

LINGUISTIC CONSIDERATIONS
REGARDING THE TRANSLATION OF
ISAIAH'S *SHEAR-JASHUB*: A REASSESSMENT

GERHARD F. HASEL

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Virtually all scholars agree that the name of Isaiah's son *שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב* (Is 7:3) is a key element of the remnant motif of Isaiah of Jerusalem. It has been suggested by L. G. Rignell that this symbolic name is the "key term"¹ in chapter 7 of Is. O. Kaiser goes even beyond this by claiming that this name "certainly contains the programme of the entire Isaianic proclamation."² There is a continuing debate on how this symbolic name is to be translated. One of the most common translations is "A remnant shall return."³ Some scholars place more stress upon the notion of conversion and translate "A remnant will repent."⁴ Others understand the name as a

¹ L. G. Rignell, "Das Immanuelszeichen," *StTh*, XI (1957), 100.

² O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja, Kap. 1-12* (2d ed.; Göttingen, 1963), p. 71.

³ Of the many supporters of this translation some may be mentioned: R. de Vaux, "Le 'Reste d'Israël' d'après les prophètes," *RB*, XLII (1933), 531; W. E. Müller, *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im Alten Testament* (Inaugural-Diss.; Leipzig, 1939), p. 56; J. P. Hyatt, *Prophetic Religion* (Nashville, 1947), p. 103; H. H. Rowley, *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* (London, 1950), p. 74; J. Y. Muckle, *Isaiah 1-39* (London, 1960), p. 29; A. Heschel, *The Prophets* (New York, 1962), p. 94; J. Mauchline, *Isaiah 1-39* (Torch Bible Commentary; London, 1962), p. 95; W. Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York, 1964), p. 236; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart, 1965), p. 129; E. J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965), I, 271; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 258. Here we may add those who translate "A remnant will return": E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* (London, 1958), p. 324; M. Buber, *The Prophetic Faith* (New York, 1960), p. 134; James M. Ward, *Amos and Isaiah: Prophets of the Word of God* (Nashville, 1969), p. 268.

⁴ Here we mention the following: B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (5th ed.; Göttingen, 1968), p. 71; G. Hölscher, *Die Ursprünge der jüdischen*

threat which emphasizes a solely ominous aspect without any hopeful notion and render it: "Only a remnant will return."⁵ J. M. P. Smith emends **יָשׁוּב** to **יָשָׁב** and thus arrives at the translation "A remnant will abide."⁶ Other scholars propose "A remnant returns."⁷ All of these translations, however, have one linguistic consideration in common, *i.e.*, they consider this name as a verbal sentence name with the syntactical structure of subject in the first element and predicate in the second element.⁸

Eschatologie (Giessen, 1925), p. 4; N. Snaith, "The Language of the Old Testament," *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York, 1952), I, 225b; E. Balla, *Die Botschaft der Propheten* (Tübingen, 1958), p. 130; E. Jenni, "Remnant," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1962), IV, 33; Th. C. Vriezen, "Essentials of the Theology of Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in honor of James Muilenburg*, eds. B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (New York, 1962), p. 138, n. 16.

⁵ Sheldon H. Blank, "The Current Misinterpretation of Isaiah's She'ar Yashub," *JBL*, LXVII (1948), 211-215; E. W. Heaton, *The Root שָׂאָר and the Doctrine of the Remnant*, *JTS*, N.S., III (1952), 37; idem, *The Old Testament Prophets* (Baltimore, 1961), p. 144; W. L. Holladay, *The Root שְׁבַח in the Old Testament* (Leiden, 1958), p. 146; C. R. North, "Shear-jashub," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1962), IV, 311; N. K. Gottwald, *All the Kingdoms of the Earth* (New York, 1964), p. 149; G. E. Wright, *Isaiah* (London, 1964), p. 37; J. Becker, *Isaias—der Prophet und sein Buch* (Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien, 30; Stuttgart, 1968), p. 46, n. 22; R. Kilian, *Die Verheissung Immanuel, Jes. 7, 14* (Stuttgart, 1969), p. 16.

⁶ J. M. P. Smith, "שָׂאָר יָשׁוּב," *ZAW*, XXXIV (1914), 220-227. Smith's textual emendation has not been accepted by scholars and must now be rejected in view of IQIs^a.

⁷ O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York, 1965), p. 304; O. Procksch, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh, 1950), pp. 581-659; "Rest-kehrt-um," so also W. Eichrodt, *Der Heilige in Israel: Jesaja 1-12* (Stuttgart, 1960), p. 82; J. Scharbert, *Die Propheten Israels bis 700 v. Chr.* (Köln, 1965), p. 230; R. E. Clements, *The Conscience of the Nation* (London, 1967), p. 68; H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern* (Leiden, 1964), p. 11.

⁸ The translations of Rignell, *op. cit.*, p. 102: "Um einen Rest handelt es sich wieder"; V. Hertrich, "λειμμα ατλ," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1942), IV, 212: "Ein Rest kommt in den rechten Stand"; *Theological Dictionary to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1967), IV, 203: "A remnant will come to a right condition"; and J. Nelis, "Rest Israels," *Bibel-Lexikon*, ed. by H. Haag (2d ed.; Einsiedeln, 1968), col. 1473: "Ein Rest allein kommt lebend

L. Köhler has challenged the supposition that שְׂאָר יָשׁוּב should be understood as a verbal sentence name with the syntactical sequence of subject-predicate. He argues that it is instead a "nackter Relativsatz" which should be translated "Der Rest, der umkehrt" ("the remnant that returns").⁹ This suggestion has been adopted by G. Fohrer¹⁰ and G. Sauer.¹¹ Köhler bases his argument upon the consideration that in Hebrew syntax the subject cannot be placed at will before or after the predicate in the independent simple clause. Therefore he assumes "that this rule of the sequence of words is also valid for names."¹² In support of his view he refers to the entries of the letter *yod* in the index of M. Noth's¹³ basic investigation of Hebrew onomastica. J. Lindblom, on the other hand, rejects Köhler's suggestion as too complicated a syntactical construction and regards שְׂאָר יָשׁוּב as a "composed nominal sentence"¹⁴ in which the first element is the subject and the second element יָשׁוּב is a verbal sentence forming the predicate. He translates

davon." All these translations are interpreting paraphrases which do not merit the quality of preserving the relative brevity and pointedness of the Hebrew name.

⁹ L. Köhler, "שְׂאָר יָשׁוּב und der nackte Relativsatz; Syntactica II," VT, III (1953), 85; the English translation is found in Köhler, *Old Testament Theology*, transl. by A. S. Todd (Philadelphia, 1957), p. 231.

¹⁰ G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Zürcher Bibelkommentar; 2d ed.; Zürich, 1966), I, 106; see also his "Die Gattung der Berichte über symbolische Handlungen der Propheten," in *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie* ("Beihefte zur ZAW," IC, Berlin, 1967), p. 97.

¹¹ G. Sauer, "Symbolischer Name," *Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch*, eds. B. Reicke and L. Rost (Göttingen, 1966), III, col. 1905; H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* ("Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament," X:1, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1965), p. 27, also translates "Rest, der umkehrt."

¹² Köhler, VT, III (1953), 85.

¹³ M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart, 1928). Noth outlined Semitic onomastica based on criteria of grammar and syntax and classified Semitic names into sentence names (verbal and nominal), genitive construct names, one-word names, and hypocoristic names.

¹⁴ J. Lindblom, *A Study on the Immanuel Section in Isaiah, Isa. vii, 1-ix, 6* (Lund, 1958), p. 9.

"a remnant, it will return,"¹⁵ which means paraphrased "there will be a remnant, and this remnant will return."¹⁶ Lindblom argues that both elements of this name are of equal significance regardless of their position. O. Kaiser has adopted Lindblom's suggestion.¹⁷

Having thus briefly outlined the major proposals for translating this symbolic name and their underlying linguistic argumentations, the remainder of this paper will be devoted to investigating the validity of these varying translations with an attempt to bring to bear on them the linguistic evidence of West Semitic sentence names with corresponding syntactical structures, especially those of recently published studies on Amorite and Ugaritic personal names.

The present writer works on the assumption that the name of Isaiah's son belongs to the class of personal names that are designated as sentence names. As far as the present writer is aware, there is on this point universal agreement among scholars. For the sake of clarification it seems advisable to summarize the characteristic features of sentence names. Here we follow Noth's fundamental work on Semitic onomastica whose proposals with regard to classification of names have been generally adopted by later scholars, including Huffmon and Gröndahl.¹⁸ Customarily sentence names are divided into two types: (1) The first type is the nominal sentence name, which contains two elements, a subject and a nominal predicate, *i.e.*, a predicate which is not an inflected verbal form. The sequence of the two elements in West Semitic nominal sentence names varies: in Amorite the usual sequence of

¹⁵ *Loc. cit.*; Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 367, n. 144.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 424.

¹⁷ O. Kaiser, "Sear jasub," *Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch*, III, col. 1752.

¹⁸ Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-20; cf. Theo Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 59; H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965), pp. 95, 96; F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Rome, 1967), pp. 45-48.

elements is predicate-subject,¹⁹ which is contrary to normal Semitic word order of nominal sentences;²⁰ Ugaritic nominal sentence names lack a preference either way,²¹ while for the rest of the West Semitic nominal sentence names the subject-predicate sequence seems to be the general rule.²² (2) The second type is the verbal sentence name which also contains two elements, a subject and a predicate, the latter consisting of a finite verb usually in the perfect or imperfect.²³ As regards the Amorite verbal sentence names, with the verb in the perfect, the sequence is perfect-substantive, except of elements with a stative verb.²⁴ The evidence from Ugarit shows that the qtl-predicate has no preferred position.²⁵ In Phoenician the substantive-perfect position is more common,²⁶ while in South Arabic, which belongs to South Semitic, the contrary sequence is the more frequent one.²⁷ The picture as regards the sequence of elements is different in verbal sentence names with an imperfect verb. In Amorite the yaqtul-predicate (as well as the other "imperfect" forms) is mostly in the first position.²⁸ This is also true of the Ugaritic yqtl-predicate²⁹ and in South Arabic names.³⁰ The conclusion to be drawn from this

¹⁹ See the fundamental work of Amorite personal names by Huffmon, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

²⁰ C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Hildesheim, 1961), II, 92-95, No. 47.

²¹ See the basic study of Ugaritic personal names by Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 47.

²² Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-19.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-31.

²⁴ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-94; Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 ff.; *idem*, "Die syrisch-palästinische Bevölkerung des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr. im Lichte neuer Quellen," *ZDPV*, LXV (1942), 26, 27; *idem*, "Mari und Israel: Eine Personennamenstudie," *Geschichte und Altes Testament. A. Alt zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1953), p. 140. Noth's statement to the contrary was premature.

²⁵ Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

²⁶ Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, p. 22.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25, 26.

²⁸ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-87.

²⁹ Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

³⁰ Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, II, 171, No. 93.

survey of the sequence of elements in Amorite, Ugaritic, Phoenician, and South Arabic sentence names is the following: there is no fixed and rigid structural pattern of sequence for the position of the two elements of nominal and verbal sentence names in these West and South Semitic languages. There are certain preferred positions, but there is no definitive pattern.³¹

We must turn our attention next to the sequence of elements in Hebrew sentence names. Noth has shown that in Hebrew onomastica the more common sequence of elements in nominal sentence names is subject-predicate with a ratio of 2:1 over against the predicate-subject sequence. With regard to verbal sentence names there is also no fixed and rigid pattern. In names which have a perfect-predicate there is no change from a subject-perfect sequence during the time of the united and divided monarchy to a perfect-subject sequence in post-exilic times. It is noteworthy, however, that in names with an imperfect-predicate—to which **יָשׁוּב** seems to correspond most closely—the more common word order is imperfect-subject. On the other hand, Noth lists a number of Hebrew names with the sequence of subject-imperfect: from the time of David **אֶלְיָהוּבָא**; the divided kingdom **יְהוֹיָכִן**, **אֶלְיָקִים**; the exile **יְהוֹיָקִים**, **אֶלְיָקִים**, **יְהוֹיָרִיב**, **אֶלְיָשִׁיב**.³² The pattern of this group of names is the following: (1) The first element acts as subject and contains the name of a deity or a theophorous element, and (2) the second element contains the predicate in the form of an imperfect verb. The syntactical structure of **שָׁאֵר יָשׁוּב** corresponds to these Hebrew names. Examples of personal sentence names with the same syntactical structure are also

³¹ It has been suggested that the sequence of the two elements in sentences in Proto-Semitic may not have been fixed; see Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 170, No. 92; W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (Rome, 1952), No. 130b.

³² Noth, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-21, 28; Lindblom, *A Study on the Immanuel Section of Isaiah*, p. 9, cites these names as examples for what he calls "composed nominal sentence" names. This is, however, misleading for the two-element nominal sentence names have a nominal predicate, which is not an inflected verb, while these names contain a predicate which consists of an inflected verb.

attested in Amorite,³³ Ugaritic,³⁴ and Phoenician³⁵ texts.

This evidence makes possible a reassessment of a number of linguistic and syntactical arguments which have been proposed with regard to the character of the syntactical structure of the name **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** and its translation. First, Köhler's assumption that the fixed rule of predicate-subject for the simple clause in Hebrew syntax applies also for the sequence of word order in names is shown to be erroneous both on account of Hebrew and of Amorite, Ugaritic, Phoenician, etc., sentence names. There are preferred positions of elements, but there is no fixed predicate-subject sequence. As regards Hebrew verbal sentence names we have indicated the development in the sequence of elements from the subject-predicate to the predicate-subject sequence, neither of which, however, is at any time exclusive and absolute. Thus Köhler's argument that the only possible syntactical structure of **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** is a "nackter Relativsatz" has lost its linguistic basis on account of Hebrew and other West Semitic onomastica. In addition, C. Brockelmann has pointed out that the normal sequence of verb-subject in the Hebrew sentence can be reversed for the sake of placing emphasis on the subject.³⁶ Secondly, Lindblom's contention that **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** is a "composed nominal sentence"³⁷ in which the first element is the subject and the second element a "verbal sentence forming the predicate" must be rejected as a too hypothetical construction. If Lindblom's hypothesis were correct, it would be without parallel as far as the present evidence is concerned. The difficulty of conceiving **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** as a "composed nominal sentence" name becomes even greater,

³³ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-86.

³⁴ Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 40, 42.

³⁵ Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936), pp. 106, 138, 150.

³⁶ Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, II, 170-172, Nos. 92-97.

³⁷ There are "one element nominal sentences" in Semitic languages according to Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, II, 35-41, but they are not joined to a verbal sentence for they consist of weakened emotional expressions. If such expressions are joined with another element they are then "two element nominal sentences."

when one is reminded that the predicate in nominal sentence names is *not* an inflected verbal form. But this is exactly the case with **יָשׁוּב** which is admittedly a Qal imperfect. The Hebrew examples cited by Lindblom in support of his hypothesis are the very names which Noth has correctly described as verbal sentence names.³⁸ Thus these Hebrew names do not support but militate against Lindblom's view. Thirdly, it has become apparent that there are no grammatical or syntactical reasons which militate against taking **יָשׁוּב יִשְׂאָר** as a verbal sentence name with the regular syntactical structure of its two normal elements—a noun and a verb—in the sequence of subject-imperfect. This conclusion is supported from the evidence of comparative Semitic names. Among the Amorite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician personal names there are verbal sentence names which have an identical syntactical structure.

Amorite and Ugaritic personal names may throw some additional light upon the semantic value of the Qal imperfect element **יָשׁוּב**. Huffmon points out that among Amorite verbal sentence names the West Semitic root *twb* is "very productive of name elements."³⁹ The Hebrew root *šwb* of which *yāšūb* is the Qal imperfect derives from the Common Semitic root *twb*.⁴⁰ There are seventeen verbal sentence names from Mari, four names from Alalakh VII,⁴¹ and two from Chagar Bazar, which have one element derived from the root *šb* (**twb*).⁴² According to Huffmon fifteen of these Amorite verbal sentence names contain the Yaqtul G imperfect form:

From Mari: *Ya-šu-ba-an, Ya-šu-bi-im, Ya-šu-ub-a-šar, Ya-šu-ub-AN, Ya-šu-ub-^aI-pu-uh,*

³⁸ *Supra*, n. 32.

³⁹ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 70.

⁴⁰ L. Köhler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1958), p. 951.

⁴¹ D. J. Wiseman, "Alalakh," in *Archaeology and Old Testament Study*, ed. D. W. Thomas (Oxford, 1967), p. 120, dates Alalakh VII to c. 1720-1650 B.C.

⁴² Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, n. 40, 266.

*Ya-šu-ub-^dDa-gan, Ya-šu-ub-ya-ha-
ad, Ya-šu-ub-li-im, Ya-šu-ub-na-ar,
Ya-šu-ub-^dMa-[], Ya-šu-ub-^d[],
Ya-šu-u[b-]*

From Alalakh VII: *Ya-šu-[u]b-ra- π i, Ya-šu-ub-[AN ?]*

From Chagar Bazar: *Ya-šu-ub-^dIM⁴³*

Gröndahl has collected ten Ugaritic personal sentence names in which one element is a form of the Common Semitic root *twb*.⁴⁴ Of these the Yaqtul G imperfect in the verbal sentence name *Yašub-ilu*⁴⁵ is of importance because of its analogy to the second element of the Hebrew name under discussion. Two observations are in order: (1) The great majority⁴⁶ of these Amorite and Ugaritic names have as their second element either the name of a divinity,⁴⁷ a theophorous element, or a hypocoristic suffix.⁴⁸ This is significant in view of the fact that the oldest written evidence at hand for the Common Semitic root *twb* (Hebrew *šub*) appears in these Amorite verbal sentence names and connects this root almost exclusively with an element of a theophorous nature. The same observation must be made with regard to those Ugaritic sentence names which contain a form of the root *twb* in one of the elements. Grammarians of comparative Semitics have observed that the semantic

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 266; for additional examples see Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer* (Leipzig, 1926), pp. 26, 30, and *idem*, "Neues Material zur 'Amoriter'-Frage," *Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*, IV (1928-29), 8.

⁴⁴ Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 42, 63.

⁴⁶ Exceptions among the Amorite names are the defective *Ya-šu-u-[b-]*, the second element of which is unknown, and *Šu-ub-na-lu-u* which has the precativ *-na-* and *-lu-u* of uncertain meaning, Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 224, 266. Among the Ugaritic names there are three names which have unexplained elements, Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 110, 153, 200.

⁴⁷ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 172, 226, 243; Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁴⁸ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, p. 210, considers *yaḥad* = "(the) unique (one)" as a theophorous or appellative element and *rapi* = "healer" as a "theophorous? element," p. 264. A hypocoristic suffix is present in *Ya-šu-ba-an* and with mimation in *Ya-šu-bi-im*, pp. 136, 132.

category to which the root *twb* belongs “describes a change of condition or transition from one situation to the opposite one.”⁴⁹ The meaning of the root *twb* is thus commonly given as “turn, return.”⁵⁰ The close connection of the forms of the root *twb* and the theophorous character of the other element in these earliest personal verbal sentence names gives additional support to the conclusion reached by W. L. Holladay that the appearances of the root *šub* in the Amorite personal names—now the Ugaritic personal names may be added—“are involved with ‘religious’ return. . . .”⁵¹ This may throw light upon the semantic value of *yāšūb* in the name of Isaiah’s son. It gives additional support to the argument that a return to Yahweh, *i.e.*, a religious return rather than a physical return from exile, is indicated. One difference, of course, is that in the Amorite and Ugaritic names a divinity is to return to man, while in the name of Isaiah’s son a return on the part of a remnant is envisioned. (2) The sequence of elements in all the Amorite and Ugaritic names with a verbal form of *twb* is predicate-subject; the name *שָׁאֵר יָשׁוּב* exhibits the subject-predicate sequence of elements. This does not need to present difficulties, because as noted above not only Hebrew but also Amorite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician verbal sentence names appear with either sequence of elements. This being the case, one should be careful not to conclude on the basis of the observation that since the subject is contained in the first element the term “remnant” must therefore be understood as an ominous threat.⁵² On the other hand, it would be equally wrong to say that both elements are of equal significance.⁵³ The position of elements, *i.e.*, the sequence of subject-verb,

⁴⁹ S. Moscati, ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Semitic Languages* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, VI; Wiesbaden, 1964), p. 189, No. 16.133; cf. von Soden, *op. cit.*, No. 104; Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 63, n. 291.

⁵⁰ Huffmon, *op. cit.*, p. 266; Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁵¹ Holladay, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁵² For those who follow this line of reasoning, see *supra*, n. 5.

⁵³ Lindblom, *op. cit.*, p. 242: “. . . both terms are equally significant.”

has importance, because it places emphasis on the subject.⁵⁴

This study has attempted to reassess the linguistic arguments that have been brought to bear on our understanding of the syntactical structure of the name **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** and its translation with the aid of all applicable evidence of Semitic onomastica, especially the West Semitic evidence of the recently published Amorite and Ugaritic personal names. It has become apparent that the syntactical structure of the name of Isaiah's oldest son is neither a "nackter Relativsatz" nor a "composed nominal sentence." It has also been shown that there is no linguistic and syntactical basis for the contention that the first element, *i.e.*, the term "remnant," must be understood as a mere ominous threat without any hopeful content. The similarities and parallels of the syntactical structure of the name **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** with the syntactical structure of the sentence names of Hebrew, Amorite, and Ugaritic onomastica led to the conclusion that this name is a *verbal sentence name* with a subject-predicate sequence of elements. This conclusion, based on linguistic and syntactical considerations,⁵⁵ strongly supports the translation of **שָׁאֵר יְשׁוּב** with "A-Remnant-*Shall*-Return," placing emphasis on the italicized "remnant."

⁵⁴ *Supra*, n. 36.

⁵⁵ For an evaluation of the possibilities of translating Hebrew imperfect names with a jussive, see the cautions and warnings of J. J. Stamm, "Hebräische Ersatznamen," in *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger* ("Assyriological Studies," No. 16; Chicago, 1965), pp. 414, 415.