' would have included the following constituent members (depending on the individual relationships): אָב *ʾāḇ* 'father', בֵּן *bēn* 'son', אָח *ʾāḥ* 'brother', אֵם *ʾēm* 'mother', בַּת *baṯ* 'daughter', and אָחוֹת *ʾāḥōṯ* 'sister'. For relations by marriage, some of whom may have been present in the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' / 'father's household' (for example, daughters-in-law, especially), see below. In the majority of cases in the Bible, the above kinship terms, which constitute part of the core component of the Hebrew lexis, are used to designate blood relationships within a given nuclear family.

For instance, the term אָח *ʾāḥ* 'brother' typically refers to males born of the same father, either via the same mother (e.g., Gen. 4.2; 25.26) or via different mothers (e.g., Gen. 37.16; 1 Kgs 1.10). In a number of contexts, however, the term אָח *ʾāḥ* may designate any type of male kin, especially a nephew. For example, in Gen. 14.14, 16, the narrator refers to Lot as אָחִיו *ʾāḥīw* lit. 'his brother', with reference to Abram, even though Lot is the nephew of Abram; while in Gen. 29.15 Laban addresses Jacob as אָחִי *ʾāḥī* lit. 'my brother', even though the relationship is once more uncle-nephew. Other texts in the Bible indicate that the term, especially in the plural, could have an even wider sense, denoting the male kin within a given tribe (Num. 16.10; 18.2, 6), or even the Israelites as a whole, as in וַיִּגְדַּל מֹשֶׁה וַיֵּצֵא אֶל־אֶחָיו וַיַּרְא בְּסִבְלֹתָם וַיַּרְא אִישׁ מִצְרִי מַכֶּה אִישׁ־עִבְרִי מֵאֶחָיו *way-yigdal mōše way-yēṣē ʾel-ʾeḥā̊w way-yar bə-siḇlōṯām way-yar ʾīš miṣrī makke ʾīš-ʿiḇrī mē-ʾeḥā̊w* 'and Moses grew up, and he went out to his brothers, and he saw their burdens, and he saw an Egyptian man beating a Hebrew man from among his brothers' (Exod. 2.11). Finally, the term can be extended to non-relatives, as in Jacob's address to the men at the well in Haran as אַחַי *ʾaḥay* lit. 'my brothers' (Gen. 29.4).

In similar fashion, the term אָב *ʾāḇ* 'father' typically refers to one's literal father (e.g., Gen. 19.31; 22.7), but in several places serves to designate a grandfather (e.g., Gen. 28.13; 32.10—in both cases with reference to Abraham vis-à-vis Jacob), a great-grandfather (e.g., 1 Kgs 15:11, with reference to David vis-à-vis Asa), or simply a distant male ancestor, especially with reference to David as the establisher of a royal line (e.g., 2 Kgs 22.2). In the plural form, אָבוֹת *ʾāḇōṯ* 'fathers', the term may refer to one's male ancestors collectively, whether in royal context (e.g., 1 Kgs 22.51) or in non-royal context (e.g., 1 Kgs 21.3–4).

Remaining within the nuclear family, note that Hebrew has special terms for 'firstborn' (one for each gender): בְּכוֹר *bəḵōr* 'firstborn son' (Gen. 22.21; 38.6–7; Exod. 6.14; 1 Sam. 8.2; 17.13; 2 Sam. 3.2; etc.) and בְּכִירָה *bəḵīrā̊* 'firstborn daughter' (Gen. 19.31–37 [4x]; 29.26; 1 Sam. 14.49). In addition, a special term exists for the 'second son' within a grouping of brothers, namely, מִשְׁנֶה *mišnɛ* 'second (one)' (1 Sam. 8.2; 17.13; 2 Sam. 3.3; 1 Chron. 5.12; in all but the last of these verses the specific form is מִשְׁנֵהוּ *mišnēhū* 'his second [one]', the possessive suffix הו- *-hū* 'his' referring back to the firstborn son, mentioned immediately prior), suggesting that the second-born son bears this rank vis-à-vis his older brother (Gordon 1935:229–230).

The term דּוֹד *dōḏ* 'uncle' is used to refer to a father's brother, or paternal uncle (e.g.,

1 Sam. 14.50; 2 Kgs 24.17); whereas the feminine form דּוֹדָה *dōḏā* 'aunt' designates either a paternal uncle's wife (Lev. 18.14; 20.20) or the sister of one's father (Exod. 6.20, to be read in conjunction with Num. 26.59). Note the connection between these terms and the word דּוֹד *dōḏ* 'beloved (m)', used widely in Song of Songs (1.13, 13, 16; etc.), especially in the form דּוֹדִי *dōḏī* 'my beloved [m]' in the mouth of the female lover (see also Isa. 5.1, with דּוֹדִי *dōḏī* 'my beloved [m]' serving as a metaphor for Israel, God's beloved). This lexical nexus suggests that the 'uncle' served as the beloved male relative, which is also true of other traditional societies (albeit usually the maternal uncle in traditional Arab culture).

Hebrew also possesses a set of kinship terms to denote individuals related by marriage. The word for 'husband' is בַּעַל *baʿal*, whose literal meaning is 'lord, owner, master' (see, for example, Gen. 20.3; Exod. 21.3; 2 Sam. 11.26; Prov. 21.3; Est. 1.17; etc.). At the same time, however, the basic word אִישׁ *ʾīš* 'man' may also serve for 'husband' (as in Gen. 16.3; 29.32; 2 Sam. 11.26; Ruth 1.3; etc.). Note the presence of both terms in וַתִּשְׁמַע אֵשֶׁת אוּרִיָּה כִּי־מֵת אוּרִיָּה אִישָׁהּ וַתִּסְפֹּד עַל־בַּעְלָהּ *wat-tišmaʿ ʾēšeṯ ʾūriyyā kī-mēṯ ʾūriyyā ʾīšāh wat-tispōḏ ʿal-baʿlāh* 'and the wife of Uriah [i.e., Bathsheba] heard that Uriah her husband (אִישָׁהּ *ʾīšāh*) was dead; and she mourned for her husband (בַּעְלָהּ *baʿlāh*)' (2 Sam. 11.26).

There is no specialized term for 'wife'; instead, the basic word אִשָּׁה *ʾiššā* 'woman' (construct: אֵשֶׁת *ʾēšeṯ*) serves this function, as illustrated once more by 2 Sam. 11.26 cited above (see also Gen. 4.1; 4.17; 16.3 [2x]; etc.). On the other hand, note the specialized legal term בְּעֻלַת בַּעַל *bəʿulaṯ baʿal* 'one (f) married to a husband' (Gen. 20.3; Deut. 22.22).

The term חָתָן *ḥāṯān* 'bride-groom' (e.g., Isa. 61.10; 62.5; Jer. 7.34; 16.9) by extension means 'son-in-law' (e.g., Gen. 19.14 [those who are married to Lot's daughters]; Judg. 15.6 [Samson to the Timnite]; 1 Sam. 18.18 [David to Saul]). The term חֹתֵן *ḥōṯēn*, derived from the same root, is used for 'father-in-law', more specifically, 'wife's father' (e.g., Exod. 3.1; 18.1; Judg. 19.4, 7, 9). Though the word apparently can also have the looser meaning of 'male relative of one's wife', including 'brother-in-law', i.e., 'wife's brother' (cf. Judg. 4.11, where Hobab is called חֹתֵן מֹשֶׁה *ḥōṯēn mōšε*

'ḥōṯēn of Moses', which should be read with Num. 10.29, where said character is the son of Reuel and thus his relationship to Moses is that of 'brother-in-law'). The feminine form חֹתֶנֶת *ḥōṯeneṯ* 'mother-in-law', specifically 'wife's mother', occurs once (Deut. 27.23, in the form חֹתַנְתּוֹ *ḥōṯantō* 'his mother-in-law').

Biblical Hebrew uses a different word, namely חָם *ḥām* 'father-in-law' to denote the second 'father-in-law' relationship, that is, 'husband's father' (evident from such passages as Gen. 38.13, 25 [Judah to Tamar]; 1 Sam. 4.19, 21 [Eli to Phineas' wife]). The feminine form of the word חָמוֹת *ḥāmōṯ* is used to describe 'husband's mother', that is, a wife's mother-in-law. This word occurs ten times in the book of Ruth to denote Naomi vis-à-vis Ruth and Orpah (see also Mic. 7.6). The word כַּלָּה *kallā* 'bride' (e.g., Isa. 61.10; 62.5; Jer. 7.34; 16.9; Mic. 7.6) by extension means 'daughter-in-law' (e.g., Gen. 11.31 [Sarai to Terah]; Gen. 38.11, 16, 24 [Tamar to Judah]; Ruth 1.22, etc. [Ruth to Naomi]).

The vocable יָבָם *yāḇām* means 'husband's brother', i.e., 'levir' (Deut. 25.5, 7; see also the denominative verb in Gen. 38.8), though it is not clear if the term refers to any brother of one's husband, or specifically the one who bears the responsibility of performing levirate marriage (Deut. 25.5–10). The corresponding feminine form is יְבָמָה *yəḇāmā* 'sister-in-law', used in two different contexts, both that specifically of the woman awaiting levirate marriage (Deut. 25.7 [2x], 9) and that of the 'sister-in-law' more generally, as in the relationship of Ruth and Orpah, two women married to brothers (Ruth 1.15 [2x]).

The Bible also attests to the term בֵּית אֵם *bēṯ ʾēm* lit. 'house of the mother', though more appropriately 'mother's household' (Meyers 1991), the exact connotation of which remains elusive. On the one hand, this term may indicate the presence of households in ancient Israel with female heads (consider, for example, the case of the Shunamite woman in 2 Kgs 4.8–37; 8.1–8; or the poetic portrayal of the ideal woman in Prov. 31.10–31) (see Meyers 1991). On the other hand, closer inspection reveals that בֵּית אֵם *bēṯ ʾēm* 'house of the mother' may bear a specialized connotation with reference to young women who are in a position to (re-)marry (Gen. 24.28; Ruth 1.8; Song 3.4; 8.2). Note the contrast with בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of

the father', not in the general sense described above, but with specific reference to young women living with their father who are not in a position to marry (Gen 38.11; Judg. 19.2).

Other terms attested in Biblical Hebrew are נִין *nīn* and נֶכֶד *neḵeḏ*, both of which mean 'progeny' (Gen. 21.23; Isa. 14.22; Job 18.19), without more specific designation. They may be simply poetic designations connoting more or less the same as זֶרַע *zeraʿ* lit. 'seed' > 'offspring' (Gen. 12.17; 13.15, etc.).

Because the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father' could include domestic servants (see above), we include here a discussion of the relevant terms—especially in light of the information provided by an ancient Hebrew epigraph. The Siloam tomb inscription, informs us that the aristocratic Shevnayahu, the *major domo* of Hezekiah's palace (Isa. 22.15), was buried in the tomb along with, quite surprisingly, ועצמת אמתה אתה *w-ʿṣmt ʾmth ʾth* 'and the bones of his slave-wife with him' (Avigad 1953). The relevant term אָמָה *ʾāmā* appears in the Bible as 'female-servant', who in fact could be married to the head of the household, as in the case of Hagar to Abraham (Gen. 20.10 [2x], 12, 13, in conjunction with Gen. 16.3); see also Ruth's use of the term to describe her status vis-à-vis Boaz, as part of what is essentially a marriage proposal (Ruth 3.9 [2x]).

Hebrew possesses a second term for 'female-servant', namely, שִׁפְחָה *šip̄ḥā* 'handmaid', also used of Hagar (Gen. 16.1–8 [6x]). Note, however, the different relationships, with Hagar as אָמָה *ʾāmā* to Abraham, but שִׁפְחָה *šip̄ḥā* vis-à-vis Sarah. The former presumably connotes a higher rank within the household (see above, regarding non-affinals as part of the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father, father's household, family household'), a point which may be borne out by other passages, such as וַיִּרְפָּא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ וְאֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאַמְהֹתָיו וַיֵּלֵדוּ: *way-yirpā ʾĕlōhīm ʾeṯ-ʾăḇīmeleḵ wə-ʾeṯ-ʾištō wə-ʾamhōṯāw way-yēlēḏū* 'and Abraham healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his female-servants, and they bore' (Gen. 20.17); and Exod. 20.10 ‖ Deut. 5.14, where the אָמָה *ʾāmā* is mentioned amongst those in the household who are proscribed from working on the Sabbath. On the other hand, we note that the second term שִׁפְחָה *šip̄ḥā* 'handmaid' derives from the same root, שפ"ח *š-p-ḥ* (never attested as a verb, though), as the kinship term מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' (see

below), which suggests a close relationship as well. A comparative ranking of the two positions is forthcoming from the book of Ruth, whose title character first describes herself as a lowly שִׁפְחָה *šip̄ḥā* 'handmaid' (Ruth 2.13), and then later (see above) as the more elevated אָמָה *ʾāmā* 'female servant' (Ruth 3.9 [2x]) (for a thorough survey of the data, though with a different conclusion, namely, that the terms are synonymous, with no ranking and no distinction, see Cohen 1982; 2003).

The male counterpart to these two terms is encompassed by a single word, i.e., עֶבֶד *ʿeḇeḏ* 'male-servant', a vocable which conveys a wide range of meanings, beyond that of simply a member of the household (both downward, that is, 'slave', as in the Israelites as slaves in Egypt; and upward, that is, 'court official', as in David's court officials; etc.). Within the domestic setting, there are two types of 'male-servant', the one purchased with silver (מִקְנַת־כֶּסֶף *miqnaṯ-keseb* 'purchase of silver' [Gen. 17.12]; קִנְיַן כַּסְפּוֹ *qinyan kaspō* 'purchase of his silver' [Lev. 22.11]), and the one born in the household (יְלִיד בָּיִת *yəlīḏ bāyiṯ* 'one [m] born in the house' [Gen. 17.12]; וִילִיד בֵּיתוֹ *w-īlīḏ bēṯō* 'and one [m] born in his house' [Lev. 22.11]). One would presume that the home-born servant might have a higher standing than the one obtained through purchase, but the passages just cited suggest otherwise: both types of male servants are to be circumcised by Abraham (Gen. 17.12–13); and both types of servants may eat of the consecrated food with the family members of the priest (Lev. 22.11), in contrast to the outsider, sojourner, or hired hand (v. 10). These passages go a long way in aiding our understanding of the עֶבֶד *ʿeḇeḏ* 'male-servant' as a member of the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'family household' in ancient Israelite society.

Lastly, we note the word פִּילֶגֶשׁ *pīlēḡeš* 'concubine' (Gen. 22.24; 25.6; 35.22; Judg. 8.31; 19.1; 2 Sam. 3.7; etc.), which refers to a secondary wife (for lack of a better term), apparently one whose sons could not or would not inherit from the *paterfamilias*. The word itself is very un-Hebraic, sharing affinities with Greek παλλακίς and Latin *paelex* (→ Cultural Words: Biblical Hebrew) (Rabin 1975; Levin 1983).

We return now to the more general kinship terms mentioned at the start of this entry. Just above the בֵּית אָב *bēṯ ʾāḇ* 'house of the father'

(in its general sense) in the hierarchy of kinship units was the מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā*. Most translations of the Bible render the term as 'family', though the word 'clan' is probably a more suitable equivalent for what the term connoted in ancient Israel. The biblical texts indicate that the מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' included a group larger than the בֵּית אָב *bēt ʾāb* 'house of the father', but smaller than the שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ* 'tribe'; see, for example, the aforecited passages in Num. 1–4, with census data and related information. In some texts, however, the term מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' bears a more flexible connotation, even overlapping with שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ* 'tribe'; see, e.g., וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד מִצָּרְעָה מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת הַדָּנִי וּשְׁמוֹ מָנוֹחַ *wa-yhī ʾīš ʾeḥād miṣ-ṣārʿā mim-mišpaḥat had-dānī u-šmō mānōaḥ* 'and there was a man from Ṣorʿa, from the clan of the Danites, and his name was Manoaḥ'.

The term אֶלֶף *ʾelep* lit. 'thousand' appears as a (nearly or wholly) synonymous term for מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan'; hence, it too probably means 'clan' in passages such as Judg. 6.15; 1 Sam. 10.19; 23.23; Mic. 5.1. It is possible that the use of the word אֶלֶף *ʾelep* for 'clan' is more archaic than the standard term מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan', and that the latter term replaced the former during the period of the monarchy (note that the passages in Judges and Samuel refer to the era before the monarchy; while the prophet Micah, from rural Judah, may retain the term as a quaint archaism). The use of the related word אַלּוּף *ʾallūp* 'chieftain, clan leader' in the archaic poem in Exod. 15 (albeit with reference to the Edomites; cf. Gen. 36) may support this assertion.

Recent studies have argued that מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' refers not only to a kinship group that traced its lineage through patrilateral descent, but also to groups that shared mutual geographical territory (Vanderhooft 2009: 489–490). The detailed information conveyed in Josh. 13–19, for example, connects מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' with territorial allotment. Such a definition of the term is also consistent with the evidence preserved in the 8th-century cache of ostraca discovered at Samaria, the capital of the northern kingdom of Israel. The ostraca record payments sent to the crown by a number of towns and groups near the capital. In several cases, the names of the regions recorded in the ostraca correspond to names mentioned in the Bible as people or places or a מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' of the tribe of Manasseh (e.g., שמידע *šmydʿ* 'Shemida', a 'clan' of Manasseh [Num. 26.32; Josh. 17.2] and נעה *nʿh* 'Noah' and חגלה *ḥglh* 'Hoglah', two of the daughters of Zelophehad of the tribe of Manasseh [Num. 26.33]). As such, the Samaria ostraca may provide testimony to the fact that this particular kinship term included a spatial dimension (Aharoni 1979:367; Stager 1985:24).

The broadest kinship unit in Biblical Hebrew, and hence of ancient Israelite society, is the שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ* 'tribe'; note that the word also means 'staff' (e.g., Exod. 21.20; Prov. 10.13), suggesting a derivation such as 'group of people under the leadership of the one who wields the staff'. The word מַטֶּה *maṭṭe* 'tribe' seems to be a wholly synonymous equivalent (e.g., Exod. 31.2; Lev. 24.11); and it too means 'staff' (e.g., Gen. 38.18; Exod. 4.2). The biblical texts indicate that the tribe was the primary kinship unit and generally held a territorial importance in ancient Israel (Num. 32.33; Josh. 13.7; Judg. 21.24). At the same time, the specific meaning of the term שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ* 'tribe' appears to have been somewhat flexible, for while most often it is used to designate 'tribe', in a few instances the word overlaps with מִשְׁפָּחָה *mišpāḥā* 'clan' and hence should be understood as 'clan'. See, for example, אַל־תַּכְרִיתוּ אֶת־שֵׁבֶט מִשְׁפְּחֹת הַקְּהָתִי מִתּוֹךְ הַלְוִיִּם *ʾal-takrītū ʾet-šēbeṭ mišpəḥōt haq-qəhātī mit-tōk ha-lwiyyīm* 'let not the tribe of the clans of the Kohathites be cut off from amongst the Levites' (Num. 4.18), with the Kohath sub-division of the Levites designated as a שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ*. This flexibility of the term שֵׁבֶט *šēbeṭ* in the Bible may indicate that its precise meaning evolved over the course of time from a general sub-group of individuals within a particular people (in this case, the Israelites) to the specific meaning of 'tribe', the largest such sub-division (for a counter-voice concerning the word 'tribe' and other matters raised herein, see Mojola 1998).

The Biblical Hebrew term most commonly used for all of Israel is בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *bənē yiśrāʾēl*, lit. 'sons of Israel', hence 'children of Israel' or 'Israelites' (534x). This core term bespeaks a pattern of tribal organization, as can be seen by comparisons with both ancient Near Eastern (e.g., the Banu-Yamina attested at Mari; the Bible's consistent use of בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן *bənē ʿammōn* 'children of Ammon' to refer to the Ammonites; etc.) and later Arabian (e.g., Banu-Quraysh,

Banu-Qurayza) parallels. Less frequent are עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל 'am yiśrā̊'ēl 'people of Israel' (4x) and a combination of the two above terms, עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 'am bənē yiśrā̊'ēl, lit. 'the people of the sons of Israel' > 'the people of the children of Israel' (Exod. 1.9 only). With the definite article, the form הָעָם hā̊-'ām 'the people' frequently refers to the entity of Israel as a collective group (e.g., Exod. 1.20; 3.12). Prayers and similar texts in the Bible sometimes use the expressions עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל 'amməkā̊ yiśrā̊'ēl 'your people Israel' (e.g., 1 Kgs 8.30, 36, 41, 43) and עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל 'ammō yiśrā̊'ēl 'his people Israel' (e.g., 1 Kgs 8.56, 59; Ps. 135.12).

The basic kinship quality of the word עָם 'ām may be seen from (a) Semitic cognates: Arabic 'am 'paternal uncle'; Jibbali 'om, Mehri 'ōm, Ḥarsusi 'ōm 'grandfather, ancestor' (in the latter two languages /'/ > /'/; perhaps also Soqotri mó'o 'ancestor', with metathesis); Argobba amme 'paternal uncle'; Gurage (Selṭi-Wolane) umi 'maternal uncle, male ancestor' (Leslau 1979:3.42; Gutt 1997:570, 1012); and (b) the repeated death notice וַיֵּאָסֶף אֶל־עַמָּיו wayyē̊'āsɛp̄ 'el-'ammā̊w 'and he was gathered to his kin' (Gen. 25.8, 17; 35.29; 49.33; Deut. 32.50), with the relevant word serving not as a collective, but rather as a true plural form connoting 'ancestors'.

The word גּוֹי gōy, usually translated 'nation', seems to connote more of a political, national entity (Speiser 1960), especially as it is frequently applied to foreign polities (e.g., Exod. 9.24; Jer. 5.15; Joel 1.6; Zeph. 2.5) or the nations of the world generally (e.g., Gen. 10.5, 20, 31; Isa. 2.4 ‖ Mic. 4.3). Though it also can be applied to Israel in certain instances, such as גּוֹי קָדוֹשׁ gōy qā̊ḏōš 'a holy nation' (Exod. 19.6), and in poetic parallelism, such as הוֹי | גּוֹי חֹטֵא עַם כֶּבֶד עָוֹן hōy gōy ḥōṭē 'am kɛḇɛḏ 'ā̊wōn 'ah, sinful nation, people laden with iniquity' (Isa. 1.4).

We now shift our attention from kinship terms in Biblical Hebrew to a survey of relevant lexemes attested in later periods. Rabbinic Hebrew adds a new term to this semantic field: אָגִיס 'ăgīs 'brother-in-law', specifically 'wife's brother' (Mishna Sanhedrin 4.3, as vocalized in MS Kaufmann A50; see also Sifre Devarim 270) / גִיס gīs (Tosefta Sanhedrin 5.3), most likely a borrowing from Aramaic. As such, the term serves to replace the aforementioned BH usage of חֹתֵן ḥōṭēn with this function, assuming

that we have interpreted the data forthcoming from Num. 10.29 and Judg. 4.11 correctly. The feminine form גיסה gīsa 'sister-in-law' is attested (apparently) for the first time in a responsum of R. Shelomo ben Aderet (Rashba) (d. 1310).

Rabbinic Hebrew, already in Tannaitic texts, uses the Aramaic forms for 'father' and 'mother', אַבָּא 'abba (e.g., Mishna Nedarim 5.6) and אִימָא 'imma (e.g., Mishna Nedarim 2.1), respectively (for the former, see also Mark 14.36). The term הורים horim 'parents', based on the BH verb הר"י h-r-y 'conceive' (see already הוֹרָה hōrā̊, lit. 'the one (f) who conceives', as a parallel word to אֵם 'ēm 'mother' in Hos. 2.7; Song 3.4), begins to appear in later rabbinic texts.

Four new kinship terms entered Hebrew during this period, namely: סבא saḇa 'grandfather' and סבתא saḇta 'grandmother' (note that in common usage, the pronunciation of סבא saḇa 'grandfather' shifts to סבא saba, due to analogy with אבא 'aba 'father'), also borrowed from Aramaic; and the pair חוֹרֵג ḥoreg 'step-son' and חורגת ḥoreget 'step-daughter'. In the medieval period, the old generic word for 'progeny' נכד neḵed (see above) came to specify 'grandson', alongside which its feminine counterpart, נכדה neḵda 'granddaughter', was created.

Most of the vocables for individual family members mentioned herein remain as standard usages in Modern Hebrew. The prime exceptions are יבם yavam 'brother-in-law' and יבמה yevama 'sister-in-law', which are not typically encountered, especially with levirate marriage no longer widely practiced. In their stead, the words גיס gis and גיסה gisa now fill these roles, regardless of the specific kind of 'brother-in-law' and 'sister-in-law' relationships.

The picture concerning the terms for 'father-in-law' and 'mother-in-law' is a bit more complicated. The distinction between חותן xoten 'father-in-law' and חותנת xotenet 'mother-in-law' (referring to the wife's parents), on the one hand, and חם xam 'father-in-law' and חמות xamot 'mother-in-law' (referring to the husband's parents), on the other hand, is not always observed in Modern Hebrew. The latter pair is commonly used for 'father-in-law' and 'mother-in-law' regardless of which side (in addition, note that חמות xamot sometimes is replaced by חמה xama in colloquial Hebrew)—though curiously חותנת xotenet 'mother-in-law'

retains a specific function as a pejorative term, for example, in mother-in-law jokes.

Modern Hebrew coined new terms for other family relations. The other Biblical Hebrew word for 'progeny' mentioned above, namely, נין *nin* received the specific connotation of 'great-grandson', on the basis of which its feminine counterpart, נינה *nina* 'great-granddaughter', was created. For 'great-grandfather' and 'great-grandmother' the phrases סבא רבא *sava* (colloquial: *saba*) *raba* and סבתא רבה *savta raba* were coined, with the second element derived from the word רב *rav* 'great'.

In 1943 the Hebrew Language Committee (→ Academy of the Hebrew Language) proposed new words for 'nephew' / 'niece' and 'cousin': נכדן *nexdan* 'nephew' and נכדנית *nexdanit* 'niece' (based on the word נכד *nexed* 'progeny, grandson'); and דודן *dodan* 'cousin' (m) and דודנית *dodanit* 'cousin' (f) (based on the word דוד *dod* 'uncle' / דודה *doda* 'aunt'). None of these terms gained wide acceptance in the Hebrew-speaking community, however. Instead, the following words serve these functions.

The relations 'nephew' and 'niece' are expressed in two different ways: (a) אחין *'axyan* 'nephew' and אחינית *'axyanit* 'niece' (based on the word אח *'ax* 'brother'), especially in the plural form אחינים *'axyanim* 'nephews' to express one's 'nieces and nephews as a group'; and (b) the frequent combinations בן אח *ben 'ax* 'son of brother', בן אחות *ben 'axot* 'son of sister', בת אח *bat 'ax* 'daughter of brother', בת אחות *bat 'axot* 'daughter of sister', each of which defines the 'nephew' / 'niece' relationship more specifically. In general usage, this distinction does not occur, however, in the combinations for 'cousin', with בן דוד *ben dod* 'son of uncle' and בת דודה *bat doda* 'daughter of aunt' serving for 'cousin' regardless of the specific relationship, though naturally the gender distinction is observable, with the former as 'male cousin' and the latter as 'female cousin'. Some Mizrahi Jews, however, may use terms such as בן דודה *ben doda* 'son of aunt', as a more specific designation of the relationship, presumably because Arabic retains eight individual terms for 'cousin', depending on the precise kinship link.

Of the two aforementioned BH options for 'husband', בעל *baʿal* remains the standard term in Modern Hebrew. In the wake of the women's movement, however, some speakers resist using the term (recall, from above, its literal meaning 'lord, owner, master') and prefer instead to use איש *'iš* 'man' > 'husband', on the analogy of אשה *'iša* 'woman' > 'wife'. Also in use today are the terms בן-זוג *ben-zug* 'spouse' (m), בת-זוג *bat-zug* 'spouse' (f), both of which hark back to earlier rabbinic and medieval usage, though with the more general connotation of 'mate' (in the sense of 'matching item').

REFERENCES

Aharoni, Yohanan. 1973. *The Land of Israel: A historical geography*. Rev. and trans. by Anson F. Rainey. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Andersen, Francis I. 1969. "Israelite kinship terminology and social structure". *The Bible Translator* 20:29–39.

Avigad, Nahman. 1953. "The epitaph of royal steward from Siloam Village". *Israel Exploration Journal* 3:137–152, plates 8–11.

Bendor, Shunya. 1996. *The social structure of Ancient Israel: The institution of the family (beit 'ab) from the settlement to the end of the monarchy*. Jerusalem: Simor.

Brichto, Herbert C. 1973. "Kin, cult, land and afterlife—A biblical complex". *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44:1–54.

Cohen, Chaim. 1982. "Studies in extra-biblical inscriptions I: The semantic range and usage of the terms אמה and שפחה". *Shnaton* 5–6:xxv–liii.

——. 2003. "Šuv: Šne ha-muvanim šel ha-munaḥim ha-maqbilim ʾamaʾ/šipḥaʾ be-ʿIvrit Miqraʾit". *Qol le-Yaʿaqov: Yaakov Bentolila Jubilee Volume*, ed. by Daniel Sivan and Pablo-Itshak Halevy-Kirtchuk, 239–257. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.

Cross, Frank Moore. 1998. *From epic to canon: History and literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Faust, Avraham. 2000. "The rural community in Ancient Israel during the Iron Age II". *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 317:17–31.

Gordon, Cyrus H. 1935. "Fratriarchy in the Old Testament". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 54:223–231.

Gottwald, Norman. *The tribes of Yahweh: A sociology of the religion of liberated Israel 1250–1050 BCE*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 1997. *Silt'e-Amharic-English Dictionary*, with Eeva H. M. Gutt and Hussein Mohammed. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

Halpern, Baruch. 1991. "Jerusalem and the lineages in the seventh century BCE: Kinship and the rise of individual moral liability". *Law and ideology in monarchic Israel*, ed. by Baruch Halpern and Deborah W. Hobson, 11–107. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

——. "Sybil, or the two nations? Archaism, alienation, and the elite redefinition of traditional culture in Judah in the eighth–seventh centuries B.C.E.". *The study of the Ancient Near East in the twenty-first century*, ed. by Jerrold S. Cooper

and Glenn M. Schwartz, 291–338. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Hopkins, David. 2003. "The clan-based economy of Biblical Israel". *Symbiosis, symbolism, and the power of the past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*, ed. by William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin, 445–453. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Leslau, Wolf. 1979. *Etymological dictionary of Gurage (Ethiopic)*, 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Levin, Saul. 1983. "Hebrew {*pi(y)légēš*}, Greek παλλακή, Latin *paelex*: The origin of intermarriage among the early Indo-Europeans and Semites". *General Linguistics* 23:191–197.

Levine, Baruch. 1983. "In praise of the Israelite *mišpāḥâ*: Legal themes in Ruth". *The quest for the kingdom of God: Studies in honor of George E. Mendenhall*, ed. by Herbert B. Huffmon, Frank A. Spina, and Alberto R. W. Green, 95–106. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

McClenney-Sadler, Madeline Gay. 2007. *Recovering the daughter's nakedness: A form analysis of Israelite kinship terminology and the internal logic of Leviticus 18*. New York: T. & T. Clark.

Meyers, Carol. 1991. "'To her mother's house': Considering a counterpart to the Israelite *bêt 'āb*". *The Bible and the politics of exegesis: Essays in honor of Norman K. Gottwald on his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. by David Jobling, Peggy Day, and Gerald T. Sheppard, 39–52, 304–307. Cleveland: Pilgrim.

——. 1997. "The family in Ancient Israel". *Families in Ancient Israel*, ed. by Leo G. Perdue, Joseph Blenkinsopp, John J. Collins, and Carol Meyers, 1–47. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1978. "Priestly terminology and the political and social structure of pre-monarchic Israel". *Jewish Quarterly Review* 69:65–81.

Mojola, Aloo Osotsi. 1998. "The 'tribes' of Israel? A bible translator's dilemma". *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 81:15–29.

Prewitt, Terry J. 1981. "Kinship structure and the Genesis genealogies". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 40:87–98.

Rabin, Chaim. 1974. "The origin of the Hebrew word *pilegeš*". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 25:353–364.

Schloen, J. David. 2001. *The house of the father as fact and symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Speiser, Ephraim A. 1960. "'People' and 'nation' of Israel". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79:157–163.

Stager, Lawrence. 1985. "The archaeology of the family in Ancient Israel". *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 260:1–35.

Tappy, Ronald E. 2000. "Lineage and law". *Revue Biblique* 107:175–204.

Vanderhooft, David. "The Israelite *mišpāḥâ*, the Priestly writings, and changing valences in Israel's kinship terminology". *Exploring the longue durée: Essays in honor of Lawrence E. Stager*, ed. by J. David Schloen, 485–496. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Weinberg, Joel P. 1973. "Das *bēit 'āḇōt* im 6-4 Jh. v.u.Z." *Vetus Testamentum* 23:400–414.

GARY A. RENDSBURG
(Rutgers University)
JEREMY D. SMOAK
(University of California, Los Angeles)

Kuntillet 'Ajrud

Kuntillet 'Ajrud (Ḥorvat Teiman) is an archeological site in the northern Sinai where several texts apparently demonstrating linguistic and orthographic features consonant with the northern Israelite dialect of Hebrew have been discovered.

In three seasons of excavations at Kuntillet 'Ajrud (1975–1976), a team led by Zeev Meshel unearthed several 9th–8th-century-B.C.E. texts written on a variety of materials (Meshel 1978; 1992; 1993). Unfortunately, the texts have yet to be published systematically in the form of an *editio princeps*, meaning that high-quality photos and definitive readings are not readily available (but cf. Aḥituv et al. forthcoming). As a result, transcriptions and descriptions of the texts have usually been obtained from the reports of those who have worked with the inscribed objects themselves or have seen the objects on display at the Israel Museum. Nonetheless, several epigraphic handbooks have collected and organized the transcriptions, from which one may begin study of the language represented therein (Davies 1991:78–82; Renz and Röllig 1995:1.47–64; Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005:277–298; Aḥituv 2008:313–329 [cf. Aḥituv 1992:152–162]).

Although many of the inscriptions comprise only one or two letters (e.g., א *ʾ*, י *y*, or קר *qr*, most likely indicating the contents of the vessel), a personal name (e.g., עירא *ʿyrʾ* [Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, KAjr 2]), or a title (e.g., לשרער *l-šrʿr* '[Belonging] to the governor of the city' [KAjr 5–8]), several offer important data for reconstructing the language spoken by those passing through this outpost or caravan waypoint. Among these important linguistic indicators are the following: (1) In an indeterminate number of inscriptions written on plaster in black and red ink, a few lexical and orthographic items mark the language and scribal system specifically as Hebrew, over against