9 Ancient Hebrew

Richard C. Steiner

This chapter is dedicated to my esteemed teacher, Professor Henry M. Hoenig-swald. (For the system of transliteration employed in this chapter see note p. 172)

Ancient Hebrew was the language of the Israelite tribes who, at the beginning of the first millennium BCE, established a united kingdom in the land formerly known as Canaan. After the reigns of David and his son, Solomon, the united kingdom split into the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom of Judah, the latter remaining loyal to the Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem, the former being ruled by a series of dynasties until its destruction by the Assyrians in 722 BCE.

The Babylonians conquered Judah in 586 BCE, exiling its people and razing the Temple that Solomon had built in Jerusalem. The Persians, who made Judah a province of their empire, allowed Jewish exiles to return and rebuild the Temple. The Hellenistic period saw the rise of an independent Judean state under the Hasmonean dynasty. The Romans brought an end to this independence, appointing Herod as their governor. Two revolts against the Romans had disastrous results. The first ended in the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. The second, led by Bar-Kokhba in 132–135 CE, emptied Judea of its Jewish inhabitants; those who were not killed or deported fled to Galilee in the north.

The two great bodies of literature in ancient Hebrew, composed during the period when it was a living language, are biblical literature and tannaitic (early Rabbinic) literature, including the code of Jewish law known as the Mishnah and legal commentaries to the Pentateuch such as the Mekhilta, the Sifra and the Sifre. (All of the citations from tannaitic literature in this chapter are from reliable vocalized manuscripts; they may disagree with standard editions and dictionaries.) The oldest dated manuscripts of these works are from the ninth century CE, but almost all of the biblical books are represented among the fragmentary scrolls from the Dead Sea (Qumran), believed to date from around the first century BCE. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls are also Hebrew versions of apocryphal books such as Jubilees (previously known from translations into Greek, Ethiopic, etc.), as well as Hebrew works authored by the Qumran sectarians themselves. There are also hundreds of inscriptions written by native speakers, ranging in time from *c.* 1200 BCE to 132–135 CE (Bar-Kokhba letters). The Canaanite glosses written in cuneiform script in the Akkadian letters found at El-Amarna, Egypt, are from pre-

Israelite Canaan (fourteenth century BCE), but they are so similar to Hebrew that they are regularly cited as evidence for Proto-Hebrew.

The language of the Hebrew Bible is by no means monolithic. There is enough variation to justify distinguishing Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH; before 500 BCE) from Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH; after 500 BCE) and both of these from the archaic poetic dialect. The relative clause, for example, is introduced in SBH by *ʾăšär* 'that', but there is also an unrelated and more archaic dialectal counterpart *ša+ > šä+* which becomes increasingly common in LBH; in the poetic dialect, these conjunctions are sometimes replaced by the archaic *zu^w*, and asyndetic relative clauses are common.

Mishnaic (or Middle) Hebrew (MH) used to be viewed as an artificial scholastic jargon, but the prevalent view today is that MH was a colloquial idiom spoken until *c.* 200 CE and that it was descended from an older colloquial idiom (hereafter: Pre-MH) spoken in the biblical period. According to this view, LBH is a purely literary language whose non-SBH features come from Pre-MH.

MH frequently exhibits the culmination of developments begun in SBH and continued in LBH. Thus, the word *ʾe^ykâ^h* 'how' in the archaic poetic dialect changes to *ʾe^yk* in SBH, then to *he^yk* in LBH and finally to *he^yʾäk* in MH. Similarly, the perfective ≠ habitual opposition could be expressed in Proto-Northwest Semitic only in the past tense. In SBH, we find a new habitual future, in LBH, a new habitual infinitive, and in MH, a new habitual imperative (see p. 158).

On the other hand, MH *täpïʾl:â^h zo^w* 'this prayer' (Berakhot 4:2), with its *t*-less and article-less demonstrative adjective reminiscent of Phoenician, is actually more archaic than its SBH counterpart, *hat:ăpïʾl:â^h haz:oʾt* (2 Sam. 7:27). The same goes for the MH relative conjunction *šä+* in comparison with SBH *ʾăšär* (see above and Relative Clauses, p. 171). The biblical evidence shows that the absence of the article is characteristic of the archaic poetic dialect (see above) and that *zo^h/zo^w* and *šä+* were features of Pre-MH and of the northern dialect(s) of Hebrew. Clearly, MH is not a direct lineal descendant of SBH.

The literature of the Qumran sectarians, despite its being preserved in ancient copies, is, in some ways, a more problematic source for reconstructing the history of Hebrew in ancient times. Most scholars believe that the language of this literature owes more to imitation of the Bible than to the Hebrew vernacular of the period.

Other aspects of the sociolinguistic interplay of dialects (regional and social) and languages in Palestine are reflected in various biblical and Talmudic passages: Judg. 12:5–6, Isa. 36:11–13, Neh. 13:23–24, Bava Ḳamma 82b–83a, ʿAvodah Zarah 58b, Ḥullin 137b, and Pal. Talm. Berakhot 4d, Megilla 71b.

Information about regional dialects can also be gleaned from inscriptions and biblical compositions whose geographic origin is known. It has been shown that the Hebrew of the northern kingdom, unlike that of the southern kingdom, differed from SBH in important respects, at least partly as a result of Phoenician influence. Some "northernisms" (e.g., *šä+* and *zo^h/zo^w* discussed above) are standard features of Pre-MH (especially in Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs) and MH; others

(e.g., *šat* 'year' and unconditional monophthongization of *ay* and *aw*) are not.

Orthography and Phonology

Consonants: Phonology
Hebrew exhibits both the loss of old consonants and the creation of new ones. Seven of the Proto-Semitic fricatives were lost by merger at various times: the interdentals *ṯ* (> *š*), and *ḏ* (> *z*) *ṱ* (> *ṣ*), the laterals *ĺ* (> *ś*) and *ɫ* (> *s*), and the uvulars *ḫ* (> *ḥ*) and *γ* (> *ʿ*). In return, seven new consonantal phones were created. An emphatic *p̣* was created to render the unaspirated *p* of Iranian and Greek, and six fricatives *ḇ*, *ḡ*, *ḏ*, *ḵ*, *p̄*, *ṯ* [v γ ð x f θ] were created as a result of the assimilation of non-emphatic, ungeminated stops to preceding vowels.

These opposing developments did not exactly cancel each other out. Although four of the seven lost fricatives were restored, the old fricatives were phonemes while the new fricatives were all allophones of stops, conditioned by a preceding vowel, at least in the beginning. (Eventually most of them were phonologized via secondary split, when some of the conditioning vowels were deleted.)

In addition, the language was left with a large concentration of labial phones: [p b p̣ f v w m]. Three of these phones were redistributed by a merger of /w/ with /b/, which seems to be attested already in the vulgar spelling of the Copper Scroll. In the Samaritan reading tradition, where the merger was unconditional, the merger product originally had three allophones, distributed roughly as follows: [w] after /u/, [v] after other vowels, and [b] elsewhere. In the Tiberian tradition, the merger was more restricted, but there too *w* retained its original bilabial realization only after *u*, as in the name *Pwh*, read [puw:å] by the Tiberians and [fuw:a] by the Samaritans.

At the other end of the articulatory tract, in the pharynx and the larynx, there was a gradual reduction in the inventory for some speakers. By the tannaitic period, the Hellenized inhabitants of Beisan, Haifa, and Tivon had merged /ḥ/ with /h/ and /ʿ/ with /ʾ/. The mergers seem to have gone further among the Qumran sectarians and the Samaritans, but Jerome's descriptions and Arabic renderings of Hebrew toponyms (including Haifa and Tivon!) show that the loss of these consonants was far from universal.

Vowels: Phonology
Proto-Semitic /i:/ and /u:/ were retained unchanged throughout the history of Hebrew, but /a:/ became raised and rounded by the fourteenth century BCE in all or most environments. The evidence of the Tiberian reading tradition (see pp. 148–9) suggests that there were two raised and rounded allophones of /a:/, which in one instance yielded doublets: *kan:oʾ* = *kan:å̄ʾ* 'zealous'.

Eventually, the inherited short vowels also developed allophones as did the upgliding diphthongs: [å:] and [ä] from /a/; [o:], [o] and [å] from /u/; [e:], [e], and [ä] from /i/; [o:] from /aw/; [e:] and [ä:] from /ay/. The merger of some of these allo-

phones resulted in a completely reorganized system in which the number of contrastive qualities was doubled and the role of quantity was greatly reduced.

Long [iː] and [uː] are in complementary distribution with [y] and]w], respectively, and alternate with them, e.g., [kǟliː] 'vessel' ~ [kälyš̥kǟ] 'your vessel', [píːhuː] ~ [piːw] 'his mouth', [šǟk̥uː] 'lookout point' ~ [šǟk̥wíː] 'rooster', [yištaḥǟwǟː] 'he will prostrate himself' ~ [wayːištáḥu:] 'and he prostrated himself'. It is, thus, possible that the semivowels should be viewed as allophones of vowels rather than consonantal phonemes.

Consonants: Orthography

The Israelites adopted unchanged a twenty-two-sign version of the alphabet current in their area, even though they had preserved more than twenty-two of the twenty-nine Proto-Semitic consonants (see p. 147). Consequently, they were forced to use some signs with more than one value.

Only one instance of such polyphony survived long enough to be recorded by the Masoretes (see Vowels, below): שׁ *š* representing both /š/ and /ś/, the latter probably realized [ɬ] until it merged with /s/. Thus, *škwr* was read [šǟk̥úːr] < [šakuːr] when it had the meaning 'intoxicated', but [sǟk̥úːr] < [ɬakuːr] with the meaning 'hired'.

Recently, there has been confirmation of an old theory positing two additional instances which survived only until the Hellenistic period: ח *ḥ* representing both /ḥ/ and /ḫ/; ע *ʿ* representing both /ʿ/ and /ɣ/. Thus, *ḥrym*, read [ḥoːríːm] by the Masoretes, originally had two realizations: one with initial [ḥ] corresponding to the meaning 'nobles, freemen' and the other with initial [ḫ] corresponding to the meanings 'holes' and 'Hurrians' (see p. 147).

The polyphony of the letters *bgdkpt* recorded by the Masoretes has a different origin (see p. 147).

Vowels: Orthography

Another type of polyphony is that of *h*, *w*, and *y*. These three letters represented vowels as well as consonants, but only in a rudimentary, ambiguous fashion, since their use as vowel letters (*matres lectionis* 'reading aids') was not consistent in all positions, and the number of vowel phonemes was, in most periods, no less than six. Thus, ancient Hebrew had a highly homographic spelling which left much to the reader's imagination.

Such a situation was intolerable in the case of the Bible. Small wonder, then, that the Talmud contains many references to an accepted biblical reading tradition, mastery of which was essential for one who aspired to be a reader in the synagogue.

There were, in fact, a number of accepted reading traditions in use at the time in Palestine and Babylonia. They were reduced to writing in the post-Talmudic period by various schools of traditionists, called "Masoretes," through the insertion of "points" into the received consonantal text. The same signs were used to record reading traditions of MH. Reliable manuscripts show that there were many

differences between the reading traditions of MH and of BH – differences which have been partially obliterated in our modern printed editions.

The differences among the Masoretic reading traditions are, for the most part, differences of dialect rather than meaning. The Tiberian and Babylonian systems (each with several subsystems) distinguish seven and six contrasting vowel qualities, respectively, while the various Palestinian systems and subsystems distinguish five, six, or seven.

Stress, Length, and *Shewa*: Orthography and Phonology

The primary stress is normally marked by one of the Masoretic accent signs; secondary stress is frequently marked by the *ga'ya* sign. Both of them lengthen vowels – hence the name *ga'ya* 'lowing, mooing' given by the Tiberians and the alternative names used by later grammarians: *mäṯäḡ* 'bridle' and *ma'ămi'd* 'restrainer'. The position of the primary stress – ultimate or penultimate – is contrastive, at least in BH, serving, for example, to distinguish the IIw sg. f. perfect from both its participial and its IIIy sg. m. counterparts (e.g., *šåḇå^h ≠ šåḇǻ^h* 'she returned ≠ returning; he captured'). The corresponding contrast between the IIw and IIIy plural perfects (e.g., *šåḇu^w ≠ šåḇú^w* 'they returned ≠ they captured', attested together in 1 Kings 8:48) seems to have been in the process of breaking down due to an increased tendency to stress the final syllable. In sg. 1c. and sg. 2m. forms of the perfect, the position of the stress is a tense marker (e.g., *måšåḥtå ≠ u^wmåšahtǻ* 'you anointed ≠ and you shall anoint' attested together in Exod. 40: 15; see p. 156).

Outside of closed unstressed syllables, which excluded long vowels, Ancient Hebrew had a contrast between long and short vowels. However, between the tannaitic period and the time of the Masoretes, short vowels in stressed syllables lengthened, erasing the contrast in those syllables. Thus, while Hebrew was still a spoken language, the *o* of infinitival *yåḵó(^w)l* 'be able' was long, while the *o* of sg. 3m. perfect *yåḵól* 'he was able' was short, like the ancestor of *å* in *yəḵåltåm*. In the Pre-Tiberian reading tradition, the *o* of sg. 3m. perfect *yåḵól* lengthened, splitting off from the ancestor of *å* in *yəḵåltåm* and merging with the long *o* of infinitival *yåḵó^wl*.

As a result of this change, length became to a large extent conditioned by stress. Outside of open unstressed syllables (where a length contrast survived), there was a simple rule: stressed vowels are long and unstressed vowels are short.

Non-systematic representation of vowel length through the use of *matres lectionis* (see p. 148) developed in SBH. These vowel letters are used to mark not only etymologically long vowels but also stressed vowels in pre-pausal position. In the Tiberian reading tradition, such vowels were probably no longer than other stressed vowels, but morphophonemic alternations show that a length difference had once existed, e.g. *tiškaḇ ~ tiškåḇ < *tiškab ~ *tiškāb, yəšal:ah ~ yəšal:eah < *yišal:eh ~ *yišal:ēh.*

Consonant length (like vowel length) was phonemic in Proto-Hebrew, but it was not represented in the biblical period, not even in an unsystematic way. Thus,

the spelling ʿrwmym was used for both members of the minimal pair Job 5:12 [ʿăru:mi:m] ≠ Job 22:6 [ʿărum:i:m] 'crafty (pl. m.) ≠ naked (pl. m.)'. And the spelling ntnw was used for both [nåṯan:u:] 'we gave' and [nåṯănu:] 'they gave', even though the long n of the former results from the coalescing of the final n of the stem and initial n of the suffix ([nåṯan+nu:]). It was only in MH that representation of consonant length began to appear, and even then, only in cases like [nåṯan+nu:] and [kårat+ti:], where a morpheme boundary was spanned. Thus, the citation of 2 Chron. 14:10 in the Mekhilta has nšʿnnw for Masoretic nšʿnw = [nišʿan+nu:] 'we have relied'.

Most of the Proto-Hebrew minimal pairs are no longer valid for the Tiberian system. Many of the new pairs are problematic in some way, since a difference in consonant length normally entails some other difference – in vowel length, secondary stress, or type of *shewa* (see below). There is a kind of vicious circle involved in phonemicizing the words [yig:ŭʿú:] ≠ [yì:ḡʿú:] ≠ [yiḡʿú:] 'they will touch ≠ they will be weary ≠ they will moo': any pair one selects will differ in two or more features.

The fact remains, however, that the Masoretes considered consonant length important enough to create a sign for it ("strong" *dagesh*). Two minimal pairs noted by the Masoretes themselves are Job 5:12 ʿăruᵂmiʸm ≠ Job 22:6 ʿăruᵂm:iʸm (see above) and Lev. 7:30 tǝbiʸʸäʸnåʰ ≠ Lev. 6:14 tǝbiʸʸän:åʰ 'they (f.) shall bring ≠ you/she shall bring it'. Although Arabic transcriptions suggest that, in the first pair, the vowel preceding the lengthened consonant was shorter than the vowel preceding its unlengthened counterpart, the Masoretes clearly considered this difference to be secondary, unworthy of being represented.

The same goes for a pair like [ḥizḳú:] ≠ [ḥiz:äḳú:] 'be strong ≠ they strengthened': the Masoretes use the same sign (whose name, *shewa*, comes from the word for 'nothingness') to represent the absence of a vowel following [z] in the first word that they use to represent the [ă] following [z:] in the second, thereby suggesting that [ă] (together with its positional variants: [ĭ], [ŭ], [ĕ], and [ŏ]) is an allophone of Ø. (Later grammarians use the terms "quiescent" for *shewa* realized as Ø and "mobile" for vocalic *shewa*.)

It is certainly true that [ă] (with its positional variants) is completely predictable in some environments: those where it is needed to break up a consonant cluster. In other environments, matters are far more complicated. For one subset of nouns, the most reliable sources seem to describe a form of metrical conditioning requiring that the secondary accent be separated from the primary accent by two syllables, one of them containing [ă], e.g., [hà:måhal:é:ḵ] ≠ [hà:mhal:äḳí:m] 'the walker ≠ the walkers'. But this is, at best, just a tendency, for there are also free variants like [hà:mḏab:ărí:m] / [hà:måḏab:ărí:m] 'the speakers' (the former in Exod. 6:27 and the latter in 2 Chron. 33:18 according to Aaron ben Asher; vice versa according to other Masoretic sources).

Such complex conditioning and free variation was completely eliminated by the increasingly schematic rules for the realization of the *shewa* sign promulgated by later grammarians. According to one of those rules, a *shewa* preceded by a long

vowel and a single consonant must have a vocalic realization (a zero realization would create an extra-heavy syllable); the closest counterpart to this in a masoretic treatise is a tendency rather than a categorical rule, and is largely restricted to *shewa* preceded by an *r*. Despite these differences, the Masoretes seem to agree with the later grammarians on the basic point: the vocalic realizations of *shewa* do not contrast with Ø.

Morphophonemic Alternations

The Tiberian reading tradition has an unusually large number of alternations, most involving vowels (usually the historically short ones) or semivowels. The great majority are – or were originally – conditioned by differences in stress, syllable structure, and/or the proximity of a laryngeal (/ʾ h ḥ ʿ/). A sample of some of the most common alternations among vowels other than shewa are shown below. The main stress is marked by ´ in context and by ˝ in (pre-)pause. Forms without either sign are proclitic.

/i/	/e/	/ä/	/a/	/å/	/o/	/u/
lib:+íʸ	léḇ	läḇ				
*tɔ̌šiḇáʸnå̊ʰ	tåšéḇnå̊ʰ					
	teléḏ	wat:éläḏ	teláḏnå̊ʰ			
	yɔ̌šal:êaḥ		yɔ̌šal:áḥ			
	to²mêr		to²már			
		wat:ó²mär	wat:o²mär			
		²ähåḏ	²aháḏ			
		²åräṣ	²arṣ+íʸ	²å̊räs		
			²åmár	²åmå̊r		
			dɔ̌ḇar+ḵå̊m	dɔ̌ḇå̊r+å̊m		
			kå̊l		kól	kul:+å̊m
					må̊tó˝ḵ	mɔ̌tu˝ḵå̊ʰ
					tåšóḇnå̊ʰ	tɔ̌šuḇáʸnå̊ʰ

Alternations of the above vowels with *shewa* result from two opposite processes: reduction and epenthesis. Thus, the alternation of *å* in *mɔ̌lå̊kiʸm* 'kings' with quiescent *shewa* in *malḵeʸ* < **malakay* 'kings of' (note the spirantized *ḵ*) is a product of reduction, while the alternation of the second *ä* in *mälä̊ḵ* < **malk* 'king' with quiescent *shewa* in *malkiʸ* 'my king' (note the unspirantized *k*) reflects epenthesis.

Reduction affected short vowels in certain kinds of unstressed open syllables, turning them into *shewa*. The most sonorous of the short vowels, *a*, was the most resistant to reduction. It survived in pretonic open syllables where it was later lengthened to *ā* > *å* (e.g., **šanatu* 'year' > **šānā* > *šå̊nå̊ʰ*) except in the construct state (e.g., *šɔ̌naṯ* 'year of'; see p. 153); as a rule, it did not survive in propretonic ones (e.g., *šɔ̌nå̊to˝* 'his year'). Short *i* sometimes behaves like *a*, surviving in open pretonic syllables (e.g., **šinatu* 'sleep' > *šenå̊ʰ*), except in the construct state (e.g., Jer. 51:39 *šɔ̌naṯ* 'sleep of' homonymous with Jer. 48:44 *šɔ̌naṯ* 'year of'). At other times, it is reduced in open pretonic syllables (e.g., **nāšibāt* > Sifre Devarim

40 $no^{w}\check{s}\partial\underline{b}o^{w}\underline{t}$ 'blowing', contrasting with Ezek. 38:12 $no^{w}\check{s}\partial\underline{b}o\underline{t}$ settled').

Epenthesis affected word-final consonant clusters, breaking them up through the insertion of $\ddot{a}$ (*segol*, hence the term "segolation"), *a* (in the vicinity of *h*, *ḥ* or ʿ) or *i* (in the vicinity of *y*). It occurred both in nouns (e.g., *rägäl* < **ragl* 'foot', *naʿal* < **naʿl* 'shoe') and verbs (e.g., *way:ägäl* < **way:agl* 'and he exiled', *wan:aʿal* < **wan:aʿl* 'and we went up'). Qumran Hebrew and the Tiberian Massorah preserve evidence of a different, no doubt earlier, rule of epenthesis in the construct form of nouns (see p. 153).

Morphology and Morphosyntax

Nouns and Adjectives

Gender and Number
Masculine singular nouns and adjectives are unmarked. Feminine singular nouns and adjectives usually take one of two endings: $+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}}$ or $+\underline{t}$ ($> +\ddot{a}/a\underline{t}$ if the stem ends in a consonant). In BH, the allomorph $+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}}$ is often in free variation with $+\underline{t}$ (e.g., *moʾăbiy:*$+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}} \sim$ *moʾăb̄iʸ*$+\underline{t}$ 'Moabitess', *ḥaṭ:â*$+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}} \sim$ *ḥaṭ:â̂*$+\underline{t}$ 'sin') or with *(ä/a)ṯ* (e.g., *ʾok̄ăl*$+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}} \sim$ *ʾokǎl*$+\ddot{a}\underline{t}$ 'consuming', *tip̄ʾăr*$+\overset{\acute{s}h}{\ddot{a}} \sim$ *tip̄ʾăr*$+\ddot{a}\underline{t}$ 'glory').

Masculine plural nouns and adjectives take the ending $+\hat{i}^{y}m$ ($> +\hat{i}^{y}n$ in MH), feminine plurals, the ending $+\hat{o}^{w}\underline{t}$. Apart from a few tree names, noun stems with the underlying form CVCC+ ("segolates") change in the plural to CVCǎC+ ($\rightarrow$ CǎCǎC+ by reduction; see p. 151), a very archaic alternation of which only traces remain in the other Semitic languages. Interchange of $+\hat{i}^{y}m$ and $+\hat{o}^{w}\underline{t}$ is common, but not their total absence. Probably the only true plurals without a suffix among the nouns are *ṣoʾn* and *bâkǎr* – the suppletive, suffixless plurals of *śä̂* 'sheep/goat' and *šo^{w}r* 'ox', respectively. Semitists use the term "collective" to describe these nouns and mass nouns, as well as true collectives.

Dual number is restricted to a small set of nouns, mainly those denoting units of measurement and counting; it is not found with adjectives (or pronouns or verbs). When used with nouns denoting paired body parts, the dual ending $+$ *ayim* is structurally a plural ending, for it does not contrast with the regular plural endings and it cooccurs with numerals greater than 1. This "pseudo-dual" remained unchanged in MH, while the true dual was partially replaced by the word for 2 (cf. already 2 Sam. 1:1 *yǎmi^{y}m šǎnǎyim* 'two days' instead of *yo^{w}mayim*).

Definiteness
Definiteness is expressed by the definite article *ha* +, which is prefixed to nouns and adjectives. A more precise transliteration would be *haC:*, for this morpheme has three (unstable) components: (1) the consonant *h*; (2) the vowel *a*; and (3) lengthening of the following consonant (the initial consonant of the word). The third component, which is discontinuous with the first two, is not found with the consonants ʾ, ʿ, *h*, *ḥ*, *r*, due to a sound change. In such cases, the second compo-

nent may undergo compensatory lengthening. The first component is normally elided following the prefixes *bǝ* + 'in', *kǝ* + 'like' and *lǝ* + 'to' (but not *me* + 'from' or *wǝ* + 'and'). For example, when *bǝ* + is added to *hab:ayiṯ* 'the house', the result is *b+ab:ayiṯ*. In the Bar-Kokhba letters, the accusative marker *ʾeṯ* (see below) has been reduced to a prefix which produces the same elision, e.g., *tsl͑ hzwʾ* < *ʾäṯ-has:äla͑ haz:oʷ* 'this sela͑' (alongside *ʾt hšṭr hzʾ* 'this document'), *tšbt hzw* < *ʾäṯ-haš:ab:åṯ haz:oʷ* 'this Sabbath'.

Indefiniteness is usually expressed by the absence of the definite article, but occasionally *ʾähåḏ* 'one' serves as an indefinite article with nouns.

Case and State
The Proto-Semitic case system has broken down in BH, largely as a result of sound change. The old accusative ending **+a* is gone, leaving only a few frozen relics behind; its functional heir, the preposition *ʾeṯ ~ ʾäṯ-*, normally governs only **definite** objects, and even with them it is not obligatory. Also gone is the old genitive ending **+i*, used in Pre-Hebrew to mark the second (attributive) constituent of noun phrases like *šämän zayiṯ* 'olive oil', *zeʸṯ šämän* 'oil olive', *͑eṣ pǝriʸ* 'fruit tree', *pǝriʸ ͑eṣ* 'tree fruit'.

In Hebrew, it is the first constituent (the head) of these phrases which sets them apart. That constituent, said to be in the "construct state," undergoes a number of distinctive modifications. Two of them are illustrated by Exod. 38:21 *ham:iškån*, *miškan hå͑eḏuṯ* 'the Tabernacle, the Tabernacle of the Pact', where the *å* in the closed final syllable of *ham:iškån* is replaced by *a* in *miškan*, and the definite article is omitted (see p. 161). Another two are illustrated by Exod. 22:4 *biśdeʰ ʾaḥer* 'in another's field', where the *å* of *śåḏäʰ* has been reduced to *ǝ* (p. 151) and then deleted entirely, and word-final *äʰ* has been replaced by *eʰ*; contrast Ruth 2:8 *bǝśåḏäʰ ʾaḥer* 'in another field'. Finally, in Gen. 44:14 *beʸṭåh yoʷsep̄ ͑* '(and Judah came) to Joseph's house', the word for 'house' has [ay] contracted to [e:] (written *eʸ*) and lacks the definite article, in contrast to Gen. 43:26 *hab:aytåʰ ͑* '(and Joseph came) to the house'. In cases where the head does not change in the construct state and the genitive noun is indefinite, ambiguity may arise. Thus, the Mekhilta feels the need to prove that Exod. 21:2 *͑äḇäḏ ͑iḇriʸ* means 'a Hebrew slave' rather than 'a Hebrew's slave'.

The sg. f. ending *+åʰ* has the allomorph *+åṯ* in the construct state; the pl. m. ending *+iʸm* has the allomorph *+eʸ*, imported from the pseudo-dual, instead of the historically expected *+iʸ*. Thus, the construct of *šåniʸm* 'years' is *šǝneʸ* 'years of', the same as the construct of *šǝnayim* 'two'.

Pronouns
There are three major sets of pronouns: "nominative" independent pronouns, "accusative" pronouns attached to verbs, and "genitive" pronouns attached to prepositions and nouns. The attached pronouns have one set of allomorphs beginning with a vowel for stems ending in a consonant and another set beginning with a consonant for stems ending in a vowel, e.g, Esther 2:7 *ʾåḇiʸ+hå wǝʾim:+åh* 'her

father and her mother' and Jer. 29:5 = 29:28 *piry+ån ~ pri^y+hän* 'their (f.) fruit'.

The same pronouns were originally used with plural nouns, e.g., *bǎne^y+häm* 'their sons' (stem ending in a vowel, like *pri^y+hän*) and *bǎno^{w}t+åm* 'their daughters' (stem ending in a consonant, like *piry+ån*), but at an early period *+e^y+häm* was reanalyzed as a single morpheme – a suffix to be used with any plural noun – and new forms like *bǎno^{w}t+e^{y}häm* were created. The variation between *+o^{w}t+åm* and *+o^{w}t+e^{y}häm* was lexically conditioned. In Jeremiah's time, *bǎno^{w}t+åm* was obsolete, but *ǎbo^{w}t+åm* 'their fathers' was still the normal form, *ǎbo^{w}t+e^{y}häm* replacing it only occasionally (e.g., Jer. 9:15 ~ 19:4, in the same expression).

In SBH, a few of the independent pronouns have long allomorphs ending in *å^h* alongside short allomorphs, e.g., *hem ~ hem:å^h* 'they'. In Qumran Hebrew more of the independent pronouns and a few of the suffixed ones have the long allomorphs, and in the Samaritan reading tradition these forms predominate. In Qumran Hebrew, the original conditioning of the allomorphs *+m ~ +må* 'them' has been partially preserved: the long suffix *+må* is never attached to a verb ending in (long) *u* or *i*.

Numerals and Quantifiers

The word for 1 is an adjective; it occasionally appears in the plural, e.g., Gen. 11:1 *sǎpå^h ʾähåt u^{w}dbǎri^{y}m ʾǎhådi^{y}m* 'one language and one$_{pl}$ (set of) words'. Numerals above 1 are nouns, as are the quantifiers *kol ~ kål-* 'all' (lit. 'totality') and *mǎ^{c}at* 'a bit'. Like those quantifiers, they normally precede the counted noun in BH and MH. However, *harbe^h* 'a lot' normally follows the quantified noun in BH and MH, and behaves more like an adjective. With rare exceptions, the three quantifiers do not agree with their nouns, while many numerals (3–10, 13–19, 23–29, etc.) exhibit a kind of reverse agreement (polarity), taking a feminine ending with masculine counted nouns (e.g., *sǎloš+å^h båni^{y}m* 'three sons') and vice versa (e.g., *sǎloš båno^{w}t* 'three daughters').

Counted nouns normally stand in apposition to the numeral, but there are exceptions. In all periods, the numerals 2–10 normally form a genitive phrase with the word for 'days' (e.g., *sǎlošät yåmi^{y}m* 'three days'), with definite nouns (e.g., 1 Sam. 31:8 and Bet She'arim inscriptions *sǎlo(^{w})šät bånå^{y}w* 'his three sons') and with other numerals (*sǎloš me^{y}o^{w}t* '300', *sǎlošät ʾålåpi^{y}m* '3,000'). With most nouns, it is definiteness which determines the state of the numeral which precedes them, e.g., Num. 28:19 *šib^{c}å^h kǎbåśi^{y}m* 'seven sheep' vs. 28:21 *šib^{c}at ha+k:ǎbåśi^{y}m* 'the seven sheep'(also: 'seven of the sheep'; cf. Exod. 26:9, Num. 35:14).

Ordinals exist only for 1–10; beyond that, cardinal numbers are used in one of four constructions. For 'the Xth year', the Bible has (1) *šǎnat ha+X šånå^h*; (2) *šǎnat ha+X*; (3) *šǎnat X*; (4) *X šånå^h*; only (3) is found in the Mishnah. Construction (4) also has the meaning 'X years'; the two meanings are found side by side in Gen. 14:4.

Conjunctions, Prepositions, Postpositions, and Adverbial Endings

The underlying form of the coordinating conjunction is normally *wə̆+*. When prefixed to a word whose initial consonant is a labial or is followed by *ə̆*, it has the allomorph *u*^{w}+ in the Tiberian reading tradition. In binomials like *šămayim wǎ̌ʾǎrǎṣ* 'heaven and earth', the underlying form is *wǎ+*.

The most primitive prepositions are *bə̆+* 'in', *kə̆+* 'like', and *lə̆+* 'to'. When prefixed to nouns, their underlying vowel is *ə̆*, but with suffixed pronouns, it is *ǎ*. With *kǎ+*, unlike *bǎ+* and *lǎ+*, the particle *mo*^{w}+ (~ *mo*^{w}*ṯ* in MH) is normally inserted before the suffixed pronoun. In the poetic dialect, that particle may be added to any of these three prepositions before nouns. Most of the longer prepositions can be seen to be derived from nouns in the construct state.

BH has a postposition +*ǎ*^{h} 'to', which alternates with the prepositions *lə̆+* and *ʾǎl*, e.g. *hǎ̌ʿaynǎ*^{h} ~ *ʾǎl-hǎ̌ʿǎyin* 'to the spring' found side by side in Gen. 24. Eventually, it became a meaningless ossified relic, used in forms like *lalə̆+ḥu*^{w}*ṣǎ*^{h} 'to the outside' (LBH, Qumran Hebrew) and even *me+ḥu*^{w}*ṣǎ*^{h} 'from the outside' (MH).

Another ending which could be viewed as a postposition is +*ǎm*, generally equivalent to *bə̆+* and used to form adverbs, e.g., *ʾǎmn+ǎm* 'really' < *ʾomän* 'truth', *ḥin:+ǎm* 'gratis' < *ḥen* 'favor', *yo*^{w}*m+ǎm* 'by day' < *yo*^{w}*m* 'day'. For the most part there is no specific affix or pattern for adverbs. For the adverbial use of verbs, see below.

Verbs

Verbs do a great deal of work in BH. The finite verbs inflect for number, gender and person, and thus contain their own pronominal subjects. Moreover, verbs are frequently used to express concepts which English expresses with adjectives ("be old," "be big," "be strong," etc.) and adverbs ("greatly," "well," "increasingly," "really").

The Root

Lexical morphemes composed solely of consonants can be isolated in members of virtually all syntactic categories, but only in the verb are these "roots" free to "interdigitate" with a large number of contrasting "patterns."

The verbal root is usually triconsonantal, occasionally quadriconsonantal, rarely quinqueconsonantal. Synchronically biconsonantal roots like *l-d* and *b-n* (see below) occur chiefly as allomorphs of triconsonantal ones. The sg. 3m. imperfect verbs in Table 9.1, p. 156, once assigned to the roots *š-b* and *s-b*, are analyzed today as representing five distinct triconsonantal roots. The three positions within the triliteral root are numbered I, II, and III; thus, a I*n* root is a root with *n* in the first position.

From a diachronic point of view, the biconsonantal allomorphs are probably relics of a very ancient stage in which biconsonantal verbs were fairly common. Viewed in this light, most, if not all, of the verbs in Table 9.1, p. 156 are seen to be originally biconsonantal verbs which were "triconsonantalized" through the

Table 9.1 Roots with "weak" radical

Verb	Meaning	Root	Class
yiš:ób	blow (wind)	n-š-b	I*n*
yaš:í^{y}b	cause to blow	n-š-b	I*n*
yeséb	sit, dwell	y-š-b	I*y*
yo^{w}ší^{y}b	cause to sit/dwell	y-š-b	I*y*
yåšú^{w}b	return	š-w-b	II*w*
yåší^{y}b	cause to return	š-w-b	II*w*
yišbä^h	capture	š-b-y	III*y*
yåsób/yis:ób	go around	s-b-b	II=III
yåséb	cause to go around	s-b-b	II=III

addition of a semi-vowel or consonant length. It is not uncommon to find alterna-
tion between two triconsonantalizations of a single biconsonantal original, e.g., *y-
g-r ~ g-w-r* 'be afraid' and *ṭ-w-b ~ y-ṭ-b* 'be good' (both Perfect ~ Imperfect). The
spread of triconsonantalization continued in the historical period via analogy, e.g.,
BH *bån+åh/åm* > MH *bǎnåy+åh/åm* 'he built it/them' and BH *yim:aḏ* > MH
yim:åḏeḏ 'it may be measured'.

Tense and Aspect
BH has six paradigms with temporal and/or aspectual value, listed below together
with conventional sg. 1c. examples from the root *k-t-b* 'write':

A Perfect: *kåṯåḇti^y* 'I wrote, I (now) write' (penultimate stress)
B Imperfect: *ʾäḵtóḇ* 'I will write, I used to write, I (habitually) write'
C Perfect + *waw* consecutive/conversive: *wǎḵåṯaḇtí^y* 'and I shall write' (final
   stress; see p. 149)
D Imperfect + *waw* consecutive/conversive: *wåʾäḵtóḇ* 'and I wrote'
E Participle: *koṯéḇ* 'writing' (also: 'writer')
F Participle + auxiliary: *(wǎ)håyí^{y}ti^y/(wå)ʾähyä^h koṯéḇ* '(and) I used to / will
   (habitually) write'

E is etymologically and morphologically nominal; accordingly, it inflects only
for number and gender. The others inflect for person, as well.
    The "converted" forms C and D are very common in BH, but they function
mainly as markers of formal style. They are virtually nonexistent in MH. They
both contain the conjunction 'and'; accordingly, they are restricted to clause-
initial position. In that position, C alternates with B, and D alternates with A.
    In an utterance whose first verb is B, the subsequent verbs may be either B or,
if clause initial, C. Jer. 49:22 *hin:e^h ḵan:äšär yaʿǎlä^h wǎyiḏ²ä^h wǎyip̄roś kǎnåp̄å^{y}w*
'behold, like an eagle, he flies up and soars and spreads his wings' is a B–B–B se-
quence, while *hin:e^h ḵan:äšär yiḏ²ä^h u^{w}p̄åraś kǎnåp̄å^{y}w* 'behold, like an eagle, he
soars and spreads his wings' in Jer. 48:40 is a B–C sequence. Similarly, in an ut-
terance whose first verb is A, the subsequent verbs may be either A or, if clause

initial, D. Thus the phrase *ʿåruᵂm råʾåh råʿåʰ wystr/wǝnistår* 'the shrewd man saw trouble and hid' in Prov. 22:3 is written as an A–D sequence (*wystr = way:is:åṭer*) but read as an A–A sequence (cf. also Jer. 7:30–31 vs. 32:34–35). Once a verb from paradigm C or D is selected, all subsequent verbs will normally be from the same paradigm, until the sequence is broken by the introduction of a non-clause-initial verb (see p. 166).

According to some scholars, paradigms A–D have temporal meaning in SBH; according to others, aspectual meaning. The question has been debated furiously and inconclusively for more than a century.

The examples below show that collocations of A and B may be used to express the past/future distinction, irrespective of the event/habit/state distinction, while the process/event distinction is expressed by collocating A and B not with each other but with E. Although A, B, and E have a bewildering variety of uses, these particular uses seem to be at the core of the system.

Expressing Distinctions of Tense and Aspect in Biblical Hebrew

	Past		Future	
Event	A		B	
	kaʾăšär *ʿåśiyṭiʸ lǝšomroᵂn ...*		*ken ʾäʿăśäʰ liʸruᵂšålayim ...*	
	'as I did to Samaria ...*		so shall I do to Jerusalem ...'	

(Isa. 10:11; cf. also Exod. 10:14 and 2 Kings 10:18)

Habit	A		B
	ʾåḇiʸ *yis:ar ʾäṯkäm baš:oᵂṭiʸm waʾăniʸ ʾăyas:er ʾäṯkäm*		
	'my father flogged you with whips, but I will flog you'		
	båʿaḳrab:iʸm		
	with scorpions'		

(1 Kings 12:11; cf. also Josh. 1:17a and Jer. 44:17)

State	A		B	
	kaʾăšär *håyiʸṭiʸ ʿim mošäʰ*		*ʾähyäʰ ʿim:åḵ*	
	'as I was with Moses I shall be with you'			

(Josh. 1:5; cf. also Josh. 1:17b and Jer. 2:36)

	Process	Event
Future	E	B
	hin:eʰʿoᵂḏåḵ mǝḏab:äräṭ šåm ʿim ham:äläḵ waʾăniʸ ʾåḇoʾ	
	'you will still be speaking there with the king, and I will come'	

(1 Kings 1:14; cf. also 1 Sam. 10:5 and Isa. 65:24)

Past		E	A
	wǝhin:eʰ ʿoᵂḏän:åʰ mǝḏab:äräṭ ʿim ham:äläḵ wǝnåṭån ... båʾ		
	'and she was still speaking with the king, and Nathan ... came'		

(1 Kings 1:22; cf. also Jud. 13:9 and Job 1:13–19)

When one considers the full range of uses of these paradigms in SBH, it becomes clear that A and B need to be described in terms of both tense and aspect.

Only for E is it possible to give a simple description, namely, imperfective aspect.

The complexity of the tense/aspect system is due, in part, to the fact that it was constantly in flux. E and F gradually took on the functions of B, in the following order:

1. progressive: complete replacement already in SBH except in present tense questions; without exception in LBH;
2. habitual: partial replacement in BH completed in MH;
3. future: large-scale replacement in MH outside of subordinate clauses;
4. modal: partial replacement in MH.

At the same time, E took on two of the functions of A: perfective present (including the performative) and present of transitive statives.

One result of this expansionism was that E lost its aspectual value and became a tense (present in LBH (?), nonpast in MH). Moreover, thanks to the spread of F, Hebrew developed the ability to distinguish habitual aspect in the future (rare in SBH, common in Qumran Hebrew and MH), the infinitive (rare in LBH, common in MH), and the imperative (MH).

Mood

The BH imperfect distinguishes, in part of its paradigm, a volitive mood (representing diachronically the conflation of the Proto-West Semitic subjunctive, imperative and jussive) from the indicative mood, e.g., *ʾåmú^{w}ṭ+å^h* 'let me die', *mú^{w}ṭ* 'die!', *yåmóṭ* 'let him die'; *ʾåší^{ʾ}ḇ+åh* 'let me bring back', *håšéḇ ~ håší^{ʾ}ḇ+å^h* 'bring back!', *ʾal-tåšéḇ/tåšåḇ* 'do not turn back'. In the first person, singular and plural, the volitive is expressed by the +å^h (cohortative) ending, which can be used with all verbs except, normally, those ending in a vowel (IIIy and IIIʾ verbs). In the third person singular, m. and f., the volitive has a distinct (jussive) form in only three categories of verbs: *hip̄ʿil* (see p. 159), IIIy, and IIw,y *ḳal*. There was also an energic mood with some kind of emphatic force, e.g. *yǝḵab:ǝḏ+ån+ni^y* 'he does honor me'.

This distinction did not survive very long. Already in SBH, the volitive forms are sometimes replaced by their indicative counterparts. In Qumran Hebrew, the breakdown of the system is virtually complete; the old volitive forms are still in use, but they no longer have their old meaning. In MH, cohortative forms are virtually nonexistent, and jussive forms are uncommon and largely restricted to certain literary genres. Thus, Deut. 13:7 *nelǝḵå^h wǝnaʿabḏå^h* 'let us go and worship' is paraphrased as *neleḵ wǝnaʿăḇo^{w}ḏ* in Sanhedrin 7:10. However, the ability to distinguish volitive future from indicative future has been regained through a restructuring of the tense system.

Binyan

Hebrew, like the other Semitic languages, has an elaborate system of morphological patterns (Medieval and Modern Hebrew *binyanim* 'buildings, verbal stems

or derivational classes') used, for the most part, to derive verbs from other, more basic, verbs. Thus, one root can generate a number of morphologically distinct verbs referring to related activities. In the case of human reproduction, the root *y-l-d* yields a verb *yâlaḏ* 'give birth' usually referring to the role of the mother, a second verb *hoᵂlîyḏ* 'sire' referring to the role of the father, a third verb *noᵂlaḏ* 'be born' referring to the role of the baby, and a fourth verb *yil:eḏ* 'deliver' referring to the role of the midwife. A fifth verb *hityal:eḏ* refers to declaring oneself to be someone's offspring.

The meaning of a given *binyan* cannot be stated in absolute terms, but only relative to a more basic *binyan*. Hence, it makes no sense to ask for the meaning of the most basic *binyan* (*ḳal*), nor does it make sense to attempt to relate the meaning of a specific "derived" verb to the meaning of its *binyan* in cases where a basic counterpart is not attested.

Despite many irregularities and nuances, perhaps produced by semantic change, the relationships in the table below are fairly typical for BH: *hitpaᶜel* is often and *puᶜal* is always the reflexive–reciprocal and medio-passive, respectively, of *piᶜel*, which, in turn, is frequently a causative of *ḳal*; and *hup̄ᶜal* is always the medio-passive of *hip̄ᶜil*, which itself frequently functions as a second causative of *ḳal*. *Nip̄ᶜal*, although normally the medio-passive or reflexive of *ḳal*, sometimes interchanges with *hitpaᶜel*.

Table 9.2   Biblical Hebrew *binyanim*

		Perfect	Imperfect	Participle
Ḳal	'be(come) holy/taboo'	kåḏáš	yiḳdáš	(kåḏóᵂš adj.)
Nip̄ᶜal	'reveal oneself as holy'	niḳdáš	yiḳ:åḏéš	niḳdåš
Piᶜel	'sanctify/purify'	ḳid:áš	yǝ̆ḳad:éš	mǝ̆ḳad:éš
Puᶜal	'be sanctified/purified'	ḳud:áš	yǝ̆ḳud:áš	mǝ̆ḳud:åš
Hip̄ᶜil	'consecrate/devote'	hiḳdîʸš	yaḳdîʸš	maḳdîʸš
Hup̄ᶜal	'be consecrated/devoted'	huḳdáš	yuḳdáš	muḳdåš
Hitpaᶜel	'sanctify/purify oneself/ reveal oneself as holy'	hitḳad:éš	yitḳad:éš	mitḳad:éš

The MH chart for *ḳ-d-š* would be much the same except in *nip̄ᶜal*, *puᶜal*, and *hitpaᶜel*. *Nip̄ᶜal* is no longer attested with this verb, no doubt because that *binyan* is no longer used for reflexives. The *puᶜal* perfect and imperfect have ceased to exist for virtually all verbs in MH, their function as medio-passive of the *piᶜel* perfect and imperfect being taken over by the *hitpaᶜel* perfect and imperfect (the former altered in form to *nitḳad:aš*, with preformative *n*+, by analogy with the *nip̄ᶜal*). Concomitantly, the rare ingressive use of the *puᶜal* participle has been transferred to the *hitpaᶜel* participle (which in the case of *ḳ-d-š* has retained its initial *m*+ but in other verbs has preformative *n*+). As a result, the *piᶜel* participle has two medio-passive counterparts in MH: the stative *puᶜal* participle and the ingressive *hitpaᶜel* participle. *Hitpaᶜel* continues to function as a reflexive, as well.

Valence: Increase and Decrease

Most of the above relationships correspond to oppositions of valence. *Pi⁽el* and
hip̄⁽il, when functioning as causatives, add an argument to the verb, while *nip̄⁽al*,
pu⁽al, *hup̄⁽al*, and *hitpa⁽el*, functioning as medio-passives, reflexives or recipro-
cals, subtract an argument, as shown below:

Binyanim	Root	Valences	Example
Ḳal, Nip̄⁽al	*r-p-ʾ*	2, 1	Jer. 17:14 *rǝp̄ǎʾeniʸ Y. wǝʾerǎp̄eʾ* 'heal me, O Lord, that I may be healed' (cf. Jer. 31:3)
Hitpa⁽el, Pi⁽el	*ḳ-d-š*	1, 2	2 Chron. 29: 5 *hitḳad:ǝ̌šuʷ wǝḳad:ǝ̌šuʷ ʾǎt-beʸt Y.* 'sanctify yourselves and sanctify the House of the Lord' (cf. Lev. 14:11)
Pi⁽el, Pu⁽al	*b-r-k*	2, 1	2 Sam. 7:29 *uʷbǎreḵ ʾǎt-beʸt ⁽abdǝ̌ḳǎ ... yǝborak beʸt ⁽abdǝ̌ḳǎ* 'and bless your servant's house ... may your servant's house be blessed'
Hip̄⁽il, Hup̄⁽al	*b-w-ʾ*	3, 2	Gen. 43:17–18 *way:ǎbeʾ hǎʾiʸš ʾǎt-hǎʾǎnǎšiʸm beʸtǎʰ yoʷsep̄ ... huʷbǝ̌ʾuʷ beʸt yoʷsep̄* 'and the man brought the men to Joseph's house ... they were brought to Joseph's house'
Pi⁽el, Ḳal	*t-h-r*	2, 1	Ezek. 24:13 *tihartiʸḵ wǝloʾ tǎhart* 'I purified you, but you would not be purified' (cf. 2 Kings 7:4)
Hip̄⁽il, Ḳal	*š-w-b*	2, 1	Jer. 31:17 *hǎšiʸbeniʸ wǝʾǎšuʷbǎʰ* 'bring me back that I may come back' (cf. 2 Sam. 15:20, 2 Kings 7:4, and Jer. 11:18)

In BH, valence decrease can take place with rearrangement of the remaining ar-
guments (type 1) or without it (type 2). The process which derives medio-passive
verbs normally deletes the subject of their active counterparts rather than allowing
it to remain in a prepositional phrase – hence the medieval Hebrew description of
medio-passive verbs as "those whose agent is not mentioned." Type 1 medio-
passives advance the original direct object by making the derived verb agree with
it and deleting the accusative marker *ʾet*, while type 2 medio-passive verbs are
impersonal (i.e., invariably sg. 3m. and subjectless) and are used with *ʾet*, e.g.,
Num. 26:53–55 *tehǎleḵ hǎʾǎrǎṣ ... yeḥǎleḵ ʾǎt-hǎʾǎrǎṣ* 'the land shall be divided
... the land shall be divided'. Intermediate types, with partial advancement, exist
as well. With oblique objects, type 2 is the norm (as in Arabic), e.g., Ezek. 10:13
lǎ+hǎm ḳoʷrǎʾ 'they were referred to (lit. to them it was called)', 16:34
ʾaḥǎrayi+ḵ loʾ zuʷn:ǎʰ 'you were not sought after (lit. after you it was not
whored)', Song 8:8 *yǝdub:ar-bǎ+h* 'she shall be spoken for (lit. it shall be spoken
about her)'. In MH, type 2 has virtually disappeared, although there is at least one
example of it in reliable manuscripts: Pesaḥim 7:7 *šǎ+n:izraḳ ʾǎt dǎmoʷ* 'whose
blood was sprinkled' (cf. also Sanhedrin 7:5 and Kelim 7:3 in the Naples edition
of the Mishna).

Change of *binyan* and change of valence do not always coincide. There is a

whole class of verbs (intransitive statives) which either have the same valence in
hiṗʿil that they have in *ḳal* or else have two meanings in *hiṗʿil* – one with valence
increase and one without it, e.g., *hiḳriᵉb* 'come near (= *ḳårab*); bring near', *hiḇʾiʸš*
'stink (= *båʾaš*); cause to stink'. Conversely, intransitive *piʿel* verbs have a caus-
ative in the same *binyan*, e.g., BH *miher* 'hurry (intrans. and trans.)', MH *ḳil:ah*
'gush, cause to gush', *meʾen* 'refuse, instruct to refuse'. There are also a few *ḳal*
verbs of this type, e.g., BH–MH *råʿåʰ* 'pasture (trans. and intrans.)' and BH *råḥaṣ*
'take a bath (= MH *råḥaṣ*), wash (part of the body = MH *hirḥiʸṣ*)'. And BH *nåṯan*
'give' and *śåm* 'put' function as suppletive causatives of *håyåʰ* 'be' without
change of *binyan*.

Denominatives
Verbs derived from triconsonantal nouns may occur in any *binyan*, and sometimes
occur in several unrelated *binyanim*. Thus, we have BH–MH *hišriʸš* 'become root-
ed' contrasting with BH–MH *šeraš* 'uproot' and MH *hiṭliʸaʿ* 'become wormy' (=
BH *way:årum toʷlåʿiʸm* 'and it became infested with worms') contrasting with
MH *til:aʿ* 'de-worm'. In these examples, the *hiṗʿil* denominatives are intransitive
stative verbs, while the *piʿel* ones are transitive privative verbs, reminiscent of En-
glish "skin a cat" and "worm a dog."

   Triconsonantal denominative verbs normally have the same morphology as oth-
er verbs, but the MH stative *hiṗʿil* meaning 'become poor', derived from *ʿåniʸ*
'poor (man)', is irregular: imperfect *yaʿniʸ*, perfect *häʿniʸ*, participle *maʿniʸ*. The
expected *yaʿånåʰ* was avoided, apparently to prevent confusion with *ḳal yaʿånåʰ*
'he will answer'.

   Quadriconsonantal denominatives cannot be accommodated in most *binyanim*.
In LBH and MH, the problem was solved through a modification of *piʿel*, *puʿal*
and *hitpaʿel/nitpaʿal* – a modification used earlier for reduplicated quadricon-
sonantals like *k-l-k-l*. Thus, in LBH we find the participles *məṯurgåm* 'translated'
and *məḵurbål* 'bemantled', derived from quadriconsonantal Aramaic nouns for
'translator, dragoman' and 'mantle', respectively. These participles have the pat-
tern *məCuCCåC*, which differs from the *məCuC:åC* pattern of the *puʿal* participle
only in that the doubled medial radical has been shortened to make room for an
additional consonant.

Syntax

Modification of Nouns
Nouns may be modified attributively by adjectives, quantifiers, nouns (genitive
and appositive), pronouns (possessive and demonstrative), prepositional phrases,
or clauses (see p. 171).

   Nominal attributes of the genitive type are distinguished from adjectival ones
in three ways: they put their heads in the construct state (see p. 153), e.g., *ʿåreʸ*
miḇṣår 'fortress cities' (contrast *ʿåriʸm bəṣuroʷṯ* fortified cities'), they do not

agree with their heads, and they normally prevent their heads from taking a definite article, e.g., *ʿåreʸ ha+m:iḇṣår* 'the fortress cities' (contrast *hä+ʿåriʸm ha+b:ə̆ṣuroʷt* 'the fortified cities').

The distinction between the two types of attributes is often blurred. Thus, in adjectival *šaʿar hå+ʿälyoʷn* 'the upper gate' (Ezek. 9:2), the head lacks the definite article, a feature which becomes common in MH, while in the genitive construction *ha+š:aʿar ha+d:åroʷm* 'the south gate' (Ezek. 40:28), the head has the definite article. In adjectival *malʾăḵeʸ råʿiʸm* 'evil emissaries' (Ps. 78:49) the head is in the construct state. In Deut. 25:15 *ʾäḇän šə̆lemåʰ wå̆ṣäḏäḵ* 'a full and righteous weight', an adjective is conjoined with an abstract genitive noun, no doubt on the analogy of interchanges like Ps. 9:5 *šoʷp̄eṭ ṣäḏäḵ* 'judge of righteousness' with Ps. 7:12 *šoʷp̄eṭ ṣad:iʸḵ* 'righteous judge'. There is also a tendency to make the genitive noun agree in number with its head (see below).

In true compounds like *ʿåreʸ ha+m:iḇṣår* and Deut. 13:4, 6 *ḥo(ʷ)lem ha+ḥăloʷm*, the definite counterpart of Deut. 13:2 *ḥolem ḥăloʷm* 'a dream dreamer', the definite article prefixed to the genitive noun serves to make the entire phrase definite. With other genitive phrases, especially possessive ones, a definite article prefixed to the genitive noun belongs to it alone, and there is no way to mark the definiteness of the head. Thus, *malʾaḵ hå+ʾălohiʸm* has the same form whether it means 'an angel of God' (Judg. 13:6, etc.) or 'the angel of God' (Judg. 13:9, etc.), and *kə̆nap̄ ha+k:ə̆ruʷḇ* has the same form whether it means 'a wing of the cherub' (1 Kings 6:27) or 'the wing of the cherub' (1 Kings 6:24).

The rule which places the definite article on the genitive noun of compounds produces bizarre results when it is applied to gentilic nouns derived from compound names (of places, tribes, or clans). The toponym *beʸṭ-ʾel/beʸṭʾel* 'Bethel', literally 'house of God', is treated in SBH as a genitive construction – even after it is converted to a gentilic through the addition of *+iʸ*. Thus, *beʸṭ hå+ʾäl+iʸ* 'the Bethelite', the definite form of **beʸṭʾäl+iʸ*, is split in the middle by the definite article, as if it meant 'house of the godly'. Small wonder that, in the later period, Bar-Kokhba calls the people of En-Gedi (lit. 'kid spring') *hʿngdyn* rather than *ʿyn-hgdyyn*.

In SBH, the plural ending is normally attached only to the head of the genitive phrase, but a second plural ending is sometimes attached to the genitive noun. This **redundant plural ending**, which becomes increasingly common in LBH and MH, is used with both mass nouns (even those which are otherwise unattested with a plural ending, e.g., Isa. 42:22 *båt:+eʸ ḵə̆lå̆+iʸm* 'houses of detention', Bava Batra 10:4 *šə̆ṭår+eʸ ʾăriʸsiy:+oʷt* 'contracts of tenantship', Sifra Nedava 8:2 *båt:+eʸ də̆šä̆n+iʸn* 'receptacles for fatty ash') and count nouns (even when ambiguity is created, e.g., Deut. 1:15 *śår+eʸ ʾălåp̄+iʸm* 'chiefs of a thousand').

The process which creates the genitive construction is **iterative** and a number of long chains are attested, e.g., Lev. 13:59, 2 Kings 18:24, Isa. 21:17, 28:1, 2 Chr. 36:10, Copper Scroll XI, 16. In 1 Chr. 9:13 [*gib:oʷreʸ ḥeʸl*] [[*mə̆lä̆ʾḵäṭ ʿăḇoʷḏaṭ*] [*beʸṭ-hå̆ʾălohiʸm*]] '[men of valor of] [[the work of the service of] [the House of God]]', the constituent phrases are easily recognizable because they are frequently

attested in the Bible. In the end product, all nouns but the last are in the construct state; hence $hayil \rightarrow he^{y}l$ and $\,{}^{c}\ddot{a}bo\,{}^{w}\underline{d}\mathring{a}^{h} \rightarrow \,{}^{c}\ddot{a}bo\,{}^{w}\underline{d}a\underline{t}$.

All nouns in the chain but the last normally dispense with the definite article. In 2 Kings 23:17, we find two exceptions in a single sentence quoting the people of Bethel: $ha+\underline{k}{:}\ddot{a}\underline{b}\ddot{a}r \,\,{}^{\prime}i^{y}\check{s} \,\, h\mathring{a}+{}^{\prime}\ddot{a}lohi^{y}m$ 'the grave of the man of God' and $ha+m{:}izbah \,\, be^{y}\underline{t}{-}{}^{\prime}el$ 'the altar of Bethel'. This may be a syntactic allusion to Gen. 31:13 $h\mathring{a}+{}^{\prime}el \,\, be^{y}\underline{t}{-}{}^{\prime}el$ 'the God of Bethel'.

A process which serves some of the same functions as the one which creates genitive phrases and which sometimes alternates with it is the insertion of the preposition $l\check{\jmath}{+}$ 'to, belonging to' (e.g., 2 Kings 5:9, Ruth 2:3), usually preceded by relative ${}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\check{s}\ddot{a}r/\check{s}\ddot{a}{+}$. This **circumlocution** permits the use of the definite article with the head noun, e.g., Gen. 29:9 $ha\underline{s}{:}o^{\,y}n \,\, {}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\check{s}\ddot{a}r \,\, l\check{\jmath}{+}{}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\underline{b}i^{y}h\mathring{a}$ 'the flocks which belong(ed) to her father' (also 31:19) vs. Gen. 37:12 $\underline{s}o^{\,y}n \,\, {}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\underline{b}i^{y}h\ddot{a}m$ 'their father's flocks'.

In some contexts, circumlocution of the genitive construction with $({}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\check{s}\ddot{a}r/\check{s}\ddot{a}{+})$ $l\check{\jmath}{+}$ is more than just a stylistic option. In MH, it is obligatory for the second genitive construction in constructions of the form "A of B ..., but (that) of C ..." (e.g., Berakhot 4:1, Sanhedrin 10:5), "... A of B; also (that) of C" (e.g., Tevul Yom 1:1, 2), and "A of B is more ... than (that) of C" (e.g., Terumot 5:9), where the second occurrence of A is deleted by a gapping transformation.

In all periods, circumlocution is obligatory when the noun phrase to be modified contains a conjunction, e.g., Gen. 40:5 $ham{:}a\check{s}\underline{k}\ddot{a}^{h} \,\, w\check{\jmath}h\mathring{a}^{\prime}op\ddot{a}^{h} \,\, {}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\check{s}\ddot{a}r \,\, l\check{\jmath}m\ddot{a}l\ddot{a}\underline{k}$ $mi\underline{s}rayim$ 'the butler **and** the baker of the king of Egypt' instead of $*ma\check{s}\underline{k}e^{h}$ $w\check{\jmath}^{\prime}op\ddot{e}^{h} m\ddot{a}l\ddot{a}\underline{k} \,\, mi\underline{s}rayim$, 2 Kings 11:10, Benei Ḥezir tomb inscription $\underline{k}br \,\, whnp\check{s}$ $\check{s}l^{\prime}l^{c}zr$ '(the) tomb **and** the monument of Eleazar', Copper Scroll III, 2–3 $kly \,\, ksp$ $wzhb \,\, \check{s}ldm^{c}$ 'vessels of [silver **and** gold] of *terumah*', Pe'ah 4:9, Shevi'it 1:4, Terumot 11:4. The genitive construction may be used only if the coordinate noun phrase is first broken up, e.g., Gen. 40:1 $ma\check{s}\underline{k}e^{h} m\ddot{a}l\ddot{a}\underline{k} \,\, mi\underline{s}rayim \,\, w\check{\jmath}h\mathring{a}^{\prime}op\ddot{a}^{h}$ 'the butler of the king of Egypt and the baker', Deut. 22:15 ${}^{\prime}\ddot{a}\underline{b}i^{y} han{:}a^{c}\ddot{a}r\mathring{a}^{h} \,\, w\check{\jmath}^{\prime}im{:}\mathring{a}h$ 'the girl's father and her mother', Sanhedrin 11:1, Menaḥot 7:4. The genitive constituent, on the other hand, is often a coordinate noun phrase, e.g., Exod. 32:2, Lev. 13:59, Num. 20:5, Deut. 8:8, Josh. 6:19, Terumot 11:4, Ḥagigah 1:8.

In MH, the phrase $\check{s}\ddot{a}+l{:}\check{\jmath}{+}$ 'that belongs to' has been reanalyzed as a single morpheme: a new preposition $\check{s}\ddot{a}l$ with the meaning 'of'. This is evident in the phrase $\check{s}hyw \,\, \check{s}l \,\, hgw^{\prime}yn$ 'which belonged to the gentiles' (Bar-Kokhba letters), for the first half of a bimorphemic $\check{s}{+}l{+}$ would be redundant following $\check{s}{+}hyw$ and the second half would elide the [h] of the definite article (see pp. 152–153) and be written as part of the next word, without a space. Chains with more than one occurrence of $\check{s}\ddot{a}l$ are attested, e.g., Kelim 12:3, 6, Zavim 4:2 (*bis*), Bet She'arim inscriptions (cited below).

Suffixed pronouns, unlike genitive nouns, are normally possessive. Thus $be^{y}\underline{t}{+}$ o^{w} 'his/its house' can be equivalent to $be^{y}\underline{t} \,\, h\mathring{a}^{\prime}i^{y}\check{s}$ 'the man's house' but not to $be^{y}\underline{t}$ $ha\underline{k}{:}ayi\underline{s}$ 'the summer house'. Another difference is that the suffixed pronoun cannot normally serve as the head of another genitive noun or any other non-

appositive modifier. Nouns modified by suffixed pronouns, like those modified by genitive nouns, do not normally retain their definite article, unless the pronoun is separated through the insertion of (*ăšär/šä*+) *lă*+, e.g., 1 Sam. 25:7 *hăro‘i^ym* *^ăšär lă̆+kå* vs. Gen. 13:8 *ro‘ä^ykå* 'your shepherds'.

The tendency of these pronouns to be attached to the last noun of a genitive construction often conflicts with the syntactic bracketing required by the sense, e.g., Prov. 24:31 [*gădär$_1$* *^ăbăn$_2$*] [*ä^xw$_3$*] 'his$_3$ stone$_2$ fence$_1$', Prov. 10:15, 18:11 [*kiryat$_1$* *‘uz$_{:2}$*][*o^w$_3$*] 'his$_3$ mighty$_2$ city$_1$' (contrast the purely poetic Ps. 71:7 *mahs$_1$+i^y$_2$-‘oz$_3$* 'my$_2$ mighty$_3$ refuge$_1$'), Yoma 5:1, Nega‘im 12:5. The conflict is sometimes resolved through the use of a circumlocution, e.g., Gen. 44:2 *găbi^x‘i^y* *găbi^ya‘ hak:äsäp* 'my silver goblet (lit. my goblet, the silver goblet)', 2 Kings 25:30; Exod. 35:16 *mikbar han:ăhošät ^ăšär-lo^w* 'its copper grating (lit. the copper grating that belongs to it)', Lev. 9:8, Judg. 3:20.

The first constituent of the genitive construction may take a suffixed pronoun referring to the second constituent. In MH, where this **anticipatory pronoun** is common, its referent must be governed by *šäl*, e.g., Sanhedrin 8:5 *mi^ytăt+ăn šäl:ărăšă‘i^yn* 'the death (of them,) of the wicked', Bet She‘arim inscriptions *^rwn+n šlšlwšt bny+w šlrby ywdn bn+w šlrby my^yšh* 'the ossuary (of them,) of the three sons (of him,) of Rabbi Judan, the son (of him,) of Rabbi My’šh'. In BH, where it is rare, its referent is (with one exception, in Song 3:7) not governed by a preposition, e.g., Ezek. 42:14 *bă̆bo^y+ăm hak:ohăni^ym* 'upon the entering of (them,) the priests'.

Modification of Verbal Nouns and Adjectives

Verbal nouns can also be modified by genitive nouns, which may be underlying subjects or objects; in 2 Sam. 1:26, *^ahăbat năši^ym* 'love of women' is ambiguous. Adjectives, too, may be used in the genitive construction, whether they function as nouns (e.g., 2 Kings 10:6 *gădole^y hă‘i^yr* 'the grandees of the city') or not (e.g., Gen. 41:2 *yă̆po^wt mar^ä^h* 'beautiful of appearance', Ezek. 17:7 *gă̆do^wl kă̆năpayim* 'great of wing', Gittin 9: 8). Here too, the definite article which logically belongs to the whole phrase is attached to the genitive noun (see pp. 161–2). Thus, when *yă̆po^wt mar^ä^h* (Gen. 41:2) and *gă̆do^wl kă̆năpayim* (Ezek. 17:7) modify definite nouns, they become *yă̆pot ham:ar^ä^h* (Gen. 41:4) and *gă̆do^wl hak:ă̆năpayim* (Ezek. 17:3), literally 'beautiful of the appearance' and 'great of the wing'.

The comparative degree of adjectives is expressed by means of an adverbial phrase introduced by the preposition *min/miC*: 'from, away from', e.g., Judg. 14:18 *măto^wk mid:ă̆baš* 'sweet beyond honey', Niddah 2:7. In MH, this adverbial may be strengthened by placing the word *yo^wter* 'more' before it (not before the adjective, as in Modern Hebrew).

The superlative, too, is expressed syntactically, e.g., Song 1:8 *hay:ăpă̊^h ban:ăši^ym* 'the fair(est) among women', Deut. 28:54. In MH and sometimes in BH, the relative conjunction is inserted before the preposition, e.g., 2 Sam. 7:9, Pesahim 9:8 *hay:ăpä^h šä+b:ăhän* 'the fair(est) among them'.

Word Order

Within the Noun Phrase
Attributive modifiers (with the exception of some quantifiers; see p. 154) follow their heads in a fairly predictable order: (1) genitive nouns; (2) possessive pronoun; (3) adjectives; (4) demonstrative pronoun/adjective; (5) relative clauses. In LBH, (3) and (4) may be reversed, e.g., 2 Chron. 1:10, Esther 9:29.

Put differently, adjectives and relative clauses may not separate the immediate constituents of a genitive phrase; they must follow the last genitive noun or pronoun. Thus, both the wide scope modifier of 1 Kings 6:24 *kǎnaₚ̄f. hak:ǎru*ʷ*b̄*m. *haš:eni*ʸ*t*f. 'the second_{f.} wing_{f.} of the cherub_{m.}' and the narrow scope modifier of 1 Kings 6:27 *u*ʷ*k̲naₚ̄f. hak:ǎru*ʷ*b̄*m. *haš:eni*ʸ*m.* 'and a wing_{f.} of the second_{m.} cherub_{m.}' come after the word for 'cherub'. However, adjectives which are inside the genitive noun phrase and, thus, do not separate it from its head are permitted, at least in MH, e.g., Bava Meṣi'a 1:5 *meṣi*ʸ*at bǎno*ʷ *u*ʷ*b̲it:o*ʷ *hag:ǎdo*ʷ*li*ʸ*m wǎ*ʿ*abdo*ʷ *wǎšiph̲ǎto*ʷ *hǎ*ʿ*i*ʸ*b̲ri*ʸ*m* 'an object found by (lit. the find of) his big son or daughter or his Hebrew manservant or maidservant'.

When both wide and narrow scope modifiers are present, the latter come first (as in Arabic), e.g., Deut. 5:24, 21:6, 28:58, 31:16 [*ʾǎlohe*ʸ *nek̲ar*] [*hǎ*ʾ*ǎräṣ*] [*ʾǎšär hu*ʷ*ʾ bǎ*ʾ *šǎm:å*ʰ] [*bǎk̲irbo*ʷ] '[the alien gods]—[of the land] [which they are about to enter]—[in their midst]' ('in their midst' modifies 'the alien gods'!), Ps. 86:2.

With some genitive types, the phrase-final placement of adjectives managed to survive the transition to circumlocution with *šäl*. Thus, some of the MH counterparts of Esther 8:15 *ʿǎṭäräṭ zǎhǎb̲ gǎdo*ʷ*lå*ʰ 'a large crown (made) of gold' (genitive of material) exhibit the old order, with the adjective at the end: Rosh Hashanah 2:3 *kǎlo*ʷ*nso*ʷ*t šäl:å*ʾ*äräz ʾǎruk:i*ʸ*m* 'long poles of cedar', Nega'im 14:1. Others have the adjective after the first noun: Tamid 3:6, Kelim 25:7 *ʿäre*ʸ*b̲å*ʰ *gǎdo*ʷ*lå*ʰ *šäl:å*ʿ*eṣ* 'a large kneading-trough of wood'. This order is found already in Ezek. 40:40 *hak:åṭeₚ̄ hǎ*ʾ*ahäräṭ ʾǎšär lǎ*ʾ*ulåm haš:a*ʿ*ar* 'the other side of the gate's vestibule'.

Within the Non-verbal Clause
In BH (and sometimes in MH too), predicative adjectives come before their subject in verbless clauses, except in those beginning with *wǎ*+ (circumstantial, concessive, and parenthetical clauses, e.g., Gen. 13:13, 18:11, 29:17, Yevamot 13:1) or the presentatives *hin:e*ʰ/*hǎlo*ʾ. Thus, in asking Jacob for lentils Esau says *ki*ʸ *ʿǎyeₚ̄ ʾǎnok̲i*ʸ 'for I am famished' (Gen. 25:30) with the adjective first, but in the previous verse (25:29) the account of Esau returning home uses a circumstantial clause with the adjective second: *way:åb̲o*ʾ *ʿeśåw min-haś:å̲då*ʰ *wǎ*+*hu*ʷ*ʾ ʿǎyeₚ̄* 'and Esau came in from the field famished (lit. and he was famished)'.

When the predicate adjective is modified by an adverbial, the predicate is often split, with the adjective preceding the subject and the adverbial following, e.g., Gen. 3:6, 12:14, Deut. 7:17, Josh. 9:22, 1 Sam. 29:9, Avot 4:17. This order seems

to be very ancient, since it is also reflected in the morphology of the stative perfect. Thus, 1 Sam. 15:17 *ḳåṭon ʾat:å^h bǝ^ʾe^ynä^yḳå* 'small are you in your (own) eyes' would have had the same order and meaning had it been expressed by a stative verb in the perfect: *ḳåṭon+tå bǝ^ʾe^ynä^yḳå* (not attested, but see Gen. 32:11).

Within the Verbal Clause

BH verbal sentences are basically VSO, but there are numerous exceptions. Verbal circumstantial and concessive clauses, like the non-verbal ones discussed on p. 165, begin with the conjunction *wǝ*+ followed by the subject (e.g., Gen. 18:13, 24:31).

Other exceptions involve **focused elements**, which are moved to the beginning of the clause, e.g., Gen. 37:4, Deut. 6:13 *ʾäṭ-Y. ʾǎlohä^yḳå ti^yrå^ʾ wǝ^ʾoṭo^w taʿǎḇoḏ u^wḇišmo^w tiš:åḇeaʿ* 'it is the Lord your God that you shall revere, and Him that you shall worship, and His name that you shall swear by', 13:5. When the focused element is the subject of the verb, a redundant independent pronoun may be inserted before the verb, e.g., Deut. 1:38–39 *yǝho^wšuaʿ ... **hu^wʾ** yåḇo^ʾ šåm:å^h ... wǝṭap:ǝḵäm ... **hem:å^h** yåḇo^ʾu^w šåm:å^h ʿ*(... you will not come there) Joshua ... **he** will come there ... and your children ... **they** will come there', Ḳiddushin 3:7.

Similar devices are used to signal **contrast** between two clauses. In some cases, the inversion or independent pronoun is found only in the second of the two clauses, e.g., Gen. 12:12 *wǝhårǝ̊gu^w ʾoṭi^y wǝ^ʾoṭåḵ yǝhay:u^w* 'and they shall kill **me**, but **you**, they will let live' (contrast Num. 22:33), Gen. 33:16–17, Exod. 33:23, Gen. 42:8 *wayak:er yosep̄ ʾäṭ-ʾäḥå^yw wǝhem lo^ʾ hik:iruhu^w* 'Joseph recognized his brothers but **they** did not recognize **him**'. In other cases, the first clause mimics the second, e.g., Gen. 41:13 *ʾoṭi^y heši^yḇ ʿal-kan:i^y wǝ^ʾoṭo^w tålå^h* '**me**, he restored to my post, and **him**, he hanged' (contrast Gen. 40:21–22), Gen. 34:21, Deut. 23:21, 1 Kings 12:11, Judg. 14:16, Ezek. 33:25, Jon. 4:10–11 (for the last three, see p. 167). Sometimes, the inverted second clause exhibits the topic–comment construction, e.g., Exod. 9:20–21, 2 Chron. 10:16–17; see p. 168.

Agreement

Verbs and predicate adjectives agree with their subjects in number and gender; attributive adjectives agree with their heads in definiteness as well. Demonstrative adjectives, being inherently definite, differ from most other attributive adjectives in discriminating between two kinds of definite heads: those with the definite article and those with a suffixed pronoun. Demonstratives take a redundant definite article with the former type but not with the latter, e.g., *had:ǝḇåri^ym hå^ʾel:ä^h* 'these words' vs. *dǝḇåray ʾel:ä^h* 'these words of mine'.

In all periods, collectives may take either singular or plural concord, but in LBH and MH the plural prevails. In SBH, there is much variation, even within a single verse or adjacent verses, e.g., Josh. 6:20, Judg. 9:36–37; attributive adjectives are consistently singular even when other modifiers are plural, e.g., Num. 14:35, Judg. 2:10, 2 Sam. 13:34 *ʿam-rab holǝḵi^ym* 'a large crowd was (lit. were) coming'. For the non-agreement of passive verbs, see p. 160.

In BH, the rules of agreement often depend on the word order, i.e., on whether the verb comes before the subject or not. This is the case with coordinate noun phrases (compound subjects). In the book of Esther, the phrase *ham:äläk̲ wəhåmån* 'the King and Haman' appears five times as a subject, four times **following a singular** verb and once **preceding a plural** verb. There is no categorical rule requiring a verb preceding a compound subject to be singular, but when it is, it agrees in gender with the closer conjunct, e.g, Esther 9:29, 31, Gen. 33:7, Shabbat 11:6, and Sanhedrin 1:6.

The clearest evidence of the influence of word order on agreement in BH comes from the many cases where we find singular verbs preceding the subject and plural verbs following it (in a subsequent clause). This is found with compound subjects (e.g., Gen. 9:23, 14:8, 21:32, 24:50, 61, 31:14, 33:7 [*bis*], 34:20, 44:14, Num. 12:1–2, 1 Sam. 27:8) and with collectives (e.g., Exod. 1:20, 4:31, 17:2 [contrast 17:3], 20:14, 32:1, 31, 33:10, Lev. 9:24, Josh. 6:20, 1 Kings 18:39).

Modifiers of genitive phrases occasionally exhibit the force of attraction, agreeing with the adjacent genitive noun instead of its head, e.g., Exod. 26:26 (contrast 26:27), Josh. 7:21, 1 Sam. 2:4, 2 Kings 1:13 *śar ḥåmiš:i^y m šəliši^y m* 'a third captain of fifty'.

Interrogation, Affirmation, and Negation

Yes–no questions are introduced by *hă+ ~ Ø*, e.g., 1 Kings 2:13 *hăšălo^w m bo^ʾ äk̲å* 'do you come in peace?' vs. 1 Sam. 16:4 *šålom bo^w ʾ äk̲å* 'you come in peace?'. Omission of the particle is especially common in astonished rhetorical questions which follow from a premise, e.g., Judg. 11:23, 14:16 *hin:e^h lə^ʾ åbi^y u^w l^ʾ im:i^y lo^ʾ hig:adti^y wəlåk̲ ʾ ag:i^y d̲* 'my father and my mother I haven't told and you I should tell?!', 1 Sam. 25:10–11, 2 Sam. 11:11, 2 Kings 19:11, Jer. 25:29, 45:4–5, 49:12, Ezek. 18:11–13, 33:25, Jon. 4:11 vs. Num. 32:6 and Ezek. 20:30–31. Such questions serve as the apodosis of *a fortiori* arguments, substituting for assertions introduced by *ʾap̄ ki^y* 'all the more so'.

Hebrew originally had no word for 'yes'; MH *hi^y n* 'yes' is an Aramaic loanword, while in Gen. 30:34 *hen* is an Aramaism in the mouth of an Aramean. Affirmative answers to yes–no questions consist of a restatement of the question in positive terms with change of person (first to second and vice versa) but not of word order. The answer is often simplified through deletion of all but its first word; thus, the affirmative reply to *hayda^c täm ʾ ät̲-låb̲ån bän-nåho^w r* 'do you know Laban son of Nahor?' (Gen. 29:5) is just *yåd̲å^c nu^w* 'we know' (not 'we know him') and the answer to *hăk̲o^w lək̲å zä^h* 'is that your voice, (my son David)?' (1 Sam. 26:17) is *k̲o^w li^y* 'my voice, (my lord king)'.

Answers to other types of questions follow the word order of the question, in which the questioned element comes first, e.g., Gen. 37:15–16, Josh. 9:8–9, Judg. 15:10, 1 Sam. 28:11, 13, 2 Sam. 1:3, Jer. 1:11, Yadayim 4:4.

In all periods, the most common negation is *lo^ʾ*. In addition, there are a number of specialized negations, including *ʾe^y n* for verbless clauses, *ʾal* for volitives, BH *bilti^y* for infinitives (see p. 170), BH *ṭäräm* 'not yet' (normally takes the imper-

fect, regardless of the tense), MH *lā'w* 'not so' (in *'im lā'w* 'otherwise') and MH negative polarity words like *kălu"m* 'anything' and *me'o"lām* 'ever (in the past)'.

The scope of *lo'* is highly variable in BH. We find it negating single words, e.g., Deut. 32:21 *lo'-'el ... lo'-'ăm* 'a non-god ... a non-folk', Jer. 5:7. We also find it negating compound and complex sentences with a scope so wide that it is difficult to reproduce in normal English, e.g., Gen. 31:27 *låm:å^h ... lo'-[hig:adtå l:i^y wă'ăšal:ehăkå bắsimhå^h u"bširi^ym]* 'why ... did (it) not (happen that) [you told me (you were leaving) and so I sent you off with festive music]', Lev. 10:17 *mad:u"a' lo'[-'ăkaltäm 'ăt-hahat:å't bimko"m hak:odäš ki^y kodäš kådăši^ym hi"']* 'why did (it) not (happen that) [you ate the sin offering in the sacred area because it is most holy]?', 2 Sam. 18:11, 19:22, Jer. 20:17.

Scope ambiguity of the negation is common. The phrase *lo' yu"mat X ki^y ...*, which occurs in 2 Sam. 19:22 with wide scope *lo'* ('it is not the case that [X shall be put to death because ...]'), occurs in 1 Sam. 11:13 and Lev. 19:20 with narrow scope *lo'* ('X shall not be put to death, because ...') (cf. also Gen. 31:27 vs. Ps. 81:12–13). Word order can sometimes be used to disambiguate. Thus, the semantic difference between Ps. 9:19 *lo' lånăṣah yiš:åkah* 'not forever will he be forgotten' and Ps. 119:93 *lă'o"lām lo'-'åškah* 'forever will I not forget = I will never forget' is made clear by word order, but not the semantic difference between Ps. 74:19 *'al-tiškah lånăṣah* 'do not forget forever' and Ps. 15:5 *lo' yim:o"ṭ lă'o"lām* 'he will never be shaken'. In MH, there is no ambiguity: *lo' ... lă'o"lām* always means 'never'.

Conjunction

Coordination

The boundary between coordination and subordination in BH is not as sharp as in English. Semantic relations which are normally made explicit through subordination are occasionally expressed less precisely in BH by coordination, e.g. Gen. 44:22 *wă'åzab 'ăt-'ăbi^yw wămet* 'he will leave his father and he will die' (entailment; contrast 1 Chron. 28:9 *wă'im ta'azbän:u"* 'and if you leave him'), Exod. 10:13 *hab:okär håyå^h wăru"ah hak:ådi^ym nåśå' 'ăt-hå'arbä^h* 'morning came and the east wind brought the locusts' (simultaneity; contrast Exod. 19:16 *bihyot hab:okär* 'as morning came').

The ubiquitous *wă+* is normally considered the main coordinating conjunction, but it is not restricted to that role. In all periods, it frequently serves to connect a main clause to a previous subordinate clause (e.g., the *waw* apodosis in Lev. 6:21 and Soṭah 8:1) and a comment to its topic (e.g., Jer. 6:19 *wăṭo"råṭi^y way:im'åsu"-båh* 'and as for my Torah, they rejected it', Shabbat 16:6). And in all periods, it is used regularly to connect subordinate clauses of one type (circumstantial) to the main clauses which they modify (see Circumstantial Clauses, p. 169). If it is used less commonly to introduce subordinate clauses of other types, that is only because they have their own, more specific, conjunctions which pre-empt it. But when for some reason those other conjunctions are not used, it is always on hand

to fill the void, e.g., Gen. 11:4 (instead of relative *ʾăšär*), Gen. 42:10 (instead of adversative *kiʸ*; cf. 42:12), and Gen. 47:6 (instead of complementizing *kiʸ*). Finally and most remarkable of all, BH *wə̆+* is not uncommon at the beginning of utterances or even whole books.

Subordination

Circumstantial Clauses
In all periods, a clause may serve as a temporal adverbial even though it contains no word meaning 'while' but simply *wə̆+* or nothing at all (e.g., Exod. 22:13). In such a clause, the subject, if definite, will come first, whether the predicate is a perfect (e.g., Gen. 24:31), an active participle (e.g., Gen. 18:1, Bava Meṣiʿa 4:10), a stative participle/adjective (e.g., Gen. 18:12, Giṭṭin 8:2, Yevamot 13:1), or a prepositional phrase (e.g., Lev. 7:20, Jer. 2:37, Ketubbot 12:3, Giṭṭin 8:1).

Conditional Clauses
The most common conditional particle in all periods is *ʾim* 'if'. Others include BH *luʷ* > MH *ʾiʸlːuʷ* (counterfactual), BH *luʷleʸ/luʷleʸ* > MH *ʾiʸlːuʷleʸ* (negative counterfactual), and MH *ʾapiʸlːuʷ* 'even if'.

Omission of the apodosis is permissible in contexts which allow the hearer to reconstruct it. When the speaker lays out two antithetical alternatives in conditional form, the apodosis of the first conditional may be omitted if it is the one preferred by the speaker and requires no further action, e.g., Gen. 4:7, Exod. 32:32 *ʾim-tiśːåʾ ḥaṭːåʾ̆tåm wə̆ʾim ʾayin mə̆heniʸ nåʾ misːiprå̆ḵå ʾăšär kå̆tå̆btå* 'if You will forgive their sin; but if not, erase me from Your book which You have written', 1 Sam. 12:14–15, Makkot 1:1 (cf. also Dan. 3:15). In all of these cases, the apodosis of the first conditional is to be understood as *ṭoʷḇ* 'well and good' and/or a volitive formed from the verb of the protasis, as in Ruth 3:13 *ʾim-yiḡʾålek ṭoʷḇ yiḡʾål wə̆ʾim loʾ yaḥpoṣ lə̆ḡåʾålek uʷḡʾaltiʸḵ ʾånoḵiʸ* 'if he will redeem, good – let him redeem; but if he does not want to redeem for you, I will redeem for you myself'.

Complement Clauses
Complement clauses occur commonly as subjects of equational sentences and as objects of verbs and prepositions, but only rarely as subjects of verbs (except for those modified by the adverbial *bə̆ʿeʸneʸ X* 'in the eyes of X'). Finite and non-finite types coexist in all periods, with the latter becoming relatively less frequent in MH.

As subjects of equational sentences and objects of prepositions, the finite and non-finite types are in free variation (cf. Gen. 27:44–45 *ʿaḏ ʾăšär-tåšuʷḇ ḥă̆mat ʾåhiʸḵå, ʿaḏ-šuʷḇ ʾap ʾåhiʸḵå mimːə̆ḵå* 'until your brother's fury turns back, until the turning back of your brother's anger from you', where the two are in apposition) or complementary distribution (see below). However, *lipneʸ* 'before' takes only non-finite complements in all periods, while BH *bə̆+ṭäräm* 'before (lit. when not yet)' usually takes finite complements. Verbs, too, generally select one type

or the other.

When a compound or complex noun sentence with two finite verbs is transformed into the complement of a preposition, and the first verb turns into an infinitive, the second verb normally remains finite in BH, even though it is also governed by the preposition. It continues to bear the same relationship to the infinitive that it did to the finite verb, whether it be consecutive (e.g., Gen. 39:18 *kahăriʸmiʸ ko ᵂliʸ wâʾäkrâʾ* 'when I raised [lit. upon my raising] my voice and cried out'; cf. 39:15 *hăriʸmoṭiʸ ko ᵂliʸ wâʾäkrâʾ* 'I raised my voice and cried out'), circumstantial (e.g., Gen. 44:30 *kⁿboʾiʸ ʾäl-ʿabdⁿkâ ʾäbiʸ wⁿhan:aʿar ʾeʸnän:u ᵂ ʾit:ânu ᵂ* 'upon my coming to your servant, my father, the boy not being with us'; cf. 44:34 *ʾeʸk ʾäʿälä ʰ ʾäl-ʾäbiʸ wⁿhan:aʿar ʾeʸnän:u ᵂ ʾit:iʸ* 'how can I go up to my father, the boy not being with me'), adversative (e.g., Exod. 12:27 *bⁿnⁿgpo ᵂ ʾäṭ-miṣrayim wⁿʾäṭ-bâṭ:eʸnu ᵂ hiṣ:iʸl* 'when he smote [lit. at the time of his smiting] the Egyptians but saved our houses [lit. our houses he saved]' [note the inverted word order], 1 Sam. 24:11 [12]) or repetitive (e.g., Ezek. 13:8; contrast Ezek. 25:6).

BH grammars do not distinguish those non-finite usages that correspond to the English verbal noun from those that correspond to the English infinitive, calling them all infinitives. The complementizer *lå/ⁿ+* (etymologically, but not syntactically, identical to the preposition *lå/ⁿ+* 'to, for') is not considered an adequate basis for distinguishing, since, in most of the environments which permit it, it is only optional (contrast Prov. 21:9 *ṭo ᵂb lå+šäbäṭ ʿal-pin:aṭ-gåḡ* 'to dwell on the corner of a roof is better ...' with 25:24 *ṭo ᵂb šäbäṭ ʿal-pin:aṭ-gåḡ* 'dwelling on the corner of a roof is better ...' and Deut. 22:19 with Deut. 22:29).

The MH situation is quite different, a sharp distinction having developed between two types of non-finite complements: an infinitive and another type reminiscent of the English verbal noun. The latter, frequently on the patterns *CⁿCiʸCâ ʰ* (in *ḳal*) and *CiC:u ᵂl* (in *piʿel*), is more noun-like than the former, appearing already in the Bible with the definite article and even the plural ending. The infinitive is the direct descendant of the old BH infinitive with the complementizer *lå/ⁿ+*. That complementizer has become obligatory and inseparable: BH *mi+b:o ᵂ* > MH *mi+l:äbo ᵂ* '(prevent/refrain/delay) from/in coming', BH *lⁿ+biltiʸ ʿäšo ᵂṭ* 'to not do' > MH (*šä+)l:oʾ laʿäšo ᵂṭ* 'not to do'.

The use of the infinitive rather than a finite complement in the imperfect was optional with some matrix verbs (contrast Demai 6:8 with Ketubbot 6:2, below, and Yevamot 9:3 with 13: 12) and obligatory with others; either way, it created a good deal of alternation between the infinitive and the imperfect, which, in turn, led to morphological contamination of the former by the latter. Thus, BH *lå+ṭeṭ* > MH *liʸt:en* 'to give', due to alternations like Makkot 1:1 *ro ᵂṣä ʰ liʸt:en* 'wants to give' ~ Avot 5:13 *ro ᵂṣä ʰ šä+y:it:en* 'wants that he give'. Similarly, BH *le+ʾmor* > MH *lo ᵂmar* 'to say', due to alternations like Demai 6:8 *yåḳo ᵂl hu ᵂ lo ᵂmar* 'he is able to say' ~ Ketubbot 6:2 *yåḳo ᵂl hu ᵂ šä+y:oʾmar* 'he is able that he say'.

Relative Clauses

In the fullest case relative clauses have a head, a relative conjunction (not a pro-noun) and a so-called "resumptive" pronoun, e.g., Gen. 9:3 *kål-rämäś ʾăšär huʷ-ḥay* 'every mobile thing such that it is alive', Deut. 18:21, 22 *had:åḇår ʾăšär loʾ-ḏib:ǝroʷ Y.* 'the thing such that the Lord did not say it', Gen. 28:13, Kilʾayim 5:1, Peʾah 2:7.

Under certain conditions, one or more of these may be omitted. When the nouns *ʾiʾš* 'person', *dåḇår* 'thing', and *måḳoʷm* 'place' serve as the head, they may be omitted, leaving behind any preposition which governed them and/or the word *kol* 'every', e.g., Exod. 35:23–24 *wǝkål-ʾiʾš ʾăšär nimṣåʾ ʾit:oʷ ... wǝkol ʾăšär nimṣåʾ ʾit:oʷ* 'and every person such that there was found with him ... and every [person] such that there was found with him ...', Num. 31:23 *kål-dåḇår ʾăšär-yåḇoʾ ḇåʾeš ... wǝkol ʾăšär loʾ-yåḇoʾ ḇåʾeš ...* 'every thing such that it withstands fire ... and every [thing] such that it does not withstand fire ...', Ruth 1:16, Berakhot 6:7, Ye-vamot 2:3.

Resumptive pronouns which function as subject or object of the relative clause are commonly omitted in all periods, yielding the gap type of relative clause. This can create syntactic ambiguity. Thus, 2 Kings 19:12 *hag:oʷyim ʾăšär šiḥătuʷ ʾăḇoʷtay* 'the nations that my ancestors destroyed' can also mean 'the nations that destroyed my ancestors', since the use of the direct object marker is not obligatory (see p. 153).

Resumptive pronouns attached to nouns (e.g., the possessive pronoun in Deut. 28:49 *goʷy ʾăšär loʾ-ṭišmaʿ lǝšonoʷ* 'a nation such that you do not understand its language', Ketubbot 4:3) may not be omitted, but resumptive pronouns attached to prepositions are occasionally omitted, especially in biblical poetry. When this occurs, the stranded preposition is normally omitted as well, e.g., Deut. 28:27, 35 *šǝḥiʾn ... ʾăšär loʾ-ṭuʷkal lǝheråpeʾ* 'an inflammation such that you will not be able to recover [from it]', Isa. 51:1 *ṣuʷr ḥuṣ:aḇtäm ... maḳ:äḇät boʷr nuḳ:artäm* 'the rock [such that] you were hewn [from it] ... the quarry [such that] you were dug [from it]', Terumot 1:2. In rare instances, we find the stranded preposition moved out of a headless relative clause and placed in front of *ʾăšär*, e.g., Gen. 31:32 *ʿim ʾăšär timṣåʾ ʾät-ʾălohäʾḳå* 'with [the person] such that you find your gods (will not live) = the person such that you find your gods with him (will not live) vs. Gen. 44:9 *ʾăšär yim:åṣe ʾit:oʷ* '[the person] such that it is found with him (will die)', Num. 22:6, Ezek. 23:40.

Asyndesis with a finite verbal predicate is common in biblical poetry, especial-ly when the antecedent of the relative clause is indefinite, e.g., Jer. 5:15 *goʷy loʾ-teḏaʿ lǝšonoʷ wǝloʾ tišmaʿ maʰ-yḏab:er* 'a nation [such that] you do not know its language and you do not understand what they are saying' (contrast Deut. 28:49, above). It is far less common in biblical prose and non-existent in the Mishnah. In the linguistically modernized version of Isaiah found at Qumran many of the asyn-detic relative clauses of the Masoretic version have been eliminated through the activity of MH-speaking scribes who found them difficult to understand.

Hebrew has considerable flexibility in forming relative clauses. It allows types

whose English counterparts are ungrammatical, e.g., Exod. 33:1, Josh. 13:21–22 *si²ḥoⁿⁿ mäläḵ häʾämoriʸ ʾăšär [hik:åʰ mošäʰ ʾoṭoⁿ wəʾät-nəśiʸ²eʸ miḏyån ... wəʾät-bilˤåm bän-bəˤoⁿʳ ... hårəg̊uⁿ bəneʸ-yiśrəʾel ...]* 'Sihon king of the Amorites such that [Moses smote him and the Midianite chiefs ... and the Israelites slew Balaam son of Beor]', 1 Sam. 25:11 *ʾănåši²m ʾăšär loʾ yåḏaˤti²ʸ²eʸ miz:åʰ hem:åʰ* 'men such that I know not where they are from'.

It also allows relative clauses to contain multiple resumptive pronouns, e.g. Deut 8:9 *ʾäräṣ ʾăšär ʾăḇånä²ʸhå ḇarzäl u²ⁿmehărårä²ʸhå taḥṣoḇ nəḥošäṭ* 'a land such that its rocks are iron and from its hills you shall hew copper', 11:6, Avot 3:17, and – with asyndesis – Jer. 5:15 (see above). Sometimes the first of these pronouns will be omitted but not the second, yielding a hybrid of the gap and pronoun retention types, e.g., Gen. 26:18, Deut. 4:46–47, Jer. 28:3, Ezra 1:7.

BH permits the formation of relative clauses with two different antecedents, as long as they are immediate constituents of the same genitive noun phrase, e.g., Gen. 24:24 *bän-milkåʰ ʾăšär yåləḏåʰ* 'the son of Milkah such that she bore [him]', 2 Sam. 16:23 *ˤaṣat ʾăhi²ṭopäl ʾăšär yåˤaṣ* 'the advice of Ahithophel such that he gave [it]' (contrast 17:7 *håˤeṣåʰ ʾăšär yåˤaṣ ʾăhi²ṭopäl* 'the advice such that Ahithophel gave [it]), Gen. 45:27, Exod. 5:14, Deut. 5:24, 1 Kings 15:30, 2 Kings 17:22, Ps. 107:2.

In addition, BH does not require the resumptive pronoun to be in the 3rd person. In syndetic relative clauses modifying the nominal predicate of a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, the resumptive pronoun is normally in the same person, e.g., Judg. 13:11 *haʾat:åʰ håʾi²š ʾăšär-diḇ:artå ʾäl-håʾiš:åʰ* 'are you the man such that you spoke to the woman?' The same is true of syndetic relative clauses modifying a vocative noun but not asyndetic ones; contrast Isa. 41:8 with 44:1.

Finally, it is worth noting that biblical style has no aversion to sentences crammed full of relative clauses. Deut. 11:2–7, with its ten relative clauses embedded at four different levels within a complement clause embedded at a fifth level, is probably about as close as one can come to infinite recursion in the real world.

Notes

Our italicized transliteration of the Masoretic pointing is based on the views of the Masoretes themselves rather than those of later theoreticians like Joseph Ḳimḥi. Thus, we distinguish seven vowel qualities: *i*, *e*, *ä*, *a*, *å*, *o*, *u*. (The choice of Swedish *å* and *ä* to represent and is based, in part, on parallels in the historical development of these vowels.) We indicate quantity in *ŏ*, *ă*, *ă*, and *å*, but the superscript letter in *iʸ*, etc. does not represent length. Whenever a letter is left unpointed in the Masoretic text of the Bible (mainly א *ʾ*, ה *h*, ו *w*, and י *y*, but in several instances צ *ṣ* and שׁ *š*), we indicate that fact using superscript signs: *ʾ*, *ʰ*, *ⁿ*, and *ʸ*. The Masoretes viewed all such letters as quiescent, unlike Ḳimḥi, who considered some of them to be markers of vowel length.

Acknowledgments

Further Reading

Azar, Moshe. 1995. *The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew.* Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language. (In Hebrew.)

Ben-Ḥayyim, Zeev. 1977. *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans,* vol. 5: *Grammar of the Pentateuch.* Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language. (In Hebrew.)

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1918–1929. *Hebräische Grammatik.* 2 vols. Leipzig: Vogel.

Blau, Joshua. 1972. *Phonology and Morphology.* Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad. (In Hebrew.)

Davidson, A. B. 1901. *Hebrew Syntax.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

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

Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Haneman, Gideon. 1980. *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew According to the Tradition of the Parma Manuscript.* Tel Aviv: Tel-Aviv University. (In Hebrew.)

Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. 1991. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1982. *A History of the Hebrew Language.* Jerusalem: Magnes.

Lambert, Mayer. 1946. *Traité de grammaire hébraïque.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Malone, Joseph L. 1993. *Tiberian Hebrew Phonology.* Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Qimron, Elisha. 1986. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

Ridzewski, Beate. 1992. *Neuhebräische Grammatik auf Grund der ältesten Handschriften und Inschriften.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Segal, Moses H. 1927. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Yeivin, Israel. 1985. *The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization.* 2 vols. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language. (In Hebrew.)

THE

SEMITIC

LANGUAGES

EDITED BY

Robert Hetzron