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

**"The 'Other' Demonstrative Pronouns:
Pejorative Colloquialisms in Biblical Hebrew."**

17. P. S. Rose, *Money and Capital Markets*, 5th edition (Burr Ridge IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1994) pp. 224 and 458.

18. In the United States, a "point" is one percent of the mortgage principal which the borrower has to pay up-front. For the sake of simplicity, the author ignores the issue of compounding.

APPENDIX A

CALCULATING THE TRUE COST OF FUNDS (THE ACTUAL RATE OF INTEREST)

The life span of loans can vary greatly, from a short period of one month or less (as in 30-day U.S. Treasury Bills), to 30 years or even longer (as in mortgages and bonds). One way to avoid confusion in comparing loan rates is to annualize them, and thus to present the rates as if their duration is one full year. Mathematically, the correct way to calculate the rate is to divide the dollar cost of the funds (over one year), i.e., the interest charges, by the principal (the actual sum available for use by the borrower during the entire period).

Example: The buyer (the lender-creditor) of a one-month $10,000 Treasury Bill from the U.S. Government (the borrower) pays only $9,900, but receives $10,000 one month later. The cost (the interest) to the government-borrower is thus $100. The interest rate is determined by dividing the $100 by the $9,900 principal loaned to the government-borrower. That is: 100/ 9,900=0.0101 or 1.01 percent for one month. This figure multiplied by 12 yields the yearly rate of 12.12 percent interest. The reason we must annualize the loan rate (or cost) is that loan duration can vary from less than one month (T-bills) to 30 years or more (bonds or mortgages). Annualizing the rate of one-month, two-month, or three-month T-bills etc., allows for a much more valid rational comparison between them.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

Detailed *Instructions for Authors* and journal style can be found on our Internet website:
http://www.jewishbible.org

JBQ 33/1 (2005),
23 - 30.

(*)author received no proofs!

THE "OTHER" DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS:
PEJORATIVE COLLOQUIALISMS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

SCOTT B. NOEGEL

The linguist Roy Andrew Miller once remarked that "probably no language on earth has ever been written as it is spoken."[1] Though perhaps a bit exaggerated, Miller's statement does draw attention to the importance of recognizing the presence in languages of diglossia, by which is meant "the phenomenon of two synchronic varieties of the same language, one for colloquial and informal purposes, the other for literary and formal purposes."[2] [See Glossary at end of paper.] Though we might be prone to think of diglossia as a reflection primarily of the spoken language, it need not refer only to that, for as Gary Rendsburg remarked, "Instead of 'spoken' one might use colloquial, substandard, popular, informal, and even vulgar."[3]

As pointed out by the linguist C.A. Ferguson, diglossia appears in many of the world's known languages, including English, German, French, Greek, and Arabic.[4] Scholars, including G. R. Driver, M. Segal, E. Ullendorff, and W. Chomsky,[5] to name but a few, long have theorized and discussed the possibility of diglossia in biblical Hebrew, but it is only in recent years that a systematic attempt has been made to isolate the diglossic features of ancient Hebrew.[6]

Criteria used to isolate diglossic features include:

1. comparative evidence by way of analogous development of similar features in other Semitic languages;

2. the appearance of a particular feature in mishnaic Hebrew (MH), a language that M. Segal called "the direct lineal descendant of the spoken Hebrew of the biblical period"[7];

3. a lack of attestation of the feature in later Hebrew literary works; for example, in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira.

Scott B. Noegel is currently Associate Professor in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization at the University of Washington-Seattle. He is author of eight books and more than forty articles. His website is: http://faculty.washington.edu/snoegel.

It is not my purpose here to reiterate the methodology and findings of previous scholarship on the subject. Rather, it is to focus and expand on our understanding of a particular colloquial usage first recognized as such by B. Levine:[8] the demonstrative pronouns "*hallazeh* [הלזה]" and "*hallaz* [הלז]" (the literary dialect employs "*zeh* [זה]" and "*zot* [זאת]").[9] What I should like to demonstrate is that these biblical demonstratives share two features in common. First, as already noted by Levine, each time they appear, they do so in direct discourse. Second, these diglossic pronouns can serve a pejorative function, or one that emphasizes or vulgarizes the ordinary.

Before providing the biblical evidence, let me note that a pejorative application of demonstrative pronouns is not unique to biblical Hebrew. In ancient Greek, for example, we find the demonstrative pronoun for "this/that" used in clearly pejorative contexts. The classic example is in Sophocles' *Ajax* line 89, in which Athena calls to Ajax scornfully: "Hey, you there, Ajax."[10] Note also a similar *koine* usage in Luke 23:2 in which a multitude accuses Jesus before Pontius Pilate: "We found this one perverting our nation . . . ."[11] The Latin demonstrative pronoun *iste*, too, according to Allen and Greenough's *Classic Latin Grammar*, "especially refers to one's opponent . . . and frequently implies a kind of contempt."[12]

Though examples in the Akkadian language are admittedly rare, I suggest that we consider the mention in Sennacherib's annals of "*Bit-Kilamzaḫ šu'atu* [that Bit-Kilamzaḫ]" which the wrathful king boasts of demolishing (I:80-81). There is possibly also an example in Hammurapi's Code law 110, where we read that if a priestess or high priestess who is not dwelling in a cloister opens a tavern or enters a tavern for liquor "they shall burn **that** woman!"[13]

With these analogues in mind, I turn now to examine the evidence for the pejorative nuance of the colloquial demonstrative pronouns *hallazeh* and *hallaz*. The pronouns occur 10 times in the Bible (Gen. 24:65, 37:19; Jud. 6:20; I Sam. 14:1, 17:26; II Kg. 4:25, 23:17; Ezek. 36:35; Zech. 2:8; Dan. 8:16).

We first find the demonstrative in Genesis 24:65 in the mouth of Rebekah when she falls off her camel[14] upon seeing Isaac "meditating" [JPS] or "walking" [NJPS] in the field (but see reference note).[15] Disappointed by his appearance, she asks: *'Who is **this** man [hallazeh] who goes in the field to meet us?'* Obvi-

ously, she is a bit shocked at their first encounter and counters his behavior with appropriate speech, culled from the vulgar dialect.

The lexeme occurs again in Genesis 37:19, this time in the mouths of Joseph's brothers, whose hatred for him is expressed repeatedly by the narrator in Genesis 37:4, 37:8. Unable to find his brothers in Shechem, Joseph finally locates them in Dothan. Seeing Joseph in the distance, they mumble to each other: *'Behold, **that** dreamer [hallazeh] comes!'* Their unabashed contempt for their younger sibling and for his self-aggrandizing dreams undoubtedly provoked their snide comment.

We find a colloquial demonstrative again in I Samuel 14:1, in the direct speech of Jonathan to his arms-bearer. Referring to the Philistine camp that is stationed on the other side of the pass of Michmas, Jonathan commands: *'Come, let us cross over to the Philistine garrison on **that** side [me'ever hallaz].'* The pejorative nuance here is underscored shortly afterwards in 14:6, when Jonathan repeats this command nearly verbatim with one exception. He replaces the colloquial usage "that side" with another equally pejorative appellative: *'those uncircumcised ones.'*[16]

The pejorative demonstrative again is employed to describe the Philistines in I Samuel 17:26. This time, however, it is the young David who employs the usage, in reference to the taunting gargantuan Goliath. David, upset by the giant's insulting and unanswered challenge, turns to the soldiers nearby and asks: *'What will be done for the man who kills **that** Philistine [hallaz] and removes the reproach from Israel? Who is that uncircumcised Philistine that he dares to defy the ranks of the living God?'* That David calls Goliath a "reproach," demonstrates the pejorative force of his remark. Note also again that the demonstrative phrase parallels *that uncircumcised Philistine*.

The appearance of *hallaz* in II Kings 4:25 is a special case, since it modifies a feminine object; namely, the Shunammite woman. Despite the gender neutralization here, another hallmark feature of diglossia, a pejorative nuance is clear from the context. This passage describes the prophet Elisha's second encounter with the Shunammite woman, to whom he had earlier given a promise that she would deliver a child. Previously, in 4:12, he referred to her as *'hashunamit hazzot.'* When Elisha sees her approaching again in 4:25, she is openly angry with him; his demanding nature, recognized already in the Talmud (Ketubot 61a,

Bava Batra 7b, Makkot 11a), is obvious. It is here, when bothered by her lack of faith, that he says to his servant Gehazi: *'Look, **that** Shunammite woman* [hallaz]*!'*

In an attempt to thwart her angry approach, Elisha has his servant run to her and ask after her welfare. After responding curtly to his question, she sidesteps his servant, rushes to Elisha, and clasps his feet. When Gehazi tries to stop her, Elisha remarks: *'Let her alone, for she is in bitter distress; and God has hidden it from me and has not told me.'* Clearly, his first impression of her was a negative one, tainted by a lack of knowledge concerning her situation. It is not until after he restores her son to life in 4:36 that Elisha refers to her again as *'that Shunammite woman* [hazzot].*'*

Bolstering the argument that Elisha had little respect for the woman are two character traits with which the narrative portrays the prophet. First, Elisha appears to bear animosity toward the House of Ahab. When King Jehoshaphat of Judah, King Jehoram of Israel, and the unnamed King of Edom come down to Elisha for some advice in their joint war against Moab, Elisha addresses Jehoram contemptuously: *'What have you to do with me? Go to your father's prophets and your mother's prophets'* (II Kg. 3:13). Second, as we are told in 4:8, this Shunammite was very wealthy and hospitable. Yet, as we know from other passages, Elisha has little respect for one's wealth. For example, when he heals Na'aman of his leprosy in 5:15-18, he will not accept any gifts of animals or silver. In fact, when his servant Gehazi takes it upon himself to get from Na'aman the money that Elisha refused, Elisha scolds him by asking: *'Is this a time to take silver in order to buy clothing and olive groves and vineyards, sheep and oxen, male and female slaves?'* (5:26) Indeed, Gehazi's interest in wealth angers Elisha so much that he strikes him with leprosy. Moreover, later in the story, when the woman returns from the land of the Philistines after a seven-year famine, she goes to the king whining about her lost wealth (8:2-5). Therefore, the text's description of the Shunammite woman as a wealthy complainer, characteristics abhorrent to Elisha, might explain why Elisha referred to her in 4:25 with the pejorative demonstrative.

We also find the pejorative in II Kings 23:17 in the words of King Josiah, who after destroying the detestable shrines of the pagan deities Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Milcom, and the sacred posts and altar at Bethel, and after removing the

bones from the graves and burning them, finds one grave marker remaining. He turns to the people around him and asks: *'What is **this** [hallaz] grave marker that I see?'* That this statement follows a long list of incendiary acts suggests that Josiah's initial thought upon seeing the standing marker was to destroy it. It is then that the men of the town reply: *'That is the grave of the man of God who came from Judah and foretold these things that you have done to the altar of Bethel.'* Whether or not the fact that this man was a prophet from Judah, it is clear that Josiah's intention was to destroy it along with the other abominable graves.

The prophet Ezekiel also employs the colloquial demonstrative in 36:35, when he proclaims: *The men of Israel shall say:* **'That** [hallezu] *land once desolate, has become like the garden of Eden, and the cities, once ruined, desolate, and ravaged, are now populated and fortified.'* Regardless of whether one re-points the lexeme to *'hallezo,'* as suggested by B. Levine,[17] it is clear that land refers deictically to the once sinful Israel whom God promises to restore. The pejorative aspect is brought out by Ezekiel's previous description of the same city in 36:29-32 as *unclean, ashamed, reproached, humiliated, and abominable.* Though one might argue that its use here, in a post-exilic work, represents a stage in the language when diglossic features had already entered literary discourse, this would not explain why Ezekiel does not employ this demonstrative elsewhere (e.g., 21:32, 23:38, 43:12, et al.)

Three instances of diglossic demonstrative constitute a special group, for they appear in the mouths of God and His messengers. Unlike their use in human discourse, they do appear to add a nuance in a way that emphasizes or belittles the ordinary.

Hallazeh in Judges 6:20, for example, appears in the mouth of an angel. Here, God's messenger tells Gideon to *'take the meat and the unleavened bread, and to put them on **that** rock [hallaz] and spill out the broth.'* The colloquialism here emphasizes the earthly nature of the rock, which acquires greater, indeed sacred, significance when the angel touches the offering with his heavenly staff. In fact, this commonplace stone becomes the site of Gideon's altar.

The transformation of something ordinary to something extraordinary is paralleled by the events of Gideon's calling which lead up to the theophany. When God tells Gideon that he is to deliver Israel from the Midianites, and that he

shall be God's messenger (6:14), Gideon replies: *'Please, my Lord, how can I deliver Israel? Why, my clan is the humblest in Manasseh, and I am the young-est in my father's household'* (6:15)! Insecure about his calling, Gideon requests of God a sign. The sign he receives comes in the form of an angel who causes fire to spring up from this ordinary rock. Thus, the colloquial demonstrative here emphasizes the parallel between the transformation of an ordinary rock and the transformation of the ordinary Gideon.

Similar is the employment of the diglossic demonstrative in Zechariah 2:8, in which one angel tells another angel to run to *that* [hallaz] *youth* – that is, Zechariah – and to tell him of a future Jerusalem, fortified with walls of fire, and with God's glory. Again one might argue that because this book is post-exilic it reflects current usage, as with Ezekiel. It then remains to be explained why the non-colloquial demonstrative pronouns occur elsewhere in Zechariah (e.g., 4:9, 8:6, 8:12). While a pejorative nuance here cannot be ruled out entirely, it seems more plausible that, just as in Judges 6:20, the colloquialism here emphasizes Zechariah's ordinariness before extraordinary beings, the angels. This would fit with the general tenor in Zechariah of angels' attitudes toward mortals. As we see in Zechariah 3:1-5, even the illustrious high priest Joshua wears *filthy clothes* and must be changed and cleansed, and fitted with a ritually pure diadem when confronted by angels.

A final usage of the diglossic pronoun appears in Daniel 8:16, also in Divine speech. Here, Daniel hears a voice in a vision coming from the Ulai River. Apparently, it is God's, though we are told that it is like a human voice. The voice commands the archangel Gabriel: *'Gabriel, make that one* [hallaz] *understand the vision!'* – "that one" meaning Daniel. Again, though we might attribute this usage to a reflection of contemporary speech, in the light of the absence of this usage elsewhere in Daniel, I prefer to see here an underscoring of the ordinary. As opposed to the extraordinary nature of angels, Daniel is a mere human.

In sum, the cumulative evidence bears two ramifications for our understanding of biblical Hebrew diglossia. First, it suggests that these diglossic demonstrative pronouns are employed by the biblical writers with an eye toward underscoring the ordinary. When employed by humans, the usage carries a pejorative nuance perfect for insulting or contemptuous speech. When placed in the mouths of

angels and God, this same usage perhaps emphasized the mundane nature of humans and the world in the presence of Divinity.

Second, the results of this research suggest a greater deliberateness in the employment of such colloquialisms within the literary language, at least for those usages that appear in the direct discourse of humans. Doubtless, while some elements of the vernacular have crept stealthily and accidentally into the Hebrew text, others have been appropriated knowingly with artful sophistication.[18] A thorough and systematic search for how other elements of ancient spoken Hebrew are employed will doubtless reveal an even greater sophistication.[19]

GLOSSARY

DEICTIC: directly pointing out, demonstrative.

DIGLOSSIC: capable of using two varieties of language; that is, colloquial versus literary language.

KOINE: a language or dialect in regular use over a wide area in which different languages or dialects are, or were, in use locally.

LEXEME: a vocabulary item.

SYNCHRONIC: a term used by linguists to designate a method of linguistic study concerned with the state of a language at one time, past or present; descriptive, as opposed to historical or diachronic.

NOTES

The original version of this paper was presented at the North American Conference of Afroasiatic Linquistics (NACAL), in March 1996 at Philadelphia, PA. I would like to thank Professor Robert Hoberman of the State University of New York at Stony Brook for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper, some of which I have incorporated.

1. Roy A. Miller, *The Japanese Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967) p. 138.

2. Gary A. Rendsburg, *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*, American Oriental Series, 72 (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1990) p. 2.

3. Rendsburg, p. 3.

4. C.A. Ferguson, "Diglossia," *Word* 15 (1959) p. 326.

5. G.R. Driver, "A Lost Colloquialism in the Old Testament (I Samuel XXV:6)," *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1957) pp. 272-273; M.H. Segal, *Mishanic Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) p. 11; Edward Ullendorff, *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977) p. 11; W. Chomsky, *Hebrew: The Eternal Language* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1964) p. 161.

6. I have in mind here Rendsburg's *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*.

7. Segal, *Mishanic Hebrew Grammar*, p. 11.

8. B. Levine, *"Peraqim be-Toldot ha-Ivrit ha-Medubberet,"* Eretz Israel 14 (1978) pp. 155-160, especially pp. 159-160.

9. Of course, one cannot rule out the possibility that "zeh" and "zot" also can carry a pejorative force, but even if such a usage is attested, it does not negate the evidence for the pejorative use of "hal-

lazeh" and "hallaz" herein. In any event, the separate usage of *hallazeh* and *hallaz* would still require an explanation.

10. For additional examples, see H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939) p. 1276.

11. I thank Professor John Darr of Boston College for bringing this passage to my attention.

12. James B. Greenough, *Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar* (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1897) p. 68. See also, Saul Levin, "Visualizing the Physical Context of Discourse in Languages of the Past," in M. R. Key and H. M. Hoenigswald, eds., *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics: In Remembrance of Stanley Newman* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1989) pp. 469-482, especially pp. 470-471.

13. Chicago Assyrian Dictionary S/3 166, s.v. *šu'ati*.

14. The rabbis (e.g., Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Rambam, Sforno) explain that this phrase means merely that Rebekah alighted from her camel, but clearly they were uncomfortable with a literal interpretation of the text. See n. 15 below.

15. It may be in Genesis 24:63 that Isaac is going to the field *lasuaḥ* "to urinate" (cf., I Kg. 18:27, Micah 6:14). On this meaning, see Gary A. Rendsburg, "Lasuah in Genesis XXIV 63," *Vetus Testamentum* 45/4 (1995) pp. 558-560; "Hebrew *sw/yh* and Arabic *shh*," in Yoel L. Arbeitman, ed., *FUCUS: A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988) pp. 419-430; "*Lasuah* in 1QS 7.15," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepripha* 5 (1989) pp. 83-94.

16. On the pejorative use of sexual body parts, see Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, *Euphemism & Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) pp. 75-116; and now Stefan Schorch, *Euphemismen in der Hebräischen Bibel* (Orientalia Biblica et Christiana, 12; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999).

17. Levine, "Peraqim be-Toldot ha-Ivrit ha-Medubberet," p. 160.

18. It is of interest that these same deictic pronouns continue to have pejorative currency among the "*Shenkinim*" or "*Tsfoniim*" in the northern residential neighborhoods of Tel Aviv.

19. There remains, of course, the issue of how to treat these pronouns in mishnaic Hebrew. I would suggest that the pejorative meaning of these forms was lost as time went on, so that eventually they came to be used as simple demonstratives, perhaps with a bit more force, but with no pejorative connotation. This might explain why the normative literary demonstratives occur alongside the colloquial forms in these books.

n.10. add: ὦ οὗτος Αἴας

n.11 add: Τοῦτον εὗραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν...

n.13 add: awīltam šu'âti igalluš i

* author received no proofs!

WHEN GOD'S WILL CAN AND CANNOT BE ALTERED:
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
THE BALAAM NARRATIVE AND I KINGS 13

HAYYIM ANGEL

In recent years, numerous articles have been published analyzing the enigmatic narrative in I Kings 13.[1] Among the perplexing issues are: The Judean Man of God's sudden noncompliance with his own prophecy; God's severe verdict against the Man of God, given that he had been deceived; and the sparing and rewarding of the fraudulent Old Prophet of Bethel (he received true prophecy in I Kings 13:20-22, and his bones were left untouched during Josiah's reforms in II Kings 23:15-18). Justifiably, the problems inherent in this narrative have attracted the attention of many scholars and students.

Rather than survey earlier opinions, I would like to propose a different starting point of analysis: The narrative in I Kings 13 bears many similarities to the story of Balaam, to the point where it appears to have been modeled after the Balaam narrative. In both narratives, a true prophet receives a command from God and initially obeys, subsequently violates his charge, is rebuked by God through the mouthpiece of one who had not previously been a prophet, and ultimately is brought into submission by God. By considering the overlapping structural elements between the two stories, and their significant divergences, we will be in a position to address several of the difficulties in I Kings 13, and to gain insight into the overall purpose of the narrative in its surrounding context.

THE SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE TWO NARRATIVES
THE POWER OF THE PROPHETS

By the time he is introduced to the reader in the Book of Numbers, Balaam already had established a wide reputation as a wonder-worker whose execrations were considered effective.

Hayyim Angel is Associate Rabbi at Congregation Shearith Israel of New York City (the Spanish-Portuguese Synagogue, founded in 1654) and teaches Tanakh at Yeshiva University. He has published articles on Tanakh in journals such as Tradition, Nahalah, Jewish Thought, *and in several collections of essays.*