

THESIS AND DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

Theological Seminary, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies

"The Meaning of *מחול* and *מחל(ו)* in the Old Testament"

Researcher: Etoughé Anani Patrick, Ph.D., October 2013

Advisor: Carlos Mora, Th.D.

The study is primarily interested with the words *מחל(ו)*, "double flutes" and *מחול*, "flute" as they appear in the phrases *בְּתַפִּים וּבְמַחֲלֵי*, "with hand drums and with double flutes" and *בְּתִפְּוֹת וּמַחֲלֵי*, "with hand drum and flute." Most of modern studies have concluded that these expressions refer to "dancing" and "dances" based on theoretical etymologizing. On the contrary, this study shows that these phrases have to say more about women's musical performances than the mere bodily movement.

The method used in this work does not take into account the form of perceptible words, but its linguistic and functional orientation. The terms *מחל(ו)* and *מחול* were investigated on the basis of their function in relationship to other elements in the text.

The phrases identify 2 main musical instruments' tradition first coined by Miriam and Israelite women at the Sea of Reeds (Exod 15). The morphosyntactical relationship considers the way words relate to each other and how certain sets of a pair of words influence the semantic fields of both terms in the pair. This helps to specify how the plural *מחל(ו)* is mostly in overlapping synonymy with percussion instruments (e.g., *מְנַעְנְעִים*, "rattles" [2 Sam 6:5]; *מְצִלְתִּים*, "cymbals" [1 Chr 13:8]) and with the chordophone *כְּנֻרֹת*, "harps" (Isa 30:32). Likewise, the singular *מחול* is ordinarily substituted within the pair by another instrument: the *כְּנֹר*, "harp" (Gen 31:27; Job 21:12; Pss 81:3; 149:3) or with *תְּלִיל*, "(family of) flute" (1 Sam 10:5; Isa 5:12).

As a paradigm, every word functions in a field or a group of words, that is, its semantic field. All of this militates for the understanding of *מחול-מחל(ו)* as a syntagmatic relationship of instruments. In this sense, the relations of the slots occupied by the second term in the pair are always substituted with another instrument of music, but never with any body movements. This paradigm found in the pair used to translate the

term under study sets rules on how to recognize when it means a body movement or the actual musical instrument.

"The Origins of Sixteenth-Century Sabbatarian Anabaptism—A Re-assessment"

Researcher: Marcel Daniel Wieland, M.A., November 2013

Advisor: Aecio Cairus, Ph.D.

Scholarship provides contradictory interpretations concerning the origins of sixteenth-century Sabbatarian Anabaptism and the issue remains debated. The purpose of this study was to reassess the question of origins of Sabbatarian Anabaptism and to suggest an interpretation to the problem. Providing a historical background, the Anabaptist movement as well as the Sabbatarian movement in Transylvania were investigated. A historical connection between the two groups could not be established.

The biographies of Oswald Glaidt and Andreas Fischer, the two most prominent Sabbatarian Anabaptists, were outlined. It could be shown that Fischer received his Sabbatarianism from Glaidt. Glaidt's Sabbatarian writings were investigated, looking for influences and motivating factors, which might have led him into his Sabbatarian convictions. No references concerning a direct influence of other Sabbatarian reformers upon Glaidt could be detected. Yet seven motivating factors were established. These are as follows: (1) the authority of Scripture, (2) literalism, (3) restorationism, (4) the impact of the Old Testament, (5) the realization of the continual validity of the Decalogue, (6) discipleship and the example of Christ, and (7) the regenerationist and ascetic tradition of late medieval piety. The view that Glaidt was the founder of Sabbatarian Anabaptism was challenged through an investigation of reports about two Sabbatarian Anabaptist preachers. These pose new questions regarding the origins of Sabbatarian Anabaptism.

The same seven motivating factors, which could be detected in Glaidt, could be established through an exploration of the only extant confession of Sabbatarian Anabaptists. This raises additional questions regarding the rise of Sabbatarian Anabaptism.

Previous scholars came up with four interpretations regarding the origin of sixteenth-century Sabbatarian Anabaptism. This study (1) confirms the biblical interpretation; (2) rejects the eschatological interpretation of previous scholars, though emphasizing eschatological elements that may have contributed positively to the origin of a literal seventh-day Sabbath rationale; (3) sees in Hans Hut's theology a field for further studies; and (4) considers Hubmaier's tradition as likely to have contributed to

the origins of Sabbatarian Anabaptism. It seems that Sabbatarian Anabaptism was in all likelihood influenced by many factors, rather than mainly by one single tradition as previous researchers held. The study concludes that a multifactorial interpretation seems to best serve the purpose of understanding the origins of sixteenth-century Sabbatarian Anabaptism.

"The Morphological and Syntactical Irregularities in the Book of Revelation"

Researcher: Laurentiu Mot, Ph.D., December 2013

Advisor: Richard A. Sabuin, Ph.D.

The dissertation explores the barbarisms and solecisms in the book of Revelation. These grammatical irregularities have been tackled by previous scholars from 2 perspectives: the author's Semitic background and the Greek language. The mainstream view holds that the source of most of John's linguistic oddities is the Hebrew or Aramaic language. A fewer but important NT scholars and grammarians hold that the source of these irregularities is the Greek language. Based on Second Language Acquisition empirical studies, which found little grammar transfer from the mother tongue into the second language (SL), this dissertation hypothesizes that the assessment of Revelation's linguistic errors should be done in the context of Greek—assumed to be John's SL.

Regarding previous studies, there is no research to have explained all the morpho-syntactical deviations in Revelation and all the monographs on the topic were realized from a Semitic angle. And once authors concluded that the source of the errors was Semitic, they did not consider to evaluate the errors in a Greek framework. This study is meant to fill this gap and looks at the Apocalypse's language as a SL production. This perspective does not neglect or reject Semitic influence to some degree.

The methodology brought together several disciplines of modern linguistics and NT studies. The first step taken was to observe how the first scribes corrected the text in trying to come to terms with its grammar. The second step was the grammatical analysis realized in a descriptive, synchronic, and diachronic perspective. Here sociolinguistics played an important role, as it advocated the replacement of the notion of "wrong" language with labels such as "different" or "not preferred" language. The third methodological step was the cross-linguistic assessment. Psycholinguistics was of primary importance at this stage as it revealed different aspects from which an irregular construction can be looked at: the mother tongue, the SL, the interlanguage (author's own language in the making), and language as system and language as performance. The fourth step

taken was to look at the morpho-syntactical issues at the discourse level. Pragmatics was informative as it left room for things implied but not written in the text.

A number of important findings resulted from the analysis. From more than 230 grammatical irregularities, less than a quarter of these are actual irregularities to the Greek language. There are very few Semitic transfers and most of the linguistic errors or ambiguities are produced because of John's less than proficient level of Greek acquisition. Though John was not volitional in his mistakes, he was intentional as he struggled to make sense of his message in Greek with the linguistic knowledge he had. This statement has repercussions in the interpretation of the text, and at times the linguistic errors were significant enough to change the meaning of what John wrote.