EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT NAME-DERIVATIONS

YAIR ZAKOVITCH

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1

BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP, which has been much concerned with etiologies in general and with name-derivations in particular, has attached primary importance to the *explicit name-derivations*. These explain the giving of a name to a person or place by use of one of the formulae such as "wherefore he called its name" or "and she called his name . . . and said" and the like. On the other hand, the *implicit name-derivations* have been neglected. These are comprised of those hints of which the reader becomes aware only by paying attention to the inner dynamics of the given literary work, as they are not accompanied by the aforementioned formulae. Such is found in the verse concerning Isaac: "and, behold, Isaac was sporting (Heb. *yiṣḥāq məsaḥēq*) with his wife" (Gen 26:8). The scholarly "shortchanging" of these implicit name-derivations is striking for two reasons. Firstly, they are by far more numerous than the explicit name-derivations, and secondly, they constitute a more organic part of the works in which they appear than do the explicit name-derivations. Seeligmann (1961, pp. 141–169) and Long (1968) have already pointed out the secondary nature of the explicit name derivations in many cases.

This paper will first discuss the process of explication of implicit name-derivations, wherein later writers, fearing that their readers would not perceive the implicit name-derivation, attached to it one of the formulae of the explicit name-derivations. Next, the paper will deal with those explicit name-

derivations which were tacked on to the implicit ones because of insensitivity, misunderstanding, or ignorance on the part of the writer in regard to the implicit name-derivation.

2

The names of the brother nations *Moab* and the *children of Ammon* are explained in the narrative concerning their birth, Gen 19:30-38. It should be noted that these verses do not comprise a separate unit; rather they are an organic division of the narrative of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.[1] The rough edges of v. 30, which at first sight might indicate a late fusion between the narrative of the birth of Moab and Ammon and the destruction narrative, are actually due to the secondary nature of the Zoar motif in this work, as will be shown further on in this paper. Although the etymological element is not the exclusive concern of the passage vv. 30–38—for this passage tells of the formation of these nations, their kinship with Israel, and the grounds for forbidding intermarriage with them (Deut 23:4)[2]—this element is nonetheless quite an organic part of the work, as its inner dynamics show us. Moab's name is hinted at and derived in the words "of our father "(Hebrew *mē'ăbînû*) (vv. 32, 34) in the speech of the elder daughter, mother of Moab, as in "by their father" (Hebrew *mē'ăbîhen*) (v. 36) and the numerous repetitions of the word "father" (Hebrew *'ab*) (vv. 31, 32, 33, 35). It should be noted that in the words "Thus were both the daughters of Lot with child *by* their father "(Hebrew *mē'ăbîhen*) we have a corruption of normal Hebrew usage, in which only the form "be with child of" is recognized (see Ehrlich 1899, part 1, p. 51). Such a digression from the norm is intentional: its purpose is to make the name-derivation more precise. The derivation from *mē'ăbînû/ mē'ăbîhen* is much closer to the derived name than the text reveals, for in the Moabite dialect the Hebrew *ô*-vocalization is pronounced *ē*. The name being derived, then, is *Mē'ăb*.[3]

Similarly, the second name, Ben-Ammi, which means *Vatersbruder* (see

1. The organic quality of the narrative of the birth of the brothers within the larger work is evident when the Deluge narrative is compared with the destruction narrative. As in the Deluge story, where, after an earth-shaking catastrophe, Noah's son "saw the nakedness" of his drunken father (Gen 9:20ff), so here Lot's daughters intoxicate their father and couple with him, also in an unnatural fashion.

2. My purpose here is not to deal with the origin of the narrative and its attitude toward the two nations, descendants of Moab and Ben-ammi. Nevertheless, I will state that it is difficult to accept Gunkel's opinion that we have here before us a Moabite myth which takes an unkindly view towards the acts of the daughters of Lot.

3. For the relationship between the derivation and the transmutation see: Nestle (1896, p. 322–323), Skinner (1930, p. 313) and Morag (1959, p. 141) for the demonstration of this point on the basis of comparative dialects.

Nestle 1896, p. 322) or "son of my kin" (see Speiser 1964, p. 144), and not
"son of my people" (which would be meaningless in this narrative) is preceded
by the foreshadowing hint "*with* him" (Hebrew *'immô*) (vv. 30, 32, 34, 35). It
is interesting to note that in conjunction with the elder daughter, mother of
Moab, the form "with her/my father (Hebrew *'et 'abîhā /'abî*)" appears, while
in conjunction with the younger daughter, mother of Ben-Ammi, the usage is
derivative of the name: *'immô*.

The derivatives of the names Moab and Ben-Ammi in the MT are no more
than implicit, and only the inner dynamics of the narrative give them away. The
case is otherwise with the LXX, where the name-derivations are explicit. After
the words "and called his name Moab," the LXX adds *legousa ek tou patros
mou*, "which is to say of my father." Moab's name-derivation is also explicit in
the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum: *wəqārēt šəmēh mō'āb 'ărûm mē 'abûhā
it'abbarat* "and she called his name Moab, for she had conceived of her
father." In v. 38, the LXX adds the name Ammon after the words "and called
his name," while what is the name itself in the MT —Ben-Ammi —here be-
comes its derivation: *kai ekalesen to onoma autou Amman huios tou genous
mou*. Furthermore, a number of manuscripts even insert the word *legousa* =
"which is to say" between the derivation of the name Ammon and its explana-
tion. (See also the Targum's attempt to explain the derivation of the name
Ammon.)

Ball (1896, p. 17) was the first to prefer the LXX's version to that of the
MT, and a not insubstantial number of scholars and commentators have fol-
lowed him. Long (1968, pp. 51–52) would have us believe that the explanation
of the names given in the LXX already existed in the translator's Hebrew
Vorlage because of the great resemblance between the LXX and the Hebrew
version in the passage —a groundless contention.

If the additional words in the LXX were in fact an organic part of the
original Hebrew version, it is impossible to understand why they were omitted
and subsequently lost. We cannot postulate a double scribal error in two
separate passages as the cause of their loss. It is also apparent that the addition to
the derivation of Ben-Ammi betrays its own secondary nature, in light of the
fact that it is only the name Ben-Ammi and not Ammon which is fitting for the
father of the people known as "the children of Ammon." The former is the
usual form in the Old Testament, and not Ammon, which appears only twice in
the MT in 1 Sam 11:11 (in the LXX "the children of Ammon") and in Ps 83:8
(Skinner 1930, p. 314).[4] On the other hand, the translator's purpose in adding
explications to the name-derivations is clear. With the implicit name-

4. The appearance of the irregular form "Ammon" in Ps 83:8 stems, in the opinion of L.
Koehler (1945), from metric considerations, while its appearance in 1 Sam 11:11 of the MT is
opposed by the LXX, Jonathan, and the Syriac versions, along with three Hebrew manuscripts,
which bear witness to the reading *bə nê 'ammôn*.

derivation, there is apprehension that the reader, especially if he lacks a sensitive ear for the Hebrew language, will not recognize the derivation — which is not the case when the name-derivation is explicit. Therefore the telltale formula "which is to say" was added. Such a measure is especially understandable if the one making the additions is a translator, for in translation an implicit name-derivation is lost altogether; while the explicit name-derivation at least explains the sense and intent of the name.[5] Nevertheless, in light of the fact that traces of an addition are to be found in two translations, we cannot rule out the possibility that the addition was made by a late *Hebrew* copier. He too

5. More than once the LXX authors have feared losing the meaning of name-derivations in the process of translation. In a manner similar to that in which the "explicator" had treated the implicit name-derivations of Moab and Ammon, the translator has treated the derivation of the name Issachar: *kai ekalesen to onoma autou Issachar, ho estin misthos* (Gen 30:18). A different and more usual manner (although there is no rule or method to the translator's treatment of name-derivations) is to translate the derived name, thus creating a similarity between the name and its derivation. Thus the name Eve (= living beast) is *Zóё* in Gen 3:20, but in 4:1 is transliterated as *Euan*. In solving one problem, a new one has been created, that of the conflict between the two names of the wife of Adam. The name Babel (Gen 11:9) is translated *Sugchisis*; Beer-Lahai-Roi (Gen 16:14), *Phrear hou enópion eidon*; Beer-Sheba (Gen 21:31), *Phrean horkismou*, and so too (Gen 26:33), *Phrear horkou*. Referring to the well which is called "seven," seven is translated *Horkos*. (The name Beer-Sheba is translated even when there is no name derivation involved, cf. Gen 21:14, 22:19); Jehova-Jireh (Gen 22:14), *Kurios eiden*; Esek (Gen 26:20), *Adikia*; Sitnah (Gen 26:21), *Echthria; Rehoboth* (Gen 26:22), *Eurouchória*; Beth-El (Gen 28:19), *Oikos theou* (in contrast, the name is given in 35:15, *Baithèl*); Gilead (Gen 31:48), *Bounos martus*; Mahanaim (Gen 32:3), *Parembolai*; Penuel (Gen 32:31), *Eidos theou* (the Lord is my seer?); Succoth (Gen 33:17), *Skènai*; Abel-Mizraim (Gen 50:11), *Penthos Aiguptou*; Marah, which is mentioned before its name is derived in Exod 15:23, where it is transliterated as *Merra*, while after the derivation it is called *Mikria* (Exod 15:23); Massah and Meribah (Exod 17:7), *Peirasmos kai Loidorèsis* (the same translation holds for the name in its other appearances in the OT as well); Jehova-Nissi (Exod 17:15), *Kurios mou kataphugè*; Taberah (Num 11:3), *Empurismos*; Kibroth-Hattaavah (Num 11:34–35), *Mnèmata tès epithumias* (these names are translated in the same way in Deut 9:22 as well); the brook of Eshcol (Num 13:23–24), *Pharagx botruos*: the water of Meribah (Num 20:13), *Hudor antilogias* and (Num 20:20–24), *Hudatos tès loedorias* (the name is translated in its other appearances in the OT as well); Hormah (Num 21:3), *Anathema*, and in Judg 1:17 the name is translated *Eksolethreusis*; Bochim (Judg 2:1,5), *Klauthmòna* (A), *Klauthmònes* (B); Jehovah-Shalom (Judg 6:24) *Eirène kuriou*; Jerubbaal (Judg 6:32) in version A, *Dikasterion tou Baal*, while in version B the name is transliterated *Iarbaal*, after which comes the secondary formula which appears in the MT and is absent in version A: *legòn Dikasasthò en autò ho Baal* (even the translator of the name is no longer calling him by name as in 7:1); Lehi–the name is transliterated in both versions of the translation in Judg 15:9; it is translated in v. 14 *Siagonos* in both versions; Ramath Lehi (Judg 15:17), *Anairesis siagonos* in both versions, while "En-Hakkore which is in Lehi" (Judg 15:19) is translated in version A: *Pègè epiklètos siagonos* and in version B: *Pègè tou epikaloumenou hè estin en Siagoni*; Sela-Hammahlekoth (1 Sam 23:28), *Petra he meristhe isa*; Helkath Hazzurim (2 Sam 2:16), *Meris tòn epiboulòn*; Baal-Perazim (2 Sam 5:20). *Epanò diakopòn* (from *ma'al-pərasîm*?), and a transliteration in 1 Chr 14:11, *Baalpharasin*, and further on the translation of the second element alongside its transliteration, *Diakopèpharasin*; Perez-Uzzah (2 Sam 6:8),

may have feared his readers' insensitivity and for that reason explicated the implicit derivation. Indeed, it is my intention to bring below several examples of the explication of implicit derivations in the MT itself. The additions that explicate the implicit derivations generally begin with the words "Wherefore was it called . . ."

This rule is clear in the derivation of the name Edom in Gen 25:30: "and Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage (Hebrew *hā' ādôm hā' ādôm*); for I am faint: *therefore was his name called Edom.* " A late author, fearing that his readers would overlook the name-derivation of Esau-Edom, especially as it appears alongside the name Esau alone, added these words, postponing, as it were, the giving of the name Edom to a later period in the life of Esau. The original form of the name-derivation is identical in type with the name-derivation of the same character in v. 25. There, beside one of his names—Esau—are derived the two others, Edom and Seir.[6]

In those cases where a place-name and its suggested (and implicit) derivation precede the formula "wherefore was it called" in the given literary work, it is clear that the formula is secondary, coming to assure that the suggested name-derivation has indeed been grasped and understood.[7]

a. "And Jacob journeyed to Succoth (the name), and built him a house, and made booths (Hebrew *sukkôt*; the derivation): <therefore the name of the place is called Succoth>." Whereas the implicit name-derivation only toys with the place-name, the explicit name-derivation affirms artificially that the name was given to the place by the character encamping there. (Gen 33:17)

b. "And Laban called it Jegar-Sahadutha: but Jacob called it Galed (name). And Laban said, This *heap* (Hebrew *gal*) is a *witness* (Hebrew *'ēd*) between me and thee this day (derivation). <Therefore was the name of it called Galed>." (Gen 31:47–48)

c. "And when they came to Marah (name), they could not drink the waters of

Diakopè Oza, so in I Chr 13:11; Lo-Ruhamah (Hos 1:6), *Ouk-èleèmenè*; Lo-Ammi (Hos 1:9), *Ou laos mou* (see also 2:1, 3, 25); the valley of Berachah (2 Chr 20:26), *aulòna tès eulogias*. In a very strange fashion the translator brings about a similarity in Chronicles between the name Jabez and its derivation (1 Chr 4:9), in that the word *'eseb* (= "sorrow"), which explains the name, is transliterated and not translated. Moreover, the word is transliterated with a metathesis, making it all the more similar to the derived name: *kai hè mètèr ekalesen to onoma autou Igabès legousa Etekon hòs gabēs*.

6. On the phenomenon of the derivation of names synonymous with the names appearing in the passage, see Zakovitch (1977, pp. 100–115). For this example see pp. 113–114.

7. The appearance of a name in a given literary work before its appearance in the work in which it is derived does not, of course, discount its originality and authenticity in the deriving work. See for example the derivation of the name Eben-Ezer (1 Sam 7:12) which comes after the name's previous mention in 1 Sam 4:1, 5:1.

Marah (name), for they were *bitter* (Hebrew *mārim*; derivation): <therefore the name of it was called Marah>." (Exod 15:23)

d. "And they came unto the brook of Eshcol (name), and cut down from thence a branch with one *cluster* (Hebrew *'eškôl*) of grapes, and they bare it between two upon a staff; and they brought of the pomegranates and of the figs (derivation). <The place was called the brook of Eshcol, because of the cluster of grapes which the children of Israel cut down from thence>." (Num 13:23—24)

e. "And they brought them unto the valley of Achor (name) and Joshua said, Why hast thou *troubled* us (Hebrew *'akartānû*)? The Lord shall trouble thee this day . . . (derivation) <Wherefore the name of that place was called, The Valley of Achor, unto this day>." (Josh 7:24–26). The addition comes after the words that originally constituted the proper conclusion to the narrative: "So the Lord turned from the fierceness of his anger." (v. 26$^{a\beta}$)

f. "And David came to Baal-Perazim (name), and David smote them there, and said, The Lord hath *broken forth* (Hebrew *pāraṣ*) upon mine enemies before me as the *breach* (Hebrew *pereṣ*) of waters (derivation). <Therefore he called the name of that place Baal-Perazim>." (2 Sam 5:20)[8]

g. "And on the fourth day they assembled themselves in the valley of Berachah (name); for there *they blessed* (Hebrew *bērǝkû*) the Lord (derivation)[9] <therefore the name of the same place was called, The Valley of Berachah, unto this day.>." (2 Chr 20:26) It is not clear if here too the formula "therefore . . ." is a late addition. It seems to me more likely that the author of Chronicles, imitating the ancient literary type of name-derivations, was acquainted with the above examples (see example f) in their present form, after the "therefore . . ." formula had already been added on.[10]

3

We will now move on to those examples wherein later scribes did not recognize the presence of an implicit name-derivation, and tacked-on an explicit name-

8. So in the parallel passage (1 Chr 14:11). As in all of the aforementioned cases and in those yet to be discussed, there is no call to view the etiological element as secondary (see Seeligmann, 1961, p. 153), and it is the explicatory formula of the name-derivation alone which is secondary. The etiological element remains an organic portion of the work. Even if the etiological element should be secondary in a given work, that does not constitute proof that it is a late tradition and that it is an editorial invention. The editor might very well have drawn it from a familiar early tradition and blended it in a secondary and artificial fashion with the initial source for his work.

9. The Hebrew should probably read *wayyǝbārǝkû*.

10. It should be noted that in the derivation of numerous place names in various passages, the opening "therefore" formula is by no means an addition: Beer-Lahai-Roi (Gen 16:14), Beer-Sheba (Gen 26:33), Abel-Mizraim (Gen 50:11), En Hakkore which is in Lehi (Judg 15:19), and Sela-Hammahlekoth (1 Sam 23:28). In Chronicles the "therefore was it called" formula appears in another passage wherein its lateness is striking in light of its being compared with its earlier parallel: "And David dwelled in the castle; *therefore they called* it the city of David" (1 Chr 11:7)—"So David dwelt in the fort, *and called* it the city of David" (2 Sam 5:9).

derivation. Upon careful reading of the narrative of Moses' birth (Exodus 2), the reader will easily notice that the word "child" is the key word of the narrative (vv. 3, 6 [twice], 7, 8, 9 [twice], 10). The author of the story, knowing the meaning of the name Moses in Egyptian: *mešu* = "child" (see Griffiths 1953, p. 229), concluded the implicit name-derivation with the words "And she called his name Moses" (v. 10). Apparently this ancient tale was well understood by its author's audience, which was aware of the meaning of the name Moses in the Egyptian language. In a later stage, the meaning of the Egyptian word having been forgotten, the reason for giving the name Moses to the newborn was no longer understood, and consequently the name was explained with an explicit name-derivation: "Because I drew him out (Hebrew *məšîṯihû*) of the water"(v. 10). This derivation ascribes a knowledge of the Hebrew language to the daughter of Pharaoh.[11]

A somewhat similar case, wherein a later scribe, failing to recognize an implicit name-derivation, added an explicit derivation of another name, is to be found in the Sodom and Gomorrah pericope. Several questions arise upon reading the narrative of the destruction of the cities of the plain: according to Gen 19:25 the plain was totally overthrown, "and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground." And here the previous passages tell of the sparing of the city of Zoar. Furthermore, Lot's elder daughter says to her sister (Gen 19:31): "Our father is old, and there is not a man in the earth to come unto us after the manner of all the earth," words that do not correspond to the sparing of Zoar. What is told in v. 30 is extremely clumsy and carelessly constituted: "And Lot went up out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain . . . for he feared to dwell in Zoar." Earlier, Lot had to flee to the mountain, and because of his fear of the flight, Zoar was not decimated. Now we are told that it was the dwelling in Zoar which he feared and he preferred to go up to the mountain.

In light of these difficulties, Gunkel posited[12] that vv. 17–22, in which the name Zoar is derived, are an accretion from an ancient legendary source, to which are to be ascribed also the words "Lot entered into Zoar" (v. 23b) and the connecting words with the main tradition "And Lot went up out of Zoar" (v. 30). Without a doubt, the etiological-etymological motive now dominates vv. 17–22. The explicit name-derivation "Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar" (v. 22) follows two allusions to the name which is to be given: "and it is a *little* one (Hebrew *miṣ'ār*) . . . (is it not a *little* one (*miṣ'ār*)?) and my soul shall live" (v. 20).

11. The secondary nature of the explicit name-derivation has been pointed out by Childs (1965, p. 116) and Long (1968, p. 56). However, they failed to recognize the implicit name-derivation from "child," which presently comes into conflict with the explicit name-derivation.

12. (1966, p. 206), likewise also Skinner (1930, p. 309) and others. See also Long (1968, p.21).

Nonetheless, we must not neglect the implicit derivation of the name Lot, the stamp of which is imprinted on the passage every bit as much as the derivation of the name of the city.[13] In these verses the root *mlṭ* appears five times, being a pun on the main character's name: "And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, *Escape* (Hebrew *himmălēṭ*) for thy life . . . *escape* (*himmălēṭ*) to the mountain, lest thou be consumed (v. 17); and *Lot* (Hebrew *lôṭ*) said . . . and I cannot *escape* (*ləhimmālēṭ*) to the mountain (v. 19) . . . O, *let me escape* (*'immāləṭā*) thither (v. 20) . . . Haste thee, *escape* (*himmālēṭ*) thither . . . (v. 22)."[14] In the present narrative the traditions deriving the name of the city Zoar explicitly and the name of Lot implicitly, are combined and intertwined. This combination does not trouble Gunkel and his followers, as we have already seen that they view vv. 17–22 as a single unified tradition interpolated in the narrative.

However, it is difficult to be convinced that a work written by one scribe would simultaneously derive two different names. When Gunkel extracts vv. 17–22, not only does he fail to solve this problem, but he also chooses an extreme way to deal with the questions raised at the start of our discussion. The following suggestion, which may solve these questions, may also account for the juxtaposition of the two derivations. Verses 17–22 are not made of one fabric. While the derivation of Lot's name is essential to the narrative, the Zoar derivation is secondary and additional. Prior to the addition of these fragmentary verses, the purpose of which is to derive the name of the city, the verse probably looked as follows: "And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, *Escape* for thy life; look not behind thee, and neither stay in all the plain; *escape* to the mountain, lest thou be consumed (v. 17). And Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord (v. 18): behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast

13. The first to recognize the derivation of Lot's name was the liturgical poet Yannai: "*qădôš b mallēt lôṭ mibbilû'* . . . " (1938, Liturgies for the Book of Genesis, 13, p. 34), and also apparently "without challenging the sons of the destruction's escape (Hebrew *millûṭ*)" (1938, Liturgies for the Book of Deuteronomy, 99, p. 135). Among modern day scholars, Ball (1896, p. 71) and Gunkel, (1966, p. 212) noted this name-derivation.

14. Sometimes the implicit name-derivations will indicate a name with hints repeated several times in order to attract the reader's attention to the derivation. One example of a short and rather monotonous word-grouping, containing three verbs conjugated from the root *swr*, the purpose of which is to play on the name Sisera, will serve as an example: "And Jael went out to meet *Sisera*, and said unto him: Turn in (Hebrew *sûrà*), my Lord, turn in (*sûrà*) to me; fear not. And when he had turned in (Hebrew *wayyàsar*) unto her into the tent, she covered him with a mantle " (Judg 4:18). In order to maximize the appearance of the root in the passage, the author has Jael utter it twice while enjoining Sisera, which adds to the persuasiveness of her entreaty. In the third appearance, Sisera has acquiesced and heeded Jael's plea.

showed unto me in saving my life; and I cannot *escape* to the mountain, lest some evil take me, and I die (v. 19): And he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing also. Haste thee, *escape* thither, for I cannot do anything till thou be come thither (v. 22ᵃ)."[15]

In this reconstructed original tradition Lot is afraid that he will not be able to make it to the mountain, because some evil will overtake him on the way (v. 19). Therefore he is promised that until he reaches his destination (i.e., the mountain), the plain will not be decimated (v. 22). In the original narrative, the derivation of the name of the main character was an organic theme. To this implicit name-derivation was joined a component, the purpose of which is to derive the name Zoar. This component is joined only in those fragments of verses which divide up the parts of the major tradition. A recognition of the fragmentary additions and their isolation from the tradition deriving the name of Lot are sufficient to remove the difficulties and smooth the rough edges of the narrative. We are thus able also to preserve the larger part of vv. 17–22 as an organic part of the original narrative. In as much as the derivation of Lot's name is an implicit derivation, it appears that whoever added the derivation of the city Zoar was utterly oblivious to it, as he may no longer have been aware of this type of implicit name-derivation.[16]

A no-less-complicated case is the name-derivation of Gilgal. It is derived explicitly in Josh 5:9: "And the Lord said unto Joshua, This day *have I rolled away* (Hebrew *gallôtî*) the reproach of Egypt from off you. " As Seeligmann (1961, p. 154) and Childs (1963, p. 285) have pointed out,[17] this name-derivation is connected only in a very loose manner to the narrative of the circumcision of the children of Israel, which it immediately follows. Actually, an implicit name-derivation is to be found in the story of the circumcision. The

---

15. These additions are intended to derive the name of the city: vv. 20, 21ᵇ, 22ᵇ, and 23ᵇ. In order to connect the Zoar tradition with the rest of the narrative dealing with Lot's dwelling in the mountain, the writer has added the words "out of Zoar" and "for he feared to dwell in Zoar" in v. 30. These additional fragments have no independent existence and are not connected. The appearance of the root *mlt* does not belong to the tradition which derives Lot's name, and it is one of the fragments that has been added to this tradition.

16. Not to be excluded from consideration is the possibility that the writer has played upon the name Lot in still another fashion, using a root akin to *mlt*, i.e. *plt*: "And they took *Lot*, Abram's brother's son who dwelt in Sodom, and his goods, and departed. And there came *one that had escaped* (Hebrew *happālît*) and told Abram the Hebrew, for he dwelt in the plain of Mamre . . ." (Gen 14:12–13). It should be noted that there is no foundation for the opinion of F. Zimmermann (1966, p. 319) to the effect that the passage makes a play on the name Lot according to the Aramaic meaning of the root *lwt* = "to curse;" thus Lot = "accursed. " It is difficult to call one who has been saved from the destruction accursed, notwithstanding his dire plight when in flight.

17. Noth, too, in his commentary on Joshua, finds in 5:9 an etiological gloss.

circumcision took place *at the hill of the foreskins* (v. 3),[18] and the name is derived in v. 7: "And their children, whom he raised up[19] in their stead, them Joshua circumcised: for they were *uncircumcised* (Hebrew = foreskinned). It is debatable whether v. 9, which is the derivation of the name Gilgal, was originally joined to the circumcision narrative by a scribe who was not aware of it not having the implicit name-derivation contained in the passage itself— something like what happened where the Zoar derivation was added to the passage which derived the name of Lot. Or perhaps it is vv. 2–8, the story of the circumcision, that is a passage from an independent source which was inserted by an editor between 5:1 and 5:9, desiring to connect the story of the circumcision to Gilgal—in which case v. 9 would have been originally connected to v. 1 of this chapter.

At first glance, Kaufmann's contention[20] that being uncircumcised, i.e. the presence of the foreskin, is conceived of as a reproach in Gen 34:14 as well, would tend to support the first alternative. However, this is a most difficult contention, for how could the author call the foreskin "the reproach of Egypt" if it was in Egypt that they were circumcised? Cf. "Now all the people that came out were circumcised." I view the continuity of vv. 1 and 9 as more natural: "And it came to pass, when all the kings of the Amorites, which were on the side of Jordan westward, and all the kings of the Canaanites, which were by the sea, heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel, until we were passed over, that their heart melted, neither was their spirit in them anymore, because of the children of Israel; and the Lord said unto Joshua, This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you . . ." The people of Israel are here portrayed as a weak and ineffectual people, as a result of their enslavement under the Egyptians. The slavery in Egypt was a stain on the people's honor— "the reproach of Egypt." But upon the present revelation of the God of Israel and the nations' consequent fear of them, this reproach was removed from them. A manifestation of might is oftentimes a removal of disgrace: "What shall be done to the man that killeth the Philistine, and taketh away the reproach from Israel" (1 Sam 17:26).[21] The Lord's salvation is perceived as a removal of reproach also in Isa 25:8, the idea

18. This appears to be what can be termed a pseudo-etiology, i.e. the invention of a name to suit its derivation, for it would be very far-fetched to find a place actually bearing such a name. See similarly the artificial creation of the name Kirbroth-Hattaavah (Num 11:34–35).

19. "Who rose up"—this is the version in the Syriac, the Vulgate, and Pseudo-Jonathan, instead of "whom he raised up," as in the MT. Thus in the MT, *haqqāmîm* became *heqîm* by virtue, no doubt, of the loss of one of the *m*'s. The other versions are to be preferred.

20. Kaufmann (1966, p. 108), in order to back up his contention, is compelled to assume the existence of a narrative which has left no traces of itself in the OT, telling how the children of Israel had vowed not to circumcise their offspring until their arrival in their land; see p. 107 and 109.

21. See, for example, passages such as Joel 2:17–18.

of which is the same as in our passage; the people coming out of Egypt were very sensitive to what the Egyptians might say of them and their God (Exod 32:12; Deut 9:28). Such a fear as that which the Lord instilled in the hearts of the Amorite and Canaanite kings was enough to restore the wounded pride of the people freed from its slavery.[22]

Thus, the passage which derives the name of Gilgal is not to be viewed as an addition, dangling as it were from the circumcision narrative. The circumcision narrative is itself an interpolation containing a derivation which was perhaps not noticed even by the editor. This editor wove the circumcision tradition in at this particular point in his desire not to let the Israelites roam the land and fight for it while they were uncircumcised.[23]

After having extracted the circumcision narrative from the discussion, the relationship between the Gilgal name-derivation and the preceding material, as told in chapters 2–4, must still be examined. Rough edges are manifold in the pericope of the crossing of the Jordan, and there are many repetitions, especially surrounding the narrative of the twelve stones (compare, for instance, 3:12 to 4:2). A glaring example of such repetitions is to be found in the leaving of the stones at first in the lodging place (4:3), the purpose of which is given in vv. 6–7, and the pitching of the stones in Gilgal (v. 20), the reasons for which are given in vv. 21–24.

Most difficult is the pitching of the twelve stones in the midst of the Jordan (4:9). It is quite probable that this passage, ''And Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the feet of the priests which bare the ark of the covenant stood,'' is to be placed before v. 3:17: ''And the preists that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground.'' Placing the verses in this order, we can now understand the command to bear these stones away from the priests' standing place in v. 4:3. The duplication to be found in the placing of the stones both in the lodging-place and in the Gilgal can only be explained away with serious difficulty in the manner proposed, for example, by Kaufmann (1966, p. 106). According to his proposal, the permanent stone-pitching in a solemn ceremony had been preceded by a temporary pitching. However, it appears that even this initial pitching had a permanent nature. (This is true

22. A similar motive wherein the Lord instills fear upon the return to the land can be found in what is told concerning Jacob in Gen 35:5. Perhaps what is told concerning him is a throwback to the motive of instilling fear upon Israel's return to her land from the Egyptian exile.

23. A fragment is added to Josh 24:30 in the LXX, and we must not discount the possibility that this fragment is authentic and was deleted from the MT for theological reasons. Here the circumcision is expressly connected with Gilgal: *ekei ethēkan met' autou eis to mnēma, eis ho ethaphsan autou ekei, tas machairas tas petrinas, en hais perietemen tous huious Israēl en Galgalois* . . . see Rofé (1977, pp. 217–227).

especially when 9aα is extracted from its present place in the narrative context, where it constitutes an unnecessary repetition, dealing as it does with an additional set of twelve stones. If this is so, the words "and they are there unto this day" would fall only upon those stones which were set up in the lodging place, v. 8).[24]

These passages which deal with the pitching of the stones at Gilgal do in fact conceal within them the derivation of the name of the place, for "pitching" can refer to a heap, cf. Josh 7:26: "And they raised over him a great heap (Hebrew gal) of stones," also 8:29 and other passages. That the name Gilgal is in fact derived here from the meaning of "heap" (Hebrew gal) can be born out by another passage in the OT where Gilgal is indeed derived in such a fashion: "Is there iniquity in Gilead? Surely they are vanity. They sacrifice bullocks[25] in Gilgal; yea, their altars are as heaps (Hebrew gallîm) in the furrows of the field" (Hos 12:12). It appears that the prophet is comparing here the many altars of Israel at Gilgal to the many heaps of stones scattered in the field. Thus it seems that originally the two name-derivations of Gilgal in Joshua, one implicit (4:20ff) and one explicit (5:9), were connected, the writer no longer recognizing the implicit derivation concealed in the pitching of the stones at Gilgal.

As is well known, there is an additional name-derivation for Gilgal in Amos 5:4–5: "For thus saith the Lord unto the house of Israel: Seek ye me, and ye shall live, but seek not Beth-El, nor enter into Gilgal. For Gilgal shall surely go into captivity (Hebrew gālō yigle), and Beth-El shall come to nought. The expression gālō yigle (= "shall surely go into captivity") is the derivation of the name Gilgal (as Rashi puts it "as is its name so is its curse"), wherein the gl element is repeated twice just as in the name itself, and is an expression peculiar to Amos, which appears again in this book, v. 7:17: ". . . and Israel shall surely go into captivity forth of his land." One might be inclined to believe that the expression had been coined originally for the purpose of the Gilgal name-derivation.

Amos' derivation now becomes more potent, if we assume that he was acquainted with the explicit derivation of the name Gilgal in its original context, without the circumcision narrative. Then it had expressed the fear of the

24. Neither is the clause 4:11b in its rightful place. It is a duplicate of 3:14b and it found its way into chapter 4 because of the words "passed over" which precede it. Verses 12, 13, and 14 are also out of place, and they are a late addition which has been worked in here for lack of a better place to work them in.

25. "In Gilgal bullocks" (Hebrew baggilgàl šǝwàrîm)—perhaps lišwàrîm = "to calves" (haplography of the "l") is to be preferred. See Ps 106:20, "Into the similitude of an ox (Hebrew šôr, referring to the calf) that eateth grass." However, even this reading is problematic, as the plural form does not exist elsewhere in the OT. The LXX would read šàrîm, archontes, and this has prompted some to see here a misreading of d for r (a common misreading of the Hebrew script). They would then read here bǝšēdîm = "to devils;" see Deut 32:17, Ps 106:37.

Amorite and Canaanite kings before Israel. Israel had passed through Gilgal upon her return to Canaan from the land of her Exile in Egypt, and the place came to symbolize the restoration of her honor and the fear of the nations of the land before her. Here the prophet turns it into a symbol of the people's ultimate dispersion.[26]

I have attempted above to prove that usually, when an explicit name-derivation appears alongside an implicit name-derivation, the explicit one is secondary. However, this is not an iron-clad law: Naomi gives the derivation of her name in her words to her daughters-in-law: "Nay, my daughters, for it grieveth (Hebrew *mār*) me much for your sakes[27] that the hand of the Lord is gone out against me" (Ruth 1:13). However, the explicit derivation of the name is to be found in the continuation of the chapter, again in the words of Naomi, this time speaking to the women of her city Bethlehem who cannot believe their eyes. "And she said unto them: Call me not Naomi (= "pleasant"), call me Mara, for the Almighty *hath dealt bitterly* (Hebrew *hēmar*) with me. I went out full, and the Lord hath brought me home again empty. Why then call you me Naomi, seeing the Lord hath testified against me, and the Almighty *hath afflicted* (Hebrew *hēra'*) me?" (v. 20–21).

At first glance, one might indeed find the explicit derivation secondary. It was already told in v. 19a how Ruth and Naomi returned to Bethlehem, while in v. 22 there is a sort of *Wiederaufnahme* which stems from the need to tie together the two ends of the story-line which had been interrupted by the name-derivation. Still, there is no proof from the *Wiederaufnahme* that the name-derivation is a late addition to the text. The initial and original conversation between Naomi and the women of Bethlehem breaks the continuity of the events, so that a connecting and unifying passage must be injected bringing back the deeds of Naomi and her daughters-in-law to the foreground.

The duplication of the explicit name-derivation also raises questions: "Call me *not* Naomi, call me Mara for *the Almighty hath* dealt bitterly with me . . . *Why* then *call you* me Naomi seeing the Lord hath testified against me and *the Almighty hath afflicted me*?"

---

26. The choice of the names Gilgal and Beth-El stems from literary considerations as well. The punishment can thus be expressed by use of the name. For literary considerations in the choice of names, see also Amos 6:13, "Ye which rejoice in a *thing of nought* (Hebrew *lō' dābār*, a topographical name), which say: Have we not taken to us *horns* (Hebrew *qarnayim*, another topographical name) by our own strength."

27. *Mikkem* can be understood in two ways. Either as translated "for your sakes," because of your lowly position; or "more than it does you." The first possibility is an especially difficult one, as another reason has been given for Naomi's straits, "for the hand of the Lord is gone out against me." Therefore, the second possibility is to be preferred, i.e. her condition is worse than theirs, the reason being the hand of God which had gone out against her and not them.

It is a matter of question if this duplication is due to a double version (not at all supported by the translations), or whether we have here a deliberate stylistic touch. I prefer the second choice, after having compared the previous words of the bitter-hearted Naomi: (Ruth 1:11, 12–13) *'Turn again, my daughters,* why will ye go with me? Are there yet any more sons in my womb, that they may be your husbands?'' *''Turn again, my daughters,* go your way . . . and should I also bear sons: would ye stay from them from having husbands?'' It seems that in this duplication there is an attempt to characterize the personal style of Naomi. Her attempt to persuade and to influence finds expression in the constant repetition of her words with a shade of change in them each time. Verse 21b, repeating what was said in the previous passage, brings a terser explanation of her bitter state-of-mind, as she has already decried her condition in her earlier words.

As in the derivation of the name Naomi, so with the name-derivations of Issachar, the explicit derivation is not secondary to the implicit one. However, the reason for their juxtaposition is different. Originally, the narrative of the birth of the sons of Jacob knew only the one explicit name-derivation: "And God hearkened unto Leah, and she conceived, and she bare Jacob the fifth son. And Leah said: God hath given me *my hire* (Hebrew *śə kārî*)'' (Gen 30:18). This name corresponds with the rest of the short declarations concerning the birth of the sons, which all have within them derivations of their names. Alongside this derivation an independent tradition has been woven within the framework of a wider narrative tradition concerning the birth of Issachar (vv. 14–16), which ends with the derivation of his name: "Thou must come in unto me, for *surely I have hired thee* (Hebrew *śākōr śəkartîkā*) with my son's mandrakes.'' The editor, who knew the wider tradition, chose to include it before giving the name-derivation of the main tradition, so that both name-derivations for Issachar, one explicit and one implicit, stand side by side.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ball, C. J. 1896. *The Book of Genesis*. Leipzig.

Childs, B. 1963. "A Study of the Formula 'Until this Day'." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82:279–292.

———. 1965. "The Birth of Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84:109–122.

Ehrlich, A. 1899. *Miqra Kipšuto*, 1. Berlin.

Griffiths, J. G. 1953. "The Egyptian Derivation of the Name Moses." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12:225–231.

Gunkel, H. 1966. *Genesis*. Goettingen.

Kaufmann, Y. 1966. *Seper Yəhošuaʿ*. Jerusalem.

Koehler, L. 1945. "Der Name Ammoniter." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1:154–155.

Long, B. O. 1968. *The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the O.T.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin.

Morag, S. 1959. "Mēšaʿ." *Ereṣ yiśrāʾel* 5:138–144.

Nestle, D. E. 1896. "Miscellen." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 16:321–327.

Noth, M. 1938. *Das Buch Josua*. Hänbuch zum A. T. Tubingen.

Piyyuṭey Yannai. 1938. Zulai edition.

Rofè, A. 197a. "Siyyumo šel seper Yəhošuaʿ ləpi targum haššibʿim." *Šənaton ləmiqra uləheqer hammizrah haqqadum* 2:217–227.

Seeligmann, I. L. 1961. "Yəsodot etyologiyim bahistoryografia hammiqraʾit." *Zion* 26:141–169.

Skinner, J. 1930. *Genesis*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh.

Speiser, E. A. 1964. *Genesis*. Anchor Bible. New York.

Zakovitch, Y. 1977. "Maʿamadam šel hammilla hannirdepet wəhaššem hannirdap biyəcirat midrəšey šemot." *Šənaton ləmiqra uləheqer hammizrah haqqadum* 2:101–115.

Zimmerman, F. 1966. "Folk Etymology of Biblical Names." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 15:311–326.