Prof. Scott B. Noegel
Chair, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization
University of Washington

Book review:
Schorch, Stefan. *Euphemismen in der Hebräischen Bibel.* Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.

Old Aramaic in the first place"; yet what Garr says is simply, "[The *N*-stem] died out in Aramaic"; since the N-stem was a feature of Proto-Semitic and Proto-Northwest Semitic, and since it is not found in Aramaic (as Garr clearly states, ibid.: "As in other Aramaic dialects, there was no *niphal* conjugation in Old Aramaic"), it is entirely correct to say that it had "died out" in the latter. Another misrepresentation of Garr appears on p. 149 n. 648. Other scholars also come under what seems unwarranted attack, e.g., J. Fitzmyer (e.g., p. 101 n. 458), V. Hug (p. 206 n. 898), and D. Testen (p. 75 n. 373, on PS *#$C\underline{n}$ > #*Car*; the fact that a sound rule applies to a small number of forms is quite irrelevant, as shown, e.g., by much of the history of English and Latin phonology). The authors' treatment of Folmer's admirable *Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period* is especially curious. Folmer covers only a selection of topics, albeit a large selection; Muraoka and Porten, in their desire to be comprehensive, must perforce go over much of the same ground again. Folmer's discussions of many topics are longer and more nuanced than those of Muraoka and Porten; it is therefore puzzling that her work is often only mentioned cursorily in a footnote, without any significant engagement (e.g., "cf. Folmer 1995: 262–325" on pp. 218–19 n. 924; "Cf. also Folmer 1995: 521–87" on p. 296 n. 1159), except on the not infrequent occasions when her conclusions come in for (again, unwarranted) sharply negative appraisal (e.g., p. 298 n. 1168). Is it simply that Folmer's work appeared too late to be taken fully into consideration in the present volume? If so, the authors should have said so; as it stands, their lack of commentary on much of Folmer's fine study is difficult to comprehend.

JOHN HUEHNERGARD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Euphemismen in der hebräischen Bibel. By STEFAN SCHORCH. Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, vol. 12. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2000. Pp. xiii + 323. DM 178.

The presence of euphemisms in the Hebrew Bible has long been observed, but until now an exhaustive treatment of the phenomenon has not appeared. In addition, scholars typically have treated the topic of euphemism in a rather general way with little attention to the broad range of linguistic phenomena represented by the term, or the literary, sociological, or historical contexts in which euphemisms occur. It is in this light that the monograph under review represents a welcome, if not long overdue, contribution. A revised version of the author's 1998

dissertation at the University of Leipzig,[1] this book offers a careful and exhaustive examination of euphemistic linguistic phenomena in the Hebrew Bible. Its close attention to a variety of contexts and its methodological sophistication make it a useful and informative resource.

Schorch begins his investigation by reviewing the various theoretical approaches to the study of euphemism, and by establishing the parameters and methodology for his own work. Building upon recent linguistic approaches to euphemism in other languages, he distinguishes between the functions of euphemisms and the motivations for their use, and asserts that any investigation into motives must consider issues of semantic range and context. Thus, Schorch sets out to establish the semantic ranges for the various euphemisms under discussion and to analyze the linguistic strategies at work in their formation (e.g., avoidance, substitution). His approach necessitates a brief review of previous research comparing euphemism with a variety of speech phenomena (e.g., dysphemism, lying, *ad-dad* words, double entendres, and a variety of tropes).

Having established the groundwork for his investigation, Schorch then examines the topic of euphemism from three diachronic perspectives. The first involves a survey of euphemisms represented by textual corrections (תיקוני סופרים) and by variants in the textual witnesses. In this section Schorch first collects the euphemisms that appear in the recensions of the text of Samuel (i.e., 4QSam^a, Septuagint [LXX], Masoretic Text [MT]), and then organizes them into seven thematic categories.

In the first category Schorch places variants that constitute euphemistic references to death. Here he includes the MT and 4QSam^a versions of 1 Sam 1:11 in which Hannah promises to dedicate her son to Yahweh all the days of "his life" (חייו), a line that the LXX reads as "his death" (θανάτου αὐτοῦ). Schorch also compares the rendering "fall" (πεσοῦνται) in the LXX and 4QSam^a (יפולו) of 1 Sam 2:33, to the MT, which reads "die" (ימותו). Also surveyed is the 4QSam^a version of 1 Sam 5:11 which reports the "panic of Yahweh (יהוה)," rather than the "panic of death," as found in the MT and LXX (מות, θανάτου).

Schorch's second category, "Transcendenz Gottes," collects euphemisms that appear to avoid direct second-person reference to יהוה. Thus, Schorch compares the MT of 1 Sam 1:11 in which Hannah vows her baby "to Yahweh," to the LXX which reads "before you" (as if Hebrew לפניך were implied). Similar variants in 1 Sam 1:21–22 and 2 Sam 2:21 are also examined.

---

[1] An excursus of the original dissertation has appeared separately under the title "Baal oder Boschet? Ein umstrittenes theophores Element zwischen Religions- und Textgeschichte," *ZAW* 112 (2000): 598–611.

In the third thematic group Schorch gathers euphemisms that relate to the topic of anthropomorphism. Included here are 1 Sam 1:23 and 5:11. The MT of the former verse has Elkanah saying to Hannah "May Yahweh fulfill his word," whereas the verse in 4QSam[a] and the LXX appears to give Hannah a bit of influence over Yahweh. It reads "fulfill the utterance of your mouth." The treatment of 1 Sam 5:11 focuses on the MT's reference to God's destructive powers as "the hand of Yahweh," whereas 4QSam[a] and the LXX read the "ark of God."

Under the rubric "Polytheismus," Schorch discusses the recensional differences of 2 Sam 7:23. Specifically, he compares a reference to "his tents" (אהליו) in the 4QSam[a] and the LXX (i.e., σκηνώματα) to the MT, which renders it as "his gods" (אלהיו). He also compares the MT's plural verb "went" (הלכו) used in reference to God, to the LXX and parallel passage in 1 Chron 17:21 which render as "his guide" (ὡδήγησεν αὐτὸν) and "went" (in the singular, הלך), respectively.

Schorch's next thematic category, "JHWH," contains biblical passages in which circumlocutions are used to express potentially objectionable references to "spurning the Lord" and "his word." Thus, the MT and LXX of 2 Sam 12:14 record the prophet Nathan reprimanding David: "you have spurned the enemies of Yahweh," though 4QSam[a] has "you have spurned the word of Yahweh." How this category differs substantially from that of Schorch's "Transzendenz Gottes" group is unclear.

Schorch's last two categories focus on apparent attempts in the versions to avoid unflattering references to the sons of Eli (1 Sam 2:17) and King David (2 Sam 5:8, 20:16, 25:22). The MT of 1 Sam 2:17 appears to gloss Eli's young sons (lit. "lads," נערים) euphemistically by adding "the men" (האנשים), where the LXX and 4QSam[a] have nothing. The recensions of 2 Sam 5:8 attest to efforts to remove the grammatical difficulty and apparent mention of David hating the lame and blind. The variants of 2 Sam 20:16 and 25:22 in the versions avoid an apparent rebuke of David by rewording, "the enemies of David."

Schorch's second diachronic investigation adopts a comparative look at proposed euphemisms in the MT and Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). He again organizes the evidence thematically. Thus, the first category (i.e., those euphemisms that avoid uncomfortable references to Yahweh) includes the SP's use of "ark" (ארון) in Exod 23:17, 34:23, where the MT has "the Lord" (האדון). Under the rubric "Polytheismus," Schorch groups the SP's use of the singular verbs in reference to God, where the MT has plurals (e.g., Gen 20:13, 31:53, 35:7, Exod 22:8, 22:19, Deut 10:17). His third category, "Tod und Krankheit," includes all verses that "soften" references to death and disease (e.g., Exod 21:20, 21:21, 21:28–36, Num 22:33, 35:25, Lev 13:32, Deut 23:18). His final category in this section contains variants in the MT and SP which reflect euphemistic references to sexual activity (i.e., Deut 23:12, 25:11, 28:30).

Schorch's third diachronic examination is a text-critical comparison between the euphemistic hand of the Deuteronomist (in Samuel and Kings) and parallel passages in Chronicles. He again classifies the euphemisms according to their semantic groupings. His categories include the ways in which the Chronicler alters references to death (e.g., הלך ["go"] for שכב ["lie down"], and נפל ["fall"] for מות ["die"]), and the ways in which foreign gods and idols are referenced. Schorch also compares Chronicles and the Deuteronomist for their references to Yahweh and his titles, especially "Lord Yahweh" (אדני יהוה). Under the category "Temple," Schorch turns his attention to an apparent unpropitious reference to Yahweh's Temple. Specifically, he compares 1 Kgs 9:8, in which we read "and this house (Temple) will be exalted," with 2 Chron 7:21, "and this house (Temple) once exalted." He then raises the issue of the Targum and other witnesses' rendering of the verse as "and this house (Temple) will become a ruin." This section also contains discussions of euphemistic references to body parts like loins and buttocks (e.g., 2 Sam 7:12/1 Chron 17:11, 2 Sam 10:4/1 Chron 19:4). Schorch concludes this section by comparing the Chronicler's use of "lift up" (נשא) in 1 Chron 10:9 for "cut off " (כרת) in 1 Sam 31:9, used in reference to the dispatching of Saul's head.

As Schorch's diachronic data demonstrate, the Bible's euphemisms appear in many forms and in a variety of contexts. They are not restricted to a single redactional layer or textual witness and there is no consistency in the types of euphemisms found in the particular redactions (such as Chronicles) or in the translations. Thus, some euphemisms appear in the LXX and not in the MT. Others occur in the MT and not LXX, or just in 4QSam[a], and so on. While in some cases this may represent the divergent and complex histories of manuscript traditions, it is likely that it also indexes a general tendency for scribes, in every period of the Bible's textual history, to update its language by way of euphemisms.

Following this series of diachronic studies is the central feature of the book: viz., a comprehensive lexicon of euphemisms found throughout the Hebrew Bible. Schorch has made the lexicon exceptionally useful by providing it with a system of cross-references that serve to connect it to all the other sections of the book. Here again the treatment is exhaustive and even includes cognate information from Akkadian and Aramaic where relevant.

Having completed his diachronic studies and supplied the reader with a complete data set in the lexicon, Schorch then provides a synchronic analysis of the data by establishing with greater precision the various semantic fields of all biblical euphemisms. Each of these broad categories is then subdivided into smaller fields of usage. Thus, the first category "Tot" is divided into the following six groups: the process of dying, the deceased, the day of death, the grave, the realm of the dead, and the corpse itself. The first of these groups is then subdivided further into "death as absence" (e.g., references to "being no more," "going" and "coming," "descending," "being

gathered," "carried off," or "taken," etc.); the realm of the dead as a place of gathering; death as a permanent end; God as the Lord of Life (e.g., God as "gatherer," "taker," "one who ends life"); and death as sleep and repose.

Schorch's other semantic categories for euphemisms include: disease, bodily defects, cursing, sexual violation, sexual practices of men and animals, sexual bodily functions, and words related to digestive processes. These too are subdivided according to semantic usage and range.

In a series of appendices Schorch also covers the substitution of God's name from a diachronic perspective, the Bible's terms for idols, and its erotic vocabulary. The latter excursus allows Schorch to return to the literary aspects of euphemisms in greater detail. Thus, he compares euphemisms to a number of stylistic devices including metaphors (e.g., sex as food and gardens), antiphrasis, litotes, foreign words as substitutes for more common ones, metonymy, periphrasis, synecdoche, ellipsis, wish formulae, and folk etymologies. The book concludes with a useful bibliography and a number of indices.

In sum, this book is a valuable resource and model. Schorch has elucidated a complex topic in the light of new research, while laying firm groundwork for future comparative work. One can imagine, for example, applying much of Schorch's methodology to the study of euphemism in other ancient Near Eastern languages and to investigations into a variety of potentially related topics such as word play, *atbash*, and the language of "magic," to name just a few.

SCOTT B. NOEGEL

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King. By BARUCH HALPERN. Grand Rapids, Mich.: WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO., 2001. Pp. xx + 492. $30.

The title of this book hardly suggests sober historiography. Indeed, it reads more like a tabloid headline. Yet the dust-jacket assures us that it is an exceptional work of biblical scholarship, "a century more advanced than any other book about David," and "sets a new standard by which all future writing of biblical history must be carried out." The author himself claims that the book is "a prelude to a history of Israel for the Anchor Bible Reference Library," so in spite of first appearances we must treat it as a serious history of the period under review. In fact, the novelty of the author's method is to extract truth from mendacity, treating the lies of the biblical record in such a way as to get at the real history behind them. This "revisionist" history of David and Solomon (the book is as much about the latter as the former) is a curious mix of

erudite discussion about archaeological problems and comparative Near Eastern historiography, on the one hand, and a narration of historical events in vivid journalistic detail with little concern for documentation or scholarly discussion of texts and their complex literary history, on the other. This combination is evidenced throughout the book by the fact that the author constantly tells the general reader to skip the technical discussion, intended for scholars, and get to the historical narrative of "real" events. The most important archaeological debate, on which much of the argument depends, is relegated to a final appendix, considered as unnecessary for most readers. In fact, many of the scholarly pieces scattered throughout the book are derived from previously published scholarly articles and poorly integrated into the whole. Although the book contains subject and author indexes, it has no scripture reference index and no bibliography. This makes it a difficult book to read and to review.

The basic thesis of this book is that the biblical accounts of the reigns of David and Solomon (1 Sam 16–1 Kgs 10) are the work of nearly contemporary court apologists with access to written documents and inscriptions, whose writing must be read "against the grain" to extract the real history of the period. Thus, contrary to the biblical version, David was directly involved in the deaths of Saul and his sons, the murders of Ishbaal and Abner, Amnon and Absalom, and many others. He did not gain full control over Israel until after the Absalom revolt. The one murder that is traditionally attributed to him, that of Uriah, he did *not* commit. That account was the work of the apologist to cover up the fact that Solomon was not really David's but Uriah's son, who therefore had no claim to the throne. Solomon continued the killing of his enemies as David had done, with rather thinly veiled pretexts created by the apologist. In this way Halpern exposes the "secret demons" of David and the not so secret ones of Solomon. Is this historical reconstruction in the least bit credible?

To answer this question one must consider this book on three different levels. The first issue is whether the archaeological evidence of the Iron Age is such that it can confirm the existence of a United Kingdom of David and Solomon and support the picture of its great extent and prestige as reflected in the Bible. It is here that Halpern reveals his roots in the old biblical archaeology. Since the excavations of Y. Yadin it has been customary to relate the biblical account of Solomon's building of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer (1 Kgs 9:15) with specific archaeological levels at these sites (Hazor X, Megiddo VA–IVB, and Gezer VIII) that reveal similar monumental architecture and a fairly sophisticated level of state administration. Halpern accepts the correlation of this biblical text to the archaeological evidence as crucial to the argument. His fellow director of the current excavations at Megiddo, Israel Finkelstein, rejects the biblical connection and associates the above-mentioned levels with Samaria I–II and the newly excavated