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FROM סֵפֶר TO סֵפֶר AND BACK: AN EPISODE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

Tania Notarius

The Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH) word סֵפֶר ‘letter, written document’ and its Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) counterparts אָסָנֶה and כְּתֵב are well-known chapters in the historical study of the Hebrew language: the CBH term was partially replaced by new terms, due to the interference of Aramaic, but continued in the usage ‘book, scroll, writing’.²

¹ Most of the research for this paper was accomplished while I was the Experienced Research Fellow at the Martin-Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, generously supported by the Humboldt Stiftung. I want to thank the organisers of the conference Biblical and Rabbinc Hebrew: New Perspectives in Philology and Linguistics for inviting me and the participants for interesting comments and discussion.

² See Hurvitz et al. (2014, 26–27, 149, 194) and the bibliography there; Hendel and Joosten (2018, 20–21). For סֵפֶר as ‘letter’ in LBH cf. 2 Chron. 32.17; Est. 1.22; 3.13; 8.5, 10; 9.20, 25, 30; see Hendel and Joosten (2018, 150 n. 51). The translation ‘book’ does not imply ‘codex’, but rather ‘a long, apparently literary, composition’, transmitted on any physical carrier; see the discussion in Naudé and Miller-Naudé (2016).
Examination of the Ugaritic corpus shows that the ancient Northwest Semitic (NWS) lexeme *spr was not always the default term for a written document:³ it gained its position gradually, contending with other terms for ‘writing’, the word *lwḥ ‘tablet, letter’ the most important among them. The goal of this paper is to demonstrate the relevance of the Ugaritic data for the historical study of Hebrew—particularly of Hebrew lexical items—and to trace the semantic development of the noun *lwḥ from Ugarit to Qumran Hebrew (QH), comparing when necessary with the master-term *spr and other terms for writing.⁴

1.0. Ugaritic spr and lwḥ

The Ugaritic lexicon (DULAT) distinguishes between the nouns spr III ‘counting, number’, explicitly related to the root s-p-r ‘count; tell’ (see ex. 1), and spr II ‘message, writing’, presumably borrowed from Akkadian šipru ‘message, matter’:⁵

³ For spr ‘writing, inscription’ in Aramaic and Phoenician see DNWSI (799–801).
⁴ This research was finalised before Philip Zhakevich’s (2015) dissertation became known to me; I could not fully accommodate the results of his study (especially pp. 125–33) in the present paper.
⁵ See DULAT (756–57); it distinguishes between four main functions of spr II: (1) “tablet / register, list, inventory; in accounting, record of tribute; of instructions”; (2) “writing, document, warrant”; (3) “letter, missive”; (4) archival note of “reference, matter”. Hawley, Pardee, and Roche-Hawley (2015, 252) derive this noun from the root s-p-r ‘count’ and observe (note 64):
(1a) $hpt\ d\ bl\ spr\ \mn\ d\ bl\ hg$
   ‘mercenaries without number, archers without count’ (1.14 II 37–38, and parallels)

(1b) $b\ py\ sprhn\ b\ \shpt\ mntyhm$
   ‘in my mouth (I have) their inventory, on my lips (is) their list’ (1.24:45–46).

In my view, there is no need to draw such a distinction, since the $spr\ II$ used about ‘writing’ also has many usages connected to ‘counting, registering, and listing’, as in (2a)–(2b), clearly motivated by the root $s-p-r$, commonly for the sake of ‘accounting’, e.g., (2c):

(2a) $spr\ npsh\ d\ \rb\ bt\ mlk\ w\ b\ spr\ l\ \st\ yrml\ l\ 3\ \shry\ 2\ldots$
   ‘record of the individuals who entered the house of the king, but who had not been put in a record: PN—3, PN—2...’ (4.338:1–6).\(^6\)

(2b) $spr\ bnsh\ mlk\ d\ \tar\shn\ \msn\ bsr\ \abn\ spshyn$
   ‘register of the personnel of the king who claim the cargo: PN, PN, PN’ (4.370:1–3).\(^7\)

Its morphological structure was probably /sipru/. The word /sipru/ appears in various literary genres in reference to the inscribed tablet itself, e.g., $spr\ hpr$ ‘document of rations’ (RS 17.106), or $spr\ dbh\ zlm$ ‘document of sacrifices of the shades’ (RS 34.126, a funerary ritual). It is clear that, as $spr\ +\ X$ defines the type of document, $spr\ +\ PN$ defines who put the document into writing.

All Ugaritic examples in this paper are according to $CAT/KTU$.

\(^6\) See also 4.33:1; 4.288:1; 4.320:1; 4.322:1; 4.561:1; 4.714:1.

\(^7\) Cf. 4.141 I 1; 4.144:1; 4.367:1; 4.609:1; + many.
(2c)  \( spr \ h\check{t}bn\ sbrdnm\ h\check{m}\check{s}[[x]]\ kkrm\ \check{d}lp[[x]]\ kbd\ \check{t}lt \)

‘account book of the bronze-smiths: five talents, one thousand (shekels) of copper’ (4.337:1–3).\(^8\)

Apparently, due to interference of the Akkadian lexeme \(\check{sh}ipru/\check{sh}ipirtu\) ‘message, instruction’,\(^9\) \( spr\) acquired the meanings ‘document, instruction’, e.g., (3a)–(3b), ‘matter, document’, e.g., (3c), and ‘warrant, license’, e.g., (3d):

(3a)  \( spr\ n^5m\ \check{s}\check{swm} \)

‘(book of) instructions about the health of horses’ (1.85:1)

(3b)  \( spr\ d\check{bh}\ \check{zl}\check{m} \)

‘(record of) instructions for the sacrifice of the spirits’ (1.161:1)

(3c)  \( spr\ \check{s}\check{ab}\ m\check{q}[d\check{s}\check{t}] \)

‘document concerning the water carriers of the sanctuary’ (6.25:1)\(^10\)

(3d)  \( spr\ \check{mlk} \)

‘royal warrant’ (3.12:13; see also 3.12:9)

Ugaritic had only one substantive \( spr\): in poetry it is used twice for ‘number, inventory’; in prose it is used in administrative

---

\(^8\) See also 4.181:1; 4.369:1; 4.610 I 1; etc. The semantic link ‘count–recount = tell’ (cf. bank \textit{teller}) / \textit{Zahl–erzählen}, etc., is widely attested crosslinguistically.

\(^9\) The interference of the Akkadian lexeme \(\check{sh}ipru/\check{sh}ipirtu\) ‘message, instruction; commission, report, task’; cf. \textit{CAD} (\(\check{S}\) 3: 73–84), presumably an early loan, indeed led to convergence with the Northwest Semitic derivative \(*\check{si}pru\); cf. the discussion in Notarius (forthcoming).

\(^10\) See also 4.120:1; 6.24:1; 6.29:1; etc.
and procedural discourse dozens of times (approx. 80 occurrences), meaning both ‘list, record, register, account, document, inventory’ and ‘matter, instruction’.

The lexeme that intersects semantically with spr ‘written document’ is lḥt ‘tablet-letter, message’.\textsuperscript{11} On the surface, lḥt and spr demonstrate different distributions: if spr is used in administrative and procedural texts, lḥt is attested in correspondence; see ex. (4). I have counted up to 19 cases of lḥt referring to the content of a letter, i.e., ‘message from / about’, as in (4a), or to the ‘tablet-letter’ itself, i.e., ‘letter concerning’, as in (4b). In poetry there is one usage of lḥt ‘tablet(s)’, phrased with mlāk ‘message’ (4c):

(4a) \textit{lḥt šlm d likt}

‘message of greeting that (she) sent’ (2.34:5–6)\textsuperscript{12}

(4b) \textit{w lḥt bt mlk āmr}

‘and the letter (about) the daughter of the king of TN’ (2.72:17)\textsuperscript{13}

(4c) \textit{lḥt mlāk ym}

‘the letter-message of DN’ (1.2 I 26)

Although most usages of spr ‘written record’ are in procedural, economic, and administrative texts, occasionally (five times) spr occurs in correspondence with the meaning ‘writing’

\begin{enumerate}
\item See \textit{DULAT} (490). According to Fox (2003, 76), \textit{lḥ} is an isolated Proto-Semitic nominal lexeme.
\item See also 2.39:17; 2.45:22–23; 2.46:10; 2.73:7, 12.
\item See also 2.31:43; 2.72:23; 2.87:18; 2.90:4; 2.98:31; 2.100:14, 16; 2.103:11, 12, 17; 2.104:11.
\end{enumerate}
(5a), occasionally overlapping with lḥt in the meaning ‘message’, as in (5b)–(5c), although the lexeme lḥt ‘message’ also overlaps with mlāk(t); cf. exs. (5c)–(5d). In one case both words are grouped together as the phrase lḥt spr ‘the tablet-letter of a message’, an equivalent of the poetic lḥt mlāk; compare (5e) with (4c) above:

(5a)  b spr štrn
  ‘put it in writing’ (2.108:14)\(^{14}\)

(5b)  k ytnt spr hnd ʾmk
  ‘when I gave this message (to be delivered) to you’ (2.88:5)

(5c)  lḥt qnīm d lik[t . bt . m]lk
  ‘the message concerning lapis lazuli that the daughter of the king has sent’ (2.73:7)

(5d)  [w] mlāktk ʾmy l likt
  ‘and your message to me you did not send’ (2.36:11)

(5e)  ūky lḥt spr d likt
  ‘what about the message tablet that I sent?’ (2.14:6–7)

Ugaritic spr also corresponds to Akkadian ṭuppu in the meaning of ‘register, writing’; cf. (6a)–(6b) for parallel cases in Ugaritic and in the Akkadian of Ugarit:

(6a)  spr Ḃrgm[n špš
  ‘record of the tribute(s) to the Sun [= Hittite king]’ (4.610 I 1) || [ṭup-pu an-nu-ú] ša ma-an-da[-at DINGIR.]UTU-šī (PRU 4 47 [RS 11.732]:1)

(6b)  št b spr ʾmy

\(^{14}\) See also 2.10:19 (cf. 1.179:43 broken); cf. ʾw Ḗt lḥt ṭgm[ “and you pronounce the letter” (2.73:12).
‘put into writing for me’ (2.10:19) || i-na ṭup-pî šu-uk-un-ni (PRU 6 18 [RS 19:53]:12)

The summary chart shows that Ugaritic lḥt is a technical word for ‘tablet-letter, message’, used once in poetry and many times in correspondence (18 times), while spr is a term for ‘counting’ in poetry (twice) and for both ‘list, inventory’ and ‘instruction, document’ in administrative and procedural discourse (about 80 times). The lexeme spr makes its first steps into the genre of correspondence in the meaning ‘writing; letter-message’ (five cases are attested), extending its functions at the expense of lḥt. Seen within the broader NWS context, Ugaritic attests the very beginning of the process:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>poetry</th>
<th>letters</th>
<th>administrative, procedural discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lḥt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘tablet’</td>
<td>‘tablet-letter, message’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | ≈ 87   | 2       | 5                                   | ≈ 80
| spr    | 2      | 5       |                                     |
|        | ‘counting’| ‘writing, message’|‘list, inventory; instruction, document’|

2.0. סֵפֶר in Biblical Hebrew

In BH there are 191 cases of סֵפֶר, referring to some kind of written document—‘inscription, letter, written document, record,
book’, in CBH it is a default term for ‘letter, message’, in clear contrast to Ugaritic:

(7a) נא׳שה ה ספר אלמלך ישראלי

‘so that I may send a letter to the king of Israel’ (2 Kgs 5.5 + many)

(7b) כי שלח אדניaira el המלך ישראלי

‘that my lord sent (him) the king’s letter [and the officials’ letter[s]’ (Lachish 6.3–4)

In Hebrew epigraphy there are up to 19 cases of ספר ‘letter’ in the correspondence from Lachish; cf. example (7b); the word לוח does not seem to be attested at all in Hebrew epigraphy.17

See HALOT (766–67): the lexeme is used about 142 times in CBH and Transitional Biblical Hebrew (TBH) and 49 time in explicitly late books. Other terms in CBH include: גּלְיָן ‘tablet’ (Isa. 3.23; 8.1); cf. Williamson (2011), מִלְּה ‘scroll’ used mainly in TBH (in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah) and with symbolic meaning; cf. Hurvitz (1996). The term מִכַּת ‘writing’ is used nine times in both corpus parts and can also mean ‘letter’.

The cases are counted with the help of the Accordance software; cf. also Aḥituv (2008, 498); Davies, Bockmuehl, and Lacey (1991, 450–51; 2004, 202); Dobbs-Allsopp (2005, 715). In Deir-Alla I.1 the lexeme is used for the title of a long composition ספר [בל] ח associative לאם ‘the book of Bil’am’.

The lexeme לוח is relatively rare in ancient Northwest Semitic epigraphy. In Imperial Aramaic the lexeme is attested three times, in quite broken contexts: twice in the same text as a product with measurements: בני לוח אחריה אמות 3+3 פלגל פתי אמות 1 דוד [ה] ... לוח אחוריה אמות 3+2 פתי [ה] ... [א] מFat 1 פষך [ו] דוד פשה [ר] ... ‘herein: another board, (length), nine cubits and a half; width, one cubit; thickne[ss, four handbreadths], another board, (length), five cubits; width, [one] cu[bit], one[ handbreadth]; thickness, [x] handbread[ths]’ (TAD D3 26.3–4) and once apparently
‘tablet, plank’ is used 43 times in the Bible—among them, just once in an explicit LBH composition, parallel to a classical usage: ex. (8a); cf. also another time in the poetic Song 8.9 in the meaning ‘plank’. The rest of the cases are in CBH, particularly in the Pentateuch and in poetry; this is an explicitly classical literary usage. Most of cases in Pentateuch (plus one in 1 Kgs 8.9) refer to the two לֻחֹת הָאֶבֶן ‘stone tablets’, called לֻחֹת הָעֵדֻת ‘tablets of testimony’ in Exodus and לֻחֹת הָבְרָת in Deuteronomy ‘tablets of covenant’, embodying ‘ten sayings’ (משרָה תֵּברִים), written on both sides (משנים שבירה) by God, sent, smashed, and rewritten by Moses; see ex. (8b). Several times לֻח refers to a concrete wooden piece of an altar, temple, or other construction (8c):

in a letter as a writing medium, [.....] ‘the board which is written / which PN wrote’ (TAD D7 19.9); see DNWSI (569). Schmitz (2009) makes a claim for the notion spr š lḥ ‘scribe on (stone-)tablet’ (KAI 37.15 = CIS I 86 A 14 [Phoenician Kition], and cf. line 17); the problem with this interpretation is that the relative pronoun is š everywhere else in this inscription. He also points out a case in a Punic letter/religious hymn: ‘went down into the valley, the tablet and the bas-relief’ (KAI 145.8 = Hr. Mak tar N° 64), observing.

The Akkadian cognate lēʾu ‘writing board, document’ can also designate wax-covered writing boards (CAD L, 156–57, 3). The īupšar leʾi designates a ‘scribe writing on waxed boards’. …Small limestone or gypsum tablets such as the one on which CIS I 86 A–B is written may also be indicated by the word lḥ.

Cf. DNWSI (570); Branden (1973); Krahmalkov (1975).
‘There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets that Moses put there at Horeb’ (2 Chron. 5.10 || 1 Kgs 8.9)

‘and I will give you the tablets of stone, with the law’ (Exod. 24.12)\(^{18}\)

‘he made it hollow, with boards’ (Exod. 38.7)\(^{19}\)

The fossilised use of לָחֶת for ‘tablet of covenant’ generated a metaphorical use לָחֶת לֵבֶם ‘tablet of their heart’, referring to an internally incorporated moral demand or memory; see ex. (9a).\(^{20}\)

Twice the word is used in prophecy (in Isa. 30.8 parallel to סֵפֶר) to denote a medium for engraving the record of a law or vision (9b):\(^{21}\)

\(^{18}\) See also Exod. 27.8; 31.18; 32.15, 16 (2x), 19; 34.1 (3x), 4 (2x), 28, 29; Deut. 4.13; 5.22; 9.9 (2x), 10, 11, 15, 17; 10.1, 2 (2x), 3 (2x), 4, 5; 1 Kgs 8.9.

\(^{19}\) See also 1 Kgs 7.36 and דֵּלֶת ‘cedar plank’ (Ezek. 27.5; Song 8.9).

\(^{20}\) See (M. Fox 2000, 145–47); he rejects Couroyer’s (1983) interpretation of the ‘tablet of the heart’ as a school tablet tied to the neck of a pupil.

\(^{21}\) In some interpretations לָחֶת as a writing medium can mean a waxed wood-plank, similar to דֵּלֶת ‘door, column (of text)’, cf. Jer. 36.23; Lachish 4.3 (הָנָבָה אֲלֵיה דֵּלֶת); and cf. the discussion in Galling (1971) and Aḥituv (2008, 71).
‘The sin of Judah is written with an iron pen; with a diamond point it is engraved on the tablet of their hearts, and on the horns of their altars.’ (Jer. 17.1; see also Prov. 3.3; 7.3)

‘Go now, write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, so that it may be for the time to come as a witness forever.’ (Isa. 30.8; see also Hab. 2.2)

In sum, although referring to different writing mediums—stone versus clay—Hebrew לוח for ‘stone-tablets’ semantically correlates with the Ugaritic lḥt ‘clay-tablet, letter, message’:22 just as the way Ugaritic tablet-letters can refer to messages sent by gods to each other, or by the Sun (= Hittite king) to his vassal Ugaritic king, encompassing demands and conditions, so the biblical ‘tablets of covenant’ are a message sent by God to his vassal-people that embodies identification formula, statements, and requirements.23 However, the Ugaritic usage is much more mundane and flexible, referring to any kind of letter or message, while the Hebrew usage is fossilised and literary: it mainly refers to the covenant tablets and, partly metaphorically, to a medium for writing inner moral demand and visions.

22 Ugaritic lḥt is not used in the case of wooden ornamental pieces or construction.

23 See 1.2 I 26 in ex. (4c) discussed above and cf. 2.39, on which see Hallo, Younger, and Orton (1997, III:94–95). On the Decalogue as a personal address directly to the people see Tigay (1996, 62): “they are not usual legal ‘cases’ shaped as conditional ‘if … then…”
3.0. לוח in Qumran Non-biblical Manuscripts

The lexeme לוח practically disappeared from the LBH lexicon, only to reappear in the Qumran corpus. I have counted up to 24 cases of לוח (אשר [ספר] is attested about 98 times) in non-biblical manuscripts, mostly in quotations or paraphrases of biblical texts, e.g., in Reworked Pentateuch and in Jubilees; many of these readings are reconstructed, as in ex. (10a):

ror omer yeha ali peisalch shen [לוחות אבנים בריאשווניכ] עלה אל החר (10a)

‘The LORD said to me, “Carve out two [tablets of stone like the former ones] and come up to me on the mountain, and make an ark of wo[od. [I will write on the tablets] the words that were on the fir[st tablets which]”’ (4Q364 f26bii + e.3 = Deut. 10.1–2).

(10b)

בֶּךָ מִשְׁפְּט לֶחָ הֵלְךָ לִבִּי

‘in the chain of judgement is the tablet of my heart...’

(1QHa 16.38; cf. 1QHa fC7.2, but very broken)

(10c)

ב[א]ר על הלוחות על מען רימ[ך] / [הקרויה]

‘Write down plainly on tablets, so that with ease [someone can read it]’ (1QpHab 6.15–16)

In some cases, the quotation or its context are modified, so that the expression acquires a new meaning. For example, the author of the Hodayot uses the expression לוח לבי ‘tablet of my heart’ rather than לוח ל HMAC על הלוחות ‘tablet of their heart’ (10b), while

24 See also 4Q364 f26bi.6, 9; f26bii + e.3, 4, 5, 7, 8; 4Q216 1.3, 6.
'write plainly on tablets’ in Pesher Habakkuk no longer refers to the prophetic vision, but to secret eternal knowledge (10c).

Apparently, the main lexical innovation of QH, comparing to the classical exemplars, is לוחות referring to a medium for writing eternal heavenly law, secret knowledge, and primordial historical order;25 the expressions לוחות העולמ ‘tablets of eternity’ and לוחות השמים ‘tablets of heaven’, unknown in classical sources, are typical in this respect (attested in Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, etc.); see ex. (11a):26

(11a)

לַחֹתֶם [טַו בֵּית דָּוִד] [לֶבַחֳלַחְוָו]チュיוウノバシド [ל] לוחות עולם

‘...in purify[ing] waters [...] on the eternal tablets’

(4Q512 f1–6.4)27

(11b)

[גַו] נַחָהו? לוחות [שת]チュウハノバシンバシド

‘...on a copper tablet’ (11Q19 34.1)


26 Interestingly, although the lexeme לוח is not used a single time in Biblical Aramaic, it is used up to 14 times in Qumran Aramaic to denote the writing material ‘tablet, letter-tablet’ for registering prophetic knowledge and destiny (cf. in the Testament of Jacob 4Q537 and the Book of Giants 4Q203) that can be washed (2Q26 1.1); I thank Esti Eshel, who called my attention to this material.

27 See also 4Q221 f7.7; 4Q247 f1.1; 11Q19 7.3; cf. broken cases in 4Q177 f1–4.12; 11Q19 7.1; PAM43695 f72.2.
We are also informed of writing on a new medium: ‘a copper tablet’ (11b).

4.0. From *lwh to *spr and Back: Conclusions

The distribution and functional scope of *lwh in the Ugaritic, CBH, LBH, and QH corpora, particularly in correlation with the item *spr as a default term for ‘written document’, demonstrates that the Ugaritic data are indeed relevant for the historical analysis of the BH lexicon. In absolute numbers the following picture emerges (the percentage in parentheses represents the share of usages of lwh out of the combined occurrences of lwh and spr in the designated corpora):

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>CBH and Epigraphy</th>
<th>TBH</th>
<th>LBH</th>
<th>QH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*lwh</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39 + 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*spr</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>122 + 19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers show that in Ugaritic, CBH (here including Iron Age epigraphy) and QH, the proportion of *lwh and *spr is about the same, while in TBH and particularly in LBH the share of *lwh is considerably smaller.

The semantic distributional factor is equally important. In Ugaritic these words refer to the same medium for writing (a clay-tablet), but they show functional complementary distribution: lḥt is for letters; spr is for other types of documents, such as lists, accounts, registers, and exhibits just the initial signs of expanding into the sphere of correspondence. In CBH, by contrast,
this process is at its very end, and סֵפֶר denotes any kind of written documents, including letters, while the function of לוּח is limited, mainly in the Pentateuch, to a fixed literary idiom referring to the Tablets of the Covenant, and, by analogy in poetic language, to a medium for prophetic writing or, metaphorically, for human thoughts; the CBH usage ‘wooden plank’ does not have a parallel in Ugaritic. LBH practically abandons the lexeme. QH revives the classical idiom and enriches its metaphorical and symbolic meaning, turning לוּח into a medium for eternal, primordial knowledge and law, innovating the phrases לוּח העולמים ‘tablets of eternity’ and לוּח השמים ‘tablets of heaven’, attesting also לוּח נחושת ‘tablet of copper’.

To a certain extent the ‘sacred’ sphere shows the most typical evolution of לֵוחות: from the message-tablet that gods send to each other (in poetic usage), exactly like human communication in Ugarit; to the divinely written tablets that are transmitted to people in the classical biblical usage; to the heavenly pre-existent eternal tablets with the law, commandments, and historical order in Qumran.
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