Inscribe It in a Book

Edited by
JOHANNES UNSOK RO
and BENJAMIN D. GIFFONE

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Edited by

Corinna Körting (Hamburg) · Konrad Schmid (Zürich)
Mark S. Smith (Princeton) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

139

Inscribe It in a Book

Scribal Practice, Cultural Memory, and the Making
of the Hebrew Scriptures

Edited by

Johannes Unsok Ro and Benjamin D. Giffone

Mohr Siebeck

Johannes Unsok Ro, born 1971; 1998 MA in Theological Studies; 2002 Dr. theol. in Old Testament; 2007 MDiv; currently Professor of Biblical Studies and Director of the Institute for the Study of Christianity and Culture at International Christian University, Japan.
orcid.org/0000-0003-1835-3093

Benjamin D. Giffone, born 1984; 2009 MS in Biblical Studies; 2012 MTh, 2014 PhD in Old Testament; since 2014 Research Associate, Universiteit van Stellenbosch; currently Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at LCC International University, Klaipėda, Lithuania.
orcid.org/0000-0003-0907-6514

Preface

This volume's journey to publication began with one researcher's initiative to study themes related to scribalism and scribal practice. Johannes Unsok Ro of International Christian University launched a collaborative project on these themes, generating reciprocal and critical communication among scholars across several continents. Contributions were solicited from scholars representing diverse cultural locations and backgrounds, drawing balance of early, mid-career, and senior scholars, with particular emphasis on the voices of East Asian scholars, which have historically been less represented in international biblical scholarship. All contributors have published monographs, and/or have forthcoming monographs, in their respective areas. The project developed more ambitiously and fruitfully than initially planned, so he sought the assistance of one of the contributors, Benjamin Giffone of LCC International University, to be co-editor of this volume.

After the papers were submitted to the editors, they were each read by two reviewers, including other contributors with complementary expertise. When necessary, outside reviewers were sought for papers with particularly specialized foci. The feedback from this process was communicated to each author, who then had the task of revising her/his contribution in light of the critical engagements of the peer reviewers.

As editors and contributors, we want to thank the following persons who were not contributors but who served as reviewers of one or more of the essays: Michael G. Cox, Daniel E. Fleming, Dominik Markl, Yigal Levin, Raymond F. Person, and Jon P. Radwan. Their critical engagements have significantly improved the quality of this book.

We also thank the series editors of FAT II, Konrad Schmid, Mark S. Smith, Hermann Spieckermann, and Andrew Teeter, for accepting our volume in this series. It was a great pleasure to work with the publishing team of Mohr Siebeck, in particular Elena Müller. We also thank Rebecca Armstrong for her assistance in preparing the manuscript for publication. The preparation of the manuscript was supported by a grant from LCC International University. The preparation of the indexes was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) through a KAKENHI research grant (22K00080).

December 2022
                                                      Johannes Unsok Ro
                                                      and Benjamin Giffone

Table of Contents

Part I

Comparative Studies

Part II

Writing about Writing in the Hebrew Bible

Part III

Case Studies

List of Abbreviations

ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AB	Anchor Bible
ABZ	*Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste*
AC	*Acta Classica*
AdSem	Advances in Semiotics
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
Ahw	*Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AMD	Ancient Magic and Divination
ANEM	Ancient Near East Monographs/Monografias sobre el Antiguo Cercano Oriente
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*
ANETS	Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
APSR	*American Political Science Review*
ARAM	*Journal for the ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies*
ARM	Archives Royales de Mari
AS	Assyriological Studies
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AUMSR	Andrews University Monographs Studies in Religion
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BA	La Bible d'Alexandrie
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BBRSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research, Supplements
BeOl	Berit Olam
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BK	*Bibel und Kirche*
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BO	Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSac	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BuL	*Bibel und Liturgie*
BW	BibleWorld

BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZABR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCGG	*Cahiers du Centre Gustave-Glotz*
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CMP	Cultural Memory in the Present
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
COS	*The Context of Scripture*
CP	*Classical Philology*
CRPOGA	Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg, Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Antiques
CurBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
DBAM	*The Dictionary of the Bible and Ancient Media*
DEC	*Driot et Cultures*
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DNWSI	*Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*
DO	Docet Omnia
DULAT	*A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*
EA	El-Amarna tablets
ÉAHA	Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EI	*Encyclopædia Iranica*
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FAT II	Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe
FiHi	*Fides et Historia*
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GBibS	Gorgias Biblical Studies
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
GMTR	Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HeBAI	*Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*

IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
IBHS	Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990)
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ITL	International Theological Library
ITQ	*Irish Theological Quarterly*
IVPBD	*InterVarsity Press Bible Dictionary*
JAJ	*Journal of Ancient Judaism*
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplement Series
JANESCU	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBTS	*Journal of Biblical and Theological Studies*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JDT	*Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JEOL	*Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux*
JHebS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JORH	*Journal of Religion and Health*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
Judaica	*Judaica: Beiträge zum Verständnis des jüdischen Schicksals in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KEH	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch
Ktèma	*Ktèma: Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grece et de Rome antiques*
LAPO	Litteratures anciennes du Proche-Orient
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LLC	*Language and Linguistics Compass*
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*
MARI	*Mari: Annales de recherches interdisciplinaires*
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MCAAS	Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences
MDOG	*Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*
MSO	Mémoires de la Sociéte d'etudes Orientales "Ex Oriente Lux"
MSSMNIA	Monograph Series of the Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology

MUN	Mémoires de l'Université de Neuchâtel
NABUM	Mémoires de *Nouvelles assyriologiques breves et utilitaires*
NAPR	*Northern Akkad Project Reports*
NGC	*New German Critique*
NSKAT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar, Altes Testament
OBC	Orientalia Biblica et Christiana
OBib	*Oxford Bibliographies Online*
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
OPSNKF	Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund
Or	*Orientalia*
OrNS	*Orientalia Nova Series*
OS	Oudtestamentische Studiën/Old Testament Studies
OT	*Oral Tradition*
OTE	*Old Testament Essays*
OTL	Old Testament Library
PBA	Proceedings of the British Academy
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
PFFAR	Publications of the Foundation for Finnish Assyriological Research
PHSC	Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts
PIPOCF	Publications de l'Institut du Proche-Orient ancient du College de France
PJTC	Perspectives on Jewish Texts and Contexts
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
PT	*Political Theory*
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archeologie orientale*
RAI	Rencontre assyriologique international
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBI	*Rivista Biblica Italiana*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RGRW	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RlA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie*
RP	*The Review of Politics*
RSJB	*Recueils de la Societé Jean Bodin*
R&T	*Religion and Theology*
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAAS	State Archives of Assyria Studies
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Study
SCaE	Supplement to Cahiers evangile
SCS	Septuagint Commentary Series

SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SOTBT	Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPCC	Sheffield Phoenix Critical Commentary
SR	*Studies in Religion*
SRSup	Studies in Religion Supplements
ST	Studienbücher Theologie
StBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
Sy	*Syria*
TAD	Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: 1–4* (Hebrew University, Department of the History of the Jewish People, Texts and Studies for Students; Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1986–99)
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TCS	Texts from Cuneiform Sources
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
ThPh	*Theologie und Philosophie*
TJ	*Trinity Journal*
TLJS	The Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
UB	Understanding the Bible Commentary Series
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WAS	Wiener Alttestamentliche Studien
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZABR	*Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*

Introduction

Johannes Unsok Ro and Benjamin D. Giffone

In the field of biblical studies, the topic of "scribal culture" gained limited attention until the 1980s and 1990s. The interest in the subject has dramatically increased in publications since the 2000s.[1] It has become *de rigueur* within biblical scholarship to acknowledge that the texts of the Hebrew Bible were products of scribal communities operating within an oral culture. This is a welcome devel-

---

[1] The literature that discusses the cultural aspects of the life of scribes is extensive. Selected volumes since 1990 would be enough to give a general picture of current scholarship: Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); Philip R. Davies and Thomas Römer, eds., *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism and Script* (London: Routledge, 2014); Raymond F. Person Jr. and Robert Rezetko, *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, AIL 25 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016); Jonathan G. Kline, *Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible*, AIL 28 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016); Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*, JSJSup 173 (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Scott B. Noegel, *"Wordplay" in Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ANEM 26 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2021); David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Brian Schmidt, ed., *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, AIL 22 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015); Seth L. Sanders, *From Adapa to Enoch: Scribal Culture and Religious Vision in Judea and Babylon*, TSAJ 167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); William M. Schniedewind, *The Finger of the Scribe: How Scribes Learned to Write the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019); idem, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Jonathan S. Greer, John W. Hilber, and John H. Walton, eds., *Behind the Scenes of the Old Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018); Ruth Ebach and Martin Leuenberger, eds., *Tradition(en) im Alten Israel: Konstruktion, Transmission und Transformation*, FAT 127 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019); Wolfgang Oswald, ed., *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten*, FAT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); David W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*, JSOTSup 109, (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991); Piotr Bienkowski et al., eds., *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard*, LHBOTS 429 (New York: T&T Clark, 2005); David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Sara J. Milstein, *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*, FRLANT 251 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Hans Jürgen Tertel, *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives*, BZAW 221 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006); Sidnie White Craw-

opment, as it permits the calibration and testing of source-, redaction-, and text-critical models, and allows for more realistic inquiry into the diverse strands that comprise the biblical texts.[2]

A great deal of biblical literary-historical scholarship has tended to proceed with the implicit assumption that biblical literature evolved solely by the medium of writing. However, it is now clear that even within the literate circles of scribes, oral correspondence/performance may have become the standard, with written texts playing a secondary role – at least until the text itself was regarded as sacred and the scrolls themselves became objects of veneration.[3] Philip Davies and Thomas Römer ask a useful question at this point: "in a world very largely preliterate, and before the institution of public reading (and translation) in synagogue, how were the scriptures disseminated (if at all) beyond literate circles?"[4] According to Davies and Römer, orality stresses efficiency, which not only requires but promotes elaboration, variation, and modification within certain limits.[5] As if each new rewriting were indeed a new "performance," the written form is constantly elaborated and changed. At least until a stage when not only the work, but also its textual fixation, was canonized, the roles of copying and composition did

---

ford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*, STDJ 95 (Leiden: Brill 2011); Benjamin Ziemer, *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*, VTSup 182 (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Raymond F. Person Jr., *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*, AIL 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010); Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, *The Transformation of Torah: From Scribal Advice to Law*, JSOTSup 287 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999); Michael LeFebvre, *Collections, Codes, and Torah: The Re-Characterization of Israel's Written Law*, LHBOTS 451 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006); Jonathan Vroom, *The Authority of Law in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism: Tracing the Origins of Legal Obligation from Ezra to Qumran*, JSJSup 187 (Leiden: Brill, 2018); Paul S. Evans, "Creating a New 'Great Divide': The Exoticization of Ancient Culture in Some Recent Applications of Orality Studies to the Bible," *JBL* 136.4 (2017): 749–64.

[2] Important examples include: Saul M. Olyan and Jacob L. Wright, *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*, BJS 361 (Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 2018); Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 75 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014); Joshua A. Berman, *Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention and the Limits of Source Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Martilla, eds., *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011); Jan Christian Gertz et al., eds., *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, FAT 111 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Kristin Weingart, *Gezählte Geschichte: Systematik, Quellen und Entwicklung der synchronistischen Chronologie in den Königebüchern*, FAT 142 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020); Joshua Berman, "Empirical Models of Textual Growth: A Challenge for the Historical-Critical Tradition," *JHebS* 16/12 (2016):1–25, doi:10.5508/jhs.2016.v16.a12.

[3] Davies and Römer, *Writing the Bible*, 2.

[4] Davies and Römer, *Writing the Bible*, 2.

[5] Davies and Römer, *Writing the Bible*, 2.

not seem to be divided. The production of texts might well be assigned to mere copyists, whose social standing was likely lower than that of an author.[6]

Research into cultural aspects of life of a scribe is frequently combined with memory studies.[7] Recently, a body of study has arisen which includes memory in conversations about transmission of tradition and scribal practices. For example, the studies by Raymond Person and David Carr pay attention to the function of recollection in the history of scribal transmission regarding biblical texts, Qumran material and other ancient literature.[8] The essays in a collection edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin also consider scribal memory as a noticeable element in transmission of tradition.[9] The term "scribal memory" applies narrowly to the awareness of the standard texts within the collective memory of scribes and, more generally, to the influence of that knowledge on the biblical texts and their manuscripts.[10] Scribal memory can affect how the individual scribe makes copies of biblical texts, creating manuscripts that may vary from others but are not alien because they represent the conscious or subconscious understanding by the scribe of other versions of the same text, of other texts, or even of a wider tradition.[11] Raymond Person has used the idea of scribal memory in a variety of studies that contradict the consensus paradigm regarding the interaction between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. Person articulates that the parallel texts between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are better interpreted not as indicating textual dependency or derivatives, but rather as two loyal reproductions of the larger heritage retained in the collective memory of the scribes.[12] In this way, the present biblical texts can be considered instantiations of individual scribes in specific time and place based on the larger repertoire of the collective memory. For example, this idea could also be insightful for clarifying literary relationship within some heterogeneous traditions of biblical manuscripts such as MT-Samuel, LXX-Samuel, and 4QSam[a]. Person's hypothesis reminds of Ferdinand de Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole* which is a theoretical linguistic dichotomy. *Langue* means the abstract and

---

[6] Davies and Römer, *Writing the Bible*, 3.

[7] For bibliography and issues related to "memory" in the Hebrew Bible cf. Barat Ellman, "Memory and History in the Hebrew Bible," *OBib* (2017), doi: 10.1093/obo/9780199840731-0143.

[8] Raymond F. Person Jr., "The Ancient Israelite Scribe as Performer," *JBL* 117 (1998): 601–9; Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*.

[9] Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, eds., *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*, FAT 85 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

[10] Raymond F. Person Jr., "Scribal Memory," *DBAM* 1:352.

[11] Person Jr., "Scribal Memory," 352.

[12] Raymond F. Person Jr., "Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments," in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writing: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literature Production*, ed. Brian Schmidt (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 197–215; idem, "The Role of Memory in the Tradition Represented by the Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles," *OT* 26 (2011): 537–50; idem, *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles*.

formal system of linguistic rules and conventions which exists independently be-
fore individual language user; *parole* indicates particular instances in utilizing
and employing langue and it differs in each individual. If Person is correct, the
current biblical text is a collection of *parole* based on scribal collective memory
which functions as a *langue.*

Furthermore, for David Carr, ancient scribal elitism was the result of advanced
curricula and schooling, and therefore there is a complex social stratification
between the different forms of Judahite literacy. Carr does not dispute that read-
ing and writing may have been skills used by many of the ancient Judahite pop-
ulation, but a group of learned elites should be investigated separately from the
scribal craftsmen. Only these elites were able to learn and memorize the texts
which formed and shaped the social discourse of the Judahite community.[13] Carr
argues that Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomistic History were at
the heart of an emerging curriculum in ancient Israel, one that had a significant
impact during the exile and subsequent periods.[14]

For the recognition of more nuanced social stratification, perhaps it is
worth noting that literacy is not a simple skill, but an intricate combination of
techniques applied to texts.[15] In addition to the technical rigors of literacy, there
are distinct categories in skills. Ancient literacy can practically be separated into
three completely different areas: (1) reading, (2) writing by a copyist or a crafts-
man; and (3) writing by a composer. These roles were usually not overlapping;
the different tasks were possibly assigned to persons of different social classes.
Members of the priestly class, in particular, seem to have been frequently divided
based on social rankings and religious authorities. For example, a priestly class
such as Levites and Hasidim were not considered as upper-class since they were
priests who were ranked lower than the כהנים (Ezra 2:36; 3:2; 6:9; Neh 3:22; 5:12;
7:64; 12:41)[16] – thereby experiencing "status inconsistency."[17]

---

[13] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 111–73.

[14] Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 142.

[15] Cf. Johannes Unsok Ro, *Poverty, Law, and Divine Justice in Persian and Hellenistic Judah*
(Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018), 21.

[16] Cf. Ro, *Poverty, Law, and Divine Justice*, 179–80.

[17] Cf. Ro, *Poverty, Law, and Divine Justice*, 180. The term "status inconsistency" refers
to a social phenomenon that occurs when a person's resources vary due to different social
class systems: According to Gerhard E. Lenski, it is human nature to strive for maximum
gratification, even though it means harming others (*Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social
Stratification* [New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966], 44). An individual with strong economic power
but limited political power, for example, would think about himself or herself in terms of the
economic class system's high-ranking status. An individual with a low occupational rank but a
high level of education would act or think in the same way. Others who associate with him or
her in society, on the other hand, have a vested interest in treating him or her in the opposite
orientation, that is, in terms of his or her lowest rated ranking (Lenski, *Power and Privilege*,
86–88). Status inconsistency may be a factor in social dispute. People whose social statuses are
inconsistent have a proclivity to resist the status quo (Lenski, *Power and Privilege*, 87). This
definition provides a rational explanation to the significant issue of why some members of the

The above brief sketch indicates several prominent developments of recent research regarding cultural aspects of scribalism. In our view, this volume contributes to the ongoing conversation within biblical and cognate studies concerning the scribal processes that produced biblical texts. The terms used within the title reflect the nodes that we seek to connect:

A. "Scribal practice": In contrast to "scribal culture," which could be narrowly construed as the subculture inhabited by scribes themselves, the term *practice* focuses on the production and social function of written texts within an oral culture.
B. "Cultural memory": Along with similar terms such as "social memory," "community memory" and "collective memory," this signifies the body of unwritten knowledge, understandings, and beliefs of a largely non-literate society of which scribes were part.[18]
C. "Hebrew scriptures": Not merely several *biblia*, but *graphai*: diverse texts which come to be regarded collectively as holy writ.
D. "Making": Includes various stages of text production, from oral utterance up to the extant manuscript forms: oral transmission, writing, copying, revision, supplementation, etc.

The essays in this volume take up the following subjects:

A. Tools and processes of scribal education, and the production of texts by scribes
B. Scribal culture in ancient Israel/Judea compared with those of other ANE cultures
C. The interaction between scribal texts and cultural/collective/community memory within an oral culture such as ancient Israel/Judea
D. The overlap and/or intersections of the roles "prophet," "priest," and "scribe" in ancient Israel/Judea and beyond
E. Conceptions of writing and scribal process within biblical texts themselves

The essays in Part I employ comparative methodologies to the topic of the scribal origins of biblical texts. The first essay, Daniel Bodi's "New Proposal for

---

upper and middle classes in a society dedicate themselves to revolutionary sociopolitical causes. To put it another way, despite their elevated status within the educational and vocational class systems, lower-ranking priests such as Levites and Hasidim did not hold a high place within the political and economic class systems. The active and dedicated involvement of Levites and Hasidim in writing and composing the Theology of the Poor can be persuasively explained using this principle of status inconsistency (Ro, *Poverty, Law, and Divine Justice*, 7–10).

    [18] See the very recent collection facilitated by one of the editors: Johannes Unsok Ro and Diana Edelman, eds., *Collective Memory and Collective Identity: Case Studies in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History*, BZAW 534 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021). Many current works in biblical studies build off the seminal work of Jan Assmann applying "social memory" studies in the ancient world: *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

the Origin of the Term 'Letter,'" analyzes the relationship between the Akkadian word *egirtu*, the Biblical Aramaic *'iggrâ* and the Biblical Hebrew *'iggeret*. Bodi evaluates scholarly suggestions as to the etymology of this term, and argues that the most useful comparison is the Old Babylonian *egirrû/igerrû* – with the sense of "placing a word" with someone about another person – in Mari texts. The chain of transmission connoted in the term *egirrû*, from god to scribe to king, has implications for the understanding of the Hebrew scriptures perceived as a "letter," a "word that has been placed" with human transmitters for other humans informing them about God.

William R. Stewart likewise appeals to Mari literature in evaluating recent scholarly claims that biblical accounts of preexilic prophets are predominantly (or exclusively) the product of the literary activity of postexilic scribes. In offering "A Comparative Study of Prophetic Sign-Reports in the Royal Archives of Mari, Syria (ARM 26/1.206) and the Hebrew Bible (Jeremiah 19:1–13)," Stewart responds to John Barton's influential suggestion that the postexilic scribes (mis) perceived preexilic prophecy as a "mantic" activity. Stewart identifies parallels between Jeremiah 19 and the Mari text, which is the earliest extant extrabiblical prophetic sign-report, and argues that the reported activities of Jeremiah are credible as a preexilic prophecy enacted and exegeted by a historical prophet.

In "Scribal Intertexts in the Book of Job: Foreign Counterparts of Job," JiSeong Kwon evaluates attempts to identify a particular source text for the book of Job. Many Egyptian, Sumerian, Ugaritic, and Edomic texts with the "righteous sufferer" theme and similar motifs have been proposed as background for Job, but no clear demonstration of direct dependence has been successfully achieved. Kwon proposes not a direct line of literary dependence, but rather a general awareness of non-Israelite "sufferer" texts among the Israelite literati, who then recreated and adapted the motifs to their own cultural memory and aims.

The final contribution to Part I ranges a bit farther afield than the more obvious comparisons to Mesopotamian, Syro-Palestinian and Egyptian scribal communities and corpora. In "Collective Identity through Scribalism: Interpreting Plato's *Menexenus* and the Book of Chronicles," Sungwoo Park and Johannes Unsok Ro compare the ways in which Plato and the Chronicler adapted earlier literary forms – in this case, leaders' speeches at moments of national transition. Park and Ro show that in the *Menexenus* Socrates coopts the form of Pericles's famous funeral speech, but in service of a new kind of Athenian collective identity – one that is less militaristic and more focused on national and personal virtue. By comparison, in the Chronicler's re-presented history of the Israelite monarchy the speeches of David at key junctures serve to (among other aims) re-formulate the All-Israel collective identity independent of a kingship, more focused on national virtue and loyalty to YHWH.

The essays in Part II approach the topic of scribal practice starting from Hebrew Bible texts that make reference to scribes and the act of writing itself. Each

of these essays, in its own way, interacts with the notion of a "divine torah," a written text taking on divine authority and its presence/performance in some way representing the deity's presence in the community.

In the essay titled, "Then Moses Wrote This Torah," Benjamin Kilchör argues for three levels of communication within Deuteronomy: an initial oral audience of Moses's speech, written communication for the benefit of the priestly and scribal elites, and – significantly – the future generations of laity who would be addressed by the oral performance of the written text, for pedagogical purposes and in cultic contexts.

In their contribution, Lisbeth S. Fried and Edward J. Mills III examine the story of "Ezra the Scribe" as that character is presented in Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8. Building on Fried's recent proposed reconstruction of an original letter from Artaxerxes to Ezra,[19] Fried and Mills here suggest that the distance between the reconstructed original and the received text can be explained by the evolution of meaning of the Aramaic term דת, and the corresponding role of Ezra as a ספר מהיר. Through comparison with Daniel 2, 6 and 7, Fried and Mills argue that as דת changes from royal *ad hoc* decree to written statute, the role of the "scribe" changes from personal agent of the king (as in the reconstructed letter) to the biblical author's understanding of Ezra: as judge and expositor of written divine "torah."

Similarly, Johanna Erzberger suggests that the evolution of the character "Baruch" reflects the textualization of prophetic authority. In "Israel's Salvation and the Survival of Baruch the Scribe," she compares the role of Baruch in the extant versions of Jeremiah and the book of Baruch, with particular focus on the structural significance of MT Jer 36 and 45 – corresponding to LXX Jer 43 and 51:31–35 – within the books of Jeremiah. She concludes that the book of Baruch may be read as furthering the textualization of prophetic authority, in closer affinity to the conception presented in MT Jeremiah, despite the closer structural continuity with LXX Jeremiah.

In "Tracing Divine Law: Written Divine Law in Chronicles," Peter Altmann analyzes references to "YHWH's torah" in Chronicles, over-against Samuel–Kings, in search of insight into the significance of written "divine law" in the late-Persian / Early Hellenistic period. Altmann observes that "YHWH's torah" is most prominent in Chronicles when good kings apply the cultic ordinances of the Pentateuch, whereas connections to other legal spheres are largely absent. The Chronicler's use of written "torah," then, points to the Pentateuchal texts' ongoing application to new cultic situations, rather than as positive, practical judicial law, with implications for our understanding of the Pentateuch's formation and promulgation in the Persian period.

---

[19] Lisbeth S. Fried, *Ezra: A Commentary*, SPCC (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015), 309–31.

The essays in Part III employ a variety of approaches to specific cases in the Hebrew Bible where the scribal process becomes evident, and can be illumined by careful study of mainly internal evidence. These studies reflect a range in the degree of confidence with which the developmental history of a specific text may be reconstructed. In each case one may see behind the text a community of scribes, working to negotiate the constraints of cultural memory while furthering their own aims and purposes.

The first three essays take up the interaction of law and narrative. In a study of Deuteronomy 13:1–5 and the Former Prophets, Jin Han alliteratively asks, "Did the Deuteronomist Detest Dreams?" Even though Deuteronomy 13 casts a shadow of doubt upon the practice of dream divination as leading to the worship of other gods, dream revelations are presented positively in several instances within the Deuteronomistic History. Han suggests that the Deuteronomists are balancing the strong, positive cultural memory of leaders experiencing revelation through dreams at key moments in Israel's story, with the desire to discourage their audience from adopting dream divination instead of relying on written "torah."

Benjamin Giffone likewise addresses another instance of apparent conflict between the written "torah" and a narrative text. In "Regathering Too Many Stones? Scribal Constraints, Community Memory, and the 'Problem' of Elijah's Sacrifice for Deuteronomism in Kings," Giffone examines the narrative elements of 1 Kings 18–19 that might have been considered problematic for a Deuteronomistic conception of cultic centralization. Giffone proposes that the editors' apparent lack of concern about Elijah's sacrifice can be explained by a desire to balance cultural memory and theological advocacy, and also by specific narrative elements that render the story at least *tolerable* from the standpoint of Persian-period, pro-Jerusalem editors.

In "Nehemiah 5:1–13 as Innerbiblical Interpretation of Pentateuchal Slavery Laws," Roger Nam reminds that conceptions of scribal practice must account for the intricacies of social systems, economic power, and political authority. Nam shows how the scribal appropriation (or application) of the slavery laws in the Nehemiah 5 narrative must be "translated" through the lens of differing economic settings.

Kristin Weingart proposes that the well-attested ancient scribal activity of "chronicle-writing" can provide insight into the scribal culture that produced the biblical texts. In "Chronography in the Book of Kings: An Inquiry into an Israelite Manifestation of an Ancient Near Eastern Genre," Weingart identifies the elements of a "Chronicle of the Kings of Israel," a continuously updated chronographic work going back to the Omrides, which served as an informational source for the book of Kings as Israel and Judah developed a scribal culture and substantial literature in the late 9th and early 8th centuries.

Woo Min Lee searches for an element of scribal preservation of cultural memory in the story of Hezekiah's prayer and YHWH's response, in "The 'Remnant'

in the Deuteronomistic Cultural Memory: A Case Study on 2 Kings 19:30–31."
Lee argues that the passage reflects the scribes' interweaving of historical and
cultural memory and eschatological perspective as a part of Isaiah's message to
Hezekiah during Sennacherib's attack against Jerusalem.

Benjamin Ziemer's bold essay, "Radical Versus Conservative? How Scribes
Conventionally Used Books While Writing Books," is overarching in its scope
and culturally self-aware in its approach. Ziemer takes issue with the axioms
of the "growth model" of redaction criticism, in particular, the principles of
addition and differentiation which would theoretically allow editorial layers to be
identified. Having marshaled many examples from the biblical texts – including
various recensions and versions – and Mesopotamian literature, Ziemer argues
that we should rather think in terms of "master scribes" (following Milstein) who
never reproduced the original in its entirety without omission, but instead were
inclined to add, combine, omit, substitute, rearrange, and otherwise update in
ways that cannot be clearly excavated without the *Vorlage(n)*.

As readers will easily recognize, the present volume explores a wide-ranging
landscape of materials and incorporates a variety of research into one volume.
Each of the fourteen essays advances its own fresh perspective and insights,
while also providing a window into larger scholarly projects related to scribal
practice, cultural memory, and the making of the Hebrew Scriptures. The editors
sincerely hope that this volume succeeds in making significant contributions to
the ongoing paradigm shift in Hebrew Bible studies.

Bibliography

Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and
    Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
Ben Zvi, Ehud, and Christoph Levin, eds. *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second
    Temple Judah*. FAT 85. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
Berman, Joshua. "Empirical Models of Textual Growth: A Challenge for the Historical-
    Critical Tradition." *JHebS* 16/12 (2016):1–25. doi:10.5508/jhs.2016.v16.a12.
Berman, Joshua. *Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention and the Limits of
    Source Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
Bienkowski, Piotr, et al., eds. *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour
    of Alan R. Millard*. LHBOTS 429. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Ox-
    ford University Press, 2011.
Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New
    York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerd-
    mans, 2008.
Davies, Philip R., and Thomas Römer, eds. *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism and Script*.
    London: Routledge, 2014.

Ebach, Ruth, and Martin Leuenberger, eds. *Tradition(en) im Alten Israel: Konstruktion, Transmission und Transformation*. FAT 127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Ellman, Barat. "Memory and History in the Hebrew Bible." *OBib* (2017). doi:10.1093/obo/9780199840731-0143.

Evans, Paul S. "Creating a New 'Great Divide': The Exoticization of Ancient Culture in Some Recent Applications of Orality Studies to the Bible." *JBL* 136.4 (2017): 749–64.

Fitzpatrick-McKinley, Anne. *The Transformation of Torah: From Scribal Advice to Law*. JSOTSup 287. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Fried, Lisbeth S. *Ezra: A Commentary*. SPCC. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015.

Gertz, Jan Christian, et al., eds. *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*. FAT 111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Greer, Jonathan S., John W. Hilber, and John H. Walton, eds. *Behind the Scenes of the Old Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*. JSOTSup 109. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.

Kline, Jonathan G. *Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible*. AIL 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016.

LeFebvre, Michael. *Collections, Codes, and Torah: The Re-Characterization of Israel's Written Law*. LHBOTS 451. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Lenski, Gerhard E. *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Milstein, Sara J. *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Müller, Reinhard, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*. RBS 75. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Najman, Hindy, and Konrad Schmid, eds. *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*. JSJSup 173. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Noegel, Scott B. *"Wordplay" in Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. ANEM 26. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2021.

Olyan, Saul M., and Jacob L. Wright. *Supplementation and the Study of the Hebrew Bible*. BJS 361. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 2018.

Oswald, Wolfgang, ed. *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten*. FAT 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Pakkala, Juha. *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*. FRLANT 251. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Person, Raymond F., Jr. "Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments." Pages 197–215 in *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writing: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literature Production*. Edited by Brian Schmidt. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

Person, Raymond F., Jr. "The Ancient Israelite Scribe as Performer." *JBL* 117 (1998): 601–9.

Person, Raymond F., Jr. *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*. AIL 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Person, Raymond F., Jr. "The Role of Memory in the Tradition Represented by the Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles." *OT* 26 (2011): 537–50.

Person, Raymond F., Jr., and Robert Rezetko. *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. AIL 25. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2016.

Ro, Johannes Unsok. *Poverty, Law, and Divine Justice in Persian and Hellenistic Judah.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018.

Ro, Johannes Unsok, and Diana Edelman, eds. *Collective Memory and Collective Identity: Case Studies in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History*. BZAW 534. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021.

Sanders, Seth L. *From Adapa to Enoch: Scribal Culture and Religious Vision in Judea and Babylon.* TSAJ 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Schmidt, Brian, ed. *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production.* AIL 22. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.

Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Schniedewind, William M. *The Finger of the Scribe: How Scribes Learned to Write the Bible.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Tertel, Hans Jürgen. *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives.* BZAW 221. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Vroom, Jonathan. *The Authority of Law in the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism: Tracing the Origins of Legal Obligation from Ezra to Qumran.* JSJSup 187. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Weingart, Kristin. *Gezählte Geschichte: Systematik, Quellen und Entwicklung der synchronistischen Chronologie in den Königebüchern.* FAT 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Weissenberg, Hanne von, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Martilla, eds. *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts.* STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill 2011.

Ziemer, Benjamin. *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz.* VTSup 182. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Part I

Comparative Studies

A New Proposal for the Origin of the Term for 'Letter': Sumerian inim.gar, i₅-gar-ra; Akkadian *egirtu*; Aramaic *'iggĕrâ*, *'iggartâ*, Hebrew *'iggeret*

Daniel Bodi

1. Akkadian *egirtu* "Letter" Derived From *egēru* Meaning, "To Be Crossed, or Twisted"?

The latest study of the Akkadian word *egirtu* in a published Harvard Ph.D. dissertation by Paul Mankowski reiterates the argument offered by Kaufman more than forty years ago[1]:

Kaufman has proposed the only plausible etymology for *egirtu*. In a 1977 article he suggested that *egirtu* is the feminine verbal adjective of the Akkadian *egēru*, "to be crossed, twisted," arguing that from the Mesopotamian (cuneiform) point of view, the orientation of Aramaic writing appeared "crosswise," and the *egirtu* was simply the Akkadian name for an Aramaic document, later having itself become a loanword in Aramaic with the specific meaning "letter."[2]

Kaufman sought corroboration for this explanation in the ninth-century bilingual Assyrian Aramaic inscription from the Tell Fekheryeh statue, where the cuneiform text is written running parallel to the long axis, at ninety degrees to the Aramaic text. Thus, Kaufman and in his vein Mankowski derive *egirtu* from *egēru* "to be crossed, twisted," presumably reflecting how the Assyrians perceived the Aramaic alphabetic writing as "lying transversally across" in respect to the cuneiform Akkadian script. This explanation may appear as an ingenious illustration of the meaning of the Akkadian verb *egēru* "to be crossed, twisted" but seems contrived.

First, Landsberger had already pointed out that *egirtu* was falsely derived from the verb *egēru* "to be twisted." He thought that this connection was not self-evident and might be erroneous.[3] Second, the way Assyrians perceived Aramaic

---

[1] Stephen A. Kaufman, "An Assyro-Aramaic *egirtu ša šulmu*," in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of J. J. Finkelstein*, ed. Maria deJong Ellis, MCAAS 19 (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1977), 119–27 (124n44).

[2] Paul V. Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*, HSS 47 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 22–25 (25). The word is variously spelled *egirrû/igerrû/igirrû/egerrû*.

[3] Benno Landsberger, "Das 'gute Wort'," *MAOG* 4 (1928–29): 294–321 (316). "Von *egēru* = 'über Kreuz,' spez. 'kompliziert sein' … ist *egirtu* schwer abzuleiten."

script is expressed differently as (^lúA.BA) "the scribe of the alphabetic script" (see below). Third, the position of the Aramaic inscription written horizontally at 90 degrees in respect to the Assyrian inscription written vertically on the Tell Fekheryeh statue is unusual. It is therefore hazardous to generalize out of a single case with a peculiar bilingual Assyrian-Aramaic disposition of an inscription. Moreover, Oppenheim suggested that the connection between *egirrû* and *egirtu* is based on some "popular" etymology used by scribes but that the precise way they relate these two terms escapes us.[4]

In this context, the use of the Sumerogram ^LÚA.BA in Neo-Assyrian documents to designate the Aramaic scribe using the alphabetic script might be significant. The usual Akkadian term for scribe is *ṭupšarru* that transcribes the Sumerogram ^LÚDUB.SAR means "the man who writes a tablet." However, the Sumerogram ^LÚA.BA is remarkably different, where LÚ stands for "man" and is usually found as a determinative before the name of professions. The following logograms A.BA have been interpreted as an attempt to indicate a scribe who uses the Aramaic alphabet, i. e. *ʾaleph-beth* as if ^LÚA.BA stood for "the man of the alphabet," or, an "alphabet scribe."[5] The Assyrian court had scribes who wrote Akkadian on clay tablets and scribes who wrote Aramaic on *sipru* (writing material made out of parchment or papyrus). Zadok equates *tupšar armāʾa*, written ^LÚA.BA ^KUR *armāʾa*, with *sepīru* which would be a term of Aramaic or Northwest Semitic origin for "scribe" like Hebrew *sōpēr*.[6] In analyzing sources from the first millennium BCE, Laurie Pearce concludes that the majority of Aramaic scribes were individuals of West Semitic parentage who bore Assyrian names, who performed their scribal duties in regions known to be heavily Aramaized and in contexts in which the services of an individual literate in Aramaic would facilitate the transaction.[7] Tadmor considers ^LÚA.BA to be a "pseudo-logogram" designating a scribe who uses alphabetic writing which he renders with "ABC-man."[8] This logogram seems to have originated in thirteenth-century Ugarit where the syllabic cuneiform Akkadian and the thirty alphabetic cuneiform signs for writing Ugaritic were employed side by side. That the "pseudo-logogram" ^LÚA.BA is of Northwest Semitic origin is confirmed beyond any doubt by the

---

[4] A. Leo Oppenheim, "Sumerian: inim.gar, Akkadian: *egirrû* = Greek: *kledon*," *AfO* 17 (1954–55): 49–55.

[5] Stefan M. Maul, "La fin de la tradition cunéiforme et les 'Graeco-Babyloniaca'," *CCGG* 6 (1995): 3–17 (6).

[6] Ran Zadok, *Assyrians in Chaldean and Achaemenid Babylonia* (Malibu, CA: Undena, 1984), 12.

[7] Laurie Pearce, "*Sepīru* and ^LÚA.BA: Scribes of the Late First Millennium," in *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm*, ed. Karel Van Lerberghe and Gabriella Voet, OLA 96 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 355–68 (361).

[8] Hayim Tadmor, "The Aramaization of Assyria: Aspects of Western Impact," in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 3 vols., RAI 25 (Berlin: Reimer, 1982), 2:449–70 (459).

lexical lists found at Ugarit where one finds the following equation: [dub].sar = [a].ba = úmbisag = *ṭup-šar-rum* (*PRU* 3,212.12´-14´, *AHw*, 1395b) and ab.[ba] = [d]ub.sar.[9] At Ugarit, the Sumerogram [LÚ]A.BA stands for a scribe writing the alphabetic cuneiform script and does not designate a scribe writing Aramaic. In the first millennium BCE, however, [LÚ]A.BA stands for the scribe writing the alphabetic Aramaic script.

2. The Akkadian *egirtu* Is Related to *egirrû* as Some Kind of "Utterance"

The traditional explanation of the term *egirtu* is to connect it with the masculine noun *egirrû*. The *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* entry on *egirrû* offers three different meanings for this word: 1.) Reputation (as expressed in utterances of others), 2.) Mood (as evoked by or expressed in utterances), 3.) An oracular utterance of uncertain nature.[10]

However, Akkadian *egirtu* is a feminine verbal adjective or noun identified by the final (*t*) and meaning, 1.) a letter, 2a.) a tablet as a legal document 2b.) a tablet of a specific form.[11] All the examples cited come from Neo-Assyrian times.[12]

The discussion on the origin of the term *egirtu* has a long and contentious history. In his dictionary and an article, von Soden argued that the Akkadian term for a letter is an Aramaic loanword.[13] However, Zimmern had already pointed out that Aramaic 'iggĕrâ is a loanword from Akkadian.[14] Moreover, Mankowski rejects this derivation referring to an article by Köbert who argued that an Aramaic derivation was unlikely on the ground that the West Semitic noun type *qittil, qittal* was largely limited to physical defects, concluding that regarding its meaning and structure the Aramaic word 'iggĕrâ is unique and stands alone.[15] Moreover, Köbert reviewed the earlier German philological scholarship on this term and aligned himself with the Akkadian derivation of the Aramaic word, but tried to explain its unusual form by saying that it was first adopted by the Persians

---

[9] Jean Nougayrol, "'Vocalises' et 'Syllabes en liberté' à Ugarit," in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger*, ed. Hans G. Güterbock and Thorkild Jacobsen, AS 16 (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1965), 29–39 (37n78).

[10] *CAD E*, 43–45.

[11] Simo Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," *JNES* 42 (1983): 1–29 (2, 18), translates *egirtu* with "one-column tablet."

[12] *CAD E*, 45–46.

[13] *AHw*, 190a; Wolfram von Soden, "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten: Ein Vorbericht I," *OrNS* 35 (1966): 1–20 (8).

[14] Heinrich Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluß* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915), 19.

[15] Raimund Köbert, "Gedanken zum semitischen Wort- und Satzbau. 1–7," *OrNS* 14 (1945): 273–83 (278–79); "Gedanklich und strukturell steht iggerā' also allein" (279). Köbert's article offers a series of earlier views by nineteenth century philologists.

and from there into Aramaic. However, the intermediary role of the Persians is unnecessary.

The two most important articles on this topic are still the ones by Landsberger and by Oppenheim. While Landsberger collected the greatest number of texts in which the Akkadian term *egirrû* occurs, Oppenheim's article on Sumerian inim. gar, Akkadian *egirrû*, Greek *klēdōn*[16] offers a valuable history of research. Oppenheim's suggestion to relate Akkadian *egirrû* with the Greek *klēdōn,* however, has now been completely abandoned since *egirrû* does not mean a word of chance, "overheard and considered endowed with ominous meanings." Both Wilcke and Durand criticized his understanding of the term (see below). Since the nineteenth century, Assyriologists have surmised that *egirrû* was some kind of utterance but were unable to determine the exact nuance of this word. Oppenheim enumerates the various early attempts since the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century to translate the term *egirrû* showing the difficulties in determining its precise meaning: Ungnad,[17] "*Stimmung*" ("mood") followed by Thureau-Dangin "*belle humeur*"[18] (i.e. "good mood," which is one of the meanings listed in *CAD* under the entry *egirrû*); Albright: "thought;"[19] Landsberger:[20] "*Formel*" ("formula" i.e. utterance in the sense of a good or evil wish, directly influencing the person to whom it is addressed); von Soden,[21] "*Formel*" and "*Schicksalsformel.*"

Misled by Oppenheim's definition of *egirrû* as a chance word endowed with ominous meanings, Cogan and Sperling compared it with the rabbinic use of the expression *bat qôl*, "daughter of the voice" as a chance utterance or word.[22]

---

[16] Oppenheim, "Sumerian: inim.gar, Akkadian: *egirrû* = Greek: *kledon*," 49–55; Landsberger, "Das 'gute Wort'," 294–321.

[17] Arthur Ungnad, "Review of *Assyriologische und archäologische Studien, Festschrift H.V. Hilprecht (1909)*," *ZDMG* 65 (1911): 109–30 (127).

[18] François Thureau-Dangin, "L'exaltation d'Ištar," *RA* 11 (1914): 141–58 (148–51 "Que mon fidèle messier, dont les livres sont inestimables, qui connaît mes secrets, que Ilabrat, mon insigne messager, soit ton commissionaire; (148 l. 23) que, devant toi, il mentienne en constante belle humeur les dieux et les déesses (*ina maḫ-ri-ka e-gir-e ili u ᵈiš-ta-ri li-dam-me -iq sa-an-tak[-ka]*)."

[19] William F. Albright, "Some Cruces in the Langdon Epic," *JAOS* 39 (1919): 65–90 (76n19) KA-GAR = *egirrû*, and (77) *banû egirrûya* "my thoughts were bright." Heinrich Zimmern, "Zu den 'Keilschrifttexten aus Assur religiösen Inhalts,'" *ZA* 30 (1915/1916): 184–229, KA-GAR *egirrū* "Deutung" = "meaning."

[20] Landsberger, "Das 'gute Wort'," 315.

[21] Wolfram von Soden, "Die Unterweltvision eines assyrischen Kronprinzen," *ZA* 43 (1939): 1–31, l. 14 *egerrê* (INIM.GAR) *lum-ni* "die Formel des Bösen" (20); Idem, "Ein Zwiegespräch Hammurabis mit einer Frau," *ZA* 49 (1950): 151–94 (170, rev. IV:5; 190–91).

[22] Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 194–99, quoted in Mordechai Cogan, "The Road to En-dor," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. D. P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 319–26 (323n22). Also David Sperling, "Akkadian *egerrû* and Hebrew *bt qwl*," *JANESCU* 4 (1972): 63–74.

The entry on *egirrû,* and *egirtu* in the *CAD*, volume E, dating from the year 1958, offers almost four pages of examples. However, not a single one comes from the Old Babylonian Mari texts, which is understandable since the Mari letters mentioning *egirrû* were published about fifteen years later.

It might be worthwhile quoting the summary which the *CAD* E, 45 offers on the three basic meanings of *egirrû*:

The meaning of *egirrû* seems to have developed in three main directions. First, it refers to utterances of approval and admiration or disapproval and contempt which, either as interjections, short curses, or blessings, follow a person in public and are considered a reflection and measure of his social acceptability (cf. German "Nachrede," and cf. mng. 1a). In a slightly different nuance, the word refers to the ways in which an interceding deity can make or undo the standing of a worshipper before an important deity, thus transferring to the religious sphere the typical relationship of a subject with an interceding courtier and with his king (cf. mng. 1b).

In another sphere of meaning, *egirrû* describes the mood of the individual as evoked by utterances of his fellow men in direct contact or as revealed by his own utterances, such as sighs, interjections, etc. (cf. mng. 2).

As a third aspect should be regarded oracular utterances of a somewhat undetermined kind which are either accidental in origin (comparable with Greek *klēdon*) or hallucinatory in nature (corresponding to dreams). In both instances, they are acoustic (cf. the use of the verbs *apālu, šemû, šūṣû* (ka … è), etc.) and considered (as) released by the deity in reply to prayers or as warnings (cf. mng. 3).

3. Sumerian inim.gar "To Place a Word" and Akkadian *egirrû* "Utterance"

Let us first state what has been secured so far with a certain degree of certainty in the course of Assyriological research. That the Akkadian term *egirrû* comes from Sumerian inim/i_5.gar had been established by Landsberger some time ago. Sumerian and Akkadian bilingual lexical lists make the following equation:

inim.gar = *i-gi-r*[*u*]-*u* (Erim-ḫuš III:175)

in[im.gar] = *e-gir-ru-u* (Antagal VIII:263)

inim.gar = *e-gir-ru-u* (Igituh short version 74).[23]

The meaning of the Sumerian inim.gar from which the Akkadian *egirrû* is derived is literally "to place a word," hence "utterance." Translated into Akkadian, it would be something like *awātam šakānum*. This also explains why *egirrû* is

---

[23] *CAD E*, 43, and Oppenheim, "Sumerian: inim.gar, Akkadian: *egirrû* = Greek: *kledon*," 49n3; Rykele Borger and Friedrich Ellermaier, "nº 15 inim/i_5-gar *egirrû* '*Leumund*,' = 'reputation,'" *ABZ*, 64.

frequently followed with the adjective *damiqu* "good." It literally means, "to place a good word" either with the king or with the deity, i. e. to put in a good word for someone. The term *egirrû* designates a word or a discourse concerning somebody else held by an intermediary. In the case of *egirrû* as a divine message, it is given in the absence of the king. The tablet with the written *egirrû* has to be brought and read to the king. In both cases, there is an absent person, which necessitates either oral or written transmission of the message.

In a late bilingual Sumerian-Akkadian text in the Louvre Museum (A.6458), line 1, and dating from the Seleucid period, the Sumerian term in[im].k[a] is rendered in Akkadian with *zikir pîšu* "the word of his mouth."

An azag-ga gal-bi in[im]-k[a]-na nu-mu-[um]-til-li(ti-il)-e-ne

ᵈ*A-nu el-lu zi-kir pi-i-šu la ga-ma-ru*

"Anu, the holy and great, whose word is without end."[24]

4. From Sumerian inim.gar, "To Place a Word"
to Akkadian *egirtu,* "Letter"

My suggestion is that the original meaning of inim.gar, "to place a word," has influenced the understanding and development of *egirrû*-message and *egirtu* as "letter, message," in the sense of placing a word with someone about a third person. The following data tend to confirm such an understanding.

A. There is a text where *egirrû* occurs with the verb *šakānu*, "to place":

egirrû(inim.gar) *dumqi u mēšari šukun elīya* literally: "place a good and just word on my behalf" (King,[25] *Magic* nº 1,22; BMS 1:22), cf. the translation in *CAD* E, 44c "grant me a happy and optimistic mood."

B. In a bilingual Sumero-Akkadian prayer,[26] one finds a highly significant variant (CT 16 8:280/281):

igi.mu.ta inim.gar sig₅.ga ḫé.en.dug₄.ga:

ana panīya e-gir-ri (var.-*tum*) *damiqti liqabbi arkīya ubānu damiqti littariṣ*

"In front of me may good words be said (about me) and may I be pointed out

with approval behind my back" (cf. *CAD* E, 43d).

---

[24] Thureau-Dangin, "L'exaltation d'Ištar," 141–58, (cuneiform text, 144; transcription, 147; translation, 150) "Anu, le saint et grand, dont la parole est sans fin." The Akkadian line differs. It does not render Sumerian gal *rabû* "great."

[25] Leonard W. King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery: Being "the Prayers of the Lifting of the Hand"* (London: Luzac, 1896; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1978).

[26] *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1903), Part 16 (50 Plates).

The texts in CT vol. 16, come from Neo-Assyrian times. There are three duplicates of this text with one variant which instead of *egirrû* has *egirtum*. In his time, Landsberger voiced the opinion that this single example is not enough to prove the case that Sumerian inim.gar was rendered into Akkadian as *egirtu* "letter, message."

C. However, now another example can be adduced where Sumerian inim.gar was understood and pronounced as *egirtu*. The Standard Babylonian Omen series from the library of Aššurbanipal, known as *Šumma ālu ina mēlê šākin*, "If a city is set on a height," is a catalog of omens, part of which date from Old Babylonian times. This is important since it would bridge the chronological gap between Sumerian inim.gar, Standard Babylonian, and Neo-Assyrian *egirtu*:[27]

diš *bi-ir-ṣu ina* gúb-*šú* igi.[du₈ n]a bi inim.gar sig₅-*ta* uš.uš-*šú*

"If a light-flash is se[en] on someone's left, favorable rumors will persistently follow that [m]an" (*Šumma ālu*, Tablet 20, Omen 35; CT 38 28:35).

The feminine adjective *damiqta*(sig₅-*ta*)[28] following the Sumerograms inim.gar normally agrees with the feminine noun that precedes it, indicating that in this case, the scribe read inim.gar as *egirtu*. Such examples show that there is a close connection between the terms inim.gar, *egirrû* and *egirtu*, and that the Akkadian feminine noun *egirtu* is yet another way of rendering Sumerian inim.gar.

D. There is an additional feature in the omen series *Šumma ālu* that might be pertinent for our demonstration. In a couple of omens, the term inim.gar is closely associated with writing and placing a written message. The prayer request is submitted to the god in a written form, to which the god answers with an oracular message. Four types of letters are part of the so-called "divine correspondence" between gods and humans: 1) Letters addressed to the gods, 2) Letters addressed to humans by gods, 3) Reports of military campaigns addressed to gods, and 4) An incantatory letter addressed to a god by a person during a divination ritual.[29]

---

[27] Sally M. Freedman, *If a City is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma Alu ina Mēlê Šakin*, OPSNKF 17 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 298–99. Although the *Šumma ālu* series were copied in Neo-Assyrian times, these omen texts had Old Babylonian precursors, cf. David B. Weisberg, "An Old Babylonian Forerunner to *šumma ālu*," *HUCA* 40–41 (1969–70): 87–104 (87); Friedrich Nötscher, "Die Omen-Serie: *šumma âlu ina mêlê šakin* (CT 38–40)," *Or* 39/42 (1929): 1–247 (41–48); Idem, *Or* 51/54 (1930): 1–243 (Fortsetzung); Idem, "Zur Omen-Serie *šumma âlu*," *OrNS* 3 (1943): 177–95.

[28] Borger and Ellermaier, "n° 454 sig₅ = *damāqu* 'gut'," *ABZ*, 174.

[29] Daniel Bodi, "Les différents genres de la correspondance divine," *Ktèma* 33 (2008): 245–58. Beate Pongratz-Leisten, *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, SAAS 10 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999), 202–9: "Échange de lettres avec les dieux' in der Mari Zeit"; 210–65: "Literarisierte Formen der Kommunikation: 'Gottesbriefe' und 'Königsberichte.'"