Studies in the Syntax
And the Dating of
Biblical Hebrew

By
Martin Gustaf Ehrensvärd

To my parents
Annie Constance Christensen and
Jørgen Christensen

Table of Contents:

Preface

Through the years, many brilliant people have graciously offered me inspiration in my work. Some have been of crucial importance. Three people stand out as very important teachers, Hans Jørgen Lundager Jensen, Finn Ove Hvidberg-Hansen, and Avi Hurvitz.

The following people have very constructively commented on earlier versions of different chapters: Martin F.J. Baasten, Avi Hurvitz, Jan Joosten, and Wido van Peursen.

The research for the dissertation has been carried out with the financial support of The Danish Research Training Office. It has been a pleasure co-operating with the people there.

I have written the four chapters and excursus of this dissertation as separate articles, and they have been published separately (see bibliography; chapter four has not yet appeared). I have modified them to align them with my current outlook. Chapter one is based on my 1994 University of Aarhus MA dissertation.

Introduction

Diachronic studies of biblical Hebrew[1] have a long history, dating back as far as 1815 where Wilhelm Gesenius published his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache*.[2] Until ten or fifteen years ago, controversy in this field of studies was fairly limited[3] - scholars usually took as departure the chronology prevalent in biblical studies and did not question the general validity of this chronology. Sometimes linguistic arguments contributed to the dating of books, but since extra-biblical, linguistic evidence from the early period is quite scarce, linguists were dependent on having a number of biblical texts they could use as baselines to establish the history of the language. What was needed was at least two corpora dateable to different periods and showing consistent linguistic differences.

It was clear that such two corpora existed: there are small but consistent differences in the Hebrew of two groups of texts, the Hebrew of Genesis-2Kings on the one hand, and the Hebrew of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles on the other. The former is sometimes known as 'early biblical Hebrew',[4] and the latter usually as 'late biblical Hebrew'.[5] As the terms suggest, the first group was dated earlier, to pre-exilic times, and the second group later, to post-exilic times. Scholars regarded EBH as a standard language which LBH writers[6] attempted at reproducing and failed. Therefore, LBH was held to be a deteriorated form of the standard language.

When, in recent years, dispute over chronology has broken down the consensus of the pre-exilic dating of the former group of baseline texts, this was bound to affect the field of diachronic language studies – if revisionist scholars wanted to date the bulk of the biblical texts to exilic or post-exilic times, they would have to explain the linguistic differences. Some scholars in the last decade or so have presented a broad linguistic defence of the revisionist view,[7] and among them Fred Cryer presents the most daring hypothesis. He argues that the linguistic differences in the biblical texts are in fact negligible and concludes that this lack of diversity can mean only one thing, i.e. the biblical texts were written within a short time span.[8]

Cryer raises important questions, questions that need answers. Of what nature are the differences between the two commonly accepted strata of BH? Could the biblical texts not have been

---

[1] = BH. Other abbreviations used: early biblical Hebrew = EBH; late biblical Hebrew = LBH; noun phrase = NP; Qumran Hebrew = QH.

[2] For full references, see bibliography.

[3] See Rooker's *forschungsgeschichte*, 'Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew'.

[4] Others: 'classical biblical Hebrew', or 'standard biblical Hebrew'.

[5] For considerations on the use of the term, see Ólafsson, 'Fact or Fiction?'.

[6] Throughout the dissertation I use the term 'writers' in the sense of whoever is responsible for the (more or less) final linguistic form of the texts. For the intricate question of the relationship between writers, scribes, copyists, and texts, see the references in n. 151 below.

[7] Knauf, 'War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?'; Davies, *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 102-05; Cryer, 'Problem of Dating'; Davies, 'Linguistic Analysis versus Social History'; de Caën, 'Minimalist Programme'; cf. also Elwolde, 'Hebrew Vocabulary'; Schüle, 'Zur Bedeutung der Formel *wajjehi*'; *Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften*, 1-3, 182-86, 192-95.

[8] 'Problem of Dating'.

V

written at one go? Are there any certain linguistic baselines to establish the earliness and lateness of different types of BH? Cryer, who is not known first and foremost for his linguistic work, comes as the outsider and asks how we know what we think we know. For ages we have worked on the basis of assumptions and perhaps the time has come to reconsider the validity of these assumptions. Are they mere assumptions or do they rest firmly on established facts?

From the opposite side of the battle a traditionalist scholar has argued against the revisionist endeavour strictly from linguistic arguments. Avi Hurvitz, in three articles in the last five years has argued that linguistic considerations in themselves necessitate a pre-exilic date for the EBH texts.[9] He points to numerous colloquial slips in the Hebrew of post-exilic texts that give their authors away as post-exilic, concluding that EBH was outdated after the exile and that post-exilic writers could not have been able to write texts in this type of Hebrew.

This is where parts of the present dissertation come in, the chapters three and four. I believe that there is room for a critical review of both Cryer's and Hurvitz's work. In chapter three, I review Cryer's article and argue, firstly, that there are in fact small, but recognizable and consistent differences between the Hebrew of the two corpora in question. Secondly, I argue that there are baselines that with high probability establishes EBH as an earlier form of Hebrew than LBH. These baselines are the extra-biblical, linguistic material which even though it is scarce, provides enough information to confirm the validity of this assessment. However welcome Cryer's work is in that it forces us to rethink what we know and why, it turns out that his arguments do not hold water and will have to be dismissed.

In chapter four I review Hurvitz's work on this subject and argue that he does not successfully defend the traditional dating as the only possible dating from a linguistic perspective. In fact, the linguistic evidence seen in isolation goes in the opposite direction, suggesting that the (final linguistic form of the) EBH texts date(s) to post-exilic times. I make two points in this regard, 1) LBH has not been substantiated as a deteriorated form of EBH, and may rather be the result of a different stylistic taste with one group of writers, and 2) some of the biblical books on clear evidence date to post-exilic times, and yet they are written in EBH. Since this is the best linguistic match for the disputed EBH texts, an unbiased and purely linguistic dating would date the disputed EBH texts to the same time as the datable EBH texts, i.e. after the exile.

As to the contents of the first two chapters, the first chapter has the least bearing on the diachronic theme of the dissertation: the subject of the chapter is the definite article and it takes as its departure a hypothesis proposed by James Barr, supported by the standard reference grammars of BH, that the definite article in Hebrew sometimes is unrelated to determination. Barr argues that the BH shows the article in a process of change and that it ends up in a closer relationship with deter-

---

[9] 'Quest for "Ancient Israel"', 'Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics'; 'Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically?'.

mination. The chapter presents my analysis of BH article usage where I argue that the definite article always is directly related to determination. This makes any diachronic explanation superfluous.

The chapter is followed by an excursus where I pursue the question of article usage into mishnaic Hebrew.[10] Here, scholars have made a similar claim of the definite article sometimes being unrelated to determination. I argue, again, that the definite article even in mishnaic Hebrew always is related to determination.

Chapter two analyzes a BH syntactic feature in depth, the different options of negating the infinitive. It turns out that there are a few such options, some of which are generally held to have diachronic implications and are used to late-date texts. I point to overlooked examples of these constructions in EBH texts, concluding that they only with caution can serve in defining texts in which they appear as LBH.

---

[10] Throughout the dissertation I use this term as equivalent to 'tannaitic Hebrew', i.e. the Hebrew of the earliest rabbinical sources, including the Mishna.

1. Determination of the Noun

I. Introduction

Definiteness is one of the most intricate problems in linguistics. It is difficult to describe and categorize in a precise manner, and the term 'fuzzy categories' has, with justice, been used in this categorization.[1] Even in BH, there is a dispute over basic categorization of the use of the quintessential means of expressing definiteness,[2] the definite article: The two comprehensive reference grammars Gesenius/Kautzsch and Joüon/Muraoka, in addition to the more or less generally accepted categories of use of the article make use of a category which they describe as not having to do with definiteness in the sense that we know it.[3] In this category they group the instances of the use of the article they cannot fit into the generally accepted categories, instances where the Hebrew definite article, in German and English respectively, is said to be expressed by an indefinite article.

James Barr discusses this problem at length and argues that it is a diachronic feature, the biblical texts showing the article in a process of change into a closer connection with determination.[4] The central part of Barr's argument is the category found in the two grammars, ostensibly showing that the article can be unrelated to determination. Augustin Müller in a response to Barr has argued that when a language has the opposition determined vs. non-determined, it does not use the definite article with non-determined words.[5] He offers an alternative analysis of some of Barr's examples but does not discuss the many additional examples adduced by Barr and the two grammars. In the following, I will take a closer look at the 67 examples adduced to substantiate the existence of the category.[6]

---

[1] See Chesterman, *On Definiteness*, especially pp. 192-196.

[2] See Chesterman, *On Definiteness*, 4.

[3] Gesenius/Kautzsch, §126q: "Eigentümlich ist dem Hebräischen die Verwendung des Artikels, um *eine einzelne, zunächst noch unbekannte und daher nicht näher zu bestimmende Person oder Sache* als eine solche zu bezeichnen, welche unter den gegebenen Umständen als vorhanden und in Betracht kommend zu denken sei. Im Deutschen steht in solchen Fällen meist der unbestimmte Artikel" [my italics, M.E.].

Joüon/Muraoka, under the heading *Imperfect Determination*, §137m: "A thing which is not determinate in the consciousness of the writer or of him who is addressed is sometimes specifically determinate in itself; therefore the noun takes, or can take the article. This use of the article, characteristic of Hebrew, is rather frequent. It can only be translated in English by *a*, sometimes *a certain…*".

Note that Gesenius/Kautzsch in §126g describes the same category in the following way: "in eigentümlicher Weise zur Bezeichnung von Personen oder Dingen, die insofern näher bestimmt sind, als sie in einer gegebenen Sachlage naturgemäss in Betracht kommen und demgemäss vorausgesetzt werden müssen (see *litt. q-s*)". This description is adequate with regard to the 24 instances I group in section IV *Associative use* below. However, my argument is that this use is not 'eigentümlich', but in line with regular associative use of the definite article.

[4] ''Determination' and the Definite Article'.

[5] 'Artikelfunktionen'.

[6] The examples are found in Gesenius/Kautzsch, §126r-t, and Joüon/Muraoka, §137m-o, and many of them are cited in both grammars. Barr only cites one example not found in the two grammars.

I will argue, like Müller, that it in all likelihood does not exist and show that most of the examples when carefully analyzed are examples of regular article usage. When the nouns in question are perceived as non-determined and translated as such, it is because we are not sufficiently familiar with ancient Hebrew language and culture and hence do not possess the contextual information the articles refer to. In the following, analyzing all the given examples, I will show which information the use of the article could have presupposed. In addition, I will place each instance in one of the generally accepted categories of article use, anaphoric use, larger situation use, associative use, generic use, idiomatic/non-functional use, cases of non-determination, and textual corruption.[7] In many of the cases this categorization is not certain, but the important thing is that they are all likely to belong to generally accepted categories and not to the proposed category of non-determination.

When Barr's category is shown to probably not exist, this should refute his claim that use of the definite article in biblical texts has diachronic implications.

II. Anaphoric use

The definite article is said to be used anaphorically when the NP refers to something that has just been mentioned, as in *I saw a dog and a cat*. The *dog chased* the *cat*. Five of the examples could belong to this category:

1. The escaped band [הַפָּלִיט] came and reported this to Abram (Gen 14.13)[8]

Scholars usually understand this verse as relating that a fugitive from the battle between Kedor-laomer and the rebelling kings reaches the great trees of Mamre to tell Abraham about the events. They understand the article here as either generic in some sense or unrelated to determination. However, הַפָּלִיט in itself does not necessarily have to be understood as "the one who escaped", it could alternatively be understood collectively as "those who escaped", as Nöldeke suggests.[9] He believes הַפָּלִיט to be a parallel of Arabic *ʾaṣ-ṣarī ḥu* "the band of helpers", *ʾal-ʿaduwwu*, "the enemy",[10] and *ʾaš-šarī du*, "the escaped (band)". If this is true, the use of the article could be explained in a straightforward way: in v. 10 a group of fugitives are mentioned: "the rest fled to the hills". Now, by 'the rest', הַנִּשְׁאָרִים, is meant that part of the fugitives that did not fall into the tar pits in the Valley of Siddim. It is likely, then, that the definite article with פָּלִיט in v. 13 refers to this band of fugitives that escaped all the way to the great trees of Mamre to report the events to Abram.

---

[7] The first four of these categories are very thoroughly examined for English in Hawkins, *Definiteness and Indefiniteness*.
[8] Throughout the dissertation I supply my own translations of the biblical texts. Sometimes, especially in the last chapter, I tacitly rely on the New Revised Standard Version.
[9] In *Neue Beiträge*, n. 5, p. 79.
[10] Notice that 'the enemy' also is a collective noun in English.

2

2. In the twelfth year…the band that had escaped [fylPh'] from Jerusalem came to me (Ezk 33.21)

Here too the article probably has anaphoric reference. The prophecy mentions a band of fugitives (fylPh) in 24.26(-27), and the best way to understand the definite article in 33.21 is as referring to the band of fugitives prophesied there. This underlines the general assumption[11] that 25.1-33.20 is an insertion.

3. Live in the booths [tKSB'] for seven days (Lev 23.42)

The Israelites were told in v. 34 that the feast of t/KSh' begins at such and such a day. Therefore, when they are told to live in t/KSh', on the textual level, it could be a direct reference to v. 34. The article could even be interpreted as associative, since booths would be a natural part of a feast of booths.

4. The LORD said to Moses: "Make a snake and put it up on a pole [snE…" So Moses made a bronze snake and put it up on the pole [sNE'] (Num 21.8-9)

This may be anaphoric reference though not in a strictly logical sense: the pole in v. 9 refers to the pole in v. 8 even though the latter is not specific.

5. Now Moabite raiders [ba/m ydWdG] used to enter the country each spring. Once while some Israel-ites were burying a man, suddenly they saw the band of raiders [dWdGh'] (2Kgs 13.20-21)

Possibly, though perhaps not very likely, there came only one band of raiders every year, hence *the* band.

III. Larger situation use

The article can be used where both speaker and hearer have general or specific knowledge that the referent is present in the larger situation surrounding the utterance.[12] Eleven of the examples proba-bly belong to this category. We cannot expect to understand the reference of all the articles in this category, since it is impossible at this time to know exactly what belonged to the larger situation in those days. In (6)-(12), the article seems to refer to known places at the time that we just happen not

---

[11] See, e.g., Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, 579.

to have other references to in our sources. Note that this category still is real even if it turns out that many of the biblical texts were written much later than the events they purport to describe. In that case, some of the referents may indeed have been unknown to both speaker and hearer (/author and reader) at the time, but the article still suggests familiarity and would in that case serve as a rhetorical device.

6. The angel of the LORD found Hagar near the spring [םִיַמַּה ןיֵע] in the desert, the spring by the road to Shur (Gen 16.7)

This was probably a known spring, and in addition, it is a case of cataphoric[13] reference: 'the spring in the desert, [i.e.] the spring by the road to Shur'.

7. When he reached a certain place [םוֹקָמַּב], he stopped for the night (Gen 28.11)

As has been suggested in the literature, the article probably refers to the fact that Jacob came to a known place, i.e. the holy place at Bethel.

8. He and his two daughters lived in the cave [הָרָעְמַּב] (Gen 19.30)

'The cave' probably refers to a known cave (as Gesenius/Kautzsch themselves consider).

9. The mule went under the thick branches of a large oak [הָלוֹדְגַּה הָלֵאָה] (2Sam 18.9)

'The large oak' was most likely a known oak.

10. They took Absalom, threw him into the great pit [לוֹדָגַּה תַחַפַּה] in the forest (2Sam 18.17)

'The great pit' was probably a known pit.

11. He found him sitting under the oak tree [הָלֵאָה] (1Kgs 13.14)

A known oak tree.

12. There he went into a cave [הָרָעְמַּה] (1Kgs 19.9)

---

[12] As when someone says to a guest: I'll just go down to the grocery store - the guest may either know specifically which grocery store is meant, or have general knowledge that there always is a grocery store to be found close to where more people live.

A known cave.

13. The virgin [hm̩l][h;] shall be with child (Isa 7.14)

It is a vexed question to whom hm̩l][h; refers. It could be to Isaiah's wife, to Ahaz' (preferred) wife, to the mythological hm̩l]['etc., nevertheless, there are good reasons to believe that a specific and hence definite hm̩l]['is meant.

14. Moses fled from Pharaoh and went to live in Midian where he lived by the well [raBÒh'] (Ex 2.15)

When Moses goes to live by the well in Midian, a specific, well known well may be meant. Alternatively, 'the well' may be determined since it is something that is always found where people live.[14]

15. There the angel of the LORD appeared to him in flames of fire from within the bush [hnSÒh'] (Ex 3.2)

This may have been a specific bush by Horeb, or perhaps the story about the angel of the LORD appearing in a bush was so well known that the article is used.

16. Then the LORD sent the venomous snakes [µypir;C]'µy j]Ni] among them (Num 21.6)

It may have been a known form of punishment for the LORD to send in The Venomous Snakes, even though the use of the article does seem strange.

IV. Associative use

The very common associative use of the definite article is when the referent is associated with something that has just been mentioned, as having mentioned a book and then referring to *the* title, *the* author etc. As the former category, this category is quite culture dependent, since, in order to know what can be associated with what in a given culture, it is necessary to know the culture well.

---

[13] Cataphoric reference: the information needed to understand the reference is supplied immediately afterwards.

[14] As *the hospital* can be used in English - "I spent my entire holiday at *the hospital*"; "we stayed in Madrid by *the hospital*". In both these cases, the article probably appeals to the hearer's general knowledge that hospitals are everywhere where people are. Similar institutions have the article in English (and other European languages): *the theatre*, *the bus* (perhaps also *the movies*), etc.

17. Then the birds of prey came down on the carcasses [fy[h] (Gen 15.11)

The birds of prey are associated with the presence of carcasses.

18. After they embalmed him, he was placed in the coffin in Egypt [÷raB] (Gen 50.26)

The coffin is associated with the fact that Joseph died and was embalmed.

19. But Jael, Heber's wife, picked up the tent peg and the hammer [tb,Q,M]h] (Jdg 4.21)

The hammer is associated with the tent.[15]

20. Then Manoah took a young goat…and sacrificed it on the rock [rWXh] to the LORD (Jdg 13.19)

The rock is probably associated with the sacrifices, as the natural place for the sacrifices to take place. It could even be a case of non-functional use of the article.[16]

21. They put their heads in the baskets [µydWDB] and sent them to Jehu (2Kgs 10.7)

The baskets are associated with the command in the previous verse to transport the heads to Jezreel.

22. I signed and sealed the deed [rp,SeB] (Jer 32.10)

The deed is associated with Jeremiah buying the field.[17]

23. On that day, the escaped band will come to tell you the news [fyl]Ph] (Ezk 24.26)

The band of fugitives[18] may have been associated with the tribulations prophesied in the previous verse - in the biblical literature there always seems to be a group that escapes from battles and tribulations, and if there was not, it is often stated explicitly (as in, for instance, Josh 10.29-43).

24. The servant [r[Nh] ran and told Moses (Num 11.27)
25. The servant girl [hjpCh] was to go and inform them (2Sam 17.17)

---

[15] This is the easiest way to explain the presence of the article. Müller 'Artikelfuntionen', 327, suggests that the article can be used because Jael is known for her act of slaying Sisera with the hammer and the pole. See also (64).
[16] For this usage, see below.
[17] As Müller suggests, 'Artikelfunktionen', n. 16, p. 322.
[18] For this understanding of the word, see (1) and (2) above.

26. They did not realize that Joseph could understand them, since the interpreter [Åyl Mh'] was among them (Gen 42.23)

27. The messenger [dyGMh'] came and told David (2Sam 15.13)

These four examples may represent a kind of associative article, used as the article in *the waiter*: in restaurants, usually *the waiter* is used even though there several waiters around and different waiters often wait the same table. *The doctor* is another example. These articles are not referring to a specific person, but to a type. It is worth noting that the Septuagint has a definite article in all four instances. This seems to suggest that the Greek-speaking audience of the Septuagint could identify the referent as a type, since no specific person can be identified. No conclusions can be built upon the evidence of the Septuagint, but it certainly is suggestive, especially since the Septuagint not automatically translates the Hebrew article with a Greek definite article - this can be shown by a comparison of the 67 examples of Gesenius/Kautzsch, Joüon/Muraoka, and Barr, with the Septuagint where many are rendered definite but a significant number is not.

Alternatively, some or all of the articles may equal possessive pronouns, *his* servant, *their* servant girl, *his* interpreter, *his* messenger. It is then another type of associative article and it equals our: I took *the car* this morning, where *the car = my car*. Yowell Aziz has made a quantitative examination of the referential differences between a novel of 552 pages by Najib Mahfouz in Arabic and the English translation of it. [19] He finds that no less than 346 times are Arabic nouns with definite article translated into English NP's containing a possessive pronoun. [20]

Another thirteen of the examples probably belong in this category:

28. He selected a choice, tender calf and gave it to his servant [r[Nh'] (Gen 18.7)

29. He put them on his donkey [r/mj h'] (Ex 4.20)

She got on her donkey [r/mj h'] (1Sam 25.42)

He saddled his donkey [r/mj h'] (2Sam 17.23)

Saddle my donkey [r/mj h'] for me (2Sam 19.27)

Saddle my donkey [r/mj h'] for me (1Kgs 13.13)

30. His master shall pierce his ear with his awl [['xrMB'] (Ex 21.6)

Then you shall take your awl [['xrMB'] (Deut 15.17)

31. When a slaveowner strikes a male or female slave with his rod [fb,VB'] (Ex 21.20)

He went against him with his rod [fb,vB'] (2Sam 23.21)

32. Moses said to Aron: "take your censer [hTj Mh']…" (Num 17.11, cp. 16.17)

33. He struck the donkey with his staff [l QMB'] (Num 22.27)

---

[19] 'Explicit and Implicit Reference'.
[20] 'Explicit and Implicit Reference', 137-38.

34. Then an Israelite man came and brought his Midianite woman [תִּמְדְיָנִית] into his family (Num 25.6)

We are told in v. 1 that the Israelite men began to indulge in sexual immorality with Moabite women, and this explains that a man can bring *his* Moabite (Midianite) woman home.

35. He entered her tent and she put her covering [בַּשְּׂמִיכָה] over him (Jdg 4.18)

The covering could even be one that was associated with/expected to be in the tent.

36. They spread his [=Gideon's] mantle [הַשִּׂמְלָה] (Jdg 8.25)
The sword of Goliath…is here wrapped in his mantle [בַּשִּׂמְלָה] (1Sam 21.10)

The last of these two cases is dubious.

37. Abimelech took his axe(s) [הַקַּרְדֻּמּוֹת] in his hand (Jdg 9.48)
38. When he had entered his house, he took his knife [הַמַּאֲכֶלֶת] (Jdg 19.29)
39. Michal took an idol and laid it on the bed…and covered it with her garment [בַּבֶּגֶד] (1Sam 19.13)

Or perhaps some form of clothes associated with the bed.

40. She let them down by her rope [בַּחֶבֶל] (Josh 2.15)

בַּחֶבֶל הוֹרִידָה may, alternatively, be a case of non-functional use of the article,[21] and the expression would then simply mean "to let down/to lower".

V. Generic use

As the European article languages[22], Hebrew uses the article *generically*. It can be used when the reference is not specific, referring either to the whole genus,[23] or to any member of the genus, as often in *comparisons*:

41. As the shepherd [הָרֹעֶה] rescues from the mouth of the lion [הָאֲרִי] (Am 3.12)

---

[21] This is the view of Meyer, *Determinationsverhältnisse*, 10. For the term 'non-functional use of the article', see below.
[22] *The horse is a mammal* etc.
[23] As in Lev 11, *passim*.

42. It will be like when a man flees from the lion [yrah], and the bear [bDh] meets him…and the snake [jhn] bites him (Am 5.19)[24]

43. Like the scroll [rpSK] (Isa 34.4)

It is frequent in utterances that have a *general* or *hypothetical* character:

44. For instance, a man may go into the forest with his neighbour to cut wood, and as he swings his axe to fell the tree [Å[h] (Deut 19.5)

In this hypothetical utterance, "*the* tree" is possible in English.

45. There were seven hundred chosen men who were left-handed each of whom could sling the stone [baB] at the hair [hr[Ch] and not miss (Jdg 20.16)

In this general statement, 'stone' and 'hair' cannot possibly have specific reference and they take the generic article in Hebrew, even though a generic definite article is not good in an English translation.

46. When the lion [yrah] or the bear [bDh] would come and carry off a sheep, I would go after it (1Sam 17.34-35)[25]

In this general statement, the generic definite article is possible in English.

47. So the prophet said, "Because you have not obeyed the LORD, as soon as you leave me, the lion [hyrah] will kill you". And after the man went away, the lion [hyrah] found him and killed him (1Kgs 20.36)

Even though not exactly hypothetical, the first reference could not be specific, and a generic definite article seems acceptable in English. The following definite article with the specific lion that actually found him and killed him is not an altogether logical anaphoric reference, nor a usual generic reference. It is found in English, however, in utterances such as *I took a walk in the forest today, and I saw* the *fox*. Here, 'the fox' (probably) has the generic article even though the speaker saw one specific fox.

---

[24] This is 'the central case' in Barr's argumentation, and is the first of Gesenius/Kautzsch's examples. But, as Müller, 'Artikelfunktionen', 323, explains, it is regular generic article usage, since these are typical, and not specific dangerous animals. In addition, it is a comparison, and this enhances the probability of the generic article being used.

48. You would plunge me into the pit [tjV'B'] (Job 9.31)

This is hypothetical, and the definite article is acceptable in English.

49. I will send the hornet [h[r'Xh'] ahead of you to drive the Hivites, Canaanites and Hittites out of your way (Ex 23.28)

Generic reference seems reasonable in this case even though the meaning of h[r'Xh' is not certain, and it is possible to use a generic definite article in English.

50. And he sent out the Raven [br[h]…and he sent out the dove [hn"Yh'] (Gen 8.7-8)

These could be cases of generic reference even though a generic reference with (what seems to be) specific individual is rare (but see [47] above). Perhaps the microcosm of Noah's Ark enhances the likelihood of finding this kind of reference, the emphasis lying on the type of bird he sends out as opposed to the specific individual. Our use of the definite article in fables provides a possible analogy:[26] "One day in the great woods, it happened that the lion, the wolf, and the sheep met…". The Septuagint uses the definite article here, and this, again, would suggest that the Greek-speaking audience could understand the reference.

VI. Idiomatic/non-functional use

The article is used in Hebrew, as in most, if not all European article languages in idiomatic expressions where it often must be analyzed as non-functional.[27] Some of the 67 examples, then, probably belong in this category:

51. (bTok]Wetc.) rpSB' (Ex 17.14; Num 5.23; 1Sam 10.25; Job 19.23)[28]

To write in 'the' scroll in BH simply means to write down.[29] The article has no function in this expression.

52. He hanged the king of Ai on the tree [Å[h] (Josh 8.29)

---

[25] I analyze this and the next example like Müller, 'Artikelfunktionen', 324.

[26] This suggestion is by no means a new one.

[27] Müller, 'Artikelfunktionen', 320-22. See the works of Grimm, *Untersuchungen*, and Laca, 'Universalität und Einzel-sprachlichkeit', in which the general linguistic aspects of non-functional article use are discussed.

[28] Jer 32.10 does not belong here, see (22). A BH expression with non-functional article usage that has been generally understood and correctly translated, is br,j,B' lp;n, "to fall for the sword".

Likewise, "to hang someone on 'the' tree" simply means "to hang someone", like English "throwing in the bin" means "throwing away". There are no other occurrences of "hanging on the tree" without specific reference in BH, but in the Temple Scroll from Qumran, 11QT[a] 64.8-12, it is found with the definite article four times, most probably without specific reference, and in the Nahum Pesher, 4QpNah 1.8, we find Å[h l [yj yl tl, "for the one hanged alive on the tree", also without specific reference.[30]

53. The word of the LORD came to Abram in the vision [hz.jM;B'] (Gen 15.1)

This may also be an example of non-functional article use, "to see in the vision" = "to see in a vision".

54. Once it happened [µ/Yh' yhiy.w'] (1Sam 1.4; 14.1; 2Kgs 4.8, 11, 18; Job 1.6, 13; 2.1 [Gen 39.11])

This must be an idiomatic expression, with a parallel in colloquial English, *You know,* the other day *I met so and so and we did so and so…* Whether or not the article can be analyzed as non-functional is not certain. One could argue that what follows the expression, i.e. the narration of what occurred, did happen on a specific day ("*on a certain day* it happened that…"), and that the article therefore must be cataphoric. On the other hand, a better translation may be "*once* it happened that…", and the article could then be said to be non-functional.

The article is used with *measurements*:

55. Take an omer [rm,[ho] of manna (Ex 16.32)
56. He…wrung out the dew – a bowlful [lp,Se] of water (Jdg 6.38)
57. Twenty eight cubits [hM;aB;] long and four cubits [hM;aB;] wide (Ex 26.2)
58. The ephah [hp;yaeh;] and the bath [tB;h'] are to be the same size (Ezk 45.11)
59. The shekel [lq,V,h'] is to consist of twenty gerahs (Ezk 45.12)

The use of article with measurements could alternatively be categorized as larger situation use, but in any case, it is not reasonable to see it as inexplicable in terms of determination. In the two last examples it is possible to use the definite article in an English translation.

The use of article with *distributive* meaning is found in Hebrew:

---

[29] I reach the same conclusion here as Meyer, *Determinationsverhältnisse*, 10.

60. A cart from every two leaders [םיִאִשְׂנ] (Num 7.3)

61. He offered a bull and a ram on each altar [ַחֵבְּזִמ] (Num 23.2)

62. A thousand men from each of the tribes [הֶטַּמ] of Israel (Num 31.4)

The nouns here refer to each of the pragmatically relevant referents, and they can therefore be determined by means of the article.

VII. Cases of non-determination

Two of the examples are probably not examples of determination at all since only the rectum is definite:

63. God spoke to Israel in visions of the night [הָלְיַלַּה תֹאְרַמ] (Gen 46.2)

64. But Jael…picked up a peg from the tent [לֶהֹאָה דַתְי] (Jdg 4.21)[31]

In most cases where the rectum is definite, the regens is also definite. This does not hold for all cases, however,[32] and among them probably (63) and (64).

VIII. Textual corruption

65. [עָלֵצַּה] (1Kgs 6.8)

[עיִכ] in v. 6Q should, logically, be amended to [לֵצ] which would give direct anaphoric reference.

66. And she made him sleep upon her knees, and she called for a man [שיִאָל] (Jdg 16.19)

There is a possibility that the presence of the article here could be due to corruption.[33] I cannot explain how שיִאָ could be determined.

67. The Israelite woman's son and an Israelite man [יִלֵאְרְשִׂיַּה] began fighting (Lev 24.10)

[30] All Qumran quotes in the dissertation are from the CD-ROM *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, 2, except for the quote from 4Q368 (no. [81] on p. 32) which is from Wacholder and Abegg, *Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls*, Fascicle 3, 135-39.

[31] See n. 14 above.

[32] See, e.g., 2Sam 23.11, שָׁדֲעַה תַקְלֶח, and Josh 7.21 רָעְנִשׁ תֶרֶדַּא. For a thorough treatment of this subject, see Baasten, *Bepaaldheid en onbepaaldheid*.

[33] Joüon/Muraoka, §147d, gives a number of examples of שיִאָ where the presence of the article can be due to corruption. For an instructive discussion of the subject of possibly added articles, see Barr, ''Determination' and the Definite Article', 325-33.

It is, likewise, hard to see how yꜣrōl could be determined. Perhaps the word was mistaken for tyꜣrōh' two words before, and supplied with the article by a scribal mistake. It is worth noticing that the Samaritan Pentateuch does not have an article with yꜣrōl.

IX. Conclusion

Of the 67 examples put forth in defending the claim that a special category of use of the definite article is found in BH, only a handful eluded a satisfactory explanation in terms of regular article usage when a closer examination was undertaken. Other problematic examples could be brought forth, but very few would turn out to be inexplicable - and after all, the article is used over 30.000 times in the biblical texts.[34] So if ten or twenty occurrences cannot be accounted for satisfactorily, there is no reason to believe that article usage in BH is deviant from what is found in other article languages. Moreover, if we grant that, for instance, examples (5), (14), (15), (16), (25), (40), (66), and (67) are not accounted for satisfactorily, they do not have enough in common to constitute a category of article use of their own. I suggest that instances such as these, where the explanations of why the article is used do not seem entirely reasonable, merely should be considered an object of further study.

As mentioned in the introduction, the hypothesis of the use of the article having chronological implications is rendered very unlikely as the proposed category is shown not to be real.

---

[34] According to Jenni and Westermann, *Theologisches Handwörterbuch*, 2, 531.

Excursus: The Definite Article in Post-Biblical Hebrew

The use of the definite article in biblical and post-biblical Hebrew is remarkably similar to the use of the definite article in western European languages. A category of Hebrew article use that would happen not to be found in one European language is likely to be found in the next. For BH, this holds for all categories of article use, except for the proposed category dealt with in chapter one above. The category has been proposed also for mishnaic Hebrew, and in the following I will show why this category probably does not exist there either.[35]

Gavriel Birnbaum analyzes the use of the article in the Mishna and makes use of a category which he calls רתוְֶיה [וִדוְּ, superfluous determination.[36] He refers to Gesenius/Kautzsch, brings some of their examples to show the existence of the category in BH, and then proceeds to analyze the mishnaic material. He provides examples from the limited *ma'ase* material in the Mishna, quoting seven, what he calls certain, examples where he argues that the article is used with words that are not definite and hence is superfluous. He feels that there are abundance examples of this category in mishnaic Hebrew, but he is not sure how to distinguish this category from the category of generic usage since he believes that most of the sentences of the Mishna do not denote things that have happened but rulings of halacha to hypothetical occurrences. I shall return shortly to the use of the article in halachic sentences, but first I shall examine Birnbaum's seven *ma'ase* examples, and for convenience I quote them in Danby's translation. The first two are in (1):

1. *Shabb.* 24.5: It once happened…that [on the Sabbath] they stopped up the light-hole [רוֹאַמֲה] with a pitcher and tied a pot [הדְּיקָמֲה] with reed grass [to a stick] in order to find out if there was in the roofing an opening of one square handbreadth or not.

The first example, רוֹאַמֲה, as you can see, Danby translates "the light-hole". In the preceding line we are told, רוֹאַמֲה תאֶ וֹמתֲיְֹק "they may stop up a light-hole", and here we are told that once it happened that they רוֹאַמֲה תאֶ וּמֲתָּסְ "stopped up the light-hole". This may not be anaphoric reference in a strictly logical sense since the first רוֹאַמֲה is generic, but רוֹאַמֲה תאֶ וּמֲתָּסְ certainly is dependent on רוֹאַמֲה תאֶ וֹמתֲיְֹק in the Hebrew as in the English and cannot be considered indefinite.

---

[35] In the Dead Sea Scrolls, it seems that there are no such difficult examples. I examined the articles in a corpus consisting of 1QRule of the Community, 4QMMT, 1QWar Scroll, 11QTemple Scroll[a], 1QHabakkuk Pesher, 3QCopper Scroll, and even the Damascus Document from the Geniza, but I found no examples that could be used to support the proposed category, on the contrary, all the articles seemed to fit the well-established categories of article use. The many lacunae in the texts naturally make it more difficult to be sure in some cases, and in other cases lack of knowledge of the cultural context makes it difficult to identify the referents.

[36] *Determination of the Noun* and 'Generic Determination'.

The second example, hdyqMh', is probably determined because it was natural to have a hdyqm in one's house. Many utensils today can take this *associative*[37] article, e.g. having mentioned *a* kitchen it is possible to refer to *the* grater, *the* toaster, etc., since these utensils are associated with kitchens.

2. *Kil.* 4.9: It once happened in Zalmon that a man planted his vineyard in rows sixteen cubits [apart], and trained the foliage of every two rows to one side and sowed over the cleared land [ryNh']; and on another year he trained the foliage towards the place that had been sown and sowed over the fallow land [rVBh'].

The two examples, ryNh' and rVBh', also have the definite article in Danby's translation and these articles are probably associative, the cleared and the fallow land being associated with the work in the vineyard just like the foliage is. There is no reason to consider ryNh' and rVBh' indefinite.

3. *Pesah.* 7.2: Rabban Gamaliel once said to his slave Tabi, "Go and roast the Passover-offering for us on the grill [hlXsAh']".

hlXsAh' is translated "the grill", and it is either referring to the grill that was natural for Rabban Gamaliel's servant to use (perhaps related to the aforementioned use with kitchen utensils), or it is the non-functional use of the article,[38] roasting it 'on the grill' simply meaning roasting it.

4. *Sukk.* 2.5: Once when they brought cooked food [lyvbTh'] to Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai to taste…

This article is probably also associative since eating and drinking is what one does in the *Sukkah*. Therefore the food is associated with the *Sukkah* and can take the article.

5. *Yebam.* 16.6: Moreover it once happened at Zalmon that a man called out, "A serpent [vjNh'] has bit me, such-a-one, the son of such-a-one, and I am dying".

The last example, vjNh', indeed seems very strange at first sight. However, the referent in question is an animal, and animals can sometimes take the article in what seems to be a strange generic usage.[39] We have a striking parallel in the Aramaic *Hermopolis* papyrus 5, 8: "And as for me, a snake [hyvj] had bit me and I was dying…".[40] Perhaps we see the whole genus in the individual, since to us they

---

[37] See chapter one, IV, above.
[38] See chapter one, VI, above.
[39] See chapter one, V, above.
[40] See Porten and Yardeni, *Aramaic Documents*, 18, from where the translation is taken. There has been some disagreement as to whether the h- of hyvj marks the emphatic state or the feminine absolute state but seen in the light of the parallel from *Yebamoth*, it is perhaps more likely that it marks the emphatic state (in the *Hermopolis* papyri, the em-

are alike, and therefore use the generic article. Similar to this is the use of the article with first time mentioning of animals in some fairytales, e.g. 'the wolf' in Little Red Riding Hood. In any case, I maintain that the words in question are semantically determined.

Moshe Azar takes Birnbaum's theory a bit further.[41] He argues explicitly that "a non-specific noun can take the article and stay non-specific",[42] and in this category he mostly includes examples from halachic sentences, referring only to two narrative examples, (4) and (5) above. He also briefly refers to the existence of this category in BH and gives an example from the *Bar Kochva* letters, "…that I put the chains [μyl bk t] on your feet".[43] To *put the chains on someone's feet*, however, is probably idiomatic with the non-functional use of the article, and does not belong in this category.

He analyzes two halachic examples and then provides a number of analogous examples. His two model examples are (6) and (7):

6. *Pe'a* 5.5: If a man gave the poor [μyYnI[h'] aught in exchange [for their gleanings] what [they give] in exchange for his is exempt [from Tithes].

He argues: "…the noun μyYnI[h', even though formally determined, is non-specific, because everyone who has exchanged or will exchange (generic-gnomic) with the poor will always do this with poor people who are not all the poor people, but only one or more individuals from among the poor".[44]

7. *B. Mes.* 1.4: If a man saw lost property [hayxMh'] and fell upon it and another came and seized it, he that seized it has acquired title to it.

He argues: "The sentence…contains a determined, non-specific noun, and not a generic noun, because the event in question is random [yrqmi], and because hayxMh' denotes any member from the genus and not all of the genus".[45]

These analyses cannot be correct. μyYnI[h' in (6) and hayxMh' in (7) are generic[46] and it is precisely the article that forces a generic reading. Since these two and all the other examples he brings are halachic, their content is general or hypothetical and this, naturally, enhances the likelihood of finding generic nouns. Had the article not been used, the words had been non-specific, and in (7) it is possible neither in English nor in modern Hebrew to use the generic definite article, and therefore we find non-specific *zero article* in Danby's translation – lost property. Nevertheless, this does not

---

phatic state morpheme generally is marked by h -). See Folmer, *Aramaic Language*, n. 768, p. 470, and Muraoka and Porten, *Egyptian Aramaic*, section 18d. Many thanks to Margaretha Folmer for drawing my attention to this passage.
[41] 'Definite Article in the Mishna' and *Mishnaic Hebrew Syntax*, 235-52.
[42] *Mishnaic Hebrew Syntax*, 248, my translation M.E.
[43] See Benoit, Milik, and de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'ât*, 159-162.
[44] 'Definite Article in the Mishna', 23, my translation, M.E.
[45] 'Definite Article in the Mishna', 25, my translation, M.E.
[46] Provided that h' + plural can be termed generic at all, see Chesterman, *On Definiteness*, 36-38.

allow us to conclude that the noun in question is non-specific in mishnaic Hebrew. There is certainly such a thing, in English as in Hebrew, as non-specific *definites*, for instance:

8. 11QTemple Scroll[a], 20.15-16: They shall offer to YHWH an offering from the rams and the lambs, the right thigh [ןימיה קוש], the breast [הזחה], […] and the foreleg [[עורזה] as far as the shoulder bone [םכשה םצע]…

These four NP's are <u>definite</u> and non-specific, but that is not the case in Azar's examples.

That which seems to lead Azar astray, is his notion of 'generic'. Azar believes that a generic noun refers to all the members of a set, and he takes this definition from a general linguistic article, but that analysis of genericness has been rebutted. [47] It is true, rather, that generic reference is reference to a *whole* set, and that makes a difference, for that which is said about a set does not have to be true of all its members. Some examples taken from the general linguistic literature should make this clear: the truth-value of *the otter is a much-loved animal* is not reduced by the existence of otters here and there that no one likes.[48] In fact, "generic *the* is generalizing in the direction of what is normal or typical for members of a class, which only sometimes coincides with what is true of all the members".[49] The following examples are particularly instructive.[50]

9. In Canada, professionals hunt the beaver

No one will argue here that professionals in Canada hunt all existing beavers, but they hunt the class 'beavers', just as in (6) "he who exchanges with the poor" exchanges with the class 'poor' and not all existing poor people. We could have had a non-specific noun instead of the generic noun:

10. In Canada, professionals hunt beavers

but it is the articles that show whether an NP is generic or non-specific. This goes for Hebrew as well, and in Azar's examples, versions without the article might very well have been just as acceptable as the extant ones, and in these versions, the nouns in question would have been non-specific. However, this should not lead us to believe that the nouns with articles in the extant versions are non-specific.

---

[47] Werth, 'Articles of Association', rebutted in Chesterman, *On Definiteness*, especially p. 78.
[48] Chesterman, *On Definiteness*, 76.
[49] Robbins, *Definite Article*, 239.
[50] Burton-Roberts, 'Generic Definite Article', especially p. 443.

2. Negating the Infinitive

I. Introduction

The many ways BH combines negatives with the infinitive construct are presented in this chapter. One of the more interesting combinations is אֵין+ infinitive. The construction has long been regarded as a trait of LBH syntax and it is described in several grammars and articles,[51] but to my knowledge it has not been the object of any exhaustive treatment - no grammar or article cites all the relevant instances. In the following, I will show that the construction is found in EBH more than usually assumed, questioning its status as a hallmark of LBH syntax. In addition, I will make the observation that the construction is used in two ways, as a general rule or command without personal reference and as an individual rule or command with overt personal reference.

II. The double status of אֵין

It is essential to realize that אֵין is used in two different ways in BH:[52] 1) to indicate non-existence or absence and 2) as a simple negative. The syntactic properties of the two uses are quite different and for my purpose here I have chosen examples involving infinitives to illustrate this. (1) and (2) are examples of the first use:

1. וְאָדָם אַיִן לַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה

And there was no man to till the ground (Gen 2.5)

2. כִּי אֵין זוּלָתְךָ לִגְאוֹל

For there is no one besides you to redeem it (Ruth 4.4)

In both cases, the infinitive phrases serve as complements, and the sentences would be grammatical without them, אָדָם אַיִן "man was non-existent" and אֵין זוּלָתְךָ "there is no one besides you". אֵין indicates non-existence or absence and in no way does it negate the infinitives. The following two examples show how BH can use אֵין to negate infinitives.

3. הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁר־אֵין מִשְׁפָּטָם לִשְׁתּוֹת הַכּוֹס שָׁתוֹ יִשְׁתּוּ

If those who did not deserve to drink the cup must drink it (Jer 49.12)

4. כִּי אֵין לָבוֹא אֶל־שַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ בִּלְבוּשׁ שָׂק

For there was no entering the king's gate clothed with sackcloth (Esth 4.2)

Here אֵין is a pure negative. As I see it, the infinitive phrase is the subject of each clause and in (4), אֵין is the sole predicate whereas in (3), מַשְׁלִיכֵהוּ‑אֵין is the predicate.[53]

III. אֵין + infinitive as general rule

(4) is almost always cited as an example of the use of אֵין to negate infinitives. It is an example that exactly matches most of the QH instances of אֵין associated with infinitives, and further, it matches modern Hebrew usage.[54] It is interesting that it does not have personal reference, as opposed to the examples (12)-(17) below. I shall analyze this as two different constructions, using the terms 'general' and 'individual'[55] rule (/construction) respectively. The general rule can be rendered literally into English as "there is no...ing..." (as in "there is no entering the king's gate")/"one should not/must not/cannot/needs not…", and it carries different modal values of lack of permission, possibility, and necessity.[56] Note also that אֵין negates the whole clause as opposed to (18)-(21) below. The presence or absence of ל in this and other uses of אֵין + infinitive does not seem significant. This is in accordance with the fact that the presence or absence of ל with infinitives in BH sometimes seems to have no significance, especially when the infinitive, as in the אֵין + infinitive constructions, is the subject of a clause.[57] The use without ל in (9), (15), (16), and (18) seems to be the same as in the parallel instances with ל, and ל when found with the infinitive in the אֵין + infinitive constructions is probably part of the non-semantic, external 'wrapping' of speech.[58] The same goes for ל in the parallel construction of לֹא + infinitive, see (75) below.

As the instances show, surface word order is not significant either since it is the constituent structure that is decisive. Compare, e.g., (7) with (8) where the constituent structure is the same

---

[53] When I use the terms 'subject' and 'predicate' in this article, I use them in the sense of logical subject and predicate. Therefore, I see the negative, be it אֵין or לֹא, as the predicate since this is the more universal and the infinitive clause is the more specific. See Baasten, 'Nominal clauses', 1-2, for the distinction between grammatical, logical, and psychological subject. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, §15g, also sees these infinitives as subject, contrary to the view of Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 71, who believes the infinitive to be the predicate in at least some of the instances.
Alternatively, one could analyze (4) and similar constructions as if a dummy subject 'there' was implicit in אֵין. אֵין would then also function as the head of the predicate, the complement of which in this case is the whole clause (this is the view of Swiggers, 'Nominal Sentence Negation', 178, if I understand him correctly). But the difference in that case between the infinitival complement here and in instances such as (1) would be that it is here grammatically indispensable since the אֵין here is the negating אֵין and not the אֵין indicating non-existence or absence.
[54] Glinert, *Modern Hebrew*, §28.4.
[55] By 'individual' I mean the opposite of general, i.e. 'restricted to a person or a group'.
[56] Throughout this chapter, I shall not distinguish between the differences in the modal nuances, but only in the different syntactic properties of the constructions.
[57] See Joüon/Muraoka, §124 l and m, and note the fluctuation within a single sentence cited there,
הִנֵּה שְׁמֹעַ מִזֶּבַח טוֹב לְהַקְשִׁיב מֵחֵלֶב אֵילִים
Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams (1Sam 15.22).

19

though the surface word order is different. Compare also (12) with (13) and (15) - all three instances have identical constituent structure as far as the negative, the prepositional phrase, and the infinitive is concerned even though the surface word order in all three is different.

I have found ten more (possible) instances of the general *ayin* + infinitive construction, (5)-(11):

5. כִּי־כְתָב אֲשֶׁר־נִכְתָּב בְּשֵׁם־הַמֶּלֶךְ וְנַחְתּוֹם בְּטַבַּעַת הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵין לְהָשִׁיב

For there is no taking back an edict written in the name of the king and sealed with the king's ring (Esth 8.8)

6. זְרַעְתֶּם הַרְבֵּה וְהָבֵא מְעָט אָכוֹל וְאֵין־לְשָׂבְעָה שָׁתוֹ וְאֵין־לְשָׁכְרָה לָבוֹשׁ וְאֵין־לְחֹם לוֹ

You have sown much, but bring in little; eating, but there is no being satisfied; drinking, but there is no getting drunk; putting on clothes, but there is no being warm for anyone (Hag 1.6)

In the four instances in (5) and (6), as in (4), *ayin* negates the whole clause. Proposing the *ayin* indicating non-existence or absence would not make sense in these instances, because it would result in preposterous translations, like:

5′. *There exists no one to take back an edict...

However, (6) cannot with certainty be said to be a general rule since the 2. person plural verb in the beginning of the quote continues in the infinitives absolute and hence might imply personal reference with the infinitives construct. In that case, (6) would belong with the instances quoted in IV below.

In the following five instances, (7)-(10), it is not clear whether the *ayin* associated with the infinitive is the negating *ayin* or the *ayin* indicating non-existence or absence:

7. הִנְנוּ לְפָנֶיךָ בְּאַשְׁמָתֵינוּ כִּי אֵין לַעֲמוֹד לְפָנֶיךָ עַל־זֹאת

Here we are before you in our guilt, for there is no standing before you because of this/for there is no one [here] to stand before you because of this (Ezra 9.15)

8. וְאֵין עִמְּךָ לְהִתְיַצֵּב

And there is no standing against you/and there is [=exists] no one to stand against you (2Chr 20.6)

9. אֵין עֲרֹךְ אֵלֶיךָ

There is no comparing with you/there is [=exists] no-one to compare with you (Ps 40.6)

10. עָלָיו אֵין לְהוֹסִיף וּמִמֶּנּוּ אֵין לִגְרֹעַ

To it there is no adding and from it there is no taking/to it there is nothing to add and from it there is nothing to take (Qoh 3.14)

---

[58] Azar has used this term in Hebrew, הא הידיעה שמטפלת על שם הדבר, 'The Definite Article', 27.

The difference in meaning between the two options is in each case very slight, and this makes it hard to decide which one is the more likely. So all we can say is that (7) - (10) are possible candidates to the construction.

Prov 17.16 is another instance where the status of אֵין is unclear:

11. לָמָּה־זֶּה מְחִיר בְּיַד־כְּסִיל לִקְנוֹת חָכְמָה וְלֶב־אָיִן

Why should a fool have a price in his hand to buy wisdom, when he has no mind? (Prov 17.16)

All modern translations and commentaries available to me understand the verse according to the constituent analysis apparent in the translation above, but the Vulgate translates according to a different analysis:

11′. Quid prodest habere divitias stultum cum sapientiam emere non possit
What good is it for a fool to have wealth when he cannot buy wisdom[59]

None of the commentaries available to me note that this alternative analysis is possible, but three linguistic authorities analyze אֵין as negating the infinitive.[60] This analysis, yielding a translation like (11′) may be correct and it makes quite good sense in the context. This may, then, be another instance of the general אֵין + infinitive construction.

IV. אֵין + infinitive as individual rule

As mentioned, of instances where אֵין negates the infinitive we can distinguish between general and individual rules. One good reason for making such a distinction, apart from the fact that it can be done, is that the peculiar distribution of the constructions shows that native Hebrew speakers may have felt the distinction - the general rule use is in frequent use in Ben Sira and QH,[61] but the individual rule use - as far as I can see - is only attested there twice, and instead QH uses l a'/al + yiqtol. In mishnaic Hebrew, the general rule use is attested once while the individual rule use is frequent.[62] The individual rule can be rendered literally into English as "for X, there is no...ing..." (as in "for X, there is no entering the king's gate")/"X should not/must not/cannot/needs not…", and like the general rule it carries the different modal values of lack of permission, possibility, and necessity. (12) is an example of the individual אֵין + infinitive construction:

---

[59] The Vulgate understands bl y/whmkj; as a hendiadys.
[60] König, *Syntax*, §397f; Bergsträsser, *Grammatik,* vol. 2, §11m; Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 102.
[61] See the instances below, (52)-(69).
[62] See below, (83) - (86).

12. וְגַם לַלְוִיִּם אֵין־לָשֵׂאת אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו לַעֲבֹדָתוֹ

And so the Levites no longer need to carry the tabernacle or any of the things for its service (1Chr 23.26)

The two constructions differ in that the subject of the assumed underlying clause, the clause usually used for translation into English, is personal and overt, governed by a preposition. This prepositional phrase may then, together with ʾ*ên*, be analyzed as the predicate of the clause where in the other construction, ʾ*ên* is the sole predicate. So the predicate of (12) is ʾ*ên* lū́ *lēwiyyim* (μg) (with ʾ*ên* functioning as head) and the subject is /*tdb(l)'wl(el K;ta)wÒ-KvMh-ta, tace*;

I have found 5 more (possible) instances of the individual ʾ*ên* + infinitive construction in BH:

13. אֵין לָהֶם לָסוּר מֵעַל עֲבֹדָתָם

They did not need to depart from their service (2Chr 35.15)

14. וְאֵין־לָנוּ אִישׁ לְהָמִית בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל

And it is not for us to put any man to death in Israel (2Sam 21.4)

The syntactically most straightforward way of reading this is to take ʾ*îš* as the subject, lū́; ʾ*ên* as the predicate and the infinitive phrase as a complement, but the resulting translation is difficult:

14´. *We do not have a man to kill in Israel

Another possibility is to regard ʾ*îš* as the preposed object of the infinitive, as is common in Aramaic. This feature is not common in BH, but there are some occurrences[63] and among them this instance, because this analysis results in the contextually necessary translation in (14). It is then an occurrence of the individual ʾ*ên* + infinitive construction.

With the preposition ta[64] and ʾ*ên* following the infinitive we have:

15. וְגַם־הֵיטֵיב אֵין אוֹתָם

They cannot do good either (literally: and doing good is not with them/in them) (Jer 10.5)

---

[63] E.g.: לָבוֹא חֲמַס שִׁבְעִים בְּנֵי־יְרֻבַּעַל וְדָמָם *לָשׂוּם* עַל־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ אֲחִיהֶם
That the violence done to the seventy sons of Jerubbaal might come and *to lay their blood* upon Abimelech their brother (Jdg 9.24)
See Gesenius/Kautzsch, §142f n. 2 and Carmignac, 'Un aramaïsme biblique et qumrânien'. See also (51) for a parallel, unambiguous instance in Ben Sira. The word order is common in Aramaic, see Folmer, *Aramaic Language*, 536-42.
[64] Note that it is the preposition and not the object marker, even though the preposition here has the form of the object marker.

As in the previous instances, the prepositional phrase associated with אֵין provides the subject of the underlying clause used in the English translation, and again the absence of ל does not seem significant.

Provided that מַשָּׂא can be regarded as an infinitive, there is another instance that belongs here:

16. אֵין־לָכֶם מַשָּׂא בַּכָּתֵף

You need not carry it on your shoulders/you do not have (it as) a burden on your shoulders (2Chr 35.3)

There seems to be a few instances in BH of infinitives with a מ-prefix.[65] It would make sense here to regard מַשָּׂא as an infinitive seeing that the construction in that case is parallel to the other instances of the individual אֵין+ infinitive construction, (12)-(15). The other option, regarding מַשָּׂא as a mere noun as expressed in the alternative translation, is also a possibility.

It is likewise unclear whether (17) belongs here:

17. וְאֵין לְבֵית אֲחַזְיָהוּ לַעְצֹר כֹּחַ לַמַמְלָכָה

The house of Ahaziah had no one to assume power over the kingdom/The house of Ahaziah could not assume power over the kingdom (2Chr 22.9)

The difference in meaning between the two options is, as was the case in (7)-(10), very slight and again it is very hard to decide which option is the more likely.

V. אֵין as an internal negator

Apart from these two אֵין+ infinitive constructions where אֵין negates whole clauses we find instances of אֵין negating an infinitive where functions as an 'internal negator in nominal compounds',[66] as (most probably) in (18) and (19). אֵין here negates only a clause fragment and not the whole clause:

18. אַל־תִּהְיוּ כְּסוּס כְּפֶרֶד אֵין הָבִין

Be not like a horse or a mule, without understanding (Ps 32.9)

19. כִּי כָל־הַכֹּהֲנִים הַנִּמְצְאִים הִתְקַדָּשׁוּ אֵין לִשְׁמוֹר לְמַחְלְקוֹת

For all the priests who were present had sanctified themselves, without regard to their divisions (2Chr 5.11)

---

[65] See Joüon/Muraoka, §49e.
[66] This term is used by Swiggers, see 'Nominal Sentence Negation', 176.

Unless the ‑אֵין+ infinitive constitutes a nominal clause of their own in (18) and (19), these instances do not belong with either the general or the individual construction. There is no indication that they are separate clauses and I see no good reason why they should be considered as such. (20) and (21) are two more possible instances of ‑אֵין negating an infinitive without negating the clause:

20. וַיָּנַצְּלוּ לָהֶם לְאֵין מַשָּׂא

And they took for themselves until they could carry no more (2Chr 20.25)

As in (16), this depends on whether or not we can regard מַשָּׂא as an infinitive. As opposed to the construction in (16) with לְהַכֵּל ‑אֵין, the construction with ‑לְאֵין + infinitive is not attested anywhere else in BH. On the other hand, the verbal sense is here unquestionable and therefore I see it as (at least) parallel to an infinitive. The construction of ‑לְאֵין + infinitive is in use in QH.[67]

21. מֵאֵין עוֹד פְּנוֹת אֶל־הַמִּנְחָה

Because he does not turn to the sacrifice (Literally: out of no turning to the sacrifice) (Mal 2.13)

The editors of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia believe that the text probably should read ‑מֵאֵן "he refuses", and not ‑מֵאֵין, but as the text stands, ‑אֵין functions as an internal negator.

VI. Proposed instances of ‑אֵין + infinitive where ‑אֵין in fact does not negate the infinitive

Other instances that scholars have classified as ‑אֵין + infinitive constructions are not instances of the negating ‑אֵין and should be treated separately. (1) is one instance, and also:

22. וּתְשׁוּרָה אֵין־לְהָבִיא לְאִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים

And there is no present to bring to the man of God (1Sam 9.7)

This is not the negating ‑אֵין. ‑אֵין here indicates the absence of a gift to bring. The infinitive phrase is a mere complement, just as in (1) and (2).[68]

---

[67] 1QM 18.2, 1QHᵃ 11.27; 16.28. See, Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 39; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 400.09; van Peursen, 'Negation', 237.

[68] Num 20.5 is another example that matches (22) better than (1) and (2) since the word combined with ‑אֵין also is the object of the infinitive:

וּמַיִם אֵין לִשְׁתּוֹת

neither is there any water to drink

Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 91, regards the use of ‑אֵין as e.g. in (22) as similar to the uses described in III and IV above, the difference being one of modality in that the use in cases such as (22) is not modal.

23. יְהוָה אֵין־עִמְּךָ לַעְזֹור בֵּין רַב לְאֵין כֹּחַ עָזְרֵנוּ יְהוָה

O LORD, it is nothing for you to help/there is no one besides you to help/there is no one like you to help between the mighty and the weak (2Chr 14.10)

24. אִם־אֵין־לְךָ לְשַׁלֵּם

If you have nothing with which to pay (Prov 22.27)

Again the infinitive phrases serve as complements.

VII. The general aḇ + infinitive construction

Scholars have noted that ʾên+ infinitive has a close parallel in aḇ + infinitive.[69] The following three instances seem to match the general ʾên+ infinitive construction completely.

25. כִּי לֹא לְהֹורִישׁ אֶת־יֹשְׁבֵי הָעֵמֶק

For there was no driving out the inhabitants of the plain (Jdg 1.19)

26. הָס כִּי לֹא לְהַזְכִּיר בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

Hush! For there is no mentioning the name of the LORD (Amos 6.10)

27. לֹא לָשֵׂאת אֶת־אֲרֹון הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי אִם־הַלְוִיִּם

There is no carrying the ark of God except for the Levites (1Chr 15.2)

Sometimes the infinitive continues a preceding verb and virtually has the value of a finite form.[70] I have found two such infinitives preceded by aḇ in BH:

28. וּבְחַלְּלֹו יְצוּעֵי אָבִיו נִתְּנָה בְּכֹרָתֹו לִבְנֵי יֹוסֵף בֶּן־יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא לְהִתְיַחֵשׂ לַבְּכֹרָה

And because he polluted his father's couch his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph the son of Israel, and he was not enrolled in the genealogy according to the birthright (1Chr 5.1)

29. וּבְהִכָּנְעֹו שָׁב מִמֶּנּוּ אַף־יְהוָה וְלֹא לְהַשְׁחִית לְכָלָה

And when he humbled himself the wrath of the LORD turned from him, and he did not destroy him completely (2Chr 12.12)

As opposed to (25)-(27), the infinitive phrase does not seem to be the subject but rather the predicate, together with aḇ. The subject is understood from the context. These two instances, then, are of

---

However, I do not see the usefulness in taking these together because in (22) and similar cases, ʾên negates the noun and not the infinitive.

[69] Driver, *Tenses*, §202; Joüon/Muraoka, §160j; Hurvitz, 'Further Comments', 136.

[70] Joüon/Muraoka, §124p.

a quite different character than any of the attested ־לא+ infinitive constructions and are excluded from the comparison.[71]

VIII. The individual אל + infinitive construction

With a prepositional phrase between the infinitive and אל we have a syntactic match of the individual ־לא+ infinitive construction. I have found four instances of the individual אל + infinitive construction in BH:[72]

30. הֲלוֹא לָכֶם לָדַעַת אֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּט

Is it not for you to know justice (Mic 3.1)

31. הֲלֹא לָכֶם לָדַעַת

Is it not for you to know (2Chr 13.5)

32. לֹא לָכֶם לְהִלָּחֵם בָּזֹאת

It is not for you to fight in this battle (2Chr 20.17)

33. לֹא־לְךָ עֻזִּיָּהוּ לְהַקְטִיר לַיהוָה

It is not for you, Uzziah, to burn incense to the LORD (2Chr 26.18)

---

[71] There are two instances of אל + infinitive that do not form clauses of their own but are complements to a verb:

a. כֹּל (הבאיש) [הֹבִישׁ] עַל־עַם לֹא־יוֹעִילוּ לָמוֹ לֹא לְעֵזֶר וְלֹא לְהוֹעִיל

Every one comes to shame through a people who cannot profit them, neither for help nor for profit (Isa 30.5)

b. בָּעֵת הַהִיא יֵאָמֵר לָעָם־הַזֶּה וְלִירוּשָׁלִַם רוּחַ צַח שְׁפָיִים בַּמִּדְבָּר דֶּרֶךְ בַּת־עַמִּי לוֹא לִזְרוֹת וְלוֹא לְהָבַר

At that time it will be said to this people and to Jerusalem, "A hot wind from the bare heights in the desert toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow or cleanse" (Jer 4.11)

None of the attested uses of ־לא+ infinitive match these.

Further, there are two instances of אלב]+ infinitive:

c. אוֹ בְכָל־אֶבֶן אֲשֶׁר־יָמוּת בָּהּ בְּלֹא רְאוֹת וַיַּפֵּל עָלָיו

Or used a stone, by which a man may die, and without seeing him cast it upon him (Num 35.23)

d. לָמָּה תִשְׁקְלוּ־כֶסֶף בְּלוֹא־לֶחֶם וִיגִיעֲכֶם בְּלוֹא לְשָׂבְעָה

Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which does not satisfy (Isa 55.2)

In (c) and (d) the use of אלב]+ infinitive comes close to the use of ־לא+ infinitive in (19) and (20) respectively.

[72] And I have found three instances of אל negating a nominal clause with an infinitive as subject that show a similar surface syntax (cp. [3]):

a. לֹא נָכוֹן לַעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן

It is not right to do so (Ex 8.22)

b. הֲלוֹא טוֹב לָנוּ שׁוּב מִצְרָיְמָה

Would it not be better for us to go back to Egypt (Num 14.3)

c. לֹא־לָכֶם וָלָנוּ לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לֵאלֹהֵינוּ

You have nothing to do with us in building a house to our God (Ezra 4.3)

IX. לְבִלְתִּי + infinitive

The most common negative with infinitives is לְבִלְתִּי[73] This combination occurs 86 times in BH, almost exclusively in EBH texts, and it never constitutes a nominal clause, it is always a complement, and almost always of a preceding verb. An example:

34. וַיֵּאֹתוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים לְבִלְתִּי קְחַת־כֶּסֶף מֵאֵת הָעָם וּלְבִלְתִּי חַזֵּק אֶת־בֶּדֶק הַבָּיִת

So the priests agreed that they should take no more money from the people, and that they should not repair the house (2Kgs 12.9)

None of the attested uses of אֵין + infinitive are comparable to לְבִלְתִּי + infinitive, except perhaps (19).

X. Positive counterparts to the negated constructions

Both the general and individual אֵין + infinitive constructions have positive counterparts. (35) - (40) are examples of the positive counterpart of the *general* אֵין + infinitive constructions.

35. אִם־אִשׁ לְהֵמִין וּלְהַשְׂמִיל מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר אֲדֹנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ[74]

One cannot turn to the right hand or to the left from anything that my lord the king has said (2Sam 14.19)

36. הֲיֵשׁ לְדַבֶּר־לָךְ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ

Should one speak on your behalf to the king (2Kgs 4.13)

37. בְּמֶתֶג־וָרֶסֶן עֶדְיוֹ לִבְלוֹם

---

[73] Other negatives used with infinitives in BH:
בְּלִי is used twice:
a. מִבְּלִי יְכֹלֶת יְהוָה לַהֲבִיאָם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר לָהֶם
Because the LORD was not able to bring them into the land which he promised them (Deut 9.28)
b. מִבְּלִי הִשְׁאִיר־לוֹ כֹּל
Because he has nothing left (Deut 28.55)
לְבִלְתִּי is also used twice:
c. מִבִּלְתִּי יְכֹלֶת יְהוָה לְהָבִיא אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לָהֶם
Because the LORD was not able to bring this people into the land which he swore to give to them (Num 14.16)
d. וַתִּזְנִי אֶל־בְּנֵי אַשּׁוּר מִבִּלְתִּי שָׂבְעָתֵךְ
You played the harlot with the Assyrians, because you were insatiable (Ezk 16.28)
The use of בְּלִי and לְבִלְתִּי with infinitives comes close to the use of אֵין in (21).
Finally, בִּלְתִּי is used with an infinitive five times, all in the formula:
e. עַד־בִּלְתִּי הִשְׁאִיר־לוֹ שָׂרִיד
Until there was no survivor left to him (Num 21.35; Deut 3.3; Josh 8.22; 10.33; 2Kgs 10.11)
[74] Note that ἰṣ functions as a negative here, providing another parallel to the general אֵין + infinitive construction (אֵין= אֵשׁ).

Which one must curb with bit and bridle (Ps 32.9)

38. הֲלָרָשָׁע לַעְזֹר

Should one help the wicked (2Chr 19.2)

39. מַה לַעֲשׂוֹת לָךְ

What should one do (2Kgs 4.13; Isa 5.4; 2Chr 25.9)

40. לְהַכּוֹת חָמֵשׁ אוֹ־שֵׁשׁ פְּעָמִים

It was necessary to strike five or six times (2Kgs 13.19)

And counterparts to the individual constructions, with various prepositions:

41. וְעָלַי לָתֶת לְךָ עֲשָׂרָה כֶּסֶף וַחֲגֹרָה אֶחָת

And I would have given you ten pieces of silver and a girdle (2Sam 18.11)

42. כִּדְבָרְךָ[75] עָלֵינוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת

We must do as you have said (Ezra 10.12)

43. וַעֲלֵיהֶם לַחֲלֹק לַאֲחֵיהֶם

And their duty was to distribute to their brethren (Neh 13.13)

44. וְלָנוּ הַסְגִּירוֹ בְּיַד הַמֶּלֶךְ

And our part shall be to surrender him into the king's hand (1Sam 23.20)

45. יֵשׁ לַיהוָה לָתֶת לְךָ הַרְבֵּה מִזֶּה

The LORD is able to give you much more than this (2Chr 25.9)[76]

In the Hebrew inscriptions, I have found no instances of negated infinitives, nor any examples of positive counterparts to the ₋yaṭal + infinitive constructions.[77]

XI. The evidence from Ben Sira

As far as I can see, the individual ₋yaṭal + infinitive constructions are not attested in Ben Sira, but the general ₋yae + infinitive construction is attested six or seven times:

---

[75] Ktiv: ûyrbdk.

[76] Syntactically related instances:

a. יֶשׁ־לְאֵל יָדִי לַעֲשׂוֹת עִמָּכֶם רָע

It is in my power to do you harm (Gen 31.29)

b. טוֹב לָנוּ עֲבֹד אֶת־מִצְרַיִם מִמֻּתֵנוּ בַּמִּדְבָּר

It would have been better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness (Ex 14.12)

c. אִם־טוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ לָבוֹא אִתִּי בָבֶל בֹּא

If it seems good to you to come with me to Babylon, come (Jer 40.4)

[77] I used as corpus Ahituv, *Handbook of Hebrew Inscriptions*. Negated infinitives are attested in one Punic and a couple of Aramaic inscriptions, see Hurvitz, 'Further Comments', examples *q* and *r*, pp. 140-43. There are also attestations in biblical Aramaic (Dan 6.9; Ezra 6.8) and in Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, §286 (e.g. Prov. 6.30 in Syriac).

46. אין לבזות דל משכיל ואין לכבד כל איש חמס

One should not despise a poor man who is wise, and one should not honour any man of violence (10.23 [A+]B)[78]

47. כי אין בשאול לבקש תענוג

For in Sheol there is no seeking of joy (14.16 A)

48. אין לאמר

One should not say (39.21 B[1+2] and 39.34 Bmg)

49. אין לבקש עמה משען

And with it there is no need to seek (other) support (40.26 B+M)

(50) is ambiguous:

50. אין חייו למנות חיים

One cannot consider his life a life[79]/ his life is not to be considered a life (40.29 B[+M])

This is either the general אין + infinitive construction and then חייו is the preposed object, or alternatively, חייו is the subject of the verbal act contained in the infinitive. The infinitive is then either qal[80] or nif'al where the h is elided.

    The general לא + infinitive construction is also attested in Ben Sira:

51. לא כל איש להביא אל בית

One should not bring every man home (11.29 A)

The object precedes the infinitive as in (14). One could argue that this example stands out from the other examples since לא may belong to כל and is not negating the whole clause. I maintain, however, that this is the same construction as in the other instances of general לא + infinitive where לא is the sole predicate negating the whole clause.

---

[78] All Ben Sira quotes are from *The Book of Ben Sira* published by The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

[79] In BH, there is no attestation of the qal of חמן in the sense of "to consider something as something" but חשב in the nif'al is used this way. Usually the preposition כ is used, but there are examples comparable to this one, with no כ:
a. הֲלוֹא נָכְרִיּוֹת נֶחְשַׁבְנוּ לוֹ
Are we not regarded by him as foreigners (Gen 31.15)
b. כִּי נֶאֱמָנִים נֶחְשָׁבוּ
For they were considered faithful (Neh 13.13)

[80] The infinitive is neutral in respect of voice, as in:
וַיְהִי הַשַּׁעַר לִסְגּוֹר
And the gate was to be closed (Josh 2.5)
See Joüon/Muraoka, §124s.

XII. The evidence from Qumran

In QH we also find the general infinitive constructions with both -yae and a0. With -yae

52. ואין לצעוד על אחד מכול דבריו

And there is no infringing even one of his words (1QS 3.10-11)

53. ואין להשנות

And there is no altering anything (1QS 3.16)

54. ואין להשיב על תוכחתכה

And there is no replying to your reproach (= [58]; 1QHa 15.28-29)

55. [ואי]ן להניף יד

And it was not possible to wave the hand (1QHa 16.33)

56. ואין לשלוח פעם

And it was not possible to take a step (1QHa 16.34)

57. ואין להדים קול [

And it was not possible to silence the voice of [(1QHa 16.35-36)

58. ואין להשיב על תוכחתכה

And there is no replying to your reproach (= [54]; 1QHa 20.30-31)

59. ואין לעבור חוקיהם

And there is no transgressing their laws (1Q34bis 3.2.2)

60. אין עוד להשתפח לבית יהודה

There will no longer be any joining with the house of Juda (CD 4.11)[81]

61. ואין להרנ[יעה]

And there is no interrupting her (4Q184 1.12)

62. ואי]ן לקדם [ו]ל[א]חר ממועדה[מה /כי אין [להת]ק[ד]ם ולהתאחר ממועדהם

For they cannot come before or after their appointed times (4Q266 2.1.2/4Q268 1.4)

63. אין להשיבה

There is no returning it (4Q270 2.2.10)

64. ואין לעבור פיהו

And there is no transgressing his command (4Q381 14.3)

65. עמו אור לאין חקר ואין לדעת]

With him there is a light that cannot be inspected nor can one know… (4Q392 1.7)

66. ואין להבי למחני הק[ו]דש כלבים

And there is no bringing dogs into the holy camp (4Q394 8.4.8)

67. אין להאכילם מהקו[ד]שים

And there is no feeding them from the sacred food (4Q396 1-2.3.11)

‫[ו]אין לערב במ[‬ .68

[And] there is no mixing with[(4QOrd^b 10.2.3)

‫ואין להט[‬ .69

And there is no[(4QOrd^b 12.3)

Since we do not have the context in all instances, some of these are not certain. Some are also ambiguous in the same way as (7) - (10), but we can still safely say that the construction is quite frequently used in QH. The same goes for the general *lō* + infinitive construction:

‫ולוא ללכת עוד בשרירות לב אשמה ‬ .70

And not to walk in the stubbornness of a guilty heart (1QS 1.6)

‫ולוא לצעוד בכול אחד מכול דברי אל בקציהם ולוא לקדם עתיהם ולוא להתאחר מכול מועדיהם ‬ .71
‫ולוא לסור מחוקי אמתו ‬

And there is no infringing any of God's orders concerning their appointed times, and there is no advancing their appointed times and no retarding anyone of their feasts, and there is no straying from his reliable precepts (1QS 1.13-15)

‫ולוא לשוב מאחרו ‬ .72

And there is no turning from him (1QS 1.17)

‫ולוא לסור ימין ושמאול ‬ .73

And there is no straying to the left or to the right (1QS 3.10)

‫ואשר לוא להוכיח ולהתרובב עם אנשי השחת ‬ .74

And there shall be no reproaching or arguing with the men of the pit (1QS 9.16)

‫ולוא הסר דרכו מכול עול ‬[82] .75

And there shall be no changing one's path because of any wickedness (1QS 9.20)

‫לוא לעבור על דברכה ‬ .76

There is no transgressing your command (1QH^a 12.24)

‫ולוא להשיב [‬ .77

And there is no replying (1QH^a 23.12-13)

‫ולוא להפרד [‬ .78

And there is no separating[(1QH^a 25.14)

‫כתוב שלוא לרבעה כלאים ‬ .79

It is written that there is no letting it mate with another species (4Q396 1-2.4.6)

‫ושלוא לזרוע שדו ‬ .80

And that there is no sowing of one's field (4Q396 1-2.4.7)

As far as I can see from an examination of Charlesworth's Graphic Concordance, the individual אל + infinitive construction is not attested in the texts at the base of that (which is the large majority of QH texts). The Wacholder/Abegg concordance,[83] however, revealed two examples of the individual אין + infinitive construction:

[84]81. ואין לו להשב יגע
And he shall not give back the fruit of his toil (4Q368 10.2.5)[85]
82. ואין עמו להבדיל בין אור לחשך
And it is not for him to separate light from darkness (4Q392 1.5)

XIII. The evidence from mishnaic Hebrew

There are no examples of the general אין infinitive construction in the Mishna, and in other tannaitic Hebrew texts there is only one example:[86]

83. אין להשיב על דברי מי שאמר והיה העולם
There is no arguing against the words of him who spoke and the world came into being (Mekhilta b-shallah 6)[87]

However, the individual אין infinitive construction is quite frequently used in the Mishna in the common phrase in (84), and further in (85) and (86):

84. אין עליך לומר/לדון
One should not say/argue[88]
85. אין לי לפרש
I cannot explain it (Mishna Pesahim 9.6)
86. אין לנו לעשות
We should not do (Mekhilta b-shallah 1)[89]

---

[83] Wacholder, Abegg, and Bowley, *Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls*, Fascicle 4.
[84] We would expect the infinitive hif'il to have a *yod* as a vowel letter, but this *yod* is sometimes not written by Qumran scribes (albeit usually when the infinitive is not prefixed by ל); see Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 47.
[85] For the source of this quote, see n. 30 above.
[86] See Sharvit, 'Modal Infinitive Sentences', 419-20; van Peursen, 'Negation', 228 .
[87] Ed. Horovitz-Rabin, 112.
[88] Pérez Fernández, *Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 148.

The Hebrew Bar Kochva letters have no negated infinitives.[90]

XIV. Summary and discussion

I have made two distinctions in this paper, one between the negating ʾên and the ʾên indicating absence or non-existence, and another between the negating ʾên with infinitive, with and without overt personal reference.

It is clear that ʾên negating an infinitive in BH, even though sparsely attested, is not one but several constructions. Two of them were more interesting, the ones I have termed the general and the individual construction. They have an important thing in common in that they both have a modal value, but the argument to distinguish between them was partly that it can be done, there is a clear semantic and syntactic difference between them, and partly that native speakers of Hebrew may have done it: one of the constructions, the general, is quite frequently attested in the Hebrew of Ben Sira and of the Dead Sea Scrolls whereas the other, individual construction is attested there only twice. The opposite situation holds in mishnaic Hebrew, one attestation of the general construction and many of the individual. As for the matching constructions with ʾal - they are both attested in BH, but only the general construction is attested in QH. Some authorities believe that the use of ʾal is stronger than the use of ʾên[91] but I see no way of substantiating this. In addition, in 1QS 3.10 ([52] and [73]) the two are used in the same line giving the impression that they were (or at least could be) used indiscriminately, at least in QH.

The most interesting question involved is whether the constructions with ʾên are useful in the linguistic dating of texts. As mentioned, scholars have long regarded what they saw as one construction as late and Avi Hurvitz, Anton Schoors, and Choon-Leong Seow[92] all use the occurrences in Qoh 3.14 to date Qohelet late. Some caution may be warranted here because, as mentioned in connection with (10), the occurrences are ambiguous. And if we grant that these are indeed occurrences of the *general* construction, we should grant the remaining ambiguous occurrences in III, (6)-(9) and (11), to count as occurrences of the general construction too. So, in addition to the two occurrences in the probable LBH of Qohelet, this gives us four attestations in the LBH of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles, (4), (5), (7), and (8), but five in the otherwise EBH of Haggai,[93] Psalm 40, and Proverbs, (6), (9), and (11).[94]

---

[89] Ed. Horovitz-Rabin, 86.

[90] See Milik in Benoit, Milik, and de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabbaʿât*, 155-68; Kutscher, 'The Hebrew Letters of Bar Koseba'; Naveh, *On Sherd and Papyrus*, 106-17.

[91] Driver, *Tenses*, §202; Hurvitz, 'Further Comments', n. 16, p. 136.

[92] Hurvitz, 'Review of Fredericks', 145-47; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 183-84; Seow, 'Dating of Qohelet', 663-64.

[93] But note the reservation stated in connection with (6) in the inclusion of the Haggai occurrences with the general construction.

[94] As for Haggai's Hebrew being EBH, see the arguments in chapter four below (*passim*); as for a brief description of the language of Proverbs, see Hurvitz, 'Hebrew of the Persian Period', 217.

In addition, sound methodology requires that we can show that any word or construction that is presumed to be LBH has a counterpart in EBH that fulfils the same function, a so-called linguistic contrast. Such contrasts have been proposed for this construction, ‏לבלתי‎ + infinitive and ‏אל/לא‎ + yiqtol.[95] As for ‏לבלתי‎ + infinitive, as mentioned in connection with (34), it is used as a complement mostly continuing a verb and never independently and does not provide a contrast. As for ‏אל/לא‎ + yiqtol, it has overt personal reference and (naturally) it constitutes a verbal clause. Both these features are in opposition to our construction, so to posit this as a linguistic contrast is not straightforward. However, ‏אל/לא‎ + yiqtol is sometimes used with an impersonal meaning as a general command/request and in that way does provide a contrast. A better match exists in EBH texts, however, the general ‏אל‎ + infinitive construction, but there are only two occurrences in EBH, (25) and (26). The positive counterpart to the general constructions occurs more often, see (35) - (40), another indication that the general ‏אל‎ and ‏לֹא‎ + infinitive constructions might have been in use in EBH, albeit not very frequently.

It is noteworthy that the construction is frequent in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls, and this greatly enhances its likelihood of being an LBH feature, but due to its occurrences in EBH texts, it should be used with caution to late-date the language of Qohelet or of any other text.

Similarly, the evidence regarding the *individual* ‏לֹא‎ + infinitive construction is not entirely conclusive either. We have four unambiguous occurrences in BH, (12) - (15): two in the LBH of Chronicles, one in the (mostly) EBH of Jeremiah[96] and one in the EBH of 2Samuel. This gives two EBH and two LBH occurrences, and if we allow the ambiguous instances to count, (16) and (17), we get two more LBH occurrences. Since the construction is attested in QH[97] and is frequent in mishnaic Hebrew, and since we have a better linguistic contrast in ‏אל/לא‎ + yiqtol than before, it seems likely that it is a late construction, albeit attested in EBH as well.[98]

As with the general construction, we have a match in the individual ‏אל‎ + infinitive construction, (30) - (33), but the evidence from the distribution of that is inconclusive, one occurrence in Micah, three in Chronicles, and none in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls: it is possibly more frequent in LBH but there is not enough evidence to substantiate this.

Since the two ‏לֹא‎ + infinitive constructions have most of their features in common, it is worthwhile also to consider their distribution together, but even so there does not emerge a clear picture of LBH distribution. It is very likely to be an LBH feature, but it is clear that it also occurs in EBH.

---

[95] See Bergey, *Book of Esther*, 75-77, and 'Late Linguistic Features', 71; Seow, 'Dating of Qohelet', 663; Hurvitz, 'Further Comments', *passim*.

[96] Cf. the remark by Rabin, *Entwicklung der hebräischen Sprache*, 15, "Bei Jeremia finden sich…syntaktische Konstruktionen, die eher dem Mishnahebräischen als der klassischen Sprache entsprechen".

[97] Albeit only twice, (81) and (82).

[98] For the existence of LBH features in EBH texts, see p. 60 below.

3. Fred Cryer and the Question of Dating

In an article from 1994,[99] Frederick Cryer sets out to demonstrate on linguistic grounds that the biblical texts were written within a short time span. He argues that the Hebrew of the biblical texts displays such a lack of diversity that a diachronic development[100] could not have taken place. Unless, therefore, the texts have been "systematically updated as to language", a hypothesis Cryer discards,[101] they must have been written "more or less at one go, or at least over a relatively short period of time".[102] Cryer first argues[103] that diversity is expected in the language of texts spanning several centuries. He compares with some Germanic languages, each of which displays an impressive diversity when texts from the beginning and from the end of this millennium are taken together. He points out that this kind of linguistic diversity is nowhere to be found in the Hebrew of the biblical texts.

Cryer goes on to examine possible explanations of this lack of diversity. The lack of phonological and morphological diversity may be due to the orthography being at fault, and "it is possible that a fair amount of both phonological and morphological development of the Hebrew language has simply gone unrecorded in the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible".[104] The lack, however, of syntactical and lexical variation remains, according to Cryer, inadequately explained. Concerning the syntax, he asks why there is no sign of a development in the verb-subject-object (VSO) word order within BH towards the post-biblical (mishnaic) subject-verb-object (SVO) word order.[105] Such a development might be expected if BH had been in use over several centuries. Likewise, a development in vocabulary would be expected if it is assumed that the language was at the base of literature from the period of the monarchy until well after the exile. Nevertheless, it is "well able to avoid use of much of the standard middle Hebrew vocabulary, just as it also reveals only faint and few traces of Aramaic influence".[106] In addition, Cryer would have expected to find the presence of an Arabic influence on BH: "If contemporary insights into the late emergence of the biblical text...are correct, then the absence of Arabic is also a silence that cries out to the heavens".[107]

---

[99] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating'.
[100] Such a development would be expected to have taken place if the language of the texts spans several centuries.
[101] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', n. 25, p. 193.
[102] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 192.
[103] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 186-87.
[104] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 189.
[105] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 190.
[106] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 191.
[107] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', n. 23, p. 191. This line of argumentation is circular: first there are assumptions regarding "the late emergence of the Biblical text" (n. 25, p. 193), assumptions which lead Cryer to expect to find "Arabisms" (p. 192) and "Arabic loans" (n. 23, p. 191). Then, when no facts can be adduced to demonstrate the expected Arabic influence, explanations are being provided in order to account for "the absence of Arabic" (n. 23, p. 191).

Subsequently, he offers some possible explanations for these facts. Regarding the word order, BH is not entirely a VSO language, in that "simulated-speech passages" to a certain extent employ SV(O) word order.[108] Regarding the problem of vocabulary, he observes that the extant texts in middle Hebrew are "quite rarefied contexts", hence "it is hardly surprising that the Hebrew of the OT does not reflect their usage".[109] The "virtual absence" of Aramaic influence he explains by the fact that the Hebrew Bible is "a work that attempts quintessentially to define the Jewish religio-national consciousness". Hence it would avoid the use of a language that "enjoyed the status of an international *lingua franca*".[110] And "the lack of Arabic loans could be equally well dismissed on the grounds that the Arabs settled on the periphery of Palestine, rather than towards its centre and, furthermore, that in late times the Jews did not have an unproblematic relationship to the Arabic-speaking Idumeans, which might have led them to consciously shun Arabisms".[111] However, Cryer chooses to disregard these attempts to account for the lack of diversity, pointing out the much simpler hypothesis that "the texts are in fact written in more or less the *same* Hebrew", and this brings him to his (already mentioned) conclusion, that the biblical texts must have been written "more or less at one go, or at least over a relatively short period of time".[112]

In the second part of the article,[113] he goes on to review a recent work by Arian Verheij[114] and concludes by questioning the usefulness of statistical arguments in dating BH texts, on the grounds that there are not enough "baselines" to establish the necessary measurements. I intend here to comment mostly on the first part of Cryer's article.

Cryer argues that cross-linguistic parallels (exemplified with some Germanic languages) suggest that a language cannot be in use for as long as a thousand years without changing drastically. However, this is not necessarily so. If we compare BH with other classical Semitic languages, we find that written standard Arabic might provide a useful parallel. It has changed remarkably little over roughly the last millennium and a half,[115] even though Arabic vernaculars have changed drastically. Indeed, the vernaculars have had a certain influence on the written language; nevertheless, it remains broadly similar. As I will point out below, there is evidence for a similar development and state of something like diglossia in BH, strengthening the case for a the comparison with Arabic.

As for *syntax*, the matter may be more complicated than Cryer presents it. Cryer takes word order as an example, but he does not mention, in this connection, an article by Talmy Givón.[116] While perhaps not equally convincing in all respects, Givón actually *did* point to evidence of word

---

[108] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 191.
[109] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 191.
[110] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 191, italics original.
[111] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 192.
[112] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 192, italics original.
[113] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 193-98.
[114] Verheij, *Verbs and Numbers*. But see Verheij's critical review of Cryer, 'Early? Late?'.
[115] Cf. Beeston, *The Arabic Language Today*, but see also the critical remarks by Blau in 'Syntactic Trends'. On diglossia in Arabic, see Corriente, 'Arabic Diglossia'.
[116] 'The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew'.

order development in BH. Others have pointed to other kinds of syntactic development in BH. Cryer himself mentions the works of Arno Kropat[117] and Mark Smith.[118] The latter concludes that there *has* been a development in the use of the *waw*-consecutive in the biblical period[119] and the former study is, despite its age, still an important study of syntactic differences within BH. In yet another study by Mats Eskhult,[120] the author concludes, among other things, regarding the dia-chronic aspects:[121]

...there is a development in the verbal system as regards the suffix conjugation, *qtl*, which has almost exclusively turned into a preterite form: it is scarcely used in performative utterances; in *subj-qtl* clauses it has ceased to describe the state of affairs of a situation; there is a loss in usage of *wqtl* as the so-called perfect consecutive...

The prefix conjugation is hardly used any more to describe ongoing actions in the past, i.e. its cursive character has faded away...

Rich material on the development of the syntax, even within BH, is to be found in the monumental work of Abba Bendavid,[122] and in the work of Menahem Kaddari.[123] The study of Yechezkel Kutscher is also very important.[124]

As for the developments in *vocabulary*, a much larger amount of work has been done than with syntax. Some of the most important scholars here are Bendavid, Kutscher, and Avi Hurvitz,[125] whose studies (books as well as articles) have appeared in the last four decades.[126] So, even in recent years, much serious work has been done in this field. Cryer has little to say about this scholarly work. Also, he does not discuss in detail any of the concrete linguistic features suggestive of a potential diachronic development, just as he does not seriously address the question of whether or not two linguistic strata in the biblical texts can be discerned - EBH and LBH.[127] If Cryer is right in his assumption that there has been no historical development within BH, he should, in order to demonstrate this, have to address specifically the question of why, and how, there seem to exist in the biblical corpus two linguistically distinct layers, only one of which - that recorded in the

---

[117] *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*.
[118] Waw-*Consecutive*.
[119] Smith, Waw-*Consecutive*, 27-33.
[120] *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*.
[121] p. 119. See pp. 106-109 for a useful overview of "Features of Later Usage as Isolated in Recent Research".
[122] *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, especially the second volume. Cryer does not make reference to any book or article written in modern Hebrew, and he makes reference to Israeli scholars in one footnote only (n. 3, pp. 185-86).
[123] *Post-Biblical Hebrew Syntax and Semantics*.
[124] *Isaiah*.
[125] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, lays out the methodology for the isolation of LBH features. Hurvitz has also published his methodological considerations in 'Linguistic Criteria' and he has recapitulated them in 'Continuity and Innovation'.
[126] For additional references, see Rooker, 'Diachronic Study'.
[127] For a useful overview over some of the features of the latter stratum, and the books that belong to it, see Hurvitz, 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', and his slightly re-worked version, 'Early and Late'. A similar overview is found in Naveh and Greenfield, 'Hebrew and Aramaic'. See also the survey in Sáenz-Badillos, *History*, 112-160; this book in its original Spanish edition is mentioned by Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', n. 3, p. 186.
I leave out the question of a possible third stratum, archaic BH, said to be found in some of the poems embedded in Genesis-2Kings. For an investigation of this problem, see Robertson, *Early Hebrew Poetry* .

undisputed post-exilic compositions (Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles) - is familiar with numerous "neologisms" not attested in biblical texts traditionally assigned to the pre-exilic period.

The hypothesis that has so far been in vogue and which Cryer does not cope with, is as follows.[128] What has been labelled EBH was the current literary language of Jerusalem (and Judah) before the exile, where it was probably also the spoken language. It changed character after the exile, when the spoken language is presumed to have changed to a kind of proto-mishnaic Hebrew.[129] EBH continued to be used as the written language, but knowledge of it was in decline, and therefore words and expressions from the spoken vernacular(s) gained a footing. Thus a new phase in the history of the language was brought about, namely LBH.

Cryer's statement that "a number of scholars firmly believe in a sharp distinction between 'late biblical Hebrew' and a sort of 'standard biblical Hebrew'"[130] is, then, not completely accurate. First of all, it is not a matter of "a number of scholars" (cf. the rich bibliography listed in Sáenz-Badillos). Secondly, as far as the linguistic data itself is concerned, it would be more precise to talk here in terms of a *recognizable* difference and not a *sharp distinction* between the two strata involved. Accordingly, *a priori*, we cannot expect to find diversity on the scale Cryer is looking for. Again, according to the traditional hypothesis, being the standard literary language, EBH was in many respects the same throughout the biblical period and developed relatively little, as is the case with standard Arabic. The *spoken* language developed rapidly and came to be used, eventually, also as a literary medium.[131] This might explain why, in the post-biblical period, most notably at Qumran, we find texts written in different kinds of Hebrew like (proto-)mishnaic Hebrew and BH.

No "sharp distinction" exists, then, between the two strata, only relatively subtle, but recognizable, differences, and it takes the utmost care and stringency of method to distinguish between them. The compelling argument in favour of making this distinction is the *frequency* of the differences and their distribution pattern within the biblical literature, since it is the two *corpora* that differ from each other, and since the specific LBH features often are found also in post-biblical Hebrew, thus providing a clear continuum in the history of the Hebrew language.

Cryer argues that previous work in the field "cannot lay claim to scientific status" since there was no access to comprehensive statistical (computer linguistic) reasoning, and that therefore "there has been no way to control the results scholars have arrived at".[132] This cannot be true. After all, the

---

[128] As I will argue in chapter four below, this traditional hypothesis has its own weaknesses. The interesting thing is that Cryer does not seriously address this hypothesis.

[129] Assuming that EBH was ever a spoken language. Even if it was not, it does not affect the basic thesis that knowledge of the language known as 'biblical Hebrew' declined some time after the exile, which is what scholars adhering to this hypothesis stress.

For a comprehensive survey of a diglossia-like state in BH, see Rendsburg, *Diglossia*, but see Blau's correct criticism of Rendsburg's use of the term diglossia, in 'Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew'.

[130] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 192.

[131] Diglossia, and the process in which the spoken language in a diglossia, in certain circumstances, comes to be used also in writing is described in Ferguson, 'Diglossia'.

[132] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 194.

linguistic research of BH made its monumental achievements long before the invention of the computer. The only adequate way of controlling results in this field, then, is to have a number of different scholars working with established methods and see if they arrive at roughly the same results. In this way the results certainly *have* been controlled. Furthermore, Verheij's computer linguistic study confirms the results of previous work in the field when he finds a difference in the language of Samuel/Kings on the one hand and Chronicles on the other. The results of previous work in the field are also confirmed in an article by Frank Polak,[133] where the author by a computer-aided examination of the *noun-verb ratio* in many of the narrative biblical texts confirms the traditional linguistic-philological periodization of BH literature.

Now, to be sure, all this does not necessarily prove that the differences between the two types of Hebrew are indicative of two distinct historical periods. One could argue that the differences are simply due to geographical or social factors. It goes without saying that the probability of this option can be drastically reduced only if it were possible to show, on the basis of non-biblical data, that the language of one biblical group conforms to external sources dated to an earlier period and that the language of the other group conforms to external sources dated to a later period.

Cryer claims that we do not have sufficient "baselines" to establish the earliness or lateness of parts of the biblical corpora[134] and that the assignment of dates are "the result of exegesis and not linguistic facts".[135] This may be true to a certain extent, but the baselines that we have, the dateable extra-biblical, linguistic evidence, provides us with an outline of the history of the Hebrew language, even though it is a very rough outline. This evidence suggests a difference in time between the language of the two groups: the linguistic features proper to LBH are almost absent from the small corpus of pre-exilic inscriptions that we have, but by and large they are prevalent in post-biblical Hebrew.[136] In the pre-exilic inscriptions, however limited the corpus may be, there *are* found, on the contrary, distinctive features indicative of EBH.[137] As we shall see, the problem here is that none of the inscriptions conform completely to BH.[138] However, the match is close enough for us to see clearly that the language of the inscriptions is closer to EBH than to LBH.

I will analyze the language of two inscriptions from Jerusalem, the Siloam Tunnel inscription and the Siloam Royal Steward inscription,[139] both dated to c. 700. They are only six and three lines long respectively, but they provide precious information about the kind of Hebrew we must assume was written in Jerusalem at the time. Even though they represent genres not matched by the biblical texts, it is quite clear that the language of the inscriptions is very close to EBH. Furthermore, it is

---

[133] 'New Means...New Ends'.
[134] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 197.
[135] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', 198.
[136] For abundance examples of this, see the works of Bendavid, Kutscher, and Hurvitz.
[137] See Torczyner, *Lachish*, 17; Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 177-79; Rabin, 'Hebrew and Aramaic', 1012; Hurvitz, 'Quest for "Ancient Israel"', 307-10.
[138] As shown by Knauf, 'War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?'; cf. also Schüle, 'Zur Bedeutung der Formel *wajjehi*'; *Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften*, 1-3, 182-86, 192-95.

clear that the language in these few lines only exhibits one feature more characteristic of LBH than EBH. On the other hand, the inscriptions contain some elements that are used only, or predominantly, in EBH. Note however that the criterion by which one judges a text to be EBH is absence of LBH features rather than presence of EBH features since most significant EBH features are preserved in LBH. Still, the presence of the following four features in the two inscriptions is noteworthy.

1. hbqnh rbd hyh hzw (Siloam Tunnel inscr., line 1).

This kind of introduction, albeit without the hyh, is found three times in EBH[140] but not in LBH.

2. bqnhl …dw[bw (Siloam Tunnel inscr., line 2).

dw[bw + infinitive is found in EBH but not in LBH.

3. bhzw ¹sk (Royal Steward inscr., line 1).

There is a tendency in EBH for ¹sk to precede bhz, while the opposite is true in LBH, where the more usual order is ¹skwbhz.[141] Being a tendency, no categorical conclusions can be drawn from this one occurrence, but since the inscriptions contain other elements matching EBH it is significant that this, and not the other order is found here.

4. …h l[rva (Royal Steward inscr., line 1).

This title is attested in biblical texts only in EBH compositions and is absent from LBH. It *is* attested, on the other hand, in pre-exilic Hebrew seals and in Akkadian (*ša eli*...).[142]

The one LBH feature in the inscriptions is the non-use of introductory yhyw in the temporal clauses beginning with dw[b (l. 1) and μyb (l. 3),[143] but note that introductory yhyw is not used at all in the narrative sections of the pre-exilic inscriptions.[144]

---

[139] Cf. Renz and Röllig, *Handbuch*, 178-189 and 261-265.
[140] hfmvh rbd hzw (Deut 15.2),
j xrh rbd hzw (Deut 19.4),
smh rbd hzw (1Kgs 9.15).
[141] Hurvitz, 'Diachronic Chiasm'. See also his *Transition Period*, 104, for a summary of the findings in the article. This change in order is attested also in extra-biblical sources, see 'Diachronic Chiasm', 248-51.
[142] Cf. Avigad, 'Epitaph of a Royal Steward', especially 144-45.
[143] On the less frequent use of introductory yhyw in LBH, see Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 22-23; Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 91-92; cf. also Kesterson, *Tense Usage*, 11.
[144] This fact has led Schüle to argue that introductory yhyw is a late phenomenon, introduced into EBH writings by redactional activity, 'Zur Bedeutung der Formel *wajjehi*'; *Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften*, 182-86.

The main difference between these inscriptions and EBH is in vocabulary, in that the Siloam Tunnel inscription uses two nouns unknown to BH, hdz (l. 3) and hbqn (l. 1 [2x][145]). The root of the latter is well known from BH, whereas the root of the former is uncertain. This difference might, however, be ascribed to the difference in genre and subject matter between the inscriptions and the biblical writings in that the biblical texts nowhere describe the digging of tunnels. However, as noted by Victor Sasson,[146] in possible opposition to the inscription BH uses hl[T] for Hezeqiah's tunnel, not hbqn.

There is probably also differences in morphology, the third feminine singular qatal of hyh being written tyh in the Siloam Tunnel inscription, line 3. This is generally htyh in BH.[147] The tyh of the inscription does not necessarily reflect a different form, it might reflect the same form as biblical htyh written defectively. The likelihood of this, however, is diminished by the fact that final matres lectionis are found throughout the inscription. Another morphological difference is the form w[r (l. 4). Apart from one instance (Jer 6.21), the noun [r always has the suffix w in BH.[148]

There is also a difference in orthography, the biblical orthography reflecting an exilic/post-exilic spelling practice with a more extensive use of matres lectionis and the predominant use of w as a marker of the suffix for third masculine singular, whereas the inscriptions generally use h-. Here, indeed, we have a clear indication, supported by both biblical and extra-biblical sources, that the orthography of the EBH texts conforms to an exilic/post-exilic spelling practice. So, in order to argue that they were written in pre-exilic times, one must assume that they have undergone a revision which levelled their spelling with texts of the later period.[149] However, no such evidence has been produced to unequivocally show that the language[150] of EBH reflects a similar process of levelling and modernization.[151] As noted above, the data at our disposal, both biblical and extra-biblical, exhibit, rather, a picture of linguistic change, reflecting developments from EBH to LBH.

Summary and Conclusions. Cryer does not make a convincing case for his claim that linguistic considerations support the revisionist school hypothesis,[152] i.e. that the bulk of the biblical texts were composed or thoroughly revised in Persian and/or Hellenistic times.[153]

---

[145] Perhaps the latter occurrence in line 1 is a verbal form, but probably not the first. The occurrence of hbqn (h) in line 3-4 may be either the same noun or a verbal form. Cf. Sasson, 'Siloam Tunnel Inscription'.

[146] 'Siloam Tunnel Inscription', 116.

[147] There are a couple of occurrences of third feminine singular qatal forms without h-, see for instance 2Kgs 9,37, cf. Kutscher, *History*, 67.

[148] See Young, *Diversity*, 105.

[149] Cf. Kutscher, *History*, 66.

[150] At any rate, in the domains of syntax and vocabulary, to which Cryer refers.

[151] Note, however, Young's interesting research on this subject in 'Archaic Poetry', '*Am* Construed as Singular and Plural', and 'Notes'. In these articles Young points to evidence of possible scribal linguistic updating of texts and shows how we cannot know to what extent our texts have been reworked in antiquity. A similar case for scribal linguistic updating of texts can be found in Fishbane, *Interpretation*, 55-63; see further Tov, *Textual Criticism*; Ulrich, 'Canonical Process'; Wise, 'Accidents and Accidence'.

[152] Cf. the studies mentioned in n. 7 on p. V above.

[153] In chapter four below we shall see that one can make such a case, but on different grounds.

Evaluating the validity of Cryer's theory, I have examined it from three different angles:

1. Adherence to strict methodological procedures in advancing linguistic arguments relating to the study of potential diachronic phenomena within BH;
2. Proficiency in the actual linguistic analysis of the primary sources involved;
3. Competence in coping with rival scholarly positions.

As already noted above, in all of these aspects the study here under consideration reveals grave deficiencies, both on the factual and interpretative levels. As far as the first aspect is concerned, Cryer does not adhere to any strict methodology. No serious discussion is to be found on linguistic criteria which might be employed in attempts seeking to detect possible late features within the biblical corpus (for instance, comparative study with extra-biblical sources, like the Siloam Inscription on the one hand and post-biblical Hebrew on the other). As for the second, it is remarkable that in a paper specifically devoted to "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel", no concrete Hebrew examples are cited and discussed for purposes of illustration. This turns the discussion in Cryer's paper into a theoretical exercise not significant for studying the actual biblical texts; i.e. for "dating biblical Hebrew".

And, finally, little notice is taken of previous research. Ignoring scholarly publications directly relevant to the study of LBH (particularly in modern Hebrew but also in European languages) presents the reader with a distorted picture of the *Forschungsgeschichte* and its achievements. For instance, as I have quoted, when Cryer states that BH "reveals only faint and few traces of Aramaic influence". The studies I have mentioned earlier,[154] and publications Cryer cites,[155] make it clear that the Aramaic influence on BH, on the contrary, must rather be said to be quite pervasive.

Cryer should be applauded for raising this important issue and making us rethink why we distinguish between two types of BH, and why we consider one of them later than the other. But his arguments in favour of dismissing the traditional hypothesis are not strong enough to be considered further.

---

[154] E.g., Bendavid and Naveh/Greenfield.
[155] Cryer, 'Problem of Dating', n. 3., pp. 185-86 (Rabin, 'Historical Background', and Kutscher, *History*).

4. Avi Hurvitz and the Question of Dating

I. Introduction

For two centuries, scholars have pointed to consistent differences in the Hebrew of certain biblical texts and interpreted these differences as reflecting the date of composition of the texts.[156] Until the 1980's, this was quite uncontroversial as the linguistic findings largely confirmed the chronology of the texts established by other means: the Hebrew of Genesis-2Kings was judged to be early and that of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles to be late. In the current debate where revisionists have questioned the traditional dating, linguistic arguments in the dating of texts have come more into focus. In the preceding chapter, I reviewed an attempt to use linguistic arguments in favour of the revisionist position. In the following, I intend to critically examine some linguistic arguments adduced to support the traditional position, and reviewing the arguments, I will point to weaknesses in the linguistic dating of EBH texts to pre-exilic times. When viewing the linguistic evidence in isolation it will be clear that a post-exilic date for the (final linguistic form of the) EBH texts is more likely.

The Israeli scholar Avi Hurvitz is well known for arguing that linguistic considerations force us to stick to the traditional dating of the texts. He does not give priority to historical or theological arguments in this dating:

"[A]s far as dating *texts* is concerned…it is precisely the evidence of *language* which must take precedence over historical and theological arguments."[157]

His argument runs along the following lines. There exist in the biblical texts at least two (on the surface not very different) types of Hebrew, one of which is more similar to pre-exilic inscriptions, and one which is more similar to post-biblical Hebrew. The bulk of the biblical texts is written in the first type of Hebrew. The latter being a post-exilic type of Hebrew and in addition a deteriorated

---

[156] As mentioned in the introduction, the German scholar Gesenius started this trend in 1815 with his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache*.

[157] Further, "[t]he antiquity of a given corpus–in any language, at any period of time–ought to be established, in the first place, by the linguistic profile of its texts", and "the *historical age* of the extant biblical texts can only be determined after the language in which they are written has been properly placed along the linguistic continuum presented by BH", 'Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically?', 144, italics original. See also his 'Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics', 22*. It would strengthen his case if he could point to other text corpora where this was an accepted method. I know of none.

Other BH scholars also lend credence to linguistic dating, e.g. Rooker: "…the diachronic study of the Hebrew language which has proven itself to be trustworthy and objective in dating biblical texts…", 'Dating Isaiah 40-66', 303.

and more aramaized version of the first type[158] shows that post-exilic writers no longer knew how to write pre-exilic Hebrew. In Hurvitz's words:

"[I]t would be a gross error to assume that the post-exilic authors, whose writing habits are openly recorded in the LBH corpus, were able to accurately reproduce the outdated style of Classical/Standard BH without slips betraying their own linguistic background."[159]

When this is the case, he argues, EBH texts must have found their final linguistic form before the exile. Hurvitz's linguistic dating of texts does not go further than distinguishing between pre- and post-exilic.[160]

Apart from the weakness inherent in the effort to linguistically date texts,[161] there are two weaknesses in this argument. One is that Hurvitz and other scholars have not shown that EBH was the standard language that LBH writers tried to reproduce. In other words we have no clear indications that LBH is a deteriorated form of EBH, and writing LBH may have been a stylistic choice for biblical writers. But the crucial weakness is that some prophetic books show that both semi-poetic and narrative EBH was in use after the exile. Hence, at least some post-exilic writers knew how to write EBH which, in turn, increases the likelihood of LBH being a stylistic choice for post-exilic writers. In the following, I shall elaborate on these two points.

II. The differences between the linguistic layers of BH

As pointed to in chapter three above, there are consistent differences in the language of two groups of biblical books giving rise to the terms EBH and LBH. The question remains how to interpret these differences. Here I shall first briefly sum up the differences, analyze a few points of interest, and then turn to the question of interpretation.

I maintain, then, that there is no question that there are differences between 1) the Hebrew of Genesis-2Kings and other books on the one hand, and 2) the Hebrew of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and others books on the other. They are small but noticeable and by no account

---

[158] If we include Polak's work ('The Oral and the Written'), we can add that this form of Hebrew is written in a more literal register as opposed to the more oral register of the first type.

[159] 'Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically?', 154. See also his 'Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics', 32*: "…the language of the fifth century, which is unmistakably post-exilic", and cf. his *A Linguistic Study*, 153.

[160] Cf. Davies's observation (*In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 102) that scholars do not use linguistic arguments in deciding whether J stems from the tenth or the sixth century, but often use linguistic arguments in deciding whether texts stem from the seventh of the fifth century. His observation is quoted and more or less confirmed by Hurvitz, 'Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics', 32*.

[161] It is quite conceivable that later writers would know an earlier form of their language well enough to produce texts in it (for an example from another time and place, see Blau, 'Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew', 28: "there were Arabic authors who wrote in a late period in a purely classical style and succeeded in avoiding not only neo-Arabic forms, but also post-classical forms"). The likelihood of this going unnoticed is higher the less we know of the history of a language, and apart from the Hebrew Bible which we are trying to date, our knowledge of pre-Qumran Hebrew must be said to be extremely limited.

do they seem to be the result of idiosyncrasies of single writers, as there are features that are frequent in some or all books belonging to one group that are less frequent in the other group. In addition we saw in chapter three above that datable extra-biblical evidence makes it very likely that the first group is reflecting an earlier type of Hebrew than the second.

Vocabulary. The vocabulary of LBH is characterized by the presence of more Aramaic loanwords than EBH, and in both groups the Aramaic loanwords are sometimes used side by side with their Hebrew counterparts, in many cases very probably as free variants. A further difference is that whereas about 15 of the Aramaic loanwords in LBH ultimately are of Persian origin, no such words are found in EBH. To a certain extent the groups also favour different prepositions, LBH again showing more Aramaic influence.[162]

Morphology. The higher frequency of a few morphological features shared with Aramaic sets LBH apart from EBH.[163]

Syntax. More importantly, as syntax tends to be more conservative than vocabulary, there also are differences in the syntax between the two groups, and with regard to many of these differences, again, LBH is closer to Aramaic. The nominal syntax shows only a few differences, such as more occurrences of the double plural construction in construct chains (as in גִּבּוֹרֵי חֲיָלִים), the *quivis* construction (=the repetition of nouns as in אִישׁ אִישׁ) with prefixed כָּל, and uncountables and collectives construed as plurals.[164] More differences are found in the verbal syntax,[165] but the differences in nominal and verbal syntax are all differences in frequency: the syntactic features of one group are also found in the other, and some of these features, then, have a significantly higher frequency in one of the groups.[166]

Style. Scholars have noted in LBH a tendency to use longer sentences with the verb placed towards the end.[167]

---

[162] For the question of Aramaisms, see Wagner, *Aramaismen*; Hurvitz, 'Chronological Significance'.

[163] See previous note.

[164] E.g., Kropat, *Syntax*, 8-13. Gewirtz, 'Syntax and Style', argues that the existence of the double plural and the *quivis* construction in early northwest Semitic literature precludes the conclusion that it is characteristic of late Hebrew. However, there is a marked difference in frequency between the two groups and this fact is not changed by Gewirtz's, otherwise interesting, research.

[165] E.g., verbal suffixes, compared to the construction of תאֵ + suffix, are more common
Temporal constructions of the type בְּשֻׁבֹּל are found much more commonly without introductory וַיְהִי
Yiqtol is less common in the past
Qatal is more common in the past and less common in its other functions
Weqatal in the apodosis after a condition is less common
Periphrastic construction of הָיָה + participle signifying cursivity is more common
For a discussion of these and other differences, see Eskhult, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 103-20; 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew'. See also below.

[166] I have found this important fact explicitly stated only twice in the literature, Rabin, *Encyclopaedia Biblica* VI, s. v. עִבְרִית col. 70, "[Late biblical Hebrew] changed to a certain extent the frequency of the grammatical and the syntactic forms without adding to them" [my translation, M.E.]; Eskhult, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 14, "It is not so easy to isolate features of late usage. It is almost exclusively a matter of tendency in some direction (the only exception would be loan-words of Persian origin)"; 119, "…it is all a matter of tendency in one direction or other".

[167] Naveh and Greenfield, 'Hebrew and Aramaic', 120; Eskhult, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 117-118, 120; Polak, 'The Oral and the Written'.

Scholars have made an additional stylistic observation relevant to the discussion here. They have noticed a certain kind of uniformity in EBH texts not shared by LBH texts. From many perspectives one cannot say that EBH texts are uniform with regard to language use,[168] but from a grammatical point of view there is at least a *certain* uniformity, the EBH grammatical features being employed with a certain regularity throughout EBH texts. As opposed to this, *some* LBH writers (idiosyncratically?) use *some* grammatical EBH features more, and others use other grammatical EBH features more.[169]

Some points of detail. I have come across only two syntactic traits claimed to be characteristic of one group and not found at all in the other: the participle as a narrative form exclusive to LBH, and the infinitive absolute as a word of command exclusive to EBH. In the following I will examine these claims and a few other points of detail.

PARTICIPLE AS NARRATIVE FORM. Mark Smith is the proponent of the theory of the participle used as a simple narrative form in LBH, as for instance in (1):[170]

1. וְכָל־עַבְדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־בְּשַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ כֹּרְעִים וּמִשְׁתַּחֲוִים לְהָמָן

And all the king's servants, that were in the king's gate, bowed, and reverenced Haman (Esth 3.2)

He claims that this use is found in EBH direct discourse but not in narrative. His criterion for seeing the participles in (1) as narrative forms is presumably that the text perfectly well could have used wayyiqtols. However, Mats Eskhult regards (1) as well as Smith's other examples as cursive use of the participle,[171] and this seems very likely. None of the examples prevent us from seeing the participle used in its normal cursive function. It is true that wayyiqtols would suit the texts equally well, but it is precisely because the participle is used that we must see them as cursive. EBH has examples of use of the participle that could well be regarded as simple narrative use since they could be meaningfully replaced by wayyiqtols:

2. וּמֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהוֹשָׁפָט מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה יֹשְׁבִים אִישׁ עַל־כִּסְאוֹ

And the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat the king of Judah sat each on his throne (1Kgs 22.10)

---

[168] See, e.g., Driver, 'Elohist', for examples of different language use in the different sources, or Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, for abundance examples of (general) BH language variation.
[169] E.g., the widespread use of the infinitive absolute as a continuance form in Esther (as evident e.g. from the examples listed in Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', n. 30, p. 90), but note that most LBH features are shared between LBH texts (because this is what constitutes LBH features). For a thorough argument in favour of EBH texts being of one 'flavour' and LBH texts being of individually different 'flavours', see Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* 1, 60-80.
[170] Smith, Waw-*Consecutive*, 28; 'Grammatically Speaking', 307; in addition he quotes the following examples, Esth 2.20; 8.17; 9.3 ('Grammatically Speaking', 307).

3. וְכָל־הַנְּבִאִים נִבְּאִים כֵּן לֵאמֹר

And all the prophets prophesied so, saying (1Kgs 22.12)

But because the participle is used, we regard the verbal actions as having a cursive character.[172] In order to safely assign a new function to the participle we would need at least a few unambiguous examples of this use. Until we have that, it is preferable to remain conservative in this regard.

INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE USED AS COMMAND. It is possible that the infinitive absolute used for command is not found in LBH. Eskhult examines a corpus consisting of the non-parallel parts of Chronicles, the Nehemiah memoirs (1.1-7.5; 12.27-13.31), and Esther, and he does not find the infinitive absolute used for command at all.[173] In undisputed LBH texts outside of his corpus I have not found it either.[174] The use is well attested in BH: Smith counts 48 instances.[175] However, one of the examples on Smith's list is taken from an LBH text included in Eskhult's corpus:

4. (וַיֹּאמֶר) [וָאֹמַר] לָהֶם לֹא יִפָּתְחוּ שַׁעֲרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם עַד־חֹם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְעַד הֵם עֹמְדִים יָגִיפוּ הַדְּלָתוֹת וֶאֱחֹזוּ וְהַעֲמֵיד מִשְׁמְרוֹת יֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם אִישׁ בְּמִשְׁמָרוֹ וְאִישׁ נֶגֶד בֵּיתוֹ

And I said to them, "Do not let the gates of Jerusalem be opened until the sun is hot; and while they stand guard, let them shut and bar the doors; and appoint guards from among the inhabitants of Jerusalem, one at his watch station and another in front of his own house." (Neh 7.3)

Gotthelf Bergsträsser reads וְהַעֲמֵיד as a continuation of the preceding two yiqtols and Eskhult regards it as replacing a finite verb,[176] but it is easier, with Smith, to read it simply as a word of command, equivalent of an imperative. In order to read it as continuing the yiqtols, one would have to accept the change of subject and the presence of an imperative as the immediately preceding form,

---

[171] *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 113-14. Polak, however, agrees that the participle is turning into a narrative tense, but it seems that he does not distinguish between instances where the use of participle denotes cursivity and the alleged use of the participle as a simple narrative form, 'The Oral and the Written', n. 23, p. 63.

[172] Other examples include 1Sam 1.13; 1Kgs 1.5.

[173] 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 90; see also Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 23; Polzin, *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 43; Kutscher, *History*, 82; Schattner-Rieser, 'L'hébreu postexilique', 200, 215-16.

[174] But note the ambiguous form b/rqw in the probable LBH of Qohelet (for a convincing case of Qohelet being LBH, see Schoors, *The Preacher*), in 4.17, which might be considered an infinitive absolute used as imperative, as Fredericks, arguing for an early date for Qohelet's language, believes, *Qoheleth's Language*, 85; Schoors hesitantly prefers other options, *The Preacher*, 179.

[175] 'Predicative Infinitive Absolute', 259. All of these are acceptable to me, except three: μtħ; and j q̇rḥw in Ezk 24.10 (Smith does not say which two of the four possible choices in this verse he regards as infinitives absolute, but if he is gathering data from the Westminster Theological Seminary Hebrew Morphology and Lemma Database [=WTM, Release 3, 1998-99 - WTM serves as basis for lemmatization in the *BibleWorks for Windows* 4.0 computer program] which analyzes these two as infinitives absolute, and the other two candidates in the verse as imperatives, he is referring to μtħ; and j q̇rḥw) and rFq in Am 4.5. For argumentation concerning j q̇rḥw and rFq, see n. 177, and regarding μtħ; when there is nothing to prevent us from seeing it as an imperative, we should not see it as an infinitive absolute. Goddard, *Hebrew Infinitive Absolute*, 60-61, counts about forty instances of infinitive absolute used as command (this work was unavailable to me so I am relying here on a quote in Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew' n. 28, p. 90).

the yiqtols being more at a distance of the infinitive absolute. While this is not impossible, the other option is easier.

The presence of a conjunction before הַעֲמֵיד should not lead us to automatically assume that it is a continuation/replacement form. There is an instructive parallel in Ezekiel, the only (other) instance of infinitive absolute used as command preceded by וְ:[177]

5. כִּי כֹה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוה הַעֲלֵה עֲלֵיהֶם קָהָל וְנָתֹן אֶתְהֶן לְזַעֲוָה וְלָבַז

For thus says the Lord GOD: Bring up an assembly against them, give them up to trouble and plunder (Ezk 23.46)

Whether one regards הַעֲלֵה as imperative or infinitive absolute, the easiest way to understand וְנָתֹן is as a word of command, regardless of the conjunction.

Neh 7.3 is important because it is the only candidate for the infinitive absolute used as an imperative I have found in undisputed LBH texts.[178]

NARRATIVE WEQATAL. Another syntactic feature believed by some scholars to characterize LBH and set it apart from EBH, is narrative weqatal.[179] However, the work on this subject by Hermann Spieckermann shows that this clearly is a feature found no less in EBH than in LBH.[180]

MODAL *yae+ INFINITIVE. The use of modal *yae+ infinitive is also believed to characterize LBH, but, as I have argued in chapter two above, this is not as certain an LBH feature as usually held.

hyh;+ PARTICIPLE. A feature characteristic of LBH is the rather frequent use of the periphrastic construction of hyh;+ participle,[181] but some clarification is needed. Takamitsu Muraoka has recently

---

[176] Bergsträsser, *Grammatik*, vol 2, §12m; Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', n. 30, p. 90.

[177] On Smith's list, another two forms are preceded by וְ but these are problematic and cannot count as further parallels:

1) jqrhw in Ez.24.10 is not an infinitive absolute but an imperative – the *pataḥ* in the last syllable shows this (infinitive absolute, as opposed to the imperative, has a historically long *ṣere* which requires *pataḥ furtivum* instead of vowel change with third-guttural verbs, see e.g. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik*, §46s and §51q).

2) rFqw in Amos 4.5 is more likely an imperative (even though Joüon/Muraoka, §123x, albeit hesitantly, regards it as an infinitive absolute). The singular form is in opposition to the six plural imperatives in this and the preceding verse but such fluctuations are not uncommon in BH. In Amos, e.g., in the following passages I have found examples of fluctuation of number and/or gender, 4.2-3; 5.22-23; 6.1-7; 9.11.

[178] But see n. 174. Note that another volitive use is attested in 1Chr 15.22, the infinitive absolute there used as equivalent of the injunctive yiqtol:

וּכְנַנְיָהוּ שַׂר־הַלְוִיִּם בְּמַשָּׂא יָסֹר בַּמַּשָּׂא כִּי מֵבִין הוּא

Chenaniah, leader of the Levites in music, was to direct the music, for he understood it

In Esth 2.3 and 6.9 the infinitive absolute continues an injunctive yiqtol.

[179] Driver, *Tenses*, 158-59; Gesenius/Kautzsch, §112pp; Rabin, *Syntax of Biblical Hebrew*, 32 ("*wepaʿal* to denote the past and *weyipʿal* to denote the future becomes more and more frequent" [my translation, M.E.]; Garr, *Dialect Geography*, 186; Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 100-02.

[180] *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*, 120-30. Note that whereas Spieckermann points to narrative weqatal forms in the Meṣad Ḥašavyahu ostracon, this is severely questioned by Weippert, 'Petition eines Erntearbeiters'. Verheij, *Verbs and Numbers*, 97, and Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 84-85, both find no evidence in support of seeing this construction as belonging chiefly to LBH.

[181] Driver, *Treatise*, 170; Morag, 'Qumran Hebrew', 160; Eskhult, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 113-14; Gibson, *Davidson's Hebrew Grammar*, 138; Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 89.

argued that this syntagm is too frequent in EBH to be said to be characteristic of LBH.[182] This is correct when you count the occurrences of hyh + participle,[183] but Eskhult argues that LBH more often shows this syntagm expressing *cursivity*, as in (6), and this is correct:

6. וַיִּהְיוּ יָמִים שְׁלוֹשָׁה בֹּזְזִים אֶת־הַשָּׁלָל כִּי רַב־הוּא

And they were three days in gathering of the spoil, it was so much (2Chr 20.25)

In his rather small corpus (the non-parallel parts of Chronicles, the Nehemiah memoirs, and Esther) Eskhult counts 24 instances that clearly belong in this category, whereas I have found only 30 clear instances in the much larger corpus of Genesis-2Kings[184] - a clear difference in frequency. Moreover, the construction is quite frequent in QH.[185]

Interpretation. What we have, then, is two types of BH, very similar but not indistinguishable. One represents an earlier stage of the language than the other. As for syntax, we do not find significant traits that are found exclusively in one group – the differences are differences in frequency.

Some questions arise at this point. Were LBH writers attempting to write EBH? Did they think that they were writing EBH when they were in fact writing LBH? Or was LBH their preferred style of writing? Did LBH writers more or less consciously use more loanwords (being more open to foreign influence), or did they not know Hebrew from Aramaic so well? These are interesting questions and authorities in the field have come up with different answers. Generally LBH writers are looked upon as imitators as opposed to innovators,[186] and as stated above, their Hebrew is seen as a deteriorating form of EBH. Scholars point especially to deterioration of the verbal system in this connection,[187] and among them Takamitsu Muraoka is the most explicit in arguing this point.[188] In the following I shall discuss his arguments.

---

[182] Muraoka, 'Participle in Qumran Hebrew', 195.

[183] Excluding passive participles and participles of stative verbs, Muraoka, 'Participle in Qumran Hebrew', counts 124 instances in the biblical texts.

[184] Gen 1.6; 39.22; Deut 9.7, 22, 24; 28.29; 31.27; Jdg 1.7; 11.10; 19.1; 1Sam 2.11; 2Sam 3.17; 4.3; 7.6; 8.15; 13.23; 15.32; 1Kgs 5.1, 24; 12.6; 20.40; 2Kgs 8.21; 9.14; 18.4; 17.25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 41. I am not counting instances where, as Eskhult correctly points out, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 114, and 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 89, the form yhy seems to be the introductory yhy not forming a syntagm with the participle.

[185] See Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §400.01.

[186] Polzin, *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 3, 74; Rabin, 'Hebrew and Aramaic', 1014; Hurvitz, 'Language of the Priestly Source', 84; Naveh and Greenfield, 'Hebrew and Aramaic', 120-21; Schattner-Rieser, 'L'hébreu postexilique', 215; Hurvitz, 'Continuity and Innovation', 4; Blau, 'Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew', 21-22; Joosten, 'Pseudo-Classicisms', 147-48; Hurvitz, 'Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically?', 154-57; cf. also the handy collection of quotes in Qimron, 'History of Early Hebrew', n. 5, pp. 350-52. Note that Hurvitz, 'Ben Sira: Lexicographical Aspects', 85, does consider the possibility that the post-exilic writers were not imitators but innovators.

[187] See Kutscher, *History*, 45; Naveh and Greenfield, 'Hebrew and Aramaic', 120-21; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 81; Morag, 'Qumran Hebrew', 155; Smith, Waw-*Consecutive*, XII-XIII; Sáenz-Badillos, *History*, 129. Note that I am referring to scholars who are pointing to the *deterioration* of the verbal system – other scholars, such as Kropat, Eskhult, and Verheij, have studied the LBH verbal system and compared it with EBH, but have remained descriptive.

He states that "[t]he later books show clear signs of gradual collapse or deterioration of the classical tense system". He goes on to cite four instances that "[n]o textual emendation can improve", 7-10:

7. אַתָּה־הוּא יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתָּ בְּאַבְרָם וְהוֹצֵאתוֹ מֵאוּר כַּשְׂדִּים וְשַׂמְתָּ שְּׁמוֹ אַבְרָהָם וּמָצָאתָ אֶת־לְבָבוֹ נֶאֱמָן לְפָנֶיךָ וְכָרוֹת עִמּוֹ הַבְּרִית... וַתָּקֶם אֶת־דְּבָרֶיךָ כִּי צַדִּיק אָתָּה

You are the LORD, the God who chose Abram and brought him out of Ur of the Chaldeans and gave him the name Abraham; and you found his heart faithful before you, and made with him a covenant …and you have fulfilled your promise, for you are righteous (Neh 9.7-8)

8. וּלְמִיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי שֹׁפְטִים עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהִכְנַעְתִּי אֶת־כָּל־אוֹיְבֶיךָ וָאַגִּד לָךְ וּבַיִת יִבְנֶה־לְּךָ יְהוָה

…from the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel; and I will subdue all your enemies. Moreover I declare to you that the LORD will build you a house (1Chr 17.10)

9. וַתְּדַבֵּר עַל־בֵּית־עַבְדְּךָ לְמֵרָחוֹק וּרְאִיתַנִי כְּתוֹר הָאָדָם הַמַּעֲלָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים

You have also spoken of your servant's house for a great while to come. You regard me as someone of high rank, O LORD God (1Chr 17.17)

10. וַיַּעַשׂ הַמֶּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם תַּחְתֵּיהֶם מָגִנֵּי נְחֹשֶׁת וְהִפְקִיד עַל־יַד שָׂרֵי הָרָצִים

But King Rehoboam made in place of them shields of bronze, and committed them to the hands of the officers of the guard (2Chr 12.10)

In (7), (9), and (10) we find weqatal where we would expect wayyiqtol, but as mentioned above, narrative weqatal is no less a feature of EBH. In EBH, we also have an occurrence of a string of weqatals in a wayyiqtol context:

11. הוּא הֵסִיר אֶת־הַבָּמוֹת וְשִׁבַּר אֶת־הַמַּצֵּבֹת וְכָרַת אֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרָה וְכִתַּת נְחַשׁ הַנְּחֹשֶׁת

He removed the high places, broke down the pillars, and cut down the sacred pole. He broke in pieces the bronze serpent (2Kgs 18.4)

In the string in (7) in addition to the weqatals and wayyiqtol, there is also an infinitive absolute in its function of continuing a preceding verb. This function is known in EBH even though, in the extant EBH texts, it is not found precisely in connection with narrative weqatals. The sequence does

---

In this connection, a note should be made of Joosten's interesting research in 'Pseudo-Classicisms'. Acknowledging the difficulties in establishing that LBH is an attempt to imitate EBH, he shows how some LBH expressions might be interpreted as if the author was trying to use an EBH term but misunderstood it and hence used the term or construction in a wrong way. If many more examples of this were found, this type of research would prove a better way of establishing the LBH writers as imitators and not innovators.

[188] Joüon/Muraoka §119za-b.

seem slightly odd, but it should be noted that it is a semi-poetic text[189] where oddities of verbal usage are more common than in prose.[190]

In (8) we find a non-past wayyiqtol. This is not impossible in EBH:

12. לָמָה תִבְעֲטוּ בְּזִבְחִי וּבְמִנְחָתִי אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי מָעוֹן וַתְּכַבֵּד אֶת־בָּנֶיךָ מִמֶּנִּי

Why then look with greedy eye at my sacrifices and my offerings that I commanded, and honour your sons more than me (1Sam 2.29)

Muraoka goes on to note the admittedly odd verbal use in Qohelet.[191] He then notes the replacement of *hyly* for *hywy*. I have found only one LBH example of *hyly* that is clause initial and hence directly could be replaced by *hywy* 1Chr 12.18. Here *hywy* certainly would be expected according to EBH usage. But the preceding clause is an μαι clause and therefore the non-use of apodotic *waw* here is the rule rather than the exception in LBH.[192] Such usage, with asyndetic yiqtol is not common in EBH, but there are examples, such as Ex 22.6. It is correct, however, that *hywy* is used very infrequently in LBH: of the almost 400 BH occurrences of the form, only five are found in the clear LBH texts.[193]

Finally he points to yiqtol and short weyiqtol gradually replacing weqatal, using the following example:

13. וּבָעִתִּים הָהֵם רַבִּים יַעַמְדוּ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב וּבְנֵי פָּרִיצֵי עַמְּךָ יִנַּשְׂאוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חָזוֹן וְנִכְשָׁלוּ

וְיָבֹא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן וְיִשְׁפֹּךְ סוֹלֲלָה וְלָכַד עִיר מִבְצָרוֹת וּזְרֹעוֹת הַנֶּגֶב לֹא יַעֲמֹדוּ וְעַם מִבְחָרָיו וְאֵין כֹּחַ לַעֲמֹד

וְיַעַשׂ הַבָּא אֵלָיו כִּרְצוֹנוֹ וְאֵין עוֹמֵד לְפָנָיו וְיַעֲמֹד בְּאֶרֶץ־הַצְּבִי וְכָלָה בְיָדוֹ וְיָשֵׂם פָּנָיו לָבוֹא בְּתֹקֶף כָּל־מַלְכוּתוֹ

In those times many shall rise against the king of the south. The lawless among your own people shall lift themselves up in order to fulfill the vision, but they shall fail.

Then the king of the north shall come and throw up siegeworks, and take a well-fortified city. And the forces of the south shall not stand, not even his picked troops, for there shall be no strength to resist.

But he who comes against him shall take the actions he pleases, and no one shall withstand him. He shall take a position in the beautiful land, and all of it shall be in his power.

He shall set his mind to come with the strength of his whole kingdom (Dan 11.14-17)

---

[189] Kittels edition of the Biblia Hebraica does not use poetic lay-out for the text whereas the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia does lay it out as poetry.

[190] See e.g. Niccacci ('Biblical Hebrew Poetry', 91), "…B[iblical]H[ebrew]P[oetry] remains a mystery from the point of view of the verbal system used while prose shows a substantial coherence".

[191] This is not necessarily due to its lateness as Isaksson has argued, *Language of Qoheleth,* 39-68, 190-197, an argument, however, that Muraoka does not seem to accept, §119za n. 1.

[192] See Kropat, Syntax, 70-71; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §400.19; Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 120-22; Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 87-88 (see the examples in n. 20, p. 88); van Peursen, 'Conditional Sentences', 218-25; *Verbal System*, 313-16, 18.

[193] 2x in Nehemiah, 3x in Chronicles and none in Esther, Daniel, Ezra; see Polzin, *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 56; Rendsburg, 'False Leads', 39.

Short weyiqtol with indicative meaning is indeed rare in EBH prose, but Elisha Qimron does count nine certain instances,[194] among them the following:

14. אַחַר כֵּן תָּבוֹא גִּבְעַת הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם נְצִבֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים וִיהִי כְבֹאֲךָ שָׁם הָעִיר וּפָגַעְתָּ חֶבֶל נְבִיאִים

After that you shall come to Gibeath-elohim, at the place where the Philistine garrison is; there, as you come to the town, you will meet a band of prophets (1Sam 10.5)

Muraoka's examples are examples of differences in frequencies of verbal usage. None of them need to be interpreted as deterioration. Due to lack of evidence, therefore, it seems preferable to stay descriptive: what we have is not so common EBH syntactic traits that (except for narrative weqatal) are more common in LBH (or vice versa).[195]

One possible argument in favour of seeing LBH as a deteriorated form of EBH might be the fact that LBH contains both EBH traits and neologisms – when many or most EBH forms are preserved instead of being abandoned in LBH, one explanation may be that writers attempted at writing EBH and failed. And another possible argument may be the relative linguistic uniformity in EBH texts versus the relative lack of linguistic uniformity in LBH texts pointed to above – one may interpret this as a result of a continuous pre-exilic scribal tradition which was broken off by the exile, this in turn giving rise to individual post-exilic writers without a strong tradition being unconsciously idiosyncratic and erring in their balance in the use of EBH forms.

These are quite possible explanations of the situation, but not the only conceivable ones. It seems clear enough that EBH writers were adhering to a tradition that LBH writers knew but (for reasons unknown) were not bound by. LBH writers may have felt free with regard to the EBH tradition and therefore used those traditional elements that appealed to them and introduced new elements when it suited them. Interestingly, not all scholars see in all LBH deteriorated Hebrew. Chaim Rabin believed that the Hebrew of Ben Sira, which is close to LBH, and the deviations of the Chronicler from the [presumed] *Vorlage* in Samuel/Kings are not results of deterioration, but rather the result of a changed stylistic taste.[196]

The problem is our lack of knowledge. The case of, e.g., Latin is different: Latin has served as written language for two millennia, and looking at its history we can see writers at times writing very good Latin and at other times we see Latin deviating from the standard by influence of the

---

[194] 'Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect', 154-55, 158. Note, however, that he assumes that this usage was not originally found in EBH and therefore he believes these nine cases to be errors.
[195] Goldfayn (*Word Order and Time*, 136) is of a similar opinion in this regard.
[196] 'Historical Background', 152. Kister, 'Contribution', 304-07, is of the same opinion regarding Ben Sira, and so is van Peursen, *Verbal System*, 44-46, 51-52.
That there should be linguistic differences between the text in Samuel/Kings and the parallel text in Chronicles is not surprising, since the books differ with regard to agenda and thus are removed from one another in ideology and perhaps also in time.

writers' mother tongue.[197] In this case we know what the standard is, and we know that the writers knew that there was a standard. This kind of information is not available to us with regard to BH.[198]

The likelihood of LBH being the result of a stylistic choice rather than imitation increases if at least some LBH and EBH texts could be shown to stem from roughly the same time, because the imitation hypothesis presupposes that EBH was outdated at the time of the LBH writers.[199] From the point of view of traditional dating this might be said to be the case with the partly LBH of Ezekiel,[200] considered to date from the first half of the sixth century where knowledge of EBH is considered to be intact,[201] but below I will show that EBH was in use even after the exile, thus increasing the likelihood of a coexistence of EBH and LBH.

III. Post-exilic EBH

As stated above, the second weakness of Hurvitz's argument is that it is clear that EBH was in use in post-exilic times: most scholars date the books of Isaiah 40-66,[202] Joel, Haggai, Zechariah,[203] and Malachi to (very late exilic/) post-exilic times,[204] even though complete consensus pertains to Haggai and Zech 1-8 only. Some authorities make the following statements regarding the language of these books: [205]

On Isaiah 40-66:

Hurvitz: "…like the language of Haggai and Zechariah - and to an even greater extent - the language of "second Isaiah" is well anchored in classical Hebrew and the imprints of late biblical Hebrew are quite scanty." [my translation, M.E.][206]

Chaim Rabin: "…fast vollkommenes klassisches Hebräisch."[207]

On Joel:

---

[197] See e.g. Bloomfield, *Language*, 490.

[198] The same goes for QH. We know from the finds at Qumran that at that time different types of Hebrew existed simultaneously – QH and a kind of proto-mishnaic Hebrew, and for biblical texts, BH. No new texts were composed in BH so it is quite possible that the ability to write this language had vanished. But there is nothing that indicates that they *thought* they were writing BH when in reality they were writing QH. As Naudé writes ('Qumran Hebrew Syntax', 116), "[c]onsidering the number of texts produced by the Qumran community as well as their relative coherence, it is hard for anyone to believe that QH could be an imitation of BH".

[199] See, e.g., Hurvitz's statement quoted above on p. 44.

[200] For Ezekiel being partly LBH, see Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*; Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*.

[201] Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 153.

[202] The question of whether one should distinguish between a second and third Isaiah is irrelevant to the discussion here.

[203] Even though the consensus is not so strong with regard to Zech 9-14.

[204] See, e.g., the overview in Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period*, 15-19, and the literature there cited.

[205] Even though (understandably) slightly outdated, see Driver's view of the language of these books, *Introduction*, 505.

[206] 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 215 (= 'Early and Late', 21).

[207] *Entwicklung der hebräischen Sprache*, 16.

Hurvitz: "With regard to language no decisive proof for its lateness has been adduced…" [my translation, M.E.][208]

On Haggai and Zechariah:

Hurvitz: "…the language of [Haggai and (first) Zechariah] has still not recognizably moved away from classical
    biblical Hebrew...It seems that the reason for this is rooted mainly in the character of the prophetic literature which
    tends to be formulated in a semi-poetic language, a language that differs from prose in its strong adherence to the
    classical style and in its avoidance of clear linguistic innovations. But it is also possible that historical-
    chronological factors brought this about: The date of composition of Haggai and Zechariah is *the beginning* of the
    Persian period; and it is possible that at this time the language of the Bible was still preserved in its purity to a
    greater extent than in the years after that." [my translation, M.E., italics original][209]

Walter Baumgartner: "…an Haggai und Zacharia lässt sich noch keinerlei Veränderung beobachten."[210]

On Malachi:

Hurvitz: "With regard to language the clear late biblical Hebrew features are absent in the Book – similar to what
    we found in Haggai and Zechariah." [my translation, M.E.][211]

I will argue that the language of these books *is* EBH rather than being *close* to EBH because
1) EBH texts contain LBH features, occasionally even clear LBH features, and
2) no clear LBH features are shown to occur in these books, and the limited number of LBH fea-
tures that scholars point to in the books can at best only tentatively be ascribed to LBH.

    Few detailed diachronic analyses of the language the books have appeared. I know of the works
of Andrew Hill and Mark Rooker, and in addition, Hurvitz has sometimes analyzed words that ap-
pear in these books as LBH.

Hill. Hill, in his doctoral dissertation, two articles, and a commentary thoroughly analyzes the lan-
guage of the books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi and finds a few imprints of LBH on it. He
finds it to be earlier than the secondary additions to P (P^s), but later than JE, D, and the groundwork
of P (P^g).[212] He bases his research on Robert Polzin's typological approach.[213] This approach relies

---

[208] 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 216.
[209] 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 215 (= 'Early and Late', 20).
[210] 'Von der hebräischen Sprache und ihrer Geschichte', 609; note, however, that he regards the language of Malachi as
belonging with Ezra and Nehemiah (in agreement with Driver, *Introduction*, 505), a view which is in opposition to what
I will argue below. Also in opposition to my views is Rendsburg's recent statement about the language of Haggai and
Zechariah (among others) clearly dating from the Persian period, 'False Leads', 23.
[211] 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 216 (= 'Early and Late', 21). Also Sznejder, "…the books of Haggai,
Zechariah, and Malachi…are in correct biblical language, i.e., there are no traits of the mishnaic language in them",
'Literary Hebrew Language', 306 [my translation, M.E.].
[212] *Book of Malachi: Its Place*; 'Dating Second Zechariah'; 'Dating the Book of Malachi'; *Malachi. A New Translation*,
395-400.
[213] See *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*.

mainly on syntax but allows for vocabulary to complete the typological picture of a given text. Polzin developed a list of 19 syntactical and 84 lexicographical features characteristic of the language of the Chronicler and argued that these were (more or less) characteristic of LBH in general. He compared these features to P and concluded that both P^s and P^g were influenced by LBH and hence could be placed between EBH and LBH.[214]

Polzin's 19 syntactical features are quite problematic from the perspective of the dating of the language, and only about five can be shown to certainly and usefully reflect LBH. Gary Rendsburg has showed this,[215] and his research is corroborated by Ziony Zevit and Hurvitz.[216] With regard to the language of P, Hurvitz has consistently showed all strands of it to be EBH.[217]

However, since Hill's is the only detailed linguistic analysis of these books, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the LBH syntactic features that he finds in one or more of the books of Haggai, (first and second) Zechariah, and Malachi:[218]

1. Preference for verbal suffixes instead of תא+ suffix. This tendency is found in Zech 9-14 and the same tendency is found in LBH where it is generally somewhat stronger than in Zech 9-14.[219] The tendency continues in QH.[220]

2. Increased use of תא in the nominative case. There is one occurrence in Haggai and one in Zech 1-8, but as Rendsburg shows, this feature probably is found with more or less the same ratio throughout BH.[221]

3. Collectives construed as plurals. Haggai has three collectives construed as plurals (1.2, 12, 14) against one construed as singular (1.12) which according to Hill might place it closer to LBH than EBH. However, all three plural cases involve עם as subject found in the context *before* the verbs, and as Ian Young has showed,[222] this highly increases the likelihood of finding verbs in the plural, in EBH and LBH alike.

---

[214] pp. 85-122.

[215] 'Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P''.

[216] Zevit, 'Date of P', 493-501; Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 163-70. Note also Hill's critique of some of Polzin's features, 'Dating Second Zechariah', 114.

[217] See 'Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Material' and the literature cited therein.

[218] *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 47-75.

[219] According to Hill's calculations (*Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 47-51), Chronicles shows a ratio of ca. 10:1 in favour of the verbal suffix, and the non-memoir portions of Nehemiah has 23 verbal suffixes and do not use תא+ suffix at all. Zech 9-14 shows a ratio of ca. 5:1 which is similar to that of Ezra and the Nehemiah memoirs, and a little more than P^s, which has a ratio of ca. 4:1. JE and D on the other hand have a ratio of ca. 2:1. See also Striedl, 'Esther', 77; Bergey, *Book of Esther*, 85-89; Fredericks, *Qoheleth's Language*, 148-150; Muraoka, 'Verb Complementation', 97-98; Eskhult, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', 88; Muraoka, 'Morphosyntax and Syntax', 202-04.

[220] Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §400.08.

[221] 'Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'', 66. However, for a different evaluation, see Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 2, and the literature there cited; Schoors, *The Preacher*, 191-92; Schattner-Rieser, 'L'hébreu postexilique', 216; see also Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 88-90, but note that Rooker, even though he quotes Rendsburg, does not address his arguments (according to Rendsburg, the feature is found 52 times in BH, and among them 28 in Genesis-2Kings [albeit partly in clusters], against seven in Chronicles, four in Nehemiah, and one in Daniel).

[222] '*ʿAm* Construed as Singular and Plural', 53-54; note also his critique of Polzin's work on this category, '*ʿAm* Construed as Singular and Plural', 69-70.

4. Decreased use of the infinitive absolute as command and in paronomastic constructions. These uses of the infinitive absolute are not found in Haggai and Malachi. The infinitive absolute as command is not found in Zech 9-14 either (it is found in Zech 6.10), but as we have seen above, this use of the infinitive absolute is a fairly uncommon feature of BH in general.

5. Decreased use of the infinitive construct with B] and K] As Rendsburg points out,[223] Polzin is quite vague about this point, and to my knowledge no subsequent research has confirmed this as a trait of LBH.

6. Decreased use of yhiy>w Zech 9-14 and Malachi display this feature (actually Zech 9-14 does not use yhiy>w at all). Rendsburg points out that this feature has quite an uneven distribution in EBH texts,[224] and Hill correctly (albeit tentatively) ascribes this feature to what he calls 'the poetic tendencies of "oracular prose"'.[225]

7. Increased use of infinitive construct with l] Haggai and Zech 1-8 show a high frequency of this feature, but, as it turns out, not significantly higher than many EBH texts.[226]

It turns out that there is very little to go on. Only (1) and (4) point to a tendency in the direction of LBH, that is one feature in each of the books of Haggai, Zech 9-14, and Malachi. In the absence of other LBH grammatical features, this seems most reasonably explained as instances of personal style.

Subsequently, Hill looks for possible LBH words in the books by taking a list of 100 candidates for LBH words and checking to see how many are found in his books.[227] 84 of his LBH words are Polzin's 84 lexicographic features of LBH mentioned above, and 16 are the LBH words and expressions Hurvitz lists in two articles.[228] He finds the following LBH lexicographic features:

1. Non-use of ykinOa;[229] Haggai and Zech 1-8 use ynIa} exclusively.[230]

2. Use of q[;z instead of q[;x.[231] The root q[;z is used once in Zech 6.8, and q[;x is not found in the book. Both roots are found throughout EBH and LBH even though there is a preference for q[;z in

---

[223] 'Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'', 68.

[224] E.g., it occurs but seven times in the book of Deuteronomy; 'Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'', 70.

[225] His hesitation in relying on 'poetic tendencies' in the books is probably due to his view that they are generally comparable to narrative prose. He argues (*Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 4-5) for the narrative nature of the texts by reference to research by Hoftijzer on tae ('Remarks Concerning the Use of the Particle *'t*') and the research of Andersen and Freedman on prose particles in general (*Hosea*, 57-66). The frequency of tae and the other prose particles in the books point to them as being all narrative prose (except for Zech 9). Note however that a couple of instances of verb gapping in the oracles of Malachi, in 1.6 and 3.24, speak against this - O'Connor (*Hebrew Verse Structure*, 124-25) argues that this is a trait found in poetry only (even though Miller ['Patterns of Ellipsis'] points to examples of this in direct discourse embedded in narrative texts [e.g., Gen 42.7; 2Kgs 6.27]).

[226] Polzin himself admits that the difference in frequency between parts of his EBH texts and LBH is negligible, *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 60.

[227] *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 86-108.

[228] 'The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job' and 'The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code'.

[229] Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 87-88; see also Driver, 'Elohist', 222; Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, n. 35, p. 169; Fredericks, *Qoheleth's Language*, 141-46; Schoors, 'Pronouns in Qoheleth', 71-72; *The Preacher*, 47-48; Schattner-Rieser, 'L'hébreu postexilique', 196.

[230] Note Hurvitz's remark (*A Linguistic Study*, n. 35, p. 169) that in *some* texts "[the use of ynIa}] represents simply a stylistic peculiarity which does not necessarily reflect LBH usage…".

LBH writings.[232] However, of the 91 BH occurrences of the root, only ten are found in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, and there are, e.g., 15 occurrences in Samuel, 11 in Judges, and seven in Isaiah 1-39. Usage of the root can therefore not be said to point in the direction of LBH.

3. Use of postpositive רֹב in the sense of "a lot of".[233] This use is found in Zech 14.14. It is attested once in Job (26.3)[234] and twice in 1Kings (1.19, 25), but in Chronicles it is found 19 times.[235] Outside of Chronicles, however, it is found but once in Nehemiah (9.25) and once in QH (11Q14.9), and it is found neither in Ben Sira nor in the Mishna. Therefore it seems that this is not an expression pointing to LBH but attributable, rather, to the personal style of the author of Chronicles.

4. Use of מוצֶקֶת, "pipe/casting".[236] This word is found, in different meanings, in Zech 4.2 ("pipe") and 2Chr 4.3 ("casting")[237] only. It is not found in post-biblical Hebrew. No chronological implications can be ascribed to the use this word in Zechariah.

5. Use of שָׂטָן with definite article.[238] This word is found in Zech 3.1, 2, and in the prose tale of Job (*passim*).[239] Arguing for the lateness of the prose-tale of Job, Hurvitz points out that a definite image of The Satan is a concept that emerges in later times. If he is right, this would show *the text* of Zech 1-8 to be late since it refers to this extra-linguistic concept. It has little bearing on whether or not *the language* of the text is late.

6. Use of עָמַד עַל in the sense of "present oneself before/take one's stand on the side of" with the preposition governing a person (or God).[240] This is found in Zech 6.5, Job 1.6; 2.1(2x); 2Chr 11.13, and in QH, 1QSa 1.20. Hurvitz argues that this is a late expression when it means to stand next to or before someone. The EBH linguistic contrast is the more usual combination עָמַד לִפְנֵי (also found in LBH, Ben Sira, and QH). In the sense of taking one's stand on the side of *something*, we do find עָמַד עַל in EBH (Num 23.3, 15; Hab 2.1; Ps 36.5), but the fairly subtle distinction between the two uses of עָמַד עַל is correct. However, the scarcity of עָמַד עַל (pers.) and the fact that it in BH is found mostly in texts that are otherwise EBH makes it doubtful whether this is a genuine LBH expression or if it might not have been an option in EBH.

Again, none of the six features with any confidence point to LBH.

---

[231] Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 93.

[232] See also Kutscher, *Isaiah*, 34 and 314.

[233] Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 95; for an in-depth diachronic semantic analysis of the different uses of רֹב, see Margain, *Essais de sémantique*, 89-96; cf. also his 'Anachronismes linguistiques', 37.

[234] Note however that the parsing of this verse is ambiguous.

[235] 1Chr 12.41; 22.3, 4, 8; 29.2, 21; 2Chr 2.8; 9.1, 9; 14.14; 17.5; 18.1, 2; 24.11, 24; 30.13, 24; 32.5, 29; note also the very similar uses in 2Chr 11.23 and 16.8.

[236] Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 97.

[237] But note that the parallel verse in 1Kings (7.24) has a different noun, מֻצָק.

[238] Hurvitz, 'The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job', 19-20; Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 102, 104.

[239] The noun is found in EBH in the sense of "adversary". In the sense of "accuser", the word is also found without article in Ps 109.6 and 1Chr 21.1.

[240] Hurvitz, 'The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job', 25-26; Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 105.

Rooker. Rooker, more or less explicitly arguing for an eight century date of the text, analyzes some features of the Hebrew of Isaiah 40-66 and compares them to LBH features of Ezekiel.[241] He points to nine orthographical, morphological, lexical, and stylistic features (analyzing four of them) where Isaiah 40-66 consistently shows EBH usage and where LBH usage is found in Ezekiel, and he states in his conclusion that "…Ezekiel, from the exilic period as well as post-exilic Hebrew literature always indicates later linguistic features than those we find in Isaiah 40-66".[242]

Hurvitz. A few times in his writings, Hurvitz points to words and expressions in Isaiah 40-66, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi that appear to be late. I have found the following.

1. br:[}n̈, "west", Isa 43.5, 45.6, 59.19.[243] br:[}n̈ instead of the usual μ§" is used once in the Hebrew parts of Daniel and seven times in Chronicles, hinting to the possibility that it is a late word. However, it occurs six more times in the Bible, three times in Isaiah 40-66, once in the EBH Psalms 75 and 107, and once in Psalm 103. Psalm 103 uses some words that point to late language, but it is not a clear LBH text.[244] In later Hebrew the term replaces μ§" and it is found in Aramaic, usually used in the Targumim for the Hebrew μ§". So with eight out of its fourteen BH occurrences found in clear LBH texts and with its continuity in post-biblical Hebrew, it is possible that the word indicates LBH. However, with five occurrences in otherwise EBH texts, it is doubtful if the word was not an option also in EBH.

2. dj a̧K̨ , "together", Isa 65.25.[245] As for dj a̧K̨ , the biblical distribution is more congenial with an interpretation as a late term: One occurrence in Qohelet, one in Nehemiah, three in Ezra, and one in Chronicles. The term is found in Aramaic, adj K̨ , "together", and is used for wDj y" in the Targumim, but dj a̧K̨ it is not found (in the sense of "together") in post-biblical Hebrew. Isaiah 40-66 uses the usual term wDj y" nine times. With its seven occurrences in BH and no continuity, it is still quite possible that this was an LBH word. But the question remains whether its presence in the otherwise EBH of Isaiah 40-66 not shows that the word also was an option in EBH.

3. fb,v] Zech 1.7, and wl,s̈K̨i Zech 7.1.[246] In Zechariah we have these two occurrences of a Babylonian month name. These are indeed clear indicators of LBH,[247] but Hurvitz correctly does not regard them as important for the dating of the language of the prophet since they appear only in superscriptions.[248] In the main body of the book, in 7.3, 5; 8.19, we find references to a number of months but all are referred to in the common EBH style.

---

[241] 'Dating Isaiah 40-66'.

[242] 'Dating Isaiah 40-66', 312.

[243] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 113-16; 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 215 (= 'Early and Late', 21).

[244] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 107-30.

[245] Hurvitz, 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 215 (= 'Early and Late', 21).

[246] Hurvitz, 'Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', 215 (= 'Early and Late', 20).

[247] See Wagner, *Aramaismen*, 20; cf. also the short note by Friedberg, 'A New Clue', but note the critique by Larsson, 'Book of Esther', and see the response by Friedberg and de Caën, 'Dating the Composition'.

[248] For the linguistic and other differences between the superscriptions and the main bodies of prophetic books, see Floyd, 'Nature of the Narrative and the Evidence of Redaction'.

4. hLgm, "scroll", Zech 5.1, 2.[249] Otherwise the word occurs in Jeremiah (14x, all in chapter 36), in Ezekiel (4x), and Psalm 40 (1x). In post-biblical Hebrew it only occurs in mishnaic Hebrew.[250] Hurvitz shows how the word enters into northwest Semitic languages fairly late (it is not attested in Ugaritic or Canaanite) and may be an LBH word. The actual Hebrew distribution of it, lacking in clear LBH texts as well as in QH and Ben Sira makes this conclusion tentative.

5. rx'a(h) tyBe, "storehouse/treasure-house", Mal 3.10.[251] The expression occurs two more times in BH, Neh 10.39 and Dan 1.2. The common BH word for "storehouse/treasure-house" is rx'a, in the singular or the plural, without tyBe. rx'a(h) tyBe is quite possibly attested once at Qumran[252] and it is frequent in mishnaic Hebrew and in Aramaic, and in the Targumim it serves as translation of BH rx'a. This is possibly an LBH expression, even though its scarcity in the Hebrew prior to the Mishna necessitates caution in this pronouncement.

6. µWĵ r̀ẁ-Wĵ', "gracious and compassionate", Joel 2.13.[253] These two words are combined 11 times in BH, but three times the order is the opposite, -Wĵ ẁµ̀Wĵr", Exodus, Psalms 86 and 103. Outside of Joel, the order µWĵ r̀ẁ-Wĵ' is found in Jonah, Psalms 111, 112, 145,[254] Nehemiah (2x), and Chronicles. As pointed to in chapter three above (p. 40) with regard to ¹sĸ, and bhz, LBH seems to prefer a different word order than EBH. This may also be the case with µWĵ r̀ẁ-Wĵ', but Hurvitz points to no extra-biblical evidence to substantiate this. The scarcity of the phrase in EBH and the presence of the order µWĵ r̀ẁ-Wĵ' in the otherwise EBH of Joel make it uncertain if not both word orders were an option in EBH.

7. µynj rB] bv, "return graciously", Zech 1.16.[255] This is the only BH occurrence of µynj rB] "graciously" in combination with the verb bv, but once at Qumran, in the Isaiah scroll, a form of the verb bv from Isa 52.8 is supplied with µynj rB]. This very rare expression may be late, but such a pronouncement can only be made with a high degree of uncertainty.

8. tywz, "corner", Zech 9.15.[256] Outside of Zechariah, the word occurs in BH only in Ps 144.12,[257] with a slightly different meaning, "cornerstone". In post-biblical Hebrew it is not found before mishnaic Hebrew. Hurvitz shows how in the Targumim the word is used to translate various Hebrew words for "corner", "side", "end", hnPi, [lxe, txqm, haPe. Again, the scarcity of pre-mishnaic occurrences makes it uncertain if it indicative of lateness.

---

[249] Hurvitz, 'The Expression rpsetLgm', esp. 40-42.

[250] Even though there is a possible occurrence in a fragment at Qumran, 4Q421 8.2, which reads: …rps tl[. This might be reconstructed rps tl[gm.

[251] Hurvitz, 'rxwa(h)-tyb'.

[252] In a reconstruction in the 3QCopper Scroll, 8.1; see Hurvitz, 'rxwa(h)-tyb', n. 10, p. 81 and the literature there cited.

[253] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 104-06.

[254] These three are acrostic psalms and all three occurrences are in the j -line, so the word order is forced.

[255] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 49.

[256] Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 164-65.

[257] This part of Psalm 144 contains some words that may be late, see Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 164-69.

Interpretation. In the otherwise EBH of Isaiah 40-66, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi we find some features that *might* be imprints of LBH. How, then, should we interpret this fact? Our texts taken together are of the same length as 1Samuel, so the fairly small number of ambiguous words and expressions we have found is not impressive. And actually, even clearly late features are found in EBH texts.[258] The most instructive example of this is the word tWlhT[259] which is very frequent (about 80 of its 91 BH occurrences) in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles where it to a large extent replaces the earlier terms hk'l'mm and hk'Wlm. The extra-biblical evidence is equally convincing: It is an Aramaic loanword and is used for hk'l'mm and hk'Wlm in the Targumim, and in post-biblical Hebrew it almost completely replaces these two words. tWlhT, however, is found in EBH texts, e.g. once in Numbers, 1Samuel, and 1Kings, but this fact does not make it an EBH word, nor does it make Numbers, 1Samuel, and 1Kings LBH texts – LBH words are simply sometimes found in EBH texts. The crucial point is the accumulation of such features as is most notable in Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.[260]

Close scrutiny of Isaiah 40-66, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi might very well reveal more items that might be imprints of LBH,[261] but I wonder if this is any different from at least parts of Genesis-2Kings.[262] As a preliminary test I looked for LBH imprints on the very small corpus of 1Sam 1-3.[263] I found no LBH words there, and in 1Sam 3, I found no LBH grammatical features. But in 1Sam 1 and 2, there is a number of LBH grammatical features:[264]

1. Use of the preposition l[' instead of la, Three occurrences.[265]

[258] See Qimron, 'History of Early Hebrew', 350, and the literature there cited.

[259] See Hurvitz, *Transition Period*, 79-88; Margain, 'Anachronismes linguistiques', 39; Bergey, *Book of Esther*, 31-35; Rooker, 'Diachronic Analysis', 139-40; Schattner-Rieser, 'L'hébreu postexilique', 202-03.

[260] Cf. Hurvitz in e.g. 'Continuity and Innovation'; also Margain's remark, "Certain traits…ne prouveraient rien", 'Anachronismes linguistiques', 43. Attempts have been made at defining single chapters of Genesis-2Kings as reflecting LBH and hence being late, see e.g. Rofé, 'Betrothal of Rebekah' (late-dating Gen 24), but such attempts have been met with due criticism, see Qimron, 'History of Early Hebrew', n. 7, p. 352 (noting Rofé's research), "I…will say…that if we press the evidence too much we may find many more such "late" chapters in classical BH and thus destroy the credulity of the whole approach. Hurvitz rightly emphasized that a text can be considered with confidence as late only if it contains a substantial number of late features…"; cf. also Rendsburg, 'False Leads', 24-35.

[261] Driver has a list of items for Joel (*Joel and Amos*, 24) of which ¹/s seems the only likely candidate for an LBH word. Likewise Hill, *Book of Malachi: Its Place*, 108-31, carries out a lexical study of Malachi and finds a couple of features he regards as being concurrent with LBH (see his list in [8] on p. 130), of which the root lag II ("defile") seems to be the only likely candidate for an LBH feature.

[262] Cf. Eskhult's assessment, n. 166 above, and Qimron's remark in n. 260.

[263] Note that Rendsburg recently has argued that 1Sam 1-2 are northern compositions, 'False Leads', 37-45. Two of Brettler's ('1 Samuel 1-2') three suggestions for LBH features in 2Sam 2.27-36: the infinitive absolute r/j b] continuing a finite verb in 2.28, and the possible Aramaism μka}rb}l] in 2.29, have been correctly rebutted by Rendsburg ('False Leads', 37-39). As to Brettler's third LBH feature, the non-use of apodotic w in 2.36, see n. 269 below.

[264] By 'LBH grammatical features' I mean features known to EBH found more often in LBH.

[265] 1.10, 13; 2.11; see Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 41-42; Striedl, 'Esther', 77; Wagner, *Aramaismen*, n. 1a, p. 143; cf. Goshen-Gottstein, 'Linguistic Structure', 108; Muraoka, 'Morphosyntax and Syntax', 204; van Peursen, Conditional Sentences', 236-40. Note, however, that the two prepositions may interchange too much in EBH (see the opposite substitution in 2.34 and 3.12, and the long list of EBH interchanges in Sperber, *Historical Grammar*, 631-33) for the substitution of la, for l[' to count as an LBH feature; cf. the hesitation of Fredericks (*Qoheleth's Language*, 151-53) and Schoors (*The Preacher*, 200-01) in counting the interchange as an LBH feature.

2. Preference for verbal suffixes instead of ʾæt + suffix. 17 verbal suffixes[266] against no non-forced instances of ʾæt + suffix.[267]

3. Use of hyh + participle to express cursivity.[268] One occurrence (2.11).

4. Non-use of apodotic w in front of verbs. Two occurrences (2.16, 36)[269]

5. hlₓ ḥₐₓw pattern. One occurrence (2.28).[270]

6. Peculiar use of verb forms. (At least) three occurrences: frequentative wayyiqtol (1.7; 2.16) and non-past wayyiqtol (2.29).[271]

Of these, (2)-(5) are clearer LBH features than (1) and (6), but still, this is a remarkable frequency of LBH grammatical features. With this frequency of LBH features, 1Sam 1-3 is not characteristic of the corpus of EBH texts as a whole, but it goes to show that EBH texts can contain a number of LBH features and still count as EBH texts. It seems fair, then, to regard Isaiah 40-66, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi as EBH texts: they have their (expected) share of features that *may* belong to LBH, and no clear LBH features.

In sum, at least some post-exilic writers knew how to write just as good EBH as that of Genesis-2Kings. And it is important to note that these post-exilic prophetic texts only partly consist of the semi-poetic, oracular prose - parts of the texts are common (prophetic) narrative, see e.g. Hag 1.12-14; 2.10-13; Zech 1.4, 8-13; 2.1-7; 3.1-6; 4.1-5; 4.11-5.3; 5.5-6.11; 6.14-15; 7.11-14.

With the most reliable evidence of post-exilic EBH stemming from prophetic literature, from the point of view of traditional dating this might count simply as a continuation of prophetic jargon. But even if this were so, and if it were possible to show that EBH was pre-exilic Hebrew, the fact would remain that the exile did not put an end to the actual ability to produce this form of Hebrew.

IV. Post-exilic Hebrew

From the end of the exile and until the close of the Qumran corpus, then, there is attested at least four types of Hebrew, EBH, LBH, general QH, and a kind of proto-mishnaic Hebrew (The Copper Scroll; Miqṣat Maʿaśe ha-Torah). How are we to view the differences between the extant forms of

---

[266] 1.6 (2x), 7, 11(2x), 13, 19, 20, 22, 24 (3x), 28; 2.8, 25, 29; cf. n. 219 above.

[267] The two instances of ʾæt + suffix in 1.23 are forced because the verbs have a suffix already, and the one in 2.28 is forced because the verb is an infinitive absolute.

[268] See above, pp. 48-49.

[269] See above p. 51 and the references in n. 192. As Rendsburg ('False Leads', 39) correctly notes in the case of the non-use of apodotic w in 1Sam 2.36, this is a feature also found in other EBH texts, but my point here is that it is a feature more frequently found in LBH.

[270] Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 75; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §310.122; Talshir, 'Development of the Imperfect Consecutive Forms'; Morag, 'Qumran Hebrew', 154-55; Eskhult, *Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique*, 106; Joüon/Muraoka, §47d.

[271] 1Sam 1 uses many different verb forms in ways that might seem peculiar, but Joosten has explained them well in 'Tenses in I Samuel 1'; see also van der Merwe, 'Structure of I Samuel 1'. For the tendency to use the verb forms in peculiar ways in LBH, see the discussion of Joüon/Muraoka, §119za-b, above pp. 49-52 and the references in n. 187.

post-exilic Hebrew? Jackie Naudé's recent publications have clarified matters.[272] Drawing upon modern linguistic research in language change,[273] he first clarifies the concept 'language' and then the concept 'change'.[274] Language, he explains, is best seen as idiolect, the output of a single speaker, because language as e.g. a socio-political concept has proved unfruitful in linguistic research.

Regarding the concept 'change', he stresses the importance of distinguishing between the concept of 'change' and the concept of 'diffusion'. 'Change', he explains, is the imperfect transmission of language from mother to child, giving rise to hitherto unknown forms, whereas 'diffusion' is the spread of such forms.

Within this terminology, within the domain of syntax it means that no change has occurred between EBH and LBH, what has happened is a diffusion in LBH of changes that had already taken place in EBH. The actual changes we see are in the domain of vocabulary (e.g. loanwords ultimately of Persian origin). QH does not show many changes from LBH, but rather, in Naudé's words, "a large diffusion of forms that changed in the transition of Hebrew towards Late Biblical Hebrew".[275]

As for exilic and post-exilic BH Naudé suggests that we might "proceed from the presupposition of a coexistence of different styles of writing somewhere in a continuum between two poles, namely Late Biblical Hebrew and Early Biblical Hebrew".[276]

As for QH he believes it is "a situation where different grammars [i.e. idiolects]…exist next to each other in the author's/speaker's mind".[277]

It is not within the scope of Naudé's work to explain *why* there are differences,[278] but he provides an elegant descriptive framework of the actual differences that we see.

We can now turn to linguistically date the disputed EBH texts.[279] This is quite simple: Do we have EBH texts that are datable in regard to the distinction pre-exilic/post-exilic? Yes, as we saw above, at least some EBH texts, prophetic oracles and common (albeit prophetic) narrative alike, date to post-exilic times. This means that linguistically we (with due caution) should date the *remaining* EBH texts to around the time of the *datable* EBH texts, i.e. sometime after the exile, since

---

[272] 'Language of the Book of Ezekiel' and 'Qumran Hebrew Syntax'.
[273] He builds especially on Hale, *Theory and Method*, unavailable to me.
[274] 'Language of the Book of Ezekiel', 61-65.
[275] 'Qumran Hebrew Syntax', 128.
[276] 'Language of the Book of Ezekiel', 60. Note that he relies on the traditional dating of EBH texts.
[277] 'Qumran Hebrew Syntax', 116.
[278] For opinions in this respect, see Blau ('Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew', 30, and *passim*) who operates with three post-exilic types of Hebrew, LBH, General Qumran Hebrew and the language of the Miqṣat Maʿaśe ha-Torah. The presence of these different types of Hebrew side by side he explains by analogy with middle Arabic where different schools and traditions, according to Blau, resulted in different types of middle Arabic existing at the same time. See also Davies (*In Search of 'Ancient Israel'*, 103-05) who believes that the reason may be sociological, the differences between EBH and LBH being differences in register (for a socio-linguistic study of BH [from the point of view of a traditional dating of the texts], see Gianto, 'Variations in Biblical Hebrew').
[279] But note the reservation expressed in n. 161 above that linguistic dating cannot take into account the possibility that older looking texts may have been written later by writers who commanded the older language.

none of the inscriptions are as good matches as, e.g., Haggai or Zech 1-8 in that their Hebrew differs from EBH in orthography, morphology, and lexicon.[280] 'Post-exilic' is still very unspecific, but with our limited knowledge of the linguistic situation it seems prudent to stay unspecific.

V. Summary

In order to test the conclusions of Avi Hurvitz, I have adopted his approach of giving linguistic considerations precedence in the dating of BH texts. This dating only pertains to the final linguistic form of the texts and does not have a bearing on whether or not it was written earlier and re-worked later since various old forms of Hebrew are found in all subsequent stages of the language. This also means that the presence of older forms not necessarily shows the language of a text to be older, but it is the absence of newer forms that shows this. On the strength of consistent similarities with pre-exilic inscriptions pointed to in chapter three above, the Hebrew of Genesis-2Kings and other books was deemed to be earlier than that of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which on the strength of similarities with post-biblical Hebrew was deemed to be later. The relative dates of the language thus seem indisputable.

Deciding the absolute dates of the language is, however, a different matter. Due to scarcity of sources for the relevant periods, Hurvitz is content with the distinction of pre- versus post-exilic, and here there is no question for him: EBH is pre-exilic and LBH is post-exilic.

However as we saw in chapter three above, even though EBH is close to the Hebrew of pre-exilic inscriptions, it does not conform to them entirely, even with the ones closest to it: the very short Siloam inscription contains a couple of words and forms unknown to or very rare in BH. Given no alternatives, it would be quite satisfactory to date EBH to around the time of this form of Hebrew because different forms of Hebrew at other times have been known to coexist. But, as pointed to above, there are texts that EBH *does* conform to entirely, even with regard to the presence of occasional LBH features, and these texts are post-exilic. Therefore, if one gives precedence to linguistic considerations, without ruling out a pre-exilic date one would prefer a post-exilic date for the (final linguistic form of the) EBH texts.

In this way EBH comes closer to LBH in time, suggesting that there may have been a coexistence of these two forms of BH, just as there was a coexistence of typologically earlier and later types of Hebrew at Qumran. The discussion of the differences between EBH and LBH concluded that these differences may have been the result of either a stylistic choice or of an unsuccesful attempt at imitation. The increased likelihood of a coexistence of EBH and LBH was deemed to diminish the likelihood of LBH being the result of imitation.

---

[280] Cf. p. 41 above; see also Knauf, 'War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?'.

Dansk sammenfatning - Studier i bibelsk hebraisk syntaks og datering

Nærværende afhandling består af fem studier som er skrevet og udgivet uafhængigt af hinanden. De er blevet opdateret og forsynet med interne henvisninger.

De første to studier, som udgør kapitel et og ekskursen hertil, omhandler brugen af den bestemte artikel i bibelsk og efterbibelsk hebraisk, nærmere betegnet en særlig brug af artiklen som påpeges af enkelte forskere og af de større grammatikker. I denne kategori, som ikke er kendt fra andre artikelsprog, samles de forekomster af artiklens brug som synes uforklarlige og hvor den bestemte artikel synes at fungere som ubestemt artikel. Man har desuden fremført at kategoriens eksistens kan have diakrone implikationer da det hævdes at forekomsterne af kategorien aftager med tiden. I afhandlingen analyseres alle til kategorien anførte forekomster, og det forsøges godtgjort at denne ikke eksisterer da forekomsterne alle kan forstås som normal brug af den bestemte artikel. Hermed overflødiggøres antagelsen af at kategoriens eksistens kan have diakrone implikationer.

I kapitel to søges kortlagt de forskellige bibelsk hebraiske måder at anvende nægtelser sammen med infinitiver. Visse af disse kombinationer antages normalt at være klare kendetegn på sen bibelsk hebraisk. Det bekræftes i kapitlet at de sandsynligvis er kendetegn på sen bibelsk hebraisk, men det påpeges at forsigtighed er nødvendig da de forekommer oftere end hidtil antaget i tekster skrevet på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk.

De sidste to kapitler placerer sig i diskussionen om datering af bibelsk hebraisk. Forskere har interesseret sig for bibelsk hebraisk sproghistorie i de seneste tohundrede år, og indtil for ti til femten år siden var der relativt få kontroverser på dette område. Det skyldes at sprogforskere tog udgangspunkt i den kronologi der var konsensus om i gammeltestamenteforskningen uden at stille spørgsmålstegn ved denne kronologi. Sommetider indgik sproglige overvejelser i datering af bøger, men eftersom der udover Den hebraiske Bibel kun fandtes få sproglige vidnesbyrd for den tidlige periode, var sprogforskere afhængige af at have en række daterbare bibelske tekster som kunne bruges til at etablere sproghistorien. Man havde brug for mindst to korpora som kunne dateres til forskellige perioder og som udviste regelmæssige sproglige forskelle.

Det blev klart at sådanne to korpora fandtes: Der er en række mindre men regelmæssigt forekommende forskelle i sproget mellem to grupper af tekster, sproget i Genesis til Kongebøgerne på den ene side og sproget i Ester, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemias og Krønikebøgerne på den anden. Førstnævnte blev dateret tidligere, før eksilet, og sidstnævnte senere, efter eksilet, og derfor kan de betegnes som hhv. tidlig bibelsk hebraisk og sen bibelsk hebraisk. Man anså tidlig bibelsk hebraisk som det standardsprog som de sene bibelske forfattere uden held forsøgte at reproducere. Sen bibelsk hebraisk blev derfor anset som værende tidlig bibelsk hebraisk i forfald.

Eftersom der for tiden ikke er konsensus om den gammeltestamentlige kronologi idet man har sat spørgsmålstegn ved den føreksilske datering af de på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk affattede tekster, påvirkes også sproghistorieforskningen – hvis revisionister ønsker at sendatere størstedelen af de gammeltestamentlige skrifter, må de forklare de sproglige forskelle. Et lille antal forskere har i de senere år argumenteret for en sendatering af sproget, og blandt disse præsenteres den dristigste hypotese af Fred Cryer. Han hævder at de sproglige forskelle de gammeltestamentlige skrifter imellem er ubetydelige og konkluderer at de må stamme fra det samme tidsrum.

Cryer stiller spørgsmål som er væsentlige og som kræver svar. Er de sproglige forskelle de gammeltestamentlige skrifter imellem betydelige eller ubetydelige? Kunne de gammeltestamentlige skrifter være skrevet i samme tidsrum? Findes der ud over Den hebraiske Bibel daterbare pejlemærker der kan etablere et omrids af den hebraiske sproghistorie?

Fra den modsatte side i kontroversen har den israelske sprogforsker Avi Hurvitz argumenteret mod de revisionistiske ideer udfra sproglige argumenter. Han påpeger at eftereksilske forfattere gentagne gange gennem træk fra talesproget røber at de er sene, og hævder at disse derfor ikke formåede at skrive tidlig bibelsk hebraisk. Af den grund må teksterne på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk være blevet til før eksilet.

Afhandlingen søger at påvise at begge disse positioner er forfejlede. I kapitel tre gennemgås Cryers argumenter, og det påpeges at der er små men klare og regelmæssigt forekommende forskelle i sproget de to korpora imellem. Dernæst påpeges det at det hebraiske indskriftsmateriale fungerer som pejlemærker og sandsynliggør at tidlig bibelsk hebraisk er en tidligere form for hebraisk end sen bibelsk hebraisk. Cryers arbejde er velkomment for så vidt det maner til refleksion, men det viser sig at hans argumenter må afvises.

I kapitel fire gennemgås Hurvitz's arbejde, og det bliver klart at han ikke forsvarer den traditionelle datering som den eneste mulige udfra et sprogligt perspektiv. Set i isolation viser det sig at sproglige overvejelser gør det mere sandsynligt at tekster affattet på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk stammer fra eftereksilsk tid. Der peges på to ting i denne forbindelse, 1) sen bibelsk hebraisk fremstår ikke som tidlig bibelsk hebraisk i forfald og kunne lige så vel være et resultat af visse forfatteres stilistiske valg, og 2) visse eftereksilske bøger viser sig at være skrevet på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk. Da de *omdiskuterede* skrifter affattet på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk sprogligt passer bedst ved siden af de *daterbare* skrifter affattet på tidlig bibelsk hebraisk, vil en sproglig datering antage at de stammer fra samme tid, dvs. efter eksilet.

Bibliography (list of works cited):

AHITUV, Shmuel, *Handbook of Hebrew Inscriptions*, *From the Period of the First Commonwealth and the Beginning of the Second Commonwealth (Hebrew, Philistine, Edomite, Moabite, Ammonite and the Bileam Inscription)* (The Biblical Encyclopaedia Library 7; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1992). [in Hebrew]

ANDERSEN, Francis I., and David N. Freedman, *Hosea* (Anchor Bible 24; New York: Doubleday, 1980).

AVIGAD, Nahman, 'The Epitaph of a Royal Steward from Siloam Village', *Israel Exploration Journal* 3 (1953), 137-52.

AZAR, Moshe, 'The Definite Article in the Mishna According to the Kaufmann Manuscript', *Hebrew Linguistics* 33-34-35 (Festschrift Gad Sarfatti; 1992), 17-31. [in Hebrew]

AZAR, Moshe, *Mishnaic Hebrew Syntax* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1995). [in Hebrew]

AZIZ, Yowell, 'Explicit and Implicit Reference in Arabic-English Translation', *Babel* 39 (1993), 129-50.

BAASTEN, Martin F.J., *Een paard van de koning. Bepaaldheid en onbepaaldheid van genetiefconstructies in het Bijbels Hebreeuws* (Unpublished MA dissertation; Leiden, 1992).

BAASTEN, Martin F.J., 'Nominal Clauses Containing a Personal Pronoun in Qumran Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 1-16.

BARR, James, ''Determination' and the Definite Article', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989), 307-35.

BAUER, Hans and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1922).

BAUMGARTNER, Walter, 'Was wir heute von der hebräischen Sprache und ihrer Geschichte wissen', *Anthropos* 35/36 (1940-41), 593-616.

BEESTON, Alfred F.L., *The Arabic Language Today* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1970).

BENDAVID, Abba, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* (2 vols.; Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1967-1971). [in Hebrew]

BENOIT, Pierre, Jósef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux (eds.), *Les grottes de Murabba'ât* (Discoveries in the Judean Desert II; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961).

BERGEY, Ronald L., 'Late Linguistic Features in Esther', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 75 (1984-85), 66-78.

BERGEY, Ronald L., *The Book of Esther - Its Place in the Linguistic Milieu of Post-Exilic Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Study in Late Biblical Hebrew* (Doctoral dissertation, Dropsie College, 1983; Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1985).

BERGSTRÄSSER, Gotthelf, *Hebräische Grammatik*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1929).

BibleWorks for Windows, Release Version 4.0. [CD-ROM]

Biblia Hebraica, Rudolf Kittel (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (3rd ed.; Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1937).

BIRNBAUM, Gavriel, *Determination of the Noun in the Language of the Mishna According to the Kaufmann Manuscript* (MA dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand; Johannesburg, 1983). [in Hebrew]

BIRNBAUM, Gavriel, 'Generic Determination and Superfluous Determination in the Language of the Mishna', in Menahem Z. Kaddari and Shimon Sharvit (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew*

Language and the Talmudic Literature, Dedicated to the Memory of Dr. Menahem Moreshet (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1989), 43-54. [in Hebrew]

BLAU, Joshua, 'Remarks on some Syntactic Trends in Modern Standard Arabic', *Israel Oriental Studies* (1973), 172-231.

BLAU, Joshua, 'The Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew in Light of Arabic Diglossia and Middle Arabic', *Leshonenu* 60 (1997), 21-32. [in Hebrew]

BLOOMFIELD, Leonard, *Language* (New York: Holt, 1933).

Book of Ben Sira, The. Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language/Shrine of the Book, 1973).

BRETTLER, Marc, 'The Composition of 1 Samuel 1-2', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997), 601-12.

BROCKELMANN, Carl, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungvereins Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1956).

BURTON-ROBERTS, Noël, 'On the Generic Definite Article', *Language* 52 (1976), 427-48.

CAËN, Vincent de, 'Hebrew Linguistics and Biblical Criticism: A Minimalist Programme', *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3 (2001), Article 6. [e-journal]

CARMIGNAC, Jean, 'Un aramaïsme biblique et qumrânien: l'infinitif placé après son complément d'object', *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1966), 503-20.

CARMIGNAC, Jean, 'L'emploi de la négation יא dans la Bible et à Qumrân', *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1974), 407-13.

CHARLESWORTH, James H., *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr-Siebeck/Westminster-John Knox, 1991).

CHESTERMAN, Andrew, *On Definiteness. A Study with Special Reference to English and Finnish* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

CORRIENTE, Federico, 'Marginalia on Arabic Diglossia and Evidence thereof in Kit~b al-Ag~nя', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975), 38-61.

CRYER, Frederick H., 'The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel', in Knud Jeppesen, Kirsten Nielsen, and Bent Rosendal (eds.), *In The Last Days. On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period* (Festschrift Benedict Otzen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994), 185-198.

Damascus Document. Magen Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, 1992).

DANBY, Herbert, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).

DAVIES, Philip R., *In Search of 'Ancient Israel'* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

DAVIES, Philip R., 'Linguistic Analysis versus Social History: Assumption, Contradiction, and Circularity', unpublished paper read to the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew section of the 2001 meeting of the European Association of Biblical Studies.

Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library, 2 (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1999). [CD-ROM]

DRIVER, Samuel R., 'On some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist', *Journal of Philology* 11 (1882), 201-36.

DRIVER, Samuel R., *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and some other Syntactical Questions* (3rd revised and improved ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892).

DRIVER, Samuel R., *The Books of Joel and Amos. With Introduction and Notes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898).

DRIVER, Samuel R., *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (8th ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909).

EHRENSVÄRD, Martin, 'Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 11 (1997), 29-40. [=An earlier version of chapter three of the present dissertation]

EHRENSVÄRD, Martin, 'Negating the Infinitive in Biblical Hebrew', *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12 (1999), 146-64. [=An earlier version of chapter two of the present dissertation]

EHRENSVÄRD, Martin, 'An Unusual Use of the Article in Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 68-76. [=An earlier version of the excursus to chapter one of the present dissertation]

EHRENSVÄRD, Martin, 'Determination of the Noun in Biblical Hebrew', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 14 (2000), 301-14. [=An earlier version of chapter one of the present dissertation]

EHRENSVÄRD, Martin, 'Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts', forthcoming in Ian Young (ed.) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, fall 2002). [= Chapter four of the present dissertation]

ELWOLDE, John F., 'Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary between the Bible and the Mishnah', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 17-55.

ESKHULT, Mats, *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Uppsala University Doctoral Dissertation; Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 12; Uppsala/Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1990).

ESKHULT, Mats, 'Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 84-93.

EWALD, G. Heinrich A., *Hebräische Sprachlehre* (8th ed.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1870).

FERGUSON, Charles A., 'Diglossia', *Word* 15 (1959), 325-40.

FISHBANE, Michael, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

FLOYD, Michael H., 'The Nature of the Narrative and the Evidence of Redaction in Haggai', *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (1995), 470-90.

FOLMER, Margaretha L., *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation* (Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 68; Louvain: Peeters, 1995).

FREDERICKS, Daniel C., *Qoheleth's Language: Re-Evaluating its Nature and Date* (Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 3; Lewiston, New York: Mellen, 1988).

FRIEDBERG, Albert D., 'A New Clue in the Dating of the Composition of the Book of Esther', *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000), 561-63.

FRIEDBERG, Albert D., and Vincent de Caën, 'Dating the Composition of the Book of Esther: Response to Larsson', forthcoming in *Vetus Testamentum*; available on the internet at: http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~decaen/papers/

GARR, W. Randall, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine 1000-586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).

GESENIUS, Wilhelm, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1815).

GESENIUS, Wilhelm, *Hebräische Grammatik, völlig umgearbeitet von E. Kautzsch* (28th ed.; Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1909).

GEWIRTZ, Stanley, 'Of Syntax and Style in the "Late Biblical Hebrew"-"Old Canaanite" Connection', *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 18 (1986), 25-29.

GIANTO, Agustinus, 'Variations in Biblical Hebrew', *Biblica* 77 (1996), 493-508.

GIBSON, John C.L., *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar. Syntax* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994).

GIVÓN, Talmy, 'The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect', in Charles N. Li (ed.), *Symposium on the Mechanisms of Syntactic Change* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1977), 181-254.

GLINERT, Lewis, *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

GODDARD, Burton L., *The Origin of the Hebrew Infinitive Absolute in the Light of Infinitive Uses in Related Languages and its Use in the Old Testament* (unpublished Harvard Divinity School Dissertation, 1943).

GOLDFAYN, Tal, *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, Moshe H., 'Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents', in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (eds.), *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 101-37.

GRABBE, Lester L., *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period. Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000).

GRIMM, Hans-Jürgen, *Untersuchungen zum Artikelgebrauch im Deutschen* (Leipzig: Enzyklopädie, 1986).

HALE, Mark, *Theory and Method in Historical Linguistics* (Unpublished manuscript; Montreal: Concordia University, 1997).

HAWKINS, John, *Definiteness and Indefiniteness* (London: Croom Helm, 1978).

HILL, Andrew E., *The Book of Malachi: Its Place in Post-Exilic Chronology Linguistically Reconsidered* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan; Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1981).

HILL, Andrew E., 'Dating Second Zechariah: A Linguistic Reexamination', *Hebrew Annual Review* 6 (1982), 105-34.

HILL, Andrew E., 'Dating the Book of Malachi: A Linguistic Reexamination', in Carol L. Meyers and Michael O'Connor (Eds.), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1983), 77-89.

HILL, Andrew E., *Malachi. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible 25d; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1998).

HOFTIJZER, Jacob, 'Remarks Concerning the Use of the Particle 't in Classical Hebrew', *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14 (1965), 1-99.

HURVITZ, Avi, 'The Chronological Significance of 'Aramaisms' in Biblical Hebrew', *Israel Exploration Journal* 18 (1968), 234-40.

HURVITZ, Avi, 'A Diachronic Chiasm in Biblical Hebrew', in *The Bible and the History of Israel. Studies in Honour of Jacob Levor* (Tel-Aviv, 1972), 248-55. [in Hebrew]

HURVITZ, Avi, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew. A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972). [in Hebrew]

HURVITZ, Avi, 'Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts', *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973), 74-79.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered', *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974), 17-34.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code. A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology', *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974), 24-56.

Hurvitz, Avi, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Document and the Book of Ezekiel. A New Approach to an Old Problem* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 20; Paris: Gabalda, 1982).

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Hebrew Language in the Persian Period', in Benjamin Mazar (general ed.), *The History of the People of Israel* vol. 6: Chaim Tadmor (ed.), *Return to Zion - The Days of Persian Rule* (Jerusalem, 1983), 210-23; 306-09. [in Hebrew]

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Language of the Priestly Source and its Historical Setting – The Case for an Early Date', in *Proceedings of the Eigth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 16-21, 1981, Panel Sessions, Bible Studies and Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1983), 83-94.

Hurvitz, Avi, Review of Daniel C. Fredericks, *Qohelet's Language: Re-Evaluating its Nature and Date*, *Hebrew Studies* 31 (1990), 144-54.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'rxwa(h)-tyb –The History of a Biblical Administrative-Economic Term', *Eretz-Israel* 24 (1994), 78-82. [in Hebrew]

Hurvitz, Avi, 'Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew - the Case of 'Semantic Change' in Post-Exilic Writings', in Takamitsu Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (Abr-Nahrain Supplement 4; Louvain: Peeters, 1995), 1-10.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Origins and Development of the Expression rpsetLjh: A Study in the History of Writing-Related Terminology in Biblical Times', in Michael V. Fox, V. Avigdor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, Michael L. Klein, Baruch J. Schwartz, and Nili Shupak (eds.), *Texts, Temples, and Traditions. A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 37*-46*. [in Hebrew]

Hurvitz, Avi, 'Early and Late in the Language of the Bible - the Nature and Character of Late Biblical Hebrew', in Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.), *Chapters in the Periods of Hebrew. Shoshanna Bahat Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1997), 15-28. [in Hebrew]

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Historical Quest for "Ancient Israel" and the Linguistic Evidence of the Hebrew Bible: Some Methodological Observations', *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997), 301-15.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Linguistic Status of Ben Sira as a link between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographical aspects', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 72-86.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'Further Comments on the Linguistic Profile of Ben Sira: Syntactical Affinities with Late Biblical Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 132-45.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'The Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics for the Historical Study of Ancient Israel', in Ron Margolin (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997, Division A, The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999), 21*-33*.

Hurvitz, Avi, 'Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the

Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew', in André Lemaire and Magne Sæbø (eds.), *Congress Volume, Oslo 1998* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 143-60.

HURVITZ, Avi, 'Once Again: The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch and its Historical Age. A Response to J. Blenkinsopp', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000), 180-91.

ISAKSSON, Bo, *Studies in the Language of Qoheleth with Special Emphasis on the Verbal System* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 10; Uppsala/Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1987).

JENNI, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (2 vols.; Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971-76).

JOOSTEN, Jan, 'Workshop: Meaning and Use of Tenses in I Samuel 1', in Ellen van Wolde (ed.), *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Biblical Interpretation Series 29; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 72-83.

JOOSTEN, Jan, 'Pseudo-Classicisms in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 146-59.

JOÜON, Poul, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, Translated and Revised by Takamitsu Muraoka* (2 vols.; Subsidia Biblica, 14.1-2; Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1991).

KADDARI, Menahem Z., *Post-Biblical Hebrew Syntax and Semantics. Studies in Diachronic Hebrew* (2 vols.; Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1991-94). [in Hebrew].

KESTERSON, John C., *Tense Usage and Verbal Syntax in Selected Qumran Documents* (Doctoral disseration, The Catholic University of America; Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1984).

KISTER, Menahem, 'A Contribution to the Interpretation of Ben Sira', *Tarbiz* 59 (1990), 303-78. [in Hebrew]

KNAUF, Ernst A., 'War 'Biblisch-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?', *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 3 (1990), 11-23.

KÖNIG, Fr. Eduard, *Historisch comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1897).

KROPAT, Arno, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 16; Giesen: Töpelmann, 1909).

KUTSCHER, E. Yechezkel, 'The Hebrew and Aramaic Letters of Bar-Koseba and his Contemporaries. Part II: The Hebrew Letters', *Leshonenu* 26 (1961), 7-23; = *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 54*-70*. [in Hebrew]

KUTSCHER, E. Yehezkel, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

KUTSCHER, E. Yehezkel, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem/Leiden: Magnes Press/Brill, 1982).

LACA, Brenda, 'Universalität und Einzelsprachlichkeit im bereich der Nominaldetermination: Artikelfunktion und Artikelfunktionen', in Jörn Albrecht, Jens Lüdtke, and Harald Thun (eds.), *Energeia und Ergon. Sprachliche Variation, Sprachgeschichte, Sprachtypologie. Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 300, vol. 3; Tübingen: Narr, 1988), 209-219.

LARSSON, Gerhard, 'Is the Book of Esther Older than has been Believed?', *Vetus Testamentum* 52 (2002), 130-31.

MARGAIN, Jean, 'Observations sur 1 Chroniques 22. À propos des anachronismes linguistiques dans la Bible', *Semitica* 24 (1974), 35-43.

MARGAIN, Jean, *Essais de sémantiques sur l'hébreu ancien. Monèmes fonctionnels et autonomes. Modalités* (Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'etudes chamito-semitiques supplement 4; Paris: Geuthner, 1976).

Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael: H. Saul Horovitz and Israel A. Rabin (eds.), *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael cum variis lectionibus et adnotationibus* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrman, 1960).

MERWE, Christo H.J. van der, 'Workshop: Text Linguistics and the Structure of I Samuel 1', in Ellen van Wolde (ed.), *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Biblical Interpretation Series 29; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 157-65.

MEYER, Max, *Die Determinationsverhältnisse im Hebräischen* (Inaugural-Dissertation, Universität zu Freiburg i. B.; Munich: Heller, 1913).

MILLER, Cynthia L., 'Patterns of Ellipsis in Prose and Verse', unpublished paper read to the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section of the 1997 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.

MORAG, Shlomo, 'Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations', *Vetus Testamentum* 38 (1988), 148-64.

MÜLLER, Augustin R., 'Zu den Artikelfunktionen im Hebräischen', in Walter Gross, Hubert Irsigler, and Theodor Seidl (eds.): *Text, Methode und Grammatik. Wolfgang Richter zum 65. Geburtstag* (St. Ottilien: Eos, 1991), 313-330.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem/Leiden: Magnes Press/Brill, 1985).

MURAOKA, Takamitsu, 'Verb Complementation in Qumran Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1997), 92-149.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu, and Bezalel Porten, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. 1, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 32; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1998).

MURAOKA, Takamitsu, 'The Participle in Qumran Hebrew with Special Reference to its Periphrastic Use', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 188-204.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu, 'An Approach to the Morphosyntax and the Syntax of Qumran Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 193-214.

NAUDÉ, Jackie A., 'The Language of the Book of Ezekiel. Biblical Hebrew in Transition?', *Old Testament Essays* 13 (2000), 46-71.

NAUDÉ, Jackie A., 'Qumran Hebrew Syntax in the Perspective of a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion', *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26 (2000), 105-32.

NAVEH, Joseph, *On Sherd and Papyrus. Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from the Second Temple, Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992). [in Hebrew]

NAVEH, Joseph and Jonas C. Greenfield, 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period', in William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 115-29.

New Revised Standard Version. The Holy Bible Containing the Old and the New Testament (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

NICCACCI, Alviero, 'Analysing Biblical Hebrew Poetry', *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 74 (1997), 77-93.

NÖLDEKE, Theodor, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1898).

NÖLDEKE, Theodor, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg: K.J. Trübner, 1910).

O'CONNOR, Michael P., *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980).

ÓLAFSSON, Sverrir, 'Late Biblical Hebrew - Fact or Fiction?', in Zdzislaw J. Kapera (ed.), *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jósef Tadeusz Milik* (Krakow: Enigma Press, 1992), 135-47.

PÉREZ FERNÁNDEZ, Miguel, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew* (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1997).

PEURSEN, W.Th. van, 'Negation in the Hebrew of Ben Sira', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 223-43.

PEURSEN, W.Th. van, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira* (Private Edition of Unpublished Leiden University Doctoral Dissertation, 1999).

PEURSEN, W.Th. van, 'Conditional Sentences with μαιin the Protasis in Qumran Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 215-31.

POLAK, Frank H., 'New Means...New Ends: Biblical Scholarship and Computer Data', in R. Ferdinand Poswick (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Colloquium Bible and Computer: Desk and Discipline – The Impact of Computers on Bible Studies (Amsterdam, 15-18 August 1994)* (Paris: Campion, 1995), 282-312.

POLAK, Frank H., 'The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative', *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 26 (1998), 59-105.

POLZIN, Robert, *Late Biblical Hebrew. Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 12; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).

PORTEN, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, vol. 1 *Letters* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1986).

QIMRON, Elisha, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986).

QIMRON, Elisha, 'Consequtive and Conjunctive Imperfect: The Form of the Imperfect with *Waw* in Biblical Hebrew', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 77 (1986-87), 149-61.

QIMRON, Elisha, 'Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents', in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10; Leiden/New York/Cologne/Jerusalem: Brill/Magnes Press/Yad Izhaq Ben Zvi, 1992), 349-61.

RABIN, Chaim, 'Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew', in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (eds.), *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 144-61.

RABIN, Chaim, *Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Academon, 1968). [in Hebrew]

RABIN, Chaim, *Encyclopaedia Biblica* VI, s. v. tyrb[i(Jerusalem: Bialik, 1971), cols. 51-73. [in Hebrew]

RABIN, Chaim, 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century', in Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century 2. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), 1007-39.

RABIN, Chaim, *Die Entwicklung der hebräischen Sprache* (Veröffentlichungen der Hochschule für jüdische Studien Heidelberg 2; Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1988).

RENDSBURG, Gary A., 'Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'', *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 12 (1980), 65-80.

RENDSBURG, Gary A., *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew* (New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1990).

RENDSBURG, Gary A., 'Some False Leads in the Identification of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Case of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2:27-36', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002), 23-46.

RENZ, Johannes and Wolfgang Röllig, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik* I (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlige Buchgesellschaft, 1995).

ROBBINS, Beverly L., *The Definite Article in English Transformations* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968).

ROBERTSON, David A., *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertaion Series 3; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1972).

ROFÉ, Alexander, 'An Enquiry into the Betrothal of Rebekah', in Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Steggemann (eds.), *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 27-39.

ROOKER, Mark F., 'The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew', *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988), 199-214.

ROOKER, Mark F., *Biblical Hebrew in Transition. The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series 90; Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

ROOKER, Mark F., 'Diachronic Analysis and the Features of Late Biblical Hebrew', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994), 135-44.

ROOKER, Mark F., 'Dating Isaiah 40-66: What does the Linguistic Evidence Say?', *Westminster Theological Journal* 58 (1996), 303-12.

SÁENZ-BADILLOS, Angel, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

SASSON, Victor, 'The Siloam Tunnel Inscription', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 114 (1982), 111-17.

SCHATTNER-RIESER, Ursula, 'L'hébreu postexilique', in Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz and André Lemaire (eds.), *La Palestine à l'époque perse* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1994), 189-224.

SCHOORS, Antoon, 'The Pronouns in Qoheleth', *Hebrew Studies* 30 (1989), 71-87.

SCHOORS, Antoon, *The Preacher Sought Pleasing Words. A Study in the Language of Qoheleth* (Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 41; Louvain: Peeters, 1992).

SCHÜLE, Andreas, 'Zur Bedeutung der Formel *wajjehi* im Übergang zum mittelhebräischen Tempussystem', in Andreas Wagner (ed.), *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 156; Freiburg, Schweiz/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 115-25.

SCHÜLE, Andreas, *Die Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament. Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments, 270; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000).

SEOW, Choon-Leong, 'Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qohelet', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996), 643-66.

SHARVIT, Shimon, 'Modal Infinitive Clauses in Mishnaic Hebrew', in Moshe Bar-Asher, Moshe Garsiel, Devorah Dimant, and Yeshayahu Maori (eds.), *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* 3 (Moshe Goshen-Gottstein in memoriam; Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1993), 413-37. [in Hebrew]

SMITH, Mark S., *The Origins and Development of the* Waw-*Consecutive. Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran* (Harvard Semitic Studies 39; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991).

SMITH, Mark S., 'Grammatically Speaking: The Participle as a Main Verb of Clauses (Predicative Participle) in Direct Discourse and Narrative in Pre-Mishnaic Hebrew', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 278-332.

SMITH, Mark S., 'The Infinitive Absolute as Predicative Verb in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey', in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 256-67.

SOISALON-SOININEN, Ilmari, 'Der Infinitivus constructus mit l im Hebräischen', *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972), 82-90.

SPERBER, Alexander, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to their Solution* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).

SPIECKERMANN, Hermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur der Alten und Neuen Testaments 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

STRIEDL, Hans, 'Untersuchung zur Syntax und Stilistik des hebräischen Buches Esther', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1937), 73-108.

SWIGGERS, Pierre, 'Nominal Sentence Negation in Biblical Hebrew: The Grammatical Status of אֵין, in Karel Jongeling, Heleen L. Murre van den Berg, and Lucas van Rompay (eds.), *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 17; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 173-79.

SZNEJDER, M.B., 'The Literary Hebrew Language', part 1, *Leshonenu* 6 (1934-35), 301-26. [in Hebrew]

TALSHIR, David, 'The Development of the Imperfect Consecutive Forms in Relation to the Modal System', *Tarbiz* 56 (1987), 585-91. [in Hebrew]

TORCZYNER, Harry, Lankester Harding, Alkin Lewis, and James L. Starkey, *Lachish 1 (Tell ed Duweir). The Lachish Letters* (The Welcome Archeological Research Expedition to the Near East Publications vol. 1; London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1938).

TOV, Emanuel, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis/Assen/Maastricht: Fortress/Van Gorcum, 1992).

ULRICH, Eugene C., 'The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and the Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible', in Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Sha'arei Talmon. Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 267-91.

VERHEIJ, Arian J.C., *Verbs and Numbers. A Study of the Frequencies of the Hebrew Verbal Tense Forms in the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles* (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990).

VERHEIJ, Arian J.C., 'Early? Late?…A Response to F.C. Cryer', *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 11 (1997), 41-43.

WACHOLDER, Ben Zion, Martin G. Abegg, and James Bowley, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls* 1-4 (Washington D.C.: Biblical Archeological Society, 1991-96).

WAGNER, Max, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 96; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966).

WEIPPERT, Manfred, 'Die Petition eines Erntearbeiters aus Mᵉṣad Ḥᵃšavyāhū und die Syntax althebräischer erzählender Prosa', in Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann (eds.), *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 449-66.

WERTH, Paul, 'Articles of Association: Determiners and Context', in Johan van der Auwera (ed.), *The Semantics of Determiners* (London: Croom Helm, 1980), 250-289.

Westminster Theological Seminary Hebrew Morphology and Lemma Database (=WTM, Release 3, 1998-99).

WISE, Michael O., 'Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of the Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran', *Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 3 (1992), 124-67.

YOUNG, Ian, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 5; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1993).

YOUNG, Ian, 'The "Archaic" Poetry of the Pentateuch in the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch and 4QExodᶜ', *Abr-Nahrain* 35 (1998), 74-83.

YOUNG, Ian, '*ʿAm* Construed as Singular and Plural in Hebrew Biblical Texts: Diachronic and Textual Perspectives', *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12 (1999), 48-82.

YOUNG, Ian, 'Notes on the Language of 4QCantᵇ', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52 (2001), 122-131.

ZEVIT, Ziony, 'Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P', *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982), 481-511.

ZIMMERLI, Walther, *Ezechiel*, vol. 2 (Biblischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament 13. 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969).