Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics

Volume 8 — 1996

David L. Allen 1
The Lukan Authorship of Hebrews: A Proposal

Ernst Wendland 23
Obadiah's "Day": On the Rhetorical Implications of Textual Form and Intertextual Influence

Lénart J. de Regt 50
Domains of Biblical Hebrew Discourse as a Translation Problem

Mary K. Houser Fox 73
Leviticus 26: Elevating or Terrifying?

JOTT: Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics
Studies in translation, discourse analysis,
and related areas of biblical research
ISSN 1055–4513

Editorial correspondence: Please send all manuscripts and correspondence to Robert E. Longacre at: 7500 West Camp Wisdom Road, Dallas, Texas 75236.

Manuscripts submitted should follow the JOTT style sheet as found in the back of this issue. Please submit your manuscripts both in printed form in duplicate, doublespaced, and on an MS-DOS formatted 5.25″ or 3.5″ computer diskette in ASCII code. Only one article per author will be accepted for publication in any one year.

Alteration policy: Once a manuscript has been reviewed and accepted, the contributor will be billed for all changes other than printing errors and changes requested by the editor.

See order form on the last page. Orders are sent surface mail within the USA and Canada unless airmail is requested, whereupon the subscriber will be charged for the airmail postage. Foreign orders are sent airmail. There is a discount for SIL members. All correspondence pertaining to orders, payment, and changes of address should be sent to:

International Academic Bookstore, Summer Institute of Linguistics
7500 West Camp Wisdom Road, Dallas, Texas 75236

THE LUKAN AUTHORSHIP OF HEBREWS: A PROPOSAL

David L. Allen

ABSTRACT

This article offers five lines of evidence to support the independent authorship of Luke for the epistle to the Hebrews. First, the linguistic argument evaluates the lexical, stylistic, and textlinguistic similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews. Second, comparison of the purposes of the three books reveals much common ground. Third, theological analysis shows there is a greater degree of similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews compared to the rest of the New Testament writings. Fourth, the argument prevails that Luke was himself Jewish and capable of writing such a work as Hebrews. Fifth, a historical reconstruction of the background of Hebrews argues that the recipients were the many former Jewish priests who had converted to Christianity (Acts 6:7) and who fled to Antioch in Syria as a result of the Stephanic persecution (Acts 8:1). Both Scripture and tradition link Luke with the Antiochene church. Hebrews was written in Rome (ca. A.D. 67) while Luke was there shortly after the death of Paul.

Introduction

For the past fifteen years the question of the authorship of Hebrews has intrigued me. The more I studied the issue, the more I became convinced of the viability of the theory of Lukan authorship. Of course the questions of authorship identification can seldom be settled for certain, and such an ambitious claim I do not make for this article. Such certainty would necessitate the discovery of an early manuscript of Hebrews with the words "Luke the Physician...to the church at..." My purpose is to suggest that there is sufficient evidence to warrant a new presentation of what is, in fact, an old theory, namely that Luke the physician and companion of Paul the Apostle and author of the two-volume Luke-Acts is the independent author of Hebrews.[1]

The suggestion that Luke may have had something to do with the writing of Hebrews has actually been around for quite some time. Early in the history of the church, Eusebius quoted Origen as saying that some felt the epistle to the Hebrews could have been the work of Luke. Throughout church history a few scholars have suggested, though none has argued for it in any extensive fashion, that Luke was in their judgment the author of Hebrews. Included in this list is John Calvin (1948 reprint) and in more recent times Franz Delitzsch (1952) in his classic two-volume commentary on Hebrews. Modern New Testament studies were quite content to leave

[1] This article is a brief summary of my 1987 dissertation on the subject.

the question unanswered, and since 1980 there have been few new theories on the subject.

The question is an important one, however, with respect to the interpretation of the book. If the author was one of the New Testament writers, then from an exegetical perspective Hebrews could be interpreted in the light of his other writings; and perhaps new light could be shed upon certain exegetical questions. For example, if the Lukan theory is correct, the translation of *machairan* as 'sword' in Hebrews 4:12 might be better translated as 'scalpel,' a secondary but nonetheless legitimate meaning of the Greek word. Both the context and the suggestion of Lukan authorship would make this interpretation and translation of the word much more likely than 'sword.'

The question of authorship is important for theological reasons as well. Again, if the author was a New Testament writer, then this fact would allow us to interpret Hebrews against the backdrop of his other writings. Conversely, Hebrews might furnish a helpful perspective that would allow us to clarify a certain theological motif in a given author's work. For example, Lukan studies since Conzelmann (1960) have generally held that Luke attributes no direct soteriological significance to the suffering and death of Jesus on the cross. Recently a number of Lukan scholars are beginning to break with this interpretation of Luke's soteriology.[2] If Hebrews was the work of Luke, then clearly Conzelmann's thesis would not only need modification but simply would have to be rejected.

Hebrews is unique in the New Testament. It does not seem to fit readily into the scheme of the Pauline, Johannine, or Petrine writings, yet it constitutes one of the most majestic presentations of Christology in the entire New Testament. Its genre is mixed, sometimes betraying epistolary characteristics, while at other times appearing to be sermonic in nature. Other terms used to describe its literary character are essay, treatise, oration, biblical exposition, and exhortation.[3] Though it is no doubt an epistle and a sermon of sorts, the designation of *exhortation* is to be preferred because it more accurately describes the discourse genre of Hebrews. From the linguistic perspective, it is best to describe Hebrews as

---

[2] See for example Neyrey (1985) and Moessner (1989).

[3] See Lane (1991:lxix.ff.) for further discussion of the genre of Hebrews. Hunt (1968:408) suggests that Hebrews may be a combination treatise and epistle. He envisions that Paul may have taken a treatise by another author and sent it to one of his churches after adding the exhortations and greetings of chapter 13. This would account for its dual nature as well as the supposed change in style at chapter 13. However, Filson (1967) shows conclusively that chapter 13 is a part of the original document and was not added by a later writer.

an example of hortatory discourse with large sections of embedded expository discourse.[4]

Two things should be kept in mind as I present evidence for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews. First, any theory which pretends to be able to answer all the questions and neatly categorize all the data so that everything fits snugly into place is suspect immediately. As in the realm of scientific investigation, a new hypothesis need not be able to answer all the questions in order to be considered a good theory. A good theory is one which accounts for most of the available data, but like the periodic chart of the elements, not everything fits neatly into the system, nor does it have to. Second, the facts are that 1) the text itself does not name the author, 2) the historical testimony regarding authorship and background is not conclusive in itself, and 3) the internal evidence of the epistle does not provide enough information to determine authorship apart from a comparison with other writings. Therefore, the most fruitful efforts at reconstruction of the provenance of this document will be those theories which provide other textual data with which to compare Hebrews in terms of lexical choice, style, and conceptual framework.

Five lines of evidence. The argument for Lukan authorship of Hebrews centers around five lines of evidence. First, the linguistic argument evaluates the lexical, stylistic, and textlinguistic similarities between Luke-Acts and Hebrews. Second, a comparison of the purposes of Luke-Acts and Hebrews reveals that they share similar purposes. Third, the theological argument assesses the conceptual framework which undergirds the three works and suggests that there is a greater degree of similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews compared to the Pauline epistles and the rest of the New Testament. Fourth, evidence from Luke-Acts suggests that Luke was himself Jewish and capable of writing such a Jewish epistle as Hebrews. Finally, a historical reconstruction of the background of Hebrews suggests that Luke wrote Hebrews to the many former Jewish priests who had been converted to Christianity during the early days of the Jerusalem church before the Stephanic persecution broke out (Acts 6:7). I suggest that as a result of this persecution, many of these priests fled to Antioch in Syria, where they became a part of the church. Both Scripture and tradition link Luke with the church at Antioch. The gospel of Luke is to be dated in A.D. 61, Acts in A.D. 63 and Hebrews in A.D. 67. I suggest Hebrews was

[4] See Neeley (1987:1–146) for an excellent discourse analysis of Hebrews which supports this conclusion.

written from Rome while Luke was there shortly after the death of Paul (2 Timothy 4:11).

The uniqueness of the theory presented here lies first in the fact that no one in this century has seriously argued for independent Lukan authorship, collating the arguments especially in the areas of vocabulary, style, and using textlinguistic comparisons as I have done. Second, no one has sought to argue for the Jewishness of Luke as further evidence for the possibility of his having written Hebrews. Third, no one has synthesized the evidence into the particular theory of authorship and background reconstruction which I am suggesting.[5]

Luke's origin? In my estimation, the primary reason why Luke has not been considered seriously as the author of Hebrews is that he is generally thought to have been a Greek while the author of Hebrews was obviously a Jew. Actually, neither conclusion can be made with certainty, but the prevailing paradigm in New Testament studies is that Luke was a Gentile as can be seen by any cursory reading of commentaries on Luke-Acts. Lukan studies within the past twenty years have begun to challenge this theory of Luke's Gentile origin. Today, there is no consensus that Luke was a Gentile.

Interpretive communities sometimes get locked into viewing the world from a particular grid with the result that often new ways of looking at things are dismissed or simply not even thought of. How true is the axiom that a way of seeing is also a way of not seeing. The practice of picking up the stick from the other end often results in new solutions to old problems, i.e., the construction of a new paradigm, to put it in Kuhn's terms (1970). My theory on the authorship of Hebrews is the result of picking up the stick from the other end. If Luke was Jewish, then the possibility of his having written Hebrews, when supported by other corroborating evidence, becomes more plausible. The attempt to approach the question of the Lukan authorship of Hebrews and of the background of Luke himself from a somewhat different perspective by offering a holistic theory undergirded by linguistic, theological, and historical evidence will, I hope, provide a viable explanatory paradigm. If such a framework elicits new insights and

[5] The closest theory to my own was suggested by J.V. Brown in a little known and often ignored article which appeared in 1923. He opted for collaborate authorship with Luke and Paul as the penmen. It was Brown who first suggested the theory that the recipients were former Jewish priests rather than Bornhauser (1932) as is usually cited by most scholars. Others who have argued for former Jewish priests as the recipients include Spicq (1952–53) and Sandegren (1955).

possibly leads to a new understanding of the problem of the authorship of Hebrews, then my purpose will be fulfilled.

Lexical, Stylistic, and Textlinguistic Similarities

With any attempt at authorship identification, the first order of business is to evaluate the vocabulary and style of the work in question and compare it with the vocabulary and style of the suspected author. A comparison of the vocabulary of Hebrews with the Lukan writings reveals no less than fifty-two words which are unique to the Lukan writings and Hebrews. I arrived at this number by carefully working through Moulton and Geden (1963) and Morgenthaler (1958). The complete list along with their occurrences can be found in Allen (1987:37–9). Compare these findings with the number of words which are unique to Luke and Acts when compared to the rest of the New Testament. That number, exclusive of proper names, is fifty-eight (Hawkins 1909:175). This fact coupled with the considerably shorter length of Hebrews when compared to either Luke or Acts is remarkable.

Westcott in his commentary on Hebrews pointed out that "no impartial student can fail to be struck by the frequent use [in Hebrews] of words characteristic of St. Luke among writers of the New Testament" (1955:xlviii). Jones (1955:117–8) examined the lexical similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews and with balanced judgment noted the following:

> Luke-Acts and Hebrews are both writings of considerable length, in which there would be plenty of scope for casual overlapping, as may well be the case with many words...which are used in different senses and contexts in the two writings; some words only occur in quotations from the Septuagint, and many of the words are compound verbs whose coining seems to be a common feature among later New Testament writers. Moreover, one can compile lists of words peculiar to Hebrews and the pastoral epistles, to Hebrews and 1 Peter and James, even to Hebrews and St. Paul, as well as those peculiar to Luke-Acts and the later non-Pauline epistles in general, which should be taken into account. But when all deductions have been made, the verbal correspondences are so numerous [between Luke-Acts and Hebrews] that a substantial area of common phraseology remains...which

may well be indicative of a closer kinship in the presence of other corroborating factors.

Further lexical similarity.[6] There are two Greek words translated 'star' in English: *astron* and *aster*. The former is used exclusively by Luke and Hebrews, while the latter is used by all other New Testament writers (three times in Paul, twenty-one times elsewhere). The deponent verb *erchomai* 'to come, go' along with its many compound forms is common in narrative discourse in the New Testament. It is used frequently in Luke-Acts and Hebrews, but relatively infrequently in the Paulines. This is all the more interesting to note in that while Luke-Acts are examples of narrative discourse, Hebrews clearly is not.

In Luke 2:26 and Hebrews 11:5 we find the exact Greek phrase *me idein thanaton* 'shall not see death.' The only other place where a phrase similar to this occurs is in John 8:51 where John employs a different word for *idein* and a stronger form of the negative. The verb *katharidzo* 'to cleanse' is used six times in Matthew, four times in Mark, three times in Paul, once in James, and twice in 1 John. It occurs seven times in Luke, three times in Acts, and four times in Hebrews. Interestingly, it is used of the cleansing of the heart and conscience only in Acts 15:9 and Hebrews 9:14 and 10:2. There is a similar phrase found in Luke 10:20 and Hebrews 12:23, which consists of a compound form of the verb *grapho*, 'to write,' and *ouranois*, 'in heaven.' In the Lukan passage Jesus tells the disciples to rejoice that 'their names are written in heaven,' while in Hebrews the reference is to the church which is written or enrolled in heaven. A similar concept is found in both the Pauline and Johannine writings with the idea of the names of believers being in the book of life.

A comparison of Luke 16:2 with Hebrews 13:17 reveals another parallel occurring nowhere else in the New Testament. In the parable of the unjust steward in Luke 16, the owner commands the steward to *apodos ton logon* 'give an account.' In Hebrews 13:17 the readers are exhorted to obey their leaders since they (the leaders) must one day *logon apodosontes*, 'give an account'. This idea of giving an account also occurs in Romans 14:12, but a different verb for 'give' is conjoined with *logon* 'account'.

The use of *schedon* 'almost' with *pas* 'all' occurs only in Hebrews 9:22, Acts 13:34, and 19:26. This adverb occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The phrase *eis ton kairon* 'in time' occurs only in Luke 1:20

[6] For a complete listing of the lexical similarity to be found in Luke-Acts and Hebrews, see Allen (1987:35–55).

and Hebrews 9:9. The phrase *houtoi pantes* 'these all' occurs twice in Acts and twice in Hebrews, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

The phrase *eis to panteles* 'to the uttermost' occurs in Luke 13:11 and Hebrews 7:25. These are the only two occurrences of this noun in the New Testament. In both instances the noun is preceded by the preposition *eis* 'into' and the article *to* 'the'. Notice further that in each clause the verb *dunamai* 'to be able' is used.

Many other examples of lexical similarity could be adduced, but enough has been presented to give the reader a feel for the strength of the lexical evidence. Some of this evidence has never been listed before in any commentary or work on the subject as far as I am aware.

Stylistic similarity. Although there is a common substratum of ideas and terminology which undergirds all of the New Testament writers, it is nevertheless possible to examine the linguistic features which distinguish the work of one author from another. It is generally agreed that the variability of some stylistic features within the writings of a given author are small when compared with the variability over different authors, especially in the same genre.[7] Stylistic studies can be used as a discriminating factor in questions of authorship identification.

Even as early as the Patristic period, it was noted that the style of Hebrews was most like that of Luke. This fact led Clement of Alexandria to suggest that Hebrews was written by Paul in the Hebrew language and that Luke translated it into Greek.[8] It is Luke-Acts and Hebrews alone in the New Testament that approach the standard of classical Greek. Some examples of a near-classical style observable in both Luke and Hebrews are frequent use of the genitive absolute, frequent insertion of material between adjective and noun and article and noun, the use of lengthy and balanced sentences, and comparatively fewer Hebraisms than the rest of the New Testament writers.

Lunemann (1885:356–62) collated the lexical and stylistic data which Franz Delitzsch (1952) frequently noted in his work on Hebrews and criticized Delitzsch's interpretation of the data as having been carried out too uncritically. He is right in that some of Delitzsch's data is not unique to the Lukan writings and Hebrews. However, even when this is taken into account, Lunemann granted that there is an amazing amount of similarity between Luke-Acts and Hebrews, but he rejected the possibility of Lukan

[7] See Ellegard (1982:528).
[8] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, VI. 14.

authorship on the presupposition that Luke was Gentile and the author of Hebrews was Jewish.

The following is an abbreviated list of examples that can be cited.[9] *dia* 'while' with the genitive is used of time passed through only in Luke 5:5, Acts 1:3, and Hebrews 2:15. The infinitive *prosechein* 'pay heed' followed by the dative is found only in Hebrews 2:1 and Acts 16:14. *hos* 'who' with the infinitive is found only in Luke 9:52, Acts 20:24, and Hebrews 7:9. The future infinitive occurs only in Acts and Hebrews. The use of the accusative participle with the dative pronoun (a very classical usage) occurs in Hebrews 2:10, Luke 1:74, Acts 11:12, 15:22, and 25:29. The use of *kai autos* 'and this' with a proper name occurs in Hebrews 11:11 and is found only three other times, all in the Lukan writings (Luke 20:42, 24:15, Acts 8:13). The use of the article *ho* 'the' followed by the untranslated *te* 'the' and a noun or substantivized participle occurs once in Luke, seven times in Acts, once in Hebrews and nowhere else in the New Testament. The conjunction *kai* 'and' followed by the preposition *pros* 'to' and a verb of speaking occurs only in Luke and Hebrews. The use of the present infinitive *pathein* 'to suffer' following the imperfect verb *edei* 'to be necessary' occurs only four times in the New Testament: twice in Luke, once in Acts and once in Hebrews. In two of these four examples (Luke 17:25; Hebrews 9:26) the pronominal adjective *polus* 'much, many' occurs between the verb and the infinitive. The conjunction *kai* 'and' followed by the nominative plural article *hoi* 'they' and the untranslated *men* 'indeed' is unique to Acts and Hebrews in the New Testament, with two occurrences each.

Other examples of a stylistic nature link Luke with Hebrews. The frequent employment of the participle is a marked stylistic similarity. The ratio of participles to total verbs and verbals is virtually identical in Hebrews and in the last half of Acts (a string of text equivalent in length to Hebrews.) Another parallel is found in the position of participial and adjectival phrases qualifying an articular noun (see chart in Turner [1976:110]). In non-biblical Greek, the participial and adjectival phrases normally occur between the article and its noun. In Jewish Greek there is a tendency to place the adjectival phrase after the noun as is done in Semitic languages, with the article repeated.

Another area of comparison I shall only mention briefly: the use of Old Testament citation formulae in Luke-Acts and Hebrews. Both Luke and the author of Hebrews have a marked preference for the use of *legei* 'he/it

[9] For the full list, see Allen (1987:61–6, 104–15).

says' in Scripture citations. This can be contrasted with the Pauline corpus where Paul alternatively employs *legei* and *gegraptai* 'it is written.' Note also that the unusual citation formula *en hetero legei* 'one somewhere says' is found only in Acts 13:35 and Hebrews 6:5. Another interesting fact is that while Paul quotes alternatively from the Masoretic text and the Septuagint (LXX), Luke and the author of Hebrews seldom use the Masoretic text, but quote rather from the Septuagint or from a text different from either of the two. Both Luke and the author of Hebrews employ the noun *theos* 'God' with some form of the verb 'to say,' while this construction is never found in the Pauline corpus. Both employ the participles *legon, eipontes*, 'saying' and the verbs *eireken* 'to say' and *diamarturato* 'to bear witness' as quote formulae, but these forms are never found in the Pauline corpus.

A comparison of the prologues in Luke, Acts, and Hebrews reveals some interesting parallels. They are relatively similar in length, they represent a literary skill unequalled in the New Testament, and all three prologues are retrospective and prospective. In addition, a considerable length of text is sandwiched between the subject and verb of each prologue, and each sentence nucleus contains an overt subject, verb, and indirect object, but no direct object. A final striking parallel is the propensity to alliterate with the Greek letter *pi* in all three prologues. Five times in the gospel of Luke and in Hebrews appear words beginning with the letter *pi*.

Another area of comparison is the two longest summaries of Old Testament history in the New Testament: Acts 7 and Hebrews 11. The number of parallels has caused not a few scholars to posit a common tradition underlying both. Given the number and nature of these parallels, it is not unwarranted for one to posit common authorship, although the possibility that one author used another as a source cannot be discounted.[10]

Westcott summed up the evidence:

> It has been already seen that the earliest scholars who speak of the Epistle notice its likeness in style to the writings of St. Luke; and when every allowance has been made for coincidences which consist in forms of expression which are found also in the LXX. or in other writers of the N.T., or in late Greek generally, the likeness is unquestionably remarkable (1955:lxxvi).

[10] See Allen (1987:72–9). Jelonek (1985:253–7) argued that Luke wrote Hebrews as a continuation of the Stephen speech in Acts 7.

Macro- and superstructures. Analyzing the macrostructures and superstructures of Luke-Acts and Hebrews may provide the reader some insight into the argument for common authorship. Since the days of Cadbury's seminal work *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927), scholars have observed the Lukan propensity to arrange large sections of embedded discourse units in chiastic fashion. Goulder (1964) argued such for the Lukan travel narrative, followed by Talbert (1974:56–8) who suggested that Paul's journey to Jerusalem in Acts 15:1 to 21:26 paralleled the Lukan travel narrative and that Luke's literary design at this point was revealed by the chiastic framework of this section. David and Doris Blood (1979:2) have suggested a chiastic framework undergirds the first major section of Acts (1:12 to 19:20).

It is now generally recognized that the entire two-volume work Luke-Acts can be described as one large chiasm. Morganthaler (1949:172) analyzed the gospel of Luke as comprising a chiastic framework and also Luke-Acts together as forming one large chiasm (1949:163). Both Goulder (1964) and Wolfe (1989:67) suggested that the chiasm is formed geographically, while Wallis (1979:3) suggested that Luke-Acts can be viewed from the standpoint of its thematic location and participants resulting in a cyclic parallelism which forms a loose chiasmus. The chiastic framework for Luke-Acts has been superimposed over the constituent structure.

Turning to Hebrews, we find evidence of this same use of chiasm as an overarching structure for the entire epistle. Vanhoye (1963), Bligh (1964) and Dussaut (1981) all argued for a chiastic structure of Hebrews. Neeley (1987:61–2) concurred with Vanhoye that Hebrews was structured in an overall chiastic framework.

> A special feature of the lexico-semantic unity of Hebrews is a chiastic ordering of major semantic divisions in the discourse as a whole. These divisions, not corresponding exactly with the organization of Hebrews into embedded discourses on different levels of embedding, form another system of organization which is superimposed on the constituent structure and is also distinct from the backbone of the book.

Can this evidence of chiasm at the highest level in Luke-Acts and Hebrews be used as evidence for common authorship? The answer is yes if

it can be shown that such phenomena are not characteristic of most of the other New Testament writings, particularly the Pauline epistles. With the possible exceptions of Matthew, Mark, and Revelation, it has not been demonstrated that chiasm as an overarching structural device has been used in any other New Testament book.[11]

The Purposes of Luke-Acts and Hebrews

In an effort to be brief, I shall only highlight in this section material which originally appeared in my article on the subject in 1989.[12] I believe based on the evidence that there is a greater probability that Luke-Acts was written to Jewish Christians rather than to Gentile Christians. Furthermore, any attempt to diagnose the Lukan purpose must take into account the prologues of both Luke and Acts. It is here that the author comes closest to giving us a statement of purpose.

My approach to the Lukan purpose involves a synthesis of the insights of Morgenthaler (1949), van Unnik (1960), Maddox (1982), Juel (1983), and O'Toole (1984).[13] I follow van Unnik (1960) as he appealed to Hebrews 2:3–4 as being descriptive of what Luke has accomplished in Luke-Acts. In reference to why Luke wrote Acts, van Unnik said, "It may be that Luke compiled his book for people like those in Hebrews who were wavering in their faith" (1960:59). Luke's purpose is best seen as essentially pastoral: do not waver in your faith, be reassured, press on to the goal.

Van Unnik explored a number of parallels between the prologues of Luke-Acts and Hebrews 2:3–4 and concluded that the Hebrews passage furnishes the clue to understanding the Lukan purpose.

> These words in the second half of this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews may fittingly be used as a heading of Luke's second volume. I am firmly convinced that here we have found the scope of Acts, the angle under which we must see it to find the right perspective, or you may

---

[11] Neither Matthew, Mark, nor John has ever been considered as possible author for Hebrews because of historical evidence, stylistic dissimilarity, and other factors. Regarding the possibility of Mark's gospel being structured chiastically, see M. Phillip Scott (1985:17–26).

The fact that this is not a propensity of Paul in his writings further argues against him as a potential author of Hebrews.

[12] Allen (1989:223–35).

[13] Allen (1989:225–7).

> say: the hidden thread holding together the string of pearls (1960:49).

The following comparisons were made by van Unnik. First, the phrase in Hebrews 2:3 *hetis archen labousa laleisthai hupo tou kuriou* 'which began to be spoken by the Lord' is parallel to Acts 1:1 *peri panton...hon erxato ho Iesous poiein te kai didaskein* 'concerning all which Jesus began both to do and to teach'. Second, a number of elements which are motifs in Acts are found in Hebrews 2:3–4—salvation, the idea of bearing witness, signs and wonders, and distributions of the Holy Spirit. Third, the activity of God described in Hebrews 2:3–4 recalls Acts 14:3 'speaking boldly for the Lord *to marturounti epi to logo tes charitos autou didonti semeia kai terata ginesthai dia ton cheiron auton*' 'bearing witness to the wonder of His grace, granting that signs and wonders be done by their hands'. Fourth, the *sun* 'with' in the compound verb of 4 calls attention to the fact that there are other witnesses, too. Van Unnik referred this to the preceding verb *ebebaiothe* 'was confirmed'. The phrase in Hebrews 2:3 'them that heard him' are indicated as witnesses which corresponds to Acts 1:8. Fifth, Jesus is the *archegos tes soterias* 'author of salvation' in Hebrews 2:10, and this title is found of him only in Acts 3:15 and 5:31 in the rest of the New Testament.[14]

The meaning of Hebrews 2:3–4 is that there is a solid bridge between the saving activity of Jesus and those who have had no personal contact with him. It is in the confirmation of this salvation sanctioned by God through miraculous gifts that the solidity of this bridge is to be seen. But it is possible to reject the outcome of this salvation (spiritual maturity) through unbelief and disobedience. The purpose of Hebrews is to exhort the readers to firmness in their faith. Hebrews 2:3–4 thus becomes an explanation for the link between Luke and Acts. Given the stated purpose of Luke in his prologue to give his reader/s 'certainty' and the connection of the prologue to Acts and the book as a whole with Hebrews 2:3–4, the parallels between the purpose of Luke-Acts and Hebrews begin to emerge. The similarity between the theme of how God brings salvation in Luke-Acts resulting in continuity/discontinuity, and the parallel to the prologue of Hebrews where God, who spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken in one who is a Son, furnishes a second major parallel.

---

[14] Van Unnik (1960:47–8).

In a previous work I have shown the linguistic similarity between the prologues of Luke-Acts and Hebrews (Allen 1987:67–72). This similarity was found to be both structural and semantic. Further study has revealed many similarities between the five warning passages (hortatory sections) of Hebrews and certain sections of Luke-Acts. Since Hebrews is an example of hortatory discourse, its purpose is most likely to be expressed in the hortatory sections rather than in the doctrinal areas.

These similarities revolve around the concept of the word being spoken and the responsibility to hear the word. In Luke-Acts we find a similar emphasis on the word of God spoken through Jesus and the apostles, and the importance of its receptivity by the people of God.[15] It would thus seem that what we have expressed in the Lukan prologues lexically and semantically is paralleled in numerous places throughout the hortatory sections of Hebrews. The Lukan use of and emphasis on the concept of the *word of God* and the importance of *hearing* that word appears in Hebrews as the central theme. The parallels mentioned above are further enhanced by the additional lexical and semantic parallels drawn from the lexical domain of certainty which pervades the three works. When the hortatory sections of Hebrews are compared to the prologues of Luke-Acts, the ground is laid for showing that the three works focus on a similar purpose. These comparisons, when coupled with other lexical and stylistic similarity, furnish additional evidence for the theory of Lukan authorship of Hebrews.

Theological Similarities

Christology. In 1955 an article appeared by C. P. M. Jones entitled "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lukan Writings," in which he very cogently argued that there is a certain "family likeness" between Hebrews and the Lukan corpus, especially with regard to Christology and eschatology. In the early church three different Christologies circulated: two-foci, (emphasis on humanity-deity of Christ) exaltation, (emphasis on Christ's position after the resurrection at the right hand of God's throne), and epiphany (emphasis on Christ as the expression of the manifestation of God among men). Paul is representative of the two-foci approach; John employs an epiphany Christology; but Luke and the writer of Hebrews exhibit an exaltation Christology. It has already been shown that Luke's gospel ends with the ascension of Jesus and Acts begins with this event. The exaltation of Christ in heaven is clearly seen in the book of Acts. The

[15] See Allen (1987:229–31) for the specific similarities.

prologue to Hebrews also emphasizes the exaltation of Christ, and this theme is recurrent throughout Hebrews.

The concept of the perfection of Christ is significant in Hebrews. The verb *to perfect* and its cognates occur most often in the writings of Luke and Hebrews. The only places in the New Testament where Jesus is described by *teleioun* 'perfect' is in Hebrews and Luke 13:32, where the attainment of perfection is said to be through suffering and death. Related to this subject is the theological concept of the testing of Jesus (Luke 22:28). Hebrews 2:18 and 4:15 place an emphasis on Jesus' testing through suffering and his resultant perfection.

The concept of Jesus as the ruler over Israel in the latter days, in fulfillment of the Davidic prophecies in 2 Sam. 7:14 and the Christological designation of Jesus as the Son in Psalm 2:7 is prominent in Hebrews 1:5–13 and 5:5, and is found as well in many places throughout Luke-Acts (Luke 1:32, 33; Acts 2:30; 13:33). There is a conceptual allusion to 2 Sam. 7:14 which stands behind the Christological discussions of much of Luke-Acts and Hebrews; yet with the exception of a non-Christological allusion in 2 Cor. 6:18, this passage is nowhere quoted or alluded to in the rest of the New Testament. Likewise, Ps. 2:7 is quoted only by Luke and Hebrews in the entire New Testament.

The high priesthood of Christ plays a crucial role in the Christology of Hebrews. Paul never mentions this aspect of Christology. For that matter, no other New Testament writer mentions it. Although Luke does not overtly deal with the priestly ministry of Jesus, he has at least illustrated it in a dramatic fashion at the conclusion of his gospel. It is stated that Jesus lifted up his hands and blessed the disciples before he was carried up into heaven. Talbert (1983:233) expressed the meaning of this act:

> This act of blessing is like that of the high priest, Simon, in Sir 50:19–20. With a priestly act the risen Jesus puts his disciples under the protection of God before he leaves them...
> Just as the gospel began with the ministry of the priest Zechariah, so it ends with Jesus acting as priest for his flock (cf. Heb 2:17; 3:1; 6:19-20).

In his discussion on the interrelationships of the gospels, Augustine pointed out that while Matthew seems to emphasize the kingship of Christ, Luke emphasizes the priesthood. He derived this distinction from his study of the differing genealogies found in Matthew and Luke. Matthew carries

the line of Jesus from David through Solomon, thus emphasizing the kingly aspect of the descent. Luke differs from Matthew at this point, tracing Jesus' descent from David thorough David's son Nathan, who was never a king, but who was associated with the priests. Thus Augustine appended the symbol of the lion (kingship) to Matthew's gospel and the symbol of the bull (priestly sacrifice) to Luke's gospel.

Finally, the Christological title *archegos* 'Leader, Captain, Prince' occurs only in Acts 5:31 and Hebrews 2:10. The Lukan use of *kurios* 'Lord' as a reference to God is found also in Hebrews.

In summary, there is a common Christological substratum undergirding Luke-Acts and Hebrews. In both we find an emphasis on the humanity of Christ, his completed work, his present glorified state, and a distinction between Christ and his faithful in terms of the nature of their suffering.

Other Similarities

Eschatology. Jones in the article mentioned above (1955) gave sufficient evidence to show that Luke-Acts and Hebrews stand over against the rest of the New Testament writers in the way eschatology is treated. The key difference seems to be that there is less emphasis placed upon the Parousia in Luke-Acts and Hebrews than in Mark, John, or the writings of Paul.[16]

Prophecy and fulfillment. The theme of prophecy and fulfillment plays a major role in Lukan theology. We find the same emphasis when we turn to Hebrews. The prophecy-fulfillment motif plays a crucial role at the very outset of the book. Hebrews 1:1–4 states theologically what Luke narrates historically in his gospel.

Angels. Regarding the subject of angels, Luke records more instances of angelic activity than any other New Testament writer, and Hebrews is the book most interested in their theological status.

God's house. Treatment of the people of God as composing God's 'house' is found only in Luke and Hebrews. The use of *epi* with *ton oikon* 'over the house' followed by the possessive genitive occurs only five times in the New Testament, once in Luke and four times in Hebrews. A concordance check on the Greek term *oikos* as used with God, Jacob, David, and Israel reveals that it is Luke and Hebrews who primarily employ such terminology. A similar concept is found in Ephesians 2:21.

---

[16] See Allen (1987:128–33) for further discussion.

The Jewish Background of Luke-Acts

The greatest objection to the Lukan authorship of Hebrews has always been the supposition that Luke was a Gentile. This is a supposition which is based on Luke's command of the Greek language, his occasional avoidance of Semitic words when compared to the other gospels, the omission of Jesus' controversies with the Pharisaic understanding of the Law in his gospel, the transformation of Palestinian local color and certain details into Hellenistic counterparts, and an inference drawn from Colossians 4:10–14 (Fitzmyer 1981:41–2).

There is no statement in the New Testament or in any of the patristic writers that Luke was a Gentile. However, there is much evidence that in recent years has come to light in Lukan studies that has caused many scholars to believe that Luke was a Jew. Clarke, in reference to Plummer's comment about Luke being the "versatile Gentile," supported strongly the opposite idea that Luke must have been a Jew.

> I find this theory of the versatile Gentile very unconvincing. Greek was the literary language of the East and known to all Jews with any claim to culture. It is easy to see that a Jew when writing Greek would from time to time use native idioms and constructions. It is difficult to conceive the case of a Greek who became so saturated with Hebraic idioms as to use them when writing in his own tongue. If, therefore, the meaning of Col. iv. 10–14 is that *Loukas* was a Greek, it is hard to suppose that he wrote either of the works attributed to him (Clarke 1933:393).

I shall only mention a few examples of the Jewishness of Luke-Acts. Luke begins his gospel with a very Greek prologue, then plunges the reader into two chapters of distinctly Jewish events and terminology. It is not only the style of these two chapters which is Septuagintal but the content as well. Drury noted that Luke is more of a historian in the Jewish tradition than in the Greek tradition (1976:8).[17] Jerusalem, and especially the temple, stand as the center of attention in Luke 1 and 2 and indeed are the focal point throughout. Notice that Luke's gospel begins and ends both in

[17] Luke Johnson (1991:5–8) argues the opposite position in his excellent commentary.

Jerusalem and in the temple. It easily can be established lexically that Luke has a definite interest in the priests and the temple.

Why does Luke make Jerusalem so central in his two-volume work? Its historical importance for early Christianity is a part of the answer to this question. But, as Johnson (1991:15) pointed out, more than historical recollection is involved. The city and the temple stand as symbols of the people Israel. "Jerusalem, in short, is the place of pivot in Luke's story of the Prophet and the people" (ibid.). Might we not propose that such is the case because Luke was Jewish?

One interesting feature of Luke 1:46–7 is the unusual combination of the present and aorist verb tenses, which has received special attention resulting in a number of unsatisfactory explanations. Buth (1984:67–83) proposed a solution which I think makes the most sense of the data. There is a feature of Hebrew poetry called "tense shift" where the tenses in adjacent clauses are switched purely for rhetorical effect. Nothing in the surface or semantic structure of the text requires such switching. Furthermore, such tense switching does not seem to be a feature of either Greek or Aramaic discourse. Of further interest is the fact that the LXX translation of the Psalms does not reflect the notion of Hebrew tense shifting. Therefore Luke could not have used the LXX as a model for his composition of the Magnificat.

Buth suggested that this verb tense phenomenon can best be explained by Hebrew tense shifting. Then the question must be asked: where did Luke learn such niceties of the Hebrew language? Whether one suggests that Luke composed the Magnificat himself, borrowed someone else's translation, or what, the point is that Luke has used his source(s) and method of composition to preserve a textual feature that makes awkward Greek, yet reflects careful translation from a (possible) Hebrew original.

The evidence argues against the notion of someone of Greek background having composed the song. However, Buth argued against Luke having composed it because he assumes Luke to be a Gentile, who could have got this information directly from Mary and preserved the phenomenon of Hebrew tense shift in his Greek narrative. But if so, why would he translate it in such a way that would make for odd reading in Greek? I think the better explanation is that Luke is Jewish.[18]

---

[18] Clarke (1933), Reicke (1964), Schlatter (1960), Easton (1955), Ellis (1977), Drury (1976), and Juel (1983) all argue for Luke's Jewish background. See also Jervell (1984), Lohfink (1975), and O'Neill (1961:146–65). In Tyson (1988) eight scholars present their views pro and con on the issue.

Historical Reconstruction

I believe Hebrews was written by Luke from Rome ca. A.D. 67 after the death of Paul. A correlation of statements in the pastoral epistles and Hebrews supports this. Imprisoned in Rome, Paul pens 2 Timothy around A.D. 66, in which he hints at his coming execution. Addressing Timothy, he says, "Do your diligence to come shortly." Either before Timothy arrived or shortly thereafter, Paul was beheaded and Timothy was imprisoned. Hebrews 13:23 refers to Timothy's being 'set free,' most naturally implying an imprisonment. In 2 Timothy 4:11 Paul comments that "only Luke is with me," thus placing Luke in Paul's company at or near the time of his death in Rome, ca. A.D. 67. Hebrews 13:24 says, "They of Italy greet you." This phrase is more naturally understood to mean that the Christians now in Italy send greetings to people living elsewhere.

I conclude that the recipients of Hebrews were former Jewish priests who had been converted to Christianity in the early years of the church in Jerusalem (Acts 6:7). With the persecution of Jerusalem Christians instigated by Stephen's martyrdom (Acts 8:1) under way, I suggest that many of these priests fled to Antioch in Syria. Luke is associated both by Scripture and tradition with Antioch in Syria. He has a more than passing interest in Antioch, as can be observed in Acts from his treatment of the church there. The high priesthood of Christ as discussed in Hebrews would of course have appeal to former Jewish priests.

Conclusion

When all the evidence (which has not been presented here) is taken together, the best theory which answers the most questions regarding the authorship of Hebrews is that of independent Lukan authorship. From a lexical, stylistic, and textlinguistic perspective, of all the New Testament writers, Luke is closer to Hebrews than anyone. From the standpoint of purpose and theology, Luke is again closer to Hebrews than Paul or any other New Testament writer. If we add to this the possibility of the Jewish background of Luke, there is no formidable argument which can be made against Lukan authorship of Hebrews. In the absence of a better theory, it would seem that we can speak legitimately about not only the possibility but also even the probability of Luke having been the author of Hebrews, assuming the author to be one of the New Testament writers.

BIOGRAPHY

David L. Allen graduated from the Criswell College in 1978 and received his M.Div. from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth in 1981. He received his Ph.D. in humanities with a linguistics major from the University of Texas at Arlington in 1987. He is currently pastor of Audelia Road Baptist Church in Dallas and also serves as an adjunct professor of New Testament and Greek at the Criswell College in Dallas.

REFERENCES

Allen, David L. An argument for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews. Ph.D. diss. University of Texas at Arlington. 1987.

———. 1989. The purposes of Luke-Acts and Hebrews compared: an argument for the Lukan authorship of Hebrews. The church at the dawn of the 21st century. Edited by Patterson, Pretlove, and Pantoja. Dallas: Criswell Publications.

Bligh, J. 1964. The structure of Hebrews. Heythrop Journal 5:170–177.

Blood, David and Doris Blood. 1979. Overview of Acts. Notes on Translation 74:2–36.

Bornhauser, K. 1932. Empfanger und verfasser des Hebraerbriefes. Gutersloh: Bertelsman.

Brown, J.V. 1923. The authorship and circumstances of Hebrews—again! Bibliotheca Sacra 80:505–538.

Buth, Randall. 1984. Hebrew poetic tenses and the magnificat. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 21:67–83.

Cadbury, H.J. 1927. The making of Luke-Acts. New York: Macmillan.

Calvin, John. 1948. Reprint. Commentary on the epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews. Translated and edited by John Owen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Clarke, Albert. 1933. Acts of the Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1960. The theology of Saint Luke. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Delitzsch, Franz. 1952. Reprint. Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Translated by Thomas L. Kingsbury. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Drury, John. 1976. Tradition and design in Luke's gospel: a study in early Christian historiography. Atlanta: John Knox Press.

Dussaut, 1981. Synopse structurelle de l'epistle aux Hebreux: approche d'analyse structurelle. Paris: Editions Due Cerf.

Easton, B.S. 1955. Early Christianity. London: S.P.C.K.

Ellegard, Alvar. 1982. Genre styles, individual styles, and authorship identification, In Text processing, proceedings of Nobel symposium 51, Edited by Sture Allen. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ellis, E. Earle. 1977. Reprint. The gospel of Luke. The century Bible. London: Oliphants.

Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, VI.14.

Filson, Floyd. 1967. "Yesterday". A study of Hebrews in the light of chapter 13. Vol. 4. In Studies in Biblical theology. Edited by C. F. D. Moule, Peter Ackroyd, Floyd Filson, and G. Ernest Wright. London: Student Christian Movement Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A. 1981. The gospel according to Luke (I-IX): Anchor Bible 28a. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Franklin, Eric. 1975. Christ the Lord. A study in the purpose and theology of Luke-Acts. London: S.P.C.K.

Goulder, Michael. 1964. The chiastic structure of the Lucan journey. Studia Evangelica II. Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Hawkins, J.C. 1909. Horae Synopticae: contributions to the study of the synoptic problem. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hunt, B. S. 1968. The epistle to the Hebrews: an anti-Judaic treatise? Studia Evangelica, Vol. 2, Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Jelonek, 1985. Chrystologia listu do Hebrajezykow. Analecta Cracoviensiea 17:253–257.

Jervell, Jacob. 1972. Luke and the people of God: a new look at Luke-Acts. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

————. 1984. The unknown Paul. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1991. A Commentary on the gospel of Luke. Sacra Pagina, Vol. 3, Minneapolis: The Liturgical Press: Michael Glazier Books.

_____. 1992. The Acts of the Apostles. Sacra Pagina, Vol. 5, Minneapolis: The Liturgical Press: Michael Glazier Books.

Jones, C.P.M. 1955. The epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan writings, In Studies in the gospels: essays in memory of R. H. Lightfoot, Edited by Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Juel, Donald. 1983. Luke-Acts: the promise of history. Atlanta: John Knox.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1970. The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lane, William. 1981. Hebrews 1–8. Word biblical commentary 47a. Dallas: Word.

Lohfink, G. 1975. Die sammlung Israels: eine untersuchung zur Lukanischen ekklesiologie. Munich: Kosel.

Lunemann, G. 1885. Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews. Translated from the 4th German edition by Maurice Evans. Meyers critical and exegetical handbook to the New Testament. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Maddox, Robert. 1982. The purpose of Luke-Acts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke.

Miesner, Donald. 1978. The missionary journeys narrative: patterns and implications. In Perspectives on Luke-Acts. Special Study series, No. 5. Edited by Charles Talbert. Danville, Ky.: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion.

Moessner, David. 1989. Lord of the banquet: the literary and theological significance of the Lukan travel narrative. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Morgenthaler, Robert. 1949. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. Zurich: Zwingli.

———. 1958. Statistik des Neutestamentlichen wortschatzes. Frankfurt am M.: Gotthelf-Verlag.

Moulton, William F., and Geden, A.S. 1963. A concordance to the Greek New Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke.

Neyrey, Jerome. 1985. The passion according to Luke: a redaction study of Luke's soteriology. Theological inquiries: studies in contemporary biblical and theological problems. Edited by Lawrence Boadt. New York: Paulist Press.

Neeley, Linda Lloyd. 1987. A discourse analysis of Hebrews. Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics, Nos. 3–4:1–146.

O'Neill, J.C. 1961. The theology of Acts in its historical setting. London: S.P.C.K.

O'Toole, Robert. 1984. The unity of Luke's theology. Vol. 9. Good News Studies. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.

Reicke, Bo. 1964. The gospel of Luke. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Richmond, Va.: John Knox.

Sandegren, C. 1955. The addressees of the epistle to the Hebrews. Evangelical Quarterly 27.221–224.

Schlatter, A. 1960. Das evangelium des Lukas: aus seined Quellen erklart. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer.

Scott, M. Phillip. 1985. Chiastic structure: a key to the interpretation of Mark's gospel. Biblical Theology Bulletin 15:17–26.

Spicq, Ceslas. 1952–53. L'epitre aux Hebreux. Vol. 1, 2. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre.

Talbert, Charles H. 1974. Literary patterns, theological themes and the genre of Luke-Acts. Society of biblical literature monograph series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press.

———. 1983. Reading Luke. New York: Crossroads.

Turner, Nigel. 1976. Style. Vol. 3, 4 of A grammar of the Greek New Testament by J.H. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Tyson, Joseph. 1988. Luke-Acts and the Jewish people: eight critical perspectives. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Vanhoye, Albert. 1963. La structure litteraire de l'epitre aux Hebreux. Paris: Desclee De Brouwer.

van Unnik, W.C. 1960. The book of Acts the confirmation of the gospel. New Testament Studies 4:26–59.

Wallis, Ethel. 1979. Thematic parallelism and prominence in Luke-Acts. Notes on Translation 75:2–6

Westcott, B.F. 1955. Reprint. The epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wolfe, Kenneth. 1989. The chiastic structure of Luke-Acts and some implications for worship. Southwestern Journal of Theology 22:60–71.

OBADIAH'S "DAY": ON THE RHETORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF TEXTUAL FORM AND INTERTEXTUAL INFLUENCE

Ernst R. Wendland

ABSTRACT

This study takes a literary-critical look at Obadiah, one of the most neglected of the Minor Prophets. The primary aim is to determine how its style of composition may have affected the rhetorical impact of the book in terms of both aesthetic appeal and persuasive force. A structurally oriented discourse analysis reveals the careful manner in which the text's macro- and micro-organization emphasize key aspects of the message being communicated about divine judgment on the apocalyptic day of YHWH. A subsequent overview of intertextual generic patterns, lexical correspondences, and apparent allusions reveals the author's dependence upon Scriptural tradition to reinforce the encouraging 'vision...concerning Edom' that he proclaims to the people of God on behalf of 'the Sovereign LORD'.

"Quanto Brevis Est, Tanto Difficilis," Jerome

Whoever reads—or preaches from—the book of Obadiah anyway? What's the point when there are so many alternatives that are more familiar and seemingly more reader-friendly? It cannot be denied that this, the smallest book in the Hebrew Scriptures, suffers from a rather serious identity crisis, situated as it is on a single page (in most English Bibles) between Amos and Jonah in the corpus of the so-called Minor Prophets. But is it correct to view Obadiah as only a short and somewhat insignificant prophecy of doom pronounced against the largely unknown ancient kingdom of Edom? Did this prophecy find its way into the biblical canon simply because a number of its constituent verses happen to resemble those of Jeremiah chapter 49?

On the contrary, as I hope to show in this article, there is considerable literary as well as theological evidence that would support the conclusion that 'the vision of Obadiah' (*ḥăzôn 'ōbadyâ*) is actually a model prophetic text—a microcosm as it were of such literature dealing with the momentous forthcoming (but immediately relevant) 'day of the LORD' (*yôm YHWH*). Despite its brevity (only about seventy poetic lines in the Hebrew), Obadiah is a masterfully constructed discourse in terms of its artistic style. It is also one that is rhetorically motivated from start to finish, conveying a powerfully persuasive message of bane as well as blessing from the LORD that has just as much relevance to believers today as it did to its original receptors over twenty-five centuries ago. The purpose of the present study is to demonstrate this claim by means of a careful examination of the form

and function of this strongly hortatory, yet beautifully poetic composition.[1] In the process I will illustrate, at least in part, a holistic, discourse-oriented approach to the analysis and interpretation of biblical texts, Hebrew prophecy in particular, with special reference to the rhetorical implications of intertextual influence.

Unity in Diversity: The Form of Obadiah among the Prophets

The prophecy of Obadiah, which I consider to be an integral unit,[2] follows the typical generic pattern of similar condemnatory "oracles against the nations" found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Accordingly, the text manifests four principal form-functional segments that serve a basic twofold purpose, namely: "to announce the enemy's defeat and to reassure Israel that God protects her security" (Klein et. al., 1993:300). These four structural units are listed and briefly described below:

1. **Identification**: There is a revelation of the foreign/pagan nation to be indicted and judged by YHWH through his chosen prophetic messenger, often using the vehicle of divine apostrophe and/or a call to battle (Obad. 1; cf. Jer. 49:7a).[3]
2. **Indictment**: The various sins of that nation are enumerated and described, often in vivid visual detail, especially those which concern the LORD's chosen people, Israel/Judah (e.g., Obad. 10–14; cf. Jer. 49:16a).
3. **Condemnation**: An appropriate punishment for the wicked nation is enunciated very graphically in direct speech by YHWH himself, often colored by military imagery, i.e., a "war oracle" (Klein, et. al., ibid.), and punctuated by warnings that all efforts to escape will prove fruitless (Obad. 2–9, 15–6, 18; cf. Jer. 49:8–22).
4. **Prediction**: There is a promise that after the devastation inflicted upon the enemy, Israel (the people of God) will be graciously restored to a position of preeminence and prosperity in 'the land' (at times incorporating the whole world), with certain pagan nations sometimes also sharing in these divine blessings (Obad. 17, 19–21; cf. Jer. 30–1; 33; 49:39).

The significance of the close correspondence with Jeremiah 49 will be considered later.

A slightly different way of analyzing the organization of Obadiah from a form-critical perspective is to view it as a *covenant-lawsuit*

---

[1] Compare Wendland (1996:54–86).

[2] The literary or structural unity of Obadiah is not always recognized, e.g., Snyman (1989).

[3] Obadiah references throughout are to verse numbers.

address, which consists of the following basic components (Huffmon 1959:285):

I. Description of the scene of judgment
II. Address by the judge to the defendant[s]
Accusation (pronouncement of guilt +/- reproach)
Sentence of punishment

As in the preceding scheme, we notice the prominent structural inversion found in Obadiah: the sentence (condemnation) portion, 2–10, appears before the accusation (indictment) section, 10–14. There is also an area of structural overlap in 10, which is obviously a major turning point. The final principal compositional unit is, like the prediction above, optional, i.e., 15–21: judgment is pronounced upon foreign nations while restoration is promised for Israel/Judah. In the case of Edom, a more specific "covenant-lawsuit" framework would seem apropos on account of that nation's flagrant "violation of fraternal relations" with the chosen people of God (10) (Niehaus 1993:496).

Characteristic of many such denunciatory oracles is the radical shift in fortunes, or 'turning' *(šûb)*, that marks a role-reversal involving Judah/Israel and the particular enemy nations(s) in question, e.g., Obad. 10, 15. Frequently these twists in divinely ordained fate are dramatically ironic in nature because the foreign oppressors will be forced to undergo a similar sort of shame and punishment which they previously inflicted upon God's people. In other words, their punishment will parallel or in some significant way correspond to the crimes that they once perpetrated (cf. Miller 1982:5–6):

> As you have done, it will be done to you;
> your deeds will return upon your own head. (Obad. 15; NIV)

Similarly, Israel will one day rule in triumph over those who had earlier occasioned and/or boasted over the fall of Jerusalem:

> The house of Jacob will be a fire ...
> the house of Esau will be stubble ... (Obad. 18; NIV)

As will be shown in the analysis to follow, such a dramatic *reversal* is also typical of Obadiah's style in the microstructure of discourse organization and thematic development. The effect of these generic and

specific compositional features is a crucial aspect of the book's conspicuous rhetorical dimension and its related theological relevance.

Overview of the Literary Structural Organization of Obadiah

The larger formal arrangement of the book of Obadiah is delineated by a number of structural markers, or diagnostic compositional features, which when considered in relation to one another, rather clearly demarcate the discourse into three major constituent sections: 1–10, 11–14, and 15–21, as outlined below. The interchange of speakers reveals an A–B–A' *ring-construction* as two complementary divine oracles having a future orientation (A/A') conjoined by a prophetic denunciation with a perspective on the past. The medial section B is closely connected with both A and A'; that is, on the one hand, the divine verdict expressed in A is followed by the words of indictment in B; on the other hand, a negative manifestation of the LORD's 'day' in relation to Judah in history (B) shifts to a positive realization in the 'messianic age' (A'). This balanced compositional framework strongly supports the rhetorical dynamics of the text as a whole. The principal sections, or strophes (poetic paragraphs), that comprise the vision of Obadiah may be briefly described as follows (cf. Wendland 1988:3–8):

Section I

(1): Introduction

The prophetic proclamation of YHWH's punitive intention with regard 'to Edom' (*le'ĕdôm*) begins.

The initial announcement of a macro-generic 'vision' (*ḥăzôn*) indicates that at least in its final form the text intends us (or the implied readers/hearers of the message) to regard Obadiah as being a specific, divinely chosen and inspired individual (cf. similar introductions in Amos 1:1; Isa. 1:1; Mic. 1:1; Nah. 1:1). This superscription, coupled with the absence of any subsequent internal compositional note, also suggests that the entire text is to be construed as a unified, if carefully divided, whole (cf. Robinson 1988:88). An implication of the divine source, authority, and certainty of Obadiah's revelation is confirmed by the subsequent messenger formula: 'thus says the LORD...' The fact that YHWH's actual speech does not begin immediately is a cause of concern to some commentators, who rush to rearrange the Hebrew text (e.g.,

Wolff 1986:33). But as we shall see, Obadiah does not always observe the standard stylistic procedures, and besides, it is reasonable to understand all of 1, including the enclosed quotation, as a deliberate build-up to the divine oracle which actually starts out in 2.

Both of the second and third poetic lines (cola) of 1 open with an emphatic verb(al)-iterated construction. Line 2 *šĕmû'ā*, line 3 *qûmû weqûmāh* 'Rise! Let us rise'. The third colon, a summons to battle (holy war), features arousing assonance in (a). The direct speech here giving the content of the 'report' (*šĕmû'â*) of the 'envoy' (*ṣîr*) constitutes the peak (thematic nucleus) and climax (emotive apex) of the dramatic introduction, which sets the stage for the prophecy per se. It graphically foreshadows the LORD's message to follow in section I of the discourse (2–10). Reference to 'the nations' also anticipates the great reversal which characterizes part 3 (15–21): now as agents, then as objects, of YHWH's just judgment will be 'the nations' (15a, a corresponding anaphoric [unit-initial] aperture). The last word of verse 1 forms a complementary, topically related rhyming inclusion with the final word of the book (21), viz., *lammilḥāmâ* 'for the battle' vs. *hammĕlûkâ* 'the kingship'.

Judgment of Edom

Despite all self-protective measures, the insolent nation of Esau will be utterly destroyed by its enemies. This will take place during the course of proximate world events and will represent the LORD's punitive justice being levied against the people of Edom for the 'violence' that they had committed against 'Jacob' (i.e., Judah 10). This section, the first of the three principal sections which comprise the book, is itself composed of three progressively intensified strophes, as distinctly delineated below. They express the certainty, the completeness, and the horror of the calamity to come. All three are uttered by YHWH (cf. 4, 8), ostensibly directly to Edom itself "in the ironic style of ancient Near Eastern divine and royal titularies" (Niehaus 1993:516). Throughout this entire pericope, "the themes of divine and human action are closely intertwined, first one and then the other coming to the fore" (Allen 1976:152), but the total supremacy of the LORD's sovereign will and decision is clearly stressed.

(2-4): The prophetic 'vision' of Obadiah appropriately leads off with an attention-drawing deictic particle *hinnē* 'look!'—which serves to emphasize the immediately following word *qātōn* 'small,' a force that continues to be exerted upon the two subsequent colon-initial

terms: *bāzûy* 'despised' and *zĕdôn* 'pride'. The segment concludes with the common oracular formula 'declaration of YHWH' (*nĕ'um-YHWH*), which in its role as an utterance punctuator here forms an inclusion with a corresponding phrase at the start of 1. The logical development of this strophe manifests a chiastic pattern which reflects the corresponding downfall (an inversion of status or belittlement) of Edom that is being predicted. The strophe begins and ends with a statement of divine purpose, one that stresses the absolute power of God in contrast to the pathetic impotence of the presumptuous Edomites described in between:

A (2) punishment = 'I [YHWH] will make you [Edom] small/despised!'
B (3a) indictment = Edom's deceptive 'pride of heart'
B'(3b) indictment = Edom's boastful self-incriminating speech
A' (4) punishment = 'I [YHWH] will bring you [Edom] down!'

This strophe reaches its peak in the final utterance with the LORD'S deflating word of rebuke: 'From there [your proud perch] I shall cause you to fall!' (*miššām 'ôrîdĕkâ*)—which is a direct retort to Edom's defiant and boastful rhetorical question of the preceding verse: 'who will cause me to fall to earth?' (*mî yôridēnî 'āreṣ*). The divine prediction summarizes in just two words the first half of the prophet's message and the LORD's judicial case against the arrogance of Edom, which is highlighted through its encoding as direct speech. This marks the emotive climax of the first strophe. It is difficult to determine the extent to which this initial strophe consists of a pastiche of conventional prophetic sayings, forming a traditional text which Obadiah (YHWH) proceeds to elaborate upon (cf. Jer. 49:14–6; Wolff 1986:41). In any case, the strophe does lay the structural and thematic foundation for the entire work, i.e., human hubris inevitably leads to a fall before YHWH (2–4 culminates in 15–18).

(5–7): Another hypothetical construction beginning with *'im* leads off this strophe as in 4 (a case of transitional overlap, or anadiplosis), but there is no connective *waw*, the asyndeton (ommission of the conjunction) perhaps suggesting unit aperture here. Some commentators (e.g., Allen 1976:137 and Wolff 1986:34), feel that the exclamation *'êk nidmêtâ* 'how you are destroyed!' (5) has "suffered dislocation" ahead of its original position after *dayyām* 'enough for them'. However, this obvious transposition could just as well be

intentional, the purpose being to mirror the drastic change in Edom's fortunes. The displacement also intensifies the emotive level, or "shock value" (Niehaus 1993:520), of the text as the second cycle of the divine judgment oracle against that nation begins. However, there is also an apparent shift in the semantic force, that is, from concession-contraexpectation (4) to condition-consequence (5). The strophe is tightly structured internally by means of a pair of elaborate syntactic and semantic arrangements, each of which features an alternating pattern that reflects the reversal in friendship, or betrayal, that Edom experienced in relation to its former allies. This *a fortiori* (or *qal wachomer*)[4] argument sequence runs as follows:

(5a) A1: *'im*—protasis	B1: *'êk*—apostrophe	C1: *hălô'*—apodasis (RQ)[5]
A2: extension		
(5b) A3: *'im*—protasis		C2: *hălô'*—apodasis (RQ)
(6a)	B2: *'êk*—exclamation	
(6b)	B3: extension	

(7a) D1: act of hostility	E1: by allies ('men of your covenant')
D2: act of hostility	
(7b) D3: act of hostility	E2: by allies ('men of your peace')
(7c)	E3: by allies ('[men of] your bread')
D4: act of hostility	

(7d) A final short contrastive monocolon of closure, set apart by a sudden shift in person, makes an ironic transition to the next strophe, i.e., Edom 'has no understanding.' Even their 'wise men' (including national politics and foreign policies) are completely confounded (8).

Indirect references to Edom's lost 'wisdom' in 7–8 along with the similar *'im* 'if' constructions in 4–5 function as complementary structural devices (i.e., formal/semantic overlapping, or anadiplosis) to smooth over the junctures that occur between these pairs of verses. Closure of this second strophe is formally marked by the strong sequence of reiterated word-final 'you' pronominals (*-kā*, 2 masc sing.) which highlights the betrayal that Edom experienced. There is also in closing a repetition of the verb 'put' (*śym*), as 'nest-placing' (4b) contrasted with 'snare-setting' (7c; i.e., a significant end-of-unit correspondence termed epiphora).

The peak of this strophe occurs in the middle (6), with the exclamatory utterance serving to emphasize the 'pillaging' of 'Esau.'

[4] What applies in a less important case will certainly apply in a more important case.
[5] RQ - rhetorical question

This is flanked on each side by a triad of participants, one hypothetical: 'thieves...robbers...grape pickers' (5); the other real (though expressed figuratively): men of your treaty...compact...close acquaintance (7). Verse 6 is also bounded by two other rhetorical devices which augment the emotive force of the strophe as a whole, i.e., a corresponding interjection of amazement in 5 (*'êk...*+ the prophetic perfect) and reiterated dramatic irony in 7. These features, along with the direct address and opening rhetorical questions, together function as a lament, a generic form which in itself heightens the mocking impact of YHWH's personal word of condemnation.

(8-10): The onset (i.e., aperture) of this third strophe is very clearly delineated by means of the following cluster of demarcative devices: a divine quotation in the form of a rhetorical question; an anaphoric (unit-initial) link with 5 in the repeated negative interrogative particles (*hălô'*); another instance of anaphora in the second and final mention of 'Edom' (*'edôm*)—cf. 1; anadiplosis, or overlapping, in the recursion of a word pointing to Edom's crucial lack (i.e., *tĕbûnâ* 'discernment'); a reiteration of the accentuating divine oracle formula (*nĕ'um-YHWH*, cf. 4c, i.e., a unit-circumscribing exclusion); and an introduction of the key thematic term 'day.' The latter is here combined with the demonstrative 'that' producing *bayyôm hahû'* 'that day' to give the expression additional eschatological overtones, namely, as a prophetic reference to a future time of divine judgment. Its significance here is reinforced by the initial alliteration created by a sequence of *h-* sounds on key terms, perhaps overlaying the oracle with a note of inevitability (Niehaus 1993:524).

Verses 8–9 emphasize Edom's forthcoming doom through repeated metonymic use of the proper name (i.e. 'Edom ... Esau ... Teman ... Esau'). In that fearful day all outstanding human resources will fail—the 'wise men' as well as the 'warriors'. The totality of the destruction predicted is typical of Near Eastern covenant theodicies (Niehaus 1993:525). Esau will surely suffer a great 'slaughter' (*miqqātel*). Suddenly then, at 10 at the close of this strophe and climax of the entire section, the reason for such harsh judgment is revealed: Esau had treated his 'blood brother Jacob' with 'violence' (*ḥămas*, cf. Deut. 23:7) The immediate juxtaposition with 'your brother' (*'āhîkā*) has an obvious rhetorical thrust. This is the first time that the shameful motivating cause for Edom's deserved destruction is mentioned (cf. Amos 1:11). Indeed, the nation was to 'be cut off forever,' a repeated expression (9–10) referring to the awful ultimate in divine punishment.

This ominous allusion to an eternity of 'shame' (*bûšâ*), in pointed contrast to their overweening 'pride' (*zĕdôn*) foregrounded in strophe 1, rounds out the first major segment of the prophecy on a grimly negative note.

Function of Verse Ten

In a departure from virtually all English versions (the *New Jerusalem Bible* being an exception) and commentaries,[6] I am proposing that verse 10 emphatically concludes the third strophe of section I rather than begins a new one. There are a number of structural and thematic reasons for this decision, which are summarized below:

1. With its cluster of key terms, 10 unexpectedly but emphatically discloses that the great crime ('violence') of the Edomites was in fact committed against their relatives (*ya'ăqōb* 'Jacob'), the covenant people of YHWH. To this shocking, deliberately delayed revelation is immediately added the appropriate divine retribution—a complete, humiliating desolation. The niphal of [*krt*] 'cut (off)' conveys the notion of "absolute termination" (cf. 9; Niehaus 1993:527). In this capacity then the verse functions as a concluding summary and peak point of the book's initial pericope.

2. The reference to 'Jacob' culminates, albeit contrastively, the cohesive string of personal names referring to his fraternal adversary 'Esau' that runs throughout the strophe comprising 8–10.

3. In 11 there is a renewed reference to events taking place 'on the day' (*bĕyôm*), a seminal prophetic term which was first mentioned at the beginning of the preceding strophe, the day of Edom's demise (similar unit openings, anaphora, cf. 15). In this instance however, the period of Judah's devastation, the predominant temporal setting, shifts to past historical events to carry on now in specific detail from the general accusation of 10a. Verse 11, also set off by asyndeton (cf. the triad of *waw*-initial cola in 12), thus introduces a semi-narrative series of indictments concerning 'the day' which run through 14.

4. The last word in 9 (*miqqātel* 'from/by slaughter') is closely linked to the initial word of 10 (*mēḥămas* 'from/because of violence'), syntactically, semantically, and phonologically (by the alliterative *m* sequence). For this reason the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartsensia* (BHS) version and some commentators suggest a transferal of the former to the latter verse (e.g., Thompson 1956:863). This makes it the longest

[6] See also the discourse analysis found in Clark (1991).

line in the entire book and very likely terminal as well. In any case, 'by slaughter' could well be a pivotal, Janus-like term with referential connections in both directions, thus joining the two verses within the same poetic unit.

5. The next section, 11–14, is bounded by a prominent lexical inclusion, formed by the verb 'you stand' (*'md*), and by other external delimiting as well as internal conjunctive devices that reveal its integrity as an independent compositional section (see further discussion on this section below).

6. An ironic reference to 'cutting off/down' (*krt*) is found at the respective endings of adjacent strophes (i.e., structural epiphora). That is to say, Edom will be punitively 'cut off' (10) because, among other things, its army cruelly 'cut down' the helpless fugitives from Jerusalem (14).

7. Another epiphoric correspondence of thematic importance (depending on one's interpretation) occurs between verse 10 and the final verse of the book. In the former, Edom's total destruction is predicted; in 21, however, there is another, a contrastive reference to 'the mountain of Esau' (*har 'esāw*), this time in a surprising soteriological setting (cf. 8–9).

On the cumulative basis of qualitative and quantitative evidence of this nature, and considering the book's larger framework of discourse design, it seems likely that 10 functions more effectively in rhetorical terms as a climactic bicola of closure, rather than one of aperture as in most other interpretations. This is not a moot point, for it certainly affects one's perception of and response to the shaping and emotive shading of the LORD's forensic argument, namely, his judicial indictment of the wicked nation of Edom.[7]

Section II

Explanatory Transition

The indictment against 'Esau,' initiated in 10, is now set forth in incisive poetic detail. However, in the light of history and prior prophetic messages, this passage also can be read rhetorically from quite a different, but not necessarily an incompatible, perspective. This would be as a retrospective, admonitory review of the divine judgment meted out against the covenant-breaking people of Judah, the proud

[7] Consider, for example, the exegetical effects of quite a different structural analysis of this little book, as outlined in Clark (1991).

leaders of Jerusalem in particular, for their sins of rapacious oppression of the poor.[8] Such an interpretation is suggested, though indirectly, by the cohesive string of colon-final terms denoting 'his/their [misfortune]' (i.e., a disaster which they suffered and/or brought upon themselves). This emphasis is especially pronounced within the thematic peak line of 13 (*'êdo*[*m*] 'his calamity,' a pun on the otherwise unnamed 'Edom', *'ĕdôm*).

Verses 11–14 constitute the second compositional third of the prophecy as whole. The section, consisting of a single strophe (or stanza),[9] functions as a structural bridge to establish firmly the judicial basis for the LORD's complete condemnation of Edom which is unfolded in sections I and III, i.e., 2–10 and 15–21. In contrast to the two surrounding sections, the spotlight here is fixed upon the merciless malevolence that Esau unleashed upon Jacob. YHWH is very much in the background throughout, though he is of course controlling the ultimate purpose being effected by all the horrible events described. The prophet as an apparent eyewitness, or participant-observer (whether by divine revelation or actual experience), provides this damning commentary on the past 'violence' (10) done to his people (13a) by the Edomites. This segment stands as a stark testimony to crimes befitting the 'shame' and 'slaughter' (9) that will befall Edom as just punishment in the future (2–9). It also serves as a timely warning to the ungodly of every age that such behavior will merit a similar verdict in the LORD's final judgment in the last times (15–18).

There are several significant, cohesion-creating similarities that exist between 11–14 and the first section of 2–10, thus linking by cause and effect (or in this case, effect and cause) the despicable acts of betrayal inflicted by Edom upon Judah and the terrible punishment that is predicted as being in store for Esau's descendants (cf. Mason 1991:100). It is an event of complete disaster (9, 13)—a total ransacking of the entire nation (6, 11)—during which a remnant of survivors attempts to escape beyond the invaded borders of the land

[8] In this connection, one observes the many correspondences here between this indictment and the LORD's castigation of Israel in the book of Amos. Especially noteworthy is the prophet's condemnation of his nation's overweening pride (e.g., Amos 6:1–8) which led to widespread social abuses (2:7; 3:10; 4:1; 5:11–2; 8:4–6). But there are also some strong parallels to the prediction of the people's future restoration (Amos 9:11–5). Thus the canonical juxtaposition of these two books certainly seems to be justified, thematically at least.

[9] The term *stanza* seems more appropriate for poetic units that are more or less balanced in terms of meter and number of lines. Of course, such strict rhythmic criteria do not apply to Hebrew poetry, although pericopes that contain strophes of similar length and style do occur—the three that make up section I, for example: 2–4, 5–7, 8–10.

(7a, 14a). This devastation is brought about by treacherous foreigners (1b–2a, 11a), who plot together with former allies (7, 10a, 11b, 12a). Throughout these tragic events, the Edomites are characterized by their supercilious arrogance (3–4a, 12–13). Because Edom dared to 'send [his hand]' (13c) upon the property of his brother, the LORD would 'send' (1b) an army against his land and 'send away' (7a) all his refugees. Such obvious lexical correspondences reinforce one another and jointly lead up to the general principle of retributive divine justice which is pronounced at the start of the next section (15b).

Many of the important delimitative bounding markers of this strophe (11–14) were pointed out above in the discussion concerning its initial border (11). In addition, the entire unit is very tightly interlocked internally by means of a strictly parallel phonological (four-beat), lexical, and syntactic sequence, which perhaps suggests the relentless, ineluctable course of these disastrous happenings. There is a perceptible build-up in dramatic tension as Edom's crimes become increasingly more heinous and morally reprehensible. After an introduction which serves to specify the critical 'day' as being the occasion(s) when 'Jerusalem' was attacked, looted, and/or destroyed (creating an anaphora with the two surrounding strophic apertures in 8 and 15; cf. Ps. 137:7), the accusation is dramatically made point blank: '...also you [i.e., Edom] (were) like one of them' (11c). The 'coming' [*bw'*] of 'thieves' and 'robbers' (making an anaphora with 5) is here paralleled by a much more serious intrusion of 'strangers' and 'foreigners' (the latter, *nakerim*, links up audibly with *nakero* 'his misfortune' in 12a).

There follows an evocative series of eight immediate (punctiliar) prohibitions (12–14) which progressively and vividly amplify the LORD's case against Esau. They all follow a similar structural pattern which not only unifies the whole, but also leads one to consider them together as a single scene: i.e., *'al* ('do not') + imperfect verb (some hostile action/attitude) + *bĕyôm* ('in the day of'--construct) + 'his/their' (people of Jerusalem) with a noun signifying some sort of disaster. The first three and last three negatives are preceded by *waw*, a feature that distinguishes them from the pair in the middle (13), which are not so introduced.

Verse 13 is further distinguished as the structural-thematic center of the section through metrical irregularity (i.e., five accents instead of four), by a cluster of reiterated lexical items from the section's beginning in 11: 'wealth' + 'entered...gates' (in reverse order), and by reference to 'my [YHWH's] people,' coupled with the emphatic and

accusatory pronoun *gam-'attâ* 'also you!' An inclusion of paired antagonistic participants surrounds the entire unit, viz., 'strangers/foreigners' (11, i.e., the enemy) and 'fugitives/survivors' (14, i.e., the prey). Verse 14 in turn stands out as the emotive climax of this highly evocative, passionately expressed section on account of its revelation of the particularly damning actions committed against the 'survivors' of Jacob/Jerusalem.

Section III

Retribution and Restoration

As was the case in the two preceding sections, so also this third and final portion of the prophecy of Obadiah is characterized by some important similarities to, and differences from, what has gone before in the discourse. The judicial message of a 'day' of judgment upon the people of Edom continues, but now it is expressed again in the words of YHWH himself (cf. section I, verse 8), under the common theme of their receiving a righteous punitive recompense for their treacherous treatment of Judah. In section III the temporal scope of this day is also extended unto the messianic-eschatological future, and the divine condemnation is broadened to include all pagan 'nations' (*gôyim*). Here too the decree is further combined with a surprising prediction of deliverance and blessing for 'the house of Jacob on Mount Zion' and everyone who is graciously incorporated into that 'holy house' of refuge (17, 21).

The section as a whole is composed of two distinct but closely related strophes, namely, 15–18 and 19–21, the second of which specifies in detail the 'inheritance' (*môrāšêhem* 17) that the people of YHWH will receive in his messianic 'kingdom' (*hammĕlûkâ* 21). Much lexical recursion links the two strophes, notably that having an eschatological thematic import, i.e., 'mountain' (*har* meaning land) 5X, 'house' (*bêt* meaning people) 5X, 'possess' (*yāraš*) 5X, 'Esau' 4X, 'Jacob/Joseph/Israel/Jerusalem' 5X, and an important future temporal indicator, 'it will be' (*hāyâ*) 6X. The penultimate word features a significant seventh occurrence in the book of the divine name, YHWH—Source of the 'message' (1) and Sovereign of the 'kingdom' about which the prophet speaks (21). This third section overall also features a much greater incidence of *waw*-linkage, perhaps to suggest implicitly the ever-expanding scope of Obadiah's vision (i.e., roughly, in I - 5%, in II - 15%, in III - 25%). Such important structural and stylistic

similarities make it unlikely that 19–21 constitute some sort of subsequent "augmentation" to the original oracle-set of Obadiah that supposedly ends in 18 (e.g., Wolff 1986:62, 67).

(15–18): There is a dramatic beginning to this section/strophe, including an asseverative *kî* 'surely, indeed!'[10] Thus the 'day' of Judah's destruction (11–14) and the 'day' when Edom will be punished for its participation in that event (8, another example of structural anaphora) are both incorporated into the all-embracing judgment of 'the day of YHWH' (*yom YHWH*), which is described as being 'near' (*qārôb*). This apical 'day of the LORD' refers to the time when YHWH will personally intervene in human history to act in perfect righteousness on behalf of his holy people, whom Obadiah describes as 'the house of Jacob' (*bêt ya'ăqōb* 17–18). Its coming is as sure as the 'word of the LORD' is true. The formula of divine attestation, 'surely YHWH has spoken,' thus signals the conclusion of this strophe, with YHWH and a deictic-emphatic *kî* forming an inclusio with the onset of 15 (also with 1a through the reiteration of 'Esau/Edom').

The near consensus of scholars notwithstanding (i.e., based on unreliable pronominal shifts),[11] there is no need to relocate the general *lex talionis* principle enunciated in 15b (cf. Exod. 21:24) out of its parallel relationship with 16a to a position concluding the strophe of 11–14. This would detract from the carefully crafted progression that culminates in 'the [unique and all-encompassing] day of the LORD,' which the sequence of days found in the preceding strophe (11–14) has been leading up to. Such a move would also disrupt the common talionic pattern of 15–16 which forcefully expresses "the principle of correspondence of sin and punishment" (Miller 1982:130).[12] Accordingly, 'Edom' is regarded as the antecedent of 'you' (singular) in 15b (as in 11–14), an interpretation that is supported by a corresponding third person reference, made explicit and doubled, in the strophic closure of 18. 'Edom' is then transformed (16a) into the iniquitous archetype of all anti-YHWHist forces ('you' plural) who will one day have to 'drink' a punishment that is commensurate with the impious nature of their crimes of opposition to divine rule and the persecution of God's people.

---

[10] The *kî* also functions as the formulaic introduction to the "verdict" portion (i.e., following the "indictment") of a typical "prophecy of punishment" (Long 1991:309).

[11] Suggested, for example, in Mason (1991:100), Allen (1976:159), and Wolff (1986:37).

[12] For another, thematic argument for leaving the text as is, see Robinson (1988:94).

There is thus a modification from retributive (15b) to distributive (16a) divine justice as far as 'Edom' is concerned (Niehaus 1993:535–6). This important thematic notion is highlighted through the parallelism evident in these verses and also phonologically in the *ā-û* assonance created by the sequence of converted perfect verbs. Some commentators see the 'you' (pl.) in 16a as referring to Judah, a notion supported by intertextual parallels, most notably Isa. 51:17–23 (cf. Pss. 60:3; 75:8) (Miller 1982:130). It could well be, however, that the reference is purposefully ambiguous: Edom 'drank' the sweet wine of victory even as Judah 'drank' the dregs of defeat (Stuart 1987:420), but the tables would one day be turned.

Edom's future desolation is depicted by means of a pair of conventional oracular figures: first, as just noted, in the ironic imagery of 'drinking' (*šth*) the cup of the LORD's wrath (15–16), and second in the stark reference to being burned up by the 'fire' (*'ēš*) 'of Joseph' (18). Both of these internal segments end on a climactic note through a prediction of Edom's inevitable demise, viz., (literally): 'they will become as though they had never been' (16d), and 'there will not be any survivor for the house of Esau' (18e). But such was clearly a fate befitting the people who ruthlessly dared to 'cut down...the survivors' of Judah (cf. 14, another example of structural epiphora). The impact of this intense, inauspicious message is further heightened syntactically, i.e., by lexical recursion in 16 and parallelism in 18.

The focal term 'survivor(s)' (*śārîd*), which serves as the basis for another expression of the principle of equivalent retribution involving 'Judah' and 'Esau', is an obvious indicator of closure (cf. 14b and 18c; an example of iterative epiphora). It would appear, however, in the light of 17 and the delimiting verses of the following strophe (19–21) that the mention of 'no survivors' for Edom should be construed hyperbolically. In other words, even Edom would be granted at least a small 'remnant' (cf. Amos 9:11–2; Mic. 4:1–5; Zech. 14:16–9). In conjunction with the preeminent 'day' and the performative 'speaking' (*dibbēr*) of the LORD, there is possibly another element in the figurative references to 'all [heathen] nations' (15a) and the 'house of Esau' (18c). As was suggested above, the latter may act as a focused synecdochic and symbolic representative of the former grouping, a notion that comes to the fore in the book's final strophe (19–21).

Carefully situated in the middle of the two denunciatory statements (15–6, 18) is a salutary prediction of 'refuge/survival' (*pĕlêtâ* 'deliverance'—NIV) for God's people (17). The latter term could also be rendered 'survivor[s],' thus linking up semantically with a similar

pair of words in 14 and another one (*śārîd*) in 18. This medial position in the discourse structure, coupled with the cluster of contrastive key terms that occur here for the first time (i.e., 'Mount Zion...holy...possess...house of Jacob...possession') and the unexpectedness of their appearance at this point, clearly mark 17 as the thematic peak of the entire book (though linked to the preceding text by the initial *waw*).

This was the essence of the message that YHWH wanted to convey to his faithful but fainthearted people through the prophecy of Obadiah. The prediction of an ultimate providential table-turning event is that kernel of good news which has the utmost significance and relevance also for his 'surviving house' of believers throughout the generations of time: All the vicissitudes of world history fall under the LORD's omnipotent but merciful rule, and he will one day make it possible for his little household (comparatively so) to 'possess' (*wĕyārĕšû*) their eternal 'inheritance' (*môrāšêhem*)—'in/on Mount Zion' of 'Jerusalem' (*yĕrûsālam*; 11, 20b), a place that serves as an emblematic designation of the past, present, and future Kingdom of God.

(19–21). This final strophe of the prophecy serves as its denouement in a sense after the dramatic revelation of 17. It elaborates upon the amazing notion of 'the house of Jacob possessing its inheritance' from its base 'on Mount Zion.' These visionary verses present several problems of interpretation, but the general thrust and intent of the Masoretic Text is quite clear as it stands if considered in relation to the discourse as a whole. The dominant motif of inherit(ance) is taken up from the preceding strophe (especially 17) and unfolded in a twofold, typically expansive figurative cycle: The dispersed people of God will one day be united and take possession of the entire land, in a manner that is strongly reminiscent of its initial invasion and subduing by ancient Israel.[13] This was simultaneously a covenantal as well as a messianic concept that is expressed here in two complementary ways.

First (19), the divinely established boundaries will extend out in all directions to approximate the territorial extent of the glorious kingdom of Solomon, i.e., south ('Esau/Edom'), west ('Shephelah'), north ('Ephraim/Samaria'), and west ('Gilead'). Even more broadly then (20), the later divided kingdom will be reunited and magnified as the exiles from Israel (who were once as deceitful and morally unclean as Canaanites—Hos. 12:7; Zech. 14:21) assume control over the northern regions (as represented by 'Zarephath' in present-day Lebanon). For

[13] Allen notes the frequent use of *yrš* 'inherit/(re)gain' in Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges (1976:169).

their part, the former exiles from 'Jerusalem'—no matter how far away they may have been dispersed, e.g., unto 'Sepharad' (i.e., Sardis in Asia Minor)—will take over the south country ('Negev'). The present concentration of historically significant proper personal and place names, which peaks out in a proximate juxtaposition of 'Zion' and 'Esau' (21), lends both formal (cohesive) and topical distinction to this concluding strophe of the Obadian vision.

Although its actual fulfillment in recorded world history is uncertain, the underlying message here, which is reiterated in augmented parallelistic terms for emphasis and conclusively summarized in 21, seems to be this: In the 'day of YHWH' and under his sovereign tutelage, the invincible 'army/host' (*hēl*) of the 'holy' place (*qōdeš*) (17, 20) will cover the entire globe and ultimately incorporate all those whom the LORD himself has chosen from among 'the nations.' The certainty of this astonishing prediction—a vision of spiritual, and ultimately celestial, restoration arising out of concrete physical and earthly imagery—is stressed by the intricate syntactic parallelism, centered in the activity of possessing, that runs throughout verses 19–20. The all-embracing, almost inconceivable scope of these words is indirectly suggested by the inclusion formed by the repeated reference to *negeb*, the barren semi-desert region to 'the south' of Judah, which is thereby given special prominence. This area formed part of the traditional domain of Edom, which was probably considerably expanded at the expense of Judah in the years immediately following the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. (Allen 1976:169). But this whole dominion would one day revert to the house of Jacob as the LORD worked out the miraculous renewal of his covenant through his ideal 'Judge-Savior' (*môšî'a*).

The latter interpretation comes to mind as YHWH, through his inspired spokesman Obadiah, provides yet another surprise for his audience in the final verse of his prophetic vision. 'Deliverers/saviors/judges' (*môšî'îm*), or in this context we might say emissaries (missionary-evangelists?), from his holy Citadel, 'the mountain of Zion' (*běhar ṣiyyôn*), will go forth to govern—in righteousness (cf. Ps. 22:28, 31)—even those who were once their most bitter enemies (opponents/oppressors) on earth, namely, those inhabiting 'the mountain of Esau' (*har 'eśāw*; cf. reiteration from 19 making an inclusion, from 18 an epiphora, and from 8b-9 an epiphora, i.e., the close of section I). The divinely orchestrated irony of these words is stressed by the parallel placement of the traditionally antithetical pair of names, *ṣiyyôn* 'Zion' and *'eśāw* 'Esau'.

In this totally unexpected way, the law of like retaliation expressed in such seemingly immutable terms at the beginning of this section (15b) and epitomized in the experience of Edom will itself be graciously reversed over the course of time by the mercy of YHWH. His saving kingdom is wide enough to embrace even the most wicked, as prefigured by those very descendants of 'Esau.' Hence, as is typical of the divine economy, it turns out that "now the loser is on the winning side" (Allen 1976:166).[14] This providential inversion of perspectives is further emphasized by the subtle contrastive inclusion that exists between the first and last passages of the book. In the former an 'envoy' is sent to exhort the 'peoples' to 'rise up' for warfare against 'Edom.' In the latter 'deliverers' are commissioned to assimilate 'Esau' too within the select circle of nations (19–20) which comprise the one 'mountain' ('house,' or family, cf. 17) of God.

Another convergence of thematically prominent items occurs in verse 21, both to mark the end of the prophecy as a whole, and more importantly to highlight the content being conveyed, in particular, that of the triumphant aphoristic close: 'and dominion belongs to the LORD!' This final line, which is exceptional in that it is half as long as each of the preceding five, complements the notion of 'the day of the LORD' at the beginning of this third section of Obadiah.[15] The meaning here clearly reflects and reinforces what was said at the book's peak in 17: One day YHWH's glorious kingdom of grace, centered on Mount Zion, will incorporate as part of its salutary 'inheritance' people from the clans of all rules and races, no matter how antithetical they may have been toward one another during certain periods of world history, i.e., those of 'Jacob' (including both Israel and Judah) as well as those of 'Esau' (Amos 9:12; cf. Zech. 14:16). In such a wonderfully paradoxical way, in this union of former opposites and opponents, the supreme sovereignty of YHWH will be most personally manifested. This is truly an event worth waiting for, even as it is an enterprise worth working for—hence the timeless significance also of the supposedly *minor* prophecy of Obadiah.

In conclusion, it is necessary to stress the importance of a thorough literary-structural study of the complete discourse of a given pericope of Scripture. While it may be true that "more than one cogent analysis

---

[14] On the benevolent implication of the verb *špt* 'judge'. see Wolff (1986:69).

[15] Proposals for relocating this distinctive line, especially on alleged metrical grounds, are unconvincing. It is rather presumptuous to claim that such a supposed "displacement" is the result of "later ignorance of the [original] strophic structure" (Allen 1976:164). Besides, from a rhetorical perspective, 21 makes better sense (or we might say: has a more powerful emotive effect) right where it stands (cf. Ps. 47:9; Jon. 2:9; Joel; 3:21; Mal.1:14).

of the book [of Obadiah] has been offered," and that "its logical unity would be evident under any of a variety of superimposed outlines" (Stuart 1987:414), it is not correct to assume that all of these proposals are of equal exegetical value or credibility in relation to one another. During the preceding compositional overview of the text, I have incorporated a number of comments of thematic significance that arise directly from the formal analysis. Furthermore, it does make a strategic difference where the larger breaks in a discourse are made, for such divisions inevitably influence one's perspective and interpretation—perhaps not in a major way, but significantly so nonetheless. For example, the decision to segment the discourse after verse 10 and to posit a structural-thematic peak at verse 17, complemented in verse 21, obviously affects how one views the organization of the message as a whole, not only with regard to form and content, but also in relation to the work's rhetorical development as well. In the final section I will give special attention to this latter, motivational aspect of the persuasive communication of divine 'prophecy,' to its intertextual dynamics in particular.

The Intertextual Component of Rhetorical Strategy in Obadiah

The finely crafted poetic qualities of the composition of Obadiah in Hebrew contribute a great deal to the communicative power of the discourse as an official proclamation from the LORD. The vivid manner of writing, the mode of direct speech in particular,[16] serves to enhance the clarity, definition, impact, and appeal of the work's specific semantic content and functional intent. In this closing portion of my article, I want to take a closer look at some of the rhetorical implications of this oratorical oracular style, as reflected not only in Obadiah, but also in many other prophetic books as well. Following Aristotle, *rhetoric* may be briefly defined as the art of verbal composition functioning as a deliberate technique of personal persuasion.[17] In order to limit the discussion, I will focus on one prominent dimension of the subject that is displayed in Obadiah, namely, the *intertextual* influence of other writings of the Hebrew

[16] The style as surveyed above reflects—perhaps deliberately so (i.e., to facilitate aural text reception)—features characteristic of dramatic oral delivery.

[17] We note that the text of Obediah manifests all three of the major functional types of Greco-Roman (classical) rhetoric: *judicial* (evaluative/judicative), *epideictic* (laudatory/denunciatory), and *deliberative* (hortatory/admonitory). For an application to Isaiah, see Gitay (1991).

Scriptures on both the generic and specific levels of stylistic arrangement (form) and thematic resonance (content).

Any discussion of the rhetorical and, specifically, the intertextual features of a given text must necessarily take the initial context of composition and communication into careful consideration, the so-called "rhetorical situation" (Gitay 1991:7). The historical setting of Obadiah's original message is particularly difficult to establish due to the almost complete lack of concrete facts (e.g., a note on the reign of a contemporary king) upon which to base such a reconstruction. In addition, the exact timing of events is hard to pinpoint even within the text because of the non-narrative pattern of tense-aspect use that is manifested. Thus "an extremely complex verbal sequence obscures the temporal reference" (Robinson 1988:90; cf. Allen 1976:149, 151). Furthermore, "nothing is known about the author beyond his name and that he received a prophetic revelation" (Finley 1990:339). That does not absolve current analysts of their responsibility toward the biblical setting and its worldview. It simply means that virtually all evidence, one way or the other, must be derived from the prophetic text itself, including a certain amount of perceptive, albeit suppositional, reading between the lines.

The discourse per se gives only a few indirect clues concerning its situational and compositional context. Nevertheless, the general contents of the book (especially the catalog of specific sins recorded in 11–14) as well as its overall style and affinity to Jeremiah 49:7–22 lead many scholars to posit a scene and circumstances in somewhat later proximity to the destruction of Jerusalem by King Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonians in 586 B.C.[18] As to which text is primary—whether Obadiah or Jeremiah or whether both are to be considered dependent upon either an earlier "third source" or a common prophetic stock—it is probably best to conclude along with Allen that "the issue is too complex to give a straightforward answer" (Allen 1976:132–3; cf. Mason 1991:90).

One contextual fact pertaining to the original event of communication is certain: Although the prophecy is for the most part addressed to Edom, it is hardly likely that any Edomite ever read, heard, or even knew about it. Rather, accepting the general situational setting specified above, the message as a whole was no doubt initially intended for the desolate, disconsolate, devastated, and dispossessed people of Judah, the former inhabitants of Jerusalem in particular,

[18] For further discussion on this issue, see, for example, Allen (1976:135); Finley (1990:341); Stuart (1987:416); and Wolff (1986:22).

wherever they might have been living in the early post-exilic period. It was in essence a familiar word of consolation and encouragement to the faithful remnant that still remained among them—those who still retained a positive theological outlook despite the almost total destruction and depopulation of their country and the loss of most of their land, which was symbolic of their national identity and special spiritual status as the people of God.

To begin with, this solemn word of judgment upon 'Edom' and all the wicked worldwide, coupled with a promise of the eventual restoration and resurgence of 'Mount Zion,' perhaps served a liturgical function in Jewish national prayers of lamentation.[19] Such services were apparently offered on a regular basis (cf. the book of Lamentations) by the faithful community in their current time of crisis and uncertainty about their past, present, and future relationship with YHWH.[20] A prominent part of the communal lament liturgy typically occurred after the people's complaint when YHWH (through the worship leader) would provide a divine response in the form of a conventional prophetic oracle of deliverance—to which the congregation appropriately would reply in words of confident hope, sometimes extending even to thanksgiving and praise. This acclamation of reverent trust constituted the concluding and climactic portion of the psalmic lament genre.[21] It may be then that the "oracle of Obadiah" functioned in this capacity, at least in its later history, namely, as a "prophetic cry of encouragement...uttered in the framework of the cult to assemblies gathered together for lamentation" (Wolff 1986:69).

Overtly, the first portion of Obadiah is a divine pronouncement of doom (or "prophecy of punishment"; Long [1991:309]) upon a particularly obnoxious neighbor, coupled with the distinct overtones of a dirge sung over a ravaged capital, Jerusalem. However, these intense poetic lines accomplish much more than make a superficial appeal to the people's desire for revenge—a literary means of releasing their pent-up emotions in a spirit of nationalistic fervor or *Schadenfreude*. Rather, a much more salutary purpose is evident: The prophet's words remind his countrymen, above all, about the justly stipulated precepts

---

[19] This is suggested by Wolff (1986:19) and strongly supported by Ogden (1982). However, Allen objects to this proposal due to "the strongly historical emphasis in the book" (1976:136).

[20] On the eschatological implications of the temporal indeterminacy that charaterizes Obadiah, see Robinson (1988:90–4).

[21] For an overview, see Westermann (1980:ch. 1.) For example, Psalm 60 may be segmented functionally as follows: 1–3 complaint, 4–5 petition, 6–8 divine response, 9–12 hymn of faith and hope of victory.

of the one and only Supreme Suzerain—YHWH, the sovereign ruler over all 'nations' (i.e., political and/or ethnic groups) on earth. As the oracle develops, his perfect justice is clearly portrayed in its two central and complementary facets. On the one hand, all who violate the principles of the universal covenant—that is, fidelity toward the LORD and mercy to one's fellowman—will eventually, but inevitably, be severely punished. That includes the chosen people of Judah-Israel, a notion expressed by the middle portion of the prophecy, which implicitly, yet no less painfully, calls this recent experience of divine judgment to their remembrance (11–14). In this respect, Obadiah's message stands as a renewed warning concerning the consequences of persistent sin and rebellion against the LORD's revealed will and ways.

On the other hand, all who remain steadfast in faith-fellowship with YHWH will receive his abundant blessing, as is symbolized by the promised land and all that is associated with this in the written *Torah*—that is, spiritual as well as physical prosperity in the LORD's chosen inheritance. Thus, after the first two sections of the prophecy integrate divine object lessons from the past and near future (1–10 and 11–14 respectively), the final section (15–21) cheers and reassures God's people with a certain hope of future revival and restitution, but only as 'holy' inhabitants of 'Mount Zion' (17) and redeemed citizens of 'the dominion of YHWH' (21).

The LORD has not forgotten or repudiated the 'house of Jacob' (17). But along with the glorious vision of an amazing inheritance to come, he is also tacitly, but sincerely, instructing them once more concerning the conditions under which such a possession would take place. This involves a reminder, both textual as well as intertextual, of the long-standing spiritual relationship that he has established with them as a divinely chosen people (cf. 17, 20–21 and Hos. 1:11; 3:5; 12:5, 9). This requires a total commitment which they in their Babel-like pride (not dissimilar to that of their arch rivals in Edom; cf. Hos. 12:8) had freely chosen to ignore and even to desecrate in the past—with disastrous consequences (cf. 15 and Hos. 12:2; 16 and Jer. 25:17–18, 28–29). In this connection it is interesting to observe how the later post-exilic prophet Joel adopted or adapted from Obadiah a certain general similarity in structure and theme in the composition of his dramatic call to repentance followed by a wondrous prediction of Israel/Judah's blessed prosperity at the time of YHWH's ultimate judgment of the nations.[22]

[22] For more details on the intertextual connections between Obadiah and Joel, see Wendland (1995:ch. 9).

Would the originally intended (implied) audience have been able to derive that much theological freight from this relatively short prophetic revelation? To this point, it is important to recall that Obadiah did not prophesy in a religious or literary vacuum. Though we cannot be sure about his exact place in the temporal continuum of Hebrew prophets, it is almost certain that the author was neither the first nor the last to carry out this inspirational ministry. As suggested above, a considerable overlapping with Jeremiah and his times seems likely. Thus Obadiah inherited an active, even if officially suppressed, prophetic tradition—probably in both oral and written, verbal and non-verbal form (i.e., religious symbolic action). This was the general situational environment and associated horizon of (religious) understanding within which he worked and which he could in turn assume was known by his addressees—whether or not they happened to accept its moral imperatives and to put its theological implications into practice. The manifold influence of intertextuality is therefore a factor of utmost importance in the analysis and interpretation of any prophetic composition, certainly increasingly so in the later works.

No fewer than six prophets dealt specifically with Edom in their oracles against foreign nations: Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Malachi.[23] On several occasions Obadiah's literary form indicated that he expected his hearers to be familiar with the particular quotation, paraphrase, figure, or allusion which he was utilizing and to agree with his traditional Yahwistic interpretation of it. This is evident, for example, in his unit-initial use of the rhetorical questions, the interrogative particle *hălô'* ('is it not so?'), and even the exclamatory *'êk* ('how?!') in verses 5 and 8. As Wolff (1986:49) observes, "Prophets not infrequently jog the memories of their listeners with phrases of this kind (Amos 9:7b; Mic. 3:1b, 11b, Hab. 1:12, Zech. 7:7...)." The whole basis for the LORD's accusation against Edom presupposes an understanding of the inimical history which had progressively poisoned relations between the two "brother" nations (10).[24]

These recollections of what was undoubtedly a still-active oral (and by this time probably also a written) tradition served to reinforce the point and impact of the current theological application, a function that Obadiah's own oracles would one day perform (e.g., 17 as used by Joel

[23] For a complete listing, see Stuart (1987:405–6). A more recent study of the various intertextual linkages is that of Dicou (1994).

[24] For a listing of the references to Edom in the patriarchal and royal chronicles of Israel, see Robinson (1988:89) and Wolff (1986:52).

in 2:32). Certain familiar judgment motifs are especially prominent in Obadiah, such as a divine call to 'battle' (e.g., Hos. 5:8; Mic. 4:13; Jer. 5:10; 6:4–6) against a 'proud' nation (e.g., Isa. 16:6; Jer. 50:29, 31; Zeph. 2:10), the wicked getting 'drunk' on their own punishment (e.g., Isa. 51:17–23; Jer. 25:15–29; Ezek. 23:31–4); or being burnt up like straw (e.g., Exod. 15:7; Isa. 33:11; Nah. 1:10). Allen draws attention to the crucial theological and larger thematic significance of the 'fire-stubble' imagery in the OT (1976:167):

> Over and over again, separately and together, [these figures] connote God's judgment of the wicked...Judah is represented not as a people who will act on their own initiative in working out their own questionable desires for revenge, but as the instrument of God by which his just verdict is to be executed.

There is even a rather close intertextual commentary on the whole situation in Ezek. 25:12–4. On the other hand, the book's salvation imagery is similarly firmly planted in prophetic tradition, notably the climactic notions of deliverance and inheritance involving alien nations in the land of Mount Zion (e.g., Isa. 2:2–3; 4:3–5; 11:10–6; 14:1–2), including Edom itself (Amos 9:11–2). The extensive affinity of Obadiah with Jeremiah 49 has already been mentioned, as has the correspondence with a number of noteworthy passages in Hosea.[25]

That is not all. Another strong intertextual thematic strand was available for immediate cognitive accessing from within the Pentateuchal corpus, in particular, the series of covenantal 'blessings and curses' that would accrue to those who respectively obeyed or violated the precepts pertaining to faith and life set forth for the holy people of God. It is interesting to observe, as Douglas Stuart points out, how the divine curses alluded to in Obadiah are predictively made to fall upon the pagan nation of Edom (or was it apostate, assuming a prior knowledge of the God of Abraham?). Such punishments had already been implemented against the closely related peoples of formerly 'Israel' and now 'Judah.' Edom's forthcoming decimation and degradation, for example, would fulfill the imprecations recorded in Mosaic passages such as Deuteronomy 28, quietly suggesting perhaps that this fraternal nation should have known God better. After all, it was YHWH as Judah's ally who was really aligned against them in righteous warfare (cf. Exod. 23:27–8; Deut. 7:22–3; Josh. 10:10–1). More specifically, the proud people's betrayal by former allies (7) and

[25] For a detailed listing of these parallels, see Stuart (1987:415) and Wolff (1986:39).

inability to defend itself (8–9) follow the pattern of the so-called helplessness curses (e.g., Deut. 28:25–9, 43–4, 62; cf. Stuart [1987:418]).

In graphic contrast, a renewed remnant of Jacob would one day—'YHWH's day'—enjoy such theocentric blessings as a reoccupation of the holy land (19–21; cf. Deut. 30:3–5) and a reestablishment of the sacred community of worship on 'Mount Zion' (cf. Exod. 15:17; Lev. 21:11–23; Num. 19:20; [Stuart 1987:420]). In this connection, as was noted above, it is important to recognize several prominent elements of Israel's lyric tradition, which are artfully interwoven into the texture of Obadiah (Mason 1991:107), especially in 17 and 21. Most likely sources in this respect are the royal psalms that laud YHWH's supremacy over all nations and gods (e.g., Pss. 47, 93–94, 96–99). This feature may have rendered the piece more appropriate for use as a divine oracle within a lament liturgy, as suggested earlier (cf. Wolff 1986:63). But it is equally possible that Obadiah incorporated such familiar cultic and liturgical motifs into his composition and significantly reinterpreted them to fit the present contextual situation of religious need in a revitalized message from 'the Sovereign LORD' (1a) (Allen 1976:137).

Such vital background information, available from the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, furnishes a helpful, indeed an indispensable, framework of interpretation for contemporary readers as well—assuming that they know their Bibles well enough. The rhetorical effect of cognitive and emotive reinforcement that is provided by these deliberately (perhaps also intuitively) interrelated passages, whether condemnatory or consolatory in nature and pentateuchal, prophetic, or psalmic in origin, is greatly diminished if they are not read in conjunction with one another (respecting, of course, their temporal or canonical progression and unique extratextual settings). A conscious awareness of the presence of such overt and covert strands of intertextual significance, coupled with a perception of the skillful shaping of the discourse, opens up for the careful interpreter a rich mosaic of meaning regarding the consummate 'day of YHWH' that resonates in varied degrees of amplification, shades of perspicuity, and levels of relevance throughout the Old Testament—and of course on into the New:

> The kingdom of the world has become
> the kingdom of our Lord
> and of his Christ,

and he will reign for ever and ever! (Rev. 11:15—NIV; cf. Obad. 21)

BIOGRAPHY

Ernst R. Wendland has a B.A. in classics and biblical languages, an M.A. in linguistics, and a Ph.D. in African languages and literature from the University of Wisconsin. Since 1968 he has been Language Coordinator for Publications of the Lutheran Church of Central Africa and instructor at the Lutheran Bible Institute and Seminary in Lusaka, Zambia. He is a translation consultant of the United Bible Societies, supervising translation projects in a number of Central African languages.

REFERENCES

Allen, Leslie C. 1976. The books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Clark, David J. 1991. Obadiah reconsidered. The Bible Translator 42(3):326–36.

Dicou, Bert. 1994. Edom, Israel's brother and antagonist: Obadiah and the other oracles against Edom, and the Jacob-Esau stories in Genesis 25–36. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 169. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Finley, Thomas J. 1990. Joel, Amos, Obadiah. The Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press.

Gitay, Yehoshua. 1991. Isaiah and his audience: The structure and meaning of Isaiah 1–12. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Huffmon, Herbert B. 1959. The covenant lawsuit in the prophets. Journal of Biblical Languages 78:285–295.

Klein, William. W., Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. 1993. Introduction to biblical interpretation. Dallas: Word Books.

Long, B. O. 1991. 2 Kings. The forms of Old Testament literature X. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Mason, R. 1991. Micah, Nahum, Obadiah. Old Testament guides. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Miller, Patrick D. 1982. Sin and judgment in the prophets: A stylistic and theological analysis. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.

Niehaus, Jeffrey J. 1993. Obadiah, In The minor prophets: An exegetical and expository commentary. Vol. 2. Edited by Thomas E. McComiskey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ogden, Graham S. 1982. Prophetic oracles against forign nations and psalms of communal lament: The relationship of Psalm 137 to Jeremiah 49:7–22 and Obadiah. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 24: 89–97.

Robinson, Robert B. 1988. Levels of naturalization in Obadiah. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 40: 83–97.

Snyman, S. D. 1989. Cohesion in the book of Obadiah. Zeitscrift fuer die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 101(1):59–71.

Stuart, Douglas. 1987. Hosea-Jonah Word biblical commentary. Waco, Tex: Word Books.

Thompson, John A. 1956. The book of Obadiah The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Nelson.

Wendland, Ernst R. 1988. The "word of the LORD" and the organization of Amos. Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics [OPTAT] 2(4):1–51. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

———. 1995. The discourse analysis of Hebrew prophetic literature: Determining the larger textual units of Hosea and Joel. Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen Biblical Press.

———. 1996. Obadiah's vision of the 'day of the LORD': on the importance of rhetoric on the biblical text and in Bible translation. Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics 7(4):54–86.

Westermann, Claus. 1980. The psalms: Structure, content and message. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Wolff, Hans Walter. 1986. Obadiah and Jonah: A commentary. Translated by M. Kohl. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

DOMAINS OF BIBLICAL HEBREW DISCOURSE AS A TRANSLATION PROBLEM

Lénart J. de Regt

ABSTRACT

A description of domains in a text contributes to better insight into the orientation of the writer as opposed to the orientation of the participants in the text. Certain interruptions in the text can thus be explained, as well as the different implications a rhetorical question may have. The opening of a subdomain and the marking of direct speech will be compared: they are not the same. Like direct speech, subdomains can be recursive. The use of imperatives in the different domains in Deuteronomy is briefly discussed. The article focuses on the translational implications of shifts from one domain to another as well as of the flowing together of domains.

Domain and Subdomain

A speaker (or writer) has his own perspective, his own conceptualization of reality. This conceptualization is referred to as his primary intensional domain (henceforth, primary domain). Rigter (1982:96) uses the term intensional domain "to refer to a domain of interpretation which has its own set of presuppositions and truth conditions, in terms of which propositions can be evaluated and interpreted..." A situation or action has its place in the chronological ordering of this conceptualization of reality. In the case of a primary domain the reader stands outside the text, although the writer will have assumed that the reader shares at least part of the writer's conceptualization of reality.[1]

In his primary domain a writer or speaker may make mention of persons who speak. These persons, then, are the speaker and hearer in a dialogue. Each of them has his own conceptualization of reality. These conceptions of reality are shared to a certain extent, depending on the dialogue. The conceptualization of reality which they share is referred to as a subdomain. That is, it is a subdomain embedded within the primary domain, with its own truth conditions and its own chronology and hence its own present. Thus actors from within the text assume the role of speaker and listener in a new domain. For instance, in 1 Kings 2:1–2 David and Solomon, actors in the narrative text, become speaker and listener in the direct speech text. The writer's

[1] Concepts from Rigter (1982, 1986) in connection with domain have been adapted and used for syntactic analysis of biblical Hebrew texts.

primary domain incorporates the new subdomain of the speaker and the listener in the text. Although these third person actors have their own perspective within the text, their domain and hence their perspective is thus influenced by the writer's.[2]

The persons mentioned in the primary domain may in their domain (subdomain 1) make mention of persons who in turn share a conceptualization of reality (subdomain 2). This is illustrated in 2 Sam. 14:5–7. Subdomain 3 and further recurring subdomains are possible as well.[3]

5c *wt'mr* (ipfc) And she said	pd	narrative
5d *'bl* Alas, I am a widow	sd1	discursive
5e *wymt* (ipfc) my husband died	sd1	narrative
7b *wy'mrw* (ipfc) And they said	sd1	narrative
7c *tny* (imp) Give up	sd2	discursive
(2 Sam. 14:5–7)		

The narrator's primary domain embeds subdomain 1 of the Tekoite woman who addresses David, which in turn embeds subdomain 2 (only created by the woman) of the whole family addressing the woman (de Regt 1983:251). When markers beginning a direct speech section are also present, then one must acknowledge that both the domain and the speaker's intention change. The world-creating verb *'mr* 'say' opens up a subdomain. The present of this subdomain 1 is not contemporaneous with the moment of speech, but is located at the time when the saying takes place in the embedding primary domain.

From present to past in the same domain. A situation or action to which a clause refers always belongs to the present domain. Within a domain it is always the same conceptualization of reality on which the speaker depends. For instance, an action in a domain may lie in the past of the speaker at the time of speaking. Yet it is part of that present

---

[2] This is, in different terms, discussed in Bar-Efrat (1989:41–5, 54–5, 65).

[3] Abbreviations:

coh: cohortative;	imp: imperative;
infa: infinitive absolute;	infc: infinitive construct;
ipf: imperfect;	ipfc: imperfect consecutive;
pc: perfect consecutive;	pd: primary domain;
pf: perfect;	pt: participle.
sd: subdomain.	

Abbreviations of Bible translations are in the references.

domain, as is an action in the speaker's present or future. Thus within the same conceptualization of reality the speaker's attention may shift from the present to the past. Within the Tekoite woman's subdomain 1 her attention shifts from the present to the past in 2 Sam. 14:5e. In the same way, within Solomon's subdomain 1 his attention shifts from the present to the past in retrospect in 1 Kings 8:24. This shift from present to past brings about a shift from discursive to narrative context. Another example is found in 1 Sam. 2:29.

29a *lmh tb'ṭw* (ipf) Why do you scorn	sd2	discursive
29c *wtkbd* (ipfc) and you honoured	sd2	narrative

(1 Sam. 2:29)

Because of this shift to narrative in 29c this line is probably not part of the question. The NJPSV has taken this into account.

> Why, then, do you maliciously trample upon the sacrifices and offerings that I have commanded? You have honoured your sons more than me, feeding on the first portions ...(1 Sam. 2:29 NJPSV)

From past to present in the primary domain. From examples like Gen. 32:32, (Hebrew 32:33) 43:32d–e (de Regt 1983:265–6) and 1 Sam. 19:24c–d one can conclude that the domain shared by writer and reader does not change when there is a transition from imperfect consecutive to imperfect without markers to indicate the beginning of a direct speech section (Talstra 1992:281). Within the same domain only the speaker's intention shifts from past to present. It turns the narrative into a kind of direct speech by the writer directed to the reader. A general truth of interest to the reader is pointed out which is not part of the narrative itself. Gen. 32:32 may also conclude the narrative (Talstra 1978:172). The writer is no longer a narrator at that point.

Another example is Esther 10:1–2, in which there is a transition from imperfect consecutive to participle *ktwbym* 'written'. In 10:2 an appeal is made to the reader's sense of history in a rhetorical question (Noss 1993:312).

1 Sam. 19:24e is part of the people's subdomain 1, but 24d is still part of the primary domain. Thus 24c–d contains a transition from past to present in the primary domain.

24c *wypl* (ipfc) and he lay naked pd
24d *'l-kn y'mrw* (ipf) Hence it is said pd
24e *hgm* "Is Saul also among the prophets?" sd1
(1 Sam. 19:24)

Domain Shift and Direct Speech

Shifts from one domain to another are to be distinguished from shifts to direct speech of a higher degree; they do not always occur together at the same time. An example like Deut. 15:11 shows that domain shift and shift to direct speech of a higher degree are not the same. Both 15:11b and 11c are part of Moses' subdomain 1.

11b *'l-kn 'nky mṣwk* (pt) *l'mr* (infc) Therefore I command you, saying sd1
11c *ptḥ* (infa) *tptḥ* (ipf) You shall open wide sd1
(Deut. 15:11)

Both these clauses are direct speech. In addition, 15:11c is an instance of direct speech within direct speech and is thus a direct speech of a higher degree.[4] Nevertheless, no domain shift occurs here because the speaker's conceptualization of reality in 15:11b and the same speaker's conceptualization of reality in 11c are not different. This is in contrast to Deut. 1:9a ('At that time I said to you ...') and 1:9b–c where the speaker of 1:9a quotes himself in 1:9b–c. Hence, in 1:9a and 1:9b–c the conceptualizations of reality are indeed different.

In Job 31:3, where a subdomain 2 occurs within Job's subdomain 1, the shift to direct speech of second degree is not marked.

Recurring Subdomains

Various examples of shifts from one domain to another will now be discussed.

Moses' first address, in Deuteronomy 1–4, provides instructive examples of the embedding of domains.

[4] The term direct speech of a higher degree has been borrowed from van Eijk. (1965:115–7). He devotes a paragraph to direct speech of second and third degree ("*directe rede van de tweede graad*" and "*directe rede van de derde graad*").

5a *b'br hyrdn ... hw'yl* (pf) *mšh* Beyond the Jordan ... Moses began	pd
5b *b'r* (pf) ... *l'mr* (infc) to explain this law, saying	pd
6a *yhwh 'lhynw dbr* (pf) ... *l'mr* (infc) The Lord our God said to us at Horeb, saying	sd1
6b *rb-lkm šbt* (infc) *bhr hzh* You have dwelt long enough at this mountain	sd2
9a *w'mr* (ipfc) *'lkm ... l'mr* (infc) At that time I said to you, saying	sd1
9b *l' 'wkl* (ipf) *lbdy* I alone am not able	sd2
9c *ś't* (infc) *'tkm* to bear you	sd2
(Deut. 1:5–9)	

Deut. 1:5a and b are part of the primary domain; 1:6a is part of subdomain 1 of Moses; 1:6b is part of subdomain 2 of God; 1:9a is again part of Moses' subdomain 1; 1:9b and c are part of subdomain 2 of Moses. Thus in this passage a subdomain 2 occurs in a subdomain 1 twice. In 1:6 Moses (subdomain 1) mentions God, who speaks in his domain (subdomain 2). In 1:9, however, both subdomain 1 and subdomain 2 are Moses'. He quotes himself in subdomain 2 (1:9b–c).

Deut. 5:28 is part of the second address in this book. 5:28c is part of subdomain 1 of Moses; 5:28d–5:30b is part of subdomain 2 of God to Moses; 5:30c is part of subdomain 3 of Moses to the people.

28c *wy'mr* (ipfc) *yhwh 'ly* And the Lord said to me	sd1
30a *lk* (imp) Go	sd2
30b *'mr* (imp) *lhm* and say to them	sd2
30c *šwbw* (imp) *lkm l'hlykm* Return to your tents	sd3
(Deut. 5:28–30)[5]	

1 Chron. 21:18 is another verse in which someone is ordered to pass an order on to a third party. By way of exception, however, no recurring subdomains occur there. 18b and c are still geared toward the speech event in 18a.

18a *wml'k yhwh 'mr* (pf) *'l-gd* And the angel of the Lord said to Gad	pd
18b *l'mr* (infc) *ldwyd* to say to David	pd
18c *ky y'lh* (ipf) *dwyd* that David should go up	pd
(1 Chron. 21:18)	

[5] 28d–30b is part of subdomain 2 of God, as already stated. It would, thus, not add anything informative if the quotation would include 28d.

Deut. 27:14–26 are a special set of examples, as is shown below.

14a *w'nw* (pc) *hlwym* And the Levites shall declare	sd1
15a *'rwr* (pt) *h'yš* "Cursed be the man"	sd2a
15d *w'nw* (pc) *kl-h'm* And all the people shall answer	sd1
15f *'mn* "Amen"	sd2b
16a *'rwr* (pt) *mqlh* "Cursed be he who dishonours"	sd2a
16b *w'mr* (pc) *kl-h'm* And all the people shall answer	sd1
16c *'mn* "Amen"	sd2b
17a *'rwr* (pt) "Cursed"	sd2a

(Deut. 27:14–17)

Within subdomain 1 of Moses, subdomain 2 of the Levites (sd2a) and the people (sd2b) occurs. The perfect consecutive clauses, i.e., 14a, 15d, and 16b, fall under subdomain 1. The participle clauses, i.e., 15a, 16a, and 17a, fall under subdomain 2a of the Levites. The elliptical clauses in 15f and 16c fall under subdomain 2b of the people.

It is clear that the curses in 16a and 17a are part of the Levites' direct speech as much as the curse in 15a. 16a and 17a are not to be connected to 15f and 16c. Although these clauses are all part of direct speech, 16a and 17a fall under (the direct speech in) subdomain 2a of the Levites, whereas 15f and 16c each constitutes a direct speech in subdomain 2b of the people. 16a and 17a are actually similar to 2 Kings 10:15 'If so, give me your hand' and the beginning of 2 Sam. 18:23 (Miller 1994:203–4, 233 n. 18) in that a quotative frame is lacking in the Hebrew text.

In Deut. 27:14–26, it is important that the translation keep clauses like 15f and 16c in sd2b separate from the curses in sd2a. Quotation marks can be used for the sd2a and sd2b clauses. Indentation (NIV) or a dash (NJPSV) can separate the sd1 clauses from the preceding curse. Readers and/or listeners should benefit from that. Alternatively, it may be necessary to provide quotation frames before *'rwr* 'cursed' clauses by repeating clause 14a.

Recurring subdomains in a prophetic context. Domain shift to recurring subdomains is, of course, an important feature of prophetic language. Prophets have been delegated to speak on another's behalf (Houston 1993:178). 2 Kings 1:6 and Jer. 19:1–3, for instance, contain four recurring subdomains.

6 a *wy'mr* (ipfc) And they said	pd
6b *'lh* (pf) There came a man	sd1
6d *wy'mr* (ipfc) and said	sd1
6f *šwbw* (imp) return to the king	sd2
6h *wdbrtm* (pc) and say to him	sd2
6i *kh 'mr* (pf) *yhwh* Thus says the Lord	sd3
6jk *hmbly ... šlḥ* (pt) Is it because ... that you are sending?	sd4

(2 Kings 1:6)

1a *kh 'mr* (pf) *yhwh* Thus said the Lord	sd1 (Jeremiah)
1b *hlwk* (infa) Go	sd2 (the Lord to Jeremiah)
3a *w'mrt* (pc) and you shall say	sd2 (the LORD to Jeremiah)
3b *šm'w* (imp) Hear the word of the Lord, O kings	sd3 (Jeremiah to kings)
3c *kh 'mr* (pf) *yhwh* Thus says the Lord	sd3 (Jeremiah to kings)
3d *hnny* Behold, I	sd4 (the Lord to kings)

(Jer. 19:1–3)

In translation this is likely to result in an uncomfortably deep nesting. The TEV ('The Lord told me to go ... to say, "Kings ... listen to what I, the Lord ... have to say. I ..."') has quite radically reduced the number of recurring subdomains in Jer. 19:1–3 to two.

a *hnny šlḥ* (pt) See, I send my messenger	sd1
g *'mr* (pf) says the Lord of hosts	pd

(Mal. 3:1)

Mal. 3:1 is in itself a fairly straightforward example. Mark 1:2, however, only quotes from the sd1 part of this verse. The first person pronominal element may thus seem to refer to the prophet himself. To solve this problem, the Dutch *Groot Nieuws Bijbel* inserts a phrase 'says God' in the translation of Mark 1:2.

Recurring subdomains and rhetorical questions. In Job 21:14–5, Job in his subdomain 1 quotes the wicked (*wy'mrw l'l* 'and they say to God:...') in their subdomain 2. The rhetorical questions in Job 21:28

with the particle *'yh* 'where' are a quotation as well: it is put into the mouth of Job's friends in subdomain 2: *ky t'mrw* 'for you say:...'

In Job 31:3, however, the quotation is implicit: it is not introduced as such, e.g., by a speech verb, and could thus be described as free direct speech. As Gordis (1978:545) states about 31:3, a "virtual quotation" is used by which Job "presents the belief he formerly held in the justice of God, that served as the basis of his code of moral behavior". It may be necessary in translating to make this implicit start of the quotation explicit. This is what the Willibrord translation does.

2 And what is my lot from God	sd1
what does the Almighty decree from on high?	sd1
3 Disaster for the bad people – they say –	sd2
misfortune for all who do evil	sd2
(Job 31:2–3, back translation of *Willibrordvertaling*)	

The rhetorical question in 31:3, introduced by *hl'* 'is it not?', constitutes the answer to the rhetorical question in 2. But it depends on the subdomain what this answer implies. Within subdomain 2 of the people, the implication of the rhetorical question in verse 3 is indeed that it is "expected to be answered in the affirmative" (Brongers 1981:179), hence the above translation as a positive statement. From Job's point of view in subdomain 1, however, the rhetorical question has a negative bias, implying that it is a virtual quotation of a certain opinion which he doubts. Although there are no markers of direct speech of second degree in Job 31:3, one must acknowledge that both the domain and the speaker's intention change. The *Willibrordvertaling* has left both subdomains intact. The BML has achieved the same by using the subjunctive form *Wäre*.

> Wäre es nicht Verderben für den Ungerechten und Unglück für den übeltäter? 'Would it not be ruin for the unrighteous and disaster for the wrongdoer?'
> (Job 31:3 BML)

Obadaiah 3 contains an example of an explicit quotation again: the Lord puts a rhetorical question into the mouth of Edom.

3c *'mr* (pt) *blbw* Who says in his heart	sd2
3d *my ywrdny* (ipf) Who can pull me down to the ground?	sd3

4c *mšm 'wrydk* (ipf) From there I shall pull you down (Obad. 3) sd2

In 4c the Lord himself gives the answer to the rhetorical question (Clark and Mundhenk 1982:11). The answer is thus not given in the same subdomain as the questioner's.

Recurring subdomain shown by pronominal or inflectional elements. Deuteronomy is an interesting corpus with its different domains. On the one hand, Deuteronomy points to a clear distinction between Moses and the narrator. On the other hand, the addresses and the narrator's information are presented simultaneously so that they flow together (Polzin 1980:70). It is not always easy to distinguish within the text between what the writer says and what the participants say. Consider Deut. 10:6–9. These verses are part of the writer's primary domain and interrupt Moses' second address in subdomain 1. In 10:8e, for instance, the expression *'d hywm hzh* 'to this day' seems to be part of the information given by the narrator to the reader. It seems unlikely, however, that 10:9c 'as the Lord your God promised him' is something intended by the narrator for the reader. Rather, it is conceivable that is is not the narrator but Moses who speaks to the people in subdomain 1 about *'lhyk* 'your God'. It would thus seem possible to detect characteristics of the narrator's language in the addresses, and vice versa (Polzin 1980:29).

This principle may also apply to passages in which the speech of different persons occurs. In Deuteronomy 11 and 29 there is a clear distinction between what Moses says and what God says. At the same time, however, "the discourse of Moses [is] passing insensibly into that of God" (Driver 1901:99). God speaks in 7:4a, 11:13–5, 28:20f and 29:4–5; at least, this is how Moses presents him during an address. These passages are part of subdomain 2 of God. The clauses before and after them are part of subdomain 1 of Moses. Domain shift is thus involved. It is only clear from pronominal elements in these passages and from their meaning that it must be God who speaks (in subdomain 2), as there are no clauses that introduce his words. These pronominal elements cannot refer to Moses. Compare the first person pronominal elements in Deut. 7:4a *m'ḥry* 'from following me', 11:13b *mṣwty* 'my commandments', 11:14a and 15a *wntty* (pc) 'and I will give', 28:20f *'zbtny* (pf) 'you have forsaken me' and 29:4a, 5d. Given Driver's

observation, these passages are not simply examples of separate virtual quotations in free, i.e., unintroduced, direct speech.

3a *wl'-ntn* (pf) *yhwh lkm* but the Lord has not given you	sd1
4a *w'wlk* (ipfc) *'tkm* and I have led you forty years in the wilderness	sd2
5c *lm'n td'w* (ipf) that you may know	sd2
5d *ky 'ny yhwh 'lhykm* that I am the Lord your God	sd2
6a *wtb'w* (ipfc) And when you came to this place	sd1

(Deut 29:3-6)

Verses 4 and 5 are considered part of subdomain 2 of God. The clauses before and after these verses belong to Moses' own words, to his address in subdomain 1. In these passages, domain shifts have been assumed because in these passages God speaks (subdomain 2); that is, he is somehow presented as doing so by Moses. At the same time, however, these passages are integral parts of Moses' subdomain 1, as they are not presented as quotations of God's words. It is only clear from pronominal elements in these passages and from their meaning, that domain shift (from subdomain 1 of Moses to subdomain 2 of God) is involved. It should be borne in mind that speeches of different domains may still flow together. While it would be artificial to mark passages like these in translation by using quotation marks, these considerations do not contradict the domain shifts in these passages as such. In translation it thus seems attractive to set off Deut. 11:13–5 and 29:4–5, which are long enough, as paragraphs of their own. The NIV does this with 11:13–5, and the NJPSV does it with 29:4–5.

Such instances of domain shift and the flowing together of the different domains are lost on the reader when in translation the Lord is referred to in third person rather than in first person pronouns. This translation technique was already used in, e.g., the Septuagint in 11:13b, 14a, 15a, 28:20f, and 29:4a, 5d. In line with this the TEV and the GrNB make reference to the Lord with third person rather than first person pronouns in 29:4a and 5d. More constructively, the BML has only done this in 4a.

> Er hat euch vierzig Jahre ... wandern lassen ...
> ... dass ich der Herr, euer Gott, bin. 'He has made you wander...for forty years...
> ...that I am the LORD, your God.'Deut 29:4-5 BML

While this makes clear that it is the Lord who led his people in the wilderness, the first person pronoun in 5d leaves the domain shift intact.

Domains flowing together in a prophetic context. The flowing together of domains is frequent in prophetic language as well, for instance, in Amos 3:1.

1a *šm'w* (imp) Hear this word	sd1
1b *'šr dbr* (pf) that the Lord has spoken against you...against the whole family	sd1
1c *'šr h'lyty* (pf) that I brought out of the land of Egypt	sd2
1d *l'mr* (infc) saying	sd1
2a *rq 'tkm yd'ty* (pf) Only you have I known	sd2
(Amos 3:1–2)	

3:2a shows a shift to direct speech of second degree as well as a shift to subdomain 2 of the Lord. But the shift to subdomain 2 of the Lord is already shown in 1c by the first person pronominal element on the verb: in this relative clause it is the Lord who speaks. Verse 1c does not contain a virtual quotation; it is not an example of free direct speech. Rather, in this verse the words of different domains seem to flow together. Because the Lord is quoted in 2a onward anyway, there is no problem in translating the verb in 1c into a third person verb. This is done in the REB and TEV ('...that he brought out of Egypt').

Exod 7:14–7 contains three recurring subdomains, but the speaking of the Lord and of his messenger Moses in the different subdomains flows together in 17b–d. The subject changes from the Lord in 17b–c back to Moses in 17d.

14a *wy'mr* (ipfc) And the Lord said to Moses	pd
16a *w'mrt* (pc) and you will say to him	sd1
16b *YHWH...šlḥny* (pf)...l*'mr* (infc) The Lord...has sent me to you, saying	sd2
16c *šlḥ* (imp) *'t-'my* Let my people go	sd3
16e *whnh l'-šm't* (pf) *'d-kh* But you have not paid heed until now	sd2
17a *kh 'mr* (pf) Thus says the Lord	sd2
17b–c *bz't td'* (ipf) By this you shall know that I am the Lord	sd3

17d *hnh 'nky mkh* (pt) See, I will strike the water
with this staff sd2
(Exod. 7:14–7)

As Childs (1974:128) correctly says, this phenomenon "lies in the nature of the material and cannot be avoided by means of artificial punctuation". The NEB, NJPSV, and NRSV (not the RSV) have included such artificial quotation marks at this point.

So now the Lord says, "By this you shall know that I am the Lord." With this rod...I shall now strike
(Exod. 7:17 NEB)

The *Revised English Bible*, which is the NEB revision, has left out these quotation marks. Similar punctuation problems have to be dealt with in, e.g., Joel and Zechariah.[6] Where, if at all, are the words of the Lord to be treated as a recurring subdomain in the prophet's domain? This poses no problem in Joel 2:25–7 (free direct speech), 2:12, and 2:19–20, where punctuation marks are used by Buber-Rosenzweig, NJPSV, NJB and NIV. It becomes more difficult in 3:1–5 and 4:1–21, and the NJPSV is right in not using them there. If one uses punctuation marks for 3:1–3 only (BJ, NJB), the literary unity of 3:1–5 will be damaged. If they are used for 3:1–5 as a whole (NIV, GrNB, TEV), it becomes strange that the Lord refers to himself in third person in 4–5. For comparison, Joel 3:1–5 (or 2:28–32) is quoted here from the BJ and NIV.

1..'Après cela je répandrai mon Esprit sur toute chair sd2
3 Je produirai des signes dans le ciel et sur la terre, ' sd2
4 Le soleil se changera en ténèbres, sd1
avant que ne vienne le jour de Yahvé, sd1
5 Tous ceux qui invoqueront le nom de Yahvé seront sauvés, sd1
comme l'a dit Yahvé... sd1
(Joel 3:1–5 BJ)

[6] Of course, punctuation marks can be used more easily where there is normal dialogue between speaker and addressee in prophetic books, e.g., in Zech. 1:9–10 and 11–12. But domains start to flow together in 14.

28 And afterward, I will pour out my Spirit on all people sd2
30 I will show wonders in the heavens and on the earth, sd2
31 The sun will be turned to darkness sd2
before the coming of the...day of the Lord sd2
32 And everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved; sd2
as the Lord has said... sd2
(Joel 2:28–32 NIV; closing quotation marks in 3:8)

And in Joel 4 it would be even more artificial than in Joel 3 to try to separate a recurring subdomain of the Lord from the domain of the prophet.[7] Childs' comment also applies here. The flowing together of domains seems characteristic of texts in which the major participant remains the same (the respective prophets in the Prophets, Moses in Deuteronomy). In his domain this major participant does not at all distance himself from what he describes or quotes.

Similarly, in John 3:1–21 it is in the end impossible to attribute a certain number of verses to Jesus in his sd1 and a certain number (e.g., 13–21 or 16–21) to the evangelist in his pd. "Jesus' words come to us through the channels of the evangelist's understanding" (Brown 1966:149). While it is Jesus who is presented as speaking (ibid.), the dialogue develops into a monologue after 3:11 which works with the ideas of the prologue in chapter 1 (Dodd 1953:305).

Interruption by Clauses of the Embedding Domain

In Judg. 20:27–8 the quotative frame, i.e., the introduction to direct speech, is split by a narrative remark:

27a *wyš'lw* (ipfc) And the people...inquired of the Lord pd
27b *wšm* (for there the ark pd
28a *wpynḥs...'md* (pt) And Phinehas...ministered) pd
l'mr (infc) saying pd
(Judg. 20:27–28)

---

[7] Compare the contrasting views on Joel 4. Deissler (1981:83): "*Der Gesamttext ist trotz gelegentlicher Nennung Jahwehs in 3.* Person (vgl. 14.16) *als Gottesrede stilisiert, in der Jahwe als Ankläger und Richter gegen die Völker auftritt. Sie ist nur in 11b durch eine Bitte des Propheten kurz unterbrochen.*" 'Although the passage occasionally mentions Jahweh in third person (compare vv. 14 and 16) it takes the shape of a speech by Jahweh in which He appears as the accuser and judge of the nations. This speech is only interrupted briefly in v. 11b by a request from the prophet.' Allen (1976:42) on section 13–21: "[C]onsists of three strophes, in all of which both Yahweh and the prophet speak."

Reading this passage can be facilitated by translating *l'mr* with a new clause: 'They asked' (NIV). This is still an example of an interruption by clauses in the same domain. Other such examples are Deut. 5:4–5 and 2 Sam. 7:7 (Miller 1994:203, 232 n. 16) in subdomain 1 and subdomain 3, respectively.

Clauses in a subdomain can, however, be interrupted by the domain in which the subdomain is embedded. A clause in a subdomain may thus be interrupted by the primary domain of the writer. This is the case in Exod. 4:4 where 4d–f as well as 4a are part of the primary domain.

4a *wy'mr* (ipfc) *yhwh* And the Lord said to Moses	pd
4b *šlḥ* (imp) *ydk* "Put out your hand	sd1
4c *w'ḥz* (w-imp) *bznbw* and take it by the tail"	sd1
4d *wyšlḥ* (ipfc) *ydw* So he put out his hand	pd
4e *wyḥzq* (ipfc) *bw* and caught it	pd
4f *wyhy* (ipfc) *lmṭh* and it became a rod in his hand	pd
5a *lm'n y'mynw* (ipf) "that they may believe	sd1
5b *ky-nr'h* (pf) *'lyk yhwh* that the Lord...has appeared to you"	sd1

(Exod. 4:4–5)

Similarly, in 1 Sam. 9:27 the writer interrupts Samuel's direct speech in order to deal with the servant, the minor participant. The servant's obeying the order to go is mentioned here in 27e rather than at the end of the direct speech.

9b *wšmw'l 'mr* (pf) And Samuel said to Saul	pd
9c *'mr* (imp) "Say to the boy	sd1
9d *wy'br* (w-ipf) that he passes on before us"	sd1
9e *wy'br* (ipfc) And he passed on	pd
9f *w'th 'md* (imp) "But you stand"	sd1

(1 Sam. 9:27)

Such interruptions of direct speech in a certain domain are not uncommon in Hebrew. There is thus no reason to treat *wy'br* (ipfc) as a subordinate clause, which is what the NRSV does.

"Tell the boy to go on before us, and when he has passed on, stop here yourself..."
(1 Sam. 9:27 NRSV)

The NIV, TEV, GrNB and BML have rendered this line in a similar fashion. However, in an English translation at least, this would not seem advisable. The TEV translation of 9:27e ('The servant left, and Samuel continued...'; compare also REB) makes the interruption of the direct speech too long for the emphatic pronoun *'th* 'you' to be effective. If the interruption in 27e cannot be rendered as such in the receptor language, an alternative may be to move its translation to the beginning of the next verse, as in GrNB: 'When the servant had gone further...' (back translation).

Sometimes in translation the direct speech may have to be introduced by a quotative clause after the interruption.

"This", said the Lord, "is to convince the people..."
(Exod. 4:5a REB)

In the following passages subdomain 1 is interrupted by explanatory remarks of the writer. Deut. 3:8 and 10 are part of Moses' subdomain 1 and are interrupted in 9 by the writer's primary domain. To make this clear, the REB has put 9 in brackets.

9a *ṣydnym yqr'w* (ipf) *lrmwn śryn* the Sidonians call Hermon Sirion — pd
9b *wh'mry yqr'w* (ipf) *-lw śnyr* while the Amorites call it Senir — pd
(Deut. 3:9)

In Josh. 13:1–7 the words of the Lord in subdomain 1 are interrupted by the redactor's explanations in his primary domain.

1b *wy'mr* (ipfc) And the Lord said to him — pd
1c *'th zqnt* (pf) You are old — sd1
1e–f *wh'rṣ nš'rh* (pf) and very much land remains to be possessed — sd1
2a *z't h'rṣ hnš'rt* (pt) This is the land that remains — pd
6b *'nky 'wryšm* (ipf) I will myself drive them out — sd1
7a *w'th ḥlq* (imp) And now, divide this land — sd1
(Josh. 13:1–7)

In 2a–6a, at least the following elements are explanatory interruptions by the writer: most of 3 ('from the Shihor...reckoned as Canaanite...five rulers of the Philistines...the Ekronite'),[8] and part of 4 ('which belongs to the Sidonians'). The list of regions and peoples as such may still be part of what the Lord says in subdomain 1, but this is unlikely. Instead, the words of 2a are to be seen as a characteristic introduction to an insertion which then continues till 6a (Kroeze 1968:157–8). The purpose of the insertion of 2a–6a was to put this wide definition of the land of Canaan in the context of the Lord's command to Joshua.

Interruption by clauses of the embedding subdomain. As the following examples show, a clause in a subdomain may also be interrupted by another subdomain in which it is embedded.

a *wb'* (pc) And if the sign or wonder come to pass	sd1
b *'šr-dbr* (pf) *'lyk* which he tells you	sd1
a *l'mr* saying	sd1
c *nlkh* (coh) Let us go after other gods	sd2
d *'šr l'-yd'tm* (pf) which you have not known	sd1
e *wn'bdm* (pc) and serve them	sd2
(Deut. 13:3)	

13:3a and b are part of Moses' subdomain 1; 13:3c and e are part of a prophet's or dreamer's subdomain 2. 13:3d is part of Moses' subdomain 1 again. So in Moses' conceptualization of reality, he interrupts what the prophet may say.

Both Deut. 3:8–10 and 13:3 illustrate, on the one hand, that the domain of one clause may overrule the domain of another clause. Thus in both examples domain shift occurs. On the other hand, the grammatical contexts in which domain shift occurs are different in these examples. 3:9 consists of independent main clauses. 13:3d, however, is a relative clause. Its antecedent in 13:3c is part of subdomain 2, whereas 13:3d belongs to subdomain 1. Thus relative clauses and their antecedents may belong to different domains (even when they constitute an expression[9]).

---

[8] Indeed put in brackets in TEV, REB, and NRSV.

[9] Compare 'to go after other gods which you have not known' in Deut. 11:28 (sd1).

Another illustrative example occurs in Deut. 13:7e and 8a.

7a *ky ysytk* (ipf) If entices you your brother...or your friend	sd1
7b *'šr knpšk* who is as your own soul	sd1
7a *bstr l'mr* (infc) secretly, saying	sd1
7c *nlkh* (coh) "Let us go	sd2
7d *wn'bdh* (w-coh) *'lhym 'ḥrym* and serve other gods",	sd2
7e *'šr l' yd't* (pf) *'th w'btyk* which you have not known, you nor your fathers	sd1
8a *m'lhy h'mym* of the gods of the people	sd1

(Deut. 13:7–8)

These clauses are part of Moses' second address in subdomain 1, except for 7c and d in subdomain 2. The object *'lhym 'ḥrym* 'other gods' (7d) in subdomain 2 is the antecedent of the following relative clause (7e) in subdomain 1. In 8a the prepositional phrase *m'lhy h'mym* in subdomain 1 is part of the object in 7d in subdomain 2. Subordinate clauses (and clause elements), on the one hand, and the clauses to which they are grammatically related (or of which they are an element), on the other hand, are not always part of the same domain.

Interruption by the embedding subdomain in a prophetic context. Jeremiah 29:30-2 contain such an interruption in 32b.

30a *wyhy* (ipfc)...*l'mr* (infc) The word of the Lord came...saying	pd
31a *šlḥ* (imp)...*l'mr* (infc) Send ...saying	sd1 (the Lord to Jere.)
31b *kh 'mr* (pf) *yhwh* Thus says the Lord	sd2 (Jeremiah to exiles)
31c *y'n 'šr nb'* (pf) Because Shemaiah has prophesied	sd3 (the Lord to exiles)
32a *lkn* Therefore	sd3 (the Lord to exiles)
32b *kh-'mr* (pf) *yhwh* Thus says the Lord	sd2 (Jeremiah to exiles)
32c *hnny pqd* (pt) Behold, I will punish...	sd3 (the Lord to exiles)

(Jeremiah 29:30–2)

As in Jeremiah 24:8, the formula in 32b marks a significant break and calls attention to the divine origin of what is introduced (Parunak 1994:506). In 32 the GrNB has translated: 'Therefore I, the Lord, shall punish...', thus sufficiently including 32b in the translation without interrupting sd3. The TEV has done this in 24:8: 'I, the Lord, will treat...'

Domains in the Prose of Deuteronomy

In the prose of Deuteronomy, 4.6% of the clauses fall under the primary domain of the writer.[10] The addresses of Moses (subdomain 1) are sometimes interrupted by this primary domain framework; in some parts God, (men from) the people, offspring, other peoples, and Moses speak (subdomain 2). Recurring subdomains occur only seldom to the extent that not only a subdomain 2 but also a subdomain 3 is involved.

Clause connections and domains. The two clauses of Deut. 4:44a and 6:1a are formally similar. After 4:44a, 6:1a is the first clause that is formally and syntactically similar to it.

Deut. 4:44a *wz't htwrh*
And this is the law pd
6:1a *wz't hmṣwh hḥqym whmšpṭym*
And this is the commandment, the statutes and the ordinances sd1

These clauses, though formally similar, are not part of the same domain. 4:44a is part of the primary domain. 6:1a is part of Moses' address to the people of Israel in subdomain 1. (This address begins at 5:1c in the text and is introduced by 5:1b, which is part of the writer's primary domain.) 6:1a (sd1) is found to be connected to 5:1c (*'t-hḥqym w't-hmšpṭym* 'the statutes and the ordinances';) (sd1). Clause connections in one domain are separate from those in the other domain.

[10] The primary domain occurs in 1:1a–1:5b, 2:10a–2:12f, 2:20a–2:23d, 3:9a–b, 3:11a–d, 3:13b–3:14b, 4:41a–5:1b, 10:6a–10:9c, 27:1a, 27:9a, 27:11a, 28:69a–29:1b, 31:1a–2a, 31:7ab, 31:9a–10a, 31:14a, 31:14g–16a, 31:22a–23b, 31:24a–25a, 31:30ab, 32:44a–46a, 32:48a, 33:1a–2a, 33:7a, 8a, 12a, 13a, 18a, 20a, 22a, 23a, 24a, 34:1a–c, 34:4a, 34:5a–12a.

Frequencies of imperative forms of verbs in subdomains in the prose of Deuteronomy.[11] In this corpus, the proportional frequency of imperatives varies strongly from subdomain to subdomain. This suggests that the type of discourse varies from subdomain to subdomain. Only 16.3% (547) of the clauses in the corpus directly belong to subdomain 2. It is thus remarkable that of the 95 imperatives in the corpus as many as 55.79% (53) occur in subdomain 2. The following observations may help to explain the relatively high frequency of imperatives in subdomain 2 on the one hand, and the remarkably low frequency of imperatives (95, only 3.1% of the verbal clauses) in the whole corpus on the other. In Deuteronomy, a text imperative in nature, imperatives would be expected to occur more often.

Reading through Deuteronomy, one observes that imperatives do not occur in clauses in which legislative rules are formulated. This applies to positive commanding clauses as well as to negative commanding clauses. For instance, the clauses with imperatives in 6:12a and 12:30a are not part of a legislative rule.

In addition, on the one hand, it is to be observed that many clauses in which legislative rules are formulated are part of subdomain 1. In subdomain 2, however, relatively few legislative clauses occur. Those clauses are to be found in 1:13, 16, 17, 5:6–21 (the Decalogue) and 18:20. On the other hand, imperatives occur seldom in subdomain 1 and often in subdomain 2. Imperatives are found in only 1.68% (41) of the verbal clauses in subdomain 1, but in not less than 10.77% (53) of the verbal clauses in subdomain 2.

It appears, then, that clauses in which legislative rules are formulated are not found in the same context as imperatives. They seem to be mutually exclusive in Deuteronomy. Imperatives are rare in subdomain 1, but occur quite frequently in subdomain 2. Subdomain 1 is highly legislative as regards content, whereas subdomain 2 is not. All this leads to a marked difference in the use of verb forms between legislative rules and commanding clauses in Deuteronomy. The two are not part of the same discourse type and may have to be handled differently in translation.

---

[11] See de Regt (1995:157–9) for a fuller discussion of this subject. The poetry in Deut. 32:1–34 and 33:2b–29 is not part of this survey. The figures on imperatives include imperatives that are preceded by *w-* 'and'.

Conclusion

Participants within a text assume the role of speaker and listener, and so constitute a new domain. The writer's primary domain incorporates the new subdomain. Recurring subdomains are possible.

Within the same domain the speaker's attention may shift from the present to the past, bringing about a shift from discursive to narrative context. It may also shift from past to present, turning the text into a kind of direct speech by the writer who points out a general truth to the reader. Shifts from one domain to another and shifts to direct speech do not always occur at the same time. Domain shift to recurring subdomains occurs frequently and is an important characteristic of prophetic language.

A clause in a subdomain may be interrupted by the primary domain of the writer or by another subdomain in which it is embedded. Subordinate clauses (and clause elements), on the one hand, and the clauses to which they are grammatically related (or of which they are an element), on the other hand, are not always part of the same domain. In a textual hierarchy, clause connections in one domain are separate from those in another.

It is not always easy to distinguish within the text between what the writer says and what the respective participants say. Sometimes domain shift is only clear from pronominal elements. In translation, passages where this occurs can frequently be set off as separate paragraphs, but quotation marks should be used sparsely when different subdomains flow together. The flowing together of domains seems characteristic of texts in which the one major participant remains the same.

Reading through Deuteronomy, one observes that imperative forms are rare in subdomain 1 but occur quite frequently in subdomain 2. Imperative forms do not occur in clauses in which legislative rules are formulated, even though the greater part of Deuteronomy is imperative in nature. Legislative rules and comanding clauses do not belong to the same discourse type and may have to be handled differently in translation.

BIOGRAPHY

Lénart de Regt read Semitic languages and general linguistics at Leiden University, where he completed his doctoral dissertation on

Hebrew linguistics in 1988. He currently teaches Bible translation in graduate and post-graduate programs at the Free University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

REFERENCES

Bible translations

BML. Bibel nach der bersetzung Martin Luthers: Bibeltext in der revidierten Fassung von 1984, 1985. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

BJ. Bible de Jérusalem 1986. Paris: Cerf.

Bücher der Kündung: Verdeutscht von Martin Buber gemeinsam mit Franz Rosenzweig. [1958] 1978. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider.

GrNB. Groot Nieuws Bijbel (Bible in Today's Dutch) 1983. Boxtel, The Netherlands: Katholieke Bijbelstichting/Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap.

NEB. New English Bible 1970. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NIV. New International Version 1978. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

NJB. New Jerusalem Bible 1985. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company.

NJPSV. New Translation of the Jewish Publication Society 1985. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

NRSV. New Revised Standard Version 1989. New York: Oxford University Press.

REB. Revised English Bible 1989. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TEV. Good News Bible: Today's English Version 1976. Glasgow: Collins/The Bible Societies.

Willibrordvertaling (Dutch Roman Catholic translation) revised edition 1995. 's-Hertogenbosch. The Netherlands: Katholieke Bijbelstichting.

Other works

Allen, Leslie C. 1976. The books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. 1989. Narrative art in the Bible. Bible and Literature Series 17. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Brongers, H.A. 1981. Some remarks on the Biblical particle *hl'*. Oudtestamentische Studiën No. 21:177–189.

Brown, Raymond E. 1966. The Gospel according to John i–xii, Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Clark, David J. & Norm Mundhenk. 1982. A translator's handbook on the books of Obadiah and Micah. London: United Bible Societies.

Childs, Brevard S. 1974. Exodus: a commentary. London: Student Christian Movement Press.

Deissler, Alfons. 1981. Zwölf Propheten: Hosea, Joël, Amos. Die neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg, Germany: Echter Verlag.

Dodd, C.H. 1953. The interpretation of the fourth gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Driver, Samuel R. 1901. A critical and exegetical commentary of the book of Deuteronomy. 3rd ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Eijk, van, H.P.A. 1965. Mededelingsvormen bij Arthur van Schendel: een stilistisch onderzoek. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

Gordis, Robert L. 1978. The book of Job: commentary, new translation, and special studies Moreshet Series 2. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Houston, W. 1993. What did the prophets think they were doing? Speech acts and prophetic discourse in the Old Testament. Biblical Interpretation 1(2):167–188.

Kroeze, J.H. 1968. Het boek Jozua. Commentaar op het Oude Testament. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok.

Miller, Cynthia L. 1994. Introducing direct discourse in biblical Hebrew narrative, In Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics, Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Noss, Philip A. 1993. A footnote on time: the book of Esther. The Bible Translator 44(3):309–320.

Parunak, H. Van Dyke. 1994. Some discourse functions of prophetic quotation formulas in Jeremiah. In Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Polzin, Robert M. 1980. Moses and the Deuteronomist: a literary study of the Deuteronomistic history, Part I: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges. New York: Seabury Press.

de Regt, Lénart J. 1983. Tempus in het Bijbels Hebreeuws, Glot 6:247–275. Dordrecht: Foris.

———. 1995. Domains and subdomains in biblical Hebrew discourse. In Narrative and comment: contributions to discourse grammar and biblical Hebrew presented to Wolfgang Schneider. Edited by Eep Talstra. Amsterdam: Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis.

Rigter, G.H. 1982. Intensional domains and the use of tense, perfect and modals in English. Journal of Semantics 1:95–145.

———. 1986. Time intervals and identity relations across boundaries of intensional domains. In Linguistics in the Netherlands 1986. Edited by Frits Beukema & Aafke Hulk. Dordrecht: Foris.

Schneider, Wolfgang. [1974] 1985. Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch. München: Claudius Verlag.

Talstra, Eep. 1978. Text grammar and Hebrew Bible I: elements of a theory. Bibliotheca Orientalis 35:169–174.

———.1992. Text grammar and biblical Hebrew: the viewpoint of Wolfgang Schneider. Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics 5(4):269–297.

Leviticus 26: Elevating or Terrifying?

Mary K. Houser Fox

ABSTRACT

This article discusses some of the linguistic forms in the three sections of Leviticus 26: the blessings, the curses, and the restoration. It looks at asyndeton and the use of certain particles. Markedness and marked verbal forms are discussed, along with chiasmus and repetition. The biblical author's method of introducing the audience's descendants as participants in the discourse is cited. It is noted that concluding verses of each section exhibit linguistic similarities, and other conclusions are drawn as to the patterns uncovered in the discourse.

Introduction

Reading Leviticus 26 in Hebrew recently, I was struck not only by the difference in content among its three sections, but also by some distinguishing formal characteristics. The three sections are: 1) the blessings (3–13), 2) the curses (14–35), and 3) the (limited) restoration (36–45).[1]

The first distinguishing feature is the length of the section. On the one hand, the blessings, formulated in one conditional paragraph, succinctly paint a picture of the peaceful and productive possibilities for an obedient Israel. The protasis section of the paragraph (the if clauses) has three clauses,[2] only eight words and no infinitive constructs,[3] while the apodosis section, (the then clauses) consists of thirty-one clauses and one infinitive construct.

On the other hand, the curses depict the destructive desolation of a disobedient Israel in a lengthy,[4] detailed series of five conditional paragraphs. The first conditional paragraph (14–17) has a double protasis using twenty-six words and two infinitive constructs. There are fifty-seven clauses in the apodoses of the curses section.

While the restoration section lacks the most obvious conditional element, *'im* 'if' (present in both the blessings and the curses), it

---

[1] Numbers throughout are to verses in Leviticus 26.

[2] The *clause* in this paper refers to any phrase with a finite verb, as well as verbless predications such as *wĕ'ên maḥărîd* 'and none shall make you afraid' (6) and *wĕ'attem bĕ'ereṣ 'ōyĕbêkem* 'while you are in the land of your enemies' (34).

[3] There are two infinitives in Hebrew, the infinitive construct and the infinitive absolute. See Gesenius (1976:339–355).

[4] Curses are almost always longer than blessings. Compare Deuteronomy 28 and other Ancient Near Eastern legal documents, and see Kitchen (1966:90–102). The bad outweighs the good in Jer. 31:28 as well.

retains some of the formal characteristics of the curses section. Repetition and restatement characterize both the curses and restoration sections, whereas the blessings are not as repetitive.

Particles abound in the last two sections, notably *'ap* 'also' and *gam* 'also', as well as *'ô* 'or' and *'āz* 'then'. Strict definition of these particles and codification of the rules governing their use have evaded grammarians for centuries. The lexicon (Brown, Driver, Briggs 1907) discusses *'ap* as present in "elevated prose," for which Leviticus 26 is the reference.

Though the style may be considered elevated (lofty, dignified), I did not feel elevated in my spirit as I read it. Rather I was reminded of a tired mother who has cleaned her parlor and dining room in expectation of important visitors. She then turns to her children to tell them not to ravel, rumple, or ruffle anything and, in detail, what will be the consequences if her conditions are not met. Having felt very strongly just the opposite of elevated as I read the curses, I chose to juxtapose the heights and the depths of Leviticus 26 in the title of this article.

To begin my study, I did a general overview of the chapter, looking at pre- and postverbal elements as well as at peculiarities like the use of particles and independent pronouns. I used a chart to help me see some of the features more clearly and readily, the seminal idea coming from Hymes (1981:309).

The chart has a line for every clause with the main verb of each clause occupying the center column of the chart, using the verbs to differentiate the lines. Such a format makes it possible to see easily what types of things come before the verb and what types of things after it, as well as to see the alternation of verb forms/consecution of tenses. The sample shows the beginning of verse 3 (though some vowels are left out for space reasons).

Sample Chart

waw	par-ticle	sub-ject	ob-ject	sub-ject	ad-verb	verb	par-ticle	sub-ject	ob-ject	sub-ject	ad-verb	notes
—	'im	—	—	—	*bḥqty*	*tēlēkû*	—	—	—	—	—	*-waw*
+			*mṣôty*	—		*tšmrû*	—	—	—	—	—	

Since normal Hebrew word order is verb + subject (VS) (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:159), any clauses with preverbal material will be considered marked[5] forms. Such clauses in Leviticus 26 seemed to fall

[5] Waltke and O'Connor (1990:56) give a simple definition of markedness: "In a paired opposition, one member of the pair is considered unmarked (i.e., simpler, shorter, more

very easily into categories posited for them in narrative by Randall Buth, as well as one suggested by Alvierro Niccacci,[6] so their terms are used in the discussion presented in this article.

The Blessings (3–13)

The blessings section is a conditional predictive juridical discourse which describes the idyllic conditions that will prevail in Israel if the people obey YHWH's laws. There is no temporal sequence in the blessings except that the blessings will follow upon Israel's obedience, so the order is logical. The author casts the discourse in the first person and has YHWH conclude with the only asyndetic (conjunctionless) clause in the blessings section, *'ănî yhwh 'ĕlōhêkem* 'I am YHWH your God' (13), followed by references to his liberation of Israel.

As is typical of predictive juridical discourse (Longacre 1994:51–2, 91–5), the verbs are either *weqatal* or *yiqtol* forms. The predominant pattern is *weqatal*, but a preverbal element generally dictates a *yiqtol* form.[7] The latter is the marked form, except when the preverbal element is a negative particle. The chart shows that of the thirty-one clauses in the blessings section, only five have preverbal elements and exhibit the *yiqtol* form. The rest are *weqatal* except for a negative existential clause in 6 and the other clause types in 13.

The protasis begins with *'im* 'if' (3) followed by two noun (N) + *yiqtol* clauses. A *weqatal* + object, *wĕ'ăśîtem 'ōtām* 'and do them',[8] concludes the protasis. The apodosis is introduced by a *weqatal*, the *waw* being known to some grammarians as the apodosis *waw* (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:526). There follows another *weqatal*, and then the pattern is broken by an N + *yiqtol*.[9] Not only is the switch to N + *yiqtol* a variation that can please the reader/listener, but it refers to a detail or part of the whole signified by the earth in the previous clause (see footnote 6).

'obvious', more 'natural'), while the other member is considered marked." It might be added that the latter is more 'difficult'.

[6] Niccacci (1994:122–3) says that the..."marked sentence informs on a detail...of an event or piece of information." Buth (1992:102, note 11) says, "The normal uses of X + *qatal*...are as comparative Topic (often with contrastive focus), time discontinuity, unit boundary, and Dramatic Pause." Leviticus 26 is a predictive juridical discourse. Thus, Buth's X + *qatal*, the marked form in narrative, becomes X + *yiqtol*, the marked form in the predictive juridical framework here considered.

[7] Andersen notes exceptions (1994:115, note 1).

[8] The same phrase occurs in Lev. 19:37; 20:8, 22; 22:31. It also occurs in Jer. 11:4, 6, and in the context of covenant and law.

[9] The triconsonantal root *ntn* 'to give' is the basis of the verb in each of the three clauses of 4. The same root occurs in 4, 6, 11, 17, 19, 30, 31.

In 5 there is another *weqatal*, 'The earth will give its produce,' then a shift to N + *yiqtol*, and back to two *weqatal* clauses again, 'you will eat your fill and dwell safely in your land.'

Verse 6 opens with a *weqatal* followed by a *waw* + negative existential participial clause, 'I will give peace in your land and none will cause fear.' There is a *weqatal* after that, 'And I will command the wild animals to cease from the land,' followed by a *waw* + N + negative + *yiqtol*, 'And a sword will not pass through your land.' The marked forms here give details or amplifications on the theme of peace (see footnote 6).

Verse 7 picks up on the sword motif with two *weqatal* clauses, 'And you will pursue your enemies and they will fall before you by the sword.' The motif of *ḥereb* 'sword', in the last clause of 6, may be classified as topic (see footnote 6). The author uses it three times in six clauses in verses 6–8, and it could be considered a metonomy for military blessings.

The chiasm in 8 should not be overlooked: *wĕrādĕpû mikkem ḥămiššâ mē'â ûmē'â mikkem rĕbābâ yîrdĕpû* 'And five of you will chase a hundred and a hundred of you will chase ten thousand'. *Rdp* 'pursue' forms an inclusion for the first two clauses, and the center of the chiasm is *mē'â* 'a hundred'. The last clause ends with *ḥereb* 'sword', and the part on military blessings is thus concluded.

Verse 9 is a string of four *weqatal* verbs, the last three of which are in the *hiphil* conjugation (sometimes called causative), first person common singular, with God as subject: *ûpānîtî 'ălê**kem** wĕhiprêtî 'et**kem** wĕhirbêtî 'et**kem** wăhăqîmōtî 'et bĕrîtî 'ît**kem*** 'And I will turn toward you and make you fruitful and multiply you and establish my covenant with you'. The suffix *kem* 'you' (plural) follows each of the four verbs. The emphasis is that God is acting on behalf of Israel and establishing his covenant with them. The repetition of verbal forms, YHWH as subject, and *-kem* suffix are striking. *Bĕrît* 'covenant', thematic in the Hebrew Scriptures, also attracts the reader's attention. The repetition, as well as the introduction of the covenant theme, suggest that 9 is the climax of the blessings section.

The next sentence (10), is again chiastic, with the root *yšn* 'sleep, dry, old' as the center. The verse begins with a *weqatal* and ends with a *yiqtol*: *wa'ăkaltem yāšān nôšān wĕyāšān mipnê ḥādāš tôṣî'û* 'And you shall eat old store long kept and you shall clear out the old to make way for the new'.

In content 10 differs from both the previous and following verses. Material or physical blessings are the subject of 4–8, while 9, 11–12, treat the metaphysical aspects of the relationship of YHWH and his

people. If 9 is the climax, then 10 would be dramatic pause (see footnote 6).

A *weqatal* clause at the beginning of 11 takes up where 9 leaves off. Again YHWH is the subject and Israel (*-kem* 'you' plural) is the object of the following prepositional phrase. A negative *yiqtol* concludes the verse.

Weqatal verbs with YHWH as subject form the basis of the first two clauses of 12, and again, have the second person plural object after prepositional phrases. The final clause, *wĕ'attem tihyû lî lĕ'ām* 'and you will be my people', has the pronoun *'attem* 'you' (plural) before the verb. The marked form here can be analyzed as comparative topic, simultaneous, with contrastive focus (see footnote 6).

'ănî yhwh 'ĕlōhêkem 'I am YHWH your God' is the verbless existential clause which begins the concluding verse of the blessings section (13). It has none of the characteristics of the foregoing clauses. It was cited in the first paragraph of the discussion of the blessings as having the only asyndetic clause of the blessings section. Only six clauses in Leviticus 26 begin with anything other than *waw*: *'im* 'if' (3), *'ap* 'also' (16, 41), *bĕ* 'in' (26) and *'āz* 'then' (twice in 34); but there are only three completely asyndetic clauses: 13, 35, and 45. Here the asyndeton draws the attention of the reader/listener.

In the Pentateuch variations on this first person statement of God's being occur starting in Exod. 6:8 and are especially common in Leviticus (11:44–5; 18:2, 4, 5, 30; 19:2, 3, 10, 12, 16, 18, 25, 28, 32, 34, 36, 37; 20:24; 21:12; 22:8, 9, 30, 33; 23:22, 43; 25:38, 55; 26:1, 2, 13, 45). They occur also in Numbers (3:13; 3:45; 10:10; 14:35; 15:41). The statement is sometimes accompanied by a reference to God's freeing the Israelites from slavery (Exod. 6:8; Lev. 11:45; 19:36; 20:33; 23:43; 25:38, 55; 26:13, 45; Num. 15:41).

Next, in 13, comes the only relative clause in the blessings section *'ăšer hôṣē'tî 'etkem mē'ereṣ miṣrayim* 'who brought you out of the land of Egypt', as in Num. 15:41, etc. It is followed by the only infinitive construct in the blessings section, *mihyōt lāhem 'ăbādîm* 'from being their slaves'. There follow two *wayyiqtol* verbs (preterites, the only ones in the blessings section) referring to God's breaking Israel's yoke of slavery. Verse 13 is strikingly unique in its verb forms, its asyndeton, its verbless existential clause, and its relative clause. It stands out as the conclusion of the blessings section.

The Curses (14–35)

As noted before, the curses are much longer than the blessings. In the protasis of the curses there are twenty-six words, as opposed to the eight of the blessings. There is actually a double protasis (14, 15 have verse-initial *wĕ'im* 'and if'). There are four more obvious protases in the rest of the chapter, at 18, 21, 23, and 27.

Deictics such as *zo(')t* 'this' and *hā'ēlleh* 'these' (both in 14) contribute to the length of the protases, as do infinitive constructs (two in 15). Adjectives (*kōl* 'all', for example, 14, 15) lengthen them also. Some words and concepts introduced in the protasis are repeated and restated in the rest of the chapter. They are *šm'* 'listen, obey' (14, 18, 21, 27); *m's* 'reject' (15, 43, 44); *g'l* 'abhor' (11, 15, 30, 43, 44); and *bĕrît* 'covenant' (9, 15, 25, 42, 44, 45).

The apodoses are different from those of the blessings. There are approximately thirty-one clauses that form the apodosis of the blessings with five clauses exhibiting the marked X + *yiqtol* word order. In the fifty-seven clauses of the curses, only five have the marked order, a much smaller ratio than in the blessings.

While in the blessings a simple *weqatal* introduces the apodosis, in the curses the apodosis starts with the rare conjunction *'ap* 'also'. It is joined to the first common singular pronoun *'ănî* 'I' (16), which is also rare since in Hebrew the person is usually indicated in the inflection of the finite verb. The connotation is correlative (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:663). The emphasis is on the person indicated by the independent pronoun, in this case, the speaker. The accent *gērĕšayim*, an accent which one analyst calls 'very emotional' (Lode 1993)[10] rests on *'ănî* 'I'. The writer/reciter is demanding the attention of the reader/listener with some clear grammatical signals before going on to specific consequences of disobedience.

The following clause is a *weqatal*, *wĕhipqadtî* 'and I will visit you', a more usual form grammatically for an apodosis (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:526). The visitation will be that of terror and illness. Two participles describe the illness, making it vividly deadly. The final clause is unusual in that it contains the only instance in the curses of the object pronoun being connected directly to the verb.[11] The rest of the clauses of the paragraph are *weqatal* clauses.

---

[10] Lars Lode: information presented (but not published) at the Seminar on Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew sponsored by the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas, 1993.

[11] It is the root *'kl* 'to eat' that has the object pronoun here. I thought I noticed when I read through the Pentateuch recently that *'kl* has the object pronoun attached directly to it more frequently than other verbs. I did not keep an exact count, however, so such a

The next conditional paragraph (18–20) promises drought and poor harvests to teach (root *ysr*, 18, 23, 28) obedience. *Wĕyāsaptî* 'and I will increase' (18) is not marked grammatically, but the curses certainly reflect the theme of increasing punishment throughout, particularly using the favorite Hebrew number *seven* (18, 21, 24, 28). The root *ntn* 'give', used three times in 4 for blessings, is negated twice in 19–20, producing a striking contrast of curse to blessing. The final clause of the paragraph is marked for word order, with the subject coming before the verb.

A third conditional paragraph occurs in 21–22. The first half of the protasis, *wĕ'im tēlēkû 'immî qerî* 'If you walk contrary to me', though unmarked grammatically, bears comment because of its vocabulary. YHWH walks *with* his people as a blessing, *hlk* 'walk' (12), but YHWH and his people walk *against* each other in the rest of the chapter. Occurring only in this chapter, only in pausal form (with the accent thrown back to the first syllable), *qerî* 'against' must be noticed both for its uniqueness and its repetition (23–24, 27–28, 40–41). The clauses are not marked for word order.

The next conditional paragraph (23–26) repeats the *hlk qerî* 'walk against' theme along with the seven-times-increase idea. It is all made more emphatic, however, by the addition of *'ap-'ănî* and *gam-'ănî,* both with the sense 'I, likewise'. The six *weqatal* clauses of 24–25 give the sense of a rapid-fire succession of curses. The first temporal clause of the chapter begins 26. It concludes the conditional paragraph by giving a graphic picture of the curse of famine.

'Angrily contrary' (*ḥămat qerî*) is YHWH's response to Israel's obstinate refusal to listen to him in the fifth and last conditional paragraph (27–29). Its concluding verse is a chiasm: *wa'ăkaltem bĕśar bĕnêkem ûbĕśar bĕnōtêkem to(')kēlû* 'you shall eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters you shall eat'. The chiasm lends an icy chill to the prospect of the Israelites being driven to cannibalize their own children.

The next five clauses (30–31) use the form *weqatal* + object marker + object to predict YHWH's rejection of Israelite cultic practices. The concluding negative + *yiqtol*, although not a marked form, draws attention to the rejection. The reader/listener is also very likely reminded that the 'pleasing odor' (*rēaḥ nîḥōaḥ*) rejected here is like that which YHWH acknowledged as precipitating the vow never to destroy the earth again by flood. It is the olfactory accompaniment to

---

possibility must be left until another time. Longacre notes that the object pronoun connected directly to the verb is exceptional (1989:155)

the sacrifices of Leviticus (1:9, etc.), and that YHWH would refuse it would be a crushing blow.

The *weqatal* chains give the sense of a rapid-fire succession of curses, closely connected like that of the shots of a machine gun. Before the reader/listener can recover from the assault of one conditional paragraph of curses, another round comes shooting out.

While *weqatal* clauses dominate 32, 33 begins with the object you (plural), here emphasizing the addressee. Two clauses with *hāyâ* 'to be' conclude this, the last conditional paragraph. The final clause uses a *yiqtol* (marked) form to give specific information on the cities of the land referred to in the previous clause. The verb *hāyâ* figures in 12, 33, 44, 45, all of which are concluding verses.

The particle *'āz*, which begins 34, has most frequently been translated 'then'. While the listings for 'then' in English in *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* take up almost four pages, *'āz* occurs only one hundred thirty-eight times (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:658 note 43) in the Hebrew Bible. Of these, approximately forty-four are found in predictive or predictive juridical discourse. Of the forty-four, approximately nineteen form part of the conclusion or result of a discourse portion (Gen. 24:41; Exod. 12:44, 48; Lev. 26:34; 1 Chron. 22:13; Josh. 1:8; 1 Sam. 6:3; 2 Sam. 5:24; Pss. 19:13; 51:19; 96:12; 119:6; Isa. 23:33; 58:14; Jer. 11:15; 22:22; Ezek. 32:14; Mic. 3:4; Hab. 1:11).[12] Here in Lev. 26:34, *'āz* helps to mark the conclusion of the conditional paragraphs of the curses.[13]

Verse 35 continues the subject of 34, that of the Sabbath rests of the land, and concludes/summarizes it. It exhibits some remarkable formal similarities to the conclusion of the blessings, 13. Verse 35 begins without a conjunction, contains a relative clause, has a reference to past time (*lō(') šābĕtâ* 'did not rest'), and an infinitive construct (*bĕšîbtĕkem* 'while you dwelt'), all of which are true of 13. Such similarities may suggest features that frequently characterize summary/concluding statements in Hebrew. At least in Leviticus, asyndeton, especially with clause-initial *kōl* 'all', is part of concluding statements (Lev. 3:16c and 17, etc.).

---

[12]I say approximately because my study of *'āz* has been brief; a more serious journey into *'āz* remains for the future.

[13]It should be noted that *'āz* is used four times in Leviticus 26. Such a cluster is not unusual. Other examples are Isa. 58:8, 9, 14 and Jer. 22:15, 16, 22. The Concordance lists other possibilities, thus providing data for a future study. Gregory Klotz (1996) in a personal communication points out that with regard to Sabbath rests, it is important to consider Lev. 26:2, the verse preceding those I have studied.

The Confession and Promise of Restoration

This is the final section of Leviticus 26. The following paragraphs discuss features of this section and some of the ways in which it differs from the other two sections.

One difference involves the participants. The speaker never mentions the audience ('you' plural 1–39) again. In a manner of speaking, though they share the limelight with the remnant in 36–39, the speaker has gradually directed the audience to the side of the stage by 40.

It can be added cautiously that some grammatical features here are a bit more difficult to analyze than in the previous two sections. The consecution of tenses is complicated by a jussive *wĕtireṣ* 'let it enjoy' (43) and two *lō(')* + negative + *qatal* forms (44), which continue a predictive juridical discourse.[14] There is an anomolous conjunction *'ô-'āz* literally 'or then', although Brown, Driver, Briggs (1907:15) translate 'if perchance'. Trying to make sense grammatically of *bĕrîtî* 'my covenant' followed by the names of the patriarchs (42) is daunting.[15] Finally, in 44, one is quite surprised by the very emphatic *wĕ'ap-gam-zo(')t*, literally 'and also even this'. In spite of these caveats, however, a brief discussion ensues.

An incomplete construction, *wĕhanniš'ārîm bākem* 'and (as for) those who are left of you' (hereafter 'remnant') begins the restoration section and introduces a new participant. The third plural in Leviticus can refer to the Canaanites (Lev. 18:24, etc.), the Israelites of the exodus period (Lev. 7:38; 23:43, etc.), the priests (Lev. 7:36; 23:9, 15–16, etc.), and offerings (Lev. 23:20, etc.). In Leviticus 26, the author has cast the discourse in the first person with YHWH addressing the people ('you', plural) directly. In these verses, however, a switch to third person plural begins, and it is referring to the remnant.

The change to third person plural referent comes after the first verbal clause of 36, *wĕhēbē(')tî mōrek bîlbābām* 'and I will bring despondency into their hearts'. The remnant is tracked as third plural object or subject of verbs through 37, but the author brings the addressee back on stage through the 'you' plural object and subject of

---

[14] See paragraph 2 of the blessings section where the more usual forms are noted.

[15] Retaining the first person suffix on 'covenant', as here, dictates that a preposition such as *with* should be between covenant and the proper name, just as in Exod. 2:24, etc. Although *bĕrîtî* could stand by itself as in 44, the speaker lets the weighty names of the patriarchs stand with YHWH's covenant here. The unusual form is likely for emphasis. The Septuagent (LXX) omits *my* and Syriac adds *with*, according to the note in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartsensia* (BHS).

verbs too in 38. The alternation between the two participants in 39 can lead to confusion.[16] By 40, however, and thereafter, the audience is not mentioned explicitly. Verses 36–39 present a gradual introduction of a new participant to the chapter, the people of Israel who are left (the 'remnant') after the curses have gone into effect. The confusing alternation between person markers in 36–39 may be the author's way of making the transition to the new participant.

The remnant will confess *wĕhitwaddû* 'and (or but)[17] they will confess' their own sins and those of previous generations, *'ăšer mā'ălû-bî* 'in which they were faithless with me'. A second relative clause follows, *wĕ'ap 'ăšer-hālakû 'immî bĕqerî* 'and, indeed, those in which they walked against me' (see also on 21, 23, 24, 27). The astute reader will notice *'ap* 'also', less emphatic here because it is not linked to a personal pronoun, but nevertheless to be noted.[18]

Except for a difference in the Masoretic accent,[19] 41 begins like 16: *'ap-'ănî* 'I, in recompense'. YHWH declares the intention of walking against Israel. By accepting Brown, Driver, Briggs' (1907:15) 'if perchance' as the meaning of *'ô 'âz*, it is easy to understand the following clause as a protasis. The next clause, *wĕ'âz yirṣû 'et-'ăbônām* 'and then they will make satisfaction for their sins' is then understood as an apodosis.

God's covenant (*bĕrîtî* 'my covenant', three times) is so arrestingly presented that it is most likely the central, or climactic, verse of this section. It is linked with the names of the patriarchs and enclosed between two forms of *zākar* 'to remember' in 42. It is unusual that Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham are mentioned out of chronological order (compare Gen. 50:24; Exod. 2:24, etc.). There is no preposition between 'my covenant' and the proper names (Exod. 2:24, etc.). The use of 'I will remember' as an inclusion is poetic. Beside the foregoing formal characteristics, the covenant idea is one of the most powerful and ubiquitous ideas in the Old Testament. The final clause, *wĕhā'āreaṣ 'ezkōr* 'and I will remember the land', evokes another emotive and universal Old Testament theme, 'the land'. Upon reaching the end of such a verse, the reader/listener is fully at attention, and it may be considered the climax of this section.

---

[16] See the textual notes in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.*

[17] Grammatically the verb form is not disjunctive, but conceptually the idea of confession certainly differs dramatically from 14–39, so that the translaton 'but' is warranted. Niccacci (1994:127) writes that *weqatal* at the beginning of a text unit is "syntactically dependent," though Longacre (1994:51) would disagree.

[18] See also 39.

[19] *rĕbîa'* is the accent in 41.

The land and its Sabbath rests are the subject of 43, as of 34. The land will enjoy its Sabbaths while Israel makes restitution for sin. What a contrast.

All the clauses in 43 are marked. The verse begins with a *waw* + noun + *yiqtol* construction, the verb with the *niphal* stem. Here the *niphal* has an ingressive-stative meaning (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:386), contrasting nicely with the more dynamic (ibid., 1990:366) *qal* stem *raṣâ* 'enjoy' or 'make restitution for', 34, 41, 43. It is followed by a *waw* + jussive, *wĕtireṣ* 'let it enjoy'. The jussive may be understood as a blessing (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:569), again contrasting with the miserable lot of Israel.

The next clause, *waw* + pronoun + *yiqtol* + direct object, affirms 41's condition that Israel make restitution for sin. It has a semi-chiastic structure, its center a third plural pronominal suffix (*-hem* 'them') which concludes the previous clause and *wĕhēm* 'and they' which begins the clause in question.

The following clause of 43 is preceded by an unusual causal conjunction, *ya'an-ûbĕya'an* 'because and (indeed) because'. It can occur with or without *waw* 'and,' and occurs only ninety-three times in the Hebrew canon: nine times in Genesis through 2 Samuel, twenty times in 1–2 Kings, eleven times in Jeremiah, and thirty-eight times in Ezekiel.[20] The causes introduced by this unusual conjunction present a failure to comply with the conditions given in 15, using the same words in reverse order. The suffix conjugation comes into the picture again here, as it does in 35, 40, 44. Although it refers to a future time, it is a time that is to take place before the time referred to by the *weqatal/yiqtol* verbs here in the restoration section. Using a *qatal* form to refer to a future time before the main future time may not be rare, viz., Lev.13:23 *lō(') pāśātâ* 'has not spread' and 2 Sam. 17:12 *nimṣā'* 'was to be found', etc.

A verse to help conclude the restoration section follows (44). It reads *wĕ'ăp-gam-zo(')t bihyôtām bĕ'ereṣ 'ōyĕbêhem lō(')-mĕ'astîm wĕlō(') gĕ'altîm lĕkallōtām lĕhāpēr bĕrîtî 'ittām kî 'ănî yhwh 'ĕlōhêkem* 'Yet I myself, even with this, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not have rejected them and I will not have abhorred them to the point of destroying them, breaking my covenant with them, for I am YHWH their God'.

As mentioned in an introductory paragraph, there are some peculiarities in 44. The opening, hyphenated words of the verse serve both for emphasis and conclusion (Waltke and O'Connor 1990:663). The *waw* + negative + *qatal* forms *wĕlō(') mĕ'astîm* and *wĕlō(')*

[20] Not an exhaustive count.

gĕ'altîm seem to belong in a narrative of past events, i.e., 'I did not reject them', etc. A *waw* + negative construction in a predictive juridical discourse is most frequently followed by a *yiqtol* form, as in 10, 14, 20, 23, 26, 31, translated with a future. It is possible that the speaker chose the *qatal* form to add to the sense of conclusion.[21] Waltke and O'Connor (1990:480, 485–6) suggest that the *qatal* form gives a global view of a situation, and in a conclusion one could certainly expect or appreciate the global view. A reason clause, *kî 'ănî yhwh 'ĕlōhêhem* 'for I am YHWH their God' concludes the verse.[22]

The final verse of the section returns to the more usual form for expressing the future *wĕzākartî* 'and I will remember'. It features not only the covenant theme, but also that of the exodus, which comes up in a relative clause like that of 13. Instead of citing the transformation to freedom, however (as in 13), 45 says *'ăšer hôṣe(')tî-'ōtām mē'ereṣ miṣrayim lĕ'ênê haggōyim* 'in which I brought them out of the land of Egypt before the eyes of the nations', pointing out that the very enemies who take the Israelites captive in the previous verse have, in the past, seen them released from captivity. A purpose clause in which *hāyâ* 'to be' figures (see above on 12, 34), concludes the sentence: *lihyōt lāhem lē(')lōhîm* 'to be their God'. I am YHWH, *'ănî yhwh*, ends the verse and section. Again, there are similarities with other concluding verses in Leviticus 26: a relative clause, a preterite, the verb *hāyâ*, an infinitive construct, and an asyndetic clause (see above in the discussion of 12, 13, 33, 35).

Conclusion

Some of the literary and linguistic phenomena of Leviticus 26 have been presented in this paper. This concluding discussion will cite some of the phenomena and make suggestions for future study. It will also state some of the limitations of the chart. Finally, it will give one answer to the question posed in the title of the paper.

Clauses marked for word order and unexpected conjugations were discussed. There was an example of the marked form to give a detail (4), amplification (6), topic (6), dramatic pause (10), and comparative topic, simultaneous, with contrastive focus (12). Such markedness was not as noted in the curses section as in the blessings.

---

[21] Longacre (1994), suggests pivotal events or foreshadowing events can occur in *weqatal* forms in narrative. Certainly, as I found in my studies of Mayan languages, unusual verb forms occur at climactic points in literature, but also in finalizing events as here, in 44.

[22] See the discussion on 13 above and 45 below. Note, however, that here the existential clause occurs with the conjunction *kî* 'because'.

Repetition, restatement, and vocabulary choice were addressed both as they applied to chapter-specific words (*qerî,* 23–24, 27–28, 40–41), and Old Testament canon-wide themes (covenant, 9, 15, 25, 42, 44, 45 and the salvation history of the exodus from Egypt, 13, 45).

Some concluding/summary statements exhibit similarities as they occur at or near the end of the sections. The existential verb, asyndeton, relative clause and infinitive construct in 12–13, 32–33, 44–45 are common features of concluding verses in Leviticus 26. Are these features common to concluding/summary statements in the rest of Leviticus and/or the rest of the canon?

Although particle use was mentioned, no observations of striking use were made. Scholars need to study particles further, however. Mulder (1991:135) mentions the multifunctional nature of *'āz* 'then' (conjunction, adverb, etc.), and goes on to cite examples from nominal and conditional sentences, its use with participles, and its appearance with *qatal* and *yiqtol* forms, many times with reference to cognate languages. While the discussion is helpful, the location of *'āz* needs to be identified more specifically. Is its position in initiating or concluding sentences, or its appearance in clusters important? Scholars should study the same (and other) aspects of all particles.

The alternation of participants in 36–39 is confusing and could be seen as evidence of different sources, differing *Sitz im Leben* 'situations in life', or differing redactors. But are we to assume that the final redactor could not keep the person markers straight or did not know Hebrew well? It would be illuminating to check other cases where a new participant is introduced into a discourse, and/or cases of paricipant reference alternation.

Charts can be helpful, but the chart discussed in this paper actually masks the paucity of X + *yiqtol* forms in the curses. Their very small ratio did not show up at first because conditionals almost always start with a particle that precludes the use of a *weqatal* form. It was the unfolding of the discussion of marked forms in the apodoses that made the paucity clear, not just simple counting of what appeared on the chart. Charts may be used, but with caution.

Is Leviticus 26 elevating or terrifying prose? The state of spiritual and physical plenty presented in the blessings elevates the reader's mind and emotions by its content, while relentless bombarding with horrible curses in the next verses plunges it into a pit of terror. The curses' proliferation of particles and repetition/restatement of horrors seems to provoke such a response intentionally.

I looked for linguistic forms that might have contributed to the positive feelings and the negative feelings, but probably it was the

meaning[23] of peace and prosperity in the blessings and the meaning (lexical intent) of captivity and starvation in the curses that prompted the feelings. However, the two sections used the same forms to produce different emotional effects.[24]

For example, in the blessings, in 3, it was noted that the use of a marked form could please the listener. Similarly, a preposed pronoun in the blessings (12) attracts the reader's attention toward a positive event, but the same form in 33 attracts it to something negative. The chiasm in 8 is pleasant to read and fun to discuss, but the same figure in 29 seems like the fortieth lash of a flogging. Repetition of *ntn* 'give' in 4 is nice, but its repetition in 19–20 is not nice. While any *weqatal* chains in the blessings had the beauty of successive color-bursts of a Roman candle, those of the curses seemed like rounds of machine gun fire.[25]

Reader response criticism (House 1992:374–407) was not part of the investigative method of this work, but it could help separate feelings and critical observations. I felt challenged in my conception of a loving God as I read the curses, so perhaps some theological conclusions could be explored. For the moment I note that obedience has its own benign outworking in our lives, while disobedience has an opposite result. There are some practical implications of the importance of Sabbath rests (Lev. 25, 26:2, 34, 35, 43) for humanity and the environment as the twenty-first century approaches. Time and space limitations do not allow these subjects to be addressed here, but future works should address them.

---

[23] Bodine (1992:102–3) makes an interesting point through this analogy:

> A research agenda [that excludes meaning from its database]...seems...like a study of arteries, veins, and capillaries without reference to blood. The very preparation of the data would involve the removal of blood from the vessels, probably filling them with some other fluid, and their isolation from their natural setting in a living organism. Though some aspects of the analysis of blood vessels might call for this isolation, others would be gravely distorted by it; and a wholistic analysis would surely be precluded...The isolation of language forms from their meaning and context is probably even more unnatural than the study of blood vessels apart from blood and the body.

[24] J.Cheryl Exum (House 1992:298) finds that the same literary devices can serve both comic and tragic modes.

[25] According to Meir Sternberg, repetition can be "wielded as a battering ram" (ibid.).

BIOGRAPHY

Mary Kathleen Houser Fox has an MCS from Regent College, Vancouver, Canada. She taught English in Egypt for five years with the Mennonite Central Committee and studied Arabic in Cairo. She and her husband, Edmund W. Fox, have participated in sociolinguistic and intelligibility surveys among the Quiches of Guatemala, where they are presently involved in translation and literacy. They were members of Summer Institute of Linguistics for ten years before joining the Lutheran Bible Translators, through whom they are now working. The Foxes have two children, Carolyn and Donald David. Ed's parents, David and Carol Fox, are longtime members of Summer Institute of Linguistics/Wycliffe Bible Translators and are currently preparing the West-central Quiche New Testament for publication.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Francis I. 1994. Salience, implicature, ambiguity, and redundancy in clause-clause relationships in biblical Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Bergen, Robert D., ed. 1994. Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Beyerlin, Walter, ed. 1978. Ground like iron. Near Eastern religious texts relating to the Old Testament:131. London: Student Christian Movement Press.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. 1990. Edited by E. Ellinger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Wurttenberg Bible Society.

Bodine, Walter R. 1992. Linguistics and biblical Hebrew. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. 1907. A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon.

Buth, Randall. 1992. The Hebrew verb in current discussions. Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics 5(2):91–105.

Gesenius, F. Wilhelm. [1910]. 1976. Hebrew grammar. 2nd English edition. Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gottstein, M. H. 1949. Afterthought and the syntax of relative clauses in biblical Hebrew. Journal of Biblical Literature 68:35–47.

Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., Bruce K. Waltke. 1980. Theological wordbook of the Old Testament. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute.

House, Paul R., ed. 1992. Beyond form criticism: Essays in Old Testament literary criticism. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.

Hymes, Dell. 1981. In vain I tried to tell you: Essays in native American ethnopoetics. Philedelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kitchen, K. A. 1966. Ancient orient and Old Testament. Chicago: Inter-varsity Press.

Longacre, Robert E. 1989. Joseph, a story of divine providence. A text theoretical and textlinguistic analysis of Genesis 37 and 38–48. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.

Longacre, Robert E. 1994. *Weqatal* forms in biblical Hebrew prose. In Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Mulder, M.J. 1991. Die partikel *'āz* in biblischen Hebraisch, from Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic syntax. Edited by K. Jongeling, H.L. Murre-Van den Berg, and K. van Rompay. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 17. Leiden:Brill.

Niccacci, Alviero. 1994. On the Hebrew verbal system. In Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael O'Connor. 1990. An Introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.

In general, the style is to conform to that of the journal LANGUAGE—especially in regard to citations of articles and books in the body of the article and to the necessity of and placing of complete bibliographical references at the end. Please note also the conventions in regard to capitalization, language forms, translation glosses, and use of quotation marks.

For citation of forms or passages in biblical languages, if the Roman alphabet is used, please follow the transcription conventions set for the Society of Biblical Literature as presented in B. If the Greek alphabet is used, hand-printed forms are not acceptable. Either a Greek typewriter/typehead must be employed or a good black photocopy must be made, cut, and pasted in the appropriate space. Only Roman transliterations of Hebrew characters will be accepted.

A. NOTES ON MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION

1. Submit all manuscripts in duplicate, doublespaced, with 1.5″ margins to facilitate editing, and accompany them by a file in ASCII code on a 5.25″ or 3.5″ MS-DOS formatted diskette.

2. Number the pages of the copy in the upper right corner. Include all pages of the manuscript in a single pagination. Use one side of the sheet only.

3. All manuscripts must be accompanied by an abstract that describes the main thrust and contribution of the proposed article.

4. Every author, except those writers who have previously published in JOTT, must submit a brief biographical note as to the author's background, education, present assignment, and activity.

5. Underscores
   a. A single straight underscore indicates italic type and a double underscore boldface. Contributors are asked to use these underscorings for only these purposes and no others.
   b. Use italics (single underscore) only for cited linguistic forms and for titles of books and journals. Do not use italics to mark familiar foreign words used as part of an English sentence: e.g., a priori, ad hoc, inter alia, ipso facto, prima facie, facon de parler, langue/parole, Sprachgefuhl, ursprachlich, etc. All are to be without underscore.

6. Punctuation
   a. Use single quotation marks in the text stream for a translation gloss. Punctuation marks follow a single quote unless the other mark is itself part of the quoted matter: The word means 'cart' not 'horse'. Does that mean 'You heard me!'? It means 'Did you hear me?'
   b. Do not use quotation marks to enclose a word or phrase cited as a linguistic example from another language. Use italics instead.
   c. Use double quotation marks for direct quotations from literary sources and for reported speech, as in John said, "I am coming." Periods and commas precede a closing quotation mark; colons and semicolons follow it.
   d. Words containing prefixes are written solid, without hyphens, when no misreading will result: antimentalism, contradistinction, extrasystemic, prevocalic, semivowel, subdialect, superstock, nonexistent. The prefix is followed by a hyphen when the next element begins with a capital: non-Germanic, pre-Greek.

e. Ellipsis is indicated by three periods, close set, with a blank space before and after, like this: ... Do not add a fourth period even if the ellipsis precedes or follows the end of a sentence.

f. Use a comma after e.g. and i.e. Use a comma before the conjunction that joins the last of a series of three or more coordinate terms: A, B, and C; X, Y, and Z. Do use a comma between independent clauses but not between parts of a compound predicate. Use commas around nonrestrictive elements of a sentence (where the meaning will not change by leaving out the phrase) but not around phrases that restrict or qualify the meaning of the main part of a sentence.

7. Footnotes

a. Footnotes are numbered serially throughout the article.

b. The footnote reference number is a raised numeral following the word or passage to which it applies; it is not enclosed in parentheses nor followed by a parenthesis or a period. Reference numbers follow marks of punctuation.

c. In the disk copy, all footnotes must follow the main text and bibliography. In the hard copy they may appear at the bottoms of text pages.

d. Each footnote is typed as a separate paragraph, with the first line indented. It begins with its reference number, raised and written as in b.

8. Cited forms

a. A letter, word, phrase, or sentence cited as a linguistic example or subject of discussion appears in italics: the suffix *-s*, the word *like*, the construction *mich friert*. Do not use quotation marks for this purpose.

b. Cited forms may also appear in phonetic or phonemic transcription, enclosed in square brackets or in slant lines: the suffix [s], the word /layk/. Symbols between brackets or slants are never underscored.

c. Cited forms in a foreign language should be followed at their first occurrence by a gloss in single quotation marks. No comma separates the gloss from the cited form: Latin *ovis* 'sheep' is a noun. No comma follows the gloss unless it is required by the sentence as a whole: Latin *ovis* 'sheep', *equus* 'horse', and *canis* 'dog' are nouns. Note that the punctuation follows the closing quotation mark.

9. Abbreviations

Abbreviations ending in a small letter have a following period; abbreviations ending in a capital generally have none.

10. Titles and headings

a. Do not underscore any part of a title, subtitle, or section heading. Leave the choice of type face to the editor.

b. Use normal capitalization: capitalize only the first word and such other words as the orthography of the language requires.

11. Bibliographical references

a. Full citation of all literature referred to should be given in a bibliography at the end of each article. Within the text brief citation will be made, normally, by giving the author's surname, year of publication, and page number(s) where relevant, e.g., Smith 1982:25. Give such brief citations in the body of the text, not in footnotes, unless they refer specifically to a statement made in a footnote.

b. The full bibliography should be doublespaced, beginning on a separate page of typescript with the heading REFERENCES. Arrange the entries alphabetically

by surnames of authors; multiple works by one author should be listed chronologically, with suffixed letter a, b, etc., to distinguish several items published in a single year. Works by multiple authors must have all authors listed. Each entry should contain the following elements in the following order: Author's or editor's surname, given name(s), coauthors if any (given names first), date of publication (copyright), title and subtitle of work, title of series, if any, and volume or number in the series, edition, reprint if not the original, or revision (include name of reviser), city of publication, and publisher's name. For an article in a periodical, give name of author, date, title of the article, name of the periodical, volume number or part number (if applicable) and sometimes the issue number, pages occupied by the article, and if a journal is not well known, the city and country of publication and publisher. If an article is part of a collection, also include the editor's name and title of the collection and the edition used. If an edition is a reprint edition (new typesetting), include the original publication (copyright) date in brackets, location, and publisher, as well as the reprint date, location, and publisher. If no edition is indicated and if no part of the work appears as a quotation in the text, use the most recent copyright date. Dates of impressions or reprintings do not apply. All numbers will be in Roman type. Use punctuation as in the following examples:

Bolinger, Dwight. 1965. The atomization of meaning. Language 41:555–73.

Brennan, Paul William. 1968. The structure of Koine Greek narrative. Ph.D. dissertation, The Hartford Seminary Foundation. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.

Brugmann, Karl. 1906. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatick der indogemanischen Sprachen. 2d ed., vol. 2, part 1. Strassburg: Trubner.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1965. Review of grammar discovery procedures, by Longacre. Language 41:640–47.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic structures. Janua linguarum, series minor 4. The Hague: Mouton.

Hockett, Charles F. 1964. The Proto central Algonquian kinship system. In Explorations in cultural anthropology. Edited by Ward Goodenough. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wenham, J. W. [1965] 1984. The elements of New Testament Greek: Based on the earlier work by H. P. V. Nunn. Reprint ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

c. The brief citations given in the text should take a form such as (Hockett 1964:240–41). If the author's name is part of the text, use this form: Bolinger (1965:564) said that... Note that the page numbers given here are only for the passage to which reference is made, not the whole paper. In text only use initials for authors' given names when necessary to distinguish, e.g., N. Chomsky and C. Chomsky, within a single article.

d. Do not replace given names of authors or editors in the bibliography with initials unless such abbreviation is the normal practice of the individual concerned: thus Miller, Roy Andrew (not Roy A. or R. A.); Hooper, Joan B. (not J. B. or J.); but Palmer, F. R. That is, use the name as given on the title page.

12. Tables

a. Plan each table so that it will fit into the printed page without crowding. Leave ample white space between columns. Do not use vertical rules unless the table would be unclear without them.

b. Column heads should be short, so as to stand clearly above the several columns. If you need longer headings, represent them by numbers or capital letters and explain these in the text preceding the table.

c. If two or more tables appear in one article, number them and refer to them by number. Do not speak of the 'preceding' or 'the following table', nor 'above' or 'below'; in paginating, the original position of the table may not be able to be preserved.

d. Each table should have a title above, rather than below it. The legend contains the table number and optionally a concise title, sometimes also (as a separate line) a brief explanation or comment.

13. Author's alteration policy. Once a manuscript has been accepted for publication, it cannot be withdrawn or revised. The contributor will be billed for all changes other than printing errors and changes requested by the editor.

B. TRANSLITERATION RULES FROM SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

1. Transliteration of Hebrew

a. Consonants: ' b g d h w z ḥ ṭ y k l m n s ' p ṣ q r ś š t (' Alep and ' ayin should be written in with a pen, if the raised semicircle is not available on a typewriter/typehead. Do not use ' for alep or raised ° for ayin or any other symbol.)

b. Vowels: a (pataḥ), ā (qāmeṣ), â (final qâmeṣ hē), e (sĕgōl), ē (ṣērê), ê (final and medial ṣērê yōd and medial sĕgōl yōd), i (short ḥîreq defectively written), î (medial or final ḥîreq yōd), o (qāmeṣ ḥātûp), ō (ḥōlem defectively written), ô (ḥōlem fully written), u (short qibbûṣ), ū (long qibbûṣ defectively written), û (šûreq). Other final vowels are to be written with the appropriate vowel sign followed by hē (or ālep) or mater lectionis (e.g. Šĕlōmōh, yigleh, qārā' [but qārâ], hinnēh, sûsāyw). Furtive pataḥ is to be recorded as pataḥ(e.g. rûaḥ). Reduced vowels are to be written with the breve: ă, ĕ, ŏ. (No distinction is made between simple šĕwâ and ḥātēp sĕgōl.) Short vowels fully written should be shown as o(w), u(w), i(y), e.g., bĕqu(w)šā'. Accents are usually not indicated; if really needed, the acute is to be used for the primary and the grave for the secondary accent. A hyphen is to be used for maqqēp.

2. Transliteration of Aramaic

The system described above for Hebrew is to be followed, even though sere and holem are frequently not markers of long vowels in Aramaic.

3. Transliteration of Greek

Th is to be used for θ, ph for Φ, ch for χ, ps for ψ, ē (not ê) for η, ō (not ô) for ω, h for the rough breathing, and y for υ, except when it is part of the diphthong (e.g., au, eu, ui). Iota subscript should be represented by a cedilla under the vowel concerned: ą for ᾳ, ę for ῃ, ǫ for ῳ.

The JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION AND TEXTLINGUISTICS is published at irregular intervals, and is available through standing orders or individual orders, rather than through subscription. Standing orders will enable you to receive automatically each future issue of JOTT . With each issue you will receive an invoice for that issue only; prepayment is not required. Because of continually rising costs, we cannot guarantee prices. However, during the next two years, we expect the average individual issue price (including postage) not to exceed $10 US and $13 foreign (including Canada).

☐ Please place me on your standing order list for JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION AND TEXTLINGUISTICS

Name _____

Organization _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Country _____

Tel _____ Fax _____

email _____

This order for: ☐ Library, bookstore, educational institution
☐ SIL member or entity
☐ Other

Mail to: International Academic Bookstore
Summer Institute of Linguistics
7500 West Camp Wisdom Road
Dallas, Texas 75236

Tel: (972) 708-7404 Fax: (972) 708-7433

email: academic_books@sil.org

☐ Visa ☐ MasterCard ☐ Discover
☐ American Express ☐ Diners Club ☐ JCB

Credit Card Account No: _____

Expiration Date: _____

Name on Card (Please Print): _____

Signature: _____
(Not required for email)

Back issues of JOTT and other publications of the Summer Institute of Linguistics are also available at the above address. Discounts are available to SIL members and, upon request, to libraries, bookstores, and educational institutions.