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Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source

Richard M. Wright
Chapter 2
MORPHOLOGY

Several characteristic features of LBH are morphological in nature, that is, morphemes or morphological traits which are either nonexistent or unproductive in pre-exilic texts. Several such morphological features of LBH which can be compared to ‘J’ are discussed in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Biblical Hebrew</th>
<th>Standard Biblical Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ḫl+q)wF</td>
<td>ḥl+q)wF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Mhytw-</td>
<td>Mtw-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) hyx</td>
<td>yx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) My%q</td>
<td>Myqh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) hyt#$, twt#$</td>
<td>štwt, štwt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ḫl+q)wF

The *waw*-consecutive (or *wayyiqtol*) in BH is normally understood as the imperfect (or ‘prefixed’) form of the verb preceded by a strong *waw*. As Jouïon-Muraoka stated:

> With the Waw inversive the verb form undergoes two changes in accordance with phonetic laws: 1) the final vowel reflects earlier shortening as in the jussive; 2) the stress recedes, and as a consequence, the post-stress vowel becomes short. These changes may occur only if the first syllable is open, and the last closed, and the first vowel is qames, sere or siriq. … Sometimes one observes the first change, sometimes the second, and sometimes neither.

Thus the *waw*-consecutive traditionally has been understood as a strong *waw* added to the imperfect form of the verb, which then undergoes

1. The ‘strong *waw*’ is ‘a Waw which has vowel *a* that adds some force (like that of the definite article and that of the interrogative pronoun) to the following consonant, which, as a consequence, is doubled’; Jouïon-Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, p. 139, §47a. Hence the alternation between * qint* and *waw*-conversive * qint*. I find the morpho-phonemic explanation of Jouïon-Muraoka preferable to that of C.H. Gordon and G.D. Young. See Gordon, *UT*, II, pp. 110–11, §12.9; and G.D. Young, ‘The Origin of the Waw Conversive’, *JNES* 12 (1953), pp. 248–52. For the contrary view, see Jouïon-Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, p. 140, §79a and references; see also E. Revell, ‘Stress and the *Waw* “Consecutive” in Biblical Hebrew’, *JAOS* 104 (1984), pp. 437–44.
certain changes, as described above. Recent research in the development of the Hebrew verbal systems would indicate that the prefix conjugation of ancient Hebrew had two tenses, each with three modes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Jussive</th>
<th>Volitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>yaqtul</td>
<td>Jussive</td>
<td>yaqtula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>yaqtulan(n)a</td>
<td>Volitive</td>
<td>yaqtulan(n)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energic</td>
<td>yaqtulan(n)a</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>yaqtulan(n)a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The waw-consecutive, then, is based on the ancient Hebrew preterite, introduced by the strong waw. The lack of an original final short vowel in both the jussive and the preterite goes far in explaining the vocalic and morphological differences between the indicative imperfect and both the jussive and the waw-consecutive.

The Hebrew cohortative is now understood to derive from the ancient Hebrew volitive, and it should not be compared to the Arabic second energetic. In Hebrew the use of the cohortative is limited to the 1st person. Moreover, because the ancient Hebrew volitive (later cohortative) was distinct from the preterite (later part of the waw-consecutive, as above), the waw-consecutive normally does not appear with the attached cohortative form. In other words, for the first person, Hebrew normally displays but not.

4. Rainey commented, ‘Because of its [the waw-consecutive’s] function in the narration of sequential actions, I propose to call this conjugation pattern the preterite continuous. The term waw conversive is obsolete… The term waw consecutive is appropriate’ (emphasis in original); ‘The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation’, p. 6. I have declined to adopt the term waw-consecutive because that term is already reserved for the simple waw plus the imperfect.
9. GKC, §48b, p. 129.
10. This section will not, for the most part, deal with the problem of final weak verbs, for which the cohortative form is morphologically identical with the imperfect; note Rainey, ‘The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation’, p. 9; but there are exceptions, discussed in E. Revell, ‘First Person Imperfect Forms with Waw Consecutive’, *VT* 38 (1988), pp. 419–26. Nor will it treat the problem of apocopated versus non-apocopated forms when attached to waw-conversive, since different morphological and analogical processes are involved for final weak verbs; see E. Qimron, ‘Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect: the Form of the Imperfect with Waw in Biblical Hebrew’, *JQR* 77 (1986–87), pp. 149–61.
A long waw-consecutive \( l+q)wF \) occurs in the Bible with the same meaning as \( hl+q)wF \). This long waw-consecutive occurs 94 times for the 1st person singular in the Bible. It occurs rarely in pre-exilic and exilic texts: Gen. 32.6; Josh. 24.8; Judg. 6.9, 6.10, 10.12; 1 Sam. 2.28, 28.15; 2 Sam. 4.10, 7.9, 12.8, 22.24; Ps 3.6, 7.5, 69.12, 69.21, 73.16; Jer. 11.18; Ezek. 3.3, 9.8, 16.1. It occurs predominantly in post-exilic texts, however: Zech. 11.13; Ps. 119.55, 119.59, 119.106, 119.131, 119.147, 119.158; Job 19.20, 29.17; Ezra 7.28, 8.15, 8.16, 8.17, 8.24, 8.25, 8.26, 8.28, 9.3, 9.5, 9.6; Neh. 1.4, 2.1, 2.6, 2.9, 2.13, 5.7, 5.8, 5.13, 6.3, 6.11, 6.12, 7.5, 12.31, 13.7, 13.8, 13.9, 13.10, 13.11, 13.13, 13.17, 13.19, 13.21, 13.22; Dan. 8.13, 8.15, 8.17, 9.3, 9.4, 10.16, 10.19, 12.8.14

Although the waw-consecutive appears several times in pre-exilic and exilic texts, the normal waw-consecutive \( l+q)wF \) pattern is more common. The ratio of normal to long waw-consecutive forms in early texts is 11:1 in Joshua, 10:3 in Judges, 9:2 in 1 Samuel, 39:1 in Jeremiah, and 57:3 in Ezekiel. Note, however, the unusual preponderance of \( hl+q)wF \) forms in 2 Samuel, where the ratio is 4:4.15 Certain late books and texts, however, display a strong preference for the \( hl+q)wF \) pattern. The ratio of normal to long waw-consecutive verbs is 0:6 in Psalm 119, 0:11 in Ezra, 3:23 in Nehemiah, 1:8 in Daniel, and 0:4 in prose sections of Job. Note, however, the ratio of 5:1 in Zechariah, which displays a preference for the unlengthened form. The above evidence suggests that the long waw-consecutive was used in the pre-exilic and exilic periods, but became the predominant form of the 1cs waw-consecutive only in the post-exilic period. (Although, it must be noted, not all post-exilic books made use of the late form.)

When the waw-consecutive is understood as a strong waw preceding the preterite (which is morphologically identical with the jussive) or, in the case of the long waw-consecutive, the cohortative, that the shift from \( l+q)wF \) to \( hl+q)wF \) can be understood. The modal distinction between the indicative \( l+q)wF \) and \( hl+q)wF \) broke down in late Hebrew. Bergsträsser commented:

11. See Bergsträsser, Hebräische Grammatik, II, p. 23, §5f. This section will focus on the 1st person singular rather than the 1st person plural forms \( l+qn%wa \) and \( hl+qn%wa \). The long waw-consecutive of the 1st person plural occurs only 5 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen. 41.11, 43.21; Ps. 90.10; Ezra 8.23, 8.31. There are not sufficient examples of \( hl+qn%wa \) to establish whether it is significantly more common in post-exilic than pre-exilic texts.

12. BHS notes, '2 Mss. no ━-.'

13. BHS notes that several manuscripts read \( hbf#$%xa)jwa \) instead of \( hbf#$%xa)jwF \).


15. The use of only the long waw-conversive in 2 Samuel might be a coincidence, or it might reflect intrusions of dialectal or colloquial forms in classical Hebrew; see Rendsburg, ‘The Strata of Biblical Hebrew’, pp. 81–99.
Cohortative and jussive are also to be found more often than what is commonly measured in the sense of a simple statement. For more recent poetry (also Dan.) this can be recognized as an authentic linguistic practice. This more recent poetry has partially lost the sense for mood differentiations as it has for tense differences.  

Kutscher also observed that Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel contain examples of ḫl+q and ḫl+q waw which are ‘not necessarily cohortative’. Just as the meaning and the use of the cohortative began to merge with that of the indicative, so the meaning and use of the long waw-consecutive began to merge with and sometimes supplant that of the normal waw-consecutive.

The lateness of the long waw-consecutive is confirmed by its predominance at Qumran. There the normal waw-consecutive occurs but once, besides which the only form of the waw-consecutive (or conjunctive) in the 1st person singular is ḫl+q waw, which occurs 31 times. Qimron added, ‘The consistency of this feature in DSS Hebrew implies that it reflects the spoken language. It cannot have been either borrowed or invented.’ If the use of ḫl+q waw reflects spoken Hebrew, this may help explain the occasional appearance of the form in pre-exilic and exilic texts. In addition, the Isaiah scroll from Qumran frequently uses a long waw-consecutive to render a ḫl+q form in the MT.

As for other post-biblical evidence, the Samaritan Pentateuch, like QH, employs ḫl+q waw for the past tense. The long waw-consecutive does not appear in rabbinic Hebrew most likely because TH (MH) is colloquial, and the waw-consecutive was a literary form. Since the frequent use of the long waw-consecutive instead of ḫl+q waw is characteristic of LBH, it is noteworthy that ‘J’ never employs the form ḫl+q waw. The ratio of normal to long waw-consecutive forms in the 1st

20. For further evidence of spoken Hebrew (as against the classical, literary form of the language) in the Bible, see G.A. Rendsburg, Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew, (AOS, 72; New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1990).
21. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa), 326. Kutscher added: ‘On the other hand, the first part of the [Isaiah] Scr. is parallel in this respect to Chronicles, where the [long] usage is not found, and whose author evinces a tendency to delete it even where his sources have it’; ibid., p. 327. This helps explain why ḫl+q waw never occurs in Chronicles (see above, pp. 24–25).
22. Qimron, HDSS, p. 44, n. 5.
person singular is 23:0 in ‘J’. Note the following examples of הָלַחְתַּנָּן in ‘J’ source texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 3.10</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן...הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 3.12</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 3.13</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.39</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.42</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.45</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.47</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.48</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן...הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 27.33</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 32.5</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 39.14</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 39.15</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 39.18</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 44.28</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 3.8</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 3.17</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 4.23</td>
<td>הָלַחְתַּנָּן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘J’’s consistent preference for הָלַחְתַּנָּן against הָלַחְתַּנָּן agrees with early Hebrew usage.

2. הֶלְחַתָּנָּן

There are two possible forms that the 3rd person masculine plural suffix can take when attached to a feminine plural noun ending in -אֹת, -אמ, or -אֶהְמ, -אֶהְמ. For example, compare הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Numb. 31.10) and הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Ezek. 6.14). This situation is true even when the pronominal suffix is added to masculine plural nouns which take the feminine plural ending -אֹת. For example, compare הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Exod. 4.5) and הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Neh. 9.2). Although there is no discernable difference in meaning between the shorter and longer endings, they are not free variants. The following chart lists how often the endings -אֹת or -אֶהְמ occur throughout the Hebrew Bible and the ratio between the two:

24. Although this section does not focus on וּ-וּ-consecutive forms for the 1st person plural, note the following examples of the normal וּ-וּ-consecutive (1cp) in ‘J’ source texts: הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Gen. 44.20); הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Gen. 44.22); הָלַחְתַּנָּן (Gen. 44.24).
The above numbers suggest that there is a gradual process in which the extended ending begins to replace the shorter ending. The shorter ending מְדוּנִים dominates in pre-exilic texts, the extended form מִדְוַיִּים being rare in comparison. Only in later books of the Bible does the extended form מִדְוַיִּים occur more frequently, eventually becoming more common than the shorter ending in the post-exilic period. Some words – מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים, מְדוּנִים – occur only with the short ending, even in exilic and post-exilic texts. But other words display strongly the trend in which the extended ending replaced the short ending in the post-exilic period, such as מְדוּנִים.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>מְדוּנִים</th>
<th>מִדְוַיִּים</th>
<th>Ratio of Short to Long Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis–Deuteronomy</td>
<td>231°28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1:0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua–Kings</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1:0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1:1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exilic books</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-exilic books</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1:1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Verses ascribed to the ‘J’ source are not included in these totals.
28. This high figure is distorted by the fact that certain chapters of the Pentateuch, due to their subject matter, contain unusually high numbers of words ending in מְדוּנִים. The book of Numbers alone contains 93 such examples because of the frequent repetition of the phrase מְדוּנִים מִדְוַיִּים מִדְוַיִּים מִדְוַיִּים מִדְוַיִּים מִדְוַיִּים. Even if we exclude Numbers from this chart, that leaves 138 examples of the short ending and 8 examples of the long, a ratio of 1:0.06.
29. As noted in the Introduction, exilic books include Isaiah 40–55, Ezekiel, and Lamentations.
30. As noted in the Introduction, post-exilic books include Isaiah 56–66, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, late Psalms, prose portions of Job, Qohelet, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.
31. Both GKC and Jouën-Muraoka observe that מְדוּנִים is older than מִדְוַיִּים, and that the former is more common in earlier books; GKC, p. 259, §91n; Jouën-Muraoka, p. 288, §94g.
32. F. Böttcher noted 56 nouns that appear only with מְדוּנִים. He found another 35 only with מִדְוַיִּים, many of which occur only in exilic or post-exilic texts. But 22 nouns appear with both the short and extended endings, although most of these nouns usually take the short ending (one exception is מְדוּנִים, which occurs 20 times as opposed to מִדְוַיִּים, which occurs but once in Gen. 34.21); Böttcher, Ausführliches Lehrbuch des hebräischen Sprachen, II (ed. F. Mühlau; Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1868), p. 42.
33. Another good example is מְדוּנִים, which Hurvitz discussed in A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, pp. 24–27.
This contrast can be more clearly seen in the following examples:

Exod. 36.34  
(Samaritan Pentateuch:)
2 Sam. 22.46  
(Compare Ps 18.46:)
1 Kgs 8.34  
(Compare 2 Chr 6.25:)
Isa. 59.8  
(Compare 1QIsa).

Hurvitz explained well the distinction between the short and long endings:

The short form $\text{moseh-tham}$—whose plurality is indicated only in the noun base ($\text{tham}$) but not by the attached possessive suffix ($\text{m}$) - is forced out by a more 'transparent' form, in which the possessive pronoun also acquires its own morpheme of plurality ($\text{tham}$). The extended new form $\text{moseh-thayhem}$ is tautological, since the morpheme $\text{-oth}$ is sufficient indication of a plural word... Such redundant employment of two plural morphemes usually stems from attempts, perhaps even unconscious, to emphasize the meaning (plural sense), which is liable to be felt insufficient on account of the form (plural ending) (emphasis in original).

Two factors may have influenced this shift from $\text{rdd}$ to $\text{rdd}$ in Biblical Hebrew: the influence of the Aramaic third person plural suffix $\text{dd}$, and internal analogy with the regular Hebrew masculine plural suffix $\text{dd}$.

Although the extended ending $\text{dd}$ does occur sporadically in early texts, it is the intensification of its use in exilic and post-exilic texts which characterizes LBH.

The late character of $\text{dd}$ can be seen in post-biblical literature. In

37. Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, p. 25; Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scoll (1QIsa), p. 445: 'process of analogy'. Further evidence that internal analogy played a significant role is the alternation between the forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>$\text{dd}$</th>
<th>$\text{dd}$</th>
<th>$\text{dd}$</th>
<th>$\text{dd}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch (excluding J)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua–Kings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-exilic texts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-exilic texts show a marked preference for the longer forms $\text{dd}$ and $\text{dd}$ and $\text{dd}$. See BDB, 767a, s.v. $\text{dd}$; 1065a, s.v. $\text{dd}$; KB, 771a, s.v. $\text{dd}$; 1026a, s.v. $\text{dd}$. Concerning the $\text{dd}$ and $\text{dd}$ see Rezetko, ‘Dating Biblical Hebrew’, pp. 226–27.
Tannaitic literature, the long form \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) occurs far more regularly than the shorter ending \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \). For example, \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) occurs 16 times, compared to \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) which occurs 6 times; \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) occurs 4 times, and only once do we find \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) in TH. Bar-Asher noted that short forms in TH should probably be understood as the result of biblicizing tendencies among the Tannaim:

One gets the impression that the occurrences of \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (e.g., ‘Avot 2.2, Niddah 4.2 [2x]) and \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (T. Sotah 6.4 according to MS Vienna; in MS Erfurt we find \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) in the singular) are due to the literary influence of the Bible. That is to say, it is ‘borrowed’, to use Hahennann’s term, and is not due to the copying of the texts by later generations... Rather, it is through the work of the Tannaitic authors themselves that we may understand the form \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) in Mishnah ‘Avot, which is a tractate with a clear literary relationship to the writings of the Bible.

The evidence from Qumran is more ambiguous. Biblical texts from Qumran prefer the longer form; for example, the Isaiah scroll from Qumran (1QIsa) twice replaces MT \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) with \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (Isa. 59.8, 66.4). But elsewhere the form \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (or \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \)) is preferred over \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (or \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \)). Nevertheless, the evidence of TH and the biblical texts from Qumran still allow us to conclude that in post-biblical literature, \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) (or \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) in QH) began to replace SBH \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) in similar contexts.

The longer ending \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) which predominates in LBH is absent from texts attributed to ‘J.’ Instead, we find two examples in which ‘J’ employs the preferred SBH ending \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \): 44

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gen. 44.13} & \quad \text{רִכְרֵעַט שְׁלַמְם} \\
\text{Exod. 5.5} & \quad \text{הַשְּׁמַלְדָּה אַחַת שָׁלְמָלָה}
\end{align*}
\]

If ‘J’ were composed during after the Exile as some maintain, we might expect at least one of these examples to display the longer form \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \).

---


43. Qimron, *HDSS*, p. 63. But twice in 11QT \( \text{לַרְחָתָמ} \) is corrected to \( \text{לַרְחָתָמ} \) (TS 21.9, 27.5); Qimron, ibid., p. 63, n. 80.

44. Note also that ‘J’ displays the SBH form \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) at Gen. 18.16 and 29.9. LBH \( \text{מַהֲרָתָא} \) is absent from ‘J’ source verses.
but such is not the case. ‘J’ employs morphology which is consistent with the pre-exilic period.

3. הָיָה

The verb הָיָה ‘live’ occurs frequently throughout the MT.\(^{45}\) The normal form of the 3ms perfect of הָיָה is יָהוּ.\(^{46}\) Regarding this form, Hurvitz commented:

Contrary to the standard inflection of final ה verbs, in which the third radical of the 3rd m.s. appears in the perfect as י (e.g., הָיָה), the root הָיָה loses both its final vowel and ה. In the paradigm of הָיָה, one finds the 3rd m.s. as יָהוּ - a form modelled after the pattern of the הָיָה verb (e.g., יַהוּ).\(^{47}\)

The form יָהוּ occurs frequently in pre-exilic texts:

Deut. 4.42\(^{48}\)

והי אל אתה:blackhole: הָיָה יָהוּ

And in exilic and post-exilic texts:

Ezek. 20.11, 13, 21\(^{49}\)

אִישׁ הָיָה אֶתְהִימָן וְיָדֵּד הָוָה

Neh. 6.11

אַלּ הָיָה הוּא הָיָה והָיָה

However, 3ms perfect הָיָה, which reflects the standard inflection of הָיָה (IIIy) verbs, occurs several times in exilic and post-exilic texts:


\(^{46}\) See BDB, הָיָה, p. 510b; KB, p. 292b; HALAT, p. 296b. For the cognate מְהַיָה in BA, see BDB, p. 1092b; and KB, מְהַיָה, p. 1092a.

\(^{47}\) Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, p. 47. Also cited in Bergey, ‘The Book of Esther’, p. 35. The 3ms perfect forms for מְהַיָה are discussed also in GKC, p. 218, §76i; and in Joüon-Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, pp. 210-211, §79s.

\(^{48}\) Also Gen. 5.5, 11.12, 11.14, 25.7; Lev. 18.5, 25.35; Deut. 5.21, 19.4, 19.5; 1 Sam. 20.31; 2 Sam. 12.22.

\(^{49}\) Also Jer. 21.9(K), 38.2(K); Ezek. 18.13, 18.24, 47.9. Note that Ezek. 20.11, 13, 21 = Lev. 18.5.

\(^{50}\) Also Jer. 21.9(Q), 38.2(Q); Ezek. 33.11. Baruch Levine argued that the unusual appearance of both SBH מְהַיָה and LBH מְהַיָה in Ezekiel 18 threatens this understanding of מְהַיָה as early and מְהַיָה as late (see below), especially given his argument that ‘P’ is literarily dependent upon Ezekiel (personal communication, March 21, 1994). First, this is not the only instance in the Bible where the same passage (sometimes the same verse) employs two different forms of the same word: consider, as but one example, the famous case of the alternation between Aramaic מְרַאָה and מְרַאָה in Jer. 10.11; see R. Ratner, ‘Morphological Variation in Biblical Hebrew Rhetoric’, Maarav 8 (1992): pp. 143–159. Second, note Hurvitz’ comment:
2. Morphology

Ezek. 18.23 et passim\(^{50}\)

Esth. 4.11 et passim\(^{51}\)

The form ℤי occurs in pre- and post-exilic Hebrew, but ℬי occurs only in late texts.

The lateness of the form ℤי is confirmed by its frequent appearance in post-biblical Hebrew.\(^{52}\) It occurs in Qumran Hebrew. Note the following example:

CD 3.16

(Compare Lev. 18.5 and Neh. 9.29)

It is also well attested in rabbinic literature:

T. Shabbat 15.8

Seder 'Olam Rabbah 1

The above evidence clearly indicates that ℬי reflects a secondary development which took place in exilic period Hebrew, in which ℬי became ℤי through analogy with regular IIIy verbs.\(^{53}\)

It is therefore significant that the 3ms perfect of ℬי in 'J'. Note the following example:

Gen. 3.22

The form of the 3ms perfect of ℬי in 'J' conforms to the classical usage, and is further evidence of the pre-exilic linguistic character of 'J'.

---

It is interesting to note that while using the formula ‘statutes and ordinances, by whose observance a man shall live’ and referring to the law of interest - both of which are mentioned in the Pentateuch - Ez. employs strictly the classical model [\[\]] as found in Lev. However, when its statements have no direct parallel in the Pentateuch, its author apparently feels himself less bound by classical usage. This may suggest that Ez. here is not only later than P linguistically, but also dependent on P literarily (emphasis in original).

See Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, p. 48

51. Also Neh. 9.29; Qoh. 6.6.


53. Thus Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, p. 47.
The Piel of the hollow verb הָרָא appears 10 times in exilic and post-exilic texts. Note the following:

- Ezek. 13.6
- Ps. 119.28
- Ps. 119.106
- Esth. 9.21
- Esth. 9.27
- Esth. 9.29
- Esth. 9.31
- Esth. 9.32
- Ruth 4.7

As can be seen in the above examples, the Piel of הָרָא is used in the sense of ‘fulfill (a word or promise), establish (a thing), confirm (a word), or impose (something on someone).’

The Aramaic equivalent of this expression, the Pael of הָרָא, occurs once in Daniel:

Dan. 6.8

The Hiphil of הָרָא is used with the same meaning in early texts of the Bible. Compare the use of הָרָא with the similar use of הָרָא in late texts:

- 2 Kgs 23.24
  (Compare Ezek. 13.6: הָרָא יַעֲשֵׂה)
- 1 Kgs 2.4
  (Compare Esth. 9.32: הָרָא יַעֲשֵׂה)

The above evidence suggests that SBH employed the Hiphil of הָרָא to mean ‘carry out, give effect to (an oath, covenant, vow, word, plan, or command of man),’ and this was replaced in late texts by the Piel of הָרָא.

The lateness of the form הָרָא is confirmed by its frequency in post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Although the Hiphil of הָרָא is prevalent at Qumran, הָרָא occurs once:

CD 12.20

54. On the late dating of this verse only (not the entire book of Ruth), see A. Hurvitz, ‘Shefat ha-Na’al’, pp. 44–49; and Hurvitz, Beyn Lashon le-Lashon, p. 140, n. 189.
55. See BDB, p. 878b; and KB, p. 832b, which calls הָרָא ‘late.’ See especially HALAT, 1016b: ‘spät, aram. Einfluss.’
56. See BDB, p. 1110b: ‘set up, establish as ordinance’; and KB, p. 1118b.
58. BDB, p. 879a; KB, p. 832b; HALAT, p. 1017a.
In rabbinic writings, the Hiphil of מְשַׁקִּית has almost completely disappeared, having been replaced by the Piel. Note the following examples:

M. Baba Batra 9.7
M. Shavu’ot 3.6
M. ‘Eduyyot 1.3
(Compare I Sam. 15.11: מְשַׁקִּית לֹא חָפֵר)
T. Makkot 5.11

The widespread use of the Piel of מְשַׁקִּית in both LBH and post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic reflects a larger morphological development. Hurvitz explained:

Furthermore, these forms constitute part of a general process manifested during this [late] period—apparently under the influence of Aramaic—in which the second radical of the Hollow Verb group (in Pi’el, Pu’al, Hithpa’al) is modified into a consonant.60

It is not only the use of מְשַׁקִּית in late and post-biblical texts which demonstrates that it is a late replacement for SBH מְשַׁקִּית: it is also the morphological development of hollow verbs in the post-exilic and post-biblical periods which demonstrate the lateness of מְשַׁקִּית.61

The ‘J’ source, however, only employs the Hiphil of מְשַׁקִּית and never LBH מְשַׁקִּית:

Gen. 26.3
(Compare M. Shavu’ot 3.6: מְשַׁקִּית לֹא קִבּוּ)

That ‘J’ employs מְשַׁקִּית instead of מְשַׁקִּית reflects SBH usage.

Besides the contrast between LBH מְשַׁקִּית and SBH מְשַׁקִּית, we can observe how LBH מְשַׁקִּית (and the Pael of מְשַׁקִּית in Aramaic) replaces other early expressions such as כֹּלֶם, מַלְאָכָה, and the Qal of מְשַׁקִּית.62 Note these examples where the early expression is used with רָדַב, in the sense of ‘fulfill or establish (a word or matter)’:63

1 Kgs 2.27
(Compare Tg. Jon.: מְשַׁקִּית לֹא קִבּוּ)
Deut. 19.15

59. HDSS, plates 16051–16060.
60. Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, p. 34. For the morphological distinction between the Hiphil and the Piel of hollow verbs, see also GKC, p. 197, §72m; and Jouïnon-Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, p. 215, §80h: ‘The examples [of piel of ayin-waw verbs], rather rare and late, appear to be loans from Aramaic.’
61. See Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel, pp. 34.
62. For a fuller discussion, see Hurvitz, Beyn Lashon le-Lashon, pp. 139–142.
63. See HDHL, plates 16051–16060; and Hurvitz, Beyn Lashon le-Lashon, pp. 141–142.
Note also several instances where post-biblical Aramaic קָפָה is employed to render Hebrew לְעָבֵּד ‘set up, establish’, וַעֲמַד ‘raise up’, נִשָּׁם ‘swear (an oath)’, and הָלַד ‘to live’:

- Deut. 32.8
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) קִמְתֶּם... (Compare Tg. Onq.) מָמְתוּ... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ...
- Exod. 9.16
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ לְדָמוּת... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ לְדָמוּת... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ לְדָמוּת...
- 2 Sam. 15.21
  - (Compare Tg. Jon.) אוֹמֵר לוֹ הַיּוֹם הָעָרֶץ... (Compare Tg. Jon.) אוֹמֵר לוֹ הַיּוֹם הָעָרֶץ... (Compare Tg. Jon.) אוֹמֵר לוֹ הַיּוֹם הָעָרֶץ...
- Deut. 6.13
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַהֲרֹן הָאָלָמָה הָרְאָה... (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַהֲרֹן הָאָלָמָה הָרְאָה... (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַהֲרֹן הָאָלָמָה הָרְאָה...

Although many of the early expressions continued to appear in post-exilic and post-biblical Hebrew, it is important to note that LBH קָפָה came to be used in expressions of similar meaning.

Significantly, ‘J’ not only never displays LBH קָפָה, but in several instances uses expressions in which the verb is later replaced, in post-exilic and post-biblical texts, by the Piel of מָקַס. Note the following:

- Gen. 3.22
  - (Compare Tg. Yer.) מָעַר לְעָבֵּד... (Compare Tg. Yer.) מָעַר לְעָבֵּד... (Compare Tg. Yer.) מָעַר לְעָבֵּד...
- Gen. 26.3
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַסָּק לְכָּרָה הָעָרֶץ לְאָבָרִים... (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַסָּק לְכָּרָה הָעָרֶץ לְאָבָרִים... (Compare Tg. Onq.) אַסָּק לְכָּרָה הָעָרֶץ לְאָבָרִים...
  - and Tg. Yer. I.
  - and M. Shavu'ot 3.6
  - and M. Shavu'ot 3.6
  - and M. Shavu'ot 3.6
- Gen. 47.25
  - (Compare Tg. Onq. and Yer. I) נְצִית... (_compare Tg. Onq. and Yer. I) נְצִית... (_compare Tg. Onq. and Yer. I) נְצִית...
- Exod. 9.16
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ...
  - (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ... (Compare Tg. Onq.) בָּרוּךְ...

Wherever ‘J’ could have used a later expression with קָפָה, it consistently displays the classical usage. The absence of LBH קָפָה is further evidence of the early background of ‘J’.

---

64. Although in this example the Targum added something not present in the MT, nevertheless the Aramaic equivalent of LBH קָפָה was employed to render fully the expression הָלַד in Gen. 3.22. Compare to the Targumic renditions of הָלַד in Gen. 47.25, below.
The term "שתה" (שתה) for the act of drinking appears but once in the Bible, in the post-exilic book of Esther:

Esth. 1.8

Elsewhere in the Bible, (1) the infinitive absolute "שתה" or (2) the infinitive construct "שתה" are employed for the same purpose. Note the following examples:

(1) 1 Sam. 1.9
Isa. 21.5
Hag. 1.6

(2) Numb. 33.14
Isa. 5.22
Jer. 2.18
Qoh. 8.15

The late character of "שתה" in Esther is confirmed by its frequent appearance in rabbinic literature. Note the following illustrations:

M. Ma’aser Sheni 1.7
(Compare Qoh 8.15.)
M. Nedarim 8.7
Sifre Deuteronomy 107

One should note the contrast between the use of "שתה" and "שתה" in M. Ma’aser Sheni 1.7 and M. Nedarim 8.7 and the use of the infinitives construct "שתה" and "שתה" in Qoh 8.15 (and elsewhere, see above). The q’tilā(h) noun pattern is itself characteristic of post-biblical Hebrew. Segal commented: ‘The Fem. form Q’tilā is exceedingly common in MH [TH] as a nomen actionis for the Qal, taking the place of the old BH construct infinitive.’ Although there are examples of the q’tilā(h) in earlier books of the Bible, these occur primarily in Northern (or non-

---

65. BDB, p. 1059a; KB, p. 1015a; HALAT, p. 1539b.
66. For a fuller discussion, see Bergey, ‘The Book of Esther’, pp. 29–30. See also Paton, Esther, p. 63; and Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 455.
67. BDB, p. 1059a; KB, p. 1014b; HALAT, p. 1537b.
68. Hebrew "שתה" is not attested at Qumran, which displays instead the participle for the same purpose; Bergey, ‘The Book of Esther’, p. 29.
69. See HDHL, plates 18343–18344; and Bergey, ‘The Book of Esther’, p. 30. The writing "שתה" in the below examples is present in HDHL, which bases its readings on MS Kaufmann.
70. Segal, Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, p. 103, §228.
Thus the appearance of הָלַ֫ה in Esth 1.8 represents a development in post-exilic Hebrew, occurring alongside the SBH use of the infinitives (תָּלַ֫ה). The ‘J’ source, on the other hand, never displays LBH הָלַ֫ה, but employs instead only the SBH infinitive construct הָלַ֫ה. Note the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.19</td>
<td>תָּלַ֫ה לֹא לֵשהָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 24.22</td>
<td>הבושר בחול הָלַ֫ה לֵשהָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 30.38</td>
<td>תָּלַ֫ה לֹא לֵשהָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 7.18</td>
<td>נַעַרְמָה מְעַרְוָה לֵשהָה מְשַׁרְרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 15.23</td>
<td>לאו לֹא לֵשהָה מְשַׁרְרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod. 17.1</td>
<td>אֶתֶּן לֹא לֵשהָה הָנֶג</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘J’’s preference for the infinitive construct הָלַ֫ה in contrast to LBH הָלַ֫ה is further evidence that ‘J’ was composed before the post-exilic period.

71. 4 examples of the q’tila(h) pattern occur in northern contexts: פְּלַשִּׁים (Judg. 5.16), פְּלַשִּׁים (1 Kgs 19.8), and פְּלַשִּׁים (Qoh. 12.12). 2 other examples occur in contexts which do not appear to be northern. פְּלַשִּׁים (Ps. 19.13), פְּלַשִּׁים (2 Chron. 30.17). Although פְּלַשִּׁים in 2 Chron. 30.17 could reflect the post-exilic date of Chronicles, it should be noted that פְּלַשִּׁים (2 Chron. 30.17) occurs in a passage describing the pilgrimage of the northern tribes to Jerusalem. Although he did not mention the examples other than in Judg 5.16 and 1 Kgs 19.8, Segal’s observation is worth repeating: ‘The fact that in earlier BH [this form] occurs only in the Song of Deborah and in the story of Elijah may, perhaps, tend to show that it was originally a Northern dialectal form, which was received into the literary language only after it had established itself in the spoken language’; Segal, Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew, p. 103, §228.

72. Examples such as הָלַ֫ה in Qoh. 8.15 testify to the persistence of the SBH forms in post-exilic Hebrew.