Textual Criticism and Linguistic Diachrony in the Book(s) of Kings



Vladimir Olivero

Wolfson College

University of Oxford

Thesis and Abstract Submitted to

The Faculty of Oriental Studies

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term 2021

78,280 Words

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

INTRODUCTION 1

The Hebrew of Kings 2

Textual Criticism of Kings 12

Hebrew 12

Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate 15

Greek 15

Old Latin 18

Ethiopic 18

Armenian 19

Georgian 20

Coptic and (Old) Church Slavonic 23

Methodology and Goals 24

CHAPTER 1: 2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39, THE TEXT-CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE 30

Brief Overview of the Scholarship on 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39 31

Textual Criticism and 2 Kings 18-20 // Isaiah 36-39 33

The Linguistic Profile of the Variants in 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39 43

Orthography and Phonology 44

Scriptio plena vs scriptio defectiva 44

Metathesis 45

Dropping of א 46

Interchange between א *and* ה 46

Interchange between מ *and* ב *and addition / omission of* א 47

Writing of the 3ms pronominal suffix with ה- or ו- 48

Morphology 48

Pronominal Suffix: Changes in Gender 48

Prepositions: Interchanges 49

Noun: Changes in Number 50

Noun: Changes in Mišqal 51

Verb: Changes in Number 51

Verb: Changes in Form and Binyan 53

Addition / omission of directional ה- 54

Syntax 55

Addition / omission of the conjunction -וְ 55

Addition / omission of the article -ה 55

Use of the Article with the Construct State 56

Addition / omission of the relative אֲשֶׁר 58

Addition / omission of אֵת 58

Conjunctions: Interchange between כִּי and פֶּן 59

Verb: Interchange between wayyiqtol and כִּי + qatal 60

Verb: Interchange between Imperative and Infinitive Absolute 60

Verb: Interchange between weqatal and הִנֵּה + pronominal suffix + participle (?) 61

Transpositions 62

Lexicon 63

Longer Text in Kings 67

Longer Text in Isaiah 72

Summary 75

CHAPTER 2: 2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LINGUISTIC DIACHRONY AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM 80

Orthography and Phonology 81

The Theophoric Endings יָהּ- and יָהוּ- 81

Scriptio Plena and Defectiva and the Numeral 80 87

The Use of Unassimilated מִן and Proclitic -מִ / -מֵ 89

Morphology 103

The Long Form of the Prefix Conjugation and the Wayyiqtol 103

Syntax 111

Weqatal in MT 2 Kgs 18:36 111

The Numeral 5180 156

הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי 159

Style 168

The Use of וַיְהִי in the Regnal Formula of MT 2 Kgs 18:1 168

CHAPTER 3: OTHER SIGNIFICANT CASES FROM KINGS 173

MT 1 Kings 12:32 173

MT 1 Kings 13:1-32 181

MT 2 Kings 17:6 194

A Classical Construction with וַיְהִי 200

Summary 222

SUMMARY 223

APPENDIX 226

BIBLIOGRAPHY 272

ABSTRACT

This thesis approaches from the perspective of textual criticism the thorny issue of Ancient Hebrew and historical linguistics, above all the possibility of providing a relative date for the biblical texts. More specifically, I argue that the linguistic assessment of the variants contained in the analyzed texts provides a solid argument in favor of the traditional understanding and periodization of Ancient Hebrew. In order to illustrate my method and approach, I have selected some passages taken from the book(s) of Kings, which is remarkable for its textual development and history.

In the Introduction, I give an overview of the linguistic profile of Kings as well as of the main textual witnesses employed in this thesis. I also discuss my approach to the text and why it is relevant in the current discussion on Ancient Hebrew and linguistic diachrony. Chapter 1 focusses on the textual profile of the parallel accounts found in Isaiah 36-39 and 2 Kings 18-20. Almost all the variants are listed and, if necessary, discussed from a linguistic perspective, showing that later scribes could reproduce the pre-exilic language without difficulty. Chapter 2 deals with those variants from the parallel accounts that are linguistically relevant for a relative dating of the two texts. This proves that a series of late readings does indeed betray the hand of late scribes who let into the text linguistic elements that cannot have belonged to the pre-exilic idiom. Finally, in Chapter 3 I discuss more late and non-classical linguistic features that can be detected through the text-critical assessment of other portions of Kings. A concluding summary describes the results achieved by this two-pronged approach to the diachronic analysis of the biblical texts and announces what should be done next in this area.

Most of the linguistic and text-critical features are collected in an appendix found at the end.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my two supervisors, Prof. Alison Salvesen and Prof. Geoffrey Khan, for their precious support during the last year of my doctorate. In a very difficult time, they stepped in and provided the human and academic help that I needed, and I am very grateful for this. The linguistic and text-critical arguments of this thesis were greatly improved thanks to their fresh contributions and deep insights, and without their guidance I would have not been able to complete this journey. I am also very thankful to Dr. John Screnock for his friendship, guidance, and constant support through the years, during my MSt first and then my DPhil. He has always been a great source of encouragement and I am grateful for his time and the many opportunities that he has given me in terms of teaching and research. I would also like to thank Prof. Jacob Dahl for the opportunity to attend his classes, join the CDLI project, and feel part of the Assyriology community at Oxford. I am grateful to my college advisor Prof. Yuhan Vevaina for his precious advice about the present and the future. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Oxford-Ullendorff Graduate Scholarship in Semitic Philology and the Rothschild Hanadiv Foundation Europe, which made it possible for me to study at this prestigious institution.

My time in this city has been very special, and in these five years there have been several seasons spent with different cohorts of people: it feels as if I have lived many lives and travelled to many countries. I have fond memories of my first year at Linacre College where I met Rocco Meli, with whom I immediately felt at home while being in a new and foreign context, Jacob Omorodion, whose kind heart taught me a great deal, Karrar Ali, whose wisdom and jokes I remember every day. With them I shared unforgettable experiences and joys. At Linacre I also met Giovanni Carù, my pizza, football, and travel buddy, who is like a brother to me. With

Nyree Manoukian I have shared my entire journey at Oxford, from matriculation to the submission of our doctoral theses. She has been an amazing friend across these years and a source of solace during the gloomy months of the pandemic. I am most grateful to the cohort of people that I have met at Wolfson College during my DPhil years: Anthony Buck, for the conversations on linguistics and theology during our gym sessions; Alessandro Vatri and Michael Depreter, with whom I shared precious experiences not only in Oxford but also in Armenia; Thea Sommerschield, my top floor housemate in Park Town; Fahraz Jan and Jean-Philippe Stone, whose rhetorical skills and jokes are always a great source of entertainment; Julien Decharneux and Ernesto Oyarbide, for the many interesting conversations and the long walks around Oxford; Yasser Khan, Amogh Sharma, and the rest of the group for all the movies, dinners, games, and fun. I am thankful to Matthew Albanese, Andrew Daniel, Bradley Marsh, and Joel Bell for all the hours spent sharing our experiences, discussing our research, and chilling with a beer in Oxford, Dublin, Scotland, and the US.

Back home, I could count on the wise advice of Ugo Mondini, on the tasty dinners and shared memories with Giacomo Felloni, and on the entertaining conversations with Sarah Papagni. I am also grateful to Gionatan Iasio, Nazario Melchionda, and Davide Galliani for our deep bond, which the time and distance have not managed to loosen nor weaken. I am thankful to Antonella Bellantuono, who has been a special person from the very beginning of our friendship.

Last but not least, my deepest gratitude and love go to my mother and to my sister, who have supported and rooted for me more than anyone else during these years of study abroad. This thesis and whatever else I may have achieved in my short academic path are dedicated to them.

INTRODUCTION

Historical Linguistics and the Book(s) of Kings

The book of Kings is among the most fascinating Ancient Hebrew linguistic corpora in prose, whose complexities and variety are probably paralleled only by those of the book of Samuel. While both still lack a systematic and comprehensive linguistic study, individual portions of Kings, most notably the northern prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha, have received the attention of the scholarly community. By the same token, there exist overviews of a series of interesting linguistic features hailing from the concluding chapters of 2 Kings. Nevertheless, neither section of Kings has been systematically described and analysed in depth.

Besides its linguistic peculiarities, Kings poses many challenges also for its manifold textual and redactional issues. Each chapter and section of the book is fraught with philological *cruces* that are not always easy or possible to solve, and the many layers that make up the finished text as we have it in the medieval Masoretic manuscripts are often difficult to identify and untangle. One of the most exciting and challenging areas of study in the field of textual criticism precisely concerns the possibility of producing an edition of the Old Greek (OG) version of Kings, a work that is still lacking among the volumes of the Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen. There is hope that the editions of both 3 and 4 Kingdoms will see the light of the day during this decade. Likewise, the scholarly community eagerly awaits the publication of the two volumes on Kings for the Hebrew Bible Critical Editions project. Most certainly, the achievement in these two areas will considerably enhance our understanding of the textual history of Kings.

In my study, I endeavour to bring together the two abovementioned approaches and fields, that is linguistics, more specifically historical linguistics, and textual criticism. The main goal is to illustrate how the descriptions of the linguistic and textual phenomena, as well as the results independently yielded by the investigations carried out in each area, shed light and overlap with each other. In other words, so-called non-classical linguistic features appear where we also find textual corruptions or marks of secondary editorial activity. The scribes who intervened and changed, expanded, cut, and copied the texts left traces also in the form of late linguistic features. It is on these elements of the text that I will focus my attention, in the hopes of contributing positively to the discussion about linguistic periodization of Ancient Hebrew by adopting an approach that has been used before only in a rather limited way. Because of its many linguistic and textual peculiarities, the book of Kings presents itself as an excellent candidate for this sort of investigation.

In the pages that follow, I will first describe what we know about the language of Kings and what aspects have been so far addressed. I will then present an overview of the text-critical profile of the Masoretic Text (MT) and of the main witnesses that are used for Kings in general and in this thesis more specifically. Finally, I will explain where I stand in the ongoing debate about historical linguistics of Ancient Hebrew, the possibility of dating the biblical texts relatively, and how my approach contributes to the discussion.

THE HEBREW OF KINGS

The most fascinating aspect of the language of Kings is the collection of unusual forms and words that are mainly scattered through the chapters that belong to the so-called northern prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha. Because of the content and provenance of these sections of Kings, scholars have usually identified the peculiar linguistic elements that occur in the

stories as northernisms. Burney (1903: 208-9) was probably the first to draw up an exhaustive list of such features. According to him, there are ten grammatical peculiarities that belong to 'the dialect of North Palestine'. Burney's list has served as the basis for all discussions that followed, sometimes being expanded, sometimes being reduced:

Pronominal suffixes 2nd fem. sing. ־כִי and ־יְכִי	2 Kgs. 4:2, 3, 7
Independent pronoun 2nd fem. sing. אַתְּי	2 Kgs. 4:16, 23; 8:1
Demonstrative pronoun זֹה	2 Kgs. 6:19
Infinitive construct of ל"ה verbs with suffix	2 Kgs. 5:18
Relative -שֶׁ	2 Kgs. 6:11
Preservation of the article after preposition -בְּ	2 Kgs. 7:12
The constructions עַד־הֵם and עַד־אֲלֵיהֶם	2 Kgs. 9:18, 20
Anticipatory pronominal suffix	1 Kgs. 19:21; 21:13
Indefinite use of אֶחָד	1 Kgs. 19:4, 5; 20:13, 35; 22:9; 2 Kgs. 4:1; 7:8; 8:6
Use of the adverb אֵיכָה with the meaning 'where'	2 Kgs. 6:13

In addition, Burney mentions some roots that 'betray the influence of Aramaic' and would therefore constitute further signs of the northern origin of the stories. Burney's survey and catalogue has generally been accepted by those commentators who tend to focus on the more technical aspects of the text (e.g., COGAN AND TADMOR 1988: 9).

Young (1995) has a more nuanced approach to these grammatical forms and correctly observes that they usually occur in direct speech and in the mouths of Elisha and of Aramean characters. Because most of the forms that appear in these chapters are those regularly attested in the rest

of the Hebrew Bible, it follows that the rare exceptions gathered by Burney reflect the intentions of the author(s) to characterize the speech of certain foreign characters by employing forms that belong to the variety of dialects that could be found around Judah.

A very important contribution in this area has come from an article by Schniedewind and Sivan (1997), who reanalyse and reconsider Burney's list, as well as some additional features that Rendsburg (1991; 1992) previously identified as northernisms in two of his studies. The more rigorous and cautious approach of Schniedewind and Sivan shows that for most of the features identified in Kings as elements of a northern Hebrew dialect there is not enough evidence pointing in that direction. The majority of the features that they identify as northernisms, by which they refer to 'a variety of non-classical dialects' (1997: 325), occurs in 1 Kings 17 and 2 Kings 4-6, sections which are best described as folktales. These are the linguistic features that can be accepted as northernisms according to the categories established by the two authors:

LEXICON	
אַדֶּרֶת 'coat'	1 Kgs. 19:13, 19; 2 Kgs. 2:8, 13, 14
אֶחָד, אַחַת 'a certain (indefinite)'	1 Kgs 19:4, 5; 20:13, 35; 22:9; 2 Kgs 4: 1; 7:8, 13; 8:6; 12:1
זֹה 'this'	2 Kgs. 6:19
כַּד 'jar'	1 Kgs. 17:12, 14, 16; 18:34
נֹקֵד 'shepherd'	2 Kgs. 3:4
-שֶׁ 'that, which'	2 Kgs. 6:11; 7:12
VERBS	
גָּהַר 'to crouch, bend'	1 Kgs. 18:42; 2 Kgs. 4:34, 35
גָּזַר 'to cut'	2 Kgs. 6:4

זוֹרֵר ‘to sneeze’	2 Kgs. 4:35
הִשְׁלָה ‘to mislead’	2 Kgs. 4:28
שִׁגֵּס ‘to gird’	1 Kgs. 18:46
2nd feminine singular verbal suffix תִּי-	1 Kgs. 17:13; 2 Kgs. 4:23
Use of the infinitive absolute as an indicative	2 Kgs. 3:16; 4:43; 5:10
PRONOMINAL FORMS	
Pronominal suffixes 2nd fem. כִי-	2 Kgs. 4:2, 3, 7
INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS	
אַתִּי	2 Kgs. 4:7, 16, 23; 8:1
PHONOLOGY	
Contraction of diphthongs	2 Kgs. 5:25
MORPHOLOGY	
The feminine nominal ending -āt (or -at)	2 Kgs. 9:17

The most thorough and far-reaching treatment of the language of Kings, and more specifically of the Elijah and Elisha stories, is that of Rendsburg (2002a), whose main goal is to identify, collect, and describe what he calls Israelian Hebrew (IH), that is a group of dialects spoken in the regions north of Judah. In his monograph, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*, he analyses the language of the chapters that run from 1 Kings 12 to 2 Kings 17. He identifies several ‘northern’ features for each chapter (APPENDIX 0.1), including many that Schniedewind and Sivan had previously dismissed (e.g., אֲכִילָה in 1 Kgs. 19:8). While Rendsburg’s analyses are very insightful, and although he draws very interesting parallels between Ancient Hebrew and other Semitic languages, it should be noted that in most cases, as Schniedewind and Sivan had observed, there is not enough evidence to consider certain features as belonging to the Israelian Hebrew group of dialects. Furthermore, Pat-El (2017) has recently shown how the

methodology usually employed by Rendsburg and a few other scholars to claim that a feature reflects a northern dialect is flawed. We should therefore exercise much caution when we try to attribute certain rare or apparently anomalous linguistic features to so-called Israelian Hebrew.

Another scholar who has often provided insightful comments on the language of the northern prophetic cycles, above all from the perspective of diachrony, is Rofé. Besides his monograph (2014) on the prophetic stories, which has plenty of linguistic notes, in his articles Rofé adopts an approach that tries to link historical linguistics to philology and date the biblical texts based on both disciplines. For instance, we see this for the story of Naboth's vineyard (1988) and 2 Kings 1 (2014: 24). This two-pronged approach is not dissimilar from the one employed in this thesis, although my emphasis and reliance on the text-critical data are stronger than his.

Finally, the Elijah and Elisha stories belong to what Polak (2012: 303) calls the 'Medial corpus', that is the collection of texts that also narrate the tales of the patriarchs, Samuel, Saul and David, and parts of the tales of Moses and the saviour-judges. According to Polak, a systematic analysis of the explicit lexicalised sentence constituents (arguments and adjuncts) shows that biblical prose is divided into three main corpora characterized by interesting stylistic differences (see also POLAK 1998, 2003, 2005, 2016a, 2016b):

- Achaemenid corpus (Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, 1-2 Chronicles, Daniel 1), characterized by very complex language and style, in which there are clear signs of Aramaic and Persian influence. The style of this corpus is typical of the administrative register. The texts are dated to the Persian and Seleucid periods.
- Judean corpus (Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic texts), characterized by long clauses, long noun groups, frequent hypotaxis. The conspicuous stylistic marks of

the written language indicate that these texts were composed at the Judean court in the 7th and 6th centuries BCE.

- Medial corpus (see above), characterized by short sentences, paratactic clauses, typical of the spoken language. These stories originated as oral narratives between the 10th and the 8th centuries BCE.

Polak's sociolinguistic and sociohistorical study on the style and syntax of the Elijah and Elisha stories further confirms the antiquity of these accounts and illustrates the potential and importance of an approach that considers larger portions of text rather than individual lexical features.

The prophetic stories, which cover the central part of Kings and contain a fair amount of the chapters that make up the book, have rightly received the attention of the scholarly community. Their many peculiar linguistic features could not go unnoticed. However, a solid and comprehensive study of the linguistic and text-critical profile of this portion of Kings is still lacking, although Rofé's work certainly constitutes a good starting point and a valuable effort in this direction. As observed above, Rendsburg's approach and conclusions should be taken with much caution, although there is no doubt that his notes contain insightful parallels with other Northwest Semitic languages and constitute a collection of interesting data.

In addition to the fascinating linguistic features of the Elijah and Elisha stories, there is another aspect of the language of Kings that is often mentioned in the commentaries and articles. Many scholars, in fact, have noticed that some of the forms that are found in Kings seem to reflect a non-classical type of language, usually identified as non-standard, exilic, or late.

In this regard, one feature that has been widely investigated and can function well to illustrate the variety of explanations provided is the use of the weqatal with the meaning of a preterite.

This form, in fact, occurs multiple times in Kings, with a rather high concentration in the concluding chapters of 2 Kings. Because it is generally believed that such weqatal substitutes the wayyiqtol only in post-biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, its presence and frequency in Kings have always been considered outstanding.

In the early 20th century, a few scholars tried to tackle the issue from a literary or stylistic point of view. Burney (1903: 318) defines the form וְתָפַשׂ in 2 Kgs. 14:7 (as well as the weqatals that appear in 2 Kgs. 18:4 and in 2 Kgs. 21:4, 6) as a 'decadence in style', a representation of 'popular style (as distinct from the prophetic or literary style) of the closing years of the kingdom of Judah'. Montgomery (1934: 50-51), with reference to וְלָקַח in 2 Kgs. 14:14, attributes such forms to a 'reduction' in the process of copying from the lapidary source, which presented a personal pronoun (in this case הוּא) between the -ו and the verb (*והוא לקח). The same obtains in 2 Kgs 18:4. He observes how these forms are signs of careless omission, even flagrant cases of offense in the light of a proper understanding of grammar. Similarly, Stade and Schwally (1904: 248) consider וְלָקַח in 2 Kgs. 14:14 'grammatically impossible', and conjecture a corruption for וַיִּקַּח, which is what Kittel proposes in the apparatus to the text in his edition of the Hebrew Bible. Interestingly, Kittel (1900: 260) in his commentary to Kings sees in both narrative וְתָפַשׂ and וְלָקַח 'die Art der späten Zeit' (but he also hypothesizes a possible textual corruption).

In more recent years, Spieckermann (1982: 120-30) discussed in a short excursus the use of the 'perfectum copulativum' (which bears no difference in meaning from the wayyiqtol) in the context of the reform account of 2 Kgs. 23.[1] He considers the reiterated presence of such a form as a sign of Aramaic influence on Hebrew, and therefore a late characteristic. His all-encompassing analysis of the ca. 200 occurrences of the weqatal used as 'perfectum

[1] Cf. 2 Kgs. 23:4 (וְנָשָׂא), 5 (וְהִשְׁבִּית), 8 (וְנָתַץ), 10 (וְטִמֵּא), 12 (וְהִשְׁלִיךְ), 14 (וְשִׁבַּר), 15 (וְשָׂרַף).

copulativum' (he rules out the possibility that the weqatals in 2 Kgs. 23 could be 'perfecta frequentativa') is aimed at putting things into perspective when one considers the ca. 15 occurrences of weqatal in the Hebrew Bible appearing in texts allegedly written before Aramaic held sway in the region. He believes that such apparently unusual occurrences should be viewed as scribal mistakes. According to Koch (1988: 103-5), the weqatal forms of 2 Kgs. 23 are to be interpreted as a literary device marking different subsections within a larger portion of narrative. Van Keulen (1996: 164), in his diachronic analysis of 2 Kgs. 21, rejects Koch's explanation because the thematic relationship between the subsections would not hold. He also argues against the idea that the weqatal could be explained from a diachronic perspective. He agrees with both Meyer (1959: 114-23) and Spieckermann that the weqatal is not necessarily a late form, but he does not consider valid the arguments of either author: on the one hand, Ugaritic belongs to a much earlier period to be compared to Hebrew (Meyer), while on the other, not every instance of early weqatal can be due to textual corruption (Spieckermann).[2]

Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd (2008: 150-5) dwell on the occurrences of the weqatal longer than the previous authors. They define the scope of their analysis as 2 Kgs. 21-25, where the verb form appears fifteen times.[3] After reviewing the work done by previous scholars on this matter, they build up their argument in three points. First, the diachronic understanding of a linear development from wayyiqtol in pre-exilic Hebrew to weqatal in LBH is unfounded as both Rezetko (2003: 233-5) and van Peursen (2004: 155-7, 165) are held to have shown in their studies. Then, they observe that, although a breakup in the verbal syntax of LBH should be expected, this is not the case. The homogeneity of the verbal system in both CBH and LBH

[2] Along with the ca. 15 occurrences of early weqatal listed by Spieckermann, van Keulen (1996: 165-7) also cites ll. 4-5 from the Meṣad Ḥashavyahu inscription, although he acknowledges the uncertain reading of ואסם, which could be understood both as a weqatal and an infinitive absolute.

[3] 2 Kgs. 21:4 (וּבָנָה), 6 (וְהֶעֱבִיר, וְעוֹנֵן, וְנִחֵשׁ, וְעָשָׂה); 23:4 (וְנָשָׂא), 5 (וְהִשְׁבִּית), 8 (וְנָתַץ), 10 (וְטִמֵּא), 12 (וְהִשְׁלִיךְ), 14 (וְשִׁבַּר), 15 (וְשָׂרַף); 24:14 (וְהִגְלָה); 25:29 (וְאָכַל, וְשִׁנָּא).

therefore goes against the idea of development from wayyiqtol to weqatal. Finally, the irregularity of the distribution of the weqatal forms in 2 Kgs. 21-25 constitutes a further proof against a diachronic understanding of the phenomenon, given that one would expect a uniform diffusion of the new form in a late(r) text. In conclusion, 'the series of weqatàlti forms in the final five chapters of Kings should not be interpreted as marks of the exilic and/or postexilic writing or editing of these chapters' (2008: 155).

As this short review of the main opinions voiced about the frequently attested weqatals in the final chapters of Kings shows, both stylistic and diachronic explanations have been invoked to clarify the unusual clustering of these forms. In Chapter 2, I will address some of these unexpected occurrences, however leaving aside those that appear in the final chapters of Kings. These, in fact, would require a much deeper treatment than this thesis allows. At the same time, most of these occurrences may not be understood through the approach that I am adopting, that is the relevance of textual criticism for the identification of late linguistic features due to scribal intervention in texts allegedly composed in pre-exilic times.

Finally, it is worth mentioning a recent contribution by Hornkohl (2016: 33) that focuses on the same chapters in which we find the above-mentioned weqatals. In an overview of Transitional Biblical Hebrew, he affirms that 'the language of 2 Kgs 24-25 also bears traits of TrBH, and there is some evidence that the second half of Kings has a later linguistic profile than the first half'. Although he does not specifically refer to the weqatal, Hornkohl mentions three features which would help identify the language of these chapters as the TBH chronolect. For one thing, he observes (p. 36) that the short theophoric element יָהּ- in Hebrew names prevails over its longer and earlier counterpart יָהוּ- in the second half of Kings. He also mentions (p. 37) the term חֲיָלִים, occurring in 2 Kgs. 25:23, 26, as an example of the tendency found in later texts to pluralize nouns otherwise used in the singular in earlier texts. The last distinctive feature of TBH which he describes (p. 40) is the double-plural construct שָׂרֵי חֲיָלִים (2 Kgs.

25:23, 26), an additional sign of non-classical language. Another feature has been discussed by Mizrahi (2011: 688-9) in his treatment of the priestly title כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ, typical of the books written in the Persian period (cf. 2 Chr. 19:11; 24:11; 26:20; 31:10; Ezr. 7:5) and also found in post-biblical Hebrew (1QM 15:4; 18:5), which sometimes replaces the older כֹּהֵן גָּדוֹל and כֹּהֵן הַמִּשְׁנֶה. Its occurrence in 2 Kgs. 25:18 (|| Jer. 52:24) further confirms the exilic linguistic profile of this chapter.

The same observations made about the prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha also apply to the final chapters of Kings, which have caught the attention of many scholars because of their peculiar linguistic features. The main difference lies in the fact that the features usually singled out in the prophetic stories are identified as northern or foreign elements and explained either as traces of a northern origin or as rhetorical devices (code switching), whereas those found in the final chapters of Kings tend to be understood as signs of non-classical or late language. Nevertheless, also for the concluding section of Kings we still lack a systematic linguistic study. Hornkohl's overview, as well as the remarks on individual features made by other scholars, provide interesting hints that suggest an exilic date for at least 2 Kings 24-25, thus confirming the *terminus post quem* provided by the content itself of such chapters.

Together with the many unique linguistic features, Kings is also (in)famous for its text-critical profile, which probably constitutes the greatest challenge of the book. Before outlining and explaining how I intend to approach the study of Kings' language, it is therefore important to discuss what has been achieved in this area so far.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF KINGS

Scholarship on the text-critical issues that populate Kings is immense and impossible to summarize in a few pages. Every commentary spends a great deal of time addressing the many problems found in MT Kings and discussing the potential solutions that one can devise through emendation or by considering and comparing the different readings contained in the witnesses of a certain verse or portion of text. We find this in fairly dated commentaries, such as that of Thenius (1873), down to the most recently published ones, such as those of Knauf (2016 and 2019) and McKenzie (2019). By the same token, very important monographs and articles have recently been published about this topic, such as Kauhanen's (2018) detailed investigation of Lucifer of Cagliari's relevance for the Old Latin text of 1-2 Kings, or Trebolle Barrera's (2020) collection of contributions recently translated from Spanish into English by Piquer Otero and Torijano. That scholarly output continues to multiply in this area testifies to the complexity of the topic and to the magnitude of its challenges. In this section, I will present the individual textual witnesses and highlight the main problems that each one of them poses, as well as their relevance for our understanding of the textual history of the book.

HEBREW

Unfortunately, Kings is only very fragmentarily preserved among the Qumran manuscripts (4QKgs, 5QKgs, 6QpapKgs), with most of the material belonging to 1 Kings (TREBOLLE BARRERA 1988; 1992; 2010; LANGE 2016a: §5.3.1.8-12). This means that we must rely on the medieval Hebrew manuscripts for most of the book, which contain a form of the text commonly known as the Masoretic Text (TOV 2012: 24). The specific form of the Masoretic textual tradition to which I will refer in my thesis is found in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia,* which presents a printed edition of Codex Leningrad B19.

As the innumerable studies published on the Hebrew text of Kings show, the Masoretic text is but one of the main witnesses and most certainly it contains an edition that must have differed from the one circulating in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, let alone in the earlier stages of formation of the text. As will be explained in the following paragraphs, the Greek and Old Latin versions are of great importance when we try to retrieve the older layers of the book. Other daughter versions may also be relevant in this regard. In the Greco-Roman period the form of Hebrew text that was imposing itself belonged to the so-called proto-Masoretic tradition. This tradition is the only one attested in the texts found outside Qumran in the sites of Masada – texts written between 50 BCE and 30 CE –, Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Ṣeʾelim – texts copied between 20 CE and 115 CE –, and it constitutes the direct precursor of the one found in the medieval Masoretic texts, being virtually identical to it (CROSS 1964; YOUNG 2002; LANGE 2009: 51-2; 2010; TOV 2019: 200-2). As for Qumran, scholars generally speak about pre-Masoretic (or MT-like) and proto-Masoretic manuscripts, the former group having more variants than the latter when compared to MT (TOV 2019: 203-5). According to Tov (2019: 209-10) there is only one certain proto-Masoretic text hailing from Qumran, i.e., 8QPhyl I. On the other hand, MT-like manuscripts are attested from 225-175 BCE (the date usually attributed to the copying of 4QJer^{a}). Both text types would have existed contemporarily until the proto-MT took over around the end of the 1st century and the beginning of the 2nd century CE.[4] Because I refer to the stages that preceded the MT only when I discuss the reconstructed *Vorlage* of a series of textual witnesses (LXX^{B} / καίγε, Peshitta, Vulgate, Targum) rather than actual manuscripts, I will keep using the widespread terminology of proto-Masoretic tradition in reference to such variants, although pre-Masoretic or MT-like may be more accurate by virtue of the absence of the readings in question in the MT. As we shall see in the following chapters, there are some readings that, based on a comparison with

[4] For different approaches to and classifications of the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts, see Lange 2016b: §1.2.2.

other witnesses, seem to have entered the text of Kings at a quite late stage, being absent in most or all witnesses of the proto-Masoretic tradition. It is to a type of text that represented this tradition that the Old Greek translation of Kings was aligned from the 1st century BCE, taking the shape of the so-called καίγε recension. Despite its diffusion and importance around the turn of the era, the proto-Masoretic tradition was only one of the traditions attested in the last few centuries BCE, and most certainly not the earliest. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation of Kings, in fact, when retrievable to any extent, often reflects a different edition of the book, which sometimes also contains an earlier form of the text. The possibility of accessing a different type of Hebrew text via the text-critical analysis of the Lucianic manuscripts (see below) and the surviving snippets and readings of the Vetus Latina (see below) constitutes one of the pillars upon which my study rests. A comparison between these witnesses and the Masoretic text, as well as their text-critical assessment, allows for a relative dating of the individual portions and variants analysed. Consequently, it will also be interesting to investigate from a linguistic perspective those variants that we encounter in the MT, informed by the knowledge that they represent a later form of the text. In order to find those portions of text that most evidently show that there was more than one edition of Kings and select the relevant readings, I will rely on the studies of other scholars who have devoted their time to analyse the different textual layers preserved in Kings and comprehend the relationship between such layers and the witnesses that contain them.

The most insightful studies on the textual history of Kings, which in many instances illustrate the secondary nature of MT, have focused on sections that present very complex issues. To name a few, Trebolle Barrera has discussed at length both the stories of Solomon and Jeroboam (1980) and those of Jehu and Joash (1984), while more recently Richelle (2010) and Tekoniemi (2019) have analysed in depth the chapters in 2 Kings on Elisha's death and the fall of Samaria, respectively. However, most of the scholarly literature on the textual history of Kings and the

nature of the Hebrew witnesses is disseminated in hundreds of articles and book chapters, and the contributions of scholars such as Trebolle Barrera, Schenker, Piquer Otero, and Torijano Morales, to mention just the most prolific, will often be cited and discussed in the chapters that follow. In Chapter 1, I will treat in depth Catastini's (1989) work on 2 Kings 18-20 because of the relevance of his research for my thesis. 2 Kings 18-20, in fact, offers a great opportunity to compare the text of Kings not only to the versions, but also, and most interestingly, to the parallel account preserved in Isaiah 36-39. It will therefore also be possible to date relatively the two forms of the text found in the MT.

TARGUM, PESHITTA, AND VULGATE

These three primary versions usually reflect a parent text that is very similar to MT, and we can therefore use them along with the καίγε recension contained in the sections βγ and γδ of Kings in LXX^B (see below) as witnesses to the proto-Masoretic tradition. Sometimes the readings attested in these textual witnesses agree with the qᵊre, thus confirming the antiquity of the reading tradition textualized by the Masoretes (SMELIK 2016; MORRISON 2016; EVERSON 2016). We will also see that there are instances in which the readings preserved in these versions differ from those contained in MT. In some of these cases the linguistic evidence corroborates the secondary character of the latter. Such variants must have entered the proto-Masoretic tradition quite late, given that they are preserved only in the MT.

GREEK

The thorniest issue about the textual criticism of Kings is without a doubt the nature of the Greek witnesses. The issues and complexities that surround the possibility of retrieving the Old Greek (OG) translation, that is the version that was translated in Alexandria, are exemplified

by the lack of a critical edition (which is nonetheless under way). The main problem with the Greek witnesses of Kings, and this also applies to Samuel, is that no manuscript preserves the OG. All manuscripts, in fact, have a text that has undergone recensions and revisions (καίγε, Lucianic, Hexaplaric) and textual contamination is very high, so that disentangling and identifying the different layers requires a huge effort and it may not always be possible. There are hundreds of publications about the Septuagint of Samuel and Kings, and this is not the right place to summarize and delve into the question. I will limit myself to describing in broad terms the most relevant aspects about the Greek witnesses. More details will be added in Chapter 1, when I discuss Catastini's work and the texts of the parallel accounts of Kings and Isaiah, and in the following chapters on a case by case basis.[5]

The two most influential contributions for the understanding of the Greek witnesses of Kings in the 20th century probably come from Thackeray (1907) and Barthélemy (1963). The former identified different hands and translation techniques in different sections of Samuel and Kings as preserved in *Codex Vaticanus* (see also WEVERS 1952; SHENKEL 1968: 113-20; TURKANIK 2008), and his original division of the four books of Kingdoms is generally accepted even today (sections βγ and γδ are grouped together against α, ββ, and γγ):

α	1 Samuel
ββ	2 Samuel 1:1-11:1
βγ	2 Samuel 11:2 – 1 Kings 2:11
γγ	1 Kings 2:12-21:43
γδ	1 Kings 22 – 2 Kings

[5] For more detailed outlines of the history of the research in this area see Kim 2009: 4-22 and Kreuzer 2013.

It was in 1963 that Barthélemy identified βγ and γδ as belonging to what he called the καίγε recension, thanks to the discovery of the scroll of the twelve prophets hailing from Naḥal Ḥever. This is a textual tradition whose beginnings are datable to the 1st century BCE and whose main characteristic is that of presenting a text type that aligns more closely to the proto-Masoretic tradition than what the Old Greek version (from which it is derived) did. A by-product of this discovery was the realization that the Lucianic (or Antiochene) text did not seem, according to Barthélemy, to have undergone this Hebraizing revision. He therefore considered the Lucianic text almost identical to the Old Greek.[6] Such a view is still defended by some scholars (KREUZER 2008; 2009; 2013). However, as various scholars have shown (BROCK 1996; LAW AND KAUHANEN 2010; KAUHANEN 2012; 2021), the Antiochene text also presents one or more recensions, and its readings need to be analysed and evaluated case by case before we can access the ancient form of the text upon which the successive recensions were made.

In the chapters that follow I will add more details and engage on a case-by-case basis with the Greek witnesses, showing how textual critics use them to retrieve the earliest attainable layer. Not rarely, we will see that when the Antiochene text has a reading that differs from that of the MT there are also evident signs of late scribal activity in the Hebrew text, as a linguistic analysis of the variants shows.

[6] The so-called Lucianic or Antiochene manuscripts (LXX^{L}) were identified by Ceriani in 1863 and Rahlfs in 1911 and owe their name to the fact that this text type was used in the region of Antioch. According to Jerome, the copies of Lucian the Martyr (d. 312 CE) were in use between Constantinople and Antioch, which explains the double terminology adopted to name this group of manuscripts. These are known both as 19, 82, 93, 108, 127 and boc_2e_2 (so in the Brooke-McLean edition) to which ms. 700 for Kings should also be added. For a critical edition of the Antiochene text of Kings see Fernández Marco and Busto Saiz 1992.

OLD LATIN

One of the ways to identify the pre-Lucianic layer within the group of Lucianic manuscripts consists in the use of what survives of the Old Latin (or Vetus Latina) witnesses, which were translated before the time of Lucian and may therefore contribute to the quest for the Old Greek layer and, ultimately, may help us reach the Hebrew *Vorlage* from which the Old Greek was translated. These Latin translations were later superseded by Jerome's Vulgate and are only poorly preserved in a few fragmentary manuscripts, in marginal readings, and in quotations from the Church Fathers (TORIJANO MORALES 2016; TREBOLLE BARRERA 2016; BOGAERT 2021). Studies on the Old Latin have recently flourished, with many publications (or re-publications, in the case of Trebolle Barrera) devoted to individual verses or larger portions of Kings (FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS 1994: 41-87; RICHELLE 2010; KAUHANEN 2013; 2018; TEKONIEMI 2019; TREBOLLE BARRERA 2020a; 2020c; 2020d). The most important direct witnesses for the Vetus Latina of Kings are the *Palimpsestus Vindobonensis* (L^{115}) edited by Fischer (1986: 315-33) and the marginal glosses ($L^{91,92,93,94,95}$) contained in some Spanish Vulgate Bibles and edited by Moreno Hernández (1992), as well as the quotations found in authors such as Lucifer of Cagliari (KAUHANEN 2018).

The Old Latin will turn out to be most helpful in more than one instance in the chapters that follow, and its importance will become clearer as we discuss the individual cases and see how different scholars have engaged with this witness.

ETHIOPIC

A serious study of the Ethiopic Old Testament has been possible only in recent times, thanks to the massive digitization process of thousands of manuscripts from the 1960s (DELAMARTER,

NICCUM, AND LEE 2016: §1.4.3). More recently, the Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament project (THEOT) was launched (ASSEFA, DELAMARTER, JOST, AND LEE 2020). The main goals of the project are to statistically analyse the variations attested in 30+ manuscripts for each book, to describe the textual history of the translation(s) and identify the major textual phases that characterise the tradition. The manuscripts are gathered into "superclusters, i.e., a conglomeration of related witnesses made up of two or more clusters" (p. 87). The relationship between manuscripts is then helpfully represented via dendrograms. Because of the lack of a better option, I use Dillmann's edition of Kings published in 1871. For Kings, there exists a brief outline of the main characteristics of the Ethiopic version done by Niccum and Prather (2016). A very detailed study of the Ethiopic translation of 2 Kings is that of Davies (1981), who shows that in most instances this version goes back to a Greek type of text very similar to that found in LXX^{B}.

ARMENIAN

The Armenian translations preserve two types of text, usually called Arm 1 and Arm 2. The former represents the older stratum, namely the translation that was made at the very beginning of the 5th century. From a text-critical perspective, Arm 1 is a valuable witness to the pre-Lucianic text (= OG).[7] Arm 2 constitutes a revision made on Arm 1 after the Council of Ephesus (431 CE), and it usually supports the Hexaplaric tradition, mostly agreeing with *Codex Alexandrinus* and the Lucianic manuscript 127 (PIQUER, TORIJANO, AND TREBOLLE BARRERA

[7] For some books, such as Psalms and Daniel, Arm 1 is a hybrid text derived from both Greek and Syriac manuscripts, which can be easily explained in light of the historical circumstances under which the enterprise of translating the Bible into Armenian began (COWE 1992; COX 2002). However, Arm 1 was usually translated from a Greek *Vorlage*, without any Syriac traces, such as in Job (COX 2006; 2014).

2008: 258).[8] From the point of view of translation technique, Arm 2 is much more literal than Arm 1 (Cox 2016: §1.4.7.4). As for Kings, Trebolle Barrera, Piquer Otero, and Torijano Morales (2008: 259) have identified a series of manuscripts that allow us to go back to a pre-Lucianic Greek text and, ultimately, to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from MT. These are mss. Matenadaran 1500 (before 1282 CE), Jerusalem 1925 (1269 CE),[9] Vienna 55 (1368-75 CE), Lambeth Library 1209, St. Lazzaro 280 (1418-22 CE), and St. Lazzaro 935 (1541 CE). To these one should add the Zohrapean edition of the Bible published in 1805: a diplomatic edition of Ms. Venice 1508 (dated 1319) with six more manuscripts and the Oskan Bible (1666) contained in the apparatus (COX 2016: §1.4.7.2). For my analysis, when I mention the Armenian version, I specifically refer to the mss. Matenadaran 1500 and Jerusalem 1925, as well as to the Zohrapean edition, as I have limited access to the remaining manuscripts.

GEORGIAN

The importance of the Georgian translation has been emphasised in recent years by Trebolle Barrera, Piquer Otero, and Tojirano Morales (2008). In their work on the text of Kings they mainly use *Codex Oshki* (= *O*) and *Codex Mcxeta* (= *S*).[10] The former is a 10th-century manuscript copied in 978 CE and now kept at Mount Athos that contains the earliest Georgian text, translated between the 5th and the 8th centuries CE. It has many pre-Lucianic readings. The latter is a late 17th-early 18th-century manuscript, heavily influenced by the majority Greek text and, therefore, less text-critically relevant than *O*. Other manuscripts, such as *Ja* (13th-14th

[8] For a detailed analysis of how much Hexaplaric material is preserved in the textual witnesses to Kings, including the Armenian, see Torijano Morales 2017: 69-119.

[9] This manuscript was also used by Cox (2006: 5) as the basis for his collation of manuscripts for the edition of Job.

[10] The 'Mcxeta Bible' is fully accessible online thanks to the TITUS project: http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/at/mcat/mcat.htm.

century), *I* (1460 CE), and *F* (15th-16th century) were composed after *O* (BRUNI 2016: §3-5.2.6.1).[11]

In order to illustrate the importance of the Georgian witnesses (as well as the Armenian ones), which have largely been neglected and do not appear in the apparatus of the editions of the LXX (e.g., Cambridge, Rahlfs, Göttingen), I will provide two examples. In 2 Kgs. 22:20 the Georgian preserves two readings that go back to a pre-Lucianic layer (in this case also identifiable with the Old Greek) and, ultimately, in one case, to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the MT. One reading occurs in *Codex Oshki*, whereas the other occurs in *Codex Mcxeta*, *F*, and *I*. MT 2 Kgs. 22:20 reads as follows:

לָכֵן֙ הִנְנִ֣י אֹסִפְךָ֔ עַל־אֲבֹתֶ֖יךָ וְנֶאֱסַפְתָּ֣ אֶל־קִבְרֹתֶ֑יךָ בְּשָׁלוֹם֙ וְלֹא־תִרְאֶ֣ינָה עֵינֶ֔יךָ בְּכֹ֖ל הָרָעָ֣ה אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִ֥י מֵבִ֛יא עַל־הַמָּק֥וֹם הַזֶּ֖ה וַיָּשִׁ֥יבוּ אֶת־הַמֶּ֖לֶךְ דָּבָֽר׃

‘“Therefore, I am about to gather you to your ancestors, and you will be buried in peace. Your eyes will not see all the evil that I am going to bring on this place.” And they referred the word to the king’.

The parallel in MT 2 Chr. 34:28 adds וְעַל־יֹשְׁבֶיו after עַל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה. This reading seems to be absent from the proto-Masoretic tradition of 2 Kgs. 22:20, because it is not attested in LXX^{B}, in the Targum, in the Peshitta, and in the Vulgate. It is also absent from the Armenian. Furthermore, no Lucianic manuscript preserves it. However, Theodoret uses a text that adds καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτόν after ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον. This reading is confirmed by the Vetus

[11] On the importance of *I* (= A-570) and *F* (= A-646) for the Hexaplaric material which they preserve in their margins see Birdsall 1972. For an introduction to the Georgian translations of the Bible see Bruni 2016: §1.4.8.

Latina in a quotation by Augustin, which has *et qui commorantur in eo* at the end of the verse. The fact that the Vetus Latina confirms a reading attested in Theodoret proves the antiquity of this reading, which must have been in present in a pre-Lucianic layer, if not even in OG. The Georgian tradition, which has nothing to do with that of the Vetus Latina, preserves the very same reading in *Codex Oshki* and reads და მკჳდრთა მაგჲსთა /da mk'widrta magista/. The fact that both the Vetus Latina and *Codex Oshki* preserve this reading in 2 Kgs. 22:20, along with the fact that it also occurs in Theodoret, who used a Lucianic type of text, could lead to the conclusion that καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτόν reflects the Old Greek, and therefore a Hebrew *Vorlage* of 2 Kgs. 22:20 that differs from MT but aligns with the text of Chronicles. Quite interestingly, also the Ethiopic, which is usually a textual witness of LXX^{B}, has the same reading (ወላዕለ ፡ እለ ፡ ይነብርዎአ). On the other hand, however, it is also possible that the fact that Chronicles has the addition may have influenced unconnected traditions to insert it in Kings for harmonistic purposes.

As for the second example, the Hebrew word לָכֵן is rendered in OG as διὰ τοῦτο and in καίγε as οὐχ οὕτως.[12] The καίγε reading is attested even in the Lucianic witnesses (οὐχ οὕτως) and in the Vetus Latina (*non sic* – so Augustin). However, *Codex Mcxeta* has a doublet and preserves the OG reading in the translation ამისთჳს /amistwis/ along with the καίγε reading არა ეგრე /ara egre/ (*Codex Oshki* has only the latter). The OG reading is also preserved in the Armenian mss. Yerevan 1500, Jerusalem 1925, and in the Zohrapean edition as վասն այդորիկ /vasn ajdorik/. In this very interesting case, OG is preserved only in the Georgian and Armenian textual traditions.

[12] For an exhaustive discussion on διὰ τοῦτο and οὐχ οὕτως in Samuel and Kings, and on how both were translated in the daughter versions, see Piquer, Torijano, Trebolle Barrera (2008: 265-7).

COPTIC AND (OLD) CHURCH SLAVONIC

Unfortunately, both the Coptic and the Old Church Slavonic textual witnesses are very difficult to access.[13] There is no critical edition of Kings in Sahidic Coptic, and the book seems to be preserved only fragmentarily (BROWNE 1978; SUCIU 2016: §3-5.2.2.2.4). No references will be made to the Coptic witnesses in my work.

As for the (Old) Church Slavonic translations, Bruni has recently published a couple of seminal studies (2018 and 2019) on the second Church Slavonic version of 1-4 Kingdoms, convincingly showing that the text of two manuscripts (*Slav*^{O} hailing from 1418 and *Slav*^{M} hailing from 1523-43) is derived from a Greek Lucianic type, thus enriching the number of textual witnesses that could help us go back to the Old Greek layer. Furthermore, *Slav*^{M} attests to a unique subdivision between 3 and 4 Kgdms, the former consisting merely of 3 Kgdms 2:12 – 11:41 with the latter starting in 3 Kgdsm 11:42. Unfortunately, I have no access to either manuscript, therefore I will not refer to these textual witnesses in my thesis.

This general overview of the main textual witnesses of Kings reveals the complexity that scholars face when embarking on a philological analysis of the book. It also explains why we do not yet have a critical edition of the Old Greek and why such critical editions are going to play a very important role when they come out. As I have already mentioned very briefly, in the following chapters I will illustrate the importance of textual criticism for a linguistic approach to the biblical texts (and vice versa). In this last part of my introduction, I will discuss

[13] For an overview of both translations and the lamentable lack of critical editions of the Sahidic Coptic Bible and the understudied area of the Old Church Slavonic Bible see Feder 2016: §1.4.2; Bruni 2016: §1.4.10; Piquer Otero 2021; Torijano Morales 2021.

more in detail how I intend to approach the text(s) of Kings and what the goals of my investigation are.

METHODOLOGY AND GOALS

Because I approach the corpus from the point of view of both linguistic periodization and textual criticism, my research on the book of Kings is pre-eminently diachronic. That a solid text-critical approach should play a key role in discussions about the language of the biblical texts has recently been reaffirmed in a series of publications, although no systematic and in-depth analysis of a large corpus has so far been carried out. The importance of textual criticism for the analysis of linguistic features in the Hebrew Bible has been increasingly acknowledged following two publications by Young and Rezetko (2008 and 2014) and a series of articles by the same authors. Their first two-volume publication, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (2008, to which also Ehrensvärd contributed), sparked the debate about the possibility of dating biblical texts on the bases of linguistic features. I will only briefly refer to the key points and arguments of these scholars and to some of the responses provided, given that other works already describe in greater detail the currents and debates that are taking place in the field of Ancient Hebrew linguistics.[14] In sum, the two main arguments of these scholars are that the degree of textual fluidity prevents us from relying on the manuscripts that we have to date the texts: the many variants and the pervasive presence of editorial activity from different periods and epochs has made it impossible to distinguish between different linguistic layers. At the

[14] An outline of the history of the debate as well as different responses to these scholars' criticism can be found in Zevit (2012: 455-89), Kim (2013: 11-44), and Hornkohl (2014: 27-50). Hornkohl's monograph, more specifically, shows how a deep and thorough analysis of all the available linguistic data confirms the traditional periodization of Ancient Hebrew. Furthermore, Gesundheit (2016: 301) chides Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd for their 'all-or-nothing approach' and for treating 'a case of 50:50 as identical to a case of 99:1'.

same time, they identify the traditional CBH and LBH linguistic features as stylistic elements and not diachronic variants. That the two corpora contain merely stylistic differences rather than diachronically relevant features is purportedly evident from the fact that 'early' features occur in 'late' texts, and 'late' features occur in 'early' texts. These statements, however, are hardly defensible,[15] given that no one would expect a language to change so dramatically that no 'early' feature is found in later stages of the same. By the same token, it is only natural to start seeing 'late' features crop up here and there during an 'earlier' stage, only to increase in frequency as the language changes. At the same time, it is hard to understand how the statements that the degree of textual fluidity is too high and that there are identifiable stylistic differences that clearly allow us to distinguish between two corpora can both be valid at the same time. Despite these shortcomings, Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd's volumes are full of interesting data, and, in many cases, they correctly point out the deficiencies found in the works of previous scholars. Furthermore, their criticism has provoked a re-evaluation of the principles and methods heretofore adopted and prompted the scholarly community to re-discuss and refine the approach to the Hebrew language and its diachronic analysis. The compilatory work and collection of linguistic features as well as the gathering of relevant bibliography on this issue are additional useful instruments that these scholars have provided.

The second volume published by Young and Rezetko in 2014, *Historical Linguistics & Biblical Hebrew*, focuses more on textual criticism. More specifically, they approach the Hebrew Bible via a cross-textual variable analysis and a variationist analysis, both considered as the 'only tried-and-true historical (socio)linguistic methods that have the potential to elucidate variation and possible change underway in ancient Hebrew' (p. 408). With the former, they refer to the comparison of the variants found in different versions of the same text (p. 118), whereas the latter refers to the attempt to describe and explain the distribution of variables (pp. 214-5). Both

[15] See for instance the reply of Holmstedt 2012.

approaches constitute the foundation of my analysis of the parallel accounts of Isaiah and Kings: I will rely on the text-critical analysis of the accounts made by other scholars, most notably Catastini (1989), and the relative dating of the different versions preserved by the textual witnesses in order to illustrate that the linguistic profile of some variants shows the same trajectory and confirms the text-critical relative dating.

The importance of textual criticism for a linguistic analysis of the Hebrew Bible has been acknowledged by many scholars, and the contributions in this area keep multiplying.[16] This is in stark contrast with the approach used in the past by Avi Hurvitz (1973: 74), who worked exclusively with the Masoretic Text. This very same shortcoming can also be found in other works such as those of Rooker (1990) and Kim (2013), in whose analyses little or no space is devoted to textual criticism. Contrary to the statements of Young and Rezetko, I believe that textual fluidity is not an insurmountable problem when it comes to Hebrew diachrony, as the many overlapping results yielded by the linguistic studies of dozens of scholars confirm. Furthermore, I disagree with Gesundheit's (2016: 302) pessimistic conclusion that 'revision – both literary and textual – is a major concern for both camps, as several scholars have noted. Textual adaptation can pollute the well by making early works look late, and conversely, it can make late features seem early.' In my analysis I will show that textual adaptation and revision of early or pre-exilic works is not a limit, but it can be identified through the combined use of textual criticism and linguistic periodization. In sum, when one looks at the raw data and at the patterns (which is something that few scholars do, despite the long discussions on the limits of all methods employed), the concerns expressed about the possibility of achieving something meaningful in this area turn out to be exaggerated and to be due to a lack of acquaintance with the linguistic and textual features in question.

[16] See, for instance, Joosten 2012a, Holmstedt 2013, Hornkohl 2017, Mizrahi 2017.

A short and very simple example will illustrate how I am going to use both text-critical and linguistic clues to spot those variants that bear on the relative dating of biblical texts. In MT 2 Sam. 17:11 we read that Hushai advises Absalom to summon as many soldiers as possible. The verse ends with the expression וּפָנֶיךָ הֹלְכִים בַּקְּרָב ‘and you yourself (lit. your face) will go to battle’. The last word קְרָב, as it is generally observed (DRIVER 1890: 250; MCCARTER 1984: 382), comes from Aramaic, where the pattern qᵊtāl for noun formation is common, and is probably a late (from the point of view of the language – it occurs in Zech. 14:3 and Qoh. 9:18 among the post-exilic books, and then in a few psalms and once in Job) variant which should be emended. The textual evidence seems to confirm this, given that LXX^{L} (εἰς μέσον αὐτῶν) and even LXX^{B} (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν) point to a *Vorlage* that had בקרבו (probably with the pronominal suffix in the singular, referred to Israel at the beginning of the verse. The final ו- may have dropped due to haplography as the following verse starts with וּבָאנוּ). Also the Vulgate (in medio eorum), the Targum (בְּרֵישֵׁנָא), and the Peshitta (ܒܡܨܥܝ̈ܗܘܢ), which are usually witnesses of the proto-Masoretic tradition, agree with the Greek. An additional linguistic remark that may help us understand why בְּקִרְבּוֹ was changed into בַּקְּרָב at a very late stage (probably at the beginning of our era) is the distribution of the compound preposition בְּקֶרֶב (or מִקֶּרֶב) in Ancient Hebrew. From a diachronic standpoint, in fact, the preposition בְּקֶרֶב (along with מִקֶּרֶב) never occurs in LBH but is quite frequent in the previous linguistic stage(s).[17] At

[17] Gen. 18:12.24; 24:3; 25:22; 45:6; 48:16; Exod. 3:20; 8:18; 10:1; 17:7; 23:21; 23:25 (מִקֶּרֶב); 31:14 (מִקֶּרֶב); 33:3, 5; 34:9, 10, 12; Lev. 17:4 (מִקֶּרֶב), 10 (מִקֶּרֶב); 18:29 (מִקֶּרֶב); 20:3 (מִקֶּרֶב), 5 (מִקֶּרֶב), 6 (מִקֶּרֶב), 18 (מִקֶּרֶב); 23:30 (מִקֶּרֶב); Num. 5:27; 11:4, 20, 21; 14:11, 13 (מִקֶּרֶב), 14, 42, 44 (מִקֶּרֶב); 15:30; Deut. 1:42; 2:14 (מִקֶּרֶב), 15 (מִקֶּרֶב), 16 (מִקֶּרֶב); 4:3 (מִקֶּרֶב), 5, 34 (מִקֶּרֶב); 6:15; 7:21; 11:6; 13:2, 6 (מִקֶּרֶב), 12, 14 (מִקֶּרֶב), 15; 15:11 (מִקֶּרֶב); 16:11; 17:2, 7 (מִקֶּרֶב), 15 (מִקֶּרֶב), 20; 18:2, 15 (מִקֶּרֶב), 18 (מִקֶּרֶב); 19:10, 19 (מִקֶּרֶב), 20; 21:8, 9 (מִקֶּרֶב), 21 (מִקֶּרֶב); 22:21 (מִקֶּרֶב), 24 (מִקֶּרֶב); 23:15, 17; 24:7 (מִקֶּרֶב); 26:11; 28:43; 29:10, 15; 31:16, 17; Josh. 1:11; 3:2, 5, 10; 4:6; 6:25; 7:12 (מִקֶּרֶב), 13 (x2, once מִקֶּרֶב); 8:35; 9:7, 16, 22; 10:1; 13:13; 16:10; 18:7; 24:5, 17.23; Judg. 1:29, 30, 32, 33; 3:5; 10:16 (מִקֶּרֶב); 18:7, 20; 1 Sam. 4:3; 16:13; 25:37; 1 Kgs. 3:28; 20:39; Is. 4:4 (מִקֶּרֶב); 5:8, 25; 6:12; 7:22; 10:23; 12:6; 19:1, 3, 14, 24; 24:13; 25:11; 26:9; 29:23; 63:11; Jer. 4:14; 6:1 (מִקֶּרֶב), 6; 9:7; 14:9; 23:9; 29:8; 30:21 (מִקֶּרֶב); 31:33; 46:21; Ezek. 11:19; 22:27; 36:26, 27; Hos. 5:4; 11:9; Joel 2:27; Amos 2:3 (מִקֶּרֶב); 3:9; 5:17; 7:8, 10; Mic. 3:11; 5:6, 7, 9 (מִקֶּרֶב),

Qumran, בְּקֶרֶב and מִקֶּרֶב are mostly found in biblical quotations or allusions.[18] Nevertheless, there is a series of creative and original usages of the preposition, maybe in an archaising way.[19] The sole occurrence in Sir. 40:30 (Ms. B) echoes Ps. 39:4. In exilic and post-exilic Hebrew we see the prepositions בְּתוֹךְ and בֵּין slowly take over the function of בְּקֶרֶב. The disappearance of בְּקֶרֶב from the spoken language, as well as the increased use of קֶרֶב, may have contributed to the misunderstanding that we find in MT, all the more in a context that describes the summoning of men for war.

As this example shows, the text-critical and linguistic assessments of the variant, which are done independently from each other, yield overlapping results. Of course, it is not always the case that later variants also constitute late linguistic features. On the contrary, I will show in Chapters 1 and 2 that the opposite is generally true. Nevertheless, there are a few variants that are also linguistically relevant, and on those I will focus my attention. In most cases, I will discuss syntactic and semantic features and changes, as speakers are generally less aware of the changes that occur in these areas and because it is harder to reproduce an earlier stage of the language when it comes to syntax and word meanings. The incapability of writing according to the proper rules and conveying the correct meanings of a previous stage of the language confirms the widespread idea that the corpus written in so-called CBH pre-dates the time from which many linguistic variants hail.

I will discuss at length every relevant linguistic and textual variant, trying to contextualize them in the passages where they occur. Too often, scholars rely on numbers and lists of occurrences,

---

12 (מִקֶּרֶב), 13 (מִקֶּרֶב); 6:14; Nah. 3:13; Hab. 2:19; 3:2 (x2); Zeph. 3:3, 5, 11 (מִקֶּרֶב), 12, 15, 17; Zech. 12:1; 14:1; Ps. 36:2; 39:4; 46:6; 48:10; 51:12; 55:5, 11, 12, 16; 62:5; 74:4, 11 (מִקֶּרֶב), 12; 78:28; 82:1; 94:19; 101:2, 7; 109:18, 22; 110:2; 138:7; 147:13; Job 20:14; Prov. 14:33; 15:31; 26:24; Lam. 1:15, 20; 3:34; 4:13.

[18] CD 20:26; 1QM 10:1; 1Q22 frg. 1 i:9; 4Q162 2:9; 4Q175 1:5; 11Q19 54:8, 18; 55:3, 15; 56:14; 61:10, 11; 63:7; 64:6; 66:4.

[19] 1QM 13:8; 1QHa 9:35; 4Q88 10:10; 4Q169 frg. 3-4 ii:5; 4Q393 frg. 1ii 2:6.

without looking at the individual context of each feature. At the same time, I find it useful to quote and list all the features discussed, because seeing the exact references and the features themselves helps finding patterns that the mere use of figures or percentages would otherwise obscure. The Appendix at the end of this thesis has precisely the function of allowing to visualize all the data considered in the discussion.

As for the structure of this thesis, in Chapter 1 I will discuss in depth the work of Catastini and a couple of other scholars who have analyzed the parallels of Isaiah 36-39 and 2 Kings 18-20 from a text-critical perspective. I will then list and discuss all the variants that occur in the two versions contained in the MT, showing that the text remained stable from the point of view of linguistic diachrony: later scribes could still reproduce the type of language that we find in pre-exilic works. However, and this will be the subject of Chapter 2, there are a few syntactic and semantic variants that are meaningful for Hebrew periodization. I will show that the text of MT 2 Kings 18-20 contains more late features than MT Isaiah 36-39, in agreement with the later form of the text preserved in MT. Finally, in Chapter 3 I will discuss and analyze more variants and portions of text in Kings, showing how both approaches yield results that confirm each other.

CHAPTER 1

2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39

THE TEXT-CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

The parallel accounts of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah offer the philologist and the linguist the privilege of comparing two versions of the same text, both transmitted in the Hebrew Bible. This is quite an unusual event, elsewhere attested for texts such as 2 Samuel 22 // Psalm 18, 2 Kings 25 // Jeremiah 52, or the parallels between Samuel – Kings and Chronicles. One of the main advantages provided by the double transmission of the same text is the possibility of establishing a relative dating of the two versions on the bases of text-critical and linguistic considerations. While this is common practice for the parallels of Samuel – Kings and Chronicles, with notable linguistic studies that illustrate the diachronic differences between the two corpora (e.g., KROPAT 1909; POLZIN 1976; HURVITZ 2014), the version of Sennacherib's third campaign recorded in 2 Kings and Isaiah has not been analysed from the perspective of language. On the other hand, for the two versions of the Assyrian campaign against Judah there exists a solid philological investigation done by Catastini (1989), later confirmed and to some extent promulgated in the English-speaking world by a less rigorous investigation carried out by Person (1997). The goal of this chapter is to integrate my linguistic analysis of the relevant variants contained in 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39 with Catastini's philological work and conclusions, in order to show that the two approaches yield overlapping and therefore dependable results.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE SCHOLARSHIP ON 2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39

Although I do not adopt a historical-critical approach to these texts, nor do I venture into a detailed description of the redactional process that lies behind the formation of the books of Kings and Isaiah, it is worth providing a brief overview of the scholarship on the chapters in question. This will clarify where my contribution stands in the ongoing debate about the priority of the version of Kings or Isaiah, and it will also lay the groundwork for further investigations that seek to understand the text from the perspective of higher criticism.

When dealing with the question of the relative dating and origin of the parallel accounts of 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39, the majority view is that the story was first composed for Kings and only later copied and attached to the end of Proto-Isaiah (WILLIAMSON 1994: 189; ANDERSON 2013: 148; KAHN 2020: 23). This solution was first proposed by Gesenius (1821: 932-36) and held sway almost undisputed for a century and a half, still nowadays being the most widely accepted reconstruction. According to the German scholar, the style and language of the account conformed better to the context of Kings. Only later were these chapters added to Isaiah and reworked in order to remove a series of issues and function as a bridge to the following chapters (Isaiah 40-66).[20] This motif has since constituted the backbone of a series of more nuanced and developed arguments that aim to show the original collocation of Hezekiah's account in Kings. Without engaging with the individual points made by those who have built on Gesenius' solution, let it be noted that the scholars who defend the priority of 2 Kings' account mostly rely on arguments of a stylistic, literary, ideological, and source-critical nature.[21]

[20] See Anderson 2013: 149-50

[21] For a more detailed description of the arguments in favour of the priority of the collocation of the account in Kings and for a list of the supporters of such arguments see the overviews presented in Anderson 2013 and Kahn 2020: 24-6.

Starting from the 1980s, however, scholars such as Smelik (1986 and 1992) and Seitz (1991), who approached the text from a more synchronic perspective, proposed that the account of Hezekiah's clash with Assyria had first been written for Isaiah and then added to Kings.[22] More recently, Anderson (2013) and Kahn (2020) have brought forth a series of arguments in favour of the Isaianic priority, the former building on Smelik's synchronic and literary approach, the latter formulating a new historical-critical solution based on the identification of different sources.[23] Not unlike the supporters of the priority of 2 Kings' version, the arguments of this latter cohort of researchers also mostly rest on considerations of stylistic, ideological, literary, and source-critical character.[24] Quite surprisingly, only a handful of contributions have tried to assess the relationship between the two literary traditions from the perspective of textual criticism.

Although both Fullerton (1925) and Orlinsky (1939) approached the two accounts from a philological standpoint, their analysis was soon made obsolete by the new discoveries of the Qumran scrolls and the achievements obtained in the study of the Septuagint recensions.[25] Besides a couple of preliminary articles on the Greek variants present in both accounts (1982 and 1983a) and on the episode of Ahaz' sun dial (1983b), it was in 1989 that Catastini published the first thorough text-critical investigation of both accounts, which still remains unsurpassed in terms of depth and method. Unfortunately, as Person rightly laments (1997: 8), Catastini's exhaustive work, as well as a couple of other essays on the philology of 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39 (KAISER 1969; TREBOLLE BARRERA 1987), has received little or no attention. Even in Kahn's study published in 2020, there seems to be no awareness of Catastini's detailed

[22] For a rebuttal of Seitz's arguments see Carr 1992: 583-97 and Williamson 1994: 189-211; 1996: 47-52.

[23] In my study I will not engage with the so-called Stade-Childs theory about the sources (A, B_1, B_2) that make up the account.

[24] See the overviews and arguments present in Williamson 1994: 189-211 and Kahn 2020: 26-30.

[25] For other few seminal works on the textual nature of the parallel accounts see Person 1997: 8-9.

investigation, despite the fact that the former reaches conclusions that align with those of the philologist as far as the relative dating of MT Isaiah and MT Kings is concerned.[26] Person's study (1997: 43-6) of the two accounts in their main versions (Hebrew and Greek) yields the same results as Catastini's with regards to the stratification of the different traditions and the grouping of the witnesses into families. Furthermore, Person attempts a reconstruction of the Urtext of these chapters (1997: 47-74), which is beyond the scope of Catastini's work. Finally, both at the end of his philological work (1997: 114) and in a later contribution (1999), Person affirms that the parallel account originated in Kings and was later inserted into Isaiah, even though the entire literary tradition and textual transmission is more conservative for the witnesses of the Isaiah version. His main arguments will be discussed below.

Because Catastini's analysis is more detailed, I will first outline the main points of his investigation with regards to the relationship between the textual witnesses in our possess.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND 2 KINGS 18-20 // ISAIAH 36-39

The first macro-difference that one observes when dealing with the two accounts is that not every section of 2 Kings 18-20 is found in Isaiah 36-39 and vice versa. 2 Kgs. 18:1-12, that is the introduction and Deuteronomistic assessment of Hezekiah's character, is absent from Isaiah. Similarly, the concluding statements that cap off the Judean king's reign (2 Kgs. 20:20-21) are also not found in the parallel account. Finally, 2 Kgs. 18:14-16, the so-called 'Source A', is unparalleled in Isaiah. As for the Isaiah account, Hezekiah's long prayer in Isa. 38:9-20 has no counterpart in Kings.

[26] Admittedly, the main obstacle for the diffusion of Catastini's analysis and results may be the fact that his monograph is written in Italian.

Luckily, the two accounts have been handed down in a good number of textual witnesses. For his philological analysis, Catastini (1989: 31-5) employs the following ones.

Among the Hebrew witnesses, he uses the Masoretic Aleppo and Leningrad codices, as well as the medieval manuscripts listed by Kennicott (K) and De Rossi (R). When relevant, he also takes into account the manuscripts that preserve the Babylonian and Palestinian traditions.[27] Obviously, much space is dedicated also to 1QIsa^{a}. In some cases, he resorts to the Peshitta, which is a direct translation from the Hebrew.

As for the Greek witnesses, Catastini refers to Ziegler's edition of Isaiah (1939) for the OG and for the (pre-)Lucianic readings found in the apparatus. The situation in Kings is a bit more complicated, given that no critical edition of the OG exists even to this day. *Codex Vaticanus* (LXX^{B}) is the main witness to the καίγε revision, whereas through a careful study of the manuscripts boc$_2$e$_2$ it is possible to retrieve a pre-Lucianic text. I will use the critical edition of the Antiochene text (FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS AND BUSTO SAIZ 1992), which had not come out yet when Catastini published his work. Two very important witnesses that confirm the pre-Lucianic character of most readings are Josephus' *Antiquities* and the Vetus Latina, which Catastini brings into the discussion when necessary.

In order to assess the nature of the textual witnesses and the value of the readings contained therein, Catastini devotes individual chapters to the comparison between manuscripts and traditions:

- the Masoretic tradition of Kings and the Masoretic tradition of Isaiah
- 1QIsa^{a} and the Isaiah tradition
- the Masoretic tradition of Isaiah and OG Isaiah

[27] The use of the manuscripts that record the Palestinian tradition is not very fruitful for these chapter, and the total number of variants adds up to three and concerns the use of *matres lectionis* (CATASTINI 1989: 36).

- the Masoretic tradition of Kings and LXX^{B}
- the Lucianic text of Isaiah and the Isaiah tradition
- the pre-Lucianic text of Kings and the rest of the traditions of Kings and Isaiah

From such comparisons very interesting observations emerge. When the two Masoretic traditions are compared, despite the high number of 'morphological variants' (40), Catastini remarks that the variants in content as well as the additions and omissions occur more frequently (55). These often have an ideological component (CATASTINI 1989: 60-1). It is also significant that the medieval tradition represented by the Kennicott and De Rossi manuscripts often attests the reading of the other book with regards to 'orthographic and phonetic variants', 'phonological variants', and 'morphological variants'. This configuration can be summarized as K-R Kings = MT Isaiah and K-R Isaiah = MT Kings. It is evident that the medieval scribes paid attention to the parallel account when copying Kings and Isaiah. It should nonetheless be noted that the medieval scribes no longer make invasive changes (additions, omissions, transpositions) that may affect the content of the accounts. The text is fixed. When this happens (very rarely in Kings), the variants are of equal value.

As for 1QIsa^{a}, we witness the same phenomenon just described for the medieval tradition: as Kutscher had already observed (1974: 546), the high frequency of such variants makes it likely that the scribe collated the text in Kings. The most important difference is that 1QIsa^{a} has a sizeable number of variants of content. This speaks to the textual fluidity that still characterised the transmission of the biblical texts in the 2nd century BCE. Quite interestingly, 1QIsa^{a} has significant agreements with OG Isaiah.

When OG Isaiah is compared to MT Isaiah, one can make the same remarks about textual fluidity as for 1QIsa^{a}. Although the variants in content attested in OG Isaiah may be attributed to the creative freedom of the translator, it is meaningful that these often overlap with 1QIsa^{a}.

These two witnesses seem to belong to the same textual tradition and, as we shall see, represent the earliest attainable layer for the parallel account of Kings and Isaiah. They attest a textual type that was in circulation during the 2nd century BCE, if not earlier. The agreements between OG Isaiah and K-R against MT Isaiah shed light on the pre-Masoretic tradition still present among the medieval manuscripts.[28]

As expected, the lowest rate of variants is attested between MT Kings and καίγε (41). Both traditions go back, albeit in slightly different ways, to a proto-Masoretic text type. However, it is frequently the case that the variants present in καίγε are also attested in MT Isaiah or 1QIsa^{a}, a situation that can be summarised as LXX^{B} Kings = MT Isaiah [1QIsa^{a}] ≠ MT Kings.[29]

The pre-Lucianic text of Kings is of particular interest. The antiquity of its readings is confirmed by the agreements (20) with 1QIsa^{a}. In most of the cases (14), these variants are also found in MT Isaiah (≠ LXX^{B} and MT Kings). Nine such variants are furthermore attested also in the medieval tradition of K-R, which highlights the antiquity of some readings absent in the Aleppo and Leningrad codices, yet present in some other Masoretic witnesses. The remaining six variants are only shared by LXX^{L} Kings and 1QIsa^{a}, also against MT Isaiah.[30] As a by-product of the agreement between the pre-Lucianic text of Kings and both 1QIsa^{a} and MT Isaiah, we can conclude that MT Isaiah is more conservative and preserves older readings than LXX^{B} Kings // MT Kings.[31]

In the conclusion, Catastini outlines the different layers that make up the Hebrew and Greek witnesses.[32] It should be stressed that these results are achieved only by the application of

[28] Catastini 1989: 98-9.

[29] Catastini 1989: 107.

[30] Catastini 1989: 233.

[31] Catastini 1989: 244.

[32] Catastini 1989: 265-6.

mechanical criteria and not via the evaluation of so-called ideological variants, to which Catastini devotes a final chapter.[33] For one thing, he observes that the literary tradition attested for Isaiah is generally more conservative than the one of 2 Kings. Within the Isaianic textual tradition, it is OG and 1QIsa[a] that constitute the earliest layer philologically attainable, that is a text type that goes back to at least the 2[nd] century BCE. The pre-Lucianic text of 2 Kings comes close to these two witnesses (see also TREBOLLE BARRERA 2020: 249). A more recent layer we find in MT Isaiah, which is superior to and older than its counterpart MT 2 Kings. Quite interestingly, when MT Isaiah has a better and older variant than MT 2 Kings, the Kennicott and De Rossi manuscripts of Kings agree with the former. Although LXX[B] generally preserves a very similar text to MT 2 Kings, at times it has better readings than the latter. These conclusions can be schematically summarized as follows:

OG Isaiah – 1QIsa[a]

LXX[L] 2 Kings

MT Isaiah

LXX[B] 2 Kings

MT 2 Kings

This stratification, as well as grouping of textual witnesses, is confirmed by the second most thorough (as well as the only other) philological analysis of the witnesses, that is Person's study.[34] His textual families are as follows:

- OG Isaiah, 1QIsa[a]
- MT Isaiah

[33] Catastini 1989: 267-81.

[34] Person 1997: 45-6.

- MT Kings, LXX^{B} Kings

Accordingly, OG Isaiah and 1QIsa^{a} (which Person too groups into one family) as well as MT Isaiah, differ from his reconstructed Urtext 16 times. On the other hand, the tradition preserved for Kings is less conservative and has 31 variants when compared to the Urtext. Person's grouping of KH (Kings Hebrew) together with KG (Kings Greek) is due to the fact that he uses Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint as source text for his retroversion from Greek into Hebrew.[35] It goes without saying that Rahlfs' text does not correspond to the pre-Lucianic text, but rather reflects the καίγε revision in most places (LXX^{B} 2 Kings in Catastini's study). This constitutes a major flaw and shortcoming in Person's method. The main difference between Catastini's and Person's analysis is therefore the absence of the fundamental and relevant pre-Lucianic witness of 2 Kings in the latter's study (the absence of the Lucianic witness for Isaiah is of secondary importance in our discussion).

Contrary to Catastini, who does not explicitly state his understanding of the redactional process of Kings and Isaiah, Person engages with this issue and affirms that the account was first composed for Kings and then added to Isaiah.[36] Two main reasons can be identified that would lead to this conclusion. First, the reconstructed Urtext contains uncontroversial Deuteronomic phraseology:

- 'You..alone are God' (2 Kgs. 19:15)[37]
- 'You made the heavens and the earth' (2 Kgs. 19:15)[38]

[35] Person 1997: 10.

[36] Person 1997: 77-78. See also Person 1999.

[37] Weinfeld 1992: 331, §6

[38] Weinfeld 1992: 331, §7.

- ‘Gods..made by human hands’ (2 Kgs. 19:18)[39]
- ‘For the sake of David, my servant’ (2 Kgs. 19:34)[40]

Regardless of the conclusions that one may reach as to the original collocation of the account, I do not find persuasive all of Person’s references to the Deuteronomic phraseology. The notion that God made the heavens and the earth (אַתָּה עָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ in MT 2 Kgs. 19:15) is attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, most notably in Genesis and Exodus.[41] The occurrence of the Deuteronomic phrase לְמַעַן דָּוִד עַבְדִּי in MT 2 Kgs. 19:34, also attested in the Isaiah tradition for 37:35, may be a secondary addition. The identical expression, in fact, appears once again in MT 2 Kgs. 20:6 but is not found in MT Isa. 38:6. The phrase is also absent from OG Isa. 38:6. Its presence in 1QIsa[a] 38:6 seems to point to the phenomenon described above according to which the Jewish scribes tended to collate the account in the parallel text, so that the occurrence in 1QIsa[a] 38:6 is due to textual contamination. Such mechanical transposition of the idiom from Kings to 1QIsa[a] would have been facilitated by the fact that the phrase is preceded by the same words as in 37:35 (וגנותי על העיר הזאת). The account of Kings contains other late undisputed Deuteronomic additions that do not belong to the early layer, e.g., בִּירוּשָׁלִָם in 18:22. It may be that also לְמַעַן דָּוִד עַבְדִּי was twice added to the text of Kings in the same context and later copied in Isaiah in one instance (both times in 1QIsa[a] in a harmonizing process) as the consequence of manuscript collation. Why would the otherwise more conservative tradition of Isaiah omit one of the two Deuteronomic-looking occurrences?

Besides these points of stylistic and theological nature, Person (1999) develops a five-pronged argument on the basis of text-critical observations showing that a now lost text of Kings was

[39] Weinfeld 1992: 324, §7.

[40] Weinfeld 1992: 354, §1.

[41] Gen. 2:4 (בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמָיִם); Exod. 20:11 (כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת־יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ), 31:17 (כִּי־שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ).

added to Isaiah, which, in its turn, underwent textual development. Nevertheless, while it is true that the Isaiah tradition shows evident signs of textual changes, I believe that some of Person's arguments are wrong and should be rejected. I will here discuss two examples.

In Isa. 39:8 (// 2 Kgs. 20:19), Person's Urtext reads as follows:[42]

ויאמר חזקיהו אל ישעיהו טוב דבר יהוה אשר דבר יהוה שלום בימי

The first difference that one observes among the textual witnesses is the absence in OG Isaiah and LXX^{L} Kings of a second ויאמר after אשר דבר (present in MT Isaiah, MT Kings, and 1QIsa^{a}).[43] The original reading (יהוה שלום) is reflected both in OG Isaiah (γενέσθω δὴ εἰρήνη) and in LXX^{L} Kings (γενέσθω εἰρήνη).[44] Person's change of the verbal form יהי into יהוה is unnecessary, and the presence of δή (which usually translates נא) in OG Isaiah seems to indicate that the earliest layer had a jussive (יהי נא). The text of MT Isaiah and 1QIsa^{a}, which reads ויאמר כי יהיה שלום, represents an intermediary stage where the jussive is still attested, although in late morphological garb. On the one hand, the particle נא has dropped (not an unusual phenomenon) leaving יהי alone. This was later changed into יהיה, once the syntactic difference between the long and short forms of the III-y verbs was lost in post-exilic times. It may also be that נא fell after יהי was turned into יהיה.[45] We find a similar phenomenon in MT Isa. 37:36, where וַיַּכֶּה occurs rather than וַיַּךְ (attested in MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 and even in 1QIsa^{a} 37:36). The particle כי would thus carry out the function of introducing direct speech rather than a declarative clause and should not be translated. From the point of view of the semantics, MT Isaiah, although

[42] Person 1997: 53.

[43] This reading must have occurred also in the proto-Masoretic text of Kings given that the mutilated text that we find in LXX^{B} seems to be due to haplography. The scribe copied / translated the first half of the verse introduced by ויאמר, but skipped the second half, also introduced by ויאמר.

[44] Rahlfs' edition, which Person used, has here ἔσθω εἰρήνη.

[45] See the occurrence of יְהִיֶה־נָּא in MT 2 Sam. 14:17, surely due to a second hand.

with a slightly developed form of the text, goes with OG Isaiah and LXX^L Kings in that both traditions report a wish: '(and he – Hezekiah – said) Let there be peace and truth in my days!'. While in OG Isaiah and LXX^L Kings this quotation belongs to the same quotation that begins the verse, in MT Isaiah Hezekiah's words are split into two statements. In both cases Hezekiah's words manipulate Isaiah's prophecy, which is probably what the author of the text wants to achieve. MT Kings represents the final stage. The verb is syntactically understood as a long *yaqtulu* form and placed in second position. This misunderstanding may have been caused by the reading of כי as a declarative conjunction followed by a subordinate clause which, as usual, has a VS word order. Furthermore, the direct speech is turned into a rhetorical question introduced by הֲלוֹא אִם. This classical expression occurs three other times in Gen. 4:7 (הֲלוֹא אִם־תֵּיטִיב), 1 Sam. 15:17 (הֲלוֹא אִם־קָטֹן אַתָּה), and Isa. 28:25 (הֲלוֹא אִם־שִׁוָּה). The occurrence in MT 2 Kgs. 20:19 is the only place where the predicate does not come before the subject (הֲלוֹא אִם־שָׁלוֹם וֶאֱמֶת יִהְיֶה), which may further point to the later character of the text of MT Kings (unless this takes place for pragmatic reasons).[46] Rather than grouping MT Isaiah and MT Kings together, I believe that there are linguistic elements that allow us to see in MT Isaiah the intermediary stage between the earlier and the later text. The use of the long form יהיה for the jussive in MT Isaiah is the cause for the use of יהיה to express the future in MT Kings. This reconstruction is in line with the understanding that MT Kings constitutes an updated version of MT Isaiah, also from the perspective of language.

As for the second example, Isa. 36:10, Person's Urtext reads:[47]

[46] Person omits ואמת from his Urtext and considers it an addition made in OG Isaiah, $1QIsa^a$, MT Isaiah, and MT Kings (1997: 74). This because the word does not occur in Rahlfs' edition. However, δικαιοσύνη does occur in the pre-Lucianic text. Person's reconstruction is hampered by the fact that he is not using one of the most important witnesses.

[47] Person 1997: 48.

[]עתה המבלעדי יהוה עליתי על [המקום הזה] להשחית[ו]

The main problem with this reconstruction is that Person misses a very simple mechanical error that occurred during the transmission of the text. The second half of the verse (יהוה אמר אלי עלה על הארץ הזאת והשחיתה), preserved in MT Isaiah, 1QIsa[a], LXX[L] Kings, MT Kings, and LXX[B] Kings was skipped by the scribe who copied the Hebrew *Vorlage* or OG Isaiah or translated it into Greek. This happened because he jumped from one השחית to another. The fact that Person declares that the God of Israel does not really speak to Sennacherib and the second half of the verse must therefore be an addition highlights, as in the previous example, how he misses the irony with which the protagonists' speeches are crafted.[48]

Although I may disagree with some aspects of Person's method and reconstruction, it is most certainly remarkable that the foundational text-critical analysis of the parallel accounts carried out by Catastini and Person supports the priority of MT Isaiah over MT 2 Kings. Of course, this does not mean that MT Isaiah never attests later readings. As Catastini's comparisons illustrate, as well as some of Person's examples, the scribes who copied the Hebrew texts of Kings and Isaiah regularly collated the parallel version of the account. Because a philological analysis moves from the bottom-up and lays the groundwork for further analysis, being preliminary to any other sort of critical investigation (be it linguistic, stylistic, ideological, literary, or source-critical), I will compare the results of my linguistic study of the variants against the backdrop of Catastini's (and Person's) conclusions. Similarly to the identification and establishment of different textual layers on a philological basis, also the linguistic approach constitutes the foundation for any further investigation, being second, I believe, only to the text-critical work. As my analysis will show, the linguistic appraisal of some of the variants

[48] Person 1999: 376. See also Cogan and Tadmor 1988: 232 for other examples of kings who declare that a foreign god has called and invited them to conquer his city.

confirms the trajectory depicted by Catastini and yields a coherent diachronic picture, whereby it is possible to date relatively MT 2 Kings 18-20 and MT Isaiah 36-39. I will refrain from entering the discussion on the redactional process of Kings and Isaiah, limiting myself to the relative dating of the two accounts preserved in their MT textual form.

THE LINGUISTIC PROFILE OF THE VARIANTS IN 2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39

The two parallel accounts preserve, all in all, rather homogeneous texts with regards to their linguistic profile. From the standpoint of linguistic periodization, the chronolect in which the earlier witness, MT Isaiah, is written falls under the label of Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH). It follows that also MT 2 Kings is penned in the same pre-exilic standardised form of Hebrew whenever it agrees with MT Isaiah. However, the same is generally true also for most of the textual variants, so that we can affirm that those scribes who intervened and changed the text during the exilic or post-exilic period generally did so very carefully without updating it linguistically. All in all, it is possible to say that, like most textual variants, also the linguistic variants are diachronically adiaphorous or indifferent.

Quite interestingly, the two accounts preserve a dozen textual variants that bear significance with regards to linguistic diachrony. These will receive our attention in Chapter 2. Here, I will list and, if necessary, discuss those variants that are not meaningful for a discussion on linguistic periodization. The variants and their textual witnesses are adapted from Catastini's thorough categorization.[49]

[49] Catastini lists the variants also according to grammatical categories such as 'phonology', 'morphology', etc. I may disagree with some of his classifications, as well as add more instances of variants.

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

SCRIPTIO PLENA VS SCRIPTIO DEFECTIVA

2 Kgs. 18:25 לְהַשְׁחִתָֽוֹ] K 1, 2, 3, 4, 21, 23, 30, 70, 85, 89, 93, 94, 96, 99, 101, 112, 115, 139, 150, 154, 155, 158, 172, 174, 175, 176, 180, 182, 187, 195, 198, 201, 226, 240, 252, 253, 257, 260, 264, 284, 359, 360, primo 82, 130, 168, forte 128.

Isa. 36:10 לְהַשְׁחִיתָֽהּ

2 Kgs. 19:6 אֹתִי] אותי K 101, 112, 158, 176; אותו K 96, 187.

Isa. 37:6 אוֹתִי] אתי K 1, 3, 4, 24, 30, 67, 72, 89, 94, 99, 102, 112, 114, 115, 139, 144, 150, 158, 175, 178, 182, 224, 226, 227, 245, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 281, 283.

2 Kgs. 19:10 בֹּטֵֽחַ] בוטח K 3, 21, 89, 99, 112, 149, 150, 174, 210, 246.

Isa. 37:10 בּוֹטֵֽחַ] בטח K 1, 3, 4, 17, 23, 24, 30, 72, 93, 94, 100, 114, 150, 154, 158, 172, 178, 182, 225, 226, 227, 253, 254, 258, 260, 264.

2 Kgs. 19:12 אֹתָם] אותם K 1, 112

Isa. 37:12 אוֹתָם] אתם K 1, 4, 17, 23, 30, 72, 82, 93, 94, 101, 102, 112, 114, 115, 116, 141, 144, 150, 154, 155, 158, 172, 175, 176, 178, 210, 224, 230, 245, 246, 252, 253, 258, 260, 270, 281.

2 Kgs. 19:25 הֲבִיאֹתִיהָ] הביאותיה K 93, 174.

Isa. 37:26 הֲבֵאֹתִיהָ] הביאתיה K 72, 96, 150, 180, 224, 245, 246, 300, primo 130, 173; הבאותיה 1QIsa[a], K 30, 93; הביאותיה K 253.

2 Kgs. 19:33 2° יָבֹא] יבוא K 3, 130, 210

Isa. 37:34 יָבֹוא] יבא Bab, K 1, 4, 17, 30, 72, 82, 89, 93, 94, 96, 99, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 154, 158, 159, 178, 224, 226, 227, 249, 253, 258, 260, 264.

Despite belonging to a more conservative tradition, MT Isaiah has five out of six full spellings, whereas MT Kings preserves more defective variants. Quite interestingly, the medieval manuscripts of Isaiah tend to align with Kings more than those of Kings with Isaiah. These remarks do not change the fact that MT Isaiah constitutes an earlier layer of the tradition, just as 1QIsa[a], in which full and late spellings surely abound, is an even earlier witness. By the same token, we shall see that the use of the scriptio defectiva by no means indicates that the language is necessarily older.

METATHESIS

2 Kgs. 19:29 סָחֵישׁ] שחיס K 30, forte 82.

Isa. 37:30 שָׂחִיס] סחיש K 93, R 305; שחים K 72, 160, 245, 258, 288, primo 4, 158; שחיש K 150, 153; שעיס 1QIsa[a].

The different spelling of this rare word (it occurs only in the parallel accounts) may be due to a mechanical error such as the metathesis of the two sibilants. As an alternative, we may be in the presence of a dialectal variant.[50]

[50] As explained in HALOT, the origin of the word is hard to unveil. On the one hand, Bauer and Leander (1922: 471) show that the nominal pattern *qatīl* is often used for agricultural terminology. In this case we would have a root √שחס or √סחש. On the other hand, this term may derive from Sumerian through Akkadian suḫḫuššu 'young palm date' (cf. CAD for the Sumerian origin of this word). If the relationship with Akkadian turned out to be true, then the spelling attested in 2 Kgs. 19:29 may be preferable. It this scenario, it would also be possible that the second ש is a śin (= Akk. š) and the spelling in MT Isaiah the result of a wrong use of the letters ס and ש.

DROPPING OF א

2 Kgs. 19:12 בְּתִלַּאשֶּׁר] בתלשר K 1, 2, 30, 82, 85, 90, 93, 96, 112, 114, 115, 154, 155, 158, 174, 176, 210, 242, 249, 601, 602; בתלשאר K 3; בתלאסר K 89; בתלסר K 23, 145, 150, 172, 182, 187, 224, 226, 240, 251, 253, 257, 260.

Isa. 37:12 בְּתִלַּשֶּׁר] בתלאשר K 225, R 296; בתלסר K 23, 93, 150, 154, 224, 245, 250, primo 130, nunc 145; ביתלסר R primo 440.

2 Kgs. 18:27 חֹרֵיהֶם] חראיהם K 2, 30, 226; צואתם חתאיהם K 93; חוריהם K 70, 96, 112, 154, 158, 172, 252, 257; חרתם K 174, R 91, primo 22; צאתם K 150; צואתם K 89, 246, 249, 250, 251, 253, 260, 264, 659. (Q^{a}re צוֹאָתָם)

Isa. 36:12 חֹרֵאיהֶם] חריהם K 17, 23, 91, 94, 100, 113, 114, 154, 155, 173, 182, 210, 225, 242, 687; חריאם K 227; חוראיהם K 116, 168, 172; חוריהם K 1, 93, 96, 224; חורהם K 153; חריהם K 158; אחריהם K 245; צואתם K 153, 260, 264, 271 A, 281, 659; צאתם K 72, 115, 149; חריהמה 1QIsa^{a}. (Q^{a}re צוֹאָתָם)

2 Kgs. 19:25 לַהֲשׁוֹת] להשאות K 93, 150, 182, 249, 288, 659; להשוות K 96, 112; לחשות K primo 99.

Isa. 37:26 לְהַשְׁאוֹת] להשות K 115; לשאוות 1QIsa^{a}.

INTERCHANGE BETWEEN א AND ה

2 Kgs. 18:18 שֶׁבְנָה] שבנא K 23, 70, 85, 90, 93, 101, 112, 128, 150, 154, 155, 158, 160, 172, 182, 210, 224, 240, 246, 252, 253, 257, 260, 271 A, 288, 601.

Isa. 36:3 שֶׁבְנָא] שובנא 1QIsa[a].

2 Kgs. 18:26 שֶׁבְנָה] שבנא K 2, 3, 23, 82, 85, 93, 102, 112, 115, 139, 150, 154, 155, 158, 172, 182, 198, 240, 252, 253, 257, 260, 282, 283, 286, 602.
Isa. 36:11 שֶׁבְנָא] שובנא 1QIsa[a].

In the other two occurrences of 2 Kgs. 18:37 and 19:2 the name occurs with the ending in א-, as it always appears in Isaiah (in addition to the above two occurrences, see Isa. 22:15; 36:22; 37:2).

INTERCHANGE BETWEEN מ AND ב AND ADDITION / OMISSION OF א.

2 Kgs. 20:12 בְּרֹאדַךְ] בראדן K primo 70; ברדך K 94, 227; בראך K 187; מרואדך K 93; מדורך K 531; מרודך K 115, 141, 580, forte 150; מראדך K 145, 154, 172, 240, 650 B, H, 476, forte 251, nunc 632, R primo 596; ברודך K 206, 226, 526; בדורך K 301; בדארך K 355, 590.
Isa. 39:1 מְרֹדַךְ] מאדך K 245; מרודך K 1, 3o, 72, 93, 96, 149, 150, 168, 172, 224, 253, 258, 260, 264; מדארך K 115; מרדאך K 113, 144; ברודך K 182, R 440; מדורך R 463 hisp., 663, 815, primo 596, 667; מדוראך R 305.

Apart from the occurrence of בְּתִלַאשָּׁר - בְּתִלַשָּׁר in 2 Kgs. 19:12 // Isa. 37:12, MT Isaiah is more precise when it comes to the correct use and preservation of the guttural א. Furthermore, it reports a more original spelling of the Hebrew version of the name Mardūk-apla-iddina.

WRITING OF THE 3MS PRONOMINAL SUFFIX WITH ה- OR ו-

2 Kgs. 19:23 קִצֹּה] קצו K 1, 2, 21, 85, 90, 112, 115, 174, 225, 246, 249, 251, 253, 288, 659, primo 30, 99, 128.

Isa. 37:24 קִצֹּו

The distribution of the letter ה- for /ō/ of the 3ms pronominal suffix in the Hebrew Bible does not shed light on the question of periodization. One may rather speak about scribal conventions, given that it occurs more often in certain sections such as the Latter Prophets and for certain words (YOUNG 2001).

MORPHOLOGY

PRONOMINAL SUFFIX: CHANGES IN GENDER

2 Kgs. 18:25 לְהַשְׁחִתָו

Isa. 36:10 לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ

The gender of the pronominal suffix is determined by the different antecedent, הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה in Kings, and הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת in Isaiah.

2 Kgs. 19:14 וַיִּקְרָאֵם] ויקראהו K 182.

Isa. 37:14 וַיִּקְרָאֵהוּ] ויקראם 1QIsa[a], K 1.

In Kings we find the pronominal suffix in the plural referred to הַסְּפָרִים, whereas Isaiah has the pronominal suffix in the singular, still referred to a preceding הַסְּפָרִים. It is likely that the earlier layer had the singular הַסֵּפֶר, as both OG Isaiah and LXX^{L} Kings indicate (τὸ βιβλίον). Being more conservative, MT Isaiah did not update the pronominal suffix once the antecedent was turned into a plural.

PREPOSITIONS: INTERCHANGES

2 Kgs. 18:25 עַל] אל K 96, 154, 158, 176, 180, 198.

Isa. 36:10 אֶל] על Bab, K 1, 82, 93, 96, 150, 154 marg, 182, 300, forte 116, nunc 249.

2 Kings repeats the preposition עַל twice (עָלֶיהָ עַל...עָלִיתִי עַל), whereas Isaiah shows some variation (עָלֶיהָ אֶל...עָלִיתִי עַל). The difference is not necessarily diachronic, but may simply be stylistic.[51]

2 Kgs. 18:26 עִמָּנוּ] אלינו K 21, 85, 93, 115, 145, 150, 174, 175, 180, 187, 201, 246, 252, R 21, 191, 196, 226, 305, 679, 688, 716, 737, primo 20, nunc 545, ad marg. 319.

Isa. 36:11 אֵלֵינוּ] עמנו K 154.

While the preposition אֶל is more frequently attested with דִּבֶּר than עִם, the latter (or אֵת) is also found quite often.[52]

[51] See Rezetko and Young (2014: 537-53) for the variants אֶל and עַל in MT and Qumran Samuel.

[52] See Rezetko and Young (2014: 557-8) on the same phenomenon in MT and Qumran Samuel.

2 Kgs. 18:27 הַעַל

Isa. 36:12 הַאֶל] העל K 150.

In this case, it is Kings that shows stylistic variation (הַעַל אֲדֹנֶיךָ וְאֵלֶיךָ), whereas Isaiah employs the same preposition twice (הַאֶל אֲדֹנֶיךָ וְאֵלֶיךָ).

2 Kgs. 19:6 לָהֶם] אליהם K 96, 115.

Isa. 37:6 אֲלֵיהֶם] להמה 1QIsa[a].

NOUN: CHANGES IN NUMBER

2 Kgs. 18:28 דְּבַר] דברי K 150, 257, 260, R primo 663.

Isa. 36:13 דִּבְרֵי] דבר K 1.

2 Kgs. 19:16 עֵינֶיךָ] עינך K 260, 263, 264.

Isa. 37:17 עֵינֶךָ] עיניך Bab, K 1, 2, 3, 17, 25, 30, 72, 82, 91, 94, 96, 112, 115, 116, 126, 149, 150, 154, 158, 172, 173, 175, 176, 182, 224, 226, 227, 245, 251, 252, 253, 258, 260, 264, 297, 301, R 4, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 174, 187, 196, 226, 305, 341, 380, 411, 440, 463, 545, 554, 560, 715, 737, 789, 815, primo 211, 518, 575, 579, 596, 663, 824; עיניכה 1QIsa[a].

Unless this is a case of defective spelling, the consonantal text of Isaiah has a singular, whereas the reading tradition vocalizes the noun as a dual.

NOUN: CHANGES IN MIŠQAL

2 Kgs. 19:23 מִבְחֹור] ומבחר K 150, 158.

Isa. 37:24 מִבְחָר] מבחור K 245.

The form attested in MT Isaiah is the more widespread of the two, and one finds it in Gen. 23:6; Exod. 15:4; Deut. 12:11; Isa. 22:7; Jer. 22:7; 48:15; Ezek. 23:7; 24:4, 5; 31:16; Dan. 11:15. On the other hand, the pattern occurring in MT 2 Kgs. 19:23 appears only once again, in 2 Kgs. 3:19. According to Rendsburg (2002a: 85), מִבְחֹור should be understood as a feature of Israelian Hebrew, in which the Phoenician shift /á/ > /ō/ is also attested. Furthermore, the fact that in both cases מִבְחֹור occurs in the words of non-Judahite characters (Elisha and the Rab-šaqeh) would confirm the non-standard profile of this noun. However, one wonders why we do not find this pattern also in texts such as Exodus 15, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, which have also been identified by Rendsburg as witnesses containing Israelian Hebrew features.

VERB: CHANGES IN NUMBER

2 Kgs. 18:17 וַיַּעַמְדוּ

Isa. 36:2 וַיַּעֲמֹד] ויעמוד K 122, 283.

The difference in number is here due to the addition that we find in MT 2 Kgs. 18:17, in which it is stated that Sennacherib sent forth the Turtanu, the Rab-saris, and the Rab-šakeh, whereas MT Isa. 36:2 only mentions the Rab-šakeh.[53]

2 Kgs. 18:22 תֹּאמְרוּן

Isa. 36:7 תֹּאמַר] תואמרו 1QIsa[a], תאמרו K 1, 226.

While MT Isaiah has the singular, in agreement with the preceding and following singulars referring to king Hezekiah in the speech of the Rab-šakeh, MT Kings seems to harmonize the number with the following בָּטָחְנוּ. LXX[L] (εἴπῃς), LXX[B] (εἶπας), and the Peshitta (ܐܡܪܬ) agree with MT Isaiah. However, OG Isaiah (λέγετε) and 1QIsa[a], that is the witnesses that usually preserve the earlier layer, agree with MT Kings. It may be that the plural was changed into a singular when the long Deuteronomistic addition (absent from OG Isaiah) הֲלוֹא־הוּא אֲשֶׁר הֵסִיר חִזְקִיָּהוּ אֶת־בָּמֹתָיו וְאֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לִיהוּדָה וְלִירוּשָׁלִַם לִפְנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה תִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ בִירוּשָׁלִָם, which originated in a revision of the account in Kings, was collated and inserted in Isaiah.[54] In sum, it is hard to assess which of the two readings is older.

2 Kgs. 20:18 יֵצֵאוּ] יקחו K 85, 145, 150, 176, 178, 224, 246, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 257, 260, 264, 271 A, 356, 650 B, 659, primo 30, 113, 158, 171. (Q[ə]re יִקָּחוּ)

Isa. 39:7 יֵצֵאוּ] יקח K 3, R 4.

[53] See Cogan and Tadmor 1988: 229-30 for the identity and roles carried out by these functionaries.

[54] Catastini (1989: 268) also identifies this portion of the verse as a secondary addition. Contrary to what Person (1997: 59) affirms, the text runs fluently without the statement. According to Van der Kooij (2006: 382-4), the translator refrained from rendering this bit into Greek in order to avoid the idea that Jerusalem (and not also Egypt) was the only place where the cult to God was acceptable. For reasons that I will explain in later, I agree with Catastini.

MT Isaiah employs the 3rd plural form of the verb to express an impersonal action, while MT Kings prefers the 3rd singular. The variant in Kings, which is corrected both in the reading tradition and in several medieval manuscripts, probably on the bases of MT Isaiah, is confirmed by λήμψεται (LXX^{B}) and יִדבַר (Targum). Because the entirety of the Isaiah tradition, as well as LXX^{L} Kings (λήψονται), the Peshitta (ܢܣܒܘܢ), and the Vulgate (tollentur) have the plural, it is not unlikely that the reading that we find in MT Kings is secondary and erroneous. The mistake may have been generated by a scribe who copied only the ו of the following word והיו, dropping by accident the ו at the end of יקחו: *יקחו והיו → יקח והיו. This would thus be a case of haplography.

VERB: CHANGES IN FORM AND BINYAN

2 Kgs. 19:12 שִׁחֲתָ֥ם] השחיתו K 93, 115, 240; השחתו K 601.

Isa. 37:12 הִשְׁחִיתוּ

The piel שִׁחֵת is used less frequently (x39) than the hiphil הִשְׁחִית (x95) in the Hebrew Bible, and, contrary to the latter, never in post-exilic books.[55] In post-biblical Hebrew, the piel is attested twice more, in 1QM 3:9 and probably 4QBarkhiNafshi 2:2, whereas the hiphil remains in use both in Qumran and in Ben Sira (there may be a piel in 6:4), occurring also in the Mishna. Although we may think that MT Isa. 37:12 has an updated version, we should bear in mind that

[55] Cf. Gen. 6:17; 9:11, 15; 13:10; 19:13, 29; 38:9; Exod. 21:26; 32:7; Num. 32:15; Deut. 9:12; 32:5; Josh. 22:33; Judg. 6:5; 1 Sam. 23:10; 2 Sam. 1:14; 14:11; 24:16; 2 Kgs. 19:12; Isa. 14:20; Jer. 5:10; 12:10; 48:18; Ezek. 5:16; 20:17; 22:30; 26: 4; 28:17; 30:11; 43:3; Hos. 9:9; 11:9; 13:9; Am. 1:11; Nah. 2:3; Mal. 2:8; Prov. 23:8; Lam. 2:5, 6.

the hiphil occurs twice in 2 Kgs. 18:25. These two variants may have been generated very early in the transmission of the text, maybe during the exile, when both forms were still used.

2 Kgs. 19:15 וַיֹּאמֶר] לאמר K 174.

Isa. 37:15 לֵאמֹר] ויאמר forte K 176.

2 Kgs. 19:33 יָבֹא] בא K 139, 172, 173, 180, 182, primo 82, nunc 99, R 174, 187, 518, 737, primo 21, 305, 413, 579, 679, nunc 319, 545.

Isa. 37:34 יָבֹא

It is likely that the qatal was turned into a yiqtol in Kings under the influence of the surrounding yiqtols. As both the Isaiah tradition indicates and the versions confirm, this change must have happened very late, given the occurrence of the suffix conjugation in the Targum (דַּאְתָא) and Peshitta (ܐܬܐ), the aorist in LXX^{B} (ἦλθεν), and the perfect in the Vulgate (venit).

ADDITION / OMISSION OF DIRECTIONAL ה-

2 Kgs. 20:17 בָּבֶלָה] om. ה- K 95, 182, 201.

Isa. 39:6 בָּבֶל

SYNTAX

ADDITION / OMISSION OF THE CONJUNCTION -וְ

2 Kgs. 18:25 עַתָּה] ועתה K 23, 30, 85, 93, 96, 101, 115, 150, 154, 158, 174, 182, 198, 210, 224, 225, 227, 240, 257, 260, primo 1, 3, R, 4, 13, 20, 21, 191, 226, 295, 380, 518, 679, 701, primo 22, 210, 440, 596, 604, 765, nunc 319, 554, 663, ad marg. 667.

Isa. 36:10 וְעַתָּה

2 Kgs. 18:30 וְלֹא

Isa. 36:15 לֹא] ולוא 1QIsa[a].

2 Kgs. 18:34 כִּי־הִצִּילוּ] וכי הצילו K 128, 234.

Isa. 36:19 וְכִי־הִצִּילוּ] om. -ו K 72, 116, 150, R primo 26, 211, 596.

2 Kgs. 20:9 זֶה

Isa. 38:7 וְזֶה

ADDITION / OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE -הַ

2 Kgs. 20:13 שֶׁמֶן] השמן K 23, 158, 172, primo 168, 249.

Isa. 39:2 הַשֶּׁמֶן] שמן K 96, 150.

It is very likely that the article was accidentally dropped in Kings, given that in the expression שֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב the adjective has it.[56]

USE OF THE ARTICLE WITH THE CONSTRUCT STATE

2 Kgs. 18:23 [אֶת־מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר] את המלך אשור K 1, 30, 70, 93, 115, 145, 154, 158, 174, 182, 187, 201, 249, 271 A, 288, 601, forte 99, 242, nunc 246.

Isa. 36:8 [הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר] מלך אשור K 253, 258, 260, 264; את מלך אשור K 1, 93, 151.

2 Kgs. 18:31 [מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר] המלך אשור K 139, 182, 253, 257, 260.

Isa. 36:16 [הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר] מלך אשור 1QIsa[a], K 130, 154.

The article occurs here and there in the Hebrew Bible with a noun in the construct state (APPENDIX 1.1), as the useful lists of occurrences drawn and discussed by König (1897: §303) and in GKC §127f-h show. Some of these occurrences are most likely due to mechanical accidents that took place during the copying and transmission of the text. For instance, in MT 2 Kgs. 23:17 the phrase הַמִּזְבַּח בֵּית־אֵל seems to stand for an original המזבח בבית אל which underwent haplography, as LXX[L] (τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἐν Βαιθήλ) and even the Targum (אֵיגוֹרָא בְּבֵית־אֵל) may indicate. In MT 1 Sam. 20:19 the expression הָאֶבֶן הָאָזֶל occurs, probably as the result of metathesis, which should be emended into האבן הלז, also based on the presence of ἐκεῖνο in LXX[B] (MCCARTER 1980: 337). In some cases, König wonders whether the article represents a dittography of the final ה- of a preceding word, e.g., MT Ezek. 41:21-22 כַּמַּרְאֵה

[56] For another possible explanation see GKC §126x.

הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֵץ. Similarly, MT may present a text expanded by what could have originally been an explanatory gloss, such as in MT 2 Kgs. 9:4, where we also see a case of dittography in the expression הַנַּעַר הַנָּבִיא הַנַּעַר (BURNEY 1903: 297; MCKENZIE 2019: 380). In MT Jer. 25:26 the ungrammatical construction הַמַּמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ is the result of the secondary addition of הָאָרֶץ, a reading not found in the Greek, which also lacks the famous final bit of the verse attested in MT (וּמֶלֶךְ שֵׁשַׁךְ יִשְׁתֶּה אַחֲרֵיהֶם). By the same token, MT Gen. 31:13 הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל presents no irregular syntax in the Septuagint, where no equivalent of בֵּית־אֵל occurs. On the other hand, a couple of occurrences may be explained as vocatives (GKC §127f), e.g., MT Jer. 48:32 (הַגֶּפֶן שִׂבְמָה) and MT Lam. 2:13 (הַבַּת יְרוּשָׁלִָם).

Besides what appear to be cumbersome scribal additions and mistakes, there seem to be two specific contexts in which the construct state takes the article. One is represented by construct chains in which the last element is a proper name of person or place (e.g., MT Gen. 24:67 הָאֹהֱלָה שָׂרָה; MT 2 Kgs. 25:11 הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּבֶל), whereas in other chains we find materials such as gold, fine linen, etc. in final position (e.g., MT Exod. 28:39 הַכְּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ; MT 2 Kgs. 16:14 הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת). The occurrences with the proper names have been explained as elliptical expressions (GKC §127f), while those in which we find a definition of the material are understood as instances of nouns in apposition (GKC §127h; JM §131d). As for the two occurrences of הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר in MT Isaiah, the anarthrous parallels found in MT 2 Kings, as well as the reading of 1QIsa[a], seem to indicate that the anomalous syntax is the result of scribal activity. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that such a phenomenon constitutes a late linguistic feature. I would rather ascribe it to either a mistake in the transmission process or to the imperfect knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the scribe responsible for the copying. It may be that such phrases as הַמֶּלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר or הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּבֶל were perceived by some as crystallized expressions, as a unity, and therefore the unnecessary article, the *nomen rectum* being a proper name, was added at the beginning of the

chain, a phenomenon which also occurs in colloquial Modern Hebrew (e.g., העורך דין instead of עורך הדין ‘the lawyer’).

ADDITION / OMISSION OF THE RELATIVE אֲשֶׁר

2 Kgs. 18:17 בְּמְסִלַּת] אֲשֶׁר om. K 96; אשר אל מסלת K 250.

Isa. 36.2 בְּמְסִלַּת] אל מסלת K 89; אל במסלת K 225.

ADDITION / OMISSION OF אֵת

2 Kgs. 18:28 דְּבַר] את דברי K 150, 257, 260, R primo 663; את דבר K 253, 264.

Isa. 36:13 אֶת־דִּבְרֵי] את דבר K 1.

2 Kgs. 18:30 אֶת־הָעִיר] om. את K 30, 70, 82, 96, 113, 130, 168, 174, 180, 182, 198, 224, 225, 228, 252, 263, R 1, 2, 20, 174, 226, 380, 440, 518, 604, 701, 789, primo 22, 210, 596, nunc 191, 663, 715, om. אֶת־הָעִיר K 187.

Isa. 36:15 הָעִיר

Despite the fact that some scholars have classified the use of the *nota accusative* with a nominative as a sign of late language (e.g., KROPAT 1909: 2-3; POLZIN 1976: 32-7), it has recently been demonstrated that this is not the case (SAMET 2021).

2 Kgs. 19:1 וְשֶׁבְנָא] ואת שבנא K 93, 150, 360.

Isa. 37:2 וְאֶת ׀ שֶׁבְנָא

2 Kgs. 19:11 אֲשֶׁר אֵתְּ] om. את K 96, 158, 174, 224, 253, 257, 260.

Isa. 37:11 אֲשֶׁר] את אשר 1QIsa[a], K 93, 96, 150, 258, 260, 264, 182 marg.

CONJUNCTIONS: INTERCHANGE BETWEEN כִּי AND פֶּן

2 Kgs. 18:32 כִּי־יַסִּית

Isa. 36:18 פֶּן־יַסִּית

The two variants are generated by the longer text that we find in Kings אֶרֶץ זַיִת יִצְהָר וּדְבַשׁ וְחִיּוּ וְלֹא תָמֻתוּ וְאַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־חִזְקִיָּהוּ, which is absent in Isaiah. The כִּי that we find in Kings goes with וְאַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ and can be translated ‘when’. It is interesting to observe that the verb סות doubles the first radical, thus showing an Aramaising form. The only other rare instances where this phenomenon happens with this verb are found in Jer. 38:22 (הִסִּיתוּךָ), 43:3 (מַסִּית), 2 Chr. 32:11 (מַסִּית), and 32:15 (יַסִּית), the last one corresponding to the parallel accounts. This distribution may point to the late change of the form יַסִּית into יַסִּית, or to the fact that the Aramaising form is placed in the mouth of a foreigner.

VERB: INTERCHANGE BETWEEN WAYYIQTOL AND כִּי + QATAL

2 Kgs. 20:12 כִּי שָׁמַע

Isa. 39:1 וַיִּשְׁמַע] כי שמע R primo 663.

The versions seem to indicate that the wayyiqtol entered the text of Isaiah very late: OG has ἤκουσεν γὰρ, the Targum כַּד שְׁמַע, the Peshitta ܫܡܥ ܘܐܚܕ, and the Vulgate audierat enim. However, the agreement between the versions on these parallel texts may well be artificial.

VERB: INTERCHANGE BETWEEN IMPERATIVE AND INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE

2 Kgs. 20:5 שׁוּב

Isa. 38:5 הָלוֹךְ] לך K 650 H.

The sequence infinive absolute – weqatal is dear to Jeremiah (in particular with הָלוֹךְ), which contains 70% of the occurrences.[57] The text of MT Isaiah may be secondary given the preference for this construction in Jeremiah, but similar occurrences in 2 Samuel and 2 Kings make this conclusion uncertain.

[57] See Fassberg 2006: 57; 2008: 58. The occurrences are the following: Num. 25:17 (צָרֹר...וְהִכִּיתֶם); Deut. 16:1 (שָׁמוֹר...וְעָשִׂיתָ); 31:26 (לָקֹחַ...וְשָׂמְתֶּם); 2 Sam. 24:12 (הָלוֹךְ וְדִבַּרְתָּ); 2 Kgs. 5:10 (הָלוֹךְ וְרָחַצְתָּ); Jer. 2:2 (הָלֹךְ וְקָרָאתָ); 3:12 (הָלֹךְ וְקָרָאתָ); 13:1 (הָלוֹךְ וְקָנִיתָ); 17:19-20 (הָלַךְ וְעָמַדְתָּ...וְאָמַרְתָּ); 19:1-3 (הָלוֹךְ וְקָנִיתָ...וְיָצָאתָ...וְקָרָאתָ...וְאָמַרְתָּ); 28:13 (הָלוֹךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ); 39:16 (הָלֹךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ); 13 (הָלוֹךְ...וְדִבַּרְתָּ...וְהַבָּאוֹתָם...וְהִשְׁקִיתָ); 35:2 (הָלֹךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ...וְאָמַרְתָּ); 34:2 (לָקוֹחַ...וּנְתַתָּם); 32:14 (וְאָמַרְתָּ הָלוֹךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ).

VERB: INTERCHANGE BETWEEN WEQATAL AND הִנֵּה + PRONOMINAL SUFFIX + PARTICIPLE (?)

2 Kgs. 20:6 וְהֹסַפְתִּי

Isa. 38:5 הִנְנִי יוֹסֵף] הנני אוסיף K 9, 150; הנני אסיף K 17, 158, R primo 380.

The two variants are due to the longer text in Kings.[58] The second half of v. 5, in fact, has הִנְנִי רֹפֵא לָךְ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי תַּעֲלֶה בֵּית יְהוָה, which shows that in this version of the account הִנְנִי goes with the participle רֹפֵא and וְהֹסַפְתִּי begins v. 6. Because Isaiah lacks this portion of the text, it takes הִנְנִי with the verb יסף. However, the construction הִנְנִי יוֹסֵף is suspicious. On the one hand, the versions seem to point to a *Vorlage* that probably read הנני מוסיף (unless the verb is re-vocalised as a qal active participle סֵף(ו)י), as expected: OG has ἰδοὺ προστίθημι, the Targum הָאֲנָא מוֹסִיף, the Peshitta ܗܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܘܣܦ, and the Vulgate ecce ego adiciam. A *Vorlage* with הנני אוסיף, as attested in some medieval manuscripts, is very unlikely. The yiqtol occurs only once, in 1 Sam. 14:43 (הִנְנִי אָמוּת), after הִנֵּה + pronominal suffix. Another option could be that יוֹסֵף should be vocalised יוֹסֵף and be read as a jussive. This very same textual and linguistic issue occurs once more in Isa. 29:14, where we find הִנְנִי יוֹסֵף. A third and last instance of a 3ms jussive (yet written as a yiqtol) after הִנְנִי appears in 2 Sam. 15:26 הִנְנִי יַעֲשֶׂה־לִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר טוֹב בְּעֵינָיו. In this case, however, הִנְנִי does not seem to be syntactically and pragmatically linked to what follows as tightly as in Isaiah. Although both unexpected occurrences in Isaiah may be interpreted as casus pendens followed by an impersonal 3rd person ('Behold me, let it be added...'), it is more likely that the Hebrew text is faulty, and we should reconstruct a participle. It is worth mentioning that in colloquial Modern Hebrew the prefix of the 1st person singular of the yiqtol sounds like *y-* after

[58] According to Catastini (1989: 269-73) a later addition. The awkward syntax may also point to the secondary omission of this bit in Isaiah, which resulted in the linguistic asperity here discussed.

a preceding *-i*, e.g., אני אספר לך *ʾanì yesapér lexá* (BOLOZKY 2013). This seems a case where the reading tradition has taken advantage of a qal form in the written tradition that could be vocalised almost as a hiphil (with the elision of alef).[59]

TRANSPOSITIONS

2 Kgs. 18:17 מִן־לָכִישׁ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ בְּחַיִל כָּבֵד יְרוּשָׁלִָם

Isa. 36:2 מִלָּכִישׁ יְרוּשָׁלִַם אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ בְּחַיִל כָּבֵד

This verse has undergone considerable change in Kings, as I will explain in chapter 2. There are a couple of fairly long additions and clear signs of scribal intervention. The occurrence of יְרוּשָׁלִַם after אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ בְּחַיִל כָּבֵד and far from מִן־לָכִישׁ is a secondary transposition.

2 Kgs. 19:2 [יְשַׁעְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא בֶּן־אָמוֹץ בן אמוץ הנביא K 174; בן אמוץ K 150.

Isa. 37:2 יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ הַנָּבִיא

As both the Isaiah tradition and LXX^{L} (Ἡσαίαν υἱὸν Ἀμὼς τὸν προφήτην) show, the reading that we find in Kings made its way into a later layer of the tradition. It was already present in proto-MT, given that we find this transposition also in the versions (LXX^{B} Ἡσαίαν τὸν προφήτην υἱὸν Ἀμώς, Targum יְשַׁעְיָה נְבִיָא בַר אָמוֹץ, Peshitta ܐܝܫܥܝܐ ܢܒܝܐ ܒܪ ܐܡܘܨ, Vulgata Esaiam prophetam filium Amos). The later character of this transposition is confirmed by its

[59] I am grateful to Geoffrey Khan and Aaron Hornkohl for pointing this out to me.

being unique in the Hebrew Bible, where the word order occurring in Isaiah is otherwise found for the same expression.[60]

LEXICON

2 Kgs. 18:25 הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה

Isa. 36:10 הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת

2 Kgs. 19:9 וַיָּשָׁב

Isa. 37:9 [וַיִּשְׁמַע וישמע וישב 1QIsa[a].

Both readings may be secondary. OG Isaiah (καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψεν) and 1QIsa[a] (וישמע וישב) preserve both verbs. MT Isaiah and MT Kings may have selected only one.

2 Kgs. 19:13 [אַיּוֹ] איה K 93, 150, 180 marg.

Isa. 37:13 אַיֵּה

Although the particle אֵי is only rarely used with a pronominal suffix in Biblical Hebrew,[61] both אֵי and אַיֵּה fall from use in post-biblical Hebrew (the former changes meaning in Mishnaic Hebrew).[62]

---

[60] Cf. 1 Kgs. 16:7 (יֵהוּא בֶן־חֲנָנִי הַנָּבִיא – in this case הַנָּבִיא is probably a later addition, cf. LXX[B]); 2 Kgs. 14:25 (יוֹנָה בֶן־אֲמִתַּי הַנָּבִיא); 2 Kgs. 20:1 (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ הַנָּבִיא); Isa. 38:1 (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ הַנָּבִיא); Jer. 28:1 (חֲנַנְיָהּ בֶן־עַזּוּר הַנָּבִיא); Zech. 1:1 (זְכַרְיָהּ בֶּן־בֶּרֶכְיָהוּ בֶּן־עִדּוֹ הַנָּבִיא), 7 (זְכַרְיָהּ בֶּן־בֶּרֶכְיָהוּ בֶּן־עִדּוֹא הַנָּבִיא); 2 Chr. 26:22 (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ הַנָּבִיא); 32:20 (וְיִשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ הַנָּבִיא), 32 (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא בֶן־אָמוֹץ).

[61] Cf. Gen. 3:9 (אַיֶּכָּה); Exod. 2:20 (אַיּוֹ); 2 Kgs. 19:13 (אַיּוֹ); Isa. 19:12 (אַיֵּם); Jer. 37:19 (אַיּוֵּ); Mic. 7:10 (אַיּוֹ); Nah. 3:17 (אַיֵּם); Job 14:10 (אַיּוֹ); 20:7 (אַיּוֹ).

[62] See Kantor 2019 for a discussion on the origin of both particles.

2 Kgs. 19:17 הַגּוֹיִם

Isa. 37:18 הָאֲרָצוֹת] הגוים K 17, 155 marg., 158, 228, 250, 355, 420, 431, 575, 601, 616, R 380, 440, 554, nunc 24, 226.

2 Kgs. 19:23 מַלְאָכֶיךָ

Isa. 37:24 עֲבָדֶיךָ

2 Kgs. 19:23 בְּרֹכֶב] ברב K 1, 21, 30, 70, 85, 89, 93, 96, 113, 115, 149, 150, 154, 158, 160, 171, 174, 175, 178, 180, 182, 187, 201, 224, 225, 227, 240, 246, 249, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 264, 270, 271 A, 288, 601, 659, primo 168; ברוב K 112, 150, 195. (Q^{e}re בְּרֹב)

Isa. 37:24 בְּרֹב

2 Kgs. 19:23 מְלֹון] מרום K 93.

Isa. 37:24 מְרֹום] מלון K 96.

The last stich of this verse seems to be preserved better in MT Kings. The reading מְרוֹם in the Isaiah tradition may have originated under the influence of the previous מְרוֹם in the same verse.

2 Kgs. 19:26 וּשְׁדֵפָה] ושדמה K 172, 180 marg., 201; ושדפמה K 150; ושרפה K 21.

Isa. 37:27 וּשְׁדֵמָה] ושדפה K 225, 352, 542, primo 154; ושדפה ושדמה K 159, primo 463 hisp.; הנשדף 1QIsa^{a}.

There is a high degree of contamination between the two traditions with regards to this reading. The root of the noun שְׁדֵפָה ‘scorching’ that we find in MT Kings occurs also in 1QIsa^{a} as a verb and lies behind OG Isaiah ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων ‘like dry grass on the rooftops’. There

is no other occurrence of the noun שְׁדֵפָה in the Hebrew Bible. Quite interestingly, the reading שְׁדֵמָה ‘field, plain, vineyard’ (?) that we find in MT Isaiah occurs in LXX^{B} and LXX^{L} Kings as πάτημα ‘what is trodden’. Such a reading is confirmed by the Ethiopic, which has ሴዲማ /sēdēmā/, a transliteration of the Hebrew term contained in MT Isaiah that was probably present also in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek manuscript used for the Ethiopic translation.[63]

The verb שָׁדַף ‘to scorch’ occurs only three times in the Joseph story (Gen. 41:6, 23, 27), besides the instance from 1QIsa^{a}. The related term שִׁדָּפוֹן ‘blight’ is of slightly more frequent and widespread use (Deut. 28:22; 1 Kgs. 8:37 // 2 Chr. 6:28; Am. 4:9; Hag. 2:17). The reading שְׁדֵפָה may have entered the text at a later stage, but a diachronic explanation remains uncertain.

2 Kgs. 20:3 לְבָב

Isa. 38:3 לֵב] לבב 1QIsa^{a}, K 93, 245, 300, 650 B, forte 130.

This is a stylistic choice. It may be that לְבָב entered the text at a later stage, given that Deuteronomy by far prefers it (x47) over the more common לֵב (x4).

2 Kgs. 20:7 קְחוּ

Isa. 38:21 יִשְׂאוּ

The textual tradition of Kings, as we find it in LXX^{L} and LXX^{B} (λαβέτωσαν) and in the Peshitta (ܢܣܒܘ), indicates that the proto-Masoretic tradition had a jussive (יקחו) rather than an imperative. This is further confirmed by the parallel version of MT Isaiah (יִשְׂאוּ). As many scholars have convincingly argued (JEREMIAS 1971: 104-11; COGAN AND TADMOR 1988: 257;

[63] See Davies 1944: 108. Similar uncertainties are found in MT 2 Kgs. 23:4, where שַׁדְמוֹת is transliterated as σαλημώθ in LXX^{B} and rendered as ἐμπυρισμῷ in LXX^{L} (again from √שדף?).

HOFFER 1992; WILLIAMSON 1996), the verse in Isaiah was moved to the end of the chapter, probably when the psalm was included in Isa. 38:9-20 as part of the same editorial process. This further corroborates the possibility that 2 Kgs. 20:7 originally had a jussive and that MT Isa. 38:21, along with the abovementioned versions, preserves, at least morphologically and syntactically speaking, the original reading.

On the other hand, there is a possibility that MT Isa. 38:21 was linguistically updated and the verb לָקַח was changed into נָשָׂא. It has been pointed out by many scholars (DRIVER 1957: 455; POLZIN 1976: 146; QIMRON 1986: 93; WRIGHT 2005: 71-4, 127) that the expression לָקַח אִשָּׁה changed into נָשָׂא אִשָּׁה in post-exilic and post-biblical Hebrew. Moreover, Kutscher (1982: 82-3), followed by Wright (2005: 73), argued that the verb נָשָׂא replaced לָקַח more generally because the latter started being employed mostly with the meaning 'to buy', so that sometimes the former was used with the new meaning 'to take'. He shows this by comparing 1 Sam. 31:12, where we read וַיִּקָּחוּ, with the parallel in 1 Chr. 10:12, where וַיִּשְׂאוּ occurs instead. The variant discussed here would perfectly fit such a scenario, given the redactional history of MT Isa. 38:21. While there is no doubt that the expression concerning the taking up of a wife underwent linguistic change, and while it is very likely that this change is rooted in a series of semantic shifts that affected both לָקַח and נָשָׂא, it should also be observed that the meaning 'to take, receive, accept, take away, carry away' is attested for נָשָׂא also in pre-exilic texts (cf. DCH נָשָׂא 7). In sum, I believe that this is a potentially relevant variant from a linguistic diachronic perspective. Nevertheless, given the distribution of נָשָׂא 'to take' also in pre-exilic texts, I have decided to include it here rather than in Chapter 2.

2 Kgs. 20:12 חִזְקִיָּהוּ] חזקיהו ויחי K 246.

Isa. 39:1 וַיֶּחֱזַק] ויחיה 1QIsa[a].

Quite interestingly, K 246 agrees with LXX^{L} Kings (Ἐζεκίας καὶ ἀνέστη), a reading which is partially preserved also in OG Isaiah (καὶ ἀνέστη) and 1QIsa^{a} (ויחיה). The fact that the noun חִזְקִיָּהוּ still has the long theophoric element in יהו- may point to the antiquity of this reading,[64] MT Isaiah being a secondary development. It should also be noted that it is the verb חיה that is employed in MT 2 Kgs. 20:1 and MT Isa. 38:1, 9 to describe Hezekiah's recovery.

2 Kgs. 20:13 וַיִּשְׁמַע] וישמח K 195, 271 A, 288, 300, 530, 541, 587, 650 B, forte 201, 451, nunc 70, R 226, 319, nunc 174, primo exter., 1, 23.

Isa. 39:2 וַיִּשְׂמַח] וישמע R 187 hisp. et 579.

MT Kings is here corrupted, as the versions confirm (LXX^{L} and LXX^{B} καὶ ἐχάρη, Peshitta ,ܫܡܚ, Vulgata laetatus est). The scribes mixed up the gutturals and the sibilants.

LONGER TEXT IN KINGS

2 Kgs. 18:17 אֶת־תַּרְתָּן וְאֶת־רַב־סָרִיס

Isa. 36:2 –

2 Kgs. 18:17 וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ יְרוּשָׁלִַם וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעַמְדוּ] ויעמדו om. K 94; ויעלו ויבאו ירושלם om. K 30, 70, 102, 253, 257, 260, R 579, 701, primo 21, 191, 545, nunc 380; ירושלם om. K 249.

Isa. 36:2 וַיַּעֲמֹד

[64] On this point see Chapter 2.

The difference in number between וַיַּעֲמֹד and וַיַּעַמְדוּ is due to the presence of אֶת־תַּרְתָּן וְאֶת־רַב־ סָרִיס ו וְאֶת־רַב־שָׁקֵה in 2 Kings, whereas Isaiah has only אֶת־רַב־שָׁקֵה. Furthermore, MT Kings has a clear case of dittography which originated very late in the tradition. Not only is it absent in LXX^{L} (καὶ ἀνέβησαν καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἔστησαν), but also in LXX^{B} (same text as LXX^{L}), the Peshitta (ܘܣܠܘ ܘܐܬܘ ܠܘܬ ܐܘܪܫܠܡ ܘܐܬܪܥܝܘ), and the Vulgate (cum ascendissent venerunt in Hierusalem et steterunt).

2 Kgs. 18:18 וַיִּקְרְאוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ

Isa. 36:3 –

2 Kgs. 18:21 עַתָּה] om. K 154.

Isa. 36:6 –

The variant of MT Kings is suspicious. For one thing, v. 20 ends with a question that reads עַתָּה עַל־מִי בָטַחְתָּ כִּי מָרַדְתָּ בִּי. The answer in v. 21 may very well begin with הִנֵּה and without the pleonastic repetition of עַתָּה. Moreover, these two elements occur together only (with one exception) when עַתָּה is preceded by the conjunction -וְ, so that what follows הִנֵּה comes as the consequence of and is tightly connected to what precedes עַתָּה.[65] From a text-critical perspective, עַתָּה may have entered the text quite late, given its absence from the Isaiah tradition, LXX^{L}, the Vetus Latina (L$^{91-95}$), the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and Josephus' *Antiquitates*. The particle עַתָּה in v. 20 may be the result of editorial activity for rhetorical purposes. Its addition gives a more solid structure to the first discourse of the Rab-šakeh (vv. 19-25), which is thus

[65] Cf. Gen. 12:19; Exod. 3:9; Num. 24:14; Deut. 26:10; Josh. 9:12, 25; 14:10; 1 Sam. 12:2, 13; 2 Sam. 24:21; 1 Kgs. 1:8; 22:23 (// 2 Chr. 18:22); Jer. 40:4; 2 Chr. 20:10. The only exception occurs in Job 16:19, where we find גַּם־עַתָּה הִנֵּה. The function does not change.

divided into three parts (four questions and three answers), each introduced by עַתָּה (vv. 21, 23, 25).

2 Kgs. 18:21 לְךָ֗

Isa. 36:6 –

2 Kgs. 18:22 בִּירוּשָׁלִָם] לירושלם K 70.

Isa. 36:7 –] בִּירוֹשָׁלִַם 1QIsa[a].

The secondary character of the reading found in 1QIsa[a] is evident from the dots placed on each letter in the manuscript, which illustrates well the phenomenon described above as textual contamination. The variant attested in the tradition of Kings is probably ideological and therefore secondary.[66]

2 Kgs. 18:26 בֶּן־חִלְקִיָּהוּ

Isa. 36:11 –

2 Kgs. 18:27 אֲלֵיהֶם

Isa. 36:12 –

2 Kgs. 18:28 וַיְדַבֵּר] om. K 23, 149, 174, 180, 242, 249, primo bis 173, R 176, primo 2, 335, 789, nunc 319.

Isa. 36:13 –

[66] See Catastini 1989: 268.

2 Kgs. 18:29 מִיָּדוֹ

Isa. 36:14 –

2 Kgs. 18:32 אֶרֶץ זַיִת יִצְהָר וּדְבַשׁ וְחְיוּ וְלֹא תָמֻתוּ וְאַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־חִזְקִיָּהוּ

Isa. 36:17 –

2 Kgs. 18:34 הֲנַע וְעִוָּה

Isa. 36:19 –

2 Kgs. 19:4 אֵת ו כָּל־דִּבְרֵי] om. כל K 30, 85, 96, 112, 130, 154, 158, 180, 201, 253, nunc 249, R 21, 174, 226, 295, 380, 545, primo 596.

Isa. 37:4 אֵת ו דִּבְרֵי] את כל דברי K 23.

2 Kgs. 19:9 הִנֵּה] om. K 1, 23, 263.

Isa. 37:9 –

2 Kgs. 19:16 שְׁלָחוֹ] שלח K 1, 23, 30, 82, 162, 300, nunc 2, 4.

Isa. 37:17 שָׁלַח] שלחו K 150.

Because the antecedent of the relative clause is דִּבְרֵי in both accounts, the resumptive pronoun in the singular found in MT Kings is wrong. The absence of the resumptive pronoun in the versions may confirm this, although it may also be interpreted as a stylistic and grammatical choice. Among the versions that allow for the presence of a resumptive pronoun, the Peshitta does not have it, whereas the Targum does (דְשַׁלְחֵיה).

2 Kgs. 19:19 הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ נָא

Isa. 37:20 הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ נא] הושיענו נא K 3, 23, 30, 72, 145, 149, 150, 154, 160, 168, 173, 182, 198, 226, 228, 254, 601, 602, forte 175.

2 Kgs. 19:19 אֱלֹהִים

Isa. 37:20 –] אלהים 1QIsa[a]; אלהינו K 150.

2 Kgs. 19:20 שָׁמָעְתִּי

Isa. 37:21 –] שמעתי K nunc 180, R nunc 319.

2 Kgs. 19:24 זָרִים] om. K 180.

Isa. 37:25 –] זתים 1QIsa[a]; רבים K 224.

2 Kgs. 19:35 וַיְהִי֙ בַּלַּ֣יְלָה הַה֔וּא

Isa. 37:36 –

2 Kgs. 20:5 רָפָ֗א לְךָ֙ בַּיּ֣וֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁ֔י תַּעֲלֶ֖ה בֵּ֥ית יְהוָֽה

Isa. 38:5 –

2 Kgs. 20:6 לְמַעֲנִ֖י וּלְמַ֣עַן דָּוִ֑ד עַבְדִּֽי

Isa. 38:6 –

2 Kgs. 20:7 וַיִּקָּֽחוּ

Isa. 38:21 –

On this verse, see Chapter 2.

2 Kgs. 20:9 וַיֹּאמֶר יְשַׁעְיָהוּ

Isa. 38:7 –

2 Kgs. 20:13 אֶת־כָּל־בֵּית נְכֹתֹה] om. כל K 2, 4, 21, 85, 96, 101, 145, 150, 158, 168, 172, 201, 224, R 4, 191, 305, 667, 679, 716, 737, primo 20, 21, 380, nunc 545.

Isa. 39:2 אֶת־בֵּית נְכֹתֹהּ] את כול בית נכתיו 1QIsa[a].

LONGER TEXT IN ISAIAH

2 Kgs. 18:32 לֵאמֹר

Isa. 36:18 חִזְקִיָּהוּ לֵאמֹר

MT Kings lacks the name חִזְקִיָּהוּ because it is mentioned in the longer text that ends the previous verse.

2 Kgs. 18:35 הָאֲרָצוֹת] הארצות האלה K 182.

Isa. 36:20 הָאֲרָצוֹת הָאֵלֶּה] om. האלה K 3.

2 Kgs. 19:15 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] יהוה אלהי הצבאות K 253.

Isa. 37:16 יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] om. אלהי ישראל K 168 : om. ישראל K 72.

The expression יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, attested ten times in MT Samuel, was almost everywhere removed from MT Kings. The only two exceptions (1 Kgs. 18:15; 2 Kgs. 3:14) are found in two identical

oath formulae in the northern prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha. This expression also used to occur elsewhere. For instance, LXX^{B} preserves the same expression in 1 Kgs. 17:1 (ζῇ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ), whereas MT lacks it. Furthermore, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is very frequent in Isaiah, and the three occurrences that we find in the parallel account (Isa. 37:16, 32; 39:5) should be deemed original, whereas in MT Kings we observe a secondary development aimed at removing this expression. Quite interestingly, LXX^{L} has κύριε παντοκράτωρ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ in this verse, as well as κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων in 19:31 (// Isa. 37:32) and κυρίου παντοκράτορος in 20:16 (// Isa. 39:5), which is the same occurrences that we find in the Isaiah tradition. The difference between κύριος παντοκράτωρ and κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων lies in the fact that the latter is a καίγε translation. We do find, in fact, κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων also in LXX^{B} in 19:31. Although this expression is absent in 19:15 and 20:16, LXX^{B} has the unique attestation of κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων θεὸς Ἰσραήλ in 19:20, which does not appear in the Isaiah tradition of 37:21. This means that יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת occurred not only in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of OG Kings, but also in some places of a proto-Masoretic exemplar. MT Kings represents the final stage in the trajectory that sees the expression יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת effaced from Kings.

2 Kgs. 19:16 אֶת דִּבְרֵי] את כל דברי K 1, 2, 3, 23, 70, 85, 93, 94, 130, 145, 149, 154, 160, 168, 172, 174, 180, 182, 187, 198, 201, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 240, 246, 249, 601, 602, R 1, 2, 4, 13, 174, 191, 196, 226, 305, 341, 380, 440, 518, 539, 545, 604, 663, 667, 679, 688, 701, 715, 737, 789, primo 22, 187, 579, 596, nunc 20, 210, 413, 554, 765, exter. 1.
Isa. 37:17 אֶת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי

We see the identical phenomenon, albeit with the opposite distribution of the variants, in MT 2 Kgs. 19:4 // MT Isa. 37:4 (see above).

In the present verse, the variant כל, although not occurring in LXX^{L} and LXX^{B}, must have been attested in some proto-Masoretic manuscripts of Kings, given its presence in the Targum – which has a slightly different text in the first half of this verse –, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate.

2 Kgs. 19:17 אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם

Isa. 37:18 אֶת־כָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת

The two variants הַגּוֹיִם and הָאֲרָצוֹת are listed above. As for כֹּל, see the previous comment.

2 Kgs. 19:31 יְהוָה] יהוה צבאות K 2, 21, 30, 70, 82, 85, 89, 93, 96, 99, 115, 128, 130, 149, 150, 155, 158, 168, 171, 174, 182, 187, 224, 225, 227, 240, 253, 257, 260, 263, 264, 270, 271 A, 297, 659, 664, R 2, 13, 174, 191, 196, 210, 226, 249, 295, 319, 346, 380, 440, 539, 554, 596, 663, 667, 679, 688, 701, 715, 716, 737, 765, 789, primo 1. (Qᵊre יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת)

Isa. 37:32 יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת] om. צבאות K 23, 154, 155.

See above on יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת.

2 Kgs. 19:37 וְשַׂרְאֶצֶר] ושראצר בניו K 1, 21, 30, 70, 89, 93, 99, 112, 115, 149, 150, 174, 240, 246, 249, 250, 253, 257, 260, 263, 264, 270, 271 A, 356, 650 B, 651, 659, primo 201, R 13, 20, 21, 191, 211, 226, 249, 319, 380, 539, 545, 554, 596, 663, 667, 679, 688, 701, 765, primo 1, 22, 335, 688, 701, 765, primo 1, 22, 335, 575, 737. (Qᵊre וְשַׂרְאֶצֶר בָּנָיו)

Isa. 37:38 וְשַׂרְאֶצֶר בָּנָיו

2 Kgs. 20:2 וַיִּסֹּב] ויסב חזקיהו K 1, 3, 23, 115, 150, 155, 174, 178, 246, 250, 253, 257, 260, 264, R 1, 13, 20, 295, 346, 554, 663, 701, 716, primo 545, nunc 210, 319; ויסב חזקיהו בן אמוץ K 89.

Isa. 38:2 וַיִּסֹּב חִזְקִיָּהוּ

2 Kgs. 20:9 הַדָּבָר] הדבר הזה K 21, 30, 150, 168, 227, forte 130.

Isa. 38:7 הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה

2 Kgs. 20:13 וְאֵת בֵּית כֵּלָיו

Isa. 39:2 וְאֵת כָּל־בֵּית כֵּלָיו

Many manuscripts of MT Kings have the variant כל, which also occurs in the main text of Kennicott's Bible. A similar expression at the beginning of the verse occurs as אֶת־כָּל־בֵּית נְכֹתֹה. See also 2 Kgs. 19:16 // Isa. 37:17.

2 Kgs. 20:14 בָּאוּ] באו אלי K 1, 23, 30, 93, 99, 145, 150, 174, 182, 198, 201, 227, 246, 249, 253, 257, 260, 264; marg. add. אלי K 180, 224, R 187, 211, 249, 440, 545, 679, 716, 737, primo 20, 22, 174, nunc 226, 789, ad marg. seu nunc exter. 1.

Isa. 39:3 בָּאוּ אֵלַי

2 Kgs. 20:16 יְהוָה] יהוה צבאות K 182, 249.

Isa. 39:5 יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת

See above on יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת.

SUMMARY

As we can see, the number of variants is quite high for so few chapters:

Orthography / Phonology	x14
Morphology	x15
Syntax	x18
Lexicon	x12
Longer Text in Kings	x25
Longer Text in Isaiah	x12

All these variants are irrelevant from the point of view of historical linguistics, even when it is clear which of the two readings entered the text at a later stage. This speaks to the linguistic skills of the scribes who could reproduce the biblical forms and style even down to the 1st century BCE or CE. At the same time, it also highlights the diachronic uniformity of Ancient Hebrew with regards to most aspects of the language. However, as we shall see in the next chapter, there is a series of features that confirm the relative dating of MT Kings and MT Isaiah. In areas such as syntax, the changes that happen tend to take place beyond the awareness of the speakers, or at least more so than what we see with morphology and orthography. An earlier syntactic construction or the use of a lost meaning for certain words is harder to emulate than conservative orthography or old fashioned morphological forms and patterns.

Finally, besides the fact that the language of both accounts is mostly identical to that of the texts written in CBH, one further point that could help anchor the composition of the core text that we now have in different versions in the 7th century BCE is the use and presence of stylistic and thematic similarities with the material from the Assyrian archives. As some scholars have pointed out (COHEN 1979; TADMOR 1985; COGAN AND TADMOR 1988: 228-52; MACHINIST 2000), there are certain elements occurring in the parallel accounts that we also find in the cuneiform sources of the time. The Neo-Assyrian sources have also been used in the attempt to shed light on obscure and possibly corrupted expressions and passages (WEISSERT 2011).

One such instance could perhaps be 2 Kgs. 18:20 // Isa. 36:5, here quoted according to MT Kings:

אָמַרְתָּ אַךְ־דְּבַר־שְׂפָתַיִם עֵצָה וּגְבוּרָה לַמִּלְחָמָה עַתָּה עַל־מִי בָטַחְתָּ כִּי מָרַדְתָּ בִּי׃

The translation adopted by Cogan and Tadmor (who follow Ehrlich) for the first half of the verse is ‘Do you think that plans and arming for war can emerge from empty talk?’. As they acknowledge, this is a difficult passage, and its beginning sounds proverbial. In Prov. 14:23 דְּבַר־שְׂפָתַיִם refers to ‘empty talk’, and עֵצָה and גְּבוּרָה are elsewhere paired in proverbs (cf. Prov. 8:14; Job 12:13). However, it seems to me that such a translation does not account for the presence of אַךְ in the text, which may rather be interpreted as an asseverative particle. On the other hand, in DCH we find the translation ‘apart from words, is there a plan’, with the attribution of a restrictive meaning to the particle אַךְ. In both translations the verb אָמַר seems to be understood with a meaning other than ‘to say’.

I wish to propose here another viable solution, which reads the first half of the verse as a quotation of Hezekiah’s words by the Rab-šaqeh:

‘You said: “Indeed (this is) the order: Counsel and strength for the war!” Now, whom did you trust that you rebelled against me?’

As mentioned above, other scholars like Cohen, Tadmor, and Machinist have observed that the speech of the Rab-šaqeh contains Assyrian idioms which one can find in the cuneiform records. Nevertheless, no one has considered that דְּבַר־שְׂפָתַיִם may also fall within this category and reflect the Assyrian idiom *zikir šaptīya* ‘the utterance of my lips’, which occurs in the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. It may occur in parallelism with *amât šarrutīya* ‘my royal commands’, often in contexts where the enemy does not listen

to the warning of the Assyrian king, rebels, and wages war against him. The following is just one example from Esarhaddon 1:ii 65-7:[67]

^{m}ab-di-mil-ku-ut-ti LUGAL ^{URU}ṣi-dun-ni
la pa-lìḫ be-lu-ti-ia la še-mu-u zi-kir šap-ti-ia
ša UGU tam-tim gal-la-tim it-tak-lu-ma is-lu-u GIŠ.ŠUDUN ^{d}aš-šur

‘(As for) Abdi-Milkūti, king of Sidon, (who) did not fear my lordship (and) did not listen to the words of my lips, who trusted in the rolling sea and threw off the yoke of the god Aššur…’

The text then goes on to tell how Sidon was destroyed.
Another example (Esarhaddon 33:o i 29-32):[68]

[ki]-a-am aq-bi-šú-ma um-ma im-ma-te-ma-a tal-te-me a-mat LUGAL dan-ni a-di 2-šú
ù a-na-ku LUGAL dan-dan-nu a-di 3-šú áš-pur-kam-ma la taš-ma-a zi-kir šap-ti-ía
[ana] pi-i-gi na-piš-ti-ía la tap-làḫ-u-ma a-na ši-pir-ti-ia la ta-da-a le-et-ka
MURUB$_4$ u MÈ tu-šá-ra-an-ni-ma GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ AN.ŠÁR ez-zu-ti ta-ad-ka-a ina šub-ti-šú-un

‘…thus I said to him, (saying): “Did you ever hear a mighty king (give his) order twice? But I am an almighty king (and) I have written to you three times (and) you have not listened to the words of my lips! You had no fear of deceiving me and you paid no attention to my message(s).

[67] RINAP 4: Esarhaddon.

[68] RINAP 4: Esarhaddon.

You began war and battle against me and (by so doing) you called up the fierce weapons of the god Aššur from their sheaths.'

As we can see, this expression refers to what the king of Assyria orders, it occurs in contexts where the enemy rebels and the Assyrian king has to intervene and make war in order to quell the upheaval, and it appears in conjunction with the motif of trust in some other entity on the part of the rebels.

Ironically, Sennacherib, via the Rab-šaqeh, attributes to Hezekiah the order to wage war by using an expression that the Assyrian kings usually employed to dissuade their subjects from taking up arms. As we know from both the Neo-Assyrian sources and from 2 Kgs. 18:7, Hezekiah indeed rebelled and was part of a coalition that sought to throw the Assyrian yoke off its neck. Furthermore, the Rab-šaqeh mentions trust in 2 Kgs. 18:20b and in the following verse, a theme that occurs also in the first snippet from Esarhaddon's inscription. The outcome is the same as usual: the king of Assyria steps in and brings the rebels back to reason. It seems to me that the occurrence of the same expressions and ideas in Kings and in the Assyrian annals makes this possibility worthy of consideration, and it may shed some light on quite an obscure verse.

CHAPTER 2

2 KINGS 18-20 AND ISAIAH 36-39

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LINGUISTIC DIACHRONY AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

In this chapter I focus on those variants that are significant for a relative dating of MT Kings and MT Isaiah based on linguistic considerations. I also take into account a couple of orthographic and stylistic features. As we have seen in the previous chapter, linguistic diachrony does not bear on the majority of the textual variants. That is, undisputable late readings do not necessarily correspond to late linguistic elements. Although Ancient Hebrew changed over time, like any other language, it did not do so in such a way that post-exilic or post-biblical Hebrew became radically incompatible with pre-exilic Hebrew. At the same time, we expect that later scribes were able to reproduce older forms of Hebrew, above all when it comes to morphology. The two parallel accounts contain a minority of readings that are relevant for linguistic periodization. These are categorised below according to orthography and phonology, morphology, syntax, and style.

Besides the features treated in this chapter, there is one additional syntactic construction with וַיְהִי that occurs in MT 2 Kgs. 20:4a but is discussed in Chapter 3 because of its relevance for more passages in Kings. Furthermore, the variant עַל and אֶל that we find in MT 2 Kgs. 19:34 and MT Isa. 37:35 should probably be included in this chapter, with Kings containing the linguistically later variant (אֶל). Nevertheless, a full treatment of all the occurrences of both prepositions in Ancient Hebrew, along with a linguistic and text-critical assessment of the individual cases of interchange, by far exceeds the space available. For an updated overview on the matter Hornkohl's (2013: 227-38) pages constitute a valid study.

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

The Theophoric Endings יָהוּ- and יָהּ-

MT 2 Kgs. 18:13 חִזְקִיָּהוּ] חזקיהו K 85, 89, 90, 96, 99, 100, 113, 114, 139, 144, 150, 155, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 187, 201, 246, 252, 270, nunc 154.

MT Isa. 36:1 חִזְקִיָּהוּ] חזקיה 1QIsa[a].

A very interesting feature that characterises both the text shared by MT Kings and MT Isaiah and the additional material present in MT Kings (e.g., 2 Kgs. 18:1-12) is found in the theophoric endings יָהוּ- and יָהּ-. From a diachronic perspective, it has been convincingly argued that the short ending יָהּ- constitutes a later development in Jewish onomastics, being mainly attested from the post-exilic time onwards (TUR-SINAI 1938: 24; KUTSCHER 1982: 60-3; ZEVIT 1983; HORNKOHL 2013: 83-91; OLIVERO 2021).

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Tur-Sinai (1938: 24) used the name גמריהו, occurring in the Lachish ostraca, to formulate an observation about the use of theophoric names in Ancient Hebrew. In the light of the evidence available to him, he came to the conclusions that personal names ending in יָהוּ- were pre-exilic, whereas those ending with the shorter ending יָהּ- hailed from the post-exilic period. This change in orthography was ascribed to Aramaic influence on Hebrew. His overarching statement was further buttressed by the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, where all personal names ended in

יָהּ- apart from the single occurrence of עבדיהו. The same conclusions can be reached also by looking at the biblical data: pre-exilic texts prevailingly show the long ending, whereas post-exilic books use a higher number of names with a short ending. In a similar way, Kutscher pointed out how 1QIsa[a] almost exclusively employs the short form (there are only two long forms in the entire scroll, one in the first verse of the book, the other in an addition by a different hand), as opposed to MT Isaiah (KUTSCHER 1974: 104-5). In the latter, 62 long forms appear against a single occurrence of the short one (HORNKOHL 2013: 87) – the name אוּרִיָּה, which may have Indo-European origins (GUSTAVS 1913).[69] As mentioned above, the diachronic explanation has since been adopted by scholars with very few exceptions (YOUNG 2003: 297; YOUNG, REZETKO, AND EHRENSVÄRD 2008: 156-7, 167).

It is important to highlight that the short form did not suddenly appear after the exile, but is already, albeit scarcely, attested in a small number of monarchic documents. The fact that the shorter ending arose during the monarchic period has not escaped the attention of the scholars who have gathered the relevant occurrences. Kutscher noted that the short form יָהּ- is attested in pre-exilic times. In his *History* (1982: 62), he mentions two seals more or less contemporary with Hezekiah inscribed with the names הודיה and מעשיה. Zevit (1983) collected a higher number of palaeographic sources, gathering fifteen short forms stemming from the 7th and 6th centuries BCE.[70] He argued that יָהּ- names must have been in use since the mid-eighth century, given that the people referred to in the seals were adults at the beginning of the seventh century. For both Kutscher and Zevit these early occurrences would justify the use of short forms in the books of the Bible written before the exile. Similarly, Young (2003: 297) claims that he found

[69] A Hurrian origin may also be possible, given the frequent occurrence of the root *ar-* "to give" in personal names (e.g., *Ariya*).

[70] The names he lists are הודיה, הגלניה, שבניה, יעדיה, אחזיה, ותניה (to be read תתניה, מתניה, or נתניה), ישעיה, עבדיה, גדליה, שמיה, מעשיה, עזריה, מעשיה, יאזניה.

fourteen short forms in pre-exilic epigraphic material, although a few are not certain, as Hornkohl (2013: 83-4, n. 30) rightly pointed out. More specifically, Young (2003: 297, n. 13) lists the name אביה found on the Gezer calendar as positive evidence for the pre-exilic use of the short ending. Yet the tablet is damaged and only [ ]אבי appears. Young's reconstruction is not certain, and other scholars such as Aḥituv (2008: 257) prefer the reading [ו]אבי, assuming an Israelite origin of the author of the tablet. Even if Young's hypothesis were true, one should keep in mind that אביה is a widespread Semitic name formed with a common Semitic ending -īya (also attached to non-Semitic names). For instance, it is attested as *A-bi-ya* among the Mari names, where the ending -īya is hypocoristic and functions as diminutive (HUFFMON 1965: 134-5). Young also mentions the two names קסריה and ברציה found on Ostracon 2 from Tell Jemmeh. Although it is not clear what the origin of the names is, most certainly they are not Hebrew names.[71] Hornkohl (2013: 83-4, n. 30), using Schniedewind's electronic database of inscriptions and stamp seals, which is based on Avigad's *Corpus* (AVIGAD AND SASS 1997), counts, for the pre-exilic period, 25 short forms against 675 long forms.

In a recent article (OLIVERO 2021), I have re-examined the available epigraphic evidence in order to quantify more precisely the occurrences of the short ending יָהּ- in the pre-exilic material. Besides Avigad's *Corpus*, I have also used Davies' *Corpus and Concordance* (1991 and 2004) and the material kept in the Kaufman collection and published by Deutsch (2003

[71] Naveh (1985: 21), who first published the ostraca, limited himself to observe the unclear nature of the two names, whereas Garbini (2012: 249) argues that the roots *qsr* and *brṣ* cannot belong to Hebrew and explains the suffix יה- as a Philistine linguistic trait. In this regard, I have already mentioned that the hypocoristic ending -īya is widely used in the Ancient Near East both for Semitic and non-Semitic names. Na'aman and Zadok (1988: 41-2) interpret the names in the context of Sargon II's resettlement of people in the area of Tell Jemmeh at the end of the 8th century. Accordingly, קסריה may be explained as an -īya patronymic of Old Iranian **Kausra*- and ברציה be linked to either Old Iranian **Bṛzya*- (yet occurring as ברזי in Aramaic), or Iranian [ ]ברצי occurring in Aramaic. This name is also attested in Neo-Assyrian as *Bar-zi-ia-a*. A Kassite origin (cf. *B*/*Purzandi*, *B*/*Purzaraš*) is judged less likely.

and 2011). The total number of pre-exilic occurrences of the short version of the theophoric element adds up to 54, without including the names for which the reading is uncertain or wrong (a little more than twenty instances). These figures are bound to change and increase as more seals, bullae, inscriptions, etc. come to light. One interesting aspect of the names ending in יָהּ- is that they always occur at the end of the line (TIGAY 1986: 47, n.1; OLIVERO 2021: 307), except in one case, Arad 2:100 from the end of the 7th century. Because there seems to be only one certain attestation of the short ending from the 8th century (i.e., Davies 101.330) and because this new form begins to gain wider currency during the 7th century, I have proposed that the change was caused by the Assyrian influence on Judah from the late 8th century and during the following decades. The many deportations of populations from other regions of the Ancient Near East to the Levant may have exposed the inhabitants of Judah to the hypocoristic ending -īya that we find everywhere outside Israel and Judah. As a result, the theophoric ending began to be shortened and became identical in form to the hypocoristic -īya.

THE LONG AND SHORT FORMS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE AND IN KINGS

As for the Hebrew Bible, we can agree with Hornkohl (2013: 86) that the picture is clear, despite some sections and data clusters that might seem to skew the figures. These (e.g., the Twelve and Chronicles), however, are easily explained (HORNKOHL 2013: 88-9). When we focus on Kings (APPENDIX 2.1), we find 319 occurrences of names that have the theophoric element at the end, 119 in 1 Kings and 200 in 2 Kings. 1 Kings has 101 instances of יָהוּ- and 18 of יָהּ-, whereas 2 Kings witnesses 146 occurrences of יָהוּ- and 72 of יָהּ-:

	-יָהוּ	-יָהּ	
1 Kings	x101 (85%)	x18 (15%)	x119 (37%)
2 Kings	x146 (73%)	x54 (27%)	x200 (63%)
Total	x247 (77%)	x72 (23%)	x319

What I find more interesting than this general overview of the occurrences in 1 and 2 Kings is the distribution of the theophoric elements at the level of the individual chapters. Most of the occurrences of the short ending in 2 Kings appear in chapters that have an interesting philological profile (e.g., chapters 1 (x5), 9 (x5), 11 (x5), 15 (x12)). Ch. 22 also stands out with its 7 occurrences of the short ending, which can be explained because of the assumed later composition of the final part of 2 Kings. Among the chapters that distinguish themselves for the relatively high frequency of -יָהּ, we also find 2 Kings 18.

In this chapter, we encounter the following instances of the short theophoric element -יָהּ:

18:1	חִזְקִיָּה
18:2	זְכַרְיָה
18:10	חִזְקִיָּה
18:13	חִזְקִיָּהוּ
18:14	חִזְקִיָּה
	חִזְקִיָּה
18:15	חִזְקִיָּהוּ
18:16	חִזְקִיָּהוּ
	חִזְקִיָּה

What is striking is that the short form occurs in the unparalleled sections of Hezekiah's story. There are three instances of יָהּ- in the introduction to the reign of Hezekiah (vv. 1-12), which is not part of the Isaiah account, and five occurrences of the same in the so-called 'Source A' (vv. 14-16), which, again, has no parallel in Isaiah. Quite interestingly, the verse (v. 13) that occurs between these two sections and corresponds to the beginning of the Isaiah account (Isa. 36:1) contains חִזְקִיָּהּ rather than חִזְקִיָּהוּ (so MT Isaiah). This most likely happens because of the influence exerted by the preceding and following unparalleled sections on v. 13. The remaining portions of the parallel accounts in both MT Kings and MT Isaiah have only the long form -יָהוּ. The sole exception appears in MT 2 Kgs. 20:10 (a heavily reworked verse which will not be treated in this thesis for lack of space), where the later form יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ occurs (KUTSCHER 1974: 104). Finally, it should also be pointed out that the unparalleled sections occurring in MT 2 Kgs. 18 also contain one instance of the long form חִזְקִיָּהוּ in 18:9. As Norin (1982) suggests and Catastini (1989: 41-2) confirms, it appears that the redactor of MT Kings made use of the text of MT Isaiah. He kept unchanged, apart from 18:13 and 20:10 for the reasons mentioned above, the long form of the names attested in Isaiah but used the short form when he joined the other unparalleled sections to the main account. The uniformity of the distribution of both forms in the paralleled and unparalleled sections may give us a late exilic or early post-exilic date (second half of the 5th century BCE) for the time in which the redactor operated. Another stylistic feature that points in the same direction will be treated below.

Although the use of the short form instead of the long form does not necessarily speak to the text-critical importance of a certain witness (1QIsa[a], unlike 1QIsa[b] which always employs the long form, never has חזקיהו and yet it represents an earlier layer than MT Isaiah), in this case the cumulative evidence that we will present below allows us to include this orthographic and onomastic feature among the elements that help provide a relative dating for the two accounts. Furthermore, the precise distribution of the two forms is too eloquent to be overlooked.

Scriptio Plena and Defectiva and the numeral 80

MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 שְׁמוֹנִים] שמנים K 4, 30, 93, 96, 115, 145, 150, 174, 178, 182, 187, 224, 226, 251, 253, 257, 260.

MT Isa. 37:36 שְׁמֹנִים] שמונים 1QIsa[a].

Hornkohl (2013: 77-8) has cautiously observed an interesting pattern with the numerals 8 (m. שְׁמֹנָה, f. שְׁמֹנֶה) and 80 (שְׁמֹנִים), which are usually written defectively. A little less than a third of the occurrences (48/147, according to Hornkohl 47/147) is written with the full spelling.[72] Quite interestingly, most of these latter instances (40/48, according to Hornkohl 39/47) appear in exilic and post-exilic texts:

	Scriptio Plena	Scriptio Defectiva	Proportion of plene to defective
Genesis	1	15	6.25%
Joshua	1	1	50%
Judges	2	5	29%

[72] The numeral 8: Judg. 3:14 (שְׁמוֹנֶה); 2 Sam. 8:13 (שְׁמוֹנָה); Jer. 52:29 (שְׁמוֹנֶה); Ezek. 40:31 (שְׁמוֹנֶה), 41 (שְׁמוֹנָה); Qoh. 11:2 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 1 Chr. 12:25 (שְׁמוֹנֶה), 31 (שְׁמוֹנָה), 32 (שְׁמוֹנָה), 36 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 16:38 (שְׁמוֹנֶה); 18:12 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 23:3 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 24:4 (שְׁמוֹנָה), 15 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 25:7 (שְׁמוֹנָה), 25 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 26:9 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 29:7 (שְׁמוֹנֹת); 2 Chr. 11:21 (שְׁמוֹנָה, שְׁמוֹנֶה); 13:1 (שְׁמוֹנֶה), 3 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 21:5 (שְׁמוֹנֶה), 20 (שְׁמוֹנָה); 29:17 (שְׁמוֹנָה, שְׁמוֹנֶה); 34:1 (שְׁמוֹנֶה), 3 (שְׁמוֹנָה), 8 (שְׁמוֹנֶה); 35:19 (שְׁמוֹנֶה); 36:9 (שְׁמוֹנֶה).

The numeral 80: Gen. 5:26 (שְׁמוֹנִים); Josh. 14:10 (שְׁמוֹנִים); Judg. 3:30 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 1 Kgs. 6:1 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 2 Kgs. 19:35 (שְׁמוֹנִים); Ps. 90:10 (שְׁמֹנִים); Esth. 1:4 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 1 Chr. 7:5 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 15:9 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 25:7 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 2 Chr. 2:1 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 11:1 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 14:7 (שְׁמוֹנִים), 17:15 (שְׁמוֹנִים), 18 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 26:17 (שְׁמוֹנִים).

2 Samuel	1	4	20%
1 Kings	1	6	14%
2 Kings	1	11	8%
Jeremiah	1	5	17%
Ezekiel	2	4	33%
Psalms	1	0	100%
Qohelet	1	0	100%
Esther	1	0	100%
1 Chronicles	16	0	100%
2 Chronicles	19	1	95%

Two important remarks can be made considering the figures in the table. For one thing, it is evident that Chronicles skews the data with its high number of occurrences among the exilic and post-exilic books (35/40). The plene spelling may therefore be a scribal peculiarity of this book. Books such as Qohelet and Esther are not easy to assess, given the single occurrence of the numerals 8 (Qohelet) or 80 (Esther). On the other hand, Ezra and Nehemiah only show a defective orthography, with, respectively, 8 and 17 occurrences each.

An important observation that Hornkohl makes is that the occurrence in Jer. 52:29 (שְׁמוֹנֶה) belongs to a portion of text that has no parallel in the Greek and may therefore prove the late nature of the spelling. He also points out that in Gen. 5:26 (שְׁמוֹנִים) and 1 Kgs. 6:1 (שְׁמוֹנֵים) the Greek reads differently, ὀκτακόσια δύο (802) and τεσσαρακοστῷ (40th), respectively.[73] In the case of MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 the text-critical argument seems compelling, given that MT Isa. 37:36 preserves the defective spelling. The fact that Kings, along with the Pentateuch, tends to have

[73] However, see De Vries (2004: 87) and Cogan (2001: 236) on the priority of MT over the Greek in 1 Kgs. 6:1.

a more defective spelling than the other book of the Hebrew Bible (ANDERSEN AND FORBES 1986: 312-8) may corroborate the idea that the reading preserved in MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 constitutes a sign of later scribal activity. As we shall see in the section dedicated to the syntax, this very numeral shows a further linguistic feature that points to its later nature. It is the overlapping evidence of linguistics and textual criticisms that brings me to the inclusion of this orthographic element among the features that corroborate the relative dating of the two accounts.

The Use of Unassimilated מִן and Proclitic -מִ- / -מֵ-

MT 2 Kgs. 18:17 מִן־לָכִישׁ] מלכיש K 30, 85, 224, 253, nunc 201.

MT Isa. 36:2 מִלָּכִישׁ

Among the variants between the account of Kings and that of Isaiah there is the prepositional phrase 'from Lachish', which occurs in 2 Kings 18:17 as מִן־לָכִישׁ and in Isaiah 36:2 as מִלָּכִישׁ. In this section I am going to analyse the behaviour of the preposition מִן in Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic, in order to show that the reading preserved in Kings is likely to represent a later linguistic variant than the one occurring in Isaiah.

GENERAL RULE

In Ancient Hebrew, the preposition מִן may or may not appear as a proclitic element. When it does, the nasal sound assimilates to the initial consonant of the following word, which, in its turn, is doubled. If the word that follows the preposition מִן begins with a guttural sound, then,

with very few exceptions, there is no doubling of the consonant, but a compensatory lengthening of the vowel of the preposition takes place: /i/ → /ē/.

THE USE OF מִן BEFORE NOUNS BEARING THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The preposition מִן occurs as a separate preposition mainly when the following word has a definite article (x632 – APPENDIX 2.2). In the Qumran biblical scrolls, one finds the preposition מִן written separately before the article six more times compared to MT, four times in places where the latter does not use the preposition at all, and twice instead of the proclitic form -מִ / -מַ (occurring before an indefinite noun in MT). 4QSam[a] has half of these unparalleled occurrences.[74] The same rule applies to the attestations of מן in the Samaritan Pentateuch, where the unassimilated preposition only precedes the article (x246 – APPENDIX 2.3).

THE USE OF PROCLITIC -מִ BEFORE NOUNS BEARING THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Nevertheless, in MT there is also a sizeable number of occurrences of proclitic מִן before nouns with the definite article (hence written -מַ, x90 – APPENDIX 2.4). To these occurrences should be added five more instances appearing in Qumran. In four of these cases, the Qumran manuscript has the article where MT lacks it.[75] Judging from the collected data, the biblical manuscripts hailing from Qumran mainly differ from MT in their addition of the definite article

[74] Num. 18:30 (4QNum[b]): מן היקב [וכתבואה] vs. MT וְכִתְבוּאָתֶ֖ךָ מִיֶּֽקֶב; Deut. 19:11 (4QDeut[k2]): מן הערים [אחת] vs. MT אַחַ֖ת הֶֽעָרִֽים; 2 Sam. 10:6 (4QSam[a]): מן ה[ערים] vs. MT Ø; 2 Sam. 12:16 (4QSam[a]): מן האלהים vs. MT אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִ֔ים; 2 Sam. 13:15 (4QSam[a]): [מן האהב]ה vs. MT מֵאַהֲבָ֔ה; Isa. 63:15 (1QIsa[a]): מן השמים vs. MT מִשְּׁמַ֔יִם.

[75] Deut. 11:12 (4QPhyl K): מהרש[י]ת vs. MT מֵרֵאשִׁ֖ית; Judg. 21:23 (4QJudg[b]): [וות]מהמחללֹ vs. MT מִן־הַמְּחֹלְלֹ֖ות; Isa. 1:24 (1QIsa[a]): מהאיבי vs. MT מֵאוֹיְבָֽי; Isa. 14:12 (1QIsa[a]): מהשמים vs. MT מִשָּׁמַ֔יִם; Isa. 58:13 (4QIsa[n]): מהשבת vs. MT מִשַּׁבָּ֑ת.

before the noun. Once the article is added, there is no clear-cut preference for the use of מִן rather than the proclitic -מִ.

THE USE OF מִן BEFORE ANARTHROUS NOUNS

In the Hebrew Bible, there are also 104 occurrences of unassimilated מִן before a noun without definite article, as opposed to the thousands of instances where the preposition מִן assimilates to the first consonant of the word that follows (APPENDIX 2.5). Besides these occurrences, the unassimilated form מִן appears thirteen more times in the biblical scrolls from Qumran.[76] In ten out of these thirteen times, the MT has proclitic -מִ / -מֵ instead of unassimilated מִן,[77] whereas in three instances there are variant readings at play (Exod. 18:13; Ps. 89:21; Song 4:16). With regards to the manuscripts, it is 4QCant^{b} that has most of the occurrences (7x), followed by 1QIsa^{a} and 4QPs^{x} (2x), and then by 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 4QPs^{a} (1x). Furthermore, the occurrences of מִן־הַוּא in MT Isa. 18:2 and מֶן־הַיִּכְלֵי in MT Ps. 45:9 are also attested in 1QIsa^{a} and 4QPs^{c}. No other occurrence of independent מִן in MT is paralleled by the Qumran scrolls, mostly because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts. Nevertheless, there are also three instances where the unassimilated form of MT occurs as proclitic element in the scrolls.[78] Overall, five manuscripts attest the shift from -מִ / -מֵ to מִן, and three manuscripts the one from מִן to -מִ / -מֵ. As for 1QIsa^{a}, one can observe that there is no marked tendency for either shift.

---

[76] Exod. 18:13 (4QpaleoExod^{m}): מן בוקר vs. MT מִן־הַבֹּקֶר; Isa. 34:4 (1QIsa^{a}): מן תאנה vs. MT מִתְּאֵנָה; 56:5 (1QIsa^{a}): מן בנות vs. MT מִבָּנוֹת; Ps. 38:19 (4QPs^{a}): מן חטאותי vs. MT מֶחַטָּאתִי; Ps. 89:20 (4QPs^{x}): מן עם vs. MT מֵעָם; 89:21 (4QPs^{x}): מן שמן vs. MT בְּשֶׁמֶן; Song 4:8 (4QCant^{b}): מן לבנון vs. MT מִלְּבָנוֹן, מן ראשי vs. MT מֵרֹאשׁ, מן הררי vs. MT מֵהַרְרֵי; 4:10 (4QCant^{b}): מן יין vs. MT מִיַּיִן, מן כל vs. MT מִכָּל; 4:16 (4QCant^{b}): [דיו]מן ג vs. מְגָדָיו.

[77] Isa. 34:4; 56:5; Ps. 38:19; 89:20; Song 4:8 (x4); 4:10 (x2).

[78] Cf. Isa. 20:5 (1QIsa^{a}): ממצרים vs. MT מִמִּצְרַיִם; Ps. 116:8 (4QPs^{o}): מדמעה vs. MT מִן־דִּמְעָה; Lam. 1:6 (4QLam): מבת vs. MT מִן־בַּת (but cf. q^{e}re מבת).

In the non-biblical Qumran scrolls, the unassimilated מִן occurs 29 times (in three instances the *nun* is supralinear), some of which in (very) fragmentary contexts (APPENDIX 2.6). The manuscript that reports the highest number of occurrences is 11Q19 (5x).

In Ben Sira, the independent form מִן occurs only twice, both times before an indefinite noun.[79]

THE PREPOSITION מִן IN DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE

It has been argued that the instances of unassimilated מִן before an anarthrous noun are a sign of late or post-exilic language (POLZIN 1976: 66). In order to explain the 'popularity' of the unassimilated מִן in post-exilic times, Polzin posits the influence of Aramaic, where, generally, the *nun* of the preposition does not assimilate to the following word. Aramaic would have thus contributed to the increasing number of unassimilated מִן from the time of the exile down to the 2nd century AD, when it still occurs in the Bar Kokhba letters (3x).[80] As for the Mishnah, Polzin relies on Kutscher's remark that he was able to find a few examples of unassimilated *nun* in the Kaufman manuscript (KUTSCHER 1962: 8). Both Kutscher (1974: 214) and Qimron (1986: 30-1) observe the same phenomenon in the Qumran scrolls, and Qimron explicitly defines it as an Aramaism. Likewise, Joüon-Muraoka (2016: 312) observe the frequent use of מִן in Chronicles. The scholarly attention was mainly drawn to the occurrences in Chronicles and the possibility that the use of מִן may come from Aramaic.

More recently, both Young and Rezetko have called into question the diachronic profile of the opposition between מִן and -מִ / -מֵ. Young (2003: 289) warns against taking the use of the unassimilated מִן before an anarthrous noun as 'a general feature of LBH'. In fact, it is only

[79] Sir. 33:10 (Ms. E): ומן עפר; 51:24 (Ms. B): מן אילו.

[80] 5/6 Ḥev 49:3 מן נכסי; XḤev/Ṣe 30:2 מן שמעון, 8 (?) מי בן.

Chronicles that, among the LBH books, attests a high number of instances.[81] In the same volume, Rezetko (2003: 230-1) offers a more thorough analysis than his predecessors. He rightly points out that books such as Ezekiel, Jonah, Haggai, Malachi, Ruth, Qohelet, and Esther only use what he calls the 'early' (the quotation marks are his, used to distance himself from a diachronic explanation) assimilated form, with exceptions in Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Nehemiah. He affirms that both Daniel and Ezra, which also contain parts written in Aramaic, prefer the unassimilated form in the sections written in Hebrew. Finally, he focuses on Chronicles and stresses that in 60% of the cases the form -מִ / -מֶ occurs in non-synoptic passages, that on only four occasions Chronicles has an unassimilated form where Samuel and Kings have the proclitic -מִ / -מֶ (2 Sam. 6:12 // 1 Chr. 15:25; 2 Sam. 23:20 // 1 Chr. 11:22; 1 Kgs. 9:22 // 2 Chr. 8:9; 2 Kgs. 15:2 // 2 Chr. 26:3.), and that the opposite situation is attested only once (2 Kgs. 14:2 // 2 Chr. 25:1). As for the number of occurrences in Chronicles, they are 54 in total, 38 of which occur before the noun בְּנֵי, two before בִּנְיָמִן, one before בָּנוֹת, and eight before a guttural consonant. Rezetko observes that מִן precedes the same consonants in more than half of the remaining attestations in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, he concludes, rather than relying on a diachronic solution, phonology and language standardisation should deserve more attention. Both Young and Rezetko put their emphasis on the fact that, instead of being a general phenomenon of LBH, the presence of מִן before anarthrous nouns shows up in specific (phonological?) contexts in few books, e.g., Chronicles or 4QCant[b].[82] In their concluding remarks, they do not mention Aramaic as a possible source for the use of unassimilated מִן in Hebrew.

[81] Young also mentions two Hebrew inscriptions where מִן before an anarthrous noun may occur (Arad 26.2 and Beersheva 1.2). However, the former is too fragmentary for a secure reading (*mem* and *nun* could be the last two letters of a word), whereas the latter surely does not contain the preposition מִן at all.

[82] They reaffirm the problematic nature of a diachronic solution in more recent publications, such as Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd 2008: 108.

The phonological context and the use of מִן in Aramaic are important to consider when assessing the situation in Hebrew. It is true that Aramaic tends not to assimilate the *nun* of מִן to a following consonant, regardless of its nature. In Biblical Aramaic, unassimilated מִן occurs, overall, 82 times (APPENDIX 2.7), whereas the assimilated form a mere nine times.[83] Quite interestingly, and maybe in order to ease the pronunciation, there seems to be a preference for the assimilation of the *nun* to a following *ṭet* (five out of nine cases), the only exceptions to this rule being Ezr. 6:14 and 7:23. The occurrence of מֵאַרְעָא in Jeremiah may stem from the fact that the verse occurs within a text written in Hebrew, although in 10:11 we also find מִן־תְּחָוֹת. If we consider the extra-biblical evidence, we see that in the Old and Imperial Aramaic inscriptions, as well as in the documents hailing from Zincirli, down to the time of king Aśoka, only the unassimilated מִן occurs.[84] Likewise, the texts written in Egyptian Aramaic have no cases of proclitic -מִ / -מֵ (MURAOKA and PORTEN 1998: 12). Quite interestingly, there are only 21 instances of assimilated מִן in Qumran Aramaic out of 725 uses of the preposition.[85] One third of the cases occurs in the expression מנהורה in 4QEnastr^{b}, whereas 11QtgJob has six occurrences. Therefore, the same phenomenon attested in Chronicles and 4QCant^{b}, namely an unusually high number of מִן, appears to be true also for the occurrences of the assimilated form in Qumran Aramaic, which are clustered around two manuscripts. The relatively high

[83] Jer. 10:11 מֵאַרְעָא; Dan. 2:45 מִטּוּרָא; 4:22 מִטַּל; 4:30 מִטַּל; 5:21 מִטַּל; 6:5 מִצַּד; Ezr. 5:11 מִקֳדְמַת; 6:8 מִנְכְסֵי; 6:14 מִשְׁעֵם.

[84] KAI 202A:10 (x2), 14; 202B:18, 19; 214:9, 12 (x2); 215:2, 4, 7 (x2), 9, 13, 15, 18; 216:8, 13; 217:6; 222A:30; 222C:15, 16, 18; 223C:2, 6, 7, 9, 16 (x2); 224:2, 9 (x2), 10 (x5), 11, 12; 225:8, 10; 226:4; 228:14, 18 (x2), 22; 233:11, 16; 257:3; 264:6; 269:3; 270A:2; 276:10; 279:2; 309:16, 17, 18, 22, 23; 311; 315:3, 11, 14, 19; 316:11; 317:2; 319:21 (x2), 22, 24.

[85] 4Q157 1:2 [ ]מא; 4Q209 frg. 6:5 מנ[ה]ורה, 6:7 מנה[ורה], 7:3 מנהורה, 7:6 מנהורה, 7:9 מנהורה, 7:12 מ[נ]הורה, 14:2 ממצ[רים]; 4Q213 4:5 מכל; 4Q318 8:9 מנכריא; 4Q339 1:3 מביתאל; 4Q553 frg. 1:3 מביניהון; 4Q559 frg. 3:4 מנ[הורה]; 4Q570 frg. 6:7 ממצרים; 4Q584 frg. 1:3 מאלה; 11Q10 5:1 ומ[חמת], 15:5 מלמהוא, 19:3 מעל[א], 20:3 מלהתב[ה], 26:2 מידך, 28:3 מרחיק.

frequency of -מִ / -מֵ in said manuscripts may be due both to phonological reasons and to the type of source used: in 4QEnastr[b], מִן is assimilated only to a noun beginning with *nun*, whereas 11QtgJob employs a Hebrew source.

Because מִן is only very rarely (30 times in total) assimilated to the following word in Biblical Aramaic and in Qumran Aramaic, and never in other sources, such as inscriptions and papyri, it seems reasonable to me that the assimilated instances represent cases of Hebraisms. It is only in later forms of Aramaic that we see the *nun* of מִן assimilate to the following word.[86] The attestations we have in Biblical and Qumran Aramaic are probably due to language interference. Hebrew scribes, or bilingual scribes, who were copying or writing certain manuscripts, changed מִן into -מִ / -מֵ or used -מִ / -מֵ consistently in some phonological contexts (e.g., before ט in Biblical Aramaic – always in Daniel – or in the expression מנהורה in 4QEnastr[b]).

THE PHONOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF UNASSIMILATED מִן AND SYNTAGMATIC CONTAMINATION

As for Rezetko's remark on the phonological context of the occurrences of unassimilated מִן, it is worth investigating the matter in more depth. In the Hebrew Bible, unassimilated מִן precedes the following consonants:

[86] For Mandaic, see Nöldeke 1875: 51; 194, where this phenomenon seems to be attested only in מיליא 'from where?'. For Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, see Levias 1900: §50.6, §176. For the Neo-Aramaic dialects, see Fassberg 2010: 29, 151 (Challa); Khan 1999: 190 (Arbel); 2002: 238 (Qaraqosh); 2004: 218 (Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja); 2008: 440 (Barwar); 2008: 196 (Urmi); 2009: 223 (Sandalaj); Napirkowska 2015: 278 (Diyana-Zariwaw).

Gutturals

א /ʔ/ Num. 23:7 (אֲרָם); Judg. 7:23 (אָשֵׁר); 2 Sam. 20:6 (אַבְשָׁלֹום); Jer. 44:18 (אָז); Jer. 44:28 (אֶרֶץ); Ps. 18:4 (אֹיְבַי); 1 Chr. 9:32 (אֶחֵיהֶם), 15:17 (אָסָף), 17:7 (אַחֲרֵי), 19:6 (אֲרָם, אֲדַם).

ה /h/ Ps. 45:9 (הֵיכְלֵי); Dan. 11:23 (הֵיכְלֵי).

ח /ħ - χ/ Josh. 11:21 (חֶבְרוֹן); 2 Kgs. 15:28 (חַטֹּאות); Neh. 12:28 (חַצְרֵי); 1 Chr. 4:40 (חָם); 1 Chr. 8:9 (חֹדֶשׁ).

ע /ʕ - ɣ/ Josh. 11:21 (עֲנָב); Jer. 7:7 (עוֹלָם); Jer. 25:5 (עוֹלָם).

ר /ʁ/ 2 Kgs. 23:36 (רוּמָה); 2 Chr. 31:3 (רְכוּשׁוֹ).

Bilabials

ב /b/ Exod. 18:14 (בֹּקֶר); Lev. 1:14 (בְּנֵי), 14:30 (בְּנֵי); Judg. 10:11 (בְּנֵי); Joel 1:12 (בְּנֵי); Ps. 73:19 (בַּלָּהוֹת); Lam. 1:6 (מִבַּת – Q^{e}re מִבַּת); 1 Chr. 4:42 (בְּנֵי), 5:18 (בְּנֵי), 9:3 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 9:4 (בְּנֵי), 9:6 (בְּנֵי), 9:7 (בְּנֵי), 9:14 (בְּנֵי), 9:30 (בְּנֵי), 9:32 (בְּנֵי), 12:17 (בְּנֵי), 12:26 (בְּנֵי), 12:27 (בְּנֵי), 12:30 (בְּנֵי), 12:31 (בְּנֵי), 15:17 (בְּנֵי), 15:25 (בֵּית), 24:3 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 24:4 (בְּנֵי), 26:1 (בְּנֵי), 26:10 (בְּנֵי), 27:3 (בְּנֵי), 27:10 (בְּנֵי); 27:14 (בְּנֵי); 2 Chr. 2:13 (בְּנוֹת), 8:8 (בְּנֵיהֶם), 8:9 (בְּנֵי), 17:17 (בִּנְיָמִן), 20:14 (בְּנֵי), 20:19 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 29:12 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 29:13 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 29:14 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי), 34:12 (בְּנֵי, בְּנֵי).

פ /p/ Judg. 10:11 (פְּלִשְׁתִּים); 2 Chr. 17:11 (פְּלִשְׁתִּים).

Dentals

ד /d/ Josh. 11:21 (דְּבִר); Ps. 116:8 (דִּמְעָה).

Velars

ג /g/ Ps. 104:7 (גַּעֲרָתְךָ); Job 30:5 (גֵּו); 2 Chr. 13:2 (גִּבְעָה).

כ /k/ Judg. 7:23 (כָּל); Dan. 1:15 (כָּל).

ק /q/ Ps. 18:49 (קָמַי); Ps. 104:7 (קוֹל); Prov. 27:8 (קִנָּהּ); 1 Chr. 11:22 (קַבְצְאֵל); 2 Chr. 15:13 (קָטֹן).

Nasals

מ /m/ Judg. 19:16 (מַעֲשֵׂהוּ); Isa. 20:5 (מִצְרַיִם); Dan. 9:25 (מֹצָא).

Labials

ל /l/ 2 Kgs. 18:17 (לָכִישׁ); Song 4:15 (לְבָנוֹן).

Alveolar fricatives / affricates

ס /s - ᵗs/ Job 40:6 (סְעָרָה).

Palato-alveolar fricatives

ש /ʃ/ Judg. 5:20 (שָׁמַיִם); 2 Sam. 22:14 (שָׁמַיִם); Jer. 25:3 (שְׁלֹשׁ); Ps. 30:4 (שְׁאוֹל); 1 Chr. 8:8 (שִׁלְחָן), 13:5 (שִׁיחוֹר).

Alveolar lateral fricatives

ש /ɬ/ Dan. 11:5 (שָׂרֶיו, although it had probably lost its lateral element by the time Daniel was written).

Palatal approximants

י /j/ 2 Kgs. 14:2 (יְרוּשָׁלָם); 2 Kgs. 21:19 (יָטְבָה); Jer. 17:5 (יְהוָה); 1 Chr. 13:2 (יְהוָה); 2 Chr. 26:3 (יְרוּשָׁלָם).

It is remarkable that the unassimilated *nun* occurs only in the following texts belonging to the pre-exilic corpus: Exod. 18:14; Lev. 1:14, 14:30; Num. 23:7; Josh. 11:21 (x3); Judg. 5:20; 7:23 (x2), 10:11 (x2), 19:16; 2 Sam. 20:6, 22:14; 2 Kgs. 14:2, 15:28; Isa. 20:5; Ps. 18:4, 18:49, 73:19, 104:7 (x2); Prov. 27:8.[87]

If we pay attention to the degree of linguistic standardisation of these texts, the list of unusual occurrences will shrink even more. In fact, Num. 23:7; Judg. 5:20; 2 Sam. 22:14; Ps. 18:4, 49 belong to what goes under the label of Archaic Biblical Hebrew. The single occurrence in Proverbs can also be removed from the list, given that the language of Proverbs differs somewhat from standard CBH (RENDSBURG 2002).[88] In Exod. 18:14 the preposition occurs in speech uttered by a foreigner, Moses' father-in-law, and style switching may therefore lie

[87] I consider Job a product of the exilic or early post-exilic period (see JOOSTEN 2013). I have not listed the occurrences in 2 Kgs. 18:17 because it is the main subject of this discussion. Furthermore, I believe that there is enough evidence to consider 2 Kgs. 21:19, 23:36 part of a section of Kings that was composed during the exilic period. The occurrences in 2 Kgs. 14:2 and 15:28 appear in chapters that have undergone revision and therefore it should not surprise to find unexpected linguistic features.

[88] I agree with Rendsburg on the notion that Proverbs has linguistic elements that often differ from the language of pre-exilic prose.

behind the choice of מִן (MISHOR 2006). As for the remaining cases, they tend to cluster around individual verses or chapters in Joshua, Judges and Psalms. A curious phenomenon that may be at work in most unexpected CBH occurrences of מִן is syntagmatic contamination (for some examples in other Semitic languages see BROCKELMANN 1908: 292-4). The instances of מִן in Lev. 1:14; 14:30; Josh. 11:21; Judg. 10:11 always appear after a previously occurring מִן which is regularly used with a word with the article. The two examples in Judg. 7:23 occurring after מִנַּפְתָּלִי 'from Naftali' may also be signs of this phenomenon. This form, which phonologically resembles מִן נַפְתָּלִי, may have generated the cases of unassimilated מִן that follow it. Quite remarkably, no case of syntagmatic contamination occurs in texts written during or after the 6th century BCE. The data collected from the Samaritan Pentateuch support this line of reasoning. The Samaritan text diverges from MT in Exod. 18:14 (מן הבקר), Lev. 1:14 (מבני), 14:30 (מבני), and Num. 23:7 (מארם) and has in each case the regularly expected forms. Either these are harmonised readings, or the Samaritan Pentateuch is witness to a text that did not undergo syntagmatic contamination of the preposition מִן. The occurrences in Leviticus, Joshua and Judges may therefore be the outcome of a mechanism internal to the (proto-)Masoretic text. Moreover, barring Judges (whose occurrences are mostly nested in two verses), in the CBH corpus the occurrences of unassimilated מִן are not scattered throughout the text like we see in the final chapters of 2 Kings, in Jeremiah, Daniel, and Chronicles. The situation looks very similar to that described above for Qumran, where individual manuscripts show high rates of the more unusual construction. Because of the historical period in which these biblical texts, as well as those Qumran manuscripts (e.g., 4QCant^{b}), were written, I am inclined to accept the explanation offered before that these are Aramaisms, which made their way into the texts via individual scribes and never attained wide diffusion in Hebrew. Although a work that presents an unassimilated מִן is not necessarily late, it is likely that the Aramaic construction entered the text at a later stage when it was composed or copied down during or after the exile.

Significantly, מִן is attested in different chapters exactly in those texts that stem from the 6th century onward when Aramaic influence on Hebrew became more prevalent. The attestations of מִן in the Hebrew inscriptions are in keeping with this reconstruction. The preposition מִן occurs by itself only three times and always before a noun with the article.[89]

The phonological context evoked by Rezetko is quite interesting. In pre-exilic texts, the unassimilated מִן occurs mainly before guttural sounds and before the bilabial /b/. As for the former category, we are therefore dealing with a phenomenon not dissimilar to the one at work when a noun has a definite article: before a guttural sound, מִן may tend not to assimilate. It is harder to explain the cases with /b/. Probably, the nasal sound /n/ shifted to /m/ before the bilabials /b/ and /p/, as in Latin or Italian (e.g., invictus – invitto vs. impossibilis – impossibile). This could have happened only if מִן was not assimilated in a spoken language (Aramaic in this case). The occurrence of מִן before a bilabial in the Hebrew text may be a form of 'hypercorrection' meant to show that the preposition should be pronounced /min/ rather than /mim/, a sound that comes closer to that of the assimilated form -מִ / -מֻ. The same explanation could be given to the occurrences of מִן before a velar sound, a context in which the nasal /n/ usually shifts to a voiced velar nasal /ŋ/, to a certain degree assimilating to the following sound (e.g., 'incorrect' /ɪŋkərɛkt/ vs. 'indirect' /ɪndɪrɛkt/ or even the graphic assimilation in Greek words such as ἄγγελος and ἀνάγκη). Instances of מִן before words beginning by /g/, /k/ and /q/ may therefore be cases of 'hypercorrection' as well. Again, this could have happened only in Aramaic. Scribes who spoke and wrote Aramaic and Hebrew and who were acquainted with the phonological shifts from /n/ to /m/ and from /n/ to /ŋ/ in certain contexts may have been trained to pay attention and to avoid assimilating מִן to a following word beginning with a bilabial or velar sound. When these bilingual individuals wrote and copied the biblical texts in

[89] Arad 3:2 מן היין; 8:2 מן השלשה; Siloam 1:5 מן המוצא. In the inscriptions there is also one occurrence of the proclitic -מ before the article, KḤinn 1:10 מהרע.

question, they over-pronounced the /n/, or better, over-wrote the *nun*, although this was unnecessary in Hebrew, where the assimilation of מִן is allowed. As a result, we find occurrences of unassimilated מִן mostly in phonological contexts that triggered the use of 'hypercorrect' (before bilabials and velars) or analogical (before gutturals) forms. As for the instances of מִן where the unassimilated preposition occurs before sounds other than those just mentioned, one may posit the same influence from Aramaic, where the preposition מִן remains unassimilated regardless of what follows. It is therefore reasonable to believe that Aramaic influenced the scribes who were composing or copying certain sections of texts, or even entire books, such as Chronicles.

THE CASE OF מִן־לָכִישׁ IN MT 2 KGS. 18:17

וַיִּשְׁלַח מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר אֶת־תַּרְתָּן וְאֶת־רַב־סָרִיס ו וְאֶת־רַב־שָׁקֵה מִן־לָכִישׁ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ בְּחַיִל כָּבֵד יְרוּשָׁלִָם וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ יְרוּשָׁלִַם וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעֲמְדוּ בִּתְעָלַת הַבְּרֵכָה הָעֶלְיוֹנָה אֲשֶׁר בִּמְסִלַּת שְׂדֵה כוֹבֵס׃

MT 2 Kgs. 18:17

וַיִּשְׁלַח מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר ו אֶת־רַב־שָׁקֵה מִלָּכִישׁ יְרוּשָׁלִַ֫מָה אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ בְּחַיִל כָּבֵד וַיַּעֲמֹד בִּתְעָלַת הַבְּרֵכָה הָעֶלְיוֹנָה בִּמְסִלַּת שְׂדֵה כוֹבֵס׃

MT Isa. 36:2

As for the occurrence of מִן־לָכִישׁ in MT 2 Kgs. 18:17, it is remarkable that the parallel text of MT Isa. 36:2 preserves the proclitic form in מִלָּכִישׁ. I believe that the reading found in MT Kings can be taken as secondary also based on the linguistic explanation provided above. Furthermore, this variant occurs in a verse that has been expanded in the Kings tradition, probably at the time when 'Source A' (vv. 13-16) was inserted. In Chapter 1, I have listed and

discussed the textual variants that occur in these verses, explaining that MT Kings has evident signs of editorial activity. For instance, יְרוּשָׁלֶָם is transposed and placed farther from מִן־לָכִישׁ than in MT Isaiah, and the dittography of וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ originated very late in the tradition, given that even LXX^{B}, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate lack it.

It therefore stands to reason that מִן־לָכִישׁ constitutes another element that entered the text at a later stage. As indicated above, the occurrence of unassimilated מִן is due to Aramaic influence on Hebrew, a phenomenon that increases during the 6th century BCE and, therefore, appears more often and more scattered throughout texts composed or revised during the Babylonian and Persian periods. The linguistic explanation overlaps with the philological evidence.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is safe to affirm that during and after the exile, down to the times of Qumran, there was limited mutual influence, mostly at the level of individual manuscripts and texts, between Hebrew and Aramaic with regards to the use of מִן and -מִ / -מֵ. This constituted a linguistic change that took place only in the case of individual bilingual scribes and that manifested itself in very limited contexts. This is in keeping with the lack of widespread attestations of ‘irregular forms’ in the LBH corpus and among Qumran manuscripts.

MORPHOLOGY

The Long Form of the Prefix Conjugation and the Wayyiqtol

MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 וַיַּךְ

MT Isa. 37:36 וַיַּכֶּהּ] ויך 1QIsa[a], K 93, 96, 153.

This morphological variant is most interesting for a series of factors. What is sometimes understood as a later development in Ancient Hebrew morphology (BLOCH 2007), that is the increased use of the originally long form *yaqtulu* with the wayyiqtol for III-y verb, occurs here in MT Isaiah rather than in 1QIsa[a], a witness that regularly shows a later type of language in comparison with MT. Similarly, MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 shows clear signs of scribal intervention, as the addition at the beginning of the verse וַיְהִי֙ בַּלַּ֣יְלָה הַה֔וּא and the orthographic and syntactic character of the numeral מֵאָ֥ה שְׁמוֹנִ֖ים וַחֲמִשָּׁ֣ה אָ֑לֶף (see below) indicate. One would have rather expected, and hoped, to find the opposite distribution for this variant.

The most thorough discussion on this morphological feature is found in Hornkohl (2013: 159-80). It is in the second half of the section on the 'Use of the Short, Full, and Lengthened wayyiqṭol' that Hornkohl treats the occurrences of the long forms of the 2nd and 3rd singular persons of the wayyiqtol for the III-y verbs. He lists 53 total occurrences of the full pattern (i.e., forms such as וַתַּעֲשֶׂה occurring in MT 1 Kgs. 14:9 instead of the expected וַתַּעַשׂ) among the roughly 2200 instances of these forms (APPENDIX 2.8). The figures in the table below (i.e., the number of long forms vs the number of short forms) may slightly vary from Hornkohl's but the general picture does not change (see also STIPP 1987: 110-20):

Torah		1 / 663	0.1 %
Prophets			
	Joshua	2 / 90	2.2 %
	Judges	1 / 121	0.8 %
	1 Samuel	3 / 161	1.8 %
	2 Samuel	1 / 157	0.6 %
	1 Kings	12 / 202	5.9 %
	2 Kings	10 (11) / 170 (171)	6.4 %
	Isaiah	2 / 40	5 %
	Jeremiah	10 / 67	14.9 %
	Ezekiel	5 / 96	5.2 %
	Habakkuk	1 / 2	50 %
Writings			
	(Job	1 / 57	1.7 %)
	Lamentations	1 / 3	33.3 %
	2 Chronicles	3 / 150	2 %

Among the minor discrepancies between my list of occurrences (APPENDIX 2.9) and Hornkohl's is the total, which adds up to 54 according to my counting. This happens because I identify one instance of long wayyiqtol in the Pentateuch, namely וַיִּתֵּא in Deut. 33:21. This form stands for וַיֶּאֱתֵה (see GKC §68h and 76d), whereas the short form should have looked like

וַיֹּאת, attested in Isa. 41:25, which shows a pattern akin to that of וַיַּרְא. Furthermore, Hornkohl's reckoning considers two cases of qᵊre, which I have also included in brackets. These are 2 Kgs. 16:15 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ) and Job 42:16 (וַיִּרְאֶ). However, such occurrences should probably be omitted, given that the consonantal text of 2 Kings and Job does not have a long form. In such case there would be no instances of the long form in the book of Job. In sum, I count 52 total occurrences.

As for the post-biblical evidence, the short form still dominates, as expected (APPENDIX 2.10). There are three occurrences of the long form in the non-biblical manuscripts from Qumran (see also HORNKOHL 2013: 172), namely וּתגלֹהִ (1QH[a] 21:10), ויעלֹהְ (4Q223-224 frag. 1 i:4), and ויכֹא (4Q225 frag. 1:3). The occurrence in 1QH[a] 21:10 is probably a mistake, given that the scribe expunged the final ה- with dots above and below (STEGEMANN and SHULLER 2009: 264). However, this mistake may indicate that the long form was somehow circulating, maybe in a spoken variety of Hebrew. As for ויעלֹהְ, only some ink is detectable after ויעל, close enough to attribute it to a letter that belongs to the same word according to the editors (VANDERKAM and MILIK 1994: 101). Quite interestingly, the biblical manuscripts found in Qumran preserve 18 occurrences of the long form (see also HORNKOHL 2013: 172; APPENDIX 2.11), only one of which is paralleled in MT, i.e., 4QJer[c] frag. 6:2 (ויעלֹה) // MT Jer. 10:13 (וַיַּעֲלֶה). The remaining occurrences are clustered around very few manuscripts containing the three books of Exodus, Samuel, and Isaiah:

Exodus	4QExod[b] frag. 3i-4:5	וֹתראה	MT Exod. 2:6 (וַתִּרְאֶהוּ)
	4QExod[c] 3:15	ויטה	MT Exod. 10:13 (וַיֵּט)
Samuel	1QSam frag. 4:2	ויכה	MT 2 Sam. 23:10 (וַיַּךְ)
	1QSam frag. 4:3	ויע[ש]הֹ	MT 2 Sam. 23:10 (וַיַּעַשׂ)
	1QSam frag. 4:5	ויכה	MT 2 Sam. 23:12 (וַיַּךְ)

	4QSam[a] frg. 61ii+63-64a-b+65-67:20	ויבנה	MT 2 Sam. 5:9 (וַיִּבֶן)
Isaiah	1QIsa[a] 4:13	ויבנא	MT Isa. 5:2 (וַיִּבֶן)
	1QIsa[a] 4:14	ויעשה	MT Isa. 5:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ)
	1QIsa[a] 4:16	וישה	MT Isa. 5:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ)
	1QIsa[a] 5:13	ותהיה	MT Isa. 5:25 (וַתְּהִי)
	1QIsa[a] 16:24	ויעני	MT Isa. 21:9 (וַיַּעַן)
	1QIsa[a] 23:19	ותהיה	MT 29:11 (וַתְּהִי)
	1QIsa[a] 23:23	ותהיה	MT 29:13 (וַתְּהִי)
	1QIsa[a] 30:19	ויעלה	MT Isa. 37:14 (וַיַּעַל)
	1QIsa[a] 31:23	ויבכא	MT Isa. 38:3 (וַיִּבְךְ)
	1QIsa[a] 32:16	ויחיה	MT Isa. 39:1 (וַיְחִי)
	1QIsa[f] frg. 8:1	ו]תהיהּ	MT Isa. 5:25 (וַתְּהִי)

It is remarkable that most occurrences come from 1QIsa[a], mainly from chapter 5 and from the parallel account. Despite the frequent substitution of short forms in MT with their long equivalents in this manuscript, in Isa. 37:36 we find the opposite distribution.

All in all, in Qumran the long form is barely attested in the non-biblical manuscripts, whereas most occurrences of the same in the biblical manuscripts are clustered around a handful of witnesses. Had the wayyiqtol maintained the same role that it served in pre-exilic Hebrew, maybe the long form could have reached wider diffusion and displaced the short form.

Furthermore, Hornkohl (2013: 172-3) points out that there are 19 out of 662 occurrences of the long form in the consonantal text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, most of which are used for the verb השתחוה (x12). The low percentage of occurrences confirms the picture that we find at

Qumran, that is a situation where this morphological variant has not reached diffusion among the different dialects of Hebrew, probably because of the progressive loss of wayyiqtol.

According to Bloch (2007: 152-65), most if not all the occurrences of the long prefixed form with the wayyiqtol are due to late scribal activity (as the many parallel passages in which both forms are found would confirm) and should be deemed secondary erroneous readings, some of which may merely occur at the level of the vocalization (e.g., Josh. 19:50 and 1 Sam. 17:42). The textual explanation is adopted also by other scholars to illustrate and discuss individual or sets of similar occurrences (STIPP 1987: 121, 126-7; JOÜON-MURAOKA §79m). Furthermore, Bloch notes with Stipp that most of these forms occur in Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, which show other orthographic anomalies such as the use of -אות for -את (on this phenomenon see MORAG 1974:13-5; HORNKOHL 2013: 192-202). Quite interestingly, the form -אות for -את is found also in 1QIsa[a] 12:21 (// MT Isa. 14:20) and 24:15 (// MT Isa. 30:8), that is in the only two instances where Proto-Isaiah employs this preposition. As Bloch (2007: 159-60) observes, while Scribe A, who copied Isa. 1-33, changed both forms into -אות, Scribe B, who copied Isa. 34-66, consistently used -את even when MT has -אות in Isa. 54:15 and 59:21. As we have seen, most of the occurrences of the long form in 1QIsa[a] appear in those columns copied by Scribe A, in whose dialect we may also find -אות. Both features are also common in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as well as in the prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha, all texts that I think employ a non-standard form of Hebrew already in use before and during the exile.

On the other hand, Hornkohl (2013: 177-8) stresses the fact that these forms probably arose already in biblical times, as their concentration in such books as Jeremiah and Ezekiel shows. While it is true that some of these occurrences are the product of late scribal interventions, it is not necessary to posit that the long prefixed form with the wayyiqtol entered the Hebrew language during the post-biblical period.

I believe that both explanations have valid points and possibly the best solution is to find some middle ground between the two options, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. On the one hand, in fact, I agree with Bloch that some occurrences are secondary readings introduced by later scribes. As Bloch (2007: 156 n. 47) points out, the text of Chronicles regularly replaces the long form found in Samuel and Kings with a short form (however, in 2 Chr. 1:17 there is a different form):

2 Sam. 23:15	וַיִּתְאַוֶּה	1 Chr. 11:17	וַיִּתְאָו
1 Kgs. 10:29	וְתַעֲלֶה	2 Chr. 1:17	וְיַעֲלוּ
1 Kgs. 22:24	וַיַּכֶּה	2 Chr. 18:23	וַיַּךְ
1 Kgs. 22:34	וַיַּכֶּהָ	2 Chr. 18:33	וַיַּךְ
1 Kgs. 22:35	וַתַּעֲלֶה	2 Chr. 18:34	וַתַּעַל
2 Kgs. 8:21	וַיַּכֶּה	2 Chr. 21:9	וַיַּךְ
2 Kgs. 22:19	וַתִּבְכֶּה	2 Chr. 34:27	וַתִּבְךְ

At the same time, Hornkohl rightly remarks that Chronicles has a clear tendency to archaize (HORNKOHL 2013: 177), and these occurrences may be due to a stylistic choice. If we take a closer look at the occurrences in the above table, there may be signs of textual accidents and revisions in only a couple of the passages listed. MT 1 Kgs. 10:29 has minor disagreements with LXX^{B}, which, in its turn, shares some readings with MT 2 Chr. 1:17 against MT 1 Kgs. 10:29. As for MT 2 Kgs. 8:21, this passage is discussed in Chapter 3 because of its textual corruptions. Outside of these parallel verses, additional textual issues may be posited for a few more forms, although not all of them are indubitably secondary additions. The verb in MT Judg. 19:2 (וַתִּזְנֶה) may have to be emended (see also the Septuagint), possibly into ותזנח,

although a root II זנה ‘to be angry’ related to Akkadian zenû could also be hypothesised; the occurrence of MT 1 Sam. 1:7 (וַתִּבְכֶּה) appears in a chapter that has been revised and reworked (see below); in MT 1 Sam. 7:9 (וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ) both the qᵊre and the versions (LXX καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὸν; Vulgate obtulit illum; Peshitta ܐܰܥܠܶܝܗ; Targum וְאַסְקֵיהּ) point to a reading of the form with a pronominal suffix; the occurrence in MT 1 Sam. 17:42 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ) has no parallel in the Septuagint (see more on 1 Sam. 17 in the section on weqatal); MT 1 Kgs. 14:9 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה) does not occur in LXX^{B} 1 Kgs. 12:24g-n; the form in MT 1 Kgs. 18:32 (וַיִּבֶן) is probably part of an early interpolation (vv. 31-32a); the long form in MT Hab. 1:14 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה) occurs as short in 1QpHab 5:12 (ותעש). Even if we assume that most of these occurrences originated as the result of scribal activity, there is reason to believe that some of them are rather early, given that they are attested also in the LXX (1 Sam. 1:7; 1 Kgs. 18:32; Hab. 1:14).

The fact that the majority of such forms occurs in books such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Lamentations and Habakkuk, although deriving from the same period, have too few instances to be significant representatives of this phenomenon), which have many non-standard linguistic features, probably hints at a dialectal variety which privileged the long form already in the 6th century. Furthermore, most of the occurrences in Kings cluster around the chapters that contain the prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha, about whose northern origin and many linguistic peculiarities there is no doubt.

Conclusion

In sum, I believe that the long form *yaqtulu* with the wayyiqtol of the III-y verbs is a linguistic feature that already belongs to a spoken variety of Hebrew in the 6th century and that differs from the standardised language of the Jerusalemite palace. In post-biblical Hebrew, this linguistic feature crops up here and there in some manuscripts from Qumran, thus indicating

that the overlapping of the *yaqtulu* and the *yaqtul* forms still belonged to at least one dialect of Ancient Hebrew. At the same time, it cannot be excluded that some of these late occurrences, both in Qumran and in the secondary additions of the scribes, constitute real mistakes, due to the progressive disappearance of the wayyiqtol.

The long form found in MT Isaiah 36:37 may therefore have entered the text as early as the 6th century BCE, or as late as the Greco-Roman period. Given the absence of the long form in both MT Kings and in 1QIsa[a], I am inclined to believe that this form entered the text very late.

SYNTAX

Weqatal in MT 2 Kgs. 18:36

MT 2 Kgs. 18:36 וְהָחֲרִישׁוּ

MT Isa. 36:21 וַיַּחֲרִישׁוּ] והחרישו 1QIsa[a].

This rather long section is divided into two main parts. In the first part I investigate the possibility that late texts may have changed the wayyiqtol of the source or of the earlier parallel account into a weqatal. Once the relationship between these parallel texts and multiple copies of the same text has been documented and assessed, I continue with a detailed study of all occurrences of 'anomalous' weqatals in CBH. More specifically, I refer to those occurrences of the weqatal that behave like wayyiqtols.

For this analysis, I will not consider the weqatals that follow a qatal, given their higher frequency and because they most likely occur by attraction to the previous qatal. The sequences qatal – weqatal require a further and detailed study which is not possible here. This is why I will adopt a minimalist approach in the evaluation of the weqatals that substitute a wayyiqtol in a later manuscript or text: I will not consider as signs of language change the occurrences in which the weqatals are preceded by qatals. However, future comprehensive analyses of this phenomenon may (and probably will, at least in part) lead to also including such instances among the textual variants that are linguistically relevant for the relative dating of texts. A brief survey of the occurrences of the qatal – weqatal sequences in the CBH prose corpus shows that

these are more or less equally encountered both in narrative and in dialogue.[90] Quite interestingly, most of these weqatals, regardless of whether they occur in narrative or in dialogue, have the meaning of a perfective which coheres with the previous qatal and elaborates a different side of an overall single event.[91] Thrice we find a weqatal with perfective meaning expressing a sequential main event, and only in narrative prose.[92] Finally, the form occurs with a resultative meaning in a few instances found in dialogic prose.[93] It may also be of interest to observe that half of the occurrences of the qatal – weqatal sequence in the Pentateuch appear in poetry, a genre in which this phenomenon is frequently attested, as the many instances found in the Prophets and the Psalms reveal.[94] This preliminary overview of the phenomenon seems to point to the origin of such sequences in the context of a series of elaborations of an overall single event. The weqatal occurs after a previous qatal as the result of syntactic attraction and because it belongs to the same event or because it describes coordinated events. One may think that over time the use of the weqatal became more generalised, as it slowly took over the meaning and function of the wayyiqtol, as rarely attested in CBH prose.

Since my approach is not merely linguistic but also text-critical, I will discuss in detail every occurrence of the weqatal in the CBH linguistic corpus. My analysis is aimed at showing that the majority of these weqatals entered the text at a later stage via scribal activity. Because no previous comprehensive text-critical analysis of all such occurrences has so far been carried

[90] Narrative: Gen. 28:6; 34:5; Josh. 6:8; Judg. 16:18; 1 Sam. 24:11; 2 Sam. 15:30; 23:20; 1 Kgs. 11:10; 20:27; 21:12; 2 Kgs. 14:7, 10. Dialogue: Gen. 31:7; 37:3; Deut. 2:30; Josh. 9:12; 22:3; 1 Sam. 10:2; 12:2; 1 Kgs. 3:11, 8:47; 13:3; Isa. 6:7.

[91] Gen. 28:6; 31:7; 37:3; Deut. 2:30; Josh. 6:8; 22:3; 2 Sam. 15:30; 23:20; 1 Kgs. 3:11; 8:47; 13:3; 20:27; 21:12; 2 Kgs. 14:7, 10.

[92] Gen. 34:5; Judg. 16:18; 1 Sam. 24:11. The occurrence of 1 Kgs. 11:10 may be due to textual corruption (cf. LXX^{B}).

[93] Josh. 9:12; 1 Sam. 10:2; 12:2; Isa. 6:7.

[94] Gen. 49:23; Num. 23:19, 20; Deut. 33:2 (x2).

out, although many scholars have pointed out the late character of some of these readings, it will be necessary to proceed slowly and discuss in depth all the examples.

THE TEXT AND ITS VARIANTS

The verse that records the people's reaction to the threatening and disheartening words uttered by the Rab-šaqe occurs in almost identical form in MT Isa. 36:21 and MT 2 Kgs. 18:36:

וַיַּחֲרִישׁוּ וְלֹא־עָנוּ אֹתוֹ דָּבָר כִּי־מִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ הָיָה לֵאמֹר לֹא תַעֲנ�ֻהוּ׃

'And they remained silent and said nothing in reply to him, because the order of the king was, saying: 'Answer him not!'.' (MT Isa. 36:21)

וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ הָעָם וְלֹא־עָנוּ אֹתוֹ דָּבָר כִּי־מִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ הָיָה לֵאמֹר לֹא תַעֲנ�ֻהוּ׃

'And the people remained silent and said nothing in reply to him, because the order of the king was, saying: 'Answer him not!'.' (MT 2 Kgs. 18:36)

Although the meaning conveyed and the scene pictured are the same in both passages, there are two variants in the texts. In MT 2 Kgs. 18:36 the grammatical subject is explicitly reported as the collective noun הָעָם 'the people', whereas this is lacking in MT Isa. 36:21.[95] That those who remained silent following the Assyrian official's speech are the people on the walls is suggested both by the context and by their mention in MT Isa. 36:11 'הָעָם אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַחוֹמָה' (see

[95] The reading העם is added in the margin of a 12th century manuscript (K 180).

also MT 2 Kgs. 18:26). From a text-critical perspective, the reading הָעָם of MT 2 Kgs. 18:36 should be considered secondary. Quite interestingly, הָעָם is attested neither in LXX^{L} nor in LXX^{B} for 2 Kgs. 18:36. However, העם occurred in the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta (ܗܲܘ ܥܲܡܐ), the Targum (וּשְׁתִיקוּ עַמָּא), and the Vulgate (*tacuit itaque populus*). It is likely that, given the absence of ὁ λαός in LXX^{B} and the presence of ܥܲܡܐ, עַמָּא, and *populus* in these other three versions, העם is a late variant that entered the proto-Masoretic text and reading tradition in its final stages of development. With regards to the textual witnesses of Isaiah, הָעָם is absent in both OG and $1QIsa^{a}$.

The other variant is a morphological one and concerns the form of the verb הֶחֱרִישׁ 'to be silent'. MT Isaiah has a wayyiqtol whereas MT 2 Kings has a weqatal. Since it is impossible to establish which of the two forms lies behind the Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin translations, the versions are irrelevant for the assessment of the two variants and the analysis must therefore depend entirely on the Hebrew witnesses. Besides MT Isaiah and MT 2 Kings, this passage is preserved also in $1QIsa^{a}$. There, the verb occurs as weqatal, as in MT 2 Kings 18:36:

והחרישו ולוא ענו אותה דבר כיא מצות המלך היה לאמור לוא תענוהו

In order to determine whether וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ is a diachronically relevant linguistic variant that can therefore contribute to a relative dating of the parallel accounts of MT 2 Kings and MT Isaiah, it may be good to start by tracing and discussing all the parallel texts in which wayyiqtol and weqatal occur. This should help us determine whether the latter may displace the former. Once such examples will have been analysed and discussed, I will move on to a detailed study of all the occurrences of weqatal in pre-exilic texts, where we would usually expect to find a wayyiqtol. This latter part is very important because I will approach and describe each

individual occurrence also from a text-critical point of view, with the goal of establishing the philological profile of each reading.

From a linguistic perspective, it is generally understood, and rightly so I believe, that the weqatal, when referring to a completed past action, took on the meaning and function of the wayyiqtol as the use of the latter was on the wane, probably under the influence of Aramaic. Whereas in Biblical and Qumran literature wayyiqtol is the main form used in such contexts, in Mishnaic Hebrew one finds that only weqatal is productive, wayyiqtol being relegated to biblical quotations.[96] At the same time, some scholars have stressed that perfective weqatal is no more characteristic of LBH than it is of CBH.[97]

THE LINGUISTIC VARIANTS WAYYIQTOL AND WEQATAL IN THE PARALLEL TEXTS

In this section I will compare MT with two important witnesses from Qumran, 1QIsa[a] and 4QSam[a]. I will also include in this analysis the parallel texts found in MT Samuel – Kings and in MT Chronicles. Because 1QIsa[a] and 4QSam[a] hail from the post-biblical period, it may be the case that the scribes substituted the wayyiqtol with the weqatal here and there. Likewise, given that Chronicles often updates the language of its sources (see the section on הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי), we cannot exclude *a priori* that we will encounter instances of perfective weqatal where the source has a wayyiqtol, although it has already been pointed out that the former's frequency does not increase in LBH.

[96] See Ewald 1881: 21; Driver 1892: 158-64; Lambert 1893: 55-60; Kropat 1909: 22; GKC §112pp-uu; Kutscher 1974: 42, 353-58; id. 1982 §§67, 129, 161; Bergey 1983: 66; Walke and O'Connor 1990: §32.3; Rooker 1990: 100-2; Meyer 1969-1992: §§100.3d-e, 101.7; Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 120; Eskhult 200: 84-5; Segal 2001: 151; Van Peursen 2004: 154-65; Moomo 2005: 98; JM §119za; Cohen 2013: 77-94.

[97] See Ehrensvärd 2003: 171-5; Rezetko 2003: 233-7; Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd 2008: 150-5; Joosten 2012: 223-8; Hornkohl 2013: 254-66, 287-93; Qimron: 2018: 369-71.

1QIsa[A]

Besides 36:11, 1QIsa[a] differs from MT Isaiah in four more places with regards to the presence of weqatal where the latter has wayyiqtol. One finds וקרא in 9:5 (MT וַיִּקְרָא),[98] והיה in 22:7 (MT וַיִּהְיוּ), והיה in 48:18 (MT וַיְהִי), and והיו in 66:2 (MT וַיִּהְיוּ).[99] It should nonetheless be noted that 1QIsa[a] regularly and only with minor variations[100] agrees with MT when the latter has wayyiqtol.[101] Three out of the five occurrences of unparalleled weqatal in 1QIsa[a] appear after

---

[98] While the LXX translates this verb with a present indicative (καλεῖται), the Gospel of Matthew (1:23) renders it with a future (καλέσουσιν), thus giving a different meaning to the weqatal.

[99] See also Kutscher 1974: 354.

[100] Such variations consist in:

1) the use of the long form *yaqtulu* instead of the short form *yaqtul* for III-y verbs (KUTSCHER 1974: 328): Isa. 5:2 (וַיְקַו vs. ויבנא and וַיַּעַשׂ vs. ויעשה), 4 (וַיַּעַשׂ vs. וישה), 25 (וַתְּהִי vs. ותהיה); 9:5 (וַתְּהִי vs. ותהיה); 21:9 (וַיַּעַן vs. ויעני); 29:11 (וַתְּהִי vs. ותהיה), 13 (וַתְּהִי vs. ותהיה); 37:14 (וַיַּעַל vs. ויעלה); 38:3 (וַיִּבְךְ vs. ויבכא); 41:25 (וַיֹּאת vs ויאתיו); 64:5 (וַנְּהִי vs. ונהיה).

2) the use of the short form *yaqtul* instead of the long form *yaqtulu* for III-y verbs (KUTSCHER 1974: 328): Isa. 37:36 (וַיַּכֶּה vs. ויך).

3) the use of the cohortative instead of yiqtol (KUTSCHER 1974: 326-7): Isa. 6:8 (וָאֹמַר vs. ואמרה), 11 (וָאֹמַר vs. ואמרה); 41:9 (וָאֹמַר vs. ואומרה); 48:5 (וָאַגִּיד vs. ואגידה); 50:7 (וָאֵדַע vs. ואדעה); 64:5 (וַנִּבָּל vs. ונבולה).

4) change of binyan, from the hiphil to the qal (Kutscher 1974: 362-3) or from the qal to the hithpa'el (KUTSCHER 1974: 359): Isa. 38:2 (וַיִּסַּב vs. ויסוב); 57:20 (וַיִּגְרְשׁוּ vs. ויתגרשו).

5) change in number: Isa. 9:18 (וַיִּהְיוּ vs. ויהי); 53:9 (וַיִּתֵּן vs. ויתנו); 57:3 (וַתִּזְנֶה vs. ותזנו); 57:8 (וַתַּעֲלִי vs ותעלו and וַתִּכְרֶת vs. ותכרותו).

6) different verbs: Isa. 39:1 (וַיֶּחֱזַק vs. ויחיה – written with the long form *yaqtulu*); 64:6 (וַתְּמוּגֵנוּ vs. ותמגדנו). Furthermore, there are some instances of verbs that are wayyiqtols in MT and yiqtols in 1QIsa[a] (KUTSCHER 1974: 355): Isa. 5:15 (וַיִּשַּׁח vs. ישח); 6:1 (וָאֶרְאֶה vs. אראה); 49:7 (וַיִּבְחָרֶךָּ vs. יבחרך); 51:16 (וָאָשִׂים vs. אשים). Once 1QIsa[a] has qatal where MT has wayyiqtol (KUTSCHER 1974: 354): Isa. 12:2 (וַיְהִי vs. היהא). In one instance, wayyiqtol in MT occurs as an otherwise unattested imperative in 1QIsa[a] (KUTSCHER 1974: 325): Isa. 41:5 (וַיֶּאֱתָיוּן vs. ואתיון).

[101] Isa. 2:7 (x2), 8, 9 (x2); 3:16 (x2); 5:2 (x6), 4, 7, 15, 16, 25 (x4); 6:4, 5, 6, 7 (x2), 8 (x2), 9, 11 (x2); 7:1, 2 (x2), 3, 10, 12, 13; 8:1, 3 (x4), 5; 9:5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17 (x2), 18, 19 (x2); 10:14; 12:2; 15:4; 20:1 (x2), 2, 3; 21:8, 9 (x2); 22:8 (x2), 9, 10, 12; 23:3, 12; 24:6, 16, 18; 26:14 (x2); 29:10, 11, 13 (x2), 15, 21; 30:12 (x2), 16; 31:1, 2; 34:15; 36:1 (x2), 2 (x2), 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13 (x3), 22 (x2); 37:1 (x4), 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 (x2), 9 (x3), 14 (x4), 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 36 (x3), 37 (x4), 38 (x2); 38:1 (x2), 2 (x2), 3 (x2), 4, 8, 9, 21, 22; 39:1 (x2), 2 (x2), 3 (x3), 4 (x2), 5, 8 (x2); 40:14 (x3), 22, 24; 41:7 (x2), 9, 25; 42:25 (x3); 44:12 (x2), 13, 14 (x2), 15 (x4); 45:4; 47:6, 7, 10 (x2); 48:3, 5, 19, 21 (x2); 49:2 (x2), 3, 6, 7, 14; 50:7; 51:3, 12, 13 (x2), 15, 16, 23; 53:2, 9; 57:3, 8 (x2), 9 (x4), 11, 17, 20; 59:15 (x3), 16 (x3), 17 (x3); 63:5, 8 (x2), 9 (x2), 10, 11; 64:4, 5 (x2), 6, 12; 66:4.

another qatal, which may easily explain the presence of the former (be it original or a scribal change) instead of wayyiqtol.[102] In fact, it is not uncommon to find in MT Isaiah weqatal coordinated with another previous qatal.[103] In 1QIsa[a] this phenomenon is more widespread and additional unparalleled occurrences are attested.[104] It is only in 1QIsa[a] 9:5 and 36:21 that the replacement of wayyiqtol with weqatal unambiguously reflects the diachronic trajectory that moves from the use of wayyiqtol in Biblical Hebrew to that of weqatal in Mishnaic Hebrew, a change for which Qohelet is the most valuable representative among the Biblical books.[105] Similar occurrences of weqatal not triggered by a preceding qatal appear twice more in MT Isaiah and four more times in 1QIsa[a].[106]

---

[102] So 1QIsa[a] 22:6-7 (נשא..ערה..והיה); 48:18 (ולוא הקשבתה..והיה); 66:2 (עשתה..והיו).

[103] 1QIsa[a] 1:2 (גִּדַּלְתִּי וְרוֹמַמְתִּי); 5:14 (הִרְחִיבָה..וּפָעֲרָה..וְיָרַד); 6:7 (נָגַע..וְסָר); 9:7-8 (שָׁלַח..וְנָפַל..וְיָדְעוּ); 19:14 (מָסַךְ..וְהִתְעָוּ); 24:6 (חָרוּ..וְנִשְׁאַר); 29:20 (אָפֵס..וְכָלָה..וְנִכְרְתוּ); 37:23 (חֵרַפְתָּ וְגִדַּפְתָּ), 25 (חָרַפְתָּ וְגִדַּפְתָּ), 26 (עָשִׂיתִי..וַיְצַרְתֶּיהָ), 27 (חָתוּ וָבֹשׁוּ); 38:12 (נִסַּע וְנִגְלָה); 40:12 (תִּכֵּן וְכָל..וְשָׁקַל); 41:4 (פָּעַל וְעָשָׂה); 43:12 (פָּעַל וְעָשָׂה), 14 (שִׁלַּחְתִּי..וְהוֹרַדְתִּי); 44:8 (הִשְׁמַעְתִּיךְ וְהִגַּדְתִּי); 63:10 (מָרוּ וְעִצְּבוּ); 66:7 (יָלְדָה..וְהִמְלִיטָה).

[104] 1QIsa[a] 15:1 (שודד..ונדמה); 19:6 (x2 – והזניחו..ודללו וחרבו..וקמלו), 7 (יבש ונדף); 28:29 (הפלה..והגדיל); 34:2 (החרימם ונתנם); 38:5 (שמעתי..וראיתי); 47:6 (קצפתי..וחללתי); 48:15 (קראתי והביאותיהו – this occurrence may be due to a scribal mistake, whereby the object suffix ו- was changed into the conjunction ו-); 52:9 (נחם..וגאל); 63:19 (קרעתה..וירדתה).

[105] Qohelet employs the wayyiqtol only in three places (1:17; 4:1, 7), as opposed to the 29 occurrences of weqatal (1:13, 16; 2:5, 9 (x2), 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 (x2), 17, 18, 20; 3:22; 4:1, 4, 7; 5:18; 8:15, 17; 9:14 (x3), 15 (x2), 16, 12:9 (x2)). Similarly, wayyiqtol is used only twice in Song of Songs, in a verse (6:9) that appears to be a reference to Prov. 31:28. However, not unlikely because of the literary genre of the poetic book, weqatal is employed only twice in Song of Songs, both times after a preceding qatal (חִמַּמְתִּי וְיָשַׁבְתִּי in 2:3 and עָנָה..וְאָמַר in 2:10).

[106] As for MT, cf. Isa. 9:19 (וְרָעֵב) and 22:14 (וְנִגְלָה). The occurrence in Isa. 40:6 (וְאָמַר) is problematic from a text-critical perspective and may have to be emended into a 1st pers. sing. of the wayyiqtol, as attested in 1QIsa[a] (ואומרה), the LXX (καὶ εἶπα), and the Vulgate (*et dixi*). The Targum (וְאָמַר) and the Peshitta (ܘܐܡܪ) agree with MT. However, these differences may also exist because the context allows for a certain variety (e.g., the Old Georgian reinterpretation and usage of the imperative თქვი ‘say!’ based on the previous verb).

As for 1QIsa[a], cf. 9:3 (והחתת – although the -ו makes little sense and could be a scribal mistake); 43:3 (ונתתי – what precedes the verb should therefore be considered as a nominal clause, unlike in MT, where נתתי is the predicate); 59:4 (והולידו – instead of a sequence of four infinitives absolute, 1QIsa[a] has a chiastic structure qatal – infinitive absolute – infinitive absolute – qatal), 13 (ודברו – like in 54:4, instead of a sequence five infinitives absolute, the first four occur in 1QIsa[a] according to the chiastic structure just noted).

Besides the examples culled from MT Isaiah and 1QIsa[a], there are other parallel texts hailing from different periods that, when compared, show some divergences with regards to the use of wayyiqtol and weqatal.[107] The book(s) of Chronicles regularly reproduces the form found in the source text, be it wayyiqtol or weqatal. There are six occurrences of weqatal in verses that have close parallels in Kings.[108] In half of the occurrences, Chronicles follows Kings, whereas the former changes or modifies the verb found in the source text in the remaining half. Starting from the latter set of occurrences, in 2 Chr. 25:19 (// 2 Kgs. 14:10) weqatal appears in both texts after qatal (הִכִּיתָ..וּנְשָׂאֲךָ). Quite interestingly, the two most anomalous occurrences of weqatal in the parallel passages occur both in Chronicles and Kings, which means that they are not innovations introduced into the text by the Chronicler: in 2 Chr. 12:10 וְהִפְקִיד follows a wayyiqtol (וַיַּעַשׂ), as in 2 Kgs. 14:27, while in 2 Chr. 33:4 וּבָנָה follows the string of wayyiqtols found in the previous verse, as in 2 Kgs. 21:3-4.

In 2 Chr. 7:12 and in 7:16 there are two weqatals that do not occur in the source text (1 Kgs. 9:3 for both verses). However, they occur after qatal in both cases (שָׁמַעְתִּי..וּבָחַרְתִּי in 7:12 and בָּחַרְתִּי וְהִקְדַּשְׁתִּי in 7:16). As for 7:16, וְהִקְדַּשְׁתִּי occurs as qatal in 1 Kgs. 9:3 (as also reflected in the daughter versions), whereas וּבָחַרְתִּי in 7:12 is original to Chronicles. Finally, 2 Chr. 34:4 changes וַיְנַתֵּץ of 2 Kgs. 23:6 into וְהִדַּק. Nonetheless, whereas the wayyiqtol in Kings follows two preceding wayyiqtols (וַיֹּצֵא..וַיִּשְׂרֹף), the verb in Chronicles occurs after two qatals (גִּדְּעוּ..שִׁבְּרוּ).

What is therefore clear is that Chronicles never shows unambiguous signs of late usage of weqatal instead of a wayyiqtol of the source text. When Chronicles differs from Kings (i.e., 2 Chr. 7:12, 16; 34:4), the weqatal may have entered the text by attraction to a preceding qatal.

[107] See also Kropat 1909: 22-3 and Hornkohl 2013: 256-7.

[108] 2 Chr. 7:12, 16 (// 1 Kgs. 9:3); 12:10 (// 1 Kgs. 14:27); 25:19 (// 2 Kgs. 14:10); 33:4 (// 2 Kgs. 21:4); 34:4 (// 2 Kgs. 23:6). VAN PEURSEN 2004: 156 mentions וּבָא in 2 Chr. 24:11 (// 2 Kgs. 12:11 uses וַיִּתְּנוּ), which, however, as he observes in footnote, has a habitual meaning.

In the three remaining occurrences of perfective weqatal to describe a past action Chronicles follows Kings. When compared to 1QIsa[a], which seems to contain two unambiguous examples of replacement of wayyiqtol with weqatal, thus reflecting the post-biblical development of the usage of the latter form, the book of Chronicles more strictly aligns with the syntax of CBH in the parallel passages.[109]

Besides 1QIsa[a], another important textual witness to the Hebrew Bible was brought to light in Qumran, 4QSam[a]. The comparison of the manuscript from Qumran with MT does not change the pattern already observed above. There are only five potential weqatals in 4QSam[a] that turn out to be useful for the present analysis.[110] Unfortunately, the occurrence of והיה in 1 Sam. 1:12 and in 2 Sam. 6:13 is uncertain. However, 4QSam[a] and MT would agree in both cases. Quite interestingly, the longer version of the episode about Naḥaš king of the Ammonites occurring in 4QSam[a] (1 Sam. 10:27) contains two weqatals (ונקר..ונתן). Because their use may have been triggered by the preceding qatal לחץ, it is not certain that they reflect the later syntax. Moreover, ונתן may be understood as a passive qal, which tends to disappear in post-biblical Hebrew. Finally, ומדד found in the manuscript in 2 Sam. 8:2 corresponds to וַיְמַדֵּד in MT. Because the manuscript is very fragmentary at this point, we cannot be sure about what verb forms preceded ומדד. However, if the text corresponded to MT (וַיַּךְ..וַיְמַדְּדֵם), then the presence of a weqatal would be remarkable. This might be the only diachronic relevant variant between MT and 4QSam[a] with regards to the use of weqatal for a perfective past action.

From the comparison of parallel passages between different biblical texts and manuscripts, it is safe to say that later scribes faithfully adhered to the source that they were using or copying

[109] Hornkohl (2013: 257) refers to the passages in 1QIsa[a] 66:2, 2 Chr. 7:12, and 2 Chr. 34:4 as examples of the evolution of the use of weqatal instead of wayyiqtol. Because the use of weqatal may also have been triggered by the preceding qatals, I do not think that these passages unambiguously help us trace such development.

[110] 1QSam[a] 1:12; 10:27 (x2); 2 Sam. 6:13; 8:2.

with regards to the presence of wayyiqtols and weqatals. Overall, there are only three occurrences of weqatal instead of wayyiqtol in the Qumran manuscripts that unambiguously point towards the shift in use from one form to the other, two in 1QIsa[a] and one in 4QSam[a], the latter unfortunately lacking context.

When it comes to 1 Kgs. 18:36, it is remarkable that on the one hand MT Isaiah has wayyiqtol whereas it is 1QIsa[a] that shares the same reading with MT Kings.[111] At the same time, we have seen that the scribes do not tend to change wayyiqtol into weqatal, unless there is a preceding qatal that may justify the new sequence qatal – weqatal. Another aspect that should be considered is that וְהָחֵרִישׁוּ may also express the persistence of a certain state, as it seems to do in Gen. 34:5.[112] According to Longacre (1994: 71-84), this category of weqatals, which occur after a chain of wayyiqtols or at the end of an episode, expresses the climactic / pivotal event. Although his suggestion is ingenious, I do not believe that this is the best solution for most of the examples that he lists, including the present one.[113] While the parallel of Gen. 34:5 and the explanation provided by Hornkohl are very persuasive, I am more inclined to believe that וְהָחֵרִישׁוּ represents one of the few changes from wayyiqtol into weqatal introduced by the scribes. This is further corroborated by the assessment of the other perfective weqatals that one finds in CBH, when these are not preceded by another qatal. Most of these, in fact, occur as the result of scribal intervention, either as mistakes or as linguistic updates.

[111] The priority of the tradition preserved in Isaiah (OG, 1QIsa[a], MT) and in LXX 2 Kings over that of MT 2 Kings for the parallel account is outlined in another section.

[112] Hornkohl (2013: 288) lists the occurrence of 2 Kgs. 18:36 among those expressing multi-stage processes.

[113] Some have already been discussed above, some others will be discussed in another section.

In CBH we do not find many occurrences of this form, as the following list indicates: Gen. 15:6; 21:25; 34:5; 38:5; Exod. 36:1, 29, 30, 38; 38:28 (x2); 39:3; Josh. 22:3; Judg. 3:23; 7:13; 1 Sam. 1:12; 10:9; 17:20, 38, 48; 24:11; 25:20; 2 Sam. 6:16; 12:31; 13:18; 16:31; 19:18, 19; 1 Kgs. 6:32 (x2), 35 (x2); 12:32; 14:27; 10:21; 2 Kgs. 3:5; 8:10; 11:1; 18:36. The peculiarity of these weqatals consists in their behaving, syntactically and semantically, like wayyiqtols. As already mentioned, in this section I do not address those weqatals that are preceded by a qatal.

Each of these occurrences will be individually analysed below, paying specific attention to the text-critical profile of the passages in question.

GENESIS 21:25

וְהוֹכַ֣ח אַבְרָהָ֔ם אֶת־אֲבִימֶ֖לֶךְ עַל־אֹד֣וֹת בְּאֵ֣ר הַמַּ֑יִם אֲשֶׁ֥ר גָּזְל֖וּ עַבְדֵ֥י אֲבִימֶֽלֶךְ׃

According to the BHS apparatus, the weqatal may be a corruption of an original wayyiqtol (וַיּוֹכַח), and the reported reading from the Samaritan Pentateuch (ויוכיח) would support this. However, BHQ makes no mention of this, and from Schorch's edition of Genesis (2021) it is evident that the Samaritan manuscripts, among which we find the base text of MS Dublin Chester Beatty Library 751, also preserved the reading והוכיח. This form has been interpreted as habitual (GKC §112rr; SKINNER 1910: 325-6; WENHAM 1994: 92), like the occurrence in Gen. 15:6 (וְהֶאֱמַן) where the nuance expressed by the weqatal could be that of persistence (GKC §112ss). The occurrence of וְהֶחֱרִשׁ in Gen. 34:5 (וחריש in the Samaritan Pentateuch) may be explained in the same way (GKC §112ss). From the point of view of the spelling, it is

interesting to observe that these three occurrences are written defectively and the י does not show. In Gen. 31:7, the form וְהֶחֱלֵף (ויחלף in the Samaritan Pentateuch), which refers to a past action and is probably triggered by the previous הָתָל, is also spelled defectively. It is remarkable that four out of the eight occurrences of weqatal used for an action taking place in the past have the defective spelling. The other four forms (וְשִׁלַּח in Gen. 28:6; וְעָשָׂה in Gen. 37:3 – ויעש in the Samaritan Pentateuch; וְהָיָה in Gen. 38:5; וָרַבּוּ in Gen. 49:23) could not possibly be spelled defectively because they are not hiphils. On the other hand, unambiguously future-oriented weqatals of verbs in the hiphil in Genesis are spelled fully (וְהִצְלִיחַ in Gen. 24:40; וַהֲשִׁיב in Gen. 40:13; וְהוֹרִידוּ in Gen. 44:31; וְהֵשִׁיב in Gen. 48:21). Likewise, וְהֵשִׁיבוּ in Gen. 29:3, which undoubtedly has a past habitual meaning, is spelled fully. It may be that in the consonantal text of Genesis the defective spelling was preserved for those occurrences that were linguistically ambiguous and harder to justify and about which there was more than one interpretation (cf. the different readings attested in the Samaritan Pentateuch).[114]

[114] As for the other occurrence of defectively spelled hiphils of the qatal in the Hebrew Bible, most of them bear a pronominal suffix or are weqatals. It is also interesting to observe that some roots are attested more than once or twice:

qatal – 3ms: Gen. 43:3 (הֵעִד); Exod. 13:9 (הוֹצִאֲךָ); Num. 5:16 (וְהֶעֱמִדָהּ); 30:12 (וְהֵחֲרִשׁ), 15 (הֶחֱרִישׁ); Deut. 7:19 (הוֹצִאֲךָ); 28:11 (וְהוֹתִרְךָ); Josh. 10:28 (הֶחֱרִם); 1 Sam. 12:24 (הִגְדִּיל); 17:37 (הִצִּלַנִי); 20:34 (הִכְלִמוֹ); 25:31 (וְהֵיטִב); 2 Sam. 14:32 (וַהֲמִתָנִי); 15:14 (וְהִשִּׂיגָנוּ), 25 (וַהֲשִׁבַנִי); 1 Kgs. 8:9 (הִנִּיחַ); 15:29 (הִשְׁמִדוֹ); 2 Kgs. 16:17 (הוֹרִד); Isa. 30:33 (הֻרְחָב); Jer. 8:14 (הֲדִמָּנוּ); 47:2 (וְהֵילֵל); Am. 3:11 (וְהוֹרֵד); Job 17:6 (וַהֲצִגֵנִי).

qatal – 3fs: Jer. 8:21 (הֲחֱזִקַתְנִי); Ruth 2:18 (הוֹתִרָה).

qatal – 3pl: Gen. 39:1 (הוֹרִדָהוּ); 42:8 (הִכִּרוּהוּ); Num. 4:5 (וְהוֹרִדוּ); Deut. 21:4 (וְהוֹרִדוּ); 1 Sam. 6:21 (הֵשִׁבוּ); 2 Sam. 1:6 (הִדְבִּקוּהוּ); Jer. 8:12 (הִבִּישׁוּ), 19 (הִכְעִסוּנִי); 26:19 (הֱמִתוּהוּ); 32:29 (וְהִסְכוּ); 36:20 (הִפְקִדוּ), 25 (הִפְגִּעוּ); Ezek. 47:22 (הוֹלִדוּ); 2 Chr. 12:11 (וֶהֱשִׁבוּם).

GENESIS 38:5

וַתֹּ֣סֶף עוֹד֮ וַתֵּ֣לֶד בֵּן֒ וַתִּקְרָ֣א אֶת־שְׁמ֔וֹ שֵׁלָ֑ה וְהָיָ֥ה בְכְזִ֖יב בְּלִדְתָּ֥הּ אֹתֽוֹ׃

The form וְהָיָה is suspicious and surely the result of textual corruption (DRIVER 1892: 161; GKC §112uu).[115] The subject of the two previous verbs (וַתֹּ֣סֶף and וַתִּקְרָ֣א) is Tamar, and to her the pronominal suffix attached to בְּלִדְתָּ֥הּ refers. The expected form of הָיָה should either be וַתְּהִי, as usual in biblical prose, or וְהָיְתָה, if we posit a weqatal. However, if וְהָיָה functioned like וַיְהִי (so the Samaritan Pentateuch), then one would expect to find the independent pronoun הִוא immediately after it. The ancient versions point to another direction:

LXX: […] αὕτη δὲ ἦν ἐν Χασβὶ ἡνίκα ἔτεκεν αὐτούς.

Vulgate: […] quo nato parere ultra cessavit.

Peshitta: .ܘܗܝܬ ܟܕ ܝܠܕ ܝܬܝܪ

Although the Septuagint, possibly in agreement with MT, understands כְּזִיב as the name of a locality, whereas both the Vulgate and the Peshitta seem to see in it a reference to menopause, these three witnesses unanimously hint at the presence of the pronoun הִוא. The LXX explicitly reports αὕτη, whereas the Vulgate and the Peshitta imply its existence in the Hebrew source by referring the verbs *cessavit* and ܝܬܝܪ to a female subject (absent in MT וְהָיָה בְכְזִיב). It is very likely that the Hebrew text preserved in MT is corrupted and that proto-MT had והוא.

[115] On the other hand, Isaksson (2015: 105) does not consider the form anomalous. However, the text-critical evidence leaves no doubt as to the corrupted nature of the text in question, and a linguistic explanation ought not to be forced onto the text.

The reconstructed verse with והוא gives a circumstantial clause expressed in perfect Classical Hebrew style and according to the rules that regulate the syntax of such clauses: והוא בכזיב בלדתה אתו.[116]

EXODUS 36 – 39

There are seven occurrences of weqatal in these four chapters.

Exod. 36:1:

וְעָשָׂה בְצַלְאֵל וְאָהֳלִיאָב וְכָל ו אִישׁ חֲכַם־לֵב אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה חָכְמָה וּתְבוּנָה בָּהֵמָּה לָדַעַת לַעֲשֹׂת אֶת־כָּל־מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה:

Exod. 36:29-30:

וְהָיוּ תוֹאֲמִם מִלְמַטָּה וְיַחְדָּו יִהְיוּ תַמִּים אֶל־רֹאשׁוֹ אֶל־הַטַּבַּעַת הָאֶחָת כֵּן עָשָׂה לִשְׁנֵיהֶם לִשְׁנֵי הַמִּקְצֹעֹת:

וְהָיוּ שְׁמֹנָה קְרָשִׁים וְאַדְנֵיהֶם כֶּסֶף שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֲדָנִים שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים שְׁנֵי אֲדָנִים תַּחַת הַקֶּרֶשׁ הָאֶחָד:

Exod. 36:38:

וְאֶת־עַמּוּדָיו חֲמִשָּׁה וְאֶת־וָוֵיהֶם וְצִפָּה רָאשֵׁיהֶם וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם זָהָב וְאַדְנֵיהֶם חֲמִשָּׁה נְחֹשֶׁת:

Exod. 38:28:

וְאֶת־הָאֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע הַמֵּאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים עָשָׂה וָוִים לָעַמּוּדִים וְצִפָּה רָאשֵׁיהֶם וְחִשַּׁק אֹתָם:

Exod. 39:3:

[116] See Exod. 16:31 for another example of verbless circumstantial clause.

וַיְרַקְּעוּ אֶת־פַּחֵי הַזָּהָב וְקִצֵּץ פְּתִילֹתֹ לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּתָוֹךְ הַתְּכֵלֶת וּבְתָוֹךְ הָאַרְגָּמָן וּבְתָוֹךְ תּוֹלַעַת הַשָּׁנִי וּבְתָוֹךְ הַשֵּׁשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב׃

The forms attested in Exod. 36:38; 38:28 (x2); 39:3 have been explained as possibly 'iterative' by Joosten and as describing multi-stage processes by Hornkohl (see also GKC §112rr). Both scholars refer to the recurrence of weqatal in such instances as building accounts (JOOSTEN 2012: 228, n. 73; HORNKOHL 2013: 288).[117] However, it should also be stressed that some of these occurrences appear in texts whose growth and changes we can trace thanks to the textual witnesses. The instances of weqatal here discussed may not go back to the earliest strata of Exodus and, therefore, deserve full attention.

The final part of the book of Exodus raises a series of questions concerning textual criticism. In fact, the fulfilment narrative of these chapters does not mirror the order of the instruction speeches of Exodus 25-31. The textual units delimited by the *petuḥah* and *setumah* signs often seem to constitute individual and movable sections (TREBOLLE BARRERA 2012). For instance, the instructions about the ark, table, and lampstand (Exod. 25:10-40) precede those about the tabernacle (Exod. 26:1-37). Yet, this section is transposed in the fulfilment narrative (Exod. 37:1-24) and placed after the paragraph on the tabernacle (Exod. 36:8-38). In one instance (Exod. 28:13-14), a short paragraph is omitted in the fulfilment narrative. Exodus 36-39 stands out also for the different order of some of its components in the LXX, whose text reflects an older stratum than that of MT, or at least derives from a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (BROOKE 1992: 81-106; BOGAERT 1996: 399-428; AEJMELAEUS 2007: 107-22; SALVESEN 2013: 37-51).

[117] It should be noted that 'iterative' is a problematic label as it describes the occurrence of a temporarily bounded (perfective) event on multiple occasions. 'Iterative', therefore, must be kept apart from 'habitual', a characterizing property of a subject which typically occurs and is imperfective with contingent modality. It is the 'habitual' that the weqatal expresses (KHAN 2021: 313-4).

That the order of the components in the fulfilment narrative differs from both the instruction speeches and, above all, from the order provided in the LXX may point towards some sort of editorial activity. Joosten (2016: 333-4) has already illustrated the later linguistic nature of the fulfilment narrative by singling out the expression אַחַת אֶל־אָחֹת (Exod. 36:10 (x2), 12, 13, 22), nowhere else attested in CBH but occurring in Ezek. 37:17, Job 41:8, and Qoh. 7:27, which replaces the classical idiom אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ (Exod. 26:3 (x2), 5, 6, 17) of the instruction speeches. This change occurs in the section on the tabernacle, which is transposed in the fulfilment narrative and is absent in the Greek translation of the latter. Notably, three instances of weqatal occur in this section. In 36:29-30 we find וְהָיוּ twice instead of wayyiqtol (Exod. 36:13; 37:9; 38:24, 27) or qatal in non-initial position (Exod. 37:9, 14, 17, 22, 25; 38:2; 39:9), both corresponding to the future-oriented weqatal found in the instruction speeches. The possibility that only these two verses present habitual actions set in the past should be rejected. It is likely that whoever wrote these two verses copied them from Exod. 26:24-25 without changing the forms. The weqatal, which referred to the future in the source text, had become the regular form to express a simple past action by the time this section was composed or edited. The scribe may have kept weqatal because it sounded natural to him. The occurrence of יִהְיוּ in v. 29, also taken from the source, does not agree with the time reference of the narrative, and may be a further indication of careless editorial work.[118] The Samaritan Pentateuch has in this case the linguistically correct form היו. Quite remarkably, also the source text (Exod. 26:24) seems to have been updated linguistically. The unusual occurrence of weyiqtol (וְיִהְיוּ) at the beginning may have crept into the text at a later stage when weyiqtol substituted weqatal for future actions (unless the form was influenced by the following יִהְיוּ, which is highly unlikely). It seems that

[118] Precisely because the form is preserved in the source text and because of the many philological problems that characterize the whole passage, I disagree with Hornkohl (2013: 288) who understands both weqatal and yiqtol as durative/continuous past actions in this and the following verse due to its frequency in geographic and architectural descriptions.

the earliest version of Exod. 26:24 is preserved in Exod. 36:29, which still has וְהָיוּ, although now referring to a past action. The occurrence of וְהָיוּ in v. 30 may be explained in the same way as יִהְיוּ in the previous verse, in this case as a transposition of the future-oriented weqatal that occurs in the source text of Exod. 26:25. Whoever composed the fulfilment account transcribed the weqatal form of the instruction speech and attributed a different meaning to the same form. However, its presence in v. 30 could also be the result of attraction and assimilation to weqatal of v. 29. Moreover, the Septuagint lacks this section.

Another instance of weqatal occurs in 36:1 (וְעָשָׂה), which belongs to the narrative, unparalleled in the instruction section that introduces the construction of the tabernacle. At the very beginning of the fulfilment section (Exod. 35:10) one finds weyiqtol (וְיַעֲשׂוּ) to express the future tense (with a jussive nuance), instead of the classical sequence יָבֹאוּ וְעָשׂוּ (cf. the Samaritan Pentateuch יבוא ועשה). Both weqatal in 36:1 and weyiqtol in 35:10 witness the late intervention of the scribes, with late secondary forms creeping into the text probably as the scribes updated and added new content to the fulfilment section.

As I have mentioned above, it has been argued, with particular reference to the forms occurring in Exod. 36:38; 38:28 (x2); 39:3, that weqatal may express actions that take place as multi-stage processes. Although Hornkohl provides parallels to Exodus, I am not persuaded that the weqatal can express lexical aspect. One should rather try to justify it from a pragmatic standpoint. However, it should also be observed that most of the passages listed by Hornkohl present textual issues that involve the verses where the verbs in question occur. My analysis aims at showing that there may be an alternative explanation, supported by text-critical elements, at least for some of the occurrences.

As for וְצִפָּה in Exod. 36:38, it occurs in a verse that corresponds to Exod. 26:37 and is considerably reworked when compared to the instruction speech. The first half of v. 38 is not

easy to interpret. One important difference between 36:38 and 26:37 is that the former lacks the verb at the beginning of the verse. Exod. 26:37, in fact, is introduced by וְעָשִׂיתָ, which, based on 26:36 // 36:37, we would expect to find in 36:38 as וַיַּעַשׂ. The absence of the verb leaves open the interpretation about the relationship of the first few words with what precedes and what follows. The expression וְאֶת־עַמּוּדָיו חֲמִשָּׁה וְאֶת־וָוֵיהֶם may thus be understood as the object of וַיַּעַשׂ of v. 37, or as a *casus pendens* that goes with what follows and is resumed by the pronominal suffix found in רָאשֵׁיהֶם, which refers to עַמּוּדָיו. If we adopt the latter option, the translation sounds as follows: 'as for its five columns and their nails/hooks, he overlaid their tops and their bars with gold and their five bases with bronze'. It should be observed that this would be the only instance of *casus pendens* in the architectural descriptions of Exodus, and it therefore stands out stylistically.[119] The second option consists in attaching וְאֶת־עַמּוּדָיו חֲמִשָּׁה וְאֶת־וָוֵיהֶם to what precedes in v. 37. This is linguistically more likely: there would be no *casus pendens*, and the presence of אֵת before עַמּוּדָיו and וָוֵיהֶם but not before מָסָךְ in v. 37 would align with the evidence that shows that the further away the object is from the verb, the higher the chances are that it will have the *nota accusativi* (BEKINS 2014: 121-8). In both cases, however, the meaning of v. 38 remains the same and, quite interestingly, it slightly differs from 26:36. In the instruction speech, in fact, both the columns and the nails/hooks are (probably entirely) overlaid with gold. In the fulfilment account, on the other hand, only the posts' tops (רָאשֵׁיהֶם) and bands (וַחֲשֻׁקֵיהֶם) are overlaid with gold. Nothing is said about the nails/hooks being overlaid with gold, as opposed to 26:36. Another feature that is unique to 36:38 is the mention of gold in relation to the bands. Nowhere else do we find this detail, and whenever the bands are mentioned (Exod. 27:10, 11; 38:10, 11, 12, 17, 19) they are made of silver.

The Greek text (occurring as 37:6) has a slightly different text:

[119] The only other instance occurs in 1 Kgs. 6:6.

καὶ τοὺς στύλους αὐτῶν πέντε καὶ τοὺς κρίκους καὶ τὰς κεφαλίδας αὐτῶν κατεχρύσωσαν χρυσίῳ, καὶ αἱ βάσεις αἱ πέντε χαλκαῖ.[120]

For one thing, there is no mention here of the bands (as in the instruction speech). As in MT, καὶ τοὺς στύλους αὐτῶν πέντε καὶ τοὺς κρίκους should be read with the previous verse (LE BOULLUEC AND SANDEVOIR 1989: 359). At this point, the Septuagint has a different word order, and τὰς κεφαλίδας αὐτῶν (= רָאשֵׁיהֶם) precedes κατεχρύσωσαν (= וְצִפָּה).[121] The *Vorlage* of the Septuagint in 36:38b would thus read וראשיהם צפה זהב ואדניהם חמשה נחשת. The object may have been fronted to emphasize the fact that the posts were overlaid with gold (as the instruction seemed to imply), specifically only in their tops. If we adopt the LXX reading, then no weqatal was used in the early stage of the text. Finally, although not mandatory, if וְצִפָּה does indeed express a multi-stage process, one could have expected more weqatals of this verb in the fulfilment account.[122] However, the verb always occurs as wayyiqtol (Exod. 36:34, 36; 37:2, 4, 11, 15, 26, 28; 38:2, 6) and once as qatal (Exod. 36:34).[123]

As for Exodus 39:3, where וְקִצֵּץ occurs, this verse has no correspondence in the instruction speeches, contrary to vv. 2 and 4 (cf. Exod. 28:6-7). Moreover, no corresponding verb occurs in this position in the Septuagint, which reads καὶ ἐτμήθη τὰ πέταλα τοῦ χρυσίου τρίχες. Although it is possible that קִצֵּץ lies behind ἐτμήθη, surely there is only one verb in the LXX rather than the two preserved in MT. It should also be observed that וְקִצֵּץ does not agree in

[120] Note that the Greek has τοὺς στύλους αὐτῶν instead of τοὺς στύλους αὐτοῦ (referred to τὸ καταπέτασμα of the previous verse) and lacks αὐτῶν after τοὺς κρίκους.

[121] In the Greek text the verbs are generally in the plural because more than one person was involved in the works (cf. Exod. 36:1).

[122] Above all, in the light of the fact that the verb צִפָּה always occurs after עָשָׂה, which, contrary to the supposed multi-stage process described by the former, indicates a more general action.

[123] The occurrence in Exod. 38:28 is discussed below.

number with the first verb of the verse וַיִּרְקְעוּ (the Samaritan Pentateuch has וקצצו, the Peshitta ܘܦܨܨܘ, and the Targum וְקַצִּיצוּ). Again, I consider וְקִצֵּץ the result of late scribal intervention.

Interestingly enough, the occurrences of וְצִפָּה and וְחִשַּׁק in Exod. 38:28 are probably caused by attraction to the preceding עָשָׂה, as regularly attested in CBH. The syntax of the verse presents no awkward linguistic features, and the Septuagint agrees here with MT, further confirming the genuine style and grammar of the Hebrew text.

As a final remark, it is interesting to observe that neither the instruction speeches nor the narrative fulfilment employ the preposition עִם 'with', which occurs 49 times in Exodus. The fact that only the variant אֵת is used (Exod. 25:2, 3, 22; 27:21; 28:1, 41; 29:21 (x2), 28 (x2); 30:16; 31:6, 18; 35:5, 23, 24; 38:23), and only in 25:3 // 35:5 in a parallel passage, may point to the 6th or early 5th century as *terminus ante quem* for the composition or edition of the fulfilment narrative. The use of אֵת, however present in the source text, in fact, does not reflect that of the literary works of the Persian or Hellenistic periods. Rather, typically late features only seldom crop up in these chapters, often where there are textual mishaps.

The double occurrence of the pronominal suffix attached to the verb (וַיְצַפֵּהוּ in Exod. 37:2; וַיִּתְּנֻם in Exod. 39:20) where the source text has the object marker (וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ in Exod. 25:11; וְנָתַתָּה אֹתָם in Exod. 28:27), in the absence of examples that go in the opposite direction, may be a further hint that confirms the relative dating of the two texts. Admittedly, also the source text presents a linguistic feature (besides the above-mentioned weyiqtol occurring in Exod. 26:24) that gains wider currency in later times and occurs in Exod. 26:29 (טַבָּעֹתֵיהֶם), as opposed to the typologically older טַבְּעֹתָם in Exod. 36:34.[124]

[124] This morphological feature is discussed below.

JOSHUA 22:3

לֹא־עֲזַבְתֶּם אֶת־אֲחֵיכֶם זֶה יָמִים רַבִּים עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־מִשְׁמֶרֶת מִצְוַת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃

The verb וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם is listed both in GKC §112ss and by Hornkohl as potential further example of habitual action set in the past. While this is entirely possible, the weqatal may have been triggered by the preceding qatal. Furthermore, it should be noted that the LXX has ἐφυλάξασθε without καὶ and takes עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה (ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας in Greek) with what follows. This could nonetheless represent a secondary, Greek interpretation of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In sum, even if weqatal is here original and expresses a continuous action in the past, I would not consider it an anomalous form comparable to the occurrences of Genesis and Exodus discussed above, nor to those analysed below, because of the presence of לֹא־עֲזַבְתֶּם.

JUDGES 3:23

וַיֵּצֵא אֵהוּד הַמִּסְדְּרוֹנָה וַיִּסְגֹּר דַּלְתוֹת הָעֲלִיָּה בַּעֲדוֹ וְנָעָל׃

2 SAMUEL 13:18

וְעָלֶיהָ כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים כִּי כֵן תִּלְבַּשְׁן בְּנוֹת־הַמֶּלֶךְ הַבְּתוּלֹת מְעִילִים וַיֹּצֵא אוֹתָהּ מְשָׁרְתוֹ הַחוּץ וְנָעַל הַדֶּלֶת אַחֲרֶיהָ׃

Both occurrences of weqatal may look puzzling, as they appear after (a series of) wayyiqtols. As for 2 Sam. 13:18, the form may have been vocalized as a weqatal instead of an infinitive absolute, which occurs in v. 17 (וּנְעָל). We would then have a wayyiqtol – infinitive absolute sequence, as in Gen. 41:43; Exod. 8:11; Judg. 7:19; Jer. 37:21; Neh. 8:8; 1 Chr. 16:36; 2 Chr. 7:3 (GKC §113z). However, this emendation may not be necessary. While it is true that locking a door is not as instantaneous or generic an action as shutting or closing it,[125] the lexical aspect should not be confused with the grammatical aspect. I do not believe that the weqatal is here employed to express a multi-stage process. The occurrence in Judg. 3:23 is similar to other sequences of wayyiqtols ended with a weqatal that marks the climactic/pivotal event (LONGACRE 1994: 71-84). This is very similar to what we see in Akkadian when a series of preterits is capped off with a perfect. The weqatal expressing climax may in fact be the imperfective habitual weqatal exploited to express lack of advance on the narrative line, as happens in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic narrative. It is therefore explained as a pragmatic device.

JUDGES 7:13

וַיָּבֹא גִדְעוֹן וְהִנֵּה־אִישׁ מְסַפֵּר לְרֵעֵהוּ חֲלוֹם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה חָלוֹם חָלַמְתִּי וְהִנֵּה צְלִיל לֶחֶם שְׂעֹרִים מִתְהַפֵּךְ בְּמַחֲנֵה מִדְיָן

וַיָּבֹא עַד־הָאֹהֶל וַיַּכֵּהוּ וַיִּפֹּל וַיַּהַפְכֵהוּ לְמַעְלָה וְנָפַל הָאֹהֶל׃

[125] For an overview of how locks and key worked in Egypt and Mesopotamia, along with a couple of detailed case studies see Potts 1990: 185-92.

Moore (1918: 207) lists a series of Greek manuscripts that lack the Greek καὶ ἔπεσεν ἡ σκηνή and considers וְנָפַל הָאֹהֶל a gloss. Also BHS marks וְנָפַל הָאֹהֶל as secondary and proposes to omit it. The tent is already said to fall (וַיִּפֹּל), and the addition of the explanatory gloss וְנָפַל הָאֹהֶל may have been felt necessary to underline that the subject of וַיִּפֹּל is the tent and not the צְלֹוחֶם as with the preceding וַיַּכֵּהוּ and the following וַיַּהַפְכֵהוּ, where the tent is the object instead. On the other hand, in BHQ it is observed that the clumsy style and syntax of the Hebrew is due to the fact that this is a dream account. I agree that וְנָפַל הָאֹהֶל should be understood as a late gloss, thus explaining the use of weqatal.

1 Samuel 1:12

וְהָיָה כִּי הִרְבְּתָה לְהִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְעֵלִי שֹׁמֵר אֶת־פִּיהָ׃

1 Samuel 1 attests a series of textual divergences between MT, the LXX, and 4QSam[a], with the latter two mostly aligned against MT (Hutzli 2007; Aejmelaeus 2012: 1-17; Hornkohl 2014: 465-77; Friesen 2015: 649-53).[126] According to Aejmelaeus, MT presents in this chapter, as well as in the rest of the book, both corruptions and corrections. In her analysis, she identifies many instances of textual growth and adaptations that took place in MT, probably as late as the 1st century BCE. The occurrence of וְהָיָה in 1:12 instead of the classical וַיְהִי appears after a verse (v. 11) that was rather heavily reworked in MT in order to reframe Hannah's role in Samuel's calling. Both the LXX and 4QSam[a] preserve a longer version of v. 11, where more details about the Nazirite vow are mentioned. It may therefore be that וְהָיָה crept into the text

[126] For a more detailed linguistic and text-critical analysis of MT 1 Sam. 1 see the section on הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי.

when the whole section underwent revision in MT. Unfortunately, both 4QSam[a] (which only preserves the first ו in v. 12) and the LXX (which has καὶ ἐγενήθη) are of no help in this specific case, and linguistic updating can only be surmised on the bases of the late linguistic traits that characterise the editorial activity that permeates 1 Samuel 1. Nevertheless, this chapter has multiple linguistic features that indicate both late editorial activity and the less than desirable care with which MT was handed down, which would also explain the occurrence of וְהָיָה in 1:12.

1 Samuel 17

There are three occurrences of weqatal used for past actions in this chapter.

1 Sam. 17:20

וַיַּשְׁכֵּם דָּוִד בַּבֹּקֶר וַיִּטֹּשׁ אֶת־הַצֹּאן עַל־שֹׁמֵר וַיִּשָּׂא וַיֵּלֶךְ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּהוּ יִשַׁי וַיָּבֹא הַמַּעְגָּלָה וְהַחַיִל הַיֹּצֵא אֶל־הַמַּעֲרָכָה וְהֵרָעוּ בַּמִּלְחָמָה׃

1 Sam. 17: 38

וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ שָׁאוּל אֶת־דָּוִד מַדָּיו וְנָתַן קוֹבַע נְחֹשֶׁת עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ שִׁרְיֹן׃

1 Sam. 17:48

וְהָיָה כִּי־קָם הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּקְרַב לִקְרַאת דָּוִד וַיְמַהֵר דָּוִד וַיָּרָץ הַמַּעֲרָכָה לִקְרַאת הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי׃

The episode of David and Goliath is probably the most outstanding example of the existence of two versions of the same story among the ancient witnesses of the book of Samuel. As it is well known, a major portion of the text found in MT (17:12-31) is absent in the Old Greek

translation, along with other shorter paragraphs. I will refrain from giving a detailed analysis of the differences between the two versions, as there are already extensive treatments of this topic (see for instance BARTHÉLEMY, GOODING, LUST, and TOV 1986). Suffice it to say that I agree with those scholars who argue in favour of the priority of the now lost Hebrew *Vorlage* that lay behind the shorter version preserved in the Old Greek. The account that has been handed down in the MT shows, it seems, a series of textual and linguistic asperities that support the view that the whole passage is the product of a later hand that put much effort in reworking the expanded story into a coherent whole. However, the signs of editorial activity still emerge in some details. For instance, the demonstrative הַזֶּה in 17:12 is a secondary addition that has the function of creating a link between the introduction of David into the story and his presence in the episodes of chapter 16. Yet, the attempt to stitch together two different sources and weave one into the other results in a clunky style flawed with an ungrammatical form.[127] Besides the repetition of הָלַךְ in v. 13 (וַיֵּלְכוּ..הָלְכָה), most likely a scribal mistake (DRIVER 1890: 109), there may be a series of linguistic features that are best described as non-classical or, at least, more frequently attested in later chronolects. The language of the additions, as well as that of the entire episode, is classical, but some unusual elements crop up, nonetheless. The occurrence of וְהֵרֵעוּ in v. 20 is one of these. The syntax of the last part of the verse does not seem to be correct, and the article before יֹצֵא is out of place in what should be a circumstantial clause. The article is probably a scribal mistake that was generated because of the preceding הַחַיִל. Once the article is removed, the form may be either a participle or a qatal. A circumstantial clause with a qatal, if it describes an action that requires more than one verb, is usually followed by a wayyiqtol carrying on the flashback action expressed by the qatal.[128] In our passage, this would mean that

[127] The awkwardness is perceived by the versions. The Peshitta changes the demonstrative into ܗܳܐ, whereas the Vulgate expands the text to better explain the function of the demonstrative (*de quo supra dictum est*).

[128] Cf. Gen. 39:1; Josh. 2:6; Judg. 1:16; 6:33; 1 Sam. 5:1; 17:2; 30:1-3; 2 Sam. 5:17-19; 18:18; 1 Kgs. 9:16; 2 Kgs. 2:7; 4:31; 5:2; Jonah 1:5.

the army had just gone out and raised a war cry. The usual wayyiqtol is substituted with a weqatal. However, it is more likely that יֹצֵא is a participle describing an action concomitant to David's arrival to the encampment. Not infrequently, a circumstantial clause with a participle is followed by a wayyiqtol that falls within the same temporal frame of the previous verb form, as we read in Gen. 23:10; Josh. 4:10; Judg. 20:28; 1 Sam. 6:13; 2 Sam. 18:24; 20:12; 1 Kgs. 1:5; 13:11; 2 Kgs. 2:23; 4:38; 6:32; 9:7 (JOOSTEN 2012: 128-9). This classical sequence is reshaped in 1 Sam. 17:20 into a participle – weqatal sequence. It expresses the same meaning, but the weqatal has substituted the wayyiqtol.

Quite interestingly, although occurring in sections that probably belonged to the older layer of 1 Samuel 17-18, both weqatal forms used in vv. 38 (וְנָתַן) and 48 (וְהָיָה) are not reflected in the Old Greek version. As for the former, וְנָתַן occurs only in MT and was perhaps added because לָבַשׁ more often refers to clothes.[129] Isa. 59:17 may be referring to this passage from Samuel, and it does not seem to use a source text that has וְנָתַן. In 1 Sam. 17:5, one finds the more frequent כּוֹבַע 'helmet'. The variant קוֹבַע is attested only in v. 38 and in Ezek. 23:24 and may have crept into the text of Samuel when it was revised and וְנָתַן was also added. It is unlikely that the same scribe would use כּוֹבַע in v. 5 and קוֹבַע in v. 38, both describing actions that mirror each other. As for the last part of v. 38 (וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ שִׁרְיוֹן), it seems to be known by II Isaiah, and although Codex Vaticanus lacks it, Josephus *Ant*. VI 184 (καὶ περιθεὶς αὐτῷ τὸν αὐτοῦ θώρακα), the Vetus Latina (*vestivit eum lorica*), and the Armenian (եւ ագոյց նմա զրահս /yev agujts' nma ᵊzrahs/) have it, which may point to its being part of the older layer of the Greek version.

[129] The Antiochene text has here ἐπέθηκεν, which lies behind the Ethiopic ወደየ and the Georgian დაადგა /daadga/.

The weqatal occurring in v. 48 (וְהָיָה) also stands out, as one would expect וַיְהִי. It has no equivalent in the Old Greek, which always translates literally both וַיְהִי כִּי and וְהָיָה כִּי (cf. 1 Sam. 1:12; 10:7; 25:30; 2 Sam. 7:1; 19:26) despite the ungrammatical nature of the syntax in Greek.[130] The verse is much shorter in OG, and, if retroverted, its Hebrew *Vorlage* could have been ויקם הפלשתי וילך לקראת דוד.[131] The addition found in MT may belong to the same version of the story found also in v. 42 (absent from OG), of which v. 48b could constitute the continuation.[132]

1 Samuel 24:11

הִנֵּה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה רָאוּ עֵינֶיךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־נְתָנְךָ יְהוָה ו הַיּוֹם ו בְּיָדִי בַּמְּעָרָה וְאָמַר לַהֲרָגֶךָ וַתָּחָס עָלֶיךָ וָאֹמַר לֹא־אֶשְׁלַח יָדִי בַּאדֹנִי כִּי־מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה הוּא׃

In this verse we find a וְאָמַר that may have been triggered by the two previous qatals רָאוּ and נְתָנְךָ. According to MT, it is God who tells David to kill Saul. However, the versions do not agree with MT and the weqatal may be secondary. According to the Vulgate (*et cogitavi*), the verb should be read as the following וָאֹמַר: David first admits he was planning to kill Saul, but then has pity on him and changes his mind. The Targum (וְאָמְרוּ אָחָרָנִין) and the Peshitta (ܐܡܪ

[130] As for 2 Sam. 6:13 OG, the verse in MT presents textual problems.

[131] The occurrence of ዝክቱ ‘this’ before ኢሎፍላዊ (a transliteration of ἀλλόφυλος) is secondary and belongs to the Ethiopic textual tradition. It was probably added by a later scribe because of the previous occurrences of the demonstrative adjective with reference to Goliath (cf. vv. 26, 32, 33, 36, 37). However, these occur in direct speech, and they are all consistently translated into Ethiopic as ዝንቱ, not ዝክቱ.

[132] There are further possible linguistic features that point to an exilic or early post-exilic period for the edition of the expanded text of MT, which cannot be treated here for lack of space.

ואמר(ו) (or ויאמר(ו)) as referring to someone other than David. Finally, the LXX has οὐκ ἠβουλήθην, which can be retroverted into Hebrew as ולא אמאן (DRIVER 1890: 151).

1 SAMUEL 25:20

וְהָיָה הֵיא ׀ רֹכֶבֶת עַל־הַחֲמֹור וְיֹרֶדֶת בְּסֵתֶר הָהָר וְהִנֵּה דָוִד וַאֲנָשָׁיו יֹרְדִים לִקְרָאתָהּ וַתִּפְגַּשׁ אֹתָם׃

2 SAMUEL 6:16

וְהָיָה אֲרוֹן יְהוָה בָּא עִיר דָּוִד וּמִיכַל בַּת־שָׁאוּל נִשְׁקְפָה ׀ בְּעַד הַחַלּוֹן וַתֵּרֶא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד מְפַזֵּז וּמְכַרְכֵּר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַתִּבֶז לוֹ בְּלִבָּהּ׃

These verses can be treated together, as they are introduced by וְהָיָה (instead of the expected וַיְהִי) followed by participle. In both cases, the evidence from the Septuagint does not show whether behind ἐγενήθη or ἐγένετο stood a *Vorlage* with וַיְהִי. Luckily, 4QSam[a] is fragmentarily preserved in 2 Sam. 6:16, where the verse is introduced by the classical ויהי, a reading most certainly preferable to that of MT. The parallel passage in 1 Chr. 15:29 also has וַיְהִי, which probably occurred in the source text of the Chronicler. It is reasonable to infer that 2 Sam. 6:16 originally had a circumstantial clause expressed with the participle and introduced by וַיְהִי, a classical construction that was lost after the exile and was later misunderstood both by the Chronicler (cf. 2 Kgs. 8:21 // 2 Chr. 21:9) and the translators of the LXX (cf. 1 Sam. 7:10),

who took it as periphrastic forms to express a continuous action (JOOSTEN 2009).[133] This late understanding of וַיְהִי + participle may be behind the shift to וְהָיָה, given the widespread use of הָיָה + participle for the imperfective aspect.

Although there is no textual evidence for וַיְהִי in 1 Sam. 25:20, one may posit a process analogous to that suggested for 2 Sam. 6:16. However, in this case וְהָיָה does not agree in gender with הָיָא ו רֹכֶבֶת and it functions like the classical construction with וַיְהִי + circumstantial clause. The text may have simply been linguistically updated through the substitution of וַיְהִי with the more common וְהָיָה.

It should be mentioned that also 1 Sam. 10:9 is introduced by וְהָיָה instead of וַיְהִי. The textual tradition does not seem to point to any corruption. However, on the bases of what has been said with regards to the other occurrences of unexpected וְהָיָה for וַיְהִי, the former may have replaced the latter also in this passage.

2 SAMUEL 12:31

וְאֶת־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ הוֹצִיא וַיָּשֶׂם בַּמְּגֵרָה וּבַחֲרִצֵי הַבַּרְזֶל וּבְמַגְזֵרֹת הַבַּרְזֶל וְהָעֱבֶיר אוֹתָם בַּמַּלְבֵּן וְכֵן יַעֲשֶׂה לְכֹל עָרֵי
בְנֵי־עַמּוֹן וַיָּשָׁב דָּוִד וְכָל־הָעָם יְרוּשָׁלָ͏ִם׃

Weqatal וְהָעֱבֶיר occurs in a verse that contains textual problems and belongs to a controversial episode. For one thing, the verb וַיָּשֶׂם ‘and he placed’ does not seem to belong to the original narrative. LXX^{L} text has here διέπρισεν ‘he sawed asunder’, which is also supported by the Vetus Latina *secaverunt* (or *serraverunt* in one witness) and by 1 Chr. 20:3 וַיְשַׂר (from שור ‘to

[133] This type of clause is treated in Chapter 3.

saw apart').[134] Quite interestingly, Jerome's Vulgate also adopts this reading and has *serravit*, whereas the καίγε revision (ἔθηκεν) agrees with MT.[135] As for the Targum, the evidence may look ambiguous at first sight. It has here the verb מְסַר, which is used elsewhere in Samuel only twice to translate שִׂים (1 Sam. 19:5; 28:21), both times in the same expression. The translator of Samuel usually employs שַׁוִי to render שִׂים, less often מַנִי, and twice קַיֵים.[136] In the light of the translation technique of the Targum of Samuel, the occurrence of מְסַר in 2 Sam. 12:31 is surprising and unexpected. However, this choice may have been dictated by the immediately following מְסָרִין 'saws', and מְסַר here would therefore mean 'to saw' (cf. 1 Kgs. 7:9, where the expression מְמַסְרָן בְּמַסָרִין occurs for the Hebrew מְגֹרָרוֹת בַּמְּגֵרָה) and not 'to deliver, pass on'.[137] The Targum has thus preserved a proto-Masoretic reading. To this very same tradition attested in the Targum, in the Vulgate, in the *Vorlage* of the Lucianic text, and in the source of the book of Chronicles is to be ascribed also Josephus, who affirms in *Ant.* VII, 7:5 that David tortured (αἰκισάμενος) and killed (διέφθειρε) the Ammonites. Based on the evidence provided by the textual witnesses, and because וַיָּשֶׂם is *lectio facilior*, the reading preserved in Chronicles (וַיָּשַׂר) is to be preferred. This change did not happen by accident but was introduced into the text by

[134] The Georgian version agrees with this reading and has განხერხნა /gankherkhna/ 'he sawed apart'. As for the Armenian, the translation արկ /ark/ 'he threw' betrays a dependency on the reading found in the Peshitta ܫܕܪ. The Syriac translation arguably derives from the adjacent word מְגֵרָה and its similarity with the verb מָגַר 'to throw' occurring in Ps. 89:45 (and maybe Ezek 21:17).

[135] The Ethiopic, which is a good witness to καίγε, has ወአንበሮሙ· 'and he placed them'.

[136] For שַׁוִי see 1 Sam. 6:8, 11, 15; 7:12; 9:20, 23, 24 (x2); 11:2; 17:40, 54; 19:13 (x2); 21:7, 13; 22:15; 25:18, 25; 28:2, 22; 30:25; 31:10; 2 Sam. 7:10, 23; 12:20; 13:19, 33; 14:3, 7, 19; 18:3 (x2); 19:20. For מַנִי see 1 Sam. 8:1, 5, 11, 12; 10:19; 11:11; 15:2; 18:5, 13; 22:7; 2 Sam. 8:6, 14 (x2), 13:32 (?); 15:4; 17:25; 18:1; 23:23. For קַיֵים see 1 Sam. 2:20; 2 Sam. 23:5.

[137] For this meaning see also Isa. 44:13 and 1 Chr. 20:3.

a scribe and it seems to have still occurred at a late stage of the proto-Masoretic tradition.[138] There are two further elements that point towards the direction of an intentional change.

In v. 30, מַלְכָּם is vocalised as 'their king', without an antecedent for the suffix pronoun. However, as Μολχόλ in the καίγε version and in LXX 1 Chr. 20:2 suggests, one should rather see here the god Milkom. This same interpretation is also found in the Talmud (AvodZ. 44a) and in Rashi. According to a later revision, David was made to wear the Ammonites' king's crown rather than the crown that once sat on the head of the statue of the god Milkom, in order to avoid any ambiguous relationship between the Israelite king and potentially idolatrous practices. The same ideological revision took place also in v. 31, where the *ketiv* בַּמַּלְכֻּן occurs. The qᵊre מַלְבֵּן 'brick mould' (cf. Arabic ملبن and Syriac ܡܠܒܢ for the same meaning) is generally preferred to it, on the grounds that confusing ב with כ is a fairly common mistake due to the similarity of the two letters in the square script. Furthermore, all the witnesses either preserve a reading corresponding to the Hebrew qᵊre (καίγε: πλινθεῖον; Armenian: ադիւսով /aġwuisov/; Ethiopic: ጸልንትያ; Vulgate: *in typo laterum*; Peshitta: ܠܒܢܐ; Targum שׁוּקָיָא – ? –) or the result of mistaken transliteration of the Hebrew (Old Greek: Μαδεββά; Georgian: მადიბადს /madibads/), which nonetheless goes back to the reading preserved in the qᵊre (cf. the presence of β / ბ). The reading מַלְכֵּן may have thus been generated under the influence of מַלְכָּם in the previous verse. Along with the qᵊre מַלְבֵּן goes also the proposed and generally accepted emendation of the verb וְהֶעֱבִיר into וְהֶעֱבִיד, nowhere attested among the witnesses. According to this reconstruction, therefore, David wore the crown of the Ammonite king and subjugated his enemies, employing them as workmen in building projects. However, there is also another possible reading of the passage couched in an earlier, possibly original, layer of this text. King

[138] According to McCarter (1984: 311), the fact that וַיָּשֶׂם is not followed by אוֹתָם like וְהֶעֱבִיר means that David did not saw apart the people. However, the object is fronted, and it is the people of the city whom he made come out (וְאֶת־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ הוֹצִיא).

David wears the crown that was on the statue of the god מִלְכֹּם, in a powerful act of dispossession, and then slaughters the Ammonites. Some he saws asunder, as the textual witnesses make clear, and some others he lets pass through the fire where the statue of מִלְכֹּם was (or in the furnace, if we accept the qᵊre), thus imitating the practice of child sacrifice. This last point is suggested by the occurrence of הֶעֱבִיר, the object אוֹתָם, and בְּמַלְכֵּן, possibly a misspelled relic of an earlier מִלְכֹּם. Given that וַיָּשֶׂם is a secondary reading, and torture is rather being described, and because הֶעֱבִיד is never attested in the textual tradition of this passage, it makes good sense to imagine that David, the 'newly-crowned Milkom', is now replicating the Ammonites' sacrificial practices to punish his enemies. Quite interestingly, this bit is omitted in Chronicles, whose author may have found this piece of information dismaying and shameful. Similarly, Josephus does not linger on the details of David's slaughter.[139]

It seems that this verse underwent a double revision: at first, around the time the book of Chronicles was written, the episode about David's abominable practice was changed (or even omitted in parallel accounts such as that of Chronicles) and reframed as the widespread custom of employing defeated enemies in large scale construction projects. Later, and only within the Masoretic tradition, also the first heinous crime was removed from the text, aligning the meaning with what followed. At the end of the process, the figure of king David was completely whitewashed and redeemed from the accusations of genocide and idolatrous practices. Although my proposed reconstruction of the earliest layer of the text has some points that are more speculative than others, there is no doubt that this verse underwent revision in MT. During this process of revision, it is not impossible that an original וַיַּעֲבֵר underwent linguistic updating and was changed into וְהֶעֱבִיר. However, the weqatal may also be justified if it has the same habitual meaning as the following יַעֲשֶׂה.

[139] For a thorough discussion of the text-critical issues in this verse see Driver 1890: 226-9.

2 SAMUEL 16:13

וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד וַאֲנָשָׁיו בַּדָּרֶךְ ס וְשִׁמְעִי הֹלֵךְ בְּצַלַע הָהָר לְעֻמָּתוֹ הָלוֹךְ וְקַל�ֵּל וְיַסֵּקֵל בָּאֲבָנִים לְעֻמָּתוֹ וְעַפַּר בֶּעָפָר׃

The pisqa be-emtsa pasuq may point to the fact that the second half of this verse was added at a later stage, yet not late enough to be absent from the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek (TREBOLLE BARRERA 2012). In fact, this snippet both repeats and expands vv. 5-6 by adding a couple of details, such as the precise location and the throwing of dust. In vv. 5-6 it is already stated that Shimei comes out cursing David and throwing stones at him and at his men. Without the later addition, the text flows smoothly from v. 13a to v. 14.

The syntax of v. 13 stands out, in that it presents a wayyiqtol (וַיְקַלֵּל) after הָלוֹךְ instead of the expected infinitive absolute (וְקַלֵּל). As a rule, in fact, when the infinitive absolute of הָלַךְ is coordinated with another verb to convey the image of a repeated action, the latter also occurs in the infinitive absolute.[140] The second element can also be a stative or an adjective.[141] As Driver (1890: 247) points out, in Samuel there are two further exceptional occurrences where the infinitive absolute הָלוֹךְ is not followed by another infinitive absolute to express a repetitive action: וַיֵּלֶךְ הָלוֹךְ וַיִּתְנַבֵּא in 1 Sam. 19:23 and וַתֵּלֶךְ הָלוֹךְ וְזָעֲקָה in 2 Sam. 13:19. Beside the three outstanding occurrences of Samuel, there are in the Hebrew Bible two more instances of הָלוֹךְ

[140] Cf. Gen. 8:3 (הָלוֹךְ וָשׁוֹב), 5 (הָלוֹךְ וְחָסוֹר); 12:9 (הָלוֹךְ וְנָסוֹעַ); Josh. 6:9 (הָלוֹךְ וְתָקוֹעַ); Judg. 14:9 (הָלוֹךְ וְאֹכֵל); 1 Sam. 6:12 (הָלֹךְ וְגָעוֹ); 2 Sam. 3:16 (הָלוֹךְ וּבָכָה); 2 Kgs. 2:11 (הָלוֹךְ וְדַבֵּר); Isa. 3:16 (הָלוֹךְ וְטָפֹּף); Jer. 50:4 (הָלוֹךְ וּבָכוֹ); Ps. 126:6 (הָלוֹךְ..וּבָכֹה).

[141] Cf. Gen. 26:13 (הָלוֹךְ וְגָדֵל); Judg. 4:24 (הָלוֹךְ וְקָשֶׁה); 1 Sam. 14:19 (הָלוֹךְ וְרַב); 2 Sam. 5:10 (הָלוֹךְ וְגָדוֹל); 18:25 (הָלוֹךְ וְקָרֵב); Isa. 20:2 (הָלֹךְ עָרוֹם וְיָחֵף); 1 Chr. 11:9 (הָלוֹךְ וְגָדוֹל).

not coordinated with another infinitive absolute. Josh. 6:13 has הַֽהֹלְכִ֥ים הָל֖וֹךְ וְתָקָֽעוּ, which almost certainly represents a graphic mistake caused by metathesis, given that in v. 9 we find the regular הָל֥וֹךְ וְתָקֹ֖ועַ. Jer. 41:6 has הֹלֵ֥ךְ הָלֹ֖ךְ וּבֹכֶ֑ה, the only case where a participle follows הָלוֹךְ. Although without הָלוֹךְ, to this list could also be added יָצֹ֥א יָצָ֖א וּמְקַלֵּֽל from 2 Sam. 16:5, where the infinitive absolute יָצֹא is followed by a participle. Because the occurrence in Joshua is the result of metathesis and the occurrence in Jeremiah can easily be explained as a non-classical construction due to the time of the composition of the book, we are left with four possibly unusual passages, all occurring in Samuel. This may be a further element that speaks both to the low accuracy with which the text was copied and handed down and to what extent the scribes intervened to modify the text. The occurrence in 2 Sam. 16:5, where יָצֹא is followed by a participle has the same construction as in Jeremiah, which confirms the non-classical (maybe vernacular or dialectal) character of the construction, be it original or a later addition in Samuel (the occurrence in Joshua, which I believe is a secondary change, may have originated in the exilic or post-exilic period). As for הָלוֹךְ וְזָעֲקָה in 2 Sam. 13:19, the versions have two participles (OG: πορευομένη καί βοώσα; καίγε: πορευομένη καὶ κράζουσα; Peshitta: ܗܐܟܢܐ ܡܙܥܩܬ; Vulgate: *ingrediens et clamans*), which could simply be a stylistic choice to render the Hebrew. However, the Targum has an infinitive absolute followed by a participle (מֵיזַל וְצָוְחָא). The fact that no version presents a past tense for וְזָעֲקָה, most importantly the Targum that seems to reproduce isomorphically its *Vorlage*, may indicate that the second verb was a participle, and therefore the construction would be identical to those found in 2 Sam. 16:5 and Jer. 41:6. As for the two wayyiqtols in 1 Sam. 19:23 and 2 Sam. 16:13, they are as hard to explain and maybe impossible to dismiss as mistaken or late forms. LXX^{B} translates וַיֵּ֥לֶךְ הָל֖וֹךְ וַיִּתְנַבֵּֽא in 1 Sam. 19:23 as καὶ ἐπορεύετο προφητεύων, which may point toward a slightly different *Vorlage*. As we have seen above, 2 Sam. 16:13b is probably a later addition, almost an exact copy of part of vv. 5b-6a (וּשְׁמֹ֣ו שִׁמְעִ֣י בֶן־גֵּרָ֗א יֹצֵ֤א יָצֹא֙ וּמְקַלֵּ֔ל וְיסַקֵּ֥ל בָּאֲבָנִ֖ים). It may

be that when this part of the text was transposed and repeated in v. 13, the מ of the participle מְקַלֵּל was mistakenly transcribed as י due to their similarity (to a certain extent) in paleo-Hebrew script, thus giving origin to the awkward wayyiqtol וַיְקַלֵּל. However, given that v. 13b is, possibly, a late addition, the wayyiqtol could also be explained as hailing from the hand of a scribe that spoke a Hebrew chronolect in which the הָלוֹךְ + infinite absolute construction was no longer productive.

The final part of v. 13 consists of a detail not contained in vv. 5-6. The form וְעִפַּר either has a habitual meaning or it expresses a simple past action. The late textual features of this verse would thus explain the use of weqatal rather than wayyiqtol if the latter option is adopted. Nevertheless, a habitual meaning would be justified by the preceding construction with הָלוֹךְ.

2 Samuel 19:18-19

וְאֶלֶף אִישׁ עִמּוֹ מִבִּנְיָמִן וְצִיבָא נַעַר בֵּית שָׁאוּל וַחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר בָּנָיו וְעֶשְׂרִים עֲבָדָיו אִתּוֹ וְצָלְחוּ הַיַּרְדֵּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ׃

וְעָבְרָה הָעֲבָרָה לַעֲבִיר אֶת־בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינָו וְשִׁמְעִי בֶן־גֵּרָא נָפַל לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּעָבְרוֹ בַּיַּרְדֵּן׃

The first thing to say with regards to v. 18 is that the first four words (וְאֶלֶף אִישׁ עִמּוֹ מִבִּנְיָמִן) go with the preceding verse (McCarter 1984: 416). As for the two weqatals, they have puzzled generations of commentators and various solutions have been proposed with regards to their meaning (Driver 1890: 257-8). The verb צָלַח should probably be translated as ‘to wade through, penetrate’ based on Aramaic צְלַח ‘to split’ (McCarter 1984: 420).[142] Weqatal is

[142] Aramaic צְלַח occurs in the Targums, e.g., Ps. 136:13; 1 Chr. 2:54; 11:18. The occurrence in 1 Chr. 11:18 is particularly interesting: וצלחו להון אורחא במשרית פלשתאי ‘they found a way through the Philistine camp’.

unexpected, and it has therefore been hypothesised that the -ו may have arisen through dittography from the preceding אִתּוֹ (WELLHAUSEN 1871: 204). Tsumura (2007: 46-8), who takes MT at face value, treats the syntax as an instance the 'unusual topicalization' that seems to characterize the book(s) of Samuel. Most of the occurrences appear with a wayyiqtol preceded by a topicalized noun (which may or may not be introduced by וַיְהִי),[143] some others with weqatal.[144] There is even one occurrence with a jussive.[145] The occurrences with weqatal are the most problematic and, in fact, a text-critical analysis shows that they are secondary additions.

As for the instances with wayyiqtol, the occurrence of 1 Sam. 14:19, however cumbersome the syntax may look, does not present any serious linguistic difficulty. 1 Sam. 17:24 has already been discussed: the form occurs in the long edition of the David and Goliath story, which represents a later stage than that attested in the Septuagint and therefore has more late linguistic features.

In 2 Sam. 19:41 the wayyiqtol is present as ketiv ויעברו, whereas the qᵊre הֶעֱבִירוּ is supported by the Targum (אַעבַרוּ), which otherwise isomorphically translates MT in the occurrences where the topicalized noun is introduced by וַיְהִי.

2 Sam. 20:14 is a troubled text: אָבֵלָה וּבֵית מַעֲכָה should probably be emended into אָבֵלָה בֵית מַעֲכָה (cf. v. 15) and וְכָל־הַבֵּרִים into וְכָל־הַבִּכְרִים, in the light of ἐν Χαρρεί in the Septuagint and the frequent reference to שֶׁבַע בֶּן־בִּכְרִי in ch. 20 (DRIVER 1890: 264; MCCARTER 1984: 428). The *setumah* marker in the midst of the verse may point to the independent origin of the two parts

[143] With וַיְהִי cf. 1 Sam. 10:11; 11:11; 2 Sam. 2:23. Tsumura also refers to Num. 9:6. Without וַיְהִי cf. 1 Sam. 14:19; 17:24; 2 Sam. 19:41; 20:14; 22:41. Driver (1892: 155-6) further provides the following examples of topicalized subjects preceding a wayyiqtol: Gen. 22:24; 30:30; Exod. 9:21; 38:24; Num 14:36; 1 Kgs. 11:26 (however a late addition); 2 Kgs. 2:14; Jer. 44:25; Ps. 107:13; 2 Chr. 25:13.

[144] Cf. 1 Sam. 17:20; 20:4; 2 Sam. 20:12.

[145] Cf. 2 Sam. 5:8.

of the verse, and the atnach below may further corroborate this idea (why not place it below מַעֲכָה if וְכָל־הַבְּרִים is clearly the subject of וַיְקַלְּלֻהוּ?). The verb וַיְקַלְּלֻהוּ was generated via metathesis and it is corrected in the q^{e}re וַיְקַהֲלוּהוּ. From what we have seen so far, this verse teems with scribal mistakes. Such mistakes may have crept into the text when v. 14b was attached to v. 14a, an intervention that the *setumah* marker seems to betray. It is not necessary to emend the text and have וַיִּנָּקְהֲלוּ, as proposed by McCarter (1984: 428), because וְכָל־הַבְּכָרִים וַיִּקָּהֲלוּ is linguistically acceptable. However, it is interesting to see how the verse took its current shape.

The occurrence in 22:41 reflects good Hebrew syntax, with the subject topicalized. Depending on whether one accepts the reading מְשַׂנְאַי or וּמְשַׂנְאַי attested in Ps. 18:41, the topicalized subject may only be מְשַׂנְאַי or the whole וְאֹיְבַי נָתַתָּה לִּי עֹרֶף וּמְשַׂנְאַי (with an unmarked relative) 'and as for the enemies whose neck you gave me and as for those who hate me'. Ps. 18:41 does not have wayyiqtol but only yiqtol (אַצְמִיתֵם), which may also be what 4QSam^{a} had, although the text is fragmentary here, and we cannot be certain. The LXX does not seem to reflect a *Vorlage* with wayyiqtol either. Whether we emend 2 Sam. 22:41 according to the other witnesses or not, MT does make good sense and its grammar is acceptable.

As for the occurrences with weqatal, 1 Sam. 17:20 has been discussed above: it occurs in the longer version of the story and may therefore be identified as a late linguistic feature. In 1 Sam. 20:4 the future-oriented weqatal may be secondary, although this is not certain. The Peshitta does not have the conjunction (ܐܝܟ), while the Greek repeats the interrogative τί (τί ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ σου, καὶ τί ποιήσω σοι). Similar occurrences of this expression in the Hebrew Bible do not have the -ו before the verb either.[146]

[146] Cf. Num. 22:17 (וְכָל אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאמַר אֵלַי אֶעֱשֶׂה); Ruth 3:5 (כָּל אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאמְרִי אֵעֱשֶׂה), 11 (כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאמְרִי אֶעֱשֶׂה־לָּךְ); 2 Kgs. 10:5 (וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאמַר אֵלֵינוּ נַעֲשֶׂה).

In 2 Sam. 20:12 וְעָמַד has a habitual meaning and appears after a participial clause.[147] I do not think that Tsumura's translation (2019: 282) is correct: rather than 'as he saw that all who came by him stood by', we should translate as 'when he saw all who would come by him and would stand by'.[148] This example should not be counted among the 'unusual topicalizations'.

Finally, going back to וְצָלְחוּ in 2 Sam. 19:18, this would be a very exceptional case of topicalization before a weqatal referring to the past. We can either accept Wellhausen's emendation and reconstruct the text as וְצִיבָא נַעַר בֵּית שָׁאוּל וַחֲמִשֶּׁת עָשָׂר בָּנָיו וְעֶשְׂרִים עֲבָדָיו אִתּוֹ צָלְחוּ הַיַּרְדֵּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ (the option I prefer, see also DRIVER 1890: 257), or take MT at face value and understand the weqatal as habitual.[149]

The expression that introduces v. 19, i.e., וְעָבְרָה הָעֲבָרָה, is the result of textual corruption too. Its literal translation 'and the ford crossed / kept crossing (?)' does not make any sense.[150] The expression has been emended in two different ways. Driver (1890: 258), for instance, favours the emendation of וְעָבְרָה into וַיַּעַבְרוּ, so as to agree in number with the subject of the previous verb. McCarter (1984: 416), on the other hand, agrees with those who give priority to the variant attested in the LXX. OG has καὶ ἐλειτούργησαν τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν, a reading preserved also in καίγε, which has a doublet with another, identical to MT, translation (καὶ διέβῃ ἡ διάβασις). A translation such as that of OG presupposes עבדם (את) ועבדו \ ויעבדו as

[147] GKC §112oo lists Judg. 19:30 and 1 Sam. 2:13f for similar occurrences. For further examples see Driver 1890: 263 and 1892: 137-8.

[148] Tsumura's translation comes close to what the LXX has: ὅτι εἶδεν ὅτι πάς ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἵσταται ἐπ'αὐτόν. The Septuagint's *Vorlage* may have looked like כאשר ראה כי כל בא עמד \ יעמד עליו.

[149] I am less inclined to emend the text into וַיִּצְלְחוּ, however reasonable such a change would be.

[150] Tsumura (2019: 272) translates the expression as 'a crossing was set up', explaining that he understands the verb as a middle and translates it as a passive. I do not find his argument persuasive.

Hebrew text.[151] While the term עֲבֹדָה is rather frequent in Genesis – Numbers,[152] it occurs only three times in Deuteronomy – 2 Kings (Deut. 26:6; Josh. 22:27; 1 Kgs. 12:4).[153] On the one hand, עבדם (את) ועבדו \ ויעבדו seems to be the *lectio difficilior*, and it would be easy to see how this reading was later changed into וְעָבְרָה הָעֲבָרָה due to the similarity of ד and ר and because of the occurrence of לַעֲבִיר immediately after. Furthermore, the whole chapter is full of references about crossing the Jordan.[154] On the other hand, עֲבֹדָה is a term that occurs in Deuteronomy – 2 Kings extremely rarely and the whole passage revolves around the episode of the crossing of the Jordan. Regardless of which of the two readings we adopt (I would preserve the root עבר), the verb should be emended into וְעָבְדוּ \ וְעָבְרוּ, so as to agree in number with what precedes. The solution I propose for this couple of verses is to posit a qatal – weqatal sequence, by simply removing the conjunction -ו in וְצָלְחוּ (due to dittography) and changing וְעָבְרָה into וְעָבְרוּ (or, possibly, וְעָבְדוּ). These are very small changes that are warranted by the evident poor state of the text in some of its parts.[155]

---

[151] The Peshitta has ܘܥܒܪܘ ܠܡܥܒܪ ‘and they did the crossings’. However, without dots ‘to do’ and ‘to cross’ are indistinguishable (ܥܒܪ).

[152] Cf. Gen. 29:27; 30:26; Exod. 1:14 (x3); 2:23 (x2); 5:9, 11; 6:6, 9; 12:25, 26; 13:5; 27:19; 30:16; 35:21, 24; 36:1, 3, 5; 38:21; 39:32, 40, 42; Lev. 23:7, 8, 21, 25, 36, 39; Num. 3:7, 8, 26, 31, 36; 4:4, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 (x2), 28, 30, 31, 32, 33 (x2), 35, 39, 43, 47 (x3), 49; 7:5 (x2), 7, 8, 9; 8:11, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26; 16:9; 18:4, 6, 7, 21 (x2), 23, 31; 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 12, 35.

[153] Because of the rarity of the term, the translator of Samuel – Kings adopted the Greek equivalent for עבדה often attested in the Pentateuch (mainly in Numbers and once in Exodus), i.e., λειτουργία, which only translates עבדה in these texts (cf. Exod. 37:19; Num. 4:24, 27 (x2), 28, 33; 7:5, 7, 8; 8:22, 25; 16:19; 18:4, 6, 7, 21 (x2), 23, 31). Since the expression העבדה (את) ועבדו \ ויעבדו contains two words from the same root, the translator used λειτουργέω also for the verb עָבַד, a term that only translates שָׁרַת in Samuel – Kings (cf. 1 Sam. 2:11, 18; 3:1; 1 Kgs. 1:4, 15; 8:11; 19:21; 2 Kgs. 25:14).

[154] Cf. 2 Sam. 19:16, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40 (x2), 41 (x3), 42.

[155] The absence of the ה in the infinitive construct לַעֲבִיר is a further sign of inaccurate copying (for more examples of such forms see GKC §53q). The καίγε reading ἐξεγεῖραι probably goes back to a corrupted *Vorlage* (or it is due to a scribal mistake in the process of translating and copying) that had לְהַעִיר ‘to rouse, stir up’. A similar case occurs in 1 Kgs. 16:3, where ἐξεγείρω corresponds to MT מְבָעֵיר. Quite interestingly, both in 2 Sam. 19:19 and in 1 Kgs. 16:3 the ב seems to have been dropped (either in the text or in pronunciation).

1 Kings 6:32.35

וּשְׁתֵּי֙ דַּלְתוֹת֙ עֲצֵי־שֶׁ֔מֶן וְקָלַ֖ע עֲלֵיהֶ֑ם מִקְלְעֹ֤ות כְּרוּבִים֙ וְתִמֹרֹ֔ות וּפְטוּרֵ֖י צִצִּ֑ים וְצִפָּ֥ה זָהָ֖ב וַיַּ֥רְ עַל־הַכְּרוּבִ֖ים וְעַל־
הַתִּמֹרֹ֑ות אֶת־הַזָּהָֽב׃

וְקָלַ֣ע כְּרוּבִ֣ים וְתִמֹרֹ֗ות וּפְטֻרֵי֙ צִצִּ֔ים וְצִפָּ֥ה זָהָ֖ב מְיֻשָּׁ֑ר עַל־הַמְּחֻקָּֽה׃

As already remarked in the paragraph on Exodus, this kind of weqatal has been explained as expressing a multi-stage process, allegedly not uncommon in architectural descriptions. While I think that this is a viable explanation, which I do not mean to dismiss entirely, it is important to highlight that also these verses, like those in Exodus, present us with a series of textual issues. Burney (1903: 71-8) considered 1 Kgs. 6:18, 29, 32, 35 secondary, all coming from the same hand. It is certainly remarkable that v. 32, which contains two weqatals, is absent in the LXX. As for v. 35, the LXX has two participles (ἐκκεκολαμμένα; περιεχόμενα), but this may be a stylistic choice.

1 Kings 14:27

וַיַּעַשׂ֩ הַמֶּ֨לֶךְ רְחַבְעָ֜ם תַּחְתָּ֗ם מָגִנֵּי֙ נְחֹ֔שֶׁת וְהִפְקִ֗יד עַל־יַ֚ד שָׂרֵ֣י הָרָצִ֔ים הַשֹּׁמְרִ֖ים פֶּ֥תַח בֵּית־הַמֶּֽלֶךְ׃

The form וְהִפְקִיד in this verse may not be easy to explain. As Burney (1903: 194) points out, it could describe a habitual action akin to those related in the following verse, where both yiqtol

(יִשָּׂאוּם) and weqatal (וְהֵשִׁיבוּם) are clearly used with this function: whenever the king would visit (מִדֵּי־בָא) the temple, the guards would take and then return the bronze shields to the guardroom. However, the action described with וְהִפְקִיד in v. 27 seems to have happened only once. The parallel of 2 Chr. 12:10 preserves an identical text.

The versions, above all the Septuagint, may point to a different *Vorlage*. For one thing, in both 1 Kgs. 14:27 and 2 Chr. 12:10 we find the prepositional phrase ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν for עַל־יַד.[156] Whereas the Hebrew affirms that the king entrusted (them, i.e., the shields) with the chiefs of the bodyguards, the Greek says that the chiefs of the bodyguards were imposed over him (the king). The Greek ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν probably goes back to עליו, which may have been changed into על יד during the transmission process, given that הִפְקִיד often takes עַל but never עַל יָד.[157] The syntax of the Hebrew is cumbersome because the verb lacks the object.[158] A pronominal suffix after the verb is provided in the Peshitta (ܗܘ ܠܐܝܕ) and the Vulgate (*tradidit ea*).[159] However, this is probably a secondary addition aimed at making the text clearer. Furthermore, the translation of וְהִפְקִיד with ἐπέθεντο in 1 Kgs. 14:27 is rather peculiar, given that the verb הִפְקִיד is regularly rendered with καθίστημι in Kings (1 Kgs. 11:28; 2 Kgs. 7:17; 25:22, 23).[160] The verb ἐπιτίθημι is normally used for שִׂים in Kings,[161] although there are a series of occurrences where ἐπιτίθημι

[156] 2 Chr. 12:10 seems to have a different *Vorlage* when it adds Σουσακεὶμ.

[157] Cf. Gen. 39:4, 5; 41:34; Lev. 26:16; Num. 1:50; Josh. 10:18; 2 Kgs. 7:17; 25:22; Isa. 62:6; Jer. 1:10; 40:11; Ps. 109:6; 1 Chr. 26:32.

[158] 1 Kgs. 14:27 and 2 Chr. 12:10 are the only two places where הִפְקִיד does not take an object, which makes its absence in Kings suspicious.

[159] See also the Ethiopic (ወአወፈዮን).

[160] The same translation we find in Gen. 39:4, 5; 41:34; Josh. 10:18; 1 Sam. 29:4; Isa. 62:6; Jer. 1:10; Jer. 40:5, 7, 11; 41:2, 18; Ps. 109(108):6; Esth. 2:3; 1 Chr. 26:32; 2 Chr. 12:10. Slightly different ones occur in Lev. 26:16 (ἐπισυνίστημι), Num. 1:50 (ἐφίστημι), Jer. 36:20 (δίδωμι φυλάσσειν), Jer. 37:21 (ἐμβάλλω), Jer. 40:7; 41:10 (παρακατατίθημι), Ps. 31:6 (παρατίθημι). Isa. 10:28 lacks a translation.

[161] Cf. 1 Kgs. 18:23 (x3), 25, 33; 20:31; 2 Kgs. 4:29, 31; 11:16; 13:16; 18:16; 20:7.

translates other verbs, a stylistic choice that may also lie behind ἐπέθεντο.[162] The Greek version of 2 Chr. 12:10 mentions Shishak king of Egypt (καὶ κατέστησεν ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν Σουσακεὶμ). The text seems to be stating that, after his razzia and after removing the golden shields that Solomon had made, Shishak put in charge over Rehoboam (ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν) the bodyguards that were now carrying the bronze shields. This would be very similar to what the Greek says in 1 Kgs. 14:27, where the chiefs of the bodyguards are imposed over the king (we do not know by whom, although this may be inferred from v. 26). The Hebrew *Vorlage* of Chronicles would thus be ויפקד עליו שישק or, possibly (so as to give background information about the bodyguards before new details about the shields and their relationship to the bodyguards be added in the following verse), ושישק הפקיד עליו. Such a text, if it ever existed, would solve the linguistic and philological issues noted above (absence of the object, unique occurrence of עַל יָד instead of the usual עָל reflected also in the Greek translation). The Greek translation of Chronicles may therefore preserve the earliest text, only partially retained in LXX 1 Kgs. 14:27 (ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν is still present but the Egyptian king has disappeared). The Greek text of Kings probably represents an intermediate stage: Shishak has been removed but it is still clear that Rehoboam is not the subject of והפקיד, which is therefore translated with a middle (passive in meaning). In the Hebrew, the name of Shishak was eliminated (I do believe that it was present as in LXX Chronicles because ויעש and והפקיד should not have the same subject) so that no memory of the humiliating terms (could the text be interpreted as a measure to safeguard the Judean king from his opponents?) that Rehoboam had to accept be recorded and handed down. This would explain the unusual adoption of ἐπιτίθημι in 1 Kgs. 14:27, a verb that connotes the imposition or infliction of a penalty, a nuance that is absent in καθίστημι. However, this gave rise to some asperities in the Hebrew, including, we may say at this point, the unexpected weqatal.

[162] Cf. 1 Kgs. 13:29 (וינחהו); 2 Kgs. 5:11 (והניף); 18:4 (תתן); 24:17 (וימלך).

The above reconstruction seeks to consider the relevant textual evidence. I propose that we reconstruct the earliest stage of 1 Kgs. 14:27 as follows:

ויעש המלך רחבעם תחתם מגני נחשת ושישק הפקיד עליו שרי הרצים השמרים פתח בית המלך

ויהי מדי בא המלך בית יהוה ישאום הרצים והשיבום אל תא הרצים

‘So king Rehoboam made bronze shields in their stead. Now Shishak had imposed over him (i.e., Rehoboam) the bodyguards on duty at the entrance of the royal palace. Whenever the king would go to the temple of YHWH, the bodyguards would take them and return them to the guardroom.’

1 KINGS 20:21

וַיֵּצֵא מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּךְ אֶת־הַסּוּס וְאֶת־הָרֶכֶב וְהִכָּה בַאֲרָם מַכָּה גְדוֹלָה׃

The weqatal probably describes a habitual action. After stating that the king of Israel went out and smote horses and chariots, Aram’s defeat is emphasised by weqatal, which stresses how thorough it was.

2 KINGS 3:15

וְעַתָּה קְחוּ־לִי מְנַגֵּן וְהָיָה כְּנַגֵּן הַמְנַגֵּן וַתְּהִי עָלָיו יַד־יְהוָה׃

LXX^{L} has καὶ ἔλαβον αὐτῷ after Elisha's order, mirroring the instruction λάβετέ μοι ψάλλοντα. Similarly, the Georgian has the fulfilment report (და მოჰგუარეს მას ერთი მაქებელი /da mohguares mas erti makebeli/), which is further expanded by the addition of ერთი მაქებელი /erti makebeli/ 'one worshipper', also taken from the direct speech. The other daughter versions such as the Armenian and the Ethiopic lack this part. One possibility is that LXX^{L}, and therefore the Georgian, preserve the earliest text (only the latter fully) and that the Hebrew *Vorlage* had ויקחו לו מנגן, which was later dropped due to haplography (Burney 1903: 269; McKenzie 2019: 258). However, the fact that such a reading is not preserved in the Armenian may indicate that this is a Lucianic expansion. Regardless of whether this is a case of haplography or a later addition, the text critical evidence can hardly be used to explain a possible change from וַיְהִי to וְהָיָה.

On the other hand, it is possible and maybe even better to understand the weqatal as describing a habitual action: Elisha ordered that they brought a harpist because the hand of YHWH would be upon him whenever the music was played (Cogan and Tadmor 1988: 45).

2 Kings 8:10

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אֱלִישָׁע לֵךְ אֱמָר־לוֹ חָיֹה תִחְיֶה וְהִרְאַנִי יְהוָה כִּי־מוֹת יָמוּת׃

In this verse the scribe famously intervened to change לוֹ (cf. the qᵊre and all the versions) into לֹא to save Elisha from the accusations of falsehood. The second half of the verse has a different word order in LXX^{L}: καὶ αὐτὸς θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται, καθώς ἔδειξέ μοι Κύριος. The Hebrew *Vorlage* probably looked like והוא מות ימות כאשר הראני יהוה, which shows a correct and flowing Hebrew syntax, with death being contrasted to life. However, it should also be noted that no other witness preserves this word order, not even the Armenian or the Georgian. If MT preserves the earlier word order, then we may understand וְהִרְאַנִי as a fronted element that creates a contrast with what precedes: although Elisha tells to report that Ben-Hadad will live, it was really shown to him by God that he will die. We should also remember that וְהִרְאַנִי may reflect the spoken variety of the North, different from the standardised Judahite language that we find in much of the biblical prose and at the same time closer to Aramaic, which would not use wayyiqtol.

2 KINGS 11:1

וַעֲתַלְיָהוּ אֵם אֲחַזְיָהוּ וְרָאֲתָה כִּי מֵת בְּנָהּ וַתָּקָם וַתְּאַבֵּד אֵת כָּל־זֶרַע הַמַּמְלָכָה׃

The weqatal contained in this verse is easily identified as a mistake, as both the qᵊre and the versions indicate.

SUMMARY

In this long section I have endeavoured to show that the occurrences of weqatal in CBH usually identified as anomalous are often the result of scribal activity. Although they are not always easy to explain, in most cases one can detect textual corruptions and asperities in the surrounding context. The analysis of these weqatals further buttresses, I believe, the argument in favour of the secondary nature of וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ in MT 2 Kgs. 18:36: as in many other cases, also this occurrence entered the text at a later stage, as the wayyiqtol in the parallel account of MT Isaiah indicates.

The Numeral 5180

MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 [מֵאָה שְׁמוֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אָלֶף] מאה ושמונים וחמשה אלף K 21, 70, primo 168; מאה ושמנים וחמשה אלף K 4, 30, 93, 96, 115, 145, 150, 174, 178, 182, 187, 224, 226, 251, 253, 257, 260.

MT Isa. 37:36 מֵאָה וּשְׁמֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אָלֶף

The constituent 80 of the numeral 5180 has already been treated in the section on orthography due to its plene spelling in MT 2 Kgs. 19:35. Starting from an observation by Hornkohl, it was stated that the variant of MT 2 Kings (plene spelling) aligns with the orthography that we tend to observe in exilic and post-exilic books. In this section, Hornkohl's argument about orthography and its application to the present case is strengthened by an additional syntactic feature that characterizes the numeral in question. The fact that two elements that tend to appear in late biblical texts occur together probably points to the later nature of the variant of MT 2 Kgs. 19:35. The evidence about the syntax of the numeral therefore justifies the inclusion of

the orthographic peculiarity in this chapter, where the diachronically relevant variants of the two accounts are discussed.

Complex Adding Numerals in Ancient Hebrew

The numeral 5180 is a so-called complex adding numeral (Screnock 2018a, 2018b, 2020). In complex adding numerals, as the definition itself indicates, the members are added together to form a total. In our case, there are two constituents: a complex adding numeral, מֵאָה שְׁמוֹנִים, and a complex multiplying numeral, חֲמִשָּׁה אֲלָפִים (Screnock 2018a). The individual components of this class of numerals are regularly coordinated with a -ו (Screnock 2018a: 145, 2018b: 794), e.g., שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה (Gen. 4:24) or חֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וָאָלֶף (Num. 3:50), regardless of whether the decreasing (שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה) or increasing (חֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וָאָלֶף) order of the constituents is attested (Appendix 2.12). What is most interesting in the occurrence of MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 is that not every constituent of the complex adding numeral is added via a -ו. Quite remarkably, in fact, the occurrence in MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 (מֵאָה שְׁמוֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֲלָפִים) does not have the conjunction -ו between the first (מֵאָה) and the second (שְׁמוֹנִים) constituent, as opposed to the more regular form attested in MT Isa. 37:36 (מֵאָה וּשְׁמֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֲלָפִים). This rare phenomenon, whereby the coordinative conjunction is omitted between the first and the second constituent while it is present between the second and the third, is attested here and there in the Hebrew Bible and once in Qumran (Appendix 2.13), as the table below shows:

	With -ו	Without -ו	Percentage
Numbers	90	5	5.3%
1 Kings	31	2	6 %

2 Kings	28	1	3.4%
Jeremiah	1	2	66.7%
Daniel	5	2	28.6%
Ezra	26	35	57.4%
Nehemiah	20	41	32.8%
Qumran	61	1	1.6%

According to these figures, the absence of -ו between the first two constituents characterizes books such as Ezra and Nehemiah, where this syntactic variant is preferred to the other, more widespread, one. Likewise, although we are dealing with a reduced number of occurrences, Daniel and Jeremiah show figures that approach those of Ezra and Nehemiah. As for Numbers and Kings, the use of the asyndetic construction is only rarely attested. Based on the evidence from Qumran, complex adding numerals were still formed with the -ו also in post-biblical times, and, in fact, there is no asyndetic construction attested in the Mishnah.

Before we draw our conclusions on the distribution of this syntactic feature, a couple of text-critical remarks on the figures in the table are on point. First of all, one of the five occurrences of MT Numbers, namely שְׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֶלֶף שְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמֵשִׁים in 31:52, occurs with the expected -ו between the first and the second constituent in 4QNum[b] (ששה ע]שר אלף ושבע מאות וחמשים[), which points to a degree of textual variety. As for 1 Kgs. 20:15, while both MT and LXX[L] have the numeral 232 (מָאתַיִם שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים and διακόσιοι τριάκοντα καί δύο, respectively), LXX[B] has 230 (διακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα). As McKenzie (2019: 158) explains, the reading in MT and LXX[L] is probably secondary and due to the occurrence of the numeral 32 in the following verse. It is interesting to observe that the very constituent that would have been added in MT (שְׁנַיִם) produces the unexpected syntax. This means that two out of the three occurrences of the asyndetic structure in MT 1-2 Kings are probably the result of late scribal changes. There is

enough textual evidence to show that מָאתַיִם שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים in MT 1 Kgs. 20:15 and מֵאָה שְׁמוֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֲלָף in MT 2 Kgs. 19:35 have arisen during the post-exilic period. While LXX^{B} preserves a better variant in the former case, in the latter it is both the parallel text of Isaiah and the scriptio plena that point to a later date for the syntactic variant.

Because the partially asyndetic structure prevails in Ezra and Nehemiah, with some additional interesting figures in Jeremiah and Daniel, it is likely that the variant reading entered the text of Kings during the Persian epoch. As we shall we both below and in Chapter 3, there are two additional features that concern the numerals and nicely tie together a later layer of Kings with Jeremiah and Ezra-Nehemiah, as well as other exilic and post-exilic books.

הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי

MT 2 Kgs. 19:15 וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חִזְקִיָּהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה

MT Isa. 37:15 [וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חִזְקִיָּהוּ אֶל־יְהוָה] ויתפלל חזקיהו לפני יהוה K 210.

This section concerns the use of the verb הִתְפַּלֵּל ‘to pray’ with the preposition לִפְנֵי ‘before’, which I will argue is a sign of post-exilic language. Of the two variants at stake, לִפְנֵי and אֶל, the one occurring in Kings therefore entered the text later via scribal intervention and is a mark of linguistic updating.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF הִתְפַּלֵּל אֶל

In Biblical Hebrew, the verb הִתְפַּלֵּל takes the preposition אֶל, usually followed by יהוה, when the notion expressed is that of a prayer addressed to God (x36).[163] The same preposition is also employed when the prayer is performed facing a specific direction, more precisely towards the temple in Jerusalem.[164] However, this latter possibility will not be taken into account here as it is not of interest for the present discussion.

In the biblical manuscripts found in Qumran, we find the preposition אֶל in the passages where we encounter it in MT.[165] In one instance – 4QSam^{a} 2:25 – אֶל occurs as part of a variant reading (ופללו ל[ו] אל יהוה) in agreement with LXX^{B} (καὶ προσεύξονται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Κύριον) and against MT (וּפִלְלָוֹ אֱלֹהִֽים). The verb with אֶל is attested once also in Ben Sira.[166]

THE DISTRIBUTION OF הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי IN POST-EXILIC TEXTS

When we observe the distribution of the less frequent use of לִפְנֵי with the verb הִתְפַּלֵּל we note a couple of interesting phenomena. For one thing, there are no more than three occurrences of the preposition לִפְנֵי in CBH, which will be discussed more in detail below.[167] Most importantly, the slight majority of occurrences in Biblical Hebrew appears in books written in LBH.[168] In Nehemiah, the two occurrences of אֶל (2:4; 4:3) are counterbalanced by the two occurrences of לִפְנֵי (1:4, 6). In Chronicles, we find three occurrences of the preposition לִפְנֵי, two of which are

[163] Gen. 20:17; Num. 11:2; 21:7; Deut. 9:26; 1 Sam. 1:26; 8:6; 2 Sam. 7:27; 1 Kgs. 8:33, 44, 48, 54; 2 Kgs. 4:33; 6:18; 19:20; 20:2; Isa. 37:15, 21; 38:2; 44:17; 45:14, 20; Jer. 29:12; 32:16; 37:3; 42:2, 4, 20; Jon. 2:2; 4:2; Psa. 5:3; 32:6; Neh. 2:4; 4:3; 2 Chr. 6:34; 32:24; 33:13.

[164] 1 Kgs. 8:29, 30, 35, 42; 2 Chr. 6:20, 21, 26, 32.

[165] 1QIsa^{a} 37:15, 21; 44:17; 45:14, 20; MurXII Jon. 2:2; 4:2.

[166] Sir. 38:9.

[167] 1 Sam. 1:12; 1 Kgs. 8:28; 2 Kgs. 19:15.

[168] Neh. 1:4, 6; 1 Chr. 17:25; 2 Chr. 6:19, 24.

noteworthy in that they illustrate very well the diachronic relationship between the two options. One of the occurrences in Chronicles (2 Chr. 6:19) is also found in the source text of 1 Kgs. 8:28. In another case, and this is most remarkable, 2 Chr. 6:24 has the preposition לִפְנֵי whereas the source text of 1 Kgs. 8:33 has אֶל. In this case, I believe that the prepositions refer to both preceding verbs that form a hendiadys (וְהֻתְפַּלְלוּ וְהִתְחַנְּנוּ). Finally, the occurrence in 1 Chr. 17:25 presents the same substitution of אֶל, found in the source text (2 Sam. 7:27), with לִפְנֵי. However, there is more to be said about this verse of Chronicles. The late nature of its language is evidenced not only by the updated valency of הִתְפַּלֵּל, but also by another interesting semantic feature. The final part of 2 Sam. 7:27 reads as follows:

[..] עַל־כֵּן מָצָא עַבְדְּךָ אֶת־לִבּוֹ לְהִתְפַּלֵּל אֵלֶיךָ אֶת־הַתְּפִלָּה הַזֹּאת

'[..] therefore your servant has found the heart (i.e., the courage) to pray unto you this prayer.'

The parallel text of 1 Chr. 17:25 slightly but significantly modifies its source:

[..] עַל־כֵּן מָצָא עַבְדְּךָ לְהִתְפַּלֵּל לְפָנֶיךָ׃

'[..] therefore your servant has managed to pray before you.'

Apart from changing אֶל with לִפְנֵי, we see that אֶת־לִבּוֹ disappears in Chronicles, so that the verb מָצָא no longer introduce a direct object, but rather the infinitive construct לְהִתְפַּלֵּל. The language of Chronicles shows here an Aramaism, as opposed to the classical expression of Samuel, which also appears in Mishnaic Hebrew (JASTROW 825a; VAN PEURSEN 2004: 159-60). In fact, the equivalent of the verb מָצָא with the infinitive is often attested in Aramaic and, later, in Syriac, where it is known that the verb ܐܫܟܚ / אשכח 'to find', can also take on the meaning of

‘to be able to’ when followed by an infinitive.[169] Interestingly, there are two additional occurrences of this phenomenon in Ancient Hebrew, both hailing from the post-biblical period. In Sir. 12:11 (Ms. A) we find the expression ולא ימצא להשחיתך ‘and he will not be able to destroy you’, whereas in Sir. 31:6 (Ms. B) we read ולא מצאו להנצל מרעה ‘and they will not manage to escape from evil’.[170] One should not include in the same category an expression such as that found in Judg. 9:33 כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא יָדֶךָ, where מָצָא derives from מצא II and means ‘to reach’.[171]

To confirm the late linguistic profile of the expression הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי we can add that the only two occurrences of this verb in Qumran non-biblical manuscripts (2Q21 f1:4 and 4Q364 f26bii+e:2) have the preposition לִפְנֵי.

Given the interesting linguistic updates found in Chronicles and the little evidence collected from the non-biblical manuscripts hailing from Qumran, it stands to reason to also include the occurrence of MT 2 Kgs. 19:15 among these. In this scenario, MT Isa. 37:15 would preserve an earlier variant, whereas MT 2 Kgs. 19:15, which usually preserves a later textual form of the parallel accounts, presents the linguistically updated reading.

---

[169] See, for instance, 1QapGen 21:13. This meaning is also attested in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (SOKOLOFF 1992: 325b). For additional details on Aramaic and Syriac, see Van Peursen 2004: 260 n. 119.

[170] In both Sir. 12:11 and 31:6, the Greek version omits the sentences where מצא occurs. On the contrary, the Syriac has a text that runs faithfully parallel to the Hebrew. It is not surprising that in both cases the Syriac employs ܐܫܟܚ. Since the Greek text omits these bits and the Syriac has a text identical to the Hebrew, and because the use of מצא echoes a well-known Aramaic semantic extension of ܐܫܟܚ / אשכח, it is reasonable to conclude with Skehan and Di Lella (1987: 381) that the Hebrew text contains a retroversion from the Syriac. Against this reconstruction Van Peursen (2004: 260 n. 118) argues that this meaning was already known in Hebrew and therefore it does not necessarily come from the Syriac. However, I find the text-critical argument strongly in favour of Skehan and Di Lella’s remark, in addition to the fact that the auxiliary function is way more common in Aramaic and Syriac than it is in Hebrew.

[171] See for instance Egyptian Aramaic כדי מטאה ידי ‘as far as my hand reaches’ (A2 4:4). The same expression is also found with Akkadian kašādum ‘to reach’ when qātum ‘hand’ functions as subject (e.g., inūma qāt bēlīya ikaššadkunūti ‘when the hand of my lord gets hold of you’), see CAD ‘kašādum 2c’.

Two Cases of הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי in Pre-Exilic Texts?

There remain two occurrences to be discussed, both belonging to the CBH linguistic corpus: MT 1 Sam. 1:12 and MT 1 Kgs. 8:28.

As for the latter, MT has many variants when compared to LXX^{B}, although the meaning of the verse is the same in both sources.

LXX^{B}	MT
καὶ ἐπιβλέψῃ	וּפָנִיתָ
	אֶל־תְּפִלַּת עַבְדְּךָ
ἐπὶ τὴν δέησίν μου	וְאֶל־תְּחִנָּתוֹ
Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ	יְהוָה אֱלֹהָי
ἀκούειν	לִשְׁמֹעַ
τῆς τέρψεως	אֶל־הָרִנָּה
	וְאֶל־הַתְּפִלָּה
ἧς ὁ δοῦλός σου προσεύχεται	אֲשֶׁר עַבְדְּךָ מִתְפַּלֵּל
ἐνώπιόν σου	לְפָנֶיךָ
πρὸς σέ	
σήμερον	הַיּוֹם

When the two versions are analysed in parallel, it appears that the two prepositional phrases אֶל־תְּפִלַּת עַבְדְּךָ and וְאֶל־הַתְּפִלָּה are later glosses which create a chiastic structure once paired with וְאֶל־תְּחִנָּתוֹ (ἐπὶ τὴν δέησίν μου) and אֶל־הָרִנָּה (τῆς τέρψεως). Furthermore, the pronominal suffix

attached to תְּחִנָּתוֹ has probably been changed from the first person singular, still occurring in LXX^{B}, to the third masculine singular to agree with the secondary reading עַבְדְּךָ. Another interesting pair of variants occurs with the name of God, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי and Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ. Finally, and most importantly, we observe that LXX^{B} has a doublet (ἐνώπιόν σου and πρὸς σέ) for the MT reading לְפָנֶיךָ, the variant πρὸς σέ corresponding to the Hebrew אֵלֶיךָ (cf. vv. 48, 54). One may suppose that LXX^{B} adds πρὸς σέ to harmonise the text with said verses (πρὸς σέ, v. 48; πρὸς Κύριον, v. 54), but I do not see why this should have happened for such a small component of the language, twenty and more verses apart. Another, more likely possibility, is that πρὸς σέ translates a Hebrew *Vorlage* that still had אֵלֶיךָ, as expected in CBH. At a later stage, the Hebrew text underwent the changes outlined above and also אֵלֶיךָ was updated into לִפְנֵיךָ. This reading entered the Greek text at a later stage, yet always in ancient times, as a doublet (ἐνώπιόν σου), without replacing the earlier πρὸς σέ.

Based on the variant attested between MT and LXX^{B}, I believe that we can safely affirm that also this occurrence of לְפָנֶיךָ, like that of MT 2 Kgs. 19:15, entered a text mostly written in CBH after scribal intervention.

Finally, the preposition לִפְנֵי occurs also in MT 1 Sam. 1:12. As already pointed out in the above section on weqatal, in this very same verse we encounter one of those unexpected occurrences of this verb form (וְהָיָה instead of וַיְהִי). It may be worth fleshing out the argument in favour of the late linguistic profile of this verse by point out seven additional late features and textual corruptions that are found in this chapter of MT Samuel.

1) In MT 1 Sam. 1:1 the geographical location הָרָמָתַיִם צוֹפִים is, as Driver (1890: 1) puts it, ‘very difficult, if indeed defensible, grammatically’ (see also McCarter 1980: 51).

2) In MT 1 Sam. 1:2 וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִית...שֵׁם אַחַת clearly lacks the article before אַחַת (the LXX has τῇ μιᾷ, whereas the Targum and the Peshitta agree with MT), a unique situation in the Hebrew Bible whenever the opposition אֶחָד – שֵׁנִי is registered.[172]

3) In MT 1 Sam. 1:5 the reading כִּי אַפַּיִם, a long-standing *crux interpretationis*, could be a corruption of אֶפֶס כִּי (for whose meaning and use cf. Num. 13:28; Deut. 15:4; Judg. 4:9; 2 Sam. 12:14; Am. 9:8), as suggested by πλὴν οὐκ of the Septuagint.

4) In MT 1 Sam. 1:9 the infinitive absolute שָׁתֹה follows the preposition אַחֲרֵי, a unique case in the Hebrew Bible. One would rather expect the infinitive construct, as in אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָה in the same verse. LXX^{B} has here a different text (καὶ κατέστη ἐνώπιον Κυρίου). As Aejmelaeus (2012: 11-2) points out, both in this verse and in v. 14, which mirrors and complements Hannah's action in v. 9 (καὶ πορεύου ἐκ προσώπον Κυρίου), only LXX^{B} describes Hannah in the presence of the Lord (v. 14 in MT is shorter), while there seems to be a deliberate change in the MT, where nothing is said about Hannah standing in and then leaving the presence of the Lord. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the unusual וְאַחֲרֵי שָׁתֹה is secondary and that it was added to complement אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָה by the scribe who revised the text. However, why would a late scribe use an infinitive absolute when we know that this form tends to disappear and is rarely used already in Qumran (QIMRON 2018: 176)? Both the LXX and the previous expression אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָה

[172] Driver (1890:1) points to Num. 28:4 and 1 Sam. 13:17-18 (הָרֹאשׁ אֶחָד – x3) for similar instances of אֶחָד without the article, albeit in these cases used as an attribute. At a closer look, however, these readings appear to be secondary. Given that the LXX preserves a better reading than MT in 1 Sam. 13:18 (Γαβεέ instead of הַגְּבוּל – it is more likely that a hill, rather than a border, overlooks the surrounding area, besides the fact that in v. 16 בְּגִבְעַ בִּנְיָמִן is already mentioned), and that it twice has ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ μία (and once the likewise determined ἡ μία ἀρχή), these verses seem to bear traces of careless copying and linguistic updating. In fact, a noun determined with the article and followed by אֶחָד occurs only in texts written during or after the exile: Jer. 24:2 (הַדּוּד אֶחָד x2); 52:20 (הַיָּם אֶחָד); Ezek. 10:9 (הַכְּרוּב אֶחָד, הַכְּרוּב אֶחָד); 1 Chr. 12:15 (הַצָּבֶא אֶחָד); 2 Chr. 3:17 (הַהֵיכָל אֶחָד); 4:15 (הַיָּם אֶחָד). With the sole exception of 1 Sam. 1:2, these expressions occur in geographical and architectural descriptions.
As for Num. 28:4 (הַכֶּבֶשׂ אֶחָד), both the LXX (τὸν ἀμνὸν τὸν ἕνα) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (הכבש האחד) may preserve the correct reading, although this could also be the work of scribes and translators.

can help us solve this. The Greek has μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτοὺς for אַחֲרֵי אָכְלָה, which presupposes the pronominal suffix ם- attached to the infinitive construct (אכלם, referred to Hannah and her husband). The pronominal suffix is necessary in this context. In MT, the mistake seems to occur at the level of the oral tradition rather than at that of the consonantal text. One could easily put a mappiq inside the ה- and make Hannah the subject of the infinitive (in agreement with וַתָּקָם).[173] This is, most likely, how the text was read. When a late scribe modified the text and complemented the action of eating with that of drinking, he added another infinitive construct with a 3rd feminine singular pronominal suffix, i.e., שְׁתֹתָהּ. The verb later became שתה as the result of haplography and was re-interpreted as an infinitive absolute, שָׁתֹה in MT. In conclusion, the scribe did not add an infinitive absolute, which would be a very unusual choice for a late intervention, but an infinitive construct that underwent haplography and became identical to an infinitive absolute.

5) In MT 1 Sam. 1:10 the preposition עַל, only here used with הִתְפַּלֵּל instead of the expected אֶל (cf. LXX^{B} πρός), probably found its way into the text during the transmission process, at a time when Aramaic influence on Hebrew was strong. The same phenomenon we encounter at the beginning of v. 27.[174]

6) In MT 1 Sam. 1:17, the word שְׁאֵלָתֵךְ is spelled as שַׁלָּתֵךְ, not an uncommon phenomenon (cf. the list in GKC §23f), but nonetheless a sign of inaccuracy (or maybe a trace of a different dialect?).[175] The word is spelled with א in its two other occurrences within the story of Hannah (cf. 1:27; 2:20).

[173] For more examples of the reading of the 3fs suffix without mappiq see Khan 2020: 167-71.

[174] For a thorough and recent discussion on אֶל and עַל see Hornkohl 2013: 227-38.

[175] Cf. 2 Sam. 20:9 (וַתֹּחֶז for ותאחז) and 22:40 (וַתְּזָרֵנִי for ותאזרני, as in Ps. 18:40) for other instances of the same phenomenon in Samuel.

7) In MT 1 Sam. 1:24, בְּפָרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה should probably be emended into בְּפָר מְשֻׁלָּשׁ, in agreement with the Septuagint, which has ἐν μόσχῳ τριετίζοντι, and with the occurrence of only a single animal in the following verse (הַפָּר). It is not unlikely that the *mem* was by accident attached to the first word, as suggested by Driver (1890: 16).[176]

CONCLUSION

As both the text-critical and the linguistic approaches show, the occurrence of הִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי in MT 2 Kgs. 19:15 constitutes a later variant than the one found in MT Isa. 37:15. While in the latter we find the preposition אֶל, typical of all stages of Ancient Hebrew, in the former we encounter a preposition that is used with הִתְפַּלֵּל only in post-exilic texts. As the Chronicler changed אֶל into לִפְנֵי twice, so did the scribe who copied and updated the Kings' version of the story. It is not unlikely that the reason for the adoption of the preposition לִפְנֵי is the presence of קדם / ܩܕܡ in Aramaic and Syriac with the corresponding verb צלי / ܨܠܝ. Thus, we would have another Aramaism which further corroborates the evidence in favour of the late nature of the construction in question.

A philological analysis of the two potential occurrences of לִפְנֵי in pre-exilic texts confirms the late character of both readings, thus yielding a coherent and fascinating picture of how textual criticism and historical linguistics may give uniform results.

[176] According to Wenham (1979: 79, n. 12), 'three bulls' (MT) is to be preferred for exegetical reasons.

STYLE

The Use of וַיְהִי in the Regnal Formula of MT 2 Kgs. 18:1

MT 2 Kgs. 18:13 Ø

MT Isa. 36:1 וַיְהִי

The variant discussed here concerns a very interesting stylistic aspect that may shed light on the editorial process behind the unparalleled section that introduces Hezekiah's reign (MT 2 Kgs. 18:1-12). The account of MT Isaiah unsurprisingly begins with וַיְהִי, attested in all the witnesses of the Isaiah textual tradition:

וַיְהִי בְּאַרְבַּעׂ עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ עָלָה סַנְחֵרִיב מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר עַל כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה הַבְּצֻרוֹת וַיִּתְפְּשֵׂם׃

'And on the fourteenth year of kings Hezekiah, Sennacherib, king of Ashur, campaigned against all the fortified cities of Judah and seized them.'

The parallel chronological notation found in MT 2 Kgs. 18:13, on the other hand, is not introduced by וַיְהִי:

וּבְאַרְבַּעׂ עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה לַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּה עָלָה סַנְחֵרִיב מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר עַל כָּל־עָרֵי יְהוּדָה הַבְּצֻרוֹת וַיִּתְפְּשֵׂם׃

'And on the fourteenth year of kings Hezekiah, Sennacherib, king of Ashur, campaigned against all the fortified cities of Judah and seized them.'

Despite the fact that all the witnesses to the parallel account of 2 Kings agree with MT and lack the introductory וַיְהִי, I do believe that this was originally present as we find it in Isaiah. What happened is that this וַיְהִי was separated from the annalistic notice about Sennacherib when vv. 1-12, which introduce Hezekiah's reign, were joined to the parallel account. As a result, the וַיְהִ֗י that we find at the beginning of MT 2 Kgs. 18:1 and that introduces Hezekiah's regnal formula corresponds to the וַיְהִ֣י occurring in MT Isa. 36:1. My argument is based on the fact that no other opening regnal formula in Kings is preceded by וַיְהִי.[177] The occurrence of MT 2 Kgs. 18:1 constitutes an outstanding stylistic feature that demands an explanation. And such an explanation is provided precisely by the fact that we do see in MT Isa. 36:1 where the anomalous וַיְהִי occurred before the insertion of vv. 1-12. As I will mention in Chapter 3 while discussing MT 1 Kgs. 13, it is often the case that the insertion of material and the sewing together of different texts and sources results in linguistic and stylistic asperities or anomalies (see also the discussion on 1 Samuel 17 above), sometimes confirmed by a text-critical analysis of the witnesses.

That vv. 1-12 come from a different hand from that which composed the parallel account is evident when we consider the theophoric elements in the onomastics of both sections. As I have shown above, the personal names in question in vv. 1-12 clearly have a later linguistic profile. In addition, we may briefly mention the striking sequence of three weqatals that we

[177] For the kings of Israel see MT 1 Kgs. 15:25 (Nadab), 33 (Baasha); 16:8 (Elah), 15 (Zimri), 23 (Omri), 29 (Achab); 22:52 (Achaziah); MT 2 Kgs. 1:17 and 3:1 (Jehoram); 13:1 (Jehoahaz), 10 (Jehoash); 14:23 (Jeroboam II); 15:8 (Zechariah), 13 (Shallum), 17 (Menahem), 23 (Pekahiah), 27 (Pekah), 30 and 17:1 (Hoshea). For the kings of Judah see MT 1 Kgs. 14:21 (Rehoboam); 15:1-2 (Abiam), 9-10 (Asa); 22:41-42 (Jehosaphat); MT 2 Kgs. 8:16-17 (Jehoram), 25-26 and 9:29 (Achaziah); 12:1-2 (Jehoash); 14:1-2 (Amaziah); 15:1-2 (Azariah), 32-33 (Jotam); 16:1-2 (Achaz). Because there are no more synchronisms after the death Hezekiah, due to the fall of Samaria, the opening formulae for Manasseh (MT 2 Kgs. 21:1), Amon (MT 2 Kgs. 21:19), Josiah (MT 2 Kgs. 22:1), Jehoahaz (MT 2 Kgs. 23:31), Jehoiakim (MT 2 Kgs. 23:36), Jehoiakin (MT 2 Kgs. 24:8), and Zedekiah (MT 2 Kgs. 24:18) adopt a different style to which that of the preceding kings cannot be compared.

find in v. 4 (וְכָרַת..וְכִתַּתְתָּ..וְשִׁבַּר), which so puzzled and horrified Montgomery (1934: 50-1), who labelled it a 'flagrant case of offense' in terms of syntax and style.[178] While I will not discuss whether such forms are diachronically significant from the perspective of linguistic change, it should nonetheless be noted that such sequences increase and are typical of the final chapters of MT 2 Kings, as pointed out by many scholars.[179] I believe that a systematic analysis of the concluding chapters of 2 Kings, i.e., 21-25, is still a *desideratum*, but Hornkohl's (2016: 31-42) preliminary survey of the material in the context of TBH looks promising and, as the content itself of these chapters of 2 Kings indicates, we cannot be dealing with original CBH. Even if we assume that the frequent weqatal sequences reflect a stylistic choice, we cannot but highlight that they are shared by the unparalleled section of MT 2 Kgs. 18, albeit only in v. 4, and the final chapters of the book.

Another stylistic feature that connects vv. 1-12 to the final portion of 2 Kings is the use of the independent personal pronoun הִיא, referred to שָׁנָה, with the epexegetic function of tying two events together so as to create a synchronism. We find this twice in MT 2 Kgs. 18:1-12, namely in vv. 9 and 10. It should be noted that many scholars, on text-critical and historical-critical grounds, consider vv. 9-11, which are adapted from 2 Kgs. 17:5-6 (especially in the form preserved by the Old Latin palimpsest *Vindobonensis*, see TEKONIEMI 2019: 78), a late insertion (ŠANDA 1912: 244-5; LEVIN 2019: 252-5; TEKONIEMI 2019: 82-4). These verses, in fact, disrupt the narrative about Hezekiah's rebellion and Sennacherib's punitive campaign to the West (LEVIN 2019: 251-2), and the fact that they occur between the *petuḥa* signs may point in the same direction. The reason for the repetition of the short account about the fall of

[178] It should be noted that these weqatals have not been treated in the above section because they follow and are introduced by a qatal at the beginning of the verse (הֵסִיר).

[179] See Spieckermann 1982: 120-30; Eynikel 1996: 155-6 n. 29; Van Keulen 1996: 162-8; Wright 2005: 9-10; Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd 2008: 150-5.

Samaria, already told in 2 Kgs. 17:3-6, is found by Levin in the addition of the two synchronisms analysed here and the theological comment in v. 12. Vv. 9 and 10 read as follows:

וַיְהִי בַּשָּׁנָה הָרְבִיעִית לַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ הִיא הַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִית לְהוֹשֵׁעַ בֶּן־אֵלָה מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל עָלָה שַׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר עַל־שֹׁמְרוֹן וַיָּצַר עָלֶיהָ׃

'In the fourth year of king Hezekiah, that is the seventh year of Hoshea, son of Elah, king of Israel, Shalmaneser, king of Ashur, campaigned against Samaria and laid siege to it.'

וַיִּלְכְּדֶהָ מִקְצֵה שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים בִּשְׁנַת־שֵׁשׁ לְחִזְקִיָּה הִיא שְׁנַת־תֵּשַׁע לְהוֹשֵׁעַ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִלְכְּדָה שֹׁמְרוֹן׃

'And he captured it at the end of three years. In the sixth year of Hezekiah, that is the ninth year of Hoshea, king of Israel, Samaria was captured.'

We find this again in MT 2 Kgs. 25:8, and then three times in Jeremiah and once in both Ezekiel and Ezra.[180] Similarly, we find the epexegetic הוּא, referring to חֹדֶשׁ and יוֹם, mostly in post-exilic texts.[181] The three occurrences of this phenomenon in a pre-exilic text (1 Kgs. 6:1, 38; 8:2) are most certainly of late origin because they explain to what months during the year (second, seventh, and eighth) the pre-exilic זִו, אֵתָנִים, and בּוּל correspond. The use of the epexegetic independent pronouns to create synchronisms is the second feature concerning the numerals that ties together a later layer or component of Kings with the exilic and post-exilic books (see the numeral 5180 above). This may reflect a convention adopted by the chancelleries of the

[180] Jer. 25:1; 32:1; 52:12; Ezek. 1:2; Ezr. 7:8.

[181] Zech. 1:7; Esth. 2:16; 3:7; 3:13; 8:9; 8:12; 9:1; Ezr. 10:9; 2 Chr. 5:3.

Persian period. In Chapter 3, I will discuss one last element that is shared by these books once again.

In sum, it seems reasonable to me that the features discussed above point to an exilic or post-exilic composition or rewriting of vv. 1-12, which were then inserted between the וַיְהִי that once stood before the date that records Sennacherib's campaign, namely where we still find it in the Isaiah tradition, and the rest of the parallel account. I do not intend to venture into the discussion of whether the original place of the account was in Kings or in Isaiah, which would require another study and the adoption of a historical-critical analysis, besides the linguistic and text-critical approaches used here.

CONCLUSION

From the above analysis of the relevant diachronic linguistic variants, it is evident that MT Kings preserves more later features than MT Isaiah. This is in line with the conclusions reached by scholars such as Catastini and Person on the bases of a text-critical assessment of the witnesses. As both Chapter 1 and 2 show, the linguistic traces of later scribal activity show up here and there in the account and they do not constitute the norm. Later scribes could reproduce the classical idiom, and their linguistic background emerges at all levels of the language. As I will show in Chapter 3, there are more instances of this phenomenon in other chapters of Kings.

CHAPTER 3

OTHER SIGNIFICANT CASES FROM KINGS

MT 1 KINGS 12:32

וַיַּעַשׂ יָרָבְעָם ׀ חָג בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁמִינִי בַּחֲמִשָּׁה־עָשָׂר יוֹם ׀ לַחֹדֶשׁ כֶּחָג ׀ אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה וַיַּעַל֙ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֔חַ כֵּ֥ן עָשָׂה֙ בְּבֵית־אֵ֔ל
לִזְבֹּ֖חַ לָֽעֲגָלִ֑ים אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂ֔ה וְהֶעֱמִיד֙ בְּבֵ֣ית אֵ֔ל אֶת־כֹּהֲנֵ֖י הַבָּמ֥וֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשָֽׂה׃

'And Jeroboam instituted a festival in the eighth month, on the 15th day of the month, like the festival that occurs in Judah, and he ascended the altar. Thus he did in Bethel to sacrifice to the calves which he had made, and he ordained in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made.'

The episode reported in MT 1 Kgs. 12:32 is part of the account of the making of the golden calves. It narrates how Jeroboam established an independent cult of YHWH in Dan and in Bethel by setting up a pair of golden calves which functioned as pedestals for the Israelite divinity. This innovation is justified in the eyes of Jeroboam as the natural consequence of the political schism that recently occurred between Israel and Judah: the introduction of a cultic counterpart to the Solomonic temple in Jerusalem is aimed at averting a potential reunification of the two newly established political entities. It goes without saying that the tone is highly polemical, and the point of view is that of the Deuteronomistic narrator, in whose opinion Jeroboam's act constitutes a sinful trespass against God's instructions relating to the cult and a manifest idolatrous practice, so much so that Jeroboam's sin is often evoked in the rest of the book as a term of comparison to evaluate the evil monarchs of Israel.

The concluding verses of MT 1 Kgs. 12 present the scholar with a series of remarkable linguistic and philological peculiarities which deserve an in-depth analysis and coherent explanation. As in many other instances, so too in this case a systematic comparison of the linguistic and text-critical data leads to an elegant solution. The discussion will revolve, again, around a perfective weqatal, which has already been shown in chapter 2 to constitute, in most cases, a secondary element in CBH prose. An important feature that goes hand in hand with the syntactic remarks about the weqatal is the semantic range, and therefore the meaning, of the verb in question, i.e., וְהֶעֱמִיד, which I have translated above as 'to ordain'. Additional linguistic and text-critical features from the surrounding context confirm the late nature of וְהֶעֱמִיד, as well as of a few other elements.

THE HIPHIL OF עָמַד IN ANCIENT HEBREW

As we have already seen in the previous discussion on the weqatal, Hornkohl (2013: 288) has written an interesting paragraph in which he proposes analysing a series of weqatals as expressing multi-stage processes. Among such occurrences we also find MT 1 Kgs. 12:32 וְהֶעֱמִיד. While I believe that this is a clever solution, there seems to be good evidence that in many, if not most, cases it is possible to bring in a diachronic dimension which takes into account the philological assessment of the relevant textual context. As I will show, there is enough linguistic and text-critical evidence to consider also this weqatal, along with other elements occurring in MT 1 Kgs. 12:31-33, a late insertion.

With regards to the meanings of עָמַד and הֶעֱמִיד, it has long been recognised that these verbs systematically take on the meaning of and replaces the verbs קוּם and הֵקִים in post-exilic and post-biblical Hebrew, to the point that the latter are scarcely attested in Mishnaic Hebrew (GESENIUS 1815: 29; KUTSCHER 1963: 124-5; 1982: 84; POLZIN 1976: 148; HURVITZ 1982: 94-

7; 1997: 78-83; BERGEY 1983: 125-8; QIMRON 1986: 94; ROOKER 1990: 149-52; JOOSTEN 2010: 344-7). The verb עָמַד, in fact, often has the meaning of 'to arise, stand up' in exilic and post-exilic Hebrew, thus taking over the role of קוּם.[182]

As for the verb הֵקִים, this has more than one nuance in pre-exilic Hebrew. It can be used literally with the meaning of 'to cause someone to stand up, raise someone up' (figuratively used for resurrection in Hos. 6:2 and with the meaning 'to stir up a storm' in Ps. 107:29).[183] It is also used with the meaning 'to set up' a construction, building, or piece of furniture.[184] It occurs with the meaning 'to establish, appoint, raise someone up' for a specific task.[185] Finally, it is employed with the meaning 'to fulfil, confirm' a covenant, vow, word, etc.[186]

---

[182] Cf. Isa. 44:11 (?); 47:13; 48:13; Ezek. 17:14; 37:10; 44:24; 106:30; 119:90; Qoh. 4:15; Esth. 4:14; 7:7 (?); 8:11 (?); 9:16 (?); Dan. 8:22 (x2), 23, 25; 11:1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 14, 16, 20, 21, 31; 12:1, 13; Ezr. 2:63; 10:14, 15; Neh. 7:65; 8:5; 1 Chr. 20:4; 21:1; 2 Chr. 20:5 (?), 23; 26:18. The occurrences that have a question mark may not mean 'to stand up', but still bear the older meaning 'to stand'. The occurrence in 1 Chr. 20:4 (וַתַּעֲמֹד מִלְחָמָה) should probably be emended into וַתְּהִי עוֹד מִלְחָמָה in keeping with the Greek καὶ ἐγένετο ἔτι πόλεμος and the Syriac ܘܗܘܬ ܒܥܕ ܩܪܒܐ, thus making unlikely the possibility of עָמַד encroaching upon the semantic range covered also by עָלָה (cf. the expression וַתַּעֲלֶה הַמִּלְחָמָה in 1 Kgs. 22:35).

[183] Cf. Gen. 49:9; Num. 24:9; Deut. 22:4 (x2); 1 Sam. 2:8; 2 Sam. 12:11, 17; 2 Kgs. 9:2; Isa. 14:9; Jer. 50:23; Ezek. 26:8; Hos. 6:2 (resurrection); Am. 5:2; Ps. 41:11; 89:44; 107:29 (cf. 107:25); 113:7; Job 4:4; 16:12; Qoh. 4:10 (x2).

[184] Cf. אֶבֶן (Deut. 27:2, 4; Josh. 4:9, 20; 24:26); אַפְסֵי אֶרֶץ (Prov. 30:4); בַּחִין (Isa. 23:13); גַּל אֲבָנִים (Josh. 7:26; 8:29); הֲרִיסָה (Am. 9:11) חָצֵר (Exod. 40:33); יְרִיעָה (Jer. 10:20); מִזְבֵּחַ (2 Sam. 24:18; 1 Kgs. 16:32; 2 Kgs. 21:3; 1 Chr. 21:18; 2 Chr. 33:3); מַצֵּבָה (Lev. 26:1; Deut. 16:22); מְצָרָה (Isa. 29:3); מִשְׁכָּן (Exod. 26:30; 40:2, 18; Num. 1:51; 7:1; 9:15; 10:21); סֵכָּה (Am. 9:11); עַמּוּד (Exod. 40:18; 1 Kgs. 7:21 (x3); 2 Chr. 3:17); פֶּסֶל (Judg. 18:30).

[185] Cf. אֶרֶץ (Isa. 49:8); בֵּן (Josh. 5:7; 1 Sam. 22:8; 1 Kgs. 15:4); גּוֹי (Am. 6:14); זֶרַע (Gen. 38:8; 2 Sam. 7:12; 1 Chr. 17:11); כֹּהֵן (2 Sam. 2:35); כִּסֵּא (2 Sam. 3:10; 1 Kgs. 9:5; 2 Chr. 7:18); כַּשְׂדִּים (Hab. 1:6); מַטֶּה (Ezek. 34:29); מוֹשִׁיעַ (Judg. 3:9, 15); מֶלֶךְ (Deut. 28:36; 1 Kgs. 14:14; Jer. 30:9); נָבִיא (Deut. 18:15, 18; Jer. 29:15; Am. 2:11); נָזִיר (Am. 2:11); עֵדוּת (Ps. 78:5); עַם (Deut. 28:9; 29:12); צֶמַח (Jer. 23:5); צֹפֶה (Jer. 6:17); רֹעֶה (Jer. 23:4; Ezek. 24:23; Mic. 5:4; Zech. 11:16); שָׂטָן (1 Kgs. 11:14, 23); שֵׁבֶט (Isa. 49:6); שֵׁם (Deut. 25:7; Ruth 4:5, 10); שֹׁמְרִים (Judg. 7:19 (x2); Jer. 51:12); שֹׁפֵט (Judg. 2:16, 18).

[186] Cf. אִמְרָה (Ps. 119:38); אָסָר (Num. 30:15); בְּרִית (Gen. 6:18; 9:9, 11, 17; 17:7, 19, 21; Exod. 6:4; Lev. 26:9; Num. 8:18; Ezek. 16:60, 62); דָּבָר (Num. 23:19 – implied; Deut. 9:15; 27:26; 1 Sam. 1:23; 3:12 – implied; 15:11, 13; 2 Sam. 7:25; 1 Kgs. 2:4; 6:12; 8:20; 12:15; 2 Kgs. 23:3, 24; Isa. 44:26; Jer. 28:6; 29:10; 33:14; 34:18; Dan. 9:12;

On the other hand, in pre-exilic Hebrew the form הֶעֱמִיד literally means ‘to make or keep someone or something standing’, which could also be rendered as ‘to present’, ‘to preserve, establish’, or ‘to station’ depending on the context.[187] The difference in meaning between הֵקִים and הֶעֱמִיד is evident from 1 Kgs. 15:4, where it is stated that God will raise up / appoint (הֵקִים) a son after David, who will succeed him and who will keep Jerusalem standing and preserve it as such (הֶעֱמִיד).

However, as mentioned above, עָמַד and הֶעֱמִיד systematically replaced קוּם and הֵקִים from the exilic period onwards.[188] As for הֶעֱמִיד, it replaces הֵקִים in all the above-mentioned contexts. It occurs regularly for building activities, with a 14 to 3 (1 Chr. 21:18; 2 Chr. 3:17; 33:3) ratio in post-exilic biblical texts.[189] Two out of the three occurrences of הֵקִים in LBH for building

---

Neh. 5:13; 9:8; 2 Chr. 6:10; 10:15); מִזְמָה (Jer. 23:20; 30:24); מִצְוָה (Jer. 35:16); נֶדֶר (Num. 30:14, 15; Jer. 44:25 (x2)); שְׁבֻעָה (Gen. 26:3; Num. 30:14; Jer. 11:5).

[187] Cf. Gen. 47:7; Exod. 9:16; Lev. 14:11; 16:7; 27:8, 11; Num. 3:6; 5:16, 18, 30; 8:13; 11:24; 27:19; 27:22; Judg. 16:25; 2 Sam. 22:34; 1 Kgs. 15:4; 2 Kgs. 8:11; Isa. 21:6; Ezek. 2:2; 3:24; 24:11; 29:7; Ps. 18:34; 30:8; 31:9; 148:6; Ezr. 3:10; Neh. 4:7 (x2); 13:11, 19; 1 Chr. 17:14; 2 Chr. 9:8; 18:34; 23:10, 19; 25:5; 30:5; 31:2; 33:8, 19; 34:32; 35:2.

[188] For הֶעֱמִיד with the meaning of הֵקִים cf. Ps. 105:10; 107:25; Job 34:24; Prov. 29:4 (?); Esth. 4:5; Dan. 8:18; 11:11, 13, 14 (?); Ezr. 2:68; 3:8; 9:9; Neh. 3:1, 3, 6, 13, 14, 15; 4:3; 6:1, 7; 7:1, 3; 10:33; 12:31; 13:30; 1 Chr. 6:16; 15:16, 17; 16:17; 22:2; 2 Chr. 8:14; 11:15, 22; 19:5, 8; 20:21; 24:13; 25:14; 29:25; 30:5; 31:2; 33:8, 19; 35:2. On the other hand, the occurrence of הֵקִים in Ps. 40:3 (וַיָּקֶם עַל־סֶלַע רַגְלָי) is exceptional, as well as the occurrence of קוּם in 2 Kgs. 13:21 (וַיָּקָם עַל־רַגְלָיו). When someone stands on their feet, the verb עָמַד is used (Ezek. 2:1; Zech. 14:12; 2 Chr. 3:13). If the context requires it, הֶעֱמִיד is used for the factitive meaning (Ezek. 2:2; 3:24; Ps. 31:9), not הֵקִים. As for the occurrence of 2 Kgs. 13:21 just mentioned, it is interesting to observe that vv. 14-21, which constitute an independent unit marked by the *petuḥah* signs, were transposed to ch. 13 from ch. 10 and their current position is secondary, as a comparison with the Veuts Latina and with the Lucianic text make clear. The unexpected קוּם may therefore be the result of scribal intervention, maybe in the form of a pseudo-classicism. The Lucianic text in this passage translates קוּם with ἱστημι, which regularly corresponds to עָמַד / הֶעֱמִיד in γδ (cf. 2 Kgs. 2:7 (x2), 13; 3:21; 4:6, 12, 15; 5:9, 15; 6:31; 8:9, 11; 9:17; 10:4 (x2); 11:11, 14; 13:18; 15:20; 18:17, 28; 23:3). On the other hand, קוּם / הֵקִים is translated in γδ with ἱστημι only in 2 Kgs. 23:24. For a discussion on the textual history of 2 Kgs. 13:10-14:16 see Richelle 2010.

[189] Cf. אֱלֹהִים – as idols – (2 Chr. 25:14); אֲשֵׁרִים (2 Chr. 33:19); בֵּית יְהוָה (Ezr. 2:68; 2 Chr. 24:13); דֶּלֶת (Neh. 3:1, 3, 6, 13, 14, 15; 6:1; 7:1); חֲרָבָה (Ezr. 9:9); פֶּסֶל (2 Chr. 33:19); שָׁמַיִם (Ps. 148:6).

activities are certainly due to the presence of the verb in the source text (1 Kgs. 7:21 // 2 Chr. 3:17 and 2 Kgs. 21:3 // 2 Chr. 33:3). We find הֶעֱמִיד for הֵקִים with the meaning 'to fulfil, confirm'.[190] With דָּבָר as object, הֵקִים is still used five times in post-exilic texts (Dan. 9:12; Neh. 5:13; 9:8; 2 Chr. 6:10; 10:15). The occurrences in 2 Chr. 6:10 and 2 Chr. 10:15 go back to the use of הֵקִים in their respective source texts, i.e., 2 Sam. 7:25 and 1 Kgs. 12:15. It also takes the meaning 'to raise up, stir up (a storm or mob)'.[191] Finally, and most importantly for the present discussion, הֶעֱמִיד replaces הֵקִים with the meaning 'to appoint'.[192] In 1 Chr. 17:11 and 2 Chr. 7:18 the verb הֵקִים is directly taken from the source text, 2 Sam. 7:12 and 1 Kgs. 9:5, respectively.

In Qumran Hebrew, contrary to what we see in LBH, one still finds almost one hundred occurrences of הֵקִים with the meanings mentioned above, and a text such as the Cairo Damascus document alone employs הֵקִים no less than 21 times.[193] However, הֶעֱמִיד is also attested with the meaning of הֵקִים a handful of times, confirming the trajectory already observable in Biblical Hebrew.[194] Also in Ben Sira הֵקִים is still used a few times.[195] As for the occurrences of הֶעֱמִיד in Ben Sira, only in 40:19 (fully preserved in Ms. B and only in fragmentary form in Mas.) does

---

[190] Cf. בְּרִית (Ps. 105:10; 1 Chr. 16:17); דָּבָר (2 Chr. 30:5); חָזוֹן (Dan. 11:14); שְׁבֻעָה (Ps. 105:10; 1 Chr. 16:17).

[191] Cf. אֲחֵרִים (Job 34:24); אֲנִי (Dan. 8:18); הָמוֹן רָב (Dan. 11:11, 13); רוּחַ סְעָרָה (Ps. 107:25). Quite interestingly, both הֵקִים and הֶעֱמִיד are used in Ps. 107:25.29 with the meaning 'to stir up' in reference to a storm. In Ps. 107:25, הֶעֱמִיד occurs in parallelism with רוֹמֵם.

[192] Cf. אֲבִיָּה (2 Chr. 11:22); אֲדָמָה (2 Chr. 33:8); אֵלֶּה – referred to singers – (1 Chr. 6:16); חֹצְבִים (1 Chr. 22:2); כֹּהֲנִים (2 Chr. 11:15; 19:8; 35:2); לְוִיִּם (Ezr. 3:8; 1 Chr. 15:17; 2 Chr. 19:8; 29:25); מַחְלְקוֹת הַכֹּהֲנִים (2 Chr. 8:14; 31:2); מִצְוֹת (Neh. 10:33); מִשְׁמֶרֶת / מִשְׁמָר (Neh. 4:3; 7:3; 13:30); מְשֹׁרְרִים (1 Chr. 15:16; 20:21); נְבִיאִים (Neh. 6:7); סָרִיסִים (Esth. 4:5); שֹׁפְטִים (2 Chr. 19:5); תּוֹדוֹת (Neh. 12:31). The occurrence of הֶעֱמִיד in Esth. 4:5 may be an archaism, if not a pseudo-classicism: although it means 'to appoint', it is followed by the preposition לִפְנֵי, typically used in the Pentateuch with הֶעֱמִיד when this means 'to make someone stand', 'to present' (e.g. Gen. 47:7; Lev. 14:11; 16:7; 27:8, 11; Num. 3:6; 5:16, 18, 30; 8:13; 27:19, 22).

[193] Cf. CD 1:11; 2:11; 3:13, 21; 4:9; 5:18; 6:2; 7:16; 9:7; 11:14; 15:6, 12; 16:1, 4, 5, 7 (x2), 9 (x2), 11, 12.

[194] Cf. 1QHa 17:12; 22:15; 4QVisSam 3 ii:3; 4QapocrJosh 1:2; 4QNon-CanonicalPsalmsB 1:7; 69:5; 4QCommunalConfession 3:7; 4QHodayot 7 ii:19; 4Q433 1:6.

[195] Sir. 36:20; 44:21, 22; 45:24; 48:5; 49:13; 50:24.

the verb have the more recent meaning of ‘to establish’.[196] Finally, הֵקִים is attested six times in the Mishnah, only in biblical quotations or allusions to biblical texts (Yebam. 12:6; Ned. 10:1; 10:7 (x3); Miqw. 9:2).

In MT 1 Kgs. 12:32, הֶעֱמִיד clearly bears the later meaning ‘to appoint, ordain’ rather than the older, literal ‘to make someone stand’, which confirms the late syntactic profile of the weqatal form. Quite interestingly, 1 Chr. 11:15, which narrates the same events, has a wayyiqtol rather than the weqatal (although with the same late meaning).[197]

ADDITIONAL LATE LINGUISTIC FEATURE

Besides הֶעֱמִיד, MT 1 Kgs. 12:31-33 betrays other non-classical elements.[198] These verses were probably composed or revised, together with its *Wiederaufnahme* in 13:33-34 (an independent section delimited by the *petuḥah* markers) at a later stage, when the story contained in MT 1 Kgs. 13:1-32 was inserted (for a linguistic assessment of chapter 13 see below). In fact, if ch. 13 is omitted, the text flows without any problems from 12:33 to 13:33. As Cogan (2001: 367) observes, the introductory וְהִנֵּה occurring in MT 1 Kgs. 13:1 could hardly constitute the beginning of a new tale. The original source from which this episode was taken is unfortunately no longer retrievable.

MT 1 Kgs. 12:31 and its *Wiederaufnahme* MT 1 Kgs. 13:33 share the same expression מִקְצוֹת הָעָם ‘some of the people, all sorts of people, all of the people’ (the translations vary), which contains קָצָה ‘end, extremity’, a noun most often appearing in the plural and typically used in

[196] The expression ‘to establish a name’, occurring as יעמידו שם in Sir. 40:19, requires הֵקִים in CBH (cf. Deut. 25:7).

[197] וַיַּעֲמֶד־לוֹ כֹּהֲנִים לַבָּמוֹת וְלַשְּׂעִירִים וְלָעֲגָלִים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה׃

[198] According to Rendsburg (2002a: 27-8), both features discussed below (מִקְצוֹת and בָּדָא) are to be considered northernisms. I do not believe that there is enough evidence to support this statement.

the architectural descriptions of Exodus (and once in 1 Kings).[199] Elsewhere in classical biblical prose, the noun occurs in Judg. 18:2 in the expression מִקְצוֹתָם אֲנָשִׁים ‘some men from among their entirety’, clearly redundant because of the previous מִמִּשְׁפַּחְתָּם חֲמֵשָׁה אֲנָשִׁים and, most importantly, lacking in the Greek, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta. Besides MT 1 Kgs. 12:31 and MT 1 Kgs. 13:33, about whose late character I am arguing, the noun occurs once more in biblical prose in MT 1 Kgs. 17:32 as מִקְצוֹתָם. This too is a secondary addition, which does not occur in the Old Greek: LXX^{B} does not have it and LXX^{L} adds ἀπὸ μέρους from a Hexaplaric source, as the Syrohexapla indicates.[200] Also the Armenian lacks this reading. The noun further occurs in Second Isaiah (40:28; 41:5, 9; 49:36), Jeremiah (49:36), Ezekiel (15:4), Psalms (19:7), and Job (26:14; 28:24). The use of קְצוֹת (outside architectural descriptions) in books that best represent exilic Hebrew may constitute a *terminus post quem* that gives us an idea of when the noun crept into the book of Kings as a secondary addition not only in a textually troubled chapter such as MT 2 Kgs. 17, but also in MT 1 Kgs. 12:31 and MT 1 Kgs. 13:33.[201]

Another feature that stands out occurs in MT 1 Kgs. 12:33. The expression בָּדָא מִלִּבּוֹ ‘he invented on his own’ (the second word to be read מִלִּבָּוֹ according to the qᵊre) occurs elsewhere only in Neh. 6:8 (כִּי מִלִּבְּךָ אַתָּה בוֹדֵאם). The verb בָּדָא ‘to fabricate’ is otherwise attested in the Mishnah (Menah. 5:1) and in Aramaic (4QTLevi 9; TAD C1.1.30; Palestianan Talmud Sheq.

[199] Cf. Exod. 25:18, 19 (x3); 26:4; 27:4; 28:7, 23, 24, 25, 26; 36:11; 37:7, 8 (x2); 39:16, 17, 18, 19; 1 Kgs. 6:24.

[200] The Syrohexapla reads ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܟܗܢ ܕܪܡ and has an obelos on the second word. The note in the margin says ܟܗܢ ܕܪܡ ܡܢ ܟܠ ܡܢ ܟܗܢ ܕܪܡ ‘α’ σ’ θ’ ε’ *et fecerunt sibi ex parte sua sacerdotes excelsorum*’. On this verse see Tekoniemi 2019: 220-1.

[201] The same may be true for לְעֻמַּת in 2 Sam. 16:13. In Chapter 2, I have observed that v. 13b may represent a late addition based on some codicological and linguistic features. In classical biblical prose, the term לְעֻמַּת occurs in the instruction and fulfilment speeches concerning the tabernacle (Exod. 25:27; 28:27; 37:14; 38:18; 39:20), once in Lev. 3:9 in a priestly context, in the temple account of 1 Kings (7:20). The term is very dear to Ezekiel (1:20, 21; 3:8 (x2), 13; 10:19; 11:22; 40:18; 42:7; 45:6, 7; 48:13, 18 (x2), 21) and it occurs fairly often in LBH (Qoh. 5:15; 7:14; Neh. 12:24; 1 Chr. 24:31; 25:8; 26:12, 16). It is therefore stylistically striking to find לְעֻמַּת in 2 Sam. 16:13, and its presence could further prove the exilic / post-exilic origin of v. 13b, as we have just seen with קְצוֹת.

46:27). Both the verb and the expression found in MT 1 Kgs. 12:33 are of Aramaic origin and further consolidate the idea that these verses have a late origin.

That these verses may have undergone corruption and scribal intervention is also evident from the omission of Bethel in v. 30 and the awkward presence of הָאֶחָד in the text (which was probably complemented by another הָאֶחָד when both Bethel and Dan were mentioned in an earlier stage of the text).[202] In v. 31, the unexpected construction אֶת־בֵּית בָּמֹות, which presents an object marker occurring before an indefinite construct chain, may also be a vestige of scribal intervention.

In sum, there is enough textual and linguistic evidence to conclude that MT 1 Kgs. 12-31-33 and MT 1 Kgs. 13:33-34 underwent an important revision during and / or after the exilic period. As I will show in my treatment of MT 1 Kgs. 13:1-32, it is very likely that some of these secondary additions entered the text when the story about the man of God and Jeroboam was inserted after chapter 12. It is a widespread phenomenon that those paragraphs and lines that are sewn together with new portions of text may present linguistic and textual asperities, as well as show evident updates in the language.[203] Other interesting examples come from MT 1 Sam. 17:12, which is part of the longer story of David and Goliath and constitutes the beginning of the addition which is lacking in the Septuagint (see Chapter 2). When the scribe merged the parts missing in the shorter account into his edition of Samuel, he did so in a cumbersome way, so that v. 12, which is tacked on to v. 11, starts with poor syntax: וְדָוִד בֶּן־אִישׁ אֶפְרָתִי הַזֶּה.

Similarly, in 11Q5 we find the forms ידורשוה (יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ in MT Ps. 119:2) and יעוזרני (יַעֲזָרֵנִי in MT Ps. 119:175). It is known that in Qumran there exists a dialect which employs a yiqotl pattern

[202] For a commentary on the textual history of v. 30 and for the related issue of the repetitions found in v. 32-33 see Burney 1903: 177-9.

[203] See, for instance, the remarks about the transposition of 2 Kgs. 13:14-21 in its current position in MT from its original placement after 2 Kgs. 10:31 as attested in the Vetus Latina (TREBOLLE BARRERA 1995: 339:41).

when the pronominal suffixes are added to the verb rather than the biblical yiqtol (REYMOND 2014: 209-21). Quite interestingly, the two abovementioned forms occur in the second verse and in the second-to-last verse of the very long Psalm 119, which is inserted between Ps. 132 and 135. I wonder if such forms emerged as the consequence of scribal intervention, with the writer focussed on arranging the new sequence (if such it is) and therefore inadvertently letting slip into the verses at the extremities of the displaced composition two forms that belonged to his dialect and differed from those of the source text. Although such a pattern is attested a few more times in 11Q5, it is not used regularly in the scroll (for instance, both MT and 11Q5 have יִקְרָאֻהוּ / יקראוהו at Ps. 145:18).

MT 1 KINGS 13:1-32

In this chapter the story of an anonymous man of God is told in a fashion reminiscent of the legendary tone that we encounter in the Elijah and Elisha prophetic cycles. This passage is also famous because in v. 2 the future king Josiah himself is mentioned by name as the main actor of the defilement of Jeroboam's altar, an event narrated in 2 Kgs. 23:15-16. The *ex eventu* reference to Josiah is a first important sign indicating that this chapter is most likely a late addition and adaptation of what must have been a legend or story that circulated orally. The editorial activity of the scribe is evident from the first word וְהִנֵּה, as mentioned above. Nevertheless, there are a couple of additional elements that point to an exilic date for the addition of this story.

The Comitative Preposition אֵת

Ancient Hebrew had two comitative prepositions which had the same meaning 'with' and could be used interchangeably in the same contexts, apparently with no remarkable difference. The preposition עִם has its parallels in Ugaritic (*ʿm* and *ʿmn*), Aramaic (עם) and Syriac (ܥܡ), Arabic (مع), and Old South Arabian (*ʿm*). By the same token, אֵת has cognates in other Semitic languages, namely Phoenician (את) and Akkadian (*itti*). The occurrence of both עִם and אֵת in Ancient Hebrew is remarkable.

Distribution and Diachrony

Scholars have long noticed that the distribution of עִם and אֵת may bear on our understanding of the historical development of Ancient Hebrew (Hornkohl 2013: 187-92; Arentsen 2019: 515-8). In fact, it varies between books and, above all, between linguistic corpora (so-called CBH, TBH, and LBH). At first glance, the two prepositions have a rather similar number of occurrences: Accordance counts 1048 occurrences for עִם and 924 for אֵת. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd (2008: 112-3) provide similar figures in their list (1048 vs 887) and add the results given in other sources (*TLOT* = Mandelkern, 1093 vs c. 900; Andersen and Forbes, 1117 vs 742; Even-Shoshan, 1091 vs 938; Kohlenberger and Swanson, 1048 vs 934). Furthermore, they calculate the percentage of אֵת for all אֵת and עִם in the Hebrew Bible (45.3%). The other sources to which they compare their numbers show a very similar ratio (*TLOT* = Mandelkern, c. 45.2%; Andersen and Forbes, 39.9%; Even-Shoshan, 46.2%; Kohlenberger and Swanson, 47.1%). The prepositions עִם and אֵת occur almost with the same frequency in the Hebrew Bible as a whole, with a slight preference for the former. Nevertheless, a close look at the individual linguistic corpora and books and a systematic analysis of the occurrences which considers the distribution of עִם and אֵת yields a more nuanced picture.

The table below contains the occurrences of both prepositions for each book with the individual percentage of עִם and אֵת for all עִם and אֵת:[204]

	עִם	אֵת	% of עִם	% of אֵת
Genesis	83	135	38%	62%
Exodus	49	44	52.7%	47.3%
Leviticus	26	27	49%	51%
Numbers	20	53	27.4%	72.6%
Deuteronomy	65	26	71%	29%
Joshua	41	28	59.4%	40.6%
Judges	59	36	62%	38%
Samuel	164	102	61.6%	38.4%
Kings	100	102	49.5%	50.5%
Isaiah (I)	14	12	53.8%	46.2%
Isaiah (II-III)	1	34	2.8 %	97.2 %
Jeremiah	7	98	6.7%	93.3%
Ezekiel	0	63	0%	100%
Hosea	14	2	87.5%	12.5%
Joel	2	0	100%	0%
Amos	3	1	75%	15%
Obadiah	0	1	0%	100%
Jonah	1	0	100%	0%
Micah	4	4	50%	50%

[204] The figures are taken from Arentsen 2019: 515 with a slight change concerning Isaiah, which I present in the table as I Isaiah and II-III Isaiah. For a more detailed analysis of the prepositions in Isaiah, the reader should refer to the article itself. To Arentsen's table, I have added the percentages.

Nahum	1	0	100%	0%
Habakkuk	0	1	0%	100%
Zephaniah	1	2	33.3%	66.7%
Haggai	0	3	0%	100%
Zechariah	4	13	23.5%	76.5%
Malachi	0	3	0%	100%
Psalms	67	25	72.8%	27.2%
Proverbs	8	25	24.2%	75.8%
Job	48	6	88.9%	11.1%
Songs	9	2	81.8%	18.2%
Ruth	14	8	63.6%	36.4%
Lamentations	0	0	-	-
Ecclesiastes	8	0	100%	0%
Esther	11	3	78.6%	21.4%
Daniel	17	2	89.5%	10.5%
Ezra	24	2	92.3%	7.7%
Nehemiah	13	6	68.4%	31.6%
Chronicles	170	28	85.8%	14.2%

As already observed by Hornkohl and Arentsen, the preposition עִם is preferred after the exile, probably under the influence of Aramaic עם, so that the use of אֵת diminishes until it is barely productive in Mishnaic Hebrew. However, during the exile we encounter more often or exclusively אֵת rather than עִם in Second Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel with figures that go from roughly 93% to 100% in favour of אֵת. Another interesting figure is that of Proverbs, a book whose Hebrew I would define as non-standard.[205] As for Numbers, it seems to present many

[205] I plan to write more on this in the future, as there is almost no literature on the topic.

features that often do not align with CBH, and a thorough linguistic analysis of this book is still a *desideratum*. It is very important to stress that sometimes it is not enough to look at tables such as this, and scholars should focus on and consider sections and chapters individually. For instance, Genesis seems to privilege the use of אֵת (62%) over עִם. Nevertheless, it has never previously been observed that the book presents a tripartite structure with regards to the use of the two comitative prepositions, with two sections strongly preferring אֵת.[206]

	אֵת	עִם	% אֵת	% עִם
Primordial History (1-11)	26	1	96.3	3.7
Patriarchal Stories (12-36, 38)	59	66	47.2	52.8
Joseph Story (37, 39-50)	50	16	75.7	24.3

If we move to Kings, the situation becomes even more interesting, given the textual history of the book. The occurrences are listed in the two tables below chapter by chapter, although this is a later division.

1 Kings	עִם	אֵת	% עִם	% אֵת
1	10	3	76,92	23,07
2	3	2	60	40
3	3	2	60	40
4	0	0	0	0

[206] As for the Joseph story, while it has recently been argued that it belongs to the CBH corpus (JOOSTEN 2019), I believe that there are enough elements that rather point to an exilic date. This, however, will need a full treatment of the entire section which is not possible here.

5	1	1	50	50
6	0	2	0	100
7	0	0	0	0
8	10	2	83,33	16,66
9	1	2	33,33	66,66
10	3	0	100	0
11	8	3	80	20
12	3	6	42,85	57,14
13	1	8	11,11	88,88
14	4	0	100	0
15	5	1	83,33	16,66
16	3	1	75	25
17	1	0	100	0
18	0	1	0	100
19	0	0	0	0
20	1	6	14,28	85,71
21	0	1	0	0
22	5	8	38,46	61,53

2 Kings	עִם	אֶת	עִם %	אֶת %
1	0	2	0	100
2	1	2	33,33	66,66
3	0	4	0	100
4	0	3	0	100
5	0	3	0	100
6	1	6	14,28	85,71

7	0	0	0	0
8	4	4	50	50
9	1	4	20	80
10	3	4	42,85	57,14
11	1	2	33,33	66,66
12	1	3	25	75
13	4	2	66,66	33,33
14	8	0	100	0
15	6	3	66,66	33,33
16	2	1	66,66	33,33
17	0	3	0	100
18	3	3	50	50
19	0	1	0	100
20	1	1	50	50
21	1	0	100	0
22	0	2	0	100
23	0	1	0	100
24	1	0	100	0
25	0	6	0	100

The most interesting figures are probably those that highlight the preference for the preposition אֵת (also attested as -אוֹת) in the Northern prophetic cycles of Elijah and Elisha. This may be due to the geographical proximity to Phoenician, which also uses את, for the place of origin of such stories. As we have seen in the Introduction, the Elijah and Elisha cycles present many linguistic peculiarities, which, from the point of view of CBH, we may call non-standard. By the same token, the final chapters of 2 Kings also show a preference for אֵת, although it is only

in chapter 25 that we have enough occurrences to appreciate it. As many scholars (SPIECKERMANN 1982: 120-30; EYNIKEL 1996: 155-6 n. 29; VAN KEULEN 1996: 162-8; WRIGHT 2005: 9-10; YOUNG, REZETKO, EHRENSVÄRD, 2008a: 11; 2008b: 150-55; HORNKOHL 2016: 33) have pointed out, the linguistic profile of these chapters seems to differ from CBH, and I believe that, again, the non-standard forms, as well as the content of the chapters itself, point us to the exilic period. Interestingly, also in the Arad ostraca, which date back to the very last years of the Judahite kingdom, we observe a strong preference for אֵת (x6 – 85.7%) over עִם (x1 – 14.3%).[207]

Quite remarkably, another chapter that stands out for its preference of אֵת over עִם is precisely 1 Kgs. 13, which shows figures that are very similar to those of the exilic triad of prophetic books. The high frequency with which אֵת is used certainly constitutes a valid element that plays in favour of the view expressed above about the scribal and editorial activity detectable around this chapter.

THE *VERBA DICENDI* AND DIRECT SPEECH

In a study published in 1991, Goldenberg discussed direct speech in the Hebrew Bible. Among many interesting observations, he remarked that the verb אָמַר is regularly and with very few exceptions required to introduce direct speech, as the manifold, almost pleonastic, occurrences of לֵאמֹר indicate. Not infrequently, we find לֵאמֹר even after אָמַר (e.g., Gen. 9:8 and 42:22). On the other hand, הִגִּיד, often followed by כִּי, always introduces indirect speech. If אָמַר + כִּי introduces indirect speech, then it means 'to command'. Other scholars before Goldenberg had noted that it is usually אָמַר that introduced direct speech and had therefore focused on the rare and anomalous occurrences in which this function is carried out by דִּבֶּר, above all in Kings. For

[207] אֵת: Arad 3:6; 5:2; 16:7; 24:17, 19; 40:8. עִם: Arad 3:4.

instance, Thenius (1873: 189) identified the occurrence of וַיְדַבֵּר introducing direct speech in MT 1 Kgs. 13:7 (as well as in v. 22) as a sign of late composition. By the same token, the many attestations of דִּבֶּר employed without אָמַר to introduce direct speech in MT 2 Kgs. 1 led Ehrlich (1900: 330) to the same conclusions as to the late date of the composition. More recently, Rofé (1988: 97-8) discussed the same phenomenon in relation to MT 1 Kgs. 21:5-6, referring to it as a sign of late composition. In another publication, while analysing 2 Kgs. 1, Rofé (2014[2]: 24) lists some of these anomalous uses of דִּבֶּר in the Hebrew Bible, stressing that passages such as Exod. 32:7-14, Josh. 22, 1 Kgs. 13, and 1 Kgs. 21, where this phenomenon is attested, are usually considered late compositions on various grounds. Cronauer's (2005: 183) reference to and brief discussion about these anomalous occurrences of דִּבֶּר in 1 Kgs. 21 rests on Rofé's survey.

Although I believe that the remarks of said scholars are on point, it is worth fleshing out their arguments with a fuller treatment of this stylistic phenomenon. There are, in fact, more occurrences (x43) of דִּבֶּר not followed by אָמַר to introduce direct speech than those found in Rofé's lists. Moreover, the verbs עָנָה 'to reply, begin to speak' and הִגִּיד 'to tell, inform, report' also sometimes exhibit this behaviour, although much more rarely than דִּבֶּר (x5 and x1, respectively).

	Occurrences	References
Genesis	1	41:17 (דִּבֶּר)
Exodus	5	9:1 (דִּבֶּר); 15:21 (עָנָה); 32:7 (דִּבֶּר), 13 (דִּבֶּר); 33:1 (דִּבֶּר)
Leviticus	2	10:12 (דִּבֶּר), 19 (דִּבֶּר)
Numbers	4	5:6 (דִּבֶּר); 14:35 (דִּבֶּר); 18:8 (דִּבֶּר); 21:5 (דִּבֶּר)
Joshua	1	22:21 (דִּבֶּר)

Judges	1	9:2 (דִּבֶּר); 20:3 (דִּבֶּר)
1 Samuel	3	4:20 (דִּבֶּר); 9:17 (עָנָה); 20:28 (עָנָה)
2 Samuel	4	19:2 (הִגִּיד), 43 (עָנָה); 23:3 (דִּבֶּר); 24:12 (דִּבֶּר)
1 Kings	8	12:10 (דִּבֶּר); 13:3 (דִּבֶּר), 7 (דִּבֶּר), 12 (דִּבֶּר), 22 (דִּבֶּר); 20:11 (דִּבֶּר); 21:5 (דִּבֶּר), 6 (דִּבֶּר)
2 Kings	12	1:3 (דִּבֶּר), 6 (דִּבֶּר), 7 (דִּבֶּר), 9 x2 (דִּבֶּר), 10 (דִּבֶּר), 11 (דִּבֶּר), 12 (דִּבֶּר), 13 (דִּבֶּר), 15 (דִּבֶּר), 16 (דִּבֶּר); 19:21 (דִּבֶּר)
Isaiah	2	37:22 (דִּבֶּר); 40:27 (דִּבֶּר)
Jeremiah	3	9:21 (דִּבֶּר); 23:17 (דִּבֶּר); 42:19 (דִּבֶּר)
Ezekiel	7	12:23 (דִּבֶּר); 32:21 (דִּבֶּר); 37:19 (דִּבֶּר), 21 (דִּבֶּר); 40:4 (דִּבֶּר), 45 (דִּבֶּר); 41:22 (דִּבֶּר)
Psalms	1	116:10 (דִּבֶּר)
Nehemiah	1	8:6 (עָנָה)
Daniel	1	2:4 (דִּבֶּר)

To the occurrences listed in the above table, one should add the five instances of דִּבֶּר and one of הִגִּיד hailing from Qumran and thus revise Rofé's (2014: 24) claim that we have no such examples among the scrolls.[208]

It should also be mentioned that in most cases where we do not find the expected אָמַר other textual witnesses such as the Septuagint or the Samaritan Pentateuch have a different reading or add a second *verbum dicendi*.

[208] CD 19:15 (דִּבֶּר); 1QM 10:1 (הִגִּיד) 4Q223_224 f2iv:6 (דִּבֶּר); 4Q252 4:2 (דִּבֶּר); 4Q267 f9v:2 (דִּבֶּר); 4Q298 f1_2i:1 (דִּבֶּר).

Gen. 41:17	LXX + λέγων
Exod. 9:1	Samaritan Pentateuch and K 69, 127, forte 75 ואמרת
Exod. 15:21	LXX + λέγουσα
Exod. 32:7	LXX + λέγων; Samaritan Pentateuch + לאמר; K 152 ויאמר
Exod. 32:13	LXX + λέγων
Exod. 33:1	Samaritan Pentateuch + לאמר; K 69 + לאמר
Lev. 10:12	-
Lev. 10:19	LXX + λέγων
Num. 5:6	LXX + λέγων; Samaritan Pentateuch + לאמר
Num. 14:35	-
Num. 18:8	K 80, 193 + לאמר
Num. 21:5	LXX + λέγοντες
Josh. 22:21	LXX + λέγοντες
Judg. 9:2	LXX + λέγοντες; K 92 לאמר
1 Sam. 4:20	-
1 Sam. 9:17	LXX^{L} + λέγων
1 Sam. 20:28	$4QSam^{b}$ + [אמר]ו; LXX^{BL} + καὶ εἶπεν; K 244 ויאמר
2 Sam. 19:2	LXX^{BL} + λέγοντες
2 Sam. 19:43	LXX^{L} + καὶ εἶπον; LXX^{B} + καὶ εἶπαν
2 Sam. 23:3	LXX^{B} + εἰπόν
2 Sam. 24:12	LXX^{BL} + λέγων; K 113 + לאמר
1 Kgs. 12:10	K 23, 30, 85, 93, marg. 96, 150, 154, 158, 228 תאמר
1 Kgs. 13:3	LXX^{B} + λέγων
1 Kgs. 13:7	LXX^{L} + λέγων
1 Kgs. 13:12	LXX^{BL} + λέγων; K 154 + לאמר
1 Kgs. 13:17 (?)	LXX^{BL} + λέγων

1 Kgs. 13:22	LXX^{BL} + λέγων; K 93 אמר
1 Kgs. 20:11	LXX^{BL} ἱκανούσθω
1 Kgs. 21:5	-
1 Kgs. 21:6	-
2 Kgs. 1:3	LXX^{BL} + λέγων
2 Kgs. 1:6	-
2 Kgs. 1:7	LXX^{B} + λέγων
2 Kgs. 1:9	LXX^{BL} + καὶ εἶπεν
2 Kgs. 1:9	> K 187
2 Kgs. 1:10	-
2 Kgs. 1:11	LXX^{BL} + καὶ εἶπεν
2 Kgs. 1:12	LXX^{B} + καὶ εἶπεν; K 160, 250, 658, forte 21 ויאמר
2 Kgs. 1:13	LXX^{B} + καὶ εἶπεν; LXX^{L} + λέγων
2 Kgs. 1:15	LXX^{B} + καὶ εἶπεν; LXX^{L} + λέγων
2 Kgs. 1:16	LXX^{BL} + καὶ εἶπεν
2 Kgs. 19:21	-
Isa. 37:22	-
Isa. 40:27	-
Jer. 9:21	> LXX
Jer. 23:17	LXX τὸν λόγον
Jer. 42:19	-
Ezek. 12:23	-
Ezek. 32:21	-
Ezek. 37:19	-
Ezek. 37:21	-
Ezek. 40:4	-

Ezek. 40:45	-
Ezek. 41:22	-
Neh. 8:6	LXX + καὶ εἶπαν (MT וַיֹּאמֶן)
Dan. 2:4	-

As the medieval manuscripts show, the forms of the verb אָמַר may have easily been added by the scribes at any point in the history of the text, above all in contexts where they are usually required to occur. Because of the frequency with which it is used, in many cases the presence of אָמַר in the medieval manuscripts, as well as in the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, may be compared to variants such as כֹּל or -וְ, whose presence or absence in the witnesses can sometimes be attributed to scribal activity without necessarily reflecting a different *Vorlage*. More specifically, the evidence from Qumran and from Ezekiel indicates that at some point during the exilic and post-exilic period it was possible to use *verba dicendi* other than אָמַר to introduce direct speech. The many occurrences that we see in Kings mostly appear in passages that show signs of late language, as already pointed out by Rofé, and the many variants that we find in the Septuagint may indicate that MT reflects an updated version of the stories with clear signs of scribal intervention. As for MT 1 Kgs. 13, there are at least four occurrences of דִּבֶּר introducing direct speech. A fifth potential instance may occur in v. 17, but the beginning of the verse is clearly corrupt (כִּי־דָבֶר אֵלַי בִּדְבַר יְהוָֹה) and LXX^{B} preserves a different, more comprehensible, reading (ὅτι οὕτως ἐντέταλταί μοι ἐν λόγῳ Κύριος λέγων). It is very interesting to note that a medieval Masoretic manuscript, namely K 225, has a reading that appears to reflect that of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (כן צוה אותי) and is not too far from what the Targum says (אֲרֵי גְזֵירָא עֲלַי בְּפִתְגָמָא דֵיוי), although K 225 may also have harmonised the text to v. 9. Unfortunately, the phenomenon according to which some readings of the LXX are also reflected in individual manuscripts collated by Kennicott and De Rossi still requires a full

treatment, and only a few studies have appeared that highlight the importance of such concords (WEVERS 1948; SACCHI 1973: 10-11; SACCHI AND CHIESA 1980: 205). This has been documented more in detail for the Palestinian tradition (CHIESA 1978: 356).

Given the text-critical and linguistic peculiarities that we find immediately before and after MT 1 Kgs. 13:1-32, it has been argued above that this independent prophetic story constitutes a later addition to the text of Kings. Based on the striking preference for the preposition אֵת over עִם and the relatively frequent use of דִּבֵּר to introduce direct speech, I would argue that the editorial activity that resulted in the insertion of MT 1 Kgs. 13:1-32 must have taken place during the exilic period.

MT 2 KINGS 17:6

בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית לְהוֹשֵׁעַ לָכַד מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר אֶת־שֹׁמְרוֹן וַיֶּגֶל אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל אַשּׁוּרָה וַיּוֹשֶׁב אֹתָם בַּחְלַח וּבְחָבוֹר נְהַר גּוֹזָן וְעָרֵי מָדָי׃

‘In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Ashur captured Samaria and deported Israel to Ashur. And he settled them in Halah, and on the Habur, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes.’

This verse occurs in one of the most challenging chapters of Kings, both from the redactional and the text-critical perspective. The first ten verses relate the fall of Samaria and its conquest at the hands of the Assyrian king. Among the most illustrious and difficult *cruces* of these verses we find the assessment of Hoshea in v. 2, who is judged in MT as a king who did evil in the eyes of God, yet not as much as the previous Israelite kings (רַק לֹא כְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ

לְפָנָיו).[209] On the other hand, the reading contained in LXX^{L} (παρὰ πάντας τοὺς γενομένους ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ) and in some Old Latin witnesses such as the palimpsest *Vindobonensis* (super omnes qui fuerunt ante eum), the marginal notes found in manuscripts L$^{91-95}$ (prae omnes qui fuerant ante eum), and Sulpicius Severus (hic ultra omnes reges superiors impius) affirm that he was the worst king of all Israelite sovereigns. Another interesting variant is the name of the mysterious Egyptian king to whom Hoshea sends messengers in v. 4. According to MT, his name was So, king of Egypt (סֹוא מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרָיִם), whereas both LXX^{L} (Ἀδραμέλεχ τὸν Αἰθίοπα τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ) and the palimpsest *Vindobonensis* (Adramalec ethiopem habitātem in aegypto) mention Adramelech the Ethiopian, who lived in Egypt. The marginal glosses found in L$^{91-95}$ have a slightly different text (Adramelech Aegyptium inhabitantem in Aegypto).[210] In both instances Tekoniemi (2018: 213-23; 2019: 53-61, 69-71), among other scholars, shows on both text-critical and ideological grounds that MT most likely preserves a revised form of the text.

The reference to the king of Egypt in v. 4 is part of a section, vv. 3-6, about which much has been written. It is, in fact, common opinion that there are different textual and redactional layers in these verses, for whose identification the literary technique of the *Wiederaufnahme* proves essential (TREBOLLE BARRERA 1981; TEKONIEMI 2019: 62-81).[211] From the point of view of the language, v. 4 contains two anomalies in a secondary addition that was further revised in MT. In OG (TORIJANO 2012: 199-200), most likely preserving an earlier reading than that

[209] On this issue and the proposed solutions see Benzinger 1899: 172; Burney 1903: 329; Stade and Schwally 1904: 260; Šanda 1912: 212; Snaith 1954: 278; Gray 1964: 583; Jones 1984: 546; Van der Kooij 1984: 110-12; Montgomery 1986: 464; Cogan and Tadmor 1988: 195-6; Trebolle Barrera 1989: 188-93; Fritz 1998: 95; Brueggemann 2000: 476; Levin 2008: 156; Piquer Otero 2012: 237; Tekoniemi 2018: 213-8; 2019: 53-61.

[210] On the identity of the foreign king see Redford 1981: 75; Cogan and Tadmor 1988: 196; Christensen 1989: 141; Day 1992; Kitchen 2003: 15-6; Schenker 2004: 117-9; Tekoniemi 2018: 218-23; 2019: 69-71.

[211] Most helpfully, Torijano (2012) has published a critical edition of OG 2 Kgs. 17:2-6 with a thorough and insightful philological commentary.

found in MT, we read that Hoshea used to send gifts to the Assyrian king every year, which constitutes a *Wiederaufnahme* of what is said at the end of v. 3. On the other hand, MT affirms that Hoshea would not pay the tribute from year to year:

OG	MT
καί	וְלֹא
ἦν Ωσηε φέρων	הֶעֱלָה
δῶρα	מִנְחָה
τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀσσυρίων	לְמֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר
ἐνιαυτὸν κατ’ἐνιαυτόν	כְּשָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה

As clearly illustrated by Tekoniemi, the original resumptive remark that Hoshea would bear tribute to Shalmaneser V every year (as we read in OG) was later changed and the negation was added (MT וְלֹא־הֶעֱלָה) in order to put more blame on Hoshea and give another reason for the Assyrian king to campaign against Samaria. That MT contains a reading that is the result of a very late revision is further corroborated by the fact that the expression הֶעֱלָה מִנְחָה occurs in the Hebrew Bible only with reference to cultic offers and not to describe the payment of tributes (TEKONIEMI 2019: 72; see also TORIJANO 2012: 205-7).[212] It is tempting to see here a calque of the Neo-Babylonian expression šūlû tēlīta ‘to deliver (literally, ‘to cause to go up’) the tēlītu-tax / outlays, disbursals, expenses’ (CAD, tēlītu 2a), which would further confirm the late nature of the addition. Furthermore, as both Torijano (2012: 206) and Tekoniemi (2019:

[212] Cf. Ex 30:9, 40:29; Lev 14:20; Judg 13:19; Josh 22:23; 1 Kgs 18:29, 36; 2 Kgs 3:20; Isa 57:6, 66:3; Jer 14:12; Amos 5:22. According to GKC §134p, such occurrences should be explained as epexegetic genitives (cf. GKC §128k).

72) have stressed, the expression כְּשָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה only makes sense if Hoshea was paying the tribute every year, and not in a scenario where he decides not to pay it.

As it was pointed out in Chapter 2, the synchronisms that we encounter in MT 2 Kgs. 18:9-10 are secondary elements that entered the text at a later stage and expanded the source employed, i.e., 2 Kgs. 17:5-6, when the latter had a textual form that differed from MT but resembled that of the earlier layer preserved in palimpsest *Vindobonensis* (see above). Given the heavy scribal activity in these verses and the multiple layers that make them up (Tekoniemi 2019: 80-1), it is only natural that we may find another very interesting linguistic element that points to stylistic, if not linguistic, change.

In MT 2 Kgs. 17:6 we find the expression בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית 'in the seventh year', which occurs in MT 2 Kgs. 18:9 as שְׁנַת־תֵּשַׁע. The presence of the noun שָׁנָה in the construct state followed by an ordinal numeral with the definite article is striking. As Levin (2018: 253) pointed out, the form in 17:6 is an example of irregular style and probably secondary. Brettler (1995: 117) goes even further and affirms, based on the distribution of such construction, that this is a linguistic feature typical of the exilic and post-exilic writings.[213] Kahn's (2018: 237) counter-argument that שת before an ordinal numeral with a definite article is frequently found in the Samaria Ostraca is irrelevant and wrong. In the dialectal variety attested in the Samaria Ostraca the noun 'year' has undergone the assimilation of the nasal to the following consonant, as in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Moabite, and Akkadian. It follows that an expression such as בשת העשרת (Ostracon n. 1) does not necessarily correspond to what we find in MT 2 Kgs. 17:6, given that בשת may be, and probably is, in the absolute state.

[213] These are the occurrences listed by Brettler (1995: 117 n. 37): Num. 33:38; 2 Kgs. 25:1; Jer. 28:1; 32:1; 46:2; 51:59; 1 Chr. 26:31; 2 Chr. 13:1; Ezr. 7:8.

The interesting aspect of this phenomenon consists, once again, in the distribution of the occurrences, as pointed out by Brettler. If we consider all the instances where the noun שָׁנָה occurs in the construct state and is followed by an ordinal numeral (by I which I refer to those numerals that do have an ordinal form, i.e., 1-10, and not to numerals above ten, for which there is only a single form that can function both as a cardinal and as an ordinal) preceded by the definite article we will be able appreciate a familiar scenario:

2 Kgs. 17:6	בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית
2 Kgs. 25:1	בִּשְׁנַת הַתְּשִׁיעִית
Jer. 28:1	בִּשְׁנָת֙ הָֽרְבִיעִ֔ית
Jer. 32:1	בִּשְׁנָת֙ הָֽעֲשִׂרִ֔ית
Jer. 46:2	בִּשְׁנַת֙ הָֽרְבִיעִ֔ית
Jer. 51:59	בִּשְׁנַת֙ הָֽרְבִעִ֔ית
Ezr. 7:8	שְׁנַת֙ הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔ית

If we were to add all the occurrences of the form שְׁנַת followed by a numeral with the definite article, we may add the following instances that present cardinal numerals:

Lev. 25:10	שְׁנַת֙ הַחֲמִשִּׁ֣ים שָׁנָ֔ה
Lev. 25:11	שְׁנַ֥ת הַחֲמִשִּׁ֖ים שָׁנָ֣ה
Num. 33:38	בִּשְׁנַת֙ הָֽאַרְבָּעִ֔ים
Deut. 15:9	שְׁנַת־הַשֶּׁ֣בַע
1 Chr. 26:31	בִּשְׁנַ֥ת הָֽאַרְבָּעִ֖ים

In post-biblical Hebrew, we find one additional example from 4Q479 f12:4 (בשנת האֿ[חד] אֿרֿבעים שנה[ו]). As the table shows, these few instances are mostly found in the Pentateuch. Furthermore, the two occurrences in Leviticus indicate that the quantified noun may occur also after the cardinal numeral, which would not be acceptable with an ordinal numeral.[214] This series of numerals, therefore, corresponds to the more frequently attested construction without the article, e.g., בַּשָּׁנָה שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה (Gen. 7:11 – APPENDIX 3.1).[215]

The fact that this interesting construction occurs in the dating formulas that appear in the concluding chapters of Kings, in Jeremiah, and in Ezra, reminds us of what we have already seen happen with the epexegetic independent pronoun employed to create synchronisms and with the complex adding numerals that lack the -ו between the first and the second constituent. As for the synchronisms mentioned in Chapter 2, it is striking that they occur in 2 Kgs. 25, Jeremiah, and Ezra. Furthermore, we find them twice in 2 Kgs. 18:9-10, which are taken and expanded from 2 Kgs. 17:5-6. It is likely that the editorial activity discussed here took place during the late stages of the exilic period, with Ezra as *terminus ad quem*. The high frequency in Ezra-Nehemiah of the asyndetic construction for complex adding numerals – at least with regards to the first two constituents of the numeral – may indicate the time of Ezra as the crucial moment where many parts of Kings were changed, expanded, cut, etc. But this remains speculative until a systematic analysis of all the material available is done.

[214] For a thorough analysis of the surface structures of complex adding numerals in Ancient Hebrew and the individual or double occurrence of the quantified noun see Screnock 2018.

[215] With שָׁנָה see also 1 Kgs. 15:1, 9, 25, 28, 33; 16:8, 10, 15, 23, 29; 22:41, 52; 2 Kgs. 1:17; 3:1; 8:16, 25; 9:29; 12:2, 7; 13:1, 10; 14:1, 23; 15:1, 8, 13, 17, 23, 27, 30, 32; 16:1; 17:1; 18:1, 10 (x2); 24:12; 25:8; Jer. 52:12, 28, 29, 30; Hag. 1:1, 15; Zech. 1:1, 7; 7:1; Esth. 1:3; 2:16; 3:7; Dan. 1:1, 21; 2:1; 8:1; 9:1, 2; 10:1; 11:1; Ezr. 1:1; 7:7; Neh. 1:1; 2:1; 5:14 (x2); 13:6; 2 Chr. 3:2; 13:1; 15:10, 19; 16:1, 12, 13; 17:7; 34:8; 36:22. Given the peculiar distribution of this construction, which is typical of Kings and, apart from Gen. 7:11, occurs only in exilic and post-exilic books, one may wonder whether the occurrences in Kings were introduced at a later stage when the whole book, during or after the exile, was being expanded and revised.

Because this linguistic variant does not displace the more regular occurrence of the noun in the absolute state followed by an ordinal numeral (there is no evidence of such phenomenon in Qumran and in the Mishnah), we are probably dealing here with a stylistic trait of the late exilic and early post-exilic language, maybe even with a mistake that was generated out of a misunderstanding of constructions such as those frequently attested in Kings mentioned above.

MT 2 Kgs. 17 is a chapter that has undergone many changes and has a very troubled textual history. While there exists a recent and deep text-critical analysis of the chapter (Tekoniemi 2019), a linguistic analysis of the variants based on the text-critical and redactional analyses done by other scholars is still lacking.[216]

A Classical Construction with וַיְהִי

This section is placed at the end of Chapter 3 because the syntactic feature treated occurs in multiple passages in Kings and perfectly illustrates the relationship between late scribal activity and linguistic change. Because Ancient Hebrew changed, the scribes who lived after the exile, down to Hellenistic times, were not familiar with the pre-exilic idiom of the Jerusalemite court and therefore allowed into the text elements that from a CBH perspective look and sound unusual or incorrect.

[216] Surveys such as that of Kartveit (2014: 34-7) on the verbal forms found in MT 2 Kgs. 17 indicate that there is much to be said about linguistic diachrony in this chapter. However, Kartveit's study has many flaws and needs revision.

וַיְהִי + CIRCUMSTANTIAL TEMPORAL CLAUSE

The purpose of the following paragraphs is to formulate with more precision the rules that seem to regulate the use of narrative וַיְהִי followed by a circumstantial clause with temporal meaning. Because it is not introduced by an adverb or conjunction, a circumstantial clause of this nature may also be termed an unmarked temporal clause. My main argument is that whenever we encounter examples that look syntactically awkward, we are also met with textual corruptions and uncertainties. A reasonable explanation for this is that the scribes who intervened in the text at a later stage were no longer familiar with this elegant syntactic construction and therefore produced a form of the text that contained linguistic aberrations.

Because we are dealing with a rather rare syntactic feature, it is worth providing some illustrative examples in the first place. In Classical Biblical Hebrew, a circumstantial clause may follow the narrative וַיְהִי and have a temporal meaning. According to Joosten (2009: 55), this construction employs the participle fifteen times to express an action contemporary to the one described in the main clause. The qatal appears five times to express a prior event to the one occurring in the main clause. The infinitive construct is employed twice to express a prospective action. Finally, a nominal clause is found three times, apparently with the same function as the participle.[217] The following examples illustrate each of the above options:

PARTICIPLE

וַיְהִ֗י שְׁמוּאֵל֙ מַעֲלֶ֣ה הָעוֹלָ֔ה וּפְלִשְׁתִּ֖ים נִגְּשׁ֣וּ לַמִּלְחָמָ֑ה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל וַיִּרְעֵ֤ם יְהוָה֙ ו בְּקוֹל־גָּד֣וֹל בַּיּ֔וֹם הַה֖וּא עַל־פְּלִשְׁתִּ֑ים וַיְהֻמֵּ֖ם וַיִּנָּגְפ֥וּ לִפְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵֽל׃

[217] Participle: Gen. 42:35; 1 Sam. 7:10; 23:26; 25:20; 2 Sam. 6:16; 1 Kgs. 13:20; 20:39, 40; 2 Kgs. 2:11; 6:5, 26; 8:5; 13:21; 19:37; Isa. 37:38. Perfect: Gen. 15:17; 24:15; 2 Sam. 15:32; 2 Kgs. 8:21; 2 Kgs. 20:4. Infinitive construct: Gen. 15:12; Josh. 2:5. Nominal clause: 2 Sam. 13:30; 1 Kgs. 18:7; Jer. 37:13.

‘And it came to pass, as Samuel was offering up the burnt offering, that the Philistines drew near to attack Israel; but the Lord thundered with a mighty voice that day against the Philistines and threw them into confusion; and they were routed before Israel.’ 1 Sam. 7:10

QATAL

וַיְהִי דָוִד בָּא עַד־הָרֹאשׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה שָׁם לֵאלֹהִים וְהִנֵּה לְקָרָאתוֹ חוּשַׁי הָאַרְכִּי קָרוּעַ כֻּתָּנְתּוֹ וַאֲדָמָה עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ׃

‘After David had come to the summit, where he would worship God, behold, Hushai the Archite came to meet him with his coat torn and earth on his head.’ 2 Sam. 15:32

INFINITIVE CONSTRUCT

וַיְהִי הַשַּׁעַר לִסְגּוֹר בַּחֹשֶׁךְ וְהָאֲנָשִׁים יָצָאוּ לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אָנָה הָלְכוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים רִדְפוּ מַהֵר אַחֲרֵיהֶם כִּי תַשִּׂיגוּם׃

‘And it came to pass, as the gate was closing at dark, the men went out. I do not know where the men went: chase after them immediately, because you will reach them!’ Josh. 2:5

NOMINAL CLAUSE

וַיְהִי֙ הֵמָּה֙ בַּדֶּ֣רֶךְ וְהַשְּׁמֻעָ֣ה בָּ֔אָה אֶל־דָּוִ֖ד לֵאמֹ֑ר הִכָּ֣ה אַבְשָׁל֗וֹם אֶת־כָּל־בְּנֵ֤י הַמֶּ֙לֶךְ֙ וְלֹא־נוֹתַ֥ר מֵהֶ֖ם אֶחָֽד׃

‘And it came to pass, while they were on the way, that the report came to David saying: “Absalom struck all the king’s sons and not one of them has survived”’ 2 Sam. 13:30

As he discusses the use of the participle in this kind of circumstantial clauses, which pre-eminently shows up in historical narratives, Driver (1892: 208) draws a parallel with the

corresponding construction found in Greek and Latin and calls it *participle absolute*. To buttress his argument, he quotes the Septuagint translation καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν καθημένων corresponding to the MT 1 Kgs. 13:20 וַיְהִי הֵם יֹשְׁבִים.[218] As it is evident from the list of occurrences provided above, the circumstantial clause with וַיְהִי is an exquisite classical feature, which fell out of use during or immediately after the exile, so that by the time of the Chronicler and the translation of the Septuagint it was no longer productive. Quite interestingly, as Joosten (2009: 56-7) has remarked, the construction was at times misunderstood: the participle, syntactically absolute and separated from the preceding וַיְהִי, was re-analysed and taken together with וַיְהִי to form a periphrastic construction expressing a durative action in the past.[219]

Having briefly outlined its main characteristics, I will now focus on a series of aspects that will help us better understand this construction. As stated, the aim is to observe and establish the syntactic rules that regulate the use of such circumstantial clauses. My argument revolves around two main points:

- the word order in the main clause

- the relationship between the subject of the circumstantial clause and the subject of the main clause

Furthermore, a simultaneous text-critical approach illustrates that there is evidence of textual corruption or editorial activity whenever the rules are broken. This is the case with Kings in particular, where many textual issues crop up. Therefore, the present analysis is revealing not only for the parallel account of 2 Kgs. 20, on which I focused in Chapter 2, but, more generally,

[218] There are other such examples as 2 Kgs. 8:21, where the Greek has αὐτοῦ ἀναστάντος.

[219] See, for instance, the first clause in 1 Sam. 7:10, reported in full above, which is rendered in Greek as καὶ ἦν Σαμουὴλ ἀναφέρων.

it sheds light on the relationship between textual criticism and historical linguistics in Kings as a whole.

Establishing the Rules: Word Order and Subjects

In this paragraph, I will first outline the syntactic rule that establishes which word order is to be employed in the main clause after an unmarked temporal clause preceded by וַיְהִי, then I will move on to analyse the problematic verses case by case. Overall, as we have seen, the unmarked temporal clause preceded by וַיְהִי occurs 25 times in the Hebrew Bible.

The main clause that follows immediately after the circumstantial clause may have a subject – qatal word order:

וַיְהִי הַמֶּלֶךְ עֹבֵר וְהוּא צָעַק אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמֶר

'And it came to pass, as the king was passing by, that he cried to the king and said…' 1 Kgs. 20:39 (circumstantial clause with participle).[220]

As an alternative, the main clause may either have a subject – participle word order or it may contain a nominal clause (both subject – predicate and predicate – subject word orders occur). Often, such main clause is introduced by the particle הִנֵּה "behold":

וַיְהִי הֵם מְרִיקִים שַׁקֵּיהֶם וְהִנֵּה־אִישׁ צְרוֹר־כַּסְפּוֹ בְּשַׂקּוֹ וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת־צְרֹרוֹת כַּסְפֵּיהֶם הֵמָּה וַאֲבִיהֶם וַיִּירָאוּ׃

[220] Other occurrences of the subject – qatal word order are found in Gen 15:12 (infinitive construct in the unmarked temporal clause); Josh. 2:5 (infinitive construct); 1 Sam. 7:10 (participle); 2 Sam. 6:16 (participle); 2 Sam. 13:30 (nominal clause); 2 Kgs. 6:5 (qatal);[220] 2 Kgs. 6:26 (participle); 2 Kgs. 19:37 (participle); 20:4 (qatal); Is. 37:38 (participle). In 2 Kgs. 6:5 the subject is preceded by the accusative marker אֵת, probably a mistake.

‘And it came to pass, as they were emptying their sacks, that, behold, each one had his bag of money in his sack. And they saw their bags of money, they and their father, and they were frightened.’ Gen. 42:35

וַיֵּלֶךְ שָׁאוּל מִצַּד הָהָר מִזֶּה וְדָוִד וַאֲנָשָׁיו מִצַּד הָהָר מִזֶּה וַיְהִי דָוִד נָחְפָּז לָלֶכֶת מִפְּנֵי שָׁאוּל וְשָׁאוּל וַאֲנָשָׁיו עֹטְרִים אֶל־דָּוִד וְאֶל־אֲנָשָׁיו לְתָפְשָׂם׃

“And Saul went along one side of the mountain, and David and his men went along the other side of the mountain. And it came to pass, as David hastened to flee from Saul, that Saul and his men surrounded David and his men to seize them” 1 Sam. 23:26

וַיְהִי־הוּא בְּשַׁעַר בִּנְיָמִן וְשָׁם בַּעַל פְּקֻדַּת וּשְׁמוֹ יִרְאִיָּה בֶּן־שֶׁלֶמְיָה בֶּן־חֲנַנְיָה וַיִּתְפֹּשׂ אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ הַנָּבִיא לֵאמֹר אֶל־הַכַּשְׂדִּים אַתָּה נֹפֵל׃

‘And it came to pass, as he was at the gate of Benjamin, that there was a captain of the ward, whose name was Yeriyah, son of Shelemyah, son of Hananyah. And he seized the prophet Jeremiah saying: “You are deserting to the Babylonians!”’ Jer. 37:13[221]

The remaining three occurrences that still need to be discussed are all found in Kings. None of these falls within either of the patterns outlined above. In 1 Kgs. 13:20 and in 2 Kgs. 8:21 the main clause begins with a wayyiqtol, whereas and in 2 Kgs. 13:21 we merely find the qatal with no explicit subject expressed before it. In all three cases the text that we have today bears the marks of scribal intervention and editorial activity, which probably constitutes the reason

[221] The other instances in which we encounter main clauses with a subject – participle word order or with a nominal clause occur in Gen. 15:17; 24:15; 1 Sam. 25:20; 2 Sam. 15:32; 1 Kgs. 18:7; 20:40; 2 Kgs. 2:11; 8:5.

behind the use of the wayyiqtol and the qatal before the subject. Each of these passages will be dealt with in detail in the following paragraph. In the same context one additional point outlined above, i.e., the relationship between the subject of the circumstantial clause and the subject of the main clause, will also be discussed.

TEXTUALLY PROBLEMATIC CASES

1 KINGS 13:20

וַיְהִי֙ הֵ֣ם יֹשְׁבִ֔ים אֶל־הַשֻּׁלְחָ֑ן פ וַיְהִ֣י דְבַר־יְהוָ֗ה אֶל־הַנָּבִיא֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר הֱשִׁיבֽוֹ׃

'And it came to pass, as they were sitting at the table, that the word of God came to the prophet that had made him come back.' 1 Kgs. 13:20

Although the narrative וַיְהִי is very often followed by a wayyiqtol in the main clause, the evidence provided above demonstrates that this pattern does not seem to apply to the construction in question. Therefore, 1 Kgs. 13:20 should strike the reader as anomalous at the very least for the presence of a wayyiqtol in the main clause following the circumstantial clause. A hint that some accident may have occurred in the textual transmission, or even in the editorial process, emerges from the unusual and abrupt ending of the literary pericope marked by the *petuḥa* sign in the middle of the verse. As Trebolle (2012: 643-59) explains, portions of text delimited by the *petuḥa* and *setumah* signs may have once been independent and self-contained unities. Textual evidence from Qumran and the Septuagint shows that a fair number of such units were subject to transposition or omission. While it is possible that the *petuḥa* sign indicates that v. 21 continued in a different way in the source and was later truncated when edited and inserted, along with the rest of the chapter, in its current position, the presence of

the wayyiqtol in the main clause may also be a sign of non-classical Hebrew, in addition to those discussed in the section above on 1 Kings 13.

2 KINGS 8:21

There is a series of linguistic, textual, and literary issues in this verse, MT being hopelessly faulty, as observed by the commentators (BURNEY 1903: 295-6; STADE AND SCHWALLY 1904: 218; COGAN AND TADMOR 1988: 96; MCKENZIE 2019: 369-70). A major problem with MT is that vv. 20-22 relate Edom's rebellion against Judah, which is first announced in v. 20 and then mentioned again in v. 22. As is clear from v. 22, the outcome of the battle recorded in v. 21 must have been favourable to the Edomites, given that they persisted in their rebellion after the clash and even down to the times in which the text was written. However, in v. 21 MT tells us that Joram, king of Judah, struck and scattered the vanquished Edomite army. This makes little sense in the light of the context, and it is very likely that the original account narrated the defeat of the Judahite army at the hands of the Edomites. Moreover, the sentence that concludes this short episode, וַיָּנָס הָעָם לְאׇהָלָיו 'and the people fled to their tents', is only found with Israel and Judah elsewhere, and it may therefore be a relic of the older account.[222] Unfortunately, the textual witnesses do not seem to offer a viable solution. Although both LXX^{L} and LXX^{B} present some variant readings, they agree with MT as to the sequence and nature of the events narrated, so that Edom is the defeated party also in this stream of the tradition.

MT	LXX^{L}	LXX^{B}
וַיַּעֲבֹר יוֹרָם צָעִירָה	καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰωρὰμ ἐκ Σιὼν	καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰωρὰμ εἰς Σειὼρ
וְכׇל־הָרֶכֶב עִמּוֹ	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἅρματα μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ

[222] Cf. 1 Sam. 4:10; 2 Sam. 18:17; 19:9; 2 Kgs. 14:12; 2 Chr. 25:22.

וַיְהִי־הוּא קָם לַיְלָה	καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀνέστη νυκτός	καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀναστάντος
	καὶ ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ Ἐδὼμ	
וַיַּךְ אֶת־אֱדוֹם	καὶ ἐπάταξε τὸν Ἐδὼμ	καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸν Ἐδὼμ
הַסֹּבֵיב אֵלָיו	τὸν λαὸν τὸν κυκλοῦντα ἐπ’αὐτὸν	τὸν κυκλώσαντα ἐπ’ αὐτὸν
וְאֵת שָׂרֵי הָרֶכֶב	καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ	καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν ἁρμάτων
וַיָּנָס הָעָם לְאָהָלָיו׃	καὶ ἔφυγεν ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἔφυγεν ὁ λαὸς εἰς τὰ σκηνώματα αὐτῶν

There are very few significant differences among the witnesses. As for LXX^{L} ἀνέβη, the Hebrew *Vorlage* likely had ויעל instead of ויעבר (probably also attested in proto-MT, given the occurrence of ἀνέβη in LXX^{B}). The exact identification of צָעִיר remains a *vexata quaestio,* and this is the only place where this toponym occurs (COGAN AND TADMOR 1988: 96; MCKENZIE 2019: 375). The LXX^{B} provides no clue for the identification of this city, whereas LXX^{L} most probably has a corrupted reading. The absence of νυκτός in LXX^{B} (also lacking in the Ethiopic) is likely to be a mistake. LXX^{L} has καὶ ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ Ἐδὼμ, absent in MT and in LXX^{B}. This is either a doublet, with καὶ ἐπάταξε τὸν Ἐδὼμ taken from LXX^{B}, or the vestige of an older layer. Quite interestingly, LXX^{L} has τὸν λαὸν, which may either be an explanatory addition within the Lucianic tradition to explain how Edom was surrounding, or a relic of the older story and refer to the people of Judah whom Edom struck despite being surrounded by them. Finally, LXX^{L} has τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ (Heb. רכביו), which may be identified with τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ (Heb. רכביו) at the beginning of the verse, both suffix pronouns referring to king Joram.

As for the Hebrew of this verse, it is certainly striking that the anomalies cluster around those phrases that have been changed in order to make Joram victorious. The portion that reads וַיְהִי־הוּא קָם לַיְלָה וַיַּךְ אֶת־אֱדוֹם in MT, which I maintain is ungrammatical from the point of view of the syntax, must have read quite differently in the original account, where it was Edom that struck Joram and not vice versa. The presence of the long form of the prefix conjugation with

the wayyiqtol in the apodosis is probably a sign of scribal intervention.[223] The parallel in 2 Chr. 21:9 has the expected form וַיַּךְ, but it misunderstands the syntax of the protasis (וַיְהִי֩ קָ֨ם לַ֜יְלָה). As for הַסֹּבֵ֗יב, the reading tradition correctly aligns with the versions and with Chronicles, which has the participle הַסּוֹבֵב.[224] The consonantal text in Kings may have been generated through metathesis *הסובב > *הסבוב > הסביב.[225]

In sum, we can be certain that the very two clauses under scrutiny here (וַיְהִי־הֽוּא֩ קָ֨ם לַ֜יְלָה וַיַּ֣ךְ אֶת־אֱד֗וֹם) are the result of scribal intervention and do not report the original information. Stade's (1904: 218) conjectural reconstruction of the text – ויקם אדום לילה ויסב אליו ויך אתו ואת שרי הרכב – is also adopted by McKenzie (2019: 369). Although I may disagree about some aspects of this reconstruction, it nevertheless confirms the need for a radical emendation of the text. The rest of the verse was only slightly modified and, with the help of LXX^{L}, we can render it as follows:

ויעבר (ויעל or) יורם צעירה (?) וכל הרכב עמו (or וכל רכבו) [...] את העם הסובב עליו ואת שרי הרכב (or רכבו) וינס העם לאהליו.

2 KINGS 13:21

This verse belongs to a very interesting episode about the death and post-mortem power of the prophet Elisha. According to MT, the prophet Elisha dies and is buried at a time in which bands

[223] See the section in Chapter 2 on this linguistic feature.

[224] A construction similar to that of Kings is found also in MT 2 Sam. 24:6 (וְסָבִ֔יב אֶל־צִיד֖וֹן), but this is probably a mistake, as the versions show (LXX^{BL} καὶ ἐκύκλωσαν; Targum אסתחר; Peshitta ܘܐܬܚܙܪ; Vulgate circumeuntesque).

[225] Note that the article precedes סָבִיב only in another textually corrupted expression in MT 1 Chr. 11:8.

of Moabites used to raid the land every year (v. 20). During one of these forays, a group of Israelites is burying one of their fellows by the tomb of Elisha. As soon as they hear the sound of the marauding bandits, they throw the corpse into Elisha's burial place and flee. Upon touching the prophet's bones, the dead Israelite miraculously resuscitates and starts walking again (v. 21). The same account we find in LXX^{B}, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the Targum.

On the other hand, the Vetus Latina, here represented by the palimpsest *Vindobonensis* (La^{115}) edited by Fischer (1986), tells a quite different story. It is, in fact, one of their men that the Moabite *piratae* themselves bury in Elisha's grave before fleeing. Therefore, the resuscitated man is no less than a member of the Moabite band.

As for LXX^{L}, this witness seems to stand between MT and the Vetus Latina: while a group of Israelites, probably the same mentioned in v. 20, are burying one of their fellows, the Moabites approach them and throw the corpse into the grave, then they flee. Of the three versions, LXX^{L} is certainly the most puzzling.

The challenging textual problems that occur in this short *legenda* have been discussed in depth by Trebolle Barrera (1983, 2020), Schenker (2004), and Richelle (2010). Both Schenker and Trebolle Barrera agree, on text-critical grounds, that the Vetus Latina preserves the original version of the story, according to which the Moabites throw one of their members into Elisha's grave and then flee. As soon as the corpse touches the prophet's bones, the Moabite comes back to life. Only later was the identity of the unwitting protagonist of this bizarre episode changed into that of an Israelite. As Trebolle Barrera (2020: 159-60) argues, such a change may have occurred on moral grounds, lest it be said that the corpse of an impious foreigner was buried, albeit inadvertently, by that of a righteous man such as the prophet Elisha. It is such legal and moral issues, in fact, that the rabbis discuss. Furthermore, both Elijah and Elisha resurrect two foreigners: the widow's son in Zarphat (1 Kgs. 17) and the Shunamite's son (2

Kgs. 4). Elisha having requested a double part of his predecessor's spirit, it stands to reason that also his second miracle of resurrection be performed for another foreigner. As for Richelle (2010: 85-6), while he seems more cautious about expressing a final judgement on the priority of either MT or the Vetus Latina, in his concluding comments he seems to list more elements in favour of the version of the story preserved by the Vetus Latina.

As reasonably stated by these scholars, the Vetus Latina is of special importance also for the assessment of this episode. It contains, in fact, more variants and a text that differs more from MT than LXX^L does. This makes it very likely that it is through the Vetus Latina that we can have access to OG. It goes without saying that every reading must be appraised and evaluated on its own and within the context regardless of this general tendency.

In the following paragraph, I will show that, once again, a solid linguistic analysis can positively contribute to illuminate the textual history of a certain passage. The unique presence of a qatal with no subject expressed in the main clause starkly departs from the syntactic rule established above on the bases of the linguistic evidence contained in the Hebrew Bible. In this passage, the text-critical and the linguistic data lead to an identical conclusion.

TEXT-CRITICAL AND LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

The table below shows where the three main textual witnesses to v. 21 are in agreement and where they are at variance.

MT	LXX^L	VL
וַיְהִי הֵם ו קֹבְרִים אִישׁ	καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν θαπτόντων τὸν ἄνθροπον ἕνα	et factum est cum sepellirent piratae hominem unum
וְהִנֵּה רָאוּ אֶת־הַגְּדוּד	καὶ ἤγγισε τὸ πειρατήριον αὐτοῖς	accesserunt ad monumentum
וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ אֶת־הָאִישׁ בְּקֶבֶר אֱלִישָׁע	καὶ ἔρριψαν τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Ἐλεισαῖε	et proiecerunt hominem in monumentum Helissei

	καὶ ἔφυγον	et fugerunt
וַיֵּלֶךְ	καὶ ἦλθε	
וַיִּגַּע הָאִישׁ בְּעַצְמוֹת אֱלִישָׁע	καὶ ἥψατο ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ θαπτόμενος τῶν ὀστῶν Ἐλεισαῖε	et adplicitus est homo ossibus Helissei
וַיִּחְי	καὶ ἔζησε	et vixi homo
וַיָּקָם עַל־רַגְלָיו:	καὶ ἔστη ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ	et surrexit super pedes suos

It should be immediately noted that the second part of the verse is straightforward, and the witnesses agree almost in everything. The only exception is MT וַיֵּלֶךְ, which is likely to be a secondary reading. In fact, it is not the corpse that 'goes' (down into the grave), but rather those who throw it in the pit that flee after getting rid of the body. Both the reading of the Vetus Latina *fugerunt* and that of LXX^{L} καὶ ἔφυγον represent here OG, which translated a now lost Hebrew וילכו.[226] The second verb of the doublet καὶ ἔφυγον καὶ ἦλθε in LXX^{L} agrees with MT and probably comes from the καίγε recension. Finally, it is very likely that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of OG had a verb such as בָּרַח, נוּס, or רוּץ given that φεύγω is used to translate these and not הָלַךְ (RICHELLE 2010: 78). Apart from the first two clauses, the verse seems to have originally sounded as follows in Hebrew:

[..] וישליכו את האיש בקבר אלישע וינ(ו)סו ויגע האיש בעצמות אלישע ויחי ויקם על רגליו

As for the beginning of the verse, that is where the major differences among the textual witnesses are clustered.

The first difference occurs in the circumstantial clause: MT and LXX^{L} have the pronouns הֵם and αὐτῶν, which may refer to the men who buried Elisha in v. 20 or to an undefined group of

[226] According to many critics, MT וַיֵּלֶךְ should be emended into a plural by the addition of a ו- which may have fallen due to haplography (TREBOLLE BARRERA 2020: 155 n.10).

people – one may render it impersonally –, whereas VL has *piratae*, that is the other group of people mentioned in v. 20 after the account of Elisha's burial.

The second difference is in the main clause, which varies in the three witnesses. In MT it is said that the men who were burying the corpse see the marauding band, whereas in LXX^L and in VL it is the band that approaches the men and the burial place, respectively. It is interesting that such variations occur exactly where the Hebrew syntax shows patent irregularities.[227] This is the only place where a qatal without explicit subject is attested after the syntactic construction in question. Furthermore, and this relates to the second aspect I set out to investigate at the beginning of the discussion, the subject of the circumstantial clause and that of the main clause is the same. The only other occurrence where we find this identity is in MT 2 Kgs. 8:21 which, as we saw above, is irreparably corrupt.[228] I propose that the unmarked temporal clause behaves like the ablative absolute in Latin, being loosened from the main clause. MT 2 Kgs 8:21 and MT 2 Kgs. 13:21, where the subject is identical in both the circumstantial clause and in the main clause, show an ungrammatical syntax that is the result of scribal interventions, as the witnesses illustrate. This point may help us evaluate which variants should be preferred for the reconstruction of the original episode. As we saw above, according to Trebolle, as well as Schenker, there is no doubt that the Vetus Latina, which reflects OG, should be privileged: its text preserves a version of the episode that has not been changed and updated like MT did: the scribes were worried about the idea of a foreign wrongdoer's body touching Elisha's bones, a concern that is attested in Rabbinic literature, and thus modified the story. I have also

[227] The occurrence of both הִנֵּה and רָאָה aimed at pointing the reader's attention to the approaching of the marauding band is stylistically rather cumbersome. Apart from some rare exceptions found in texts that are not written, for the most part, in CBH (Gen. 45:12; 1 Sam. 21:15; 24:11; 1 Kgs. 22:25 // 2 Chr. 18:24; 2 Kgs. 7:2, 19; Jer. 32:24), such a sequence is rather attested when used by a speaker who is pointing to what s/he is seeing.

[228] Although the logical subject is identical, Gen. 42:35 has two different grammatical subjects.

mentioned that Richelle's judgement is more balanced, while at the same time he rightly finds Trebolle's arguments persuasive and well-founded.

When it comes to the identity of those who were burying the corpse, I do agree with Richelle's (2010: 82) remark that *piratae* may be a secondary, explanatory reading, a change that was made in order to remove the ambiguous and indefinite הֵם / αὐτῶν that we find in MT and LXX^{L}. In my opinion, the sequence *cum seppellirent...accesserunt* makes little sense: how is it possible that the band approached the *monumentum* as they were in the process of burying a corpse? Should they not have approached the grave before burying the corpse? I do not think that the original account had here a hysteron-proteron, and, according to the rules of the *consecutio temporum*, cum + imperfect subjunctive in Latin can only express an action contemporary with another action in the past (here *accesserunt*). An acceptable reading would have been *ut seppellirent*, so that their approaching Elisha's *monumentum* had as main goal the burial of one of their men. But this is not what the witnesses say. Furthermore, according to the Vetus Latina, the subject of both *seppellirent* and *accesserunt* is *piratae*, which I maintain is a mistake. I believe that we should consider the reading 'they' rather than 'pirates' as original, so that the circumstantial clause has a different subject from the main clause:

ויהי הם קברים איש (אחד)

As I have already mentioned, MT's main clause is not acceptable from the standpoint of the syntax. It has no parallel and it shares with the Vetus Latina the flaw of having the same subject as the circumstantial clause, although here it refers to a different group of people. LXX^{L} seems to preserve the best reading, which can be retroverted into Hebrew as ויגש הגדוד אליהם. The only problem with this reconstruction may be the presence of the wayyiqtol, only attested in MT 1 Kgs 13:20 and MT 2 Kgs. 8:21, for which I have highlighted potential or clear signs of editorial

activity. However, we could find a compromise between MT and LXX^{L} and keep the וְהִנֵּה found in the former. This particle, in fact, is never attested with a qatal in the main clause, which confirms the secondary nature of MT, but it occurs quite often with a participle or with a verbless clause.[229] A text such as והנה לקראתם הגדוד only requires a little change and closely resembles the apodoses found in MT 2 Sam. 15:32 (וְהִנֵּה לְקָרָאתוֹ חוּשַׁי הָאַרְכִּי), 25:20 (וְהִנֵּה דָוִד וַאֲנָשָׁיו יֹרְדִים לְקָרָאתָהּ), and MT 1 Kgs. 18:7 (וְהִנֵּה אֵלִיָּהוּ לְקָרָאתוֹ). One may even push the argument further and say that MT's רָאוּ אֶת is a corruption of לקראתם, although this may be slightly speculative. In sum, I propose that we reconstruct the whole verse as follows:

ויהי הם קברים איש אחד והנה לקראתם הגדוד וישליכו את האיש בקבר אלישע וינוסו ויגע האיש בעצמות אלישע ויחי ויקם על רגליו

I find this a reasonable reconstruction that considers both the textual witnesses and the syntax of the Hebrew language. This latter aspect has not been taken into account in previous analyses of this verse. Most importantly, the aberrant syntax that we encounter in MT is confirmed by the text-critical analysis of the main sources. As for the priority of the reading contained in the Vetus Latina – the main agents of the different actions, and the identity of the resurrected man – I believe that the linguistic assessment and reconstruction offered above points to a compromise. On the one hand, because we must have two different grammatical subjects, those who are burying the corpse at the beginning of the episode are to be identified, probably, with the same group of Israelites who buried Elisha in the previous verse (if not with an anonymous and new group of people). In this case, therefore, MT and LXX^{L} have a better reading than the explanatory addition *piratae* found in the Vetus Latina. On the other hand, the main clause is linguistically unacceptable in MT, and I follow the Vetus Latina and LXX^{L}, according to which

[229] Gen. 15:17; 24:15; 42:35; 1 Sam. 25:20; 2 Sam. 15:32; 1 Kgs. 18:7; 2 Kgs. 2:11; 8:5.

the brigands are approaching. At this point one can see the ambiguity concerning the subject of the verb וישליכו: does it refer to the plurality of Israelites who were burying someone at the beginning of the verse, or should we assume that the plural has as subject the adjacent collective noun גדוד? I believe that both readings are possible. According to the former, the Israelites who were burying someone threw the corpse into the grave at the approach of the Moabites, whereas according to the latter option, the Moabites approached the place and threw the corpse of one of their members (who might have been killed during the foray) into the grave where a group of Israelites had already been burying someone and then fled. We can now understand why we have two versions of the same story. The Vetus Latina, and therefore probably its Greek *Vorlage*, read this episode as if the subject of וישליכו were the Moabites, whereas MT, as Trebolle Barrera has convincingly argued, bears the evident marks of editorial activity aimed at removing from the text the possibility that the corpse that touched Elisha's bones was that of a Moabite. In sum, with regards to the reconstruction of the earliest layer of the story, I find myself, albeit on different, mainly linguistic, grounds, more in line with Richelle's balanced judgement.

THE TWO NEGATIVE CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSES

There are two instances of this construction. The latter, in particular, which is most relevant for the discussion about the parallel account of Kings and Isaiah, will receive extensive treatment.

Gen. 24:15.

וַיְהִי־הוּא טֶרֶם֙ כִּלָּה לְדַבֵּר֔ וְהִנֵּה רִבְקָה יֹצֵ֣את אֲשֶׁר֩ יֻלְּדָ֨ה לִבְתוּאֵ֜ל בֶּן־מִלְכָּ֗ה אֵ֚שֶׁת נָחֹ֣ור אֲחִ֣י אַבְרָהָ֔ם וְכַדָּ֖הּ עַל־שִׁכְמָֽהּ׃

‘And before he had finished speaking, behold Rebekah coming out, who was born to Betuel, son of Milcah, wife of Nahor, brother of Abraham. And she had her jar on her shoulder.’

The use of the qatal with טֶרֶם is striking. It is known that this particle requires the yiqtol,[230] as it is usually the case also with בְּטֶרֶם (which has a different meaning).[231] There is one additional occurrence of a qatal used with טֶרֶם, i.e., MT 1 Sam. 3:7. However, this is most likely a mistake in the vocalization, טֶרֶם יָדַע instead of טֶרֶם יֵדַע (in the same verse we also find the regular טֶרֶם יִגָּלֶה).

As for Gen. 24:15, the unexpected expression טֶרֶם כִּלָּה occurs in a chapter whose peculiar linguistic features have long been recognized. According to Rofé (1976, 1981, 1990), this chapter contains late elements, and its composition should therefore be dated to the Persian period, the chronolect used being LBH. According to Hendel and Joosten (2018: 81-2), however, the presence of classical features that disappear in LBH and in Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew point to a sixth century date and to TBH. At the same time, they also acknowledge style switching in this chapter (HENDEL AND JOOSTEN 2018: 33), in agreement with Rendsburg’s (2002b: 23-46) explanation, who identifies in the Aramaean setting the catalyst for the use of Aramaisms in Gen. 24. These three approaches share the common view and the

[230] Cf. Gen. 2:5 (טֶרֶם יִהְיֶה; טֶרֶם יִצְמָח); 19:4 (טֶרֶם יִשְׁכָּבוּ); 24:45 (טֶרֶם אֲכַלֶּה); Exod. 9:30 (טֶרֶם תִּירְאוּן); 10:7 (טֶרֶם תֵּדַע); 12:34 (טֶרֶם יֶחְמָץ); Num. 11:33 (טֶרֶם יִכָּרֵת); Josh. 2:8 (טֶרֶם יִשְׁכָּבוּן); 3:1 (טֶרֶם יַעֲבְרוּ); 1 Sam. 3:3 (טֶרֶם יִכְבֶּה), 7 (טֶרֶם יִגָּלֶה); Isa. 65:24 (טֶרֶם־יִקְרָאוּ); Ps. 119:67 (טֶרֶם אֶעֱנֶה).

[231] The qatal occurs twice also with בְּטֶרֶם, in Ps. 90:2 and Prov. 8:25. As noted in GKC §113j, both instances constitute the only two cases where the predicate is separated from the particle by the subject, which may have determined the preference for the qatal over the yiqtol. However, there may be other explanations for such unusual occurrences. In Ps. 90:2 we have a passive qal which is vocalised as pual, בְּטֶרֶם הָרִים יֻלָּדוּ. Being a I-w/y verb, it is not unlikely that the yiqtol of the passive qal looked the same as the qatal (like in the active). As for Proverbs, the language of this book often differs from the standardised idiom of biblical prose, and the use of the qatal may be a sign of such divergence.

awareness that Gen. 24 is not written like the chapters that surround it. There are clear dialectal / stylistic and diachronic differences. The unique construction טֶרֶם כְּלָה confirms this view, and the use of the qatal both with טֶרֶם and in the unmarked temporal clause is exceptional.

2 KGS. 20:4A // ISA. 38:4A

In MT 2 Kgs. 20:1-11 we read about king Hezekiah's illness and miraculous recovery. The episode is also reported in MT Isa. 38:1-22, with the major addition of the so-called 'song of Hezekiah' in vv. 9-20. At a less macroscopic level, the two parallel texts are rife with variant readings, some of which bear importance for a relative linguistic dating of the two accounts.

A very interesting variant concerning the syntax occurs in MT 2 Kgs. 20:4a // MT Isa. 38:4a. The picture that emerges from the textual witnesses is clear and it shows that the reading contained in Isaiah is older than the reading found in 2 Kings. From a linguistic perspective, the assessment of the two variants confirms the posteriority of the latter. The syntactic construction of MT 2 Kgs. 20:4a does not seem to follow the classical pattern. In order to illustrate how both the philological and the linguistic evidence agree on the relationship between the two texts, I will first analyse the textual witnesses and then discuss the syntax of MT 2 Kings 20:4a.

THE TEXTUAL WITNESSES AND THE VARIANTS COMPARED

In this paragraph, I will begin by arranging in parallel columns the main textual witnesses to both 2 Kings 20:4a and Isaiah 38:4a. I will then discuss separately both verses and the variants attested in each one, and only at the end will I compare the text of Kings with the text of Isaiah.

Isaiah 38:4a

MT	1QIsa[a] 38:4a	LXX
וַיְהִי דְּבַר־יְהוָה	ויהי דבר יהוה	Καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος Κυρίου
אֶל־יְשַׁעְיָהוּ לֵאמֹר:	אל ישעיה לאמור	πρὸς Ἠσαίαν λέγων.

As the table shows, the textual tradition of Isaiah 38:4a is uniform. There are no textual variants that may point to a different *Vorlage*. The only relevant linguistic feature is the expected theophoric ending in יָהּ- found in 1QIsa[a], as opposed to the older ending יָהוּ- occurring in MT.[232]

2 Kings 20:4a

MT	LXX[B]	LXX[L]	Vulgate	Peshitta	Targum
וַיְהִי יְשַׁעְיָהוּ	Καὶ ἦν Ἠσαίας	Καὶ ἦν Ἠσαίας	Et antequam egrederetur Esaias	ܘܗܘܐ ܐܫܥܝܐ	וַהֲוָה יְשַׁעְיָה
לֹא יָצָא	-	-		ܠܐ ܢܦܩ ܥܕܡ	לָא נְפַק
הָעִיר	ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τῇ μέσῃ	ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τῇ μέγαλῃ	mediam partem atrii	ܒܦܠܓ ܕܐܬܪܐ	לְדָרְתָא מְצִיעְיָתָא
הַתִּיכֹנָה					
וּדְבַר־יְהוָה	καὶ ῥῆμα Κυρίου	καὶ ῥῆμα Κυρίου	factus est sermo Domini ad eum	ܘܦܬܓܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܥܡ	וּפִתְגָם נְבוּאָה מִן קֳדָם יוי
הָיָה אֵלָיו	ἐγένετο πρὸς αὐτὸν	ἐγένετο πρὸς αὐτὸν		ܗܘܐ ܐܠܝܘ,	הֲוָה עִמֵּיה
לֵאמֹר	λέγων	λέγων	dicens	ܠܡܐܡܪ	לְמֵימַר

The situation is slightly more complex and more interesting when one compares the different witnesses of 2 Kings 20:4a. Two variant readings are attested across the main textual traditions.

The first variant, which is attested only in a minority of Masoretic manuscripts, stems from a misreading of the Hebrew consonantal text. Although both the Aleppo and Leningrad codices

[232] On this, see the section dedicated to the theophoric elements in personal names.

have העיר ‘city’ as ketib, the qᵊre חָצֵר ‘courtyard’ is noted in the margins. The latter is also attested in some Masoretic codices collated by Kennicott and De Rossi.[233] The reading חָצֵר must have been present also in the proto-Masoretic reading tradition, as it is clear from the καίγε revision, which has αὐλή,[234] the Targum (דָּרְתָּא), the Peshitta (ܕܪܬܐ), and the Vulgate (atrium). Similarly, חָצֵר occurred in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation, as the reading preserved in the Lucianic text probably indicates (αὐλή).[235] The reading העיר, attested in part of the Masoretic tradition, originated because of the resemblance of ה with ח and of ע with צ in the square script. Once the graphically ‘defective’ noun הער crept into the text, it is likely that it was later corrected into העיר.[236] Such a mistake probably found its way into the textual tradition quite late, given its absence in the καίγε revision, in the Targum, in the Vulgate, and in the Peshitta. It is also interesting to observe that the verb יָצָא is rarely used transitively,[237] and in four out of the six occurrences the object is עִיר.[238] It may be that the scribe was also influenced by these passages when he misread the letters of the text he was copying.

As for the second variant, the textual witnesses are split into two traditions. MT has לֹא יָצָא, also reflected in the Targum (לָא נְפַק), in the Peshitta (ܠܐ ܢܦܩ), and in the Vulgate (antequam egrederetur). The other tradition describes the same scene, which depicts Isaiah in the courtyard, in a less dynamic way by simply using the verb ‘to be’. Both LXX^{L} and LXX^{B}, in fact, have ἦν.[239] The evidence shows that the reading לֹא יָצָא was absent from the proto-

[233] החצר K 33, 180; חצר חציר K 4; העיר חצר K 30; חצר K 70, 112, 115, 149, 150, 153, 174, 225, 240, 246, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 257, 260, 270, 271 A, 659, R 211, 226, 380, 554, 596, 679, 701, primo 440. See also Catastini 1989: 103.

[234] A reading supported and confirmed by the Ethiopic ማእከላዊ.

[235] This reading is also found in the Armenian (սրահ /srah/) and Georgian daughter versions (ეზო /ezo/).

[236] See also Orlinsky 1939: 34-9. For the defective spelling ער see, for instance, Kuntillet Ajrud 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1.

[237] Elsewhere only in Gen. 44:4; Exod. 9:29, 33; Num. 35:26; Deut. 14:22; Sir. 6:35.

[238] Gen. 44:4; Exod. 9:29, 33; Num. 35:26 (אֶת־גְּבוּל֙ עִיר).

[239] See also Eth. ወበጽሐ, Arm. էր /er/, and Georg. ოყო /iqo/.

Masoretic tradition that was used by the scribes who revised OG and produced the καίγε text. The *Vorlage* of καίγε must have had ויהי ישעיהו בחצר התיכונה ודבר יהוה אליו לאמר. Rather than introducing a temporal clause, וַיְהִי occurred in both the Hebrew *Vorlage* of OG and in the proto-Masoretic tradition with its lexical meaning ‘to be’.

We find in MT 2 Kgs. 20:4 לֹ֣א יָצָ֗א with the meaning ‘he had not left yet’. From a linguistic point of view, a scribe writing before or during the sixth century would have rather used the classical טֶרֶם יֵצֵא to express this concept. Furthermore, instead of employing the old-fashioned unmarked temporal clause, the scribe would have used בְּטֶרֶם + yiqtol (בְּטֶרֶם יֵצֵא יְשַׁעְיָהוּ) or בְּטֶרֶם + infinitive construct (בְּטֶרֶם צֵאת יְשַׁעְיָהוּ). However, because וַיְהִי was already present in the text, he tried to replicate the classical idiom. From a literary perspective, the notion that Isaiah has not left the courtyard when the word of the Lord reaches him adds a dramatic nuance to the story. The classical idiom, on the other hand, seems to be used to stress the fact that two actions are occurring at the same time, rather than convey an idea of anteriority or expressing the notion that the action contained in the unmarked temporal clause had not happened yet.

Conclusion

In sum, it appears to me that the unmarked temporal clause was a syntactic device used in CBH to add a touch of suspense to the narrative. The action expressed in the circumstantial clause is contemporaneous with that of the main clause. Before revealing the main event, the narrative slows down to add some circumstantial information about what is going on at the time the main action takes place. Late scribal interventions are evident when we consider the identity of the subjects and the word order of the main clause. Similarly, the unusual occurrence of two negative elements such as טֶרֶם and לֹא in Gen. 24:15 and MT 2 Kgs. 20:4 points to both the

foreign context of the story (without necessarily excluding a diachronic explanation), in the former case, and to the late nature of the addition, in the latter case.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have discussed four interesting features from the perspective of linguistic diachrony and textual criticism. These revolve around syntax and semantics. The book of Kings contains more such features which could not be treated here but certainly deserve more attention and space in future contributions on the subject.

SUMMARY

The main contribution of this thesis, I believe, is the focus on the tight relationship between linguistic diachrony and textual criticism. While it is true that the latter has previously been considered in matters that pertain to periodization and Ancient Hebrew, no in-depth study of an entire section or corpus has so far been carried out. Indeed, most such analyses occupy no more space than what an article allows and revolve around a single verse or linguistic feature. The present study, conversely, has taken into consideration the entire book of Kings, which lent itself to this approach because of its troubled and fascinating textual history. Since a thorough analysis of every passage and chapter of Kings would probably require thousands of pages, I focussed on the parallel accounts found both in 2 Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39. This allowed me to assess every variant reading occurring between the two accounts and to select those that stand out for their diachronic linguistic relevance. As pointed out in Chapter 1, most of the variants do not bear on the linguistic comparison of the two accounts if the goal is to provide a relative dating. The scribes who transmitted the biblical texts were capable and knowledgeable individuals who could reproduce the pre-exilic idiom even when it varied from the vernacular or standardised language of their times. Nevertheless, I was able to show in Chapter 2 that some variants do indeed help us detect the activity of later scribes who intervened and modified the text, maybe without realising it. The analysis of such variants yields results that align with the general understanding of how Ancient Hebrew developed during and after the exile. The traditional view, which has been refined and strengthened during the last few years and according to which the exilic and post-exilic times differentiate themselves from the pre-exilic ones from the linguistic perspective, is thus confirmed by the extensive text-critical analysis of the parallel accounts. The fact that non-classical linguistic

features can be identified through the analysis of the textual variants opens new possibilities. Furthermore, it allows researchers to single out new features that can be added to those already known and accepted by Hebraists.

In Chapter 3, I extended my research to other chapters of Kings in which interesting linguistic features crop up where the text has clearly undergone revision, updating, or corruption. Sometimes, as we see with the unmarked temporal clause introduced by וַיְהִי, it is possible to emend a portion of text on the basis of the correct understanding of the syntax, and therefore propose new solutions to thorny issues. Unfortunately, due to restrictions of space that a doctoral thesis provides, I could not proceed with a thorough analysis of individual chapters or sections as I did in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. However, the fact that some fascinating elements were identifiable and discussed illustrates the potential of this approach for a deeper and more exhaustive examination of Kings. By the same token, while discussing the individual variants and linguistic features in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 3, I could comment on similar phenomena occurring elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran. Among others, Samuel and Numbers are two books that stood out for the number of interesting data that could be understood and explained through the approach adopted in this thesis. The former in particular, which shares similar issues with Kings, is a goldmine of fascinating data and its language still needs to be analysed from a text-critical perspective. The book of Numbers sometimes aligns with exilic and post-exilic texts, and this need to be addressed soon. For different reasons, also the language of Proverbs deserves special attention, given its many non-classical elements.

My future plan is to first carry out a thorough analyses of the entire book of Kings in order to have a complete and exhaustive picture of the exilic and post-exilic linguistic features and thus be able to compare them. This, coupled with a text-critical assessment, should lead to the identification of different layers of scribal activity. At the same time, it would be good to proceed with the text-critical and linguistic analysis of the two books mentioned above and,

ultimately, of the whole Hebrew Bible. This two-pronged approach is an important addition to those already adopted for the relative dating of the biblical texts, as the two methods illuminate each other.

Finally, once the text-critical and linguistic examination of all the relevant features has yielded its results, it will be possible to integrate the historical-critical and literary approaches (which were already employed here and there in this thesis) in order to reconstruct with more accuracy the formation and growth of Kings. It is not unlikely that a new, more refined, and nuanced solution will be offered in this area, given that previous works barely include linguistic data and often neglect the text-critical component.

It is my hope that the scholarly community will benefit from this study and will integrate and further develop this type of analysis, which includes the simultaneous assessment of text-critical variants and their linguistic value for a relative dating of the biblical texts.

APPENDIX

A 0.1 ISRAELIAN HEBREW FEATURES IN KINGS ACCORDING TO RENDSBURG:

1 Kings 12	מִקְצוֹת (v. 31)
	בָּדָא (v. 33)
1 Kings 13	סָעַד (v. 7)
	מַתַּת (v. 7)
	אֶחָד (v. 11)
	אֶל (v. 29)
1 Kings 14	הִשְׁתַּנָּה (v. 2)
	אַתְּי (v. 2)
	זֶה הַיּוֹם (v. 14)
	מֶה (v. 14)
1 Kings 15	בֵּית יִשָּׁשכָר (v. 27)
1 Kings 16	אַרְמוֹן (v. 18)
1 Kings 17	לִקָּחִי (v. 11)
	כַּד (vv. 12, 14, 16)
	תֵּתֵן (v. 14)
	הִתְגּוֹרֵר (v. 20)
	הִתְמוֹדֵד (v. 21)
	עַל קִרְבּוֹ (vv. 21, 22)
1 Kings 18	עַד לְ- (v. 29)

	כַּד (v. 34)
	גָּהַר (v. 42)
	אֶל (v. 46)
	שִׂגַּס (v. 46)
1 Kings 19	בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה (v. 3)
	אֶחָד (vv. 4, 5)
	אֲכִילָה (v. 8)
1 Kings 20	מָנַע (v. 7)
	שָׂפַק (v. 10)
	אֶחָד (v. 13)
	מְדִינָה (vv. 14, 15, 17, 19)
	-אוֹת (v. 25 x2)
	חָשַׂף (v. 27)
	נָחַשׁ (v. 33)
	הִחְלִיט (v. 33)
	עָשָׂה (v. 40)
	עַל (v. 43)
1 Kings 21	הֵיכָל (v. 1)
	yiqtol (v. 6)
	חוֹרִים (vv. 8, 11)
	הִתְמַכֵּר (v. 20, 25)
1 Kings 22	-אוֹת (vv. 7, 8, 24)
	אֶחָד (v. 9)
	כַּמָּה (v. 16)
	אֵי זֶה (v. 24)

	דִּבֶּר בְּ- (v. 28) infinitive absolute (v. 30 x2) הָיָה + participle (v. 35)
2 Kings 1	חֳלִי זֶה (v. 2) מֶה (v. 7) -אוֹת (v. 15 x2)
2 Kings 2	גָּלַם (v. 8) צָלוֹחִית (v. 20)
2 Kings 3	נֹקֶד (v. 4) -אוֹת (vv. 11, 12, 26) infinitive absolute (v. 16) מִבְחוֹר (v. 19 x2) הָחָרֵב נָחֳרִבוּ (v. 23)
2 Kings 4	אַחַת (v. 1) כִּי- (vv. 2, 3, 7 x2) מֶה (vv. 13, 14) הֲ-...אוֹ... (v. 13) אַתְּי (vv. 16, 23) הֹלֶכֶת (v. 23) לְ- (v. 24) הִשְׁלָה (v. 28) זוֹרֵר (v. 35) אֹרָה (v. 39) פַּקֻּעֹת (v. 39) פִּלַּח (v. 39)

	בְּצַקְלֹנוֹ (v. 42) infinitive absolute (v. 43)
2 Kings 5	אחלי (v. 3) בהשתחויתי (v. 18) מאן (v. 25)
2 Kings 6	גזר (v. 4) קצב (v. 6) היה + participle (v. 8) תחנות (v. 8) נחיתים (v. 9) משלנו (v. 11) איכה (v. 13) -אות (v. 16) זה (v. 19) כרה (v. 23) קב (v. 25) ה...או... (v. 27) זאת הרעה (v. 33)
2 Kings 7	על (v. 7) אחד (v. 8) בהשדה (v. 12)
2 Kings 8	אתי (v. 1) אל (v. 3 x2) אחד (v. 6) -מאות (v. 8)

	חלי זה (vv. 8, 9) preterite yiqtol (v. 29)
2 Kings 9	אל (vv. 3, 6 x3) חלק (vv. 10, 36, 37) גרם (v. 13) preterite yiqtol (v. 15) שפעת (v. 17 x2) עד הם (v. 18) עד אליהם (v. 20) עד (v. 22) וַיִּרְמְסֻנָּה (v. 33) הית (v. 37)
2 Kings 10	דוד (v. 7) צבר (v. 8) מצבת (v. 26) רבעים (v. 30) קצה (v. 32)
2 Kings 13	חיה...קום... (v. 21)
2 Kings 14	בְּבֵית שֶׁמֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה (v. 11) ב- (v. 13) ל- (v. 28)
2 Kings 15	קבל (v. 10) רבעים (v. 12) ירח (v. 13) הוציא (v. 20)

	ארמון (v. 25) ארגוב (v. 25) מִן־חַטֹּאות (v. 28)
2 Kings 17	התמכר (v. 17) מקצות (v. 32) היה + participle (vv. 33 x2, 41) שם שם (v. 34)

A 1.1 OCCURRENCES OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE WITH A NOUN IN THE CONSTRUCT STATE IN THE HEBREW BIBLE:

Gen. 24:67 (הָאֹהֱלָה שָׂרָה); 31:13 (הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל)

Exod. 9:18 (הַיּוֹם הִוָּסְדָה); 28:39 (הַכְּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ); 39:17 (הָעֲבֹתֹת הַזָּהָב), 27 (הַכָּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ)

Num. 21:14 (הַנְּחָלִים אַרְנֹן); 22:5 (עַל־הַנָּהָר אֶרֶץ בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹ); 34:2 (הָאָרֶץ כְּנָעַן)

Josh. 3:11 (נְשִׂאֵי הָאָרֹון בְּרִית־יְהוָה), 14 (אֲרֹון הַבְּרִית), 17 (כֹּל־) 8:11; (הַמַּלְחָמָה הָעָם), 33 (הָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל); 13:5 (הָאָרֶץ הַגִּבְלִי), 7 (חֲצִי הַשֵּׁבֶט הַמְנַשֶּׁה)

Judg. 8:11 (הַשְּׁכוּנֵי בָאֳהָלִים); 16:14 (הִיתֵד הָאָרֹג)

1 Sam. 4:1 (הָאֶבֶן הָעֵזֶר); 20:19 (הָאֶבֶן הָאָזֶל); 26:22 (הַחֲנִית הַמֶּלֶךְ)

2 Sam. 19:25 (הַיּוֹם לֶכְתִּ הַמֶּלֶךְ); 20:23 (כָּל־הַצָּבָא יִשְׂרָאֵל); 24:5 (הַנַּחַל הַגָּד)

1 Kgs. 14:24 (הַתּוֹעֵבֹת הַגּוֹיִם)

2 Kgs. 7:13 (הֲהָמוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל); 9:4 (הַנַּעַר הַנָּבִיא); 16:14 (הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת), 17 (הַמִּסְגְּרוֹת הַמְּכֹנוֹת); 23:12 (הַגַּג) עֲלִיַּת אָחָז), 17 x2 (הַמִּזְבַּח בֵּית־אֵל; הַקָּבָר אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים); 25:11 (הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּבֶל), 19 (הַסֹּפֵר שַׂר הַצָּבָא).

Jer. 25:26 (הַמַּמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ); 31:40 (כָּל־הָעֵמֶק הַפְּגָרִים); 32:12 (הַסֵּפֶר הַמִּקְנָה); 38:6 (הַבּוֹר ו מַלְכִּיָּהוּ);
48:32 (הַגֶּפֶן שִׂבְמָה)

Ezek. 27:3 (הַיֹּשֶׁבְתִי עַל־מְבוֹאֹת יָם); 40:15 (הַשַּׁעַר הֶיאתּוֹן), 28 (הַשַּׁעַר הַדָּרוֹם); 41:22 (הַמִּזְבַּח עֵץ); 42:12
(הַמִּגְדֶּרֶת הַגִּינָּה); 43:21 (הַפֶּר הַחַטָּאת); 45:14 (הַבַּת הַשֶּׁמֶן), 16 (הָעָם הָאָרֶץ); 46:19 (הַלִּשְׁכוֹת הַקֹּדֶשׁ); 47:8
(הַמִּגְדֶּרֶת חֶתְלָן), 15 (הַיָּמָּה הַמּוּצָאִים)

Zech. 4:7 (הָאֶבֶן הָרֹאשָׁה), 10 (הָאֶבֶן הַבְּדִיל)

Ps. 113:5 (הַמַּגְבִּיהִי לָשָׁבֶת), 6 (הַמַּשְׁפִּילִי לִרְאוֹת); 114:8 (הַהֹפְכִי הַצּוּר); 123:1 (הַיֹּשְׁבִי בַּשָּׁמָיִם), 4 (הַלַּעַג
הַשַּׁאֲנַנִּים)

Lam. 2:13 (הַבַּת יְרוּשָׁלָ͏ִם)

Dan. 8:13 (הֶחָזוֹן הַתָּמִיד)

Ezr. 8:29 (הַלִּשְׁכוֹת בֵּית יְהוָה); 9:1 (הָעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל)

Neh. 7:5 (סֵפֶר הַיַּחַשׂ הָעוֹלִים)

1 Chr. 9:26 (הָאֹצָרוֹת בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים); 15:27 (הַשִּׂר הַמַּשָּׂא הַמְשֹׁרְרִים)

2 Chr. 8:16 (הַיּוֹם מוּסַד בֵּית־יְהוָה); 15:8 (הַנְּבוּאָה עֹדֵד הַנָּבִיא)

A 2.1 OCCURRENCES OF THE THEOPHORIC ELEMENT AT THE END OF PERSONAL NAMES IN KINGS:

I KINGS

CHAPTER	-יָהוּ	-יָהּ	PERCENTAGE
1	19x אֲדֹנִיָּהוּ 12 בְּנָיָהוּ 7	3x אֲדֹנִיָּה	86,4% – 13,6%
2	12x	2x	85,7% – 14,3%

	אַדְנִיָּה	אֲדֹנִיָּהוּ 6 בְּנָיָהוּ 6	
3	0	0	
4	1x אֲחִיָּה	3x בְּנָיָהוּ 1 עֲזַרְיָהוּ 2	75% – 25%
5	0	0	
6	0	0	
7	0	0	
8	0	0	
9	0	0	
10	0	0	
11	2x אֲחִיָּה 2	0	0% – 100%
12	2x אֲחִיָּה 1 שְׁמַעְיָה 1	0	0% – 100%
13	0	1x יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ	100% – 0%
14	3x אֲבִיָּה 1 אֲחִיָּה 2	4x אֲחִיָּהוּ 4	57,1% – 42,8%
15	3x אֲחִיָּה 3	0	0% – 100%
16	0	0	

17	9x אֱלֹהִיָּהוּ 9	0	100% – 0%
18	29x אֱלֹהִיָּהוּ 22 עֹבַדְיָהוּ 7	0	100% – 0%
19	8x אֱלֹהִיָּהוּ 8	0	100% – 0%
20	0	0	
21	3x אֱלֹהִיָּהוּ 3	1x אֲחִיָּה 1	75% – 25%
22	13x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 3 מִיכָיְהוּ 9 צִדְקִיָּהוּ 1	1x צִדְקִיָּה 1	92,8% – 7,1%

II KINGS

CHAPTER	-יָהוּ	-יָה	PERCENTAGE
1	5x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 1 אֱלִיָּהוּ 4	5x אֲחַזְיָה 1 אֱלִיָּה 4	50% – 50%
2	12x אֱלִיָּהוּ 12	0	100% – 0%
3	1x	0	100% – 0%

	אֱלִיָהוּ 1		
4	0	0	
5	0	0	
6	0	0	
7	0	0	
8	5x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 4 עֲתַלְיָהוּ 1	0	100% – 0%
9	3x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 2 אֱלִיָהוּ 1	5x אֲחַזְיָה 4 אֲחִיָה 1	37,5% – 62,5%
10	4x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 2 אֱלִיָהוּ 2	0	100% – 0%
11	4x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 2 עֲתַלְיָהוּ 2	5x אֲחַזְיָה 1 עֲתַלְיָה 4	44,4% – 55,6%
12	1x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 1	1x אֲמַצְיָה 1	50% – 50%
13	1x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 1	1x אֲמַצְיָה 1	50% – 50%
14	11x אֲחַזְיָהוּ 1 אֲמַצְיָהוּ 10	3x אֲמַצְיָה 1 זְכַרְיָה 1 עֲזַרְיָה 1	78,6% – 21,4%

15	12x אֲמַצְיָהוּ 1 זְכַרְיָהוּ 1 יְכָלְיָהוּ 1 עֲזַיָּהוּ 2 עָזַרְיָהוּ 2 רְמַלְיָהוּ 5	12x אֲמַצְיָה 1 זְכַרְיָה 1 עֲזַיָּה 2 עָזַרְיָה 5 פְּקַחְיָה 3	50% – 50%
16	3x חִזְקִיָּהוּ 1 רְמַלְיָהוּ 2	0	100% – 0%
17	0	0	
18	11x חִזְקִיָּהוּ 9 חִלְקִיָּהוּ 2	9x זְכַרְיָה 1 חִזְקִיָּה 8	55% – 45%
19	13x חִזְקִיָּהוּ 9 יְשַׁעְיָהוּ 4	0	100% – 0%
20	25x חִזְקִיָּהוּ 15 יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ 1 יְשַׁעְיָהוּ 9	0	100% – 0%
21	3x חִזְקִיָּהוּ 1 יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ 2	0	100% – 0%
22	6x	7x	46,2% – 53,8%

	אצליהו 1 חִלְקִיָּהוּ 3 יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ 2	חִלְקִיָּה 3 מִיכָיָה 1 עֲדָיָה 1 עֲשָׂיָה 2	
23	12x חִלְקִיָּהוּ 2 יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ 9 יִרְמְיָהוּ 1	1x פְּדָיָה 1	92,3% – 6,7%
24	4x יִרְמְיָהוּ 1 צִדְקִיָּהוּ 3	1x מַתַּנְיָה 1	80% – 20%
25	10x גְּדַלְיָהוּ 5 יַאֲזַנְיָהוּ 1 צִדְקִיָּהוּ 3 צְפַנְיָהוּ 1	4x נְתַנְיָה 2 שְׂרָיָה 2	71,4% – 28,6%

A 2.2 OCCURRENCES OF UNASSIMILATED מִן BEFORE A NOUN WITH DEFINITE ARTICLE:

Gen. 2:6, 7, 9, 19, 22; 3:11, 12, 17; 4:10, 11; 5:29; 6:20; 7:2, 8 (x3), 23; 8:2, 10, 16, 19; 9:18, 21; 10:11; 13:14; 19:12, 14, 24; 21:15, 17; 22:11, 15; 25:29, 30; 29:2; 30:16; 31:13; 32:14; 33:15; 34:7; 37:28; 38:17; 40:14, 17; 41:2, 3, 14, 18; 50:24; Exod. 1:10, 2:7, 10, 23 (x2); 3:8; 4:9; 7:18, 21; 8:9 (x3); 9:15, 18; 10:5 (x2); 12:5 (x2), 7, 22, 33, 46 (x2); 16:4, 27; 18:13, 14;

19:3, 14, 17; 20:22; 23:16; 25:19, 33, 35; 26:28; 29:21, 22, 34; 32:1, 8, 15, 28; 33:7; 34:29; 36:22; 37:8, 19; 39:1; Lev. 1:2 (x3), 3, 10 (x3), 14 (x2); 2:3, 9, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:6, 7, 17, 18; 5:6, 15, 16, 18, 25; 7:25; 8:24, 30; 9:10 (x2), 19 (x2); 11:13, 39; 13:4, 20, 21, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 56 (x4); 14:3, 7, 16 (x2), 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 37, 38; 16:14, 19; 17:8, 10, 13; 20:2, 4, 24, 26; 21:12, 22; 22:6, 7, 18; 25:12, 22, 33; 26:6; 27:29; Num. 5:2, 17, 26; 6:19 (x2); 10:34; 11:17, 25, 31; 13:23 (x2), 33; 14:6, 38; 15:2, 23, 30; 18:9, 26, 27 (x2); 20:8, 10, 28; 22:6, 23; 31:28 (x4), 30 (x5), 35, 37, 42, 43, 47 (x3); 34:7; Deut. 3:16; 4:32, 36, 42; 9:7, 12, 15, 16, 21; 10:5, 7; 11:24 (x2), 28; 12:3; 13:6, 18; 16:4; 17:10, 11, 20; 19:5; 26:13, 15; 28:24; 31:29; 33:22; Josh. 2:1, 4:2, 16, 17, 19, 20; 6:18 (x2); 7:1, 4, 9, 11; 8:4, 6, 16, 22, 29; 10:2, 7, 9, 11, 22, 23; 11:17, 21; 13:3, 6; 15:2; 18:12, 14; 21:4; 23:4; Judg. 1:24; 2:1, 17, 21; 3:19, 27; 6:21, 38; 7:3, 5; 8:13, 26 (x2); 9:15, 35, 43; 10:11; 11:22; 12:9; 13:5, 7; 15:13; 19:16; 20:14, 21, 25, 31, 32, 38, 40; 21:21, 23; 1 Sam. 1:1; 2:20; 4:16 (x2), 7:11, 9:5; 11:5; 13:15; 14:11; 17:40, 50; 24:9; 28:9, 13; 30:19; 2 Sam. 1:2, 4 (x2); 4:1; 5:9; 7:8, 11; 11:17; 12:17; 15:24; 18:13; 19:10, 25, 43; 20:2, 5, 12, 13, 16; 21:10; 23:19, 23; 24:15; 1 Kgs. 1:39; 5:1, 13, 20, 23; 6:8, 16; 7:34; 8:8, 10, 16; 9:20; 10:3; 11:2, 26; 12:9; 13:5, 26; 15:12; 16:2; 17:6, 23; 20:19; 22:34, 47; 2 Kgs. 1:10 (x2), 12 (x2), 14; 2:1, 23, 24; 4:3, 22; 6:27; 7:12 (x2), 13; 8:29; 9:15 (x2); 10:24, 33; 12:14; 15:28; 21:8, 9, 15; 23:16; 25:19; Isa. 2:22; 6:6; 14:3; 16:4, 10; 28:7 (x2); 55:10; Jer. 1:1; 7:25; 8:3; 13:7; 16:9; 17:26 (x3); 20:3; 21:7 (x3); 22:11; 24:5; 25:35; 28:3, 8; 32:31; 37:21; 38:10, 13; 39:4, 10; 40:1, 4; 41:6, 14, 16; 48:44; 51:25; 52:25; Ezek. 1:4, 13; 5:6, 7; 10:19; 11:17 (x2); 16:34; 20:34 (x2), 41 (x2); 23:48; 25:7 (x2); 28:25; 29:13, 15; 34:13 (x2), 25; 36:24; 39:10 (x2), 22, 27; 43:23, 25; 44:31 (x2); 45:1, 3, 4, 14, 15; 47:2, 12, 15, 17; Hos. 2:2, 20; Jo. 2:2; 4:7; Am. 3:5; 6:2, 10; Jon. 3:8; 4:5; Mic. 6:5; 7:2; Zeph. 1:4, 10; Hag. 2:9, 15, 18, 19; Zech. 8:10; 13:2 (x2); 14:2; Mal. 2:8; Ps. 10:18; 12:8; 104:35; 106:47, 48; 118:5; 148:1, 7; Job 1:16, 30:8; 37:9; 38:1; Ruth 1:7; 2:14, 16; 3:10; 4:12 (x2); Song 2:9 (x2); 3:6; 4:2; 5:4; 6:5, 6; 8:5; Eccl. 2:13 (x2); 3:19, 20; 4:2, 9; 6:3, 8; 9:4; Est. 7:9; Dan. 1:3, 10, 12; 8:3, 5, 9, 10 (x2); 10:12;

11:13, 35; Ezr. 2:62, 70; 3:7; 7:7; 8:20, 22; 10:11, 23, 24 (x2); Neh. 1:2, 3, 3:20; 4:10; 5:17; 6:9; 7:63, 64, 72; 8:3, 17; 8:18; 9:5; 11:1, 10, 15, 36; 12:28, 13:6, 8, 13, 21; 1 Chr. 5:9; 9:5, 10, 14, 31; 10:3; 11:8, 15, 21, 25; 12:8, 9, 36, 38; 16:4, 35, 36; 17:5, 7; 21:21, 26; 24:6; 26:27 (x2); 2 Chr. 2:15; 5:9, 11; 6:5, 21, 23, 25, 30, 33, 35, 39; 7:14; 8:7; 9:26; 10:9; 15:8, 11; 16:10; 18:33; 19:3, 8; 21:15; 26:18; 28:12, 15; 29:5, 12; 33:9; 34:3; 35:24; 36:20.

A 2.3 OCCURRENCES OF UNASSIMILATED מן BEFORE A NOUN WITH DEFINITE ARTICLE IN THE SAMARITAN PENATEUCH:

Gen. 2:6; 2:9; 2:19; 2:22; 3:11; 3:12; 3:17; 4:10; 4:11; 5:29; 6:20 (x2); 7:2; 7:8 (x3); 7:23; 8:2; 8:10; 8:16; 8:19; 9:18; 9:21; 10:11; 13:14; 19:12; 19:14; 19:24; 21:15; 21:17; 22:11; 22:15; 25:29; 25:30; 29:2; 30:37; 31:13; 32:14; 33:15; 34:7; 37:28; 38:17; 40:14; 41:2; 41:3; 41:14; 41:18; 50:24; Exod. 1:10; 2:7; 2:10; 2:23 (x2); 3:8; 4:9; 7:18 (x2); 7:21; 8:9 (x3); 9:15; 9:19; 10:2 (x2); 10:5 (x2); 12:5 (x2); 12:7; 12:22; 12:33; 12:46 (x2); 16:4; 16:27; 18:13; 18:14; 19:3; 19:14; 19:17; 19:25; 20:19; 23:16; 25:19; 25:33; 25:35; 26:28; 29:21; 29:22; 29:34; 32:1; 32:8; 32:15; 32:28; 33:7; 34:29; 36:33; 37:8; 37:19; 39:1; Lev. 1:2 (x3); 1:3; 1:10 (x3); 1:14 (x2); 2:3; 2:9; 2:10; 3:1; 3:6; 4:6; 4:7; 4:17 (x2); 4:18; 5:6; 5:15; 5:16; 5:18; 5:25; 7:25; 8:24; 8:30; 9:10 (x2); 9:19 (x2); 11:39; 13:4; 13:20; 13:21; 13:25; 13:26; 13:30; 13:31; 13:32; 13:34; 13:56 (x4); 14:3; 14:7; 14:16 (x2); 14:26; 14:27; 14:28; 14:30; 14:37; 14:38; 16:14; 16:19; 17:8; 17:10; 17:13; 20:2; 20:4; 20:24; 20:26; 21:12; 21:22; 22:6; 22:7; 22:18; 25:12; 25:22; 25:33; 26:6; 27:29; Num. 5:2; 5:17; 5:26; 6:19 (x2); 10:34; 11:17; 11:25; 11:31; 13:23 (x2); 13:33; 14:6; 14:38; 15:3 (x2); 15:23; 15:30 (x2); 18:9; 18:26; 18:27 (x2); 20:10; 20:28; 22:6; 22:23; 31:28 (x4); 31:30 (x5); 31:35; 31:37; 31:42; 31:43; 31:47 (x3); 34:7; Deut. 3:16; 4:32; 4:36;

4:42; 9:7; 9:12; 9:15; 9:16; 9:21; 10:5; 11:24; 11:28; 12:3; 13:6; 13:18; 16:4; 17:10; 17:11; 17:20; 19:5 (x2); 26:13 (x2); 26:15; 28:24; 31:29; 33:22.

A 2.4 OCCURRENCES OF PROCLITIC -מ BEFORE A NOUN WITH THE DEFINITE ARTICLE:

Gen. 6:20; Josh. 1:4; 2:23; 3:1; 8:7; 20:4; Judg. 1:36; 14:14; 17:8; 20:15, 31, 42; 1 Sam. 4:12; 9:3, 25; 10:5; 14:4 (x2), 28; 15:21; 16:13, 18; 17:34; 18:9; 24:8; 25:14 (x2); 26:22; 28:3, 23; 30:17, 22 (x2), 25, 26; 31:3; 2 Sam. 1:15; 2:21, 27; 3:22, 37; 12:20; 16:1; 17:21; 23:13; 24:15; 1 Kgs. 7:7; 17:4; 18:5, 26; 20:41; 2 Kgs. 4:40; 17:27, 28; Isa. 1:29; 19:5; Jer. 19:34; 33:5; 52:7; Ezek. 1:10; 14:7; 15:7; 25:9; 40:7, 8, 9; 41:20, 25; 42:5, 6, 9, 14; 43:6, 14, 15; Zeph. 1:10; Ps. 41:14; Ezr. 3:8, 12; 6:21; 8:35; 10:9; 1 Chr. 5:22; 2 Chr. 2:7; 3:17; 7:1; 20:1; 25:20; 29:34; 34:13.

A 2.5 OCCURRENCES OF UNASSIMILATED מִן BEFORE ANARTHROUS NOUNS:

Exod. 18:14; Lev. 1:14; 14:30; Num. 23:7; Josh. 11:21 (x3); Judg. 5:20; 7:23 (x2); 10:11 (x2); 19:16; 2 Sam. 20:6; 22:14; 2 Kgs. 14:2; 15:28; 18:17; 21:19; 23:36; Isa. 18:2; 20:5; Jer. 7:7; 17:5; 25:3, 5; 44:18, 28; Joel 1:12; Ps. 18:4, 49; 30:4; 45:9; 73:19; 104:7 (x2); 116:8; Prov. 27:8; Job 30:5; 40:6; Song 4:15; Lam. 1:6; Dan. 1:15; 9:25; 11:5, 23; Neh. 12:28; 1 Chr. 4:40, 42; 1 Chr. 5:18; 8:8, 9; 9:3 (x3), 4, 6, 7, 14, 30, 32 (x2); 11:22; 12:17, 26, 27, 30, 31; 13:2, 5; 15:17 (x2), 25; 17:7; 19:6 (x2); 24:3 (x2), 4; 26:1, 10; 27:3, 10, 14; 2 Chr. 2:13, 8:8, 9; 13:2; 15:13; 17:11, 17; 20:14, 19 (x2); 26:3; 29:12 (x2), 13 (x2), 14 (x2); 31:3; 34:12 (x2). I include

in the list the occurrence of Isa. 18:2, where the preposition and the independent pronoun are kept apart (מִן־הָוּא instead of מִמֶּנּוּ).

A 2.6 OCCURRENCES OF UNASSIMILATED מִן BEFORE ANARTHROUS NOUNS IN THE NON-BIBLICAL QUMRAN SCROLLS:

1QS 7:3 מן טהרת; 1QSa 1:6 [ומן נע[וריו; 1Q22 frag. 1 IV:2 מִנְ שנֹי; 4Q166 1:11 [ ]מן מ; 4Q176 frag. 1 I:4 ומן ספר; 4Q185 frag. 1 I:14 מן [ח]בורת; frag. 1 II:6 מן מלאכיו; frag. 1 II:9 [ ]מִנְ א; 4Q223-224 frag. 2 I:49 מן נעוריו; 4Q266 frag. 16a:2 מן אִיש; 4Q282g frag. 1:3 מנשמים; 4Q364 frag. 18:6 מן בן; 4Q365 frag. 9b II:2 [מן שמ[ן; 4Q374 frag. 9:4 [ ]מן ח; 4Q379 frag. 1:6 ומן עד; 4Q381 frag. 69:5 מן שמים; 4Q381 frag. 97:3 [ ]מוֹאֹשׁ (the ן is supralinear and was added later); 4Q382 frag. 115:2 מן דרך; 4Q385b frag. 1:4 [מן ב[ני; 3Q397 frag. 1 2:2 מה[ות] מן ע[ו]רֹ; 4Q437 frag. 2 I:7 מן תחנוני; 4Q443 frag. 1:8 מן בני; 4Q522 frag. 9 II:12 [מן לֹ[וז; 11Q5 28:3 מוֹאחי (the ן is supralinear and was added later); 11Q19 34:15 מן מקרת; 39:14 מן פנה; 57:11; 60:10 מן בני, מוֹכל (the ן is supralinear and was added later).

A 2.7 OCCURRENCES OF UNASSIMILATED מִן IN BIBLICAL ARAMAIC:

Jer. 10:11 מִן־תְּחוֹת; Dan. 2:6 מִן־קֳדָמַי; 2:8 מִן־יַצִיב; 2:15 מִן־קֳדָם; 2:16 מִן־מַלְכָּא; 2:18 מִן־קֳדָם; 2:20 מִן־ 2:25 מִן־בְּנֵי; 2:30 מִן־כָּל; 2:35 מִן־אִדְרֵי; 2:41 מִן־נִצְבְּתָא; 2:42 מִן־קְצָת; 2:47 קֻשְׁטָ; 2:49 מִן־מַלְכָּא; עָלְמָא; 3:15 מִן־יְדָי; 3:17 מִן־אַתּוּן, מִן־יְדָךְ; 3:22 מִן־דְּי; 3:26 מִן־גּוֹא; 4:10 מִן־שְׁמַיָּא; 4:11 מִן־תַּחְתּוֹהִי, מִן־עַנְפּוֹהִי; 4:13 מִן־אֲנָשָׁא; 4:20 מִן־שְׁמַיָּא; 4:22 מִן־אֲנָשָׁא; 4:23 מִן־דִּי; 4:28 מִן־שְׁמַיָּא; 4:29 מִן־אֲנָשָׁא; 4:30 מִן־אֲנָשָׁא; 5:2 מִן־הֵיכְלָא; 5:3 מִן־הֵיכְלָא; 5:13 מִן־בְּנֵי, מִן־יְהוּד; 5:19 מִן־רְבוּתָא, מִן־קֳדָמוֹהִי; 5:20 מִן־כָּרְסֵא; 5:21 מִן־

מִן־גֶּבֶא 6:24; מִן־אַרְיֵוָתָא 6:21; מִן־בְּנֵי 6:14; מִן־כָּל 6:13; מִן־קֳדָמַת 6:11; מִן־כָּל 6:8; מִן־קָדָמוֹהִי 5:24; בְּנֵי־
מִן־ ,מִן־קַרְנַיָּא 7:8; מִן־כָּל 7:7; מִן־אַרְעָא 7:4; מִן־דָּא ,מִן־יַמָּא 7:3; מִן־יַד 6:28; מִן־קֳדָם ,מִן־קָדָמַי 6:27; מִן־גֻּבָּא
מִן־ ,מִן־קָדָמַיהּ 7:20; מִן־כָּלְהֶון 7:19; מִן־אַרְעָא 7:17; מִן־קָאֲמַיָּא 7:16; מִן־קָל 7:11; מִן־קָדָמוֹהִי 7:10; קָדָמֵיהּ
חַבְרָתַהּ; 7:23 מִן־כָּל 7:24; מִן־קֳדָמַיָּא Ezr. 4:12; מִן־לְוָתָךְ 4:15; מִן־יוֹמָת 4:19; מִן־יוֹמָת 4:23; מִן־דִּי 5:12;
מִן־דִּי 5:14; מִן־הֵיכְלָא ,מִן־הֵיכְלָא 5:16; מִן־אֱדַיִן 5:17; מִן־כְּוֹרֶשׁ 6:4; מִן־בֵּית 6:5; מִן־הֵיכְלָא 6:6; מִן־תַּמָּה
6:11 מִן־בַּיְתֵהּ; 6:14 מִן־טַעַם; 7:13 מִן־עַמָּה; 7:14 מִן־קֳדָם; 7:20 מִן־בֵּית; 7:23 מִן־טַעַם.

A 2.8 OCCURRENCES OF SHORT FORM OF THE III-Y VERBS IN THE WAYYIQTOL (FORMS WITH THE PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES ARE MARKED IN RED):

2ND MASCULINE SINGULAR

Gen. 33:10 (וַתִּרְצֵנִי)

1 Sam. 15:19 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

2 Sam. 12:21 (וַתֵּבְךְּ)

1 Kgs. 13:22 (וַתִּשְׁתְּ)

Ezek. 28:4 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

Jon. 2:7 (וַתַּעַל)

Psa. 39:12 (וַתֶּמַס); 44:20 (וַתִּכַּס); 50:18 (וַתָּרָץ); 80:6 (וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ); 118:21 (וַתְּהִי); 119:26 (וַתַּעֲנֵנִי); 138:3 (וַתַּעֲנֵנִי)

Job 4:5 (וַתֵּלֶא)

Dan. 9:15 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

Neh. 9:9 (וַתִּקְרָא), 10 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

2 Chr. 34:27 (וַתִּבְכְּךָ)

3RD MASCULINE SINGULAR

Gen. 1:3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיַּרְא), 5 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 7 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיִּקְרָא), 11 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיַּרְא), 13 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 (וַיַּרְא), 19 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיִּקְרָא), 23 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיְהִי), 25 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיַּעַשׂ), 30 (וַיְהִי), 31 x3 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי, וַיַּרְא); 2:2 (וַיִּכַל), 7 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְצַו), 22 (וַיִּבֶן); 3:21 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 4:2 (וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיִּשַׁע), 5 (וַיִּחַר), 8 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי); 5:3 (וַיְחִי), 6 (וַיְחִי), 7 (וַיְחִי), 9 (וַיְחִי), 10 (וַיְחִי), 12 (וַיְחִי), 13 (וַיְחִי), 15 (וַיְחִי), 16 (וַיְחִי), 18 (וַיְחִי), 19 (וַיְחִי), 21 (וַיְחִי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְחִי), 26 (וַיְחִי), 28 (וַיְחִי), 30 (וַיְחִי), 31 (וַיְהִי), 32 (וַיְהִי); 6:1 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיַּרְא), 12 (וַיַּרְא), 22 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 7:5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיִּמַּח); 8:6 (וַיְהִי), 13 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּרְא), 20 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַל); 9:21 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ, וַיִּתְגַּל), 22 (וַיַּרְא), 28 (וַיְחִי); 10:11 (וַיִּבֶן), 19 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיְהִי); 11:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְחִי), 13 (וַיְחִי), 15 (וַיְחִי), 16 (וַיְחִי), 17 (וַיְחִי), 18 (וַיְחִי), 19 (וַיְחִי), 20 (וַיְחִי), 21 (וַיְחִי), 22 (וַיְחִי), 23 (וַיְחִי), 24 (וַיְחִי), 25 (וַיְחִי), 26 (וַיְחִי); 12:7 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיֵּרָא), 8 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיֵּט), 10 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְצַו); 13:1 (וַיַּעַל), 7 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּרְא), 18 (וַיִּבֶן); 14:1 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי); 15:12 (וַיִּכֶּם); 17:1 x2 (וַיֵּרָא, וַיְהִי), 22 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיִּכֹּל); 18:1 (וַיֵּרָא), 2 x3 (וַיַּרְא, וַיַּרְא, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 27 (וַיַּעַן); 19:1 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיַּרְא), 3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 14 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיִּתְמַהְמָהּ), 17 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיַּרְא), 29 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיַּעַל), 34 (וַיְהִי); 20:13 (וַיְהִי); 21:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 20 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְהִי); 22:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיַּרְא), 9 (וַיִּבֶן), 13 x2 (וַיִּרְא, וַיִּרְאֵהוּ), 20 (וַיְהִי); 23:7 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 10 (וַיַּעַן), 12 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 14 (וַיַּעַן); 24:15 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 30 (וַיְהִי), 50 (וַיַּעַן), 52 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיְהִי), 63 (וַיַּרְא); 25:11 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 34 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ, וַיִּבְז); 26:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיֵּרָא), 8 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְצַו), 14 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיִּחַן), 23 (וַיַּעַל), 24 (וַיֵּרָא), 25 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיֵּט), 30 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 32 (וַיְהִי), 34 (וַיְהִי); 27:1 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ), 30 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 31 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 37 (וַיַּעַן), 38 (וַיִּבְךְ), 39 (וַיַּעַן); 28:1 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ), 6 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיְצַו), 8 (וַיַּרְא); 29:2 (וַיַּרְא), 10 x2 (וַיַּשְׁקְ, וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּבְךְ), 13 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 31 (וַיַּרְא);

30:2 (וַיִּחַר), 25 (וַיְהִי), 43 (וַיְהִי); 31:2 (וַיִּרְא), 10 (וַיְהִי), 31 (וַיַּעַן), 36 x2 (וַיַּעַן, וַיִּחַר), 43 (וַיַּעַן); 32:5 (וְיָצָו), 6 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיַּסִּיר), 18 (וַיְצַו), 20 (וַיִּצַּו), 26 (וַיַּרְא); 33:1 x2 (וַיִּחַן, וַיִּרְאֵ), 3 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ), 5 (וַיַּרְא), 17 (וַיִּבֶן), 18 (וַיִּחַן), 19 (וַיִּקֶן); 34:2 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיְעַנֶּהָ), 7 (וַיִּחַר), 25 (וַיְהִי); 35:3 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיִּבֶן), 9 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיַּעַל), 16 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּט), 22 (וַיְהִי); 37:23 (וַיְהִי), 35 (וַיִּבְךְ); 38:1 x2 (וַיִּרְאֵ), 2 (וַיַּט, וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיַּעַל), 15 (וַיִּרְאֶהָ), 16 (וַיַּט), 24 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי); 39:1 (וַיִּקְּהוּ), 2 x3 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיִּרְא), 5 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 19 x2 (וַיִּחַר, וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי), 21 x2 (וַיַּט, וַיְהִי); 40:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיִּרְא), 16 (וַיַּרְא), 18 (וַיַּעַן), 20 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי); 41:1 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיַּעַן), 54 (וַיְהִי); 42:1 (וַיַּרְא), 7 (וַיַּרְא), 22 (וַיִּעַן), 24 (וַיִּבְךְ), 25 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 27 (וַיִּרְאֵ), 35 (וַיְהִי); 43:2 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיַּרְא), 17 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 21 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ), 29 (וַיַּרְא), 30 (וַיִּבְךְ); 44:1 (וַיְצַו), 2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 24 (וַיְהִי); 45:14 (וַיִּבְךְ), 15 (וַיִּבְךְ), 27 (וַיִּרְאֵ); 46:29 x3 (וַיִּבְךְ, וַיֵּרָא, וַיֵּעָל); 47:20 (וַיִּקֶן), 28 x2 (וַיְחִי, וַיְחִי), 31 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 48:1 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיַּרְא), 12 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 17 (וַיַּרְא); 49:15 x3 (וַיַּרְא, וַיַּט, וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְצַו), 33 (וַיֶּאֱסֹף); 50:1 (וַיִּבְךְ), 2 (וַיְצַו), 7 (וַיַּעַל), 9 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַל), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיַּרְא), 17 (וַיִּבְךְ), 22 (וַיְחִי), 23 (וַיַּרְא)

Exod. 1:5 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּבֶן), 20 (וַיֵּרֶב), 21 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְצַו); 2:10 (וַתְּהִי), 11 x3 (וַיַּרְא, וַיְהִי, וַיַּרְא), 12 x3 (וַיַּרְאֵ), 17 (וַיַּשְׁקְ), 19 (וַיַּשְׁקְ), 23 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיַּרְא); 3:2 x2 (וַיֵּרָא, נִרְאָה), 4 (וַיַּרְא); 4:1 (וַיַּעַן), 3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיִּחַר), 24 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיֵּרַף), 30 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 5:6 (וַיְצַו); 6:13 (וַיְצַוֵּם), 28 (וַיְהִי); 7:6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיַּדְּ), 21 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיִּפְן); 8:2 (וַיַּט), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיַּרְא), 13 x2 (וַיַּטְ, וַיַּדְּ), 20 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 9:6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיַּט), 24 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיַּדְּ), 34 (וַיַּרְא); 10:6 (וַיִּפֶן), 13 (וַיַּט), 14 (וַיַּעַל), 15 (וַיְכַס), 22 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּט); 12:29 (וַיְהִי), 41 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 51 (וַיּוֹצֵא); 13:15 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי); 14:20 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּט), 24 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיַּטְ), 30 (וַיַּרְא), 31 (וַיַּרְא); 15:2 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיּוֹרֵהוּ); 16:10 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי); 17:6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 12 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיִּבֶן); 18:7 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 9 (וַיַּחַדְּ), 13 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיִּרְאֵ), 24 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 19:2 (וַיִּחֲנוּ), 16 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיַּעַל), 19 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיֵּעַל); 20:18 (וַיַּרְא); 24:3 (וַיַּעַן), 4 (וַיִּבֶן), 9 (וַיַּעַל), 13 (וַיַּעַל), 15 x2 (וַיְכַס, וַיַּעַל), 16 (וַיִּכְסֵהוּ), 18 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי); 32:1 (וַיַּרְא), 4 (וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ), 5 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיִּבֶן), 11 (וַיְחַל), 15 (וַיִּפֶן), 19 x3 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּרְא, וַיְחַר), 20 x2 (וַיִּשְׂרֹף, וַיִּזֶר), 25 (וַיַּרְא), 30 (וַיְהִי); 34:4 (וַיַּעַל), 8 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 28 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיַּרְא), 32 (וַיְצַוֵּם), 33 (וַיְכַל); 36:6 (וַיְצַו), 11

(וַיַּעַשׂ), 13 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 17 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 20 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 31 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 33 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 34 (וַיְצַו), 35 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 36 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַפֵּם), 37 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 37:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 2 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 4 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 12 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 15 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 17 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 25 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 26 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 28 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 29 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 38:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 2 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 6 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַו), 8 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 24 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 39:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 22 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 39:43 (וַיַּרְא); 40:16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 17 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיַּעַל), 29 (וַיַּעַל), 33 (וַיְכַל), 34 (וַיְכַס)

Lev. 8:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיַּז), 30 (וַיַּז), 36 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 9:1 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיַּעֲשֵׂהָ), 23 (וַיֵּרָא), 24 (וַיַּרְא); 16:34 (וַיַּעַשׂ)

Num. 3:43 (וַיְהִי); 7:1 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי); 8:3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 20 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 9:6 (וַיְהִי); 10:11 (וַיְהִי), 35 (וַיְהִי); 11:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּחַר), 10 (וַיִּחַר), 25 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיַּעַן), 33 (וַיִּז); 12:9 (וַיִּחַר), 10 (וַיִּפֶן); 13:30 (וַיַּהַס); 16:15 (וַיִּחַר), 19 (וַיֵּרָא), 31 (וַיְהִי); 17:7 x2 (וַיֵּרָא, וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 20:6 (וַיֵּרָא), 11 (וַיַּךְ), 21 (וַיֵּט), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 21:1 (וַיִּשְׁבְּ), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 24 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 22:2 (וַיַּרְא), 11 (וַיְכַס), 18 (וַיַּעַן), 22 (וַיִּחַר), 23 (וַיַּךְ), 27 x2 (וַיַּךְ, וַיִּחַר), 31 x3 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיִּקְרָא, וַיִּגְלְ), 41 x3 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ, וַיִּרְא); 23:2 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַל), 4 (וַיִּקָּר), 12 (וַיַּעַן), 14 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיִּבְנְ), 16 (וַיִּקָּר), 26 (וַיַּעַן), 30 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַשׂ); 24:1 (וַיַּרְא), 2 (וַיַּרְא), 10 (וַיִּחַר), 20 (וַיַּרְא), 21 (וַיַּרְא); 25:3 (וַיִּחַר), 7 (וַיַּרְא), 19 (וַיְהִי); 27:22 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ); 31:31 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 32 (וַיְהִי), 37 (וַיְהִי), 52 (וַיְהִי); 32:10 (וַיִּחַר), 13 (וַיִּחַר), 28 (וַיְצַו); 33:38 (וַיַּעַל); 34:13 (וַיְצַו); 36:5 (וַיְצַו)

Deut. 1:3 (וַיְהִי); 2:16 (וַיְהִי); 4:33 (וַיְחִי); 5:23 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיְחִי); 6:24 (וַיְצַוֵּנוּ); 7:8 (וַיִּפְדְּךָ); 8:3 (וַיַּעַנְךָ); 9:11 (וַיְהִי); 15:15 (וַיִּפְדְּךָ); 17:3 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 24:18 (וַיִּפְדְּךָ); 26:5 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיִּרְא); 27:1 (וַיְצַו), 11 (וַיְצַו); 29:26 (וַיִּחַר); 31:10 (וַיְצַו), 15 (וַיֵּרָא), 23 (וַיְצַו), 24 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְצַו); 32:19 (וַיַּרְא), 45 (וַיְכַל); 33:5 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּרְא); 34:1 x2 (וַיַּרְאֵהוּ, וַיַּעַל)

Josh. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְצַו); 2:5 (וַיְהִי); 3:2 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי); 4:1 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְצַו), 18 (וַיְהִי); 5:1 (וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 (וַיְהִי), 13 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 15 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 6:8 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 20 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי), 27 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 7:1 (וַיִּחַר), 5 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיַּעַן); 8:4 (וַיְצַו), 10 (וַיַּעַל), 14 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיֵּט), 24 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי); 9:1 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 16 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 10:1 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיַּעַל), 10 x2 (וַיַּכֵּם,

וַיַּכֵּם), 11 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיְהִי), 26 x2 (וַיַּכֵּם, וַיִּתְלֵם), 27 (וַיְהִי), 28 x2 (וַיַּכֶּהָ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 30 x2 (וַיַּכֶּהָ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 31 (וַיִּחַן), 32 (וַיַּכֶּהָ), 33 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 36 (וַיַּעַל), 41 (וַיַּכֵּם); 11:1 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 12 (וַיַּכֵּם), 17 (וַיַּכֵּם); 13:12 (וַיַּכֵּם), 16 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיְהִי); 15:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיַּעַל), 18 (וַיְהִי); 16:5 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי); 17:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי); 18:8 (וַיְצַו), 11 (וַיַּעַל), 12 (וַיְהִי); 19:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 10 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 33 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 41 (וַיְהִי); 21:4 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי), 40 (וַיְהִי); 22:17 (וַיְהִי); 23:1 (וַיְהִי); 24:7 (וַיְכַסֵּהוּ), 16 (וַיַּעַן), 29 (וַיְהִי)

Judg. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיַּעַל), 14 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיַּרְאֵם), 26 (וַיִּבֶן), 28 (וַיְהִי); 2:1 (וַיַּעַל), 4 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיִּחַר), 20 (וַיִּחַר); 3:8 (וַיִּחַר), 13 (וַיַּךְ), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 31 (וַיַּךְ); 4:10 (וַיַּעַל), 11 (וַיֵּט); 6:7 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיֵּרָא), 14 (וַיִּפֶן), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 20 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 22 (וַיַּרְא), 24 (וַיִּבֶן), 25 (וַיְהִי), 27 x3 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַשׂ), 38 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיָּמֶץ), 40 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי); 7:6 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 14 (וַיַּעַן), 15 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ), 16 (וַיַּחַץ); 8:8 (וַיַּעַל), 11 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּךְ), 26 (וַיְהִי), 27 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיְהִי); 9:3 (וַיֵּט), 30 (וַיִּחַר), 36 (וַיַּרְא), 42 (וַיְהִי), 43 x3 (וַיֶּחֱצֵם, וַיַּרְא, וַיַּכֵּם), 48 (וַיַּעַל), 50 (וַיִּחַן); 10:4 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיִּחַר); 11:4 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיַּכֵּם); 35 (וַיְהִי), 39 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַשׂ); 12:9 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי); 13:2 (וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיֵּרָא), 19 (וַיַּעַל), 20 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַל); 14:1 (וַיַּרְא), 2 (וַיַּעַל), 9 (וַיִּרְדֵּהוּ), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 19 x3 (וַיַּךְ, וַיִּחַר, וַיַּעַל); 15:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיִּפֶן), 8 (וַיַּךְ), 15 (וַיַּךְ), 17 (וַיְהִי), 19 x2 (וַיֵּשְׁתְּ, וַיֶּחִי); 16:1 (וַיַּרְא), 3 (וַיַּעֲלֵם), 4 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיֵּט); 17:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 x2 (וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ, וַיְהִי), 5 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 12 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 18:26 x2 (וַיַּרְא, וַיִּפֶן); 19:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ), 5 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּרְא); 20:4 (וַיַּעַן), 37 (וַיַּךְ), 40 (וַיִּפֶן), 46 (וַיְהִי); 21:4 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְצַו)

1 Sam. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּעַן), 20 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּעַל), 28 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 2:6 (וַיַּעַל); 3:2 (וַיְהִי); 4:1 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּעַן), 18 (וַיְהִי); 5:6 (וַיַּךְ), 9 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּךְ), 10 (וַיְהִי); 6:1 (וַיְהִי), 19 x2 (וַיַּךְ, וַיַּךְ); 7:2 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיִּבֶן); 8:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי); 9:1 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיַּעַן), 21 (וַיַּעַן), 26 (וַיְהִי); 10:11 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיַּעַן), 13 (וַיְכַל), 23 (וַיִּגְבַּהּ), 27 (וַיְהִי); 11:1 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיִּחַן), 6 (וַיִּחַר), 11 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 13:3 (וַיַּךְ), 9 (וַיַּעַל), 10 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ), 15 (וַיַּעַל); 14:1 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיַּעַל), 19 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיֹּאֶל), 25 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיַּעַן), 32 (וַיַּעַט), 35 (וַיִּבֶן), 46 (וַיַּעַל), 48 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּךְ); 15:7 (וַיַּךְ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 11

(וַיִּסַּ֑ר), 31 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 16:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 6 x2 (וַיִּרָא, וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיַּעַן), 21 (וַיְהִי); 17:28 (וַיִּסַּר), 39 (וַיֹּאֶל), 42 (וַיִּבְזֵהוּ), 49 (וַיִּד), 50 (וַיִּד); 18:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיִּסַּר), 9 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיִּרָא), 19 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיִּצְּאוּ), 27 (וַיִּד), 28 (וַיִּרָא), 29 (וַיְהִי), 30 (וַיְהִי); 19:5 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּד), 7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיִּד), 10 (וַיִּד), 20 (וַיִּרָא); 20:24 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיַּעַן), 30 (וַיִּסַּר), 32 (וַיַּעַן), 35 (וַיְהִי), 41 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 21:5 (וַיַּעַן), 6 (וַיַּעַן), 14 x2 (וַיִּשַּׁנְּאוּ, וַיִּתֵּיו); 22:2 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיִּנָּחֵם), 9 (וַיַּעַן), 14 (וַיַּעַן); 23:4 (וַיְעַנֵּהוּ), 5 (וַיִּד), 6 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיִּרָא), 26 (וַיְהִי); 24:1 (וַיַּעַל), 2 (וַיְהִי), 6 x2 (וַיִּד, וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 17 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּבְךְּ); 25:2 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּעַן), 37 (וַיְהִי), 38 (וַיְהִי); 26:3 x2 (וַיֵּרֶא, וַיִּסַּן), 5 (וַיִּרָא), 6 (וַיַּעַן), 14 (וַיַּעַן), 22 (וַיַּעַן); 27:7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיַּעַל); 28:1 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיִּרָא), 14 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 16 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 29:9 (וַיַּעַן); 30:1 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיִּכֶּם), 22 (וַיַּעַן), 25 (וַיְהִי); 31:5 (וַיִּרְאוּ), 8 (וַיְהִי)

2 Sam. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 x3 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 7 x2 (וַיִּפֶן, וַיִּרְאֵנִי), 15 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 2:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיַּעַל), 11 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיִּפֶן), 23 x2 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ, וַיְהִי); 3:2 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיִּסַּר); 3:20 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 27 x2 (וַיַּטֵּהוּ, וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 32 (וַיִּבְךְּ); 4:4 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיַּעַן), 12 (וַיְצַו); 5:9 (וַיִּבֶן), 20 (וַיִּכֶּם), 25 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּד); 6:7 (וַיִּסַּר, וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 8 (וַיִּסַּר), 10 (וַיַּטֵּהוּ), 12 (וַיִּעַל), 13 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּעַל), 18 (וַיְכַל); 7:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 8:1 x2 (וַיִּד, וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיִּד), 3 (וַיִּד), 5 (וַיִּד), 10 (וַיְכַּהוּ), 13 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 14 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי); 9:6 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 8 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 10:1 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּרָא), 15 (וַיִּרְאוּ); 11:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 x2 (וַיִּרְא, וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ), 14 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְצַו); 12:3 (וַיִּסָּיֶהָ), 4 (וַיַּעַשֶׂהָ), 5 (וַיִּסַּר), 18 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיִּרָא), 20 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 13:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיִּתְחַל), 14 (וַיְעַנֶּהָ); 21 (וַיִּסַּר), 23 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיְצַו), 30 (וַיְהִי), 32 (וַיַּעַן), 34 (וַיִּרָא), 36 (וַיְהִי), 38 (וַיְהִי); 14:6 (וַיִּכְוֹ), 18 (וַיַּעַן), 22 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 33 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 15:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַשׂ), 2 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּעַן), 24 (וַיַּעַל), 32 (וַיְהִי); 16:16 (וַיְהִי); 17:18 (וַיִּרְאוּ), 21 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְצַו), 26 (וַיִּסַּן), 27 (וַיְהִי); 18:5 (וַיְצַו), 8 (וַיֶּרֶב), 10 (וַיִּרְאוּ), 21 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 24 (וַיֵּרֶא), 26 (וַיִּרְא), 28 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 19:1 x2 (וַיִּבְךְּ, וַיַּעַל), 10 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיָּט), 22 (וַיַּעַן), 26 (וַיְהִי), 43 (וַיִּעַן), 44 x2 (וַיִּשַּׁק, וַיַּעַן); 20:2 (וַיַּעַל), 10 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 12 (וַיֵּרֶא), 20 (וַיַּעַן); 21:1 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיַּעַל), 17 (וַיִּד), 18 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיַּךְ), 20 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 22:10 (וַיָּט), 11 (וַיִּרְא), 19 (וַיְהִי); 23:10 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּךְ), 12 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּד), 19 (וַיְהִי); 24:10 (וַיִּד), 19 (וַיַּעַל), 20 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיִּרְא), 24 (וַיִּקֶן), 25 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַל)

1 Kgs. 1:5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 28 (וַיַּעַן), 36 (וַיַּעַן), 43 (וַיַּעַן), 47 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 53 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 2:1 (וַיְצַו), 19 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 22 (וַיַּעַן), 34 (וַיַּעַל), 39 (וַיְהִי), 46 (וַיְצַו); 3:15 x3 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיַּעַן); 4:1

(וַיְהִי); 5:2 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיְהִי), 27 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּעַל), 29 (וַיְהִי), 31 (וַיְצַו); 6:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּבְנוּ), 4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּבְנוּ), 9 (וַיִּבֶן), 10 (וַיִּבְנוּ), 11 (וַיְהִי), 14 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיְכַלֵּהוּ), 15 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיִּצַּף), 16 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיִּבְנוּ), 20 x2 (וַיְצַו, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 21 x2 (וַיִּצַּף, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 23 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיְכַלֵּהוּ), 15 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיִּצַּף), 16 x2 (וַיִּבְנוּ, וַיִּבְנוּ), 20 x2 (וַיְצַו, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 21 x2 (וַיִּצַּף, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 23 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 28 (וַיִּצַּף), 36 (וַיִּבֶן), 38 (וַיִּבְנֵהוּ); 7:1 (וַיִּכֹל), 2 (וַיִּבֶן), 14 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 38 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 40 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּכֹל), 48 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 8:10 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 54 (וַיְהִי), 65 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 9:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיֵּרָא), 9 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲו), 10 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיִּבֶן), 21 (וַיַּעֲלֵם); 10:12 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 14 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 18 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 26 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּנָּחֵם); 11:3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 15 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּדְּ), 20 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיִּבֶן), 29 (וַיְהִי), 40 (וַיְהִי); 12:2 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיַּעַן), 16 (וַיֵּרָא), 20 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְהִי), 25 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיִּבֶן), 28 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 30 (וַיְהִי), 31 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 32 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַל), 33 x3 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַל); 13:4 (וַיְהִי), 6 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיִּטַּל), 19 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ), 20 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 31 (וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 34 (וַיְהִי); 14:6 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיִּבֶן), 25 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיִּשָּׂא), 28 (וַיְהִי); 15:11 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 17 x2 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַל), 20 (וַיִּדְּ), 21 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיִּבֶן), 26 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 27 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 29 (וַיְהִי), 34 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 16:1 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 11 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 24 x2 (וַיִּקַּח, וַיִּבֶן), 30 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 31 x2 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 17:2 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 17 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיֶּחֱי); 18:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיַּעַן), 27 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי), 32 (וַיְהִי), 36 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 39 (וַיִּרְאֶ), 43 (וַיַּעַל), 44 (וַיַּעַל), 45 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 19:3 (וַיֵּרָא), 6 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ), 13 (וַיְהִי); 20:1 (וַיַּעַל), 4 (וַיַּעַן), 11 (וַיַּעַן), 12 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיִּדְּ), 25 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 26 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ), 36 (וַיְכַהוּ), 37 (וַיְכַהוּ), 39 (וַיְהִי), 40 (וַיְהִי); 21:1 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי), 28 (וַיְהִי); 22:2 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 29 (וַיַּעַל), 32 (וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיְהִי), 53 (וַיְהִי)

2 Kgs. 1:2 (וַיֶּחֱל), 9 (וַיַּעַל), 11 (וַיַּעַן), 12 (וַיַּעַן), 13 (וַיַּעַל); 2:1 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 11 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיַּעַל), 24 x2 (וַיִּפֶן, וַיְקַלְלֵם); 3:5 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּוָּעֵן), 20 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיִּרְאֶ), 27 x2 (וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ, וַיְהִי); 4:6 (וַיְהִי), 8 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 34 (וַיַּעַל), 35 (וַיַּעַל), 40 (וַיְהִי); 5:7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיִּפֶן); 6:5 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ), 17 (וַיִּרְאֶ), 18 (וַיַּכֵּם), 20 (וַיְהִי), 24 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיְהִי), 30 x2 (וַיִּקָּרַע, וַיְהִי); 7:2 (וַיַּעַן), 13 (וַיַּעַן), 16 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיַּעַן), 20 (וַיְהִי); 8:3 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּבְךְּ), 15 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 21 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 9:17 (וַיִּקְרָא), 22 (וַיְהִי), 24 (וַיִּדְּ), 33 (וַיִּז), 34 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ); 10:7 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיִּדְּ), 15 (וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ), 17 (וַיִּדְּ), 25 (וַיְהִי), 32 (וַיַּכֵּם); 11:3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיֵּרָא), 5 (וַיְצַוֵּם),

15 (וַיִּצְוֹ); 12:3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיְהִי); 12:11 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיֹּאמֶר), 19 (וַיַּעַל); 13:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 (וַיֵּחַר), 4 (וַיִּתֵּן), 14 (וַיֹּאמֶר), 17 (וַיֹּאור), 18 (וַיִּבֶן), 21 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּחַי), 23 (וַיִּפֶן); 14:3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּבְּזוּ), 17 (וַיְחִי), 24 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 15:3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 10 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 12 (וַיְהִי), 14 x2 (וַיִּבְּזוּ, וַיַּעַל), 16 (וַיִּבֶּז), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 24 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 25 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 28 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 29 (וַיִּגְלֶם), 30 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 34 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 16:9 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּגְלֶהָ), 10 (וַיִּרְא), 11 (וַיֶּבֶן), 12 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיִּרְא), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 17:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 (וַיְהִי), 5 x2 (וַיַּעַל), 6 (וַיֶּגֶל), 7 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיַּעַבֵּם), 23 (וַיֶּגֶל), 25 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיִּצְוֹ), 28 (וַיְהִי), 35 (וַיְצַוֵּם); 18:1 (וַיְהִי), 3 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 (וַיְהִי), 11 x2 (וַיֶּגֶל, וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיִּחַר), 19 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 21 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 24 (וַיִּבֶּז); 19:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּתְכַּס), 14 (וַיֹּאמֶר), 35 x2 (וַיִּבֶּז, וַיְהִי), 37 (וַיְהִי); 20:3 (וַיִּבְרְךָ), 4 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיִּחַי), 13 (וַיִּנָּחֵם); 21:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 x3 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 (וַיִּבֶן), 9 (וַיִּתְעֵם), 20 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 21 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 24 (וַיִּבֶּז); 22:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ); 23:2 (וַיַּעַל), 4 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ), 16x2 (וַיִּשְׁרָא, וַיִּפֶן), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 21 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ), 32 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 37 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 24:1 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 15 (וַיֶּגֶל), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 25:1 x2 (וַיִּחַן, וַיְהִי), 21 x2 (וַיִּבֶּז, וַיֶּגֶל), 25 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי)

Isa. 5:2 x3 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיְקַוֵּהוּ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיְקַוֵּהוּ), 16 (וַיִּגְבַּהּ), 25 (וַיֵּט, וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 7:1 (וַיַּעַל); 9:18 (וַיִּקְדְ); 12:2 (וַיְהִי); 20:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 21:9 (וַיַּעַן); 22:7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיִּגַּל); 36:1 (וַיְהִי); 37:1 x2 (וַיִּתְכַּס, וַיְהִי); 14 (וַיַּעַל), 38 (וַיְהִי); 38:3 (וַיִּבְרְךָ), 4 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּחַי); 39:2 (וַיִּרְאֵם); 41:25 (וַיֹּאת); 44:13 (וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ), 15 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 48:18 (וַיִּקְדְ), 19 (וַיִּקְדְ); 53:2 (וַיַּעַל); 59:15 (וַיַּרְא), 16 (וַיַּרְא), 17 (וַיַּעַט); 63:8 (וַיִּקְדְ)

Ger. 1:3 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי); 2:1 (וַיְהִי); 8:14 (וַיַּשְׁקֵנוּ); 13:3 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי); 15:16 (וַיְהִי); 16:1 (וַיְהִי); 18:4 (וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ), 5 (וַיְהִי); 20:3 (וַיְהִי); 24:4 (וַיְהִי); 26:8 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְחַל), 23 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ); 28:1 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי); 29:30 (וַיְהִי); 32:26 (וַיְהִי); 33:1 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 34:12 (וַיְהִי); 35:11 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי); 36:1 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי); 37:6 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי); 38:12 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 39:4 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְצַוֵּה); 40:3 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 41:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 10 x2 (וַיִּבְּזוּ, וַיִּשְׁבְּתָ), 13 (וַיְהִי); 42:7 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 43:1 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי); 51:16 (וַיַּעַל); 52:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 4 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיֶּגֶל), 31 (וַיְהִי)

Ezek. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 25 (וַיְהִי); 3:16 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 6:1 (וַיְהִי); 7:1 (וַיְהִי); 8:1 (וַיְהִי); 9:8 (וַיְהִי); 10:6 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיֵּרָא); 11:13 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיַּעַל), 24 (וַיַּעַל); 12:1 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיְהִי), 26

(וַיְהִי); 13:1 (וַיְהִי); 14:2 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי); 15:1 (וַיְהִי); 16:1 (וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיֶּהֱי), 23 (וַיְהִי), 34 (וַיְהִי); 17:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי); 18:1 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיֹּאמֶר), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 19:11 (וַיַּכּוּ), 20:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי); 21:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 22:1 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 23:1 (וַיְהִי); 24:1 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי); 25:1 (וַיְהִי); 26:1 (וַיְהִי); 27:1 (וַיְהִי); 28:1 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיִּגְבַּהּ), 11 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי); 29:17 (וַיְהִי); 30:1 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיְהִי); 31:1 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיֵּרֶף); 32:1 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 33:1 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 34:1 (וַיְהִי); 35:1 (וַיְהִי); 36:16 (וַיְהִי); 37:7 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיְהִי); 38:1 (וַיְהִי); 40:6 (וַיַּעַל), 14 (וַיַּעַשׂ)

Hos. 5:13 (וַיַּרְא); 7:11 (וַיְהִי); 8:14 (וַיִּבֶן)

Joel 2:19 (וַיַּעַן)

Am. 7:14 (וַיַּעַן)

Jon. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי); 2:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְמַן), 3 (וַיַּעֲנֵנִי); 3:1 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיִּכַּס), 10 (וַיַּרְא); 4:1 (וַיִּחַר), 5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 6 x2 (וַיְמַן, וַיַּעַל), 7 (וַיְמַן), 8 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְמַן)

Hab. 1:3 (וַיְהִי); 2:2 (וַיַּעֲנֵנִי)

Hag. 1:3 (וַיְהִי); 2:14 (וַיַּעַן), 20 (וַיְהִי)

Zech. 1:10 (וַיַּעַן), 12 (וַיַּעַן), 13 (וַיַּעַן), 2:3 (וַיֵּרְאֵנִי); 3:1 (וַיַּרְאֵנִי), 4 (וַיַּעַן); 4:5 (וַיַּעַן), 6 (וַיַּעַן), 8 (וַיְהִי); 6:5 (וַיַּעַן), 9 (וַיְהִי); 7:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי); 8:1 (וַיְהִי), 18 (וַיְהִי)

Ps. 3:5 (וַיַּעֲנֵנִי); 18:10 (וַיֵּט), 11 (וַיִּדְאֶ), 19 (וַיְהִי); 33:9 (וַיֶּהִי); 40:2 (וַיֵּט), 3 (וַיַּעֲלֵנִי); 60:2 (וַיָּנֹד); 64:8 (וַיֹּרֵם); 76:3 (וַיְהִי); 78:14 (וַיַּנְחֵם), 15 (וַיַּשְׁקְ), 23 (וַיְצַו), 33 (וַיִּכַל), 51 (וַיַּךְ), 53 (וַיַּנְחֵם), 66 (וַיַּךְ), 69 (וַיִּבֶן), 72 (וַיִּרְעֵם); 94:22 (וַיְהִי); 105:24 (וַיֶּפֶר), 33 (וַיַּךְ), 36 (וַיַּךְ), 106:40 (וַיִּחַר), 44 (וַיַּרְא); 107:30 (וַיַּנְחֵם), 40 (וַיַּתְעֵם), 118:14 (וַיְהִי); 120:1 (וַיַּעֲנֵנִי)

Job 1:3 x2 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיַּעַן), 9 (וַיַּעַן), 13 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ); 2:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיַּעַן), 4 (וַיַּעַן), 7 (וַיַּךְ); 3:2 (וַיַּעַן), 25 (וַיֵּאָתֵנִי); 4:1 (וַיַּעַן); 6:1 (וַיַּעַן); 8:1 (וַיַּעַן); 9:1 (וַיַּעַן), 16 (וַיַּעֲנֵנִי); 11:1 (וַיַּעַן), 11 (וַיַּרְא); 12:1 (וַיַּעַן), 4 (וַיַּעַנֵהוּ), 23 (וַיַּנְחֵם), 24 (וַיַּתְעֵם), 25 (וַיַּתְעֵם); 15:1 (וַיַּעַן), 27 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 16:1 (וַיַּעַן); 18:1 (וַיַּעַן); 19:1 (וַיַּעַן), 11 (וַיִּחַר); 20:1 (וַיַּעַן); 21:1 (וַיַּעַן); 22:1 (וַיַּעַן); 23:1 (וַיַּעַן), 13

(וַיַּעַשׂ); 25:1 (וַיַּעַן); 26:1 (וַיַּעַן); 30:11 (וַיְעַנֶּנִּי), 31 (וַיְהִי); 31:27 (וַתִּפְתְּ); 32:2 (וַיַּחַר), 5 (וַיִּרְא), 6 (וַיַּעַן); 33:26 x2 (וַיִּרְצֶהוּ, וַיִּרְא); 34:1 (וַיַּעַן); 35:1 (וַיַּעַן); 36:10 (וַיִּגָּל), 32 (וַיִּצַו); 38:1 (וַיַּעַן); 40:1 (וַיַּעַן), 3 (וַיַּעַן), 6 (וַיַּעַן); 42:1 (וַיַּעַן), 7 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי), 16 x2 (וַיִּרְאֶ, וַיִּחַ)

Prov. 4:4 (וַיֹּרֵנִי)

Ruth 1:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי), 19 (וַיְהִי); 2:3 (וַיִּקֶר), 6 (וַתַּעַן), 11 (וַיַּעַן), 15 (וַתְּצַו), 17 (וַתְּהִי); 3:7 (וַתֵּשְׁתְּ), 8 (וַיְהִי)

Lam. 1:13 (וַיִּרְדֶּנָּה); 2:5 (וַיְּרֶב)

Est. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 2:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּשָּׂגֶּה), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 3:4 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיַּרְא), 6 (וַיְבַז); 4:17 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 5:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיַּעַשׂ)

Dan. 1:5 (וַיְמַן), 6 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיְנַסֵּם), 16 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיְהִי); 8:2 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיַּדְּ), 15 (וַיְהִי)

Ezr. 4:4 (וַיְהִי); 9:9 (וַיִּט), 10:2 (וַיַּעַן)

Neh. 1:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיְהִי); 2:1 (וַיְהִי); 3:33 x2 (וַיִּחַר, וַיְהִי); 38 (וַיְהִי); 4:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיִּחַר), 6 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיְהִי); 5:6 (וַיִּחַר), 13 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 6:1 (וַיְהִי), 16 (וַיְהִי); 7:1 (וַיְהִי); 13:3 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 19 (וַיְהִי)

1 Chr. 2:3 (וַיְהִי), 22 (וַיְהִי); 4:9 (וַיְהִי); 5:26 (וַיַּגְלֵם); 6:51 (וַיְהִי); 10:5 (וַיַּרְא), 8 (וַיְהִי); 11:6 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיְהִי), 8 (וַיִּבֶן), 17 (וַיִּתְאָו), 21 (וַיְהִי); 12:18 (וַיַּעַן); 13:6 (וַיַּעַל), 10 x2 (וַיִּחַר, וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 11 (וַיִּחַר), 13 (וַיַּסֵּהוּ); 14:11 (וַיַּכֵּם), 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 15:1 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיֵּט), 25 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי); 16:2 (וַיְכַל); 17:1 (וַיְהִי), 3 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיְהִי); 18:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּדְּ), 2 (וַיַּדְּ), 3 (וַיַּדְּ), 5 (וַיַּדְּ), 6 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 14 (וַיְהִי); 19:1 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּרְא), 16 (וַיַּרְא); 20:1 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיַּדְּ), 4 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיַּדְּ), 6 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 21:5 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיַּדְּ), 16 (וַיַּרְא), 19 (וַיַּעַל), 20 (וַיַּרְא), 21 (וַיַּשְׁתַּחוּ, וַיַּרְא), 26 x3 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעֲנֵהוּ); 22:6 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ), 8 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיְצַו); 23:3 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי); 25:1 (וַיְהִי), 7 (וַיְהִי); 27:24 (וַיְהִי)

2 Chr. 1:6 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַל), 14 (וַיְהִי), 17 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 3:4 (וַיְצַפֵּהוּ), 5 (וַיְחַפֵּהוּ, וַיַּעַל), 6 (וַיְצַף), 7 (וַיְחַף), 8 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְחַפֵּהוּ), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 14 x2 (וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַשׂ), 15 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 16 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ); 4:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְכַל), 18 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 5:9 (וַיְהִי), 11

(וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיְהִי); 6:7 (וַיְהִי); 7:8 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיְכַל), 12 (וַיֵּרָא); 8:1 (וַיְהִי), 4 (וַיָּבֶן), 5 (וַיִּבֶן), 8 (וַיִּעְלֶם); 9:11 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 13 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיִּזְעַשׂ), 17 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיְצַפְּדֵהוּ), 25 (וַיְהִי), 26 (וַיְהִי); 10:2 (וַיְהִי), 13 (וַיִּעְנֶם); 11:2 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיִּבֶן), 6 (וַיָּבֶן), 12 (וַיְהִי); 12:1 (וַיְהִי), 2 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּסַּע), 10 (וַיִּרַּעַשׂ), 11 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 13:15 (וַיְהִי); 14:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 (וַיַּכֶּן), 7 (וַיְהִי); 16:1 (וַיִּבֶן), 5 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיָּבֶן); 17:3 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיְהִי), 6 (וַיִּגְבַּהּ), 10 (וַיְהִי), 12 x2 (וַיְהִי, וַיָּבֶן); 18:1 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 23 (וַיִּדְּ), 28 (וַיַּעַל), 31 (וַיְהִי), 32 (וַיְהִי), 33 (וַיִּדְּ); 19:9 (וַיִּצְּאוּ); 20:1 (וַיְהִי), 29 (וַיְהִי); 21:6 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 x2 (וַיִּדְּ, וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיִּזָּן), 19 (וַיְהִי); 22:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 (וַיְהִי), 12 (וַיְהִי); 24:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 4 (וַיְהִי), 11 (וַיְהִי), 14 (וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ), 18 (וַיְהִי), 23 (וַיְהִי); 25:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 (וַיְהִי), 10 (וַיִּחַר), 11 (וַיִּדְּ), 14 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיֵּחַר), 16 (וַיְהִי), 21 (וַיִּעַל), 25 (וַיְהִי); 26:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 5 (וַיְהִי), 9 (וַיִּבֶן), 10 (וַיִּבֶן), 11 (וַיְהִי), 15 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 20 (וַיָּקֻן), 21 (וַיְהִי); 27:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 28:5 (וַיִּדְּ), 24 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 29:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 8 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיַּעַל), 31 (וַיִּעַן), 32 (וַיְהִי); 31:20 x2 (וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיַּעַשׂ); 32:1 (וַיִּחַן), 2 (וַיַּרְא), 5 x3 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַל, וַיַּעַשׂ), 25 (וַיְהִי), 27 (וַיְהִי); 33:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 3 x3 (וַיִּבֶן, וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 5 (וַיִּבֶן), 9 (וַיִּסַּע), 14 (וַיַּגִּבִּיהֶהָ), 22 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 34:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 15 (וַיַּעַן), 19 (וַיְהִי), 20 (וַיִּצְּ), 30 (וַיַּעַל); 35:1 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 36:5 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 9 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 12 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 13 (וַיִּקַּשׁ), 17 (וַיַּעַל), 20 (וַיִּגָּל).

3RD FEMININE SINGULAR

Gen. 3:6 (וַתֵּרֶא); 4:1 (וַתַּהַר), 17 (וַתַּהַר); 10:10 (וַתְּהִי); 11:3 (וַתְּהִי), 30 (וַתְּהִי); 16:4 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתַּהַר), 5 (וַתֵּרֶא), 6 (וַתְּעַנֶּהָ); 19:26 (וַתְּהִי); 20:12 (וַתְּהִי); 21:2 (וַתַּהַר), 9 (וַתֵּרֶא), 14 (וַתֵּתַע), 16 (וַתֵּבְךְּ), 19 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתַּשְׁקֵ); 24:16 (וַתֵּעַל), 18 (וַתַּשְׁקֵהוּ), 19 (וַתִּכְל), 20 (וַתְּעַר), 64 (וַתֵּרֶא), 65 (וַתִּתְּכָּס), 67 (וַתְּהִי); 25:21 (וַתַּהַר); 27:14 (וַתַּעַשׂ); 29:32 (וַתַּהַר), 33 (וַתַּהַר), 34 (וַתַּהַר), 35 (וַתַּהַר); 30:1 (וַתֵּרֶא), 5 (וַתַּהַר), 7 (וַתַּהַר), 9 (וַתֵּרֶא), 17 (וַתַּהַר), 19 (וַתַּהַר), 23 (וַתַּהַר); 31:14 (וַתַּעַן); 35:16 (וַתְּקַשׁ); 38:3 (וַתַּהַר), 4 (וַתַּהַר), 14 (וַתִּכָּס), 18 (וַתַּהַר); 41:47 (וַתַּעַשׂ); 43:34 (וַתֵּרֶב); 45:27 (וַתְּחִי); 47:13 (וַתֵּלַהּ); 20 (וַתְּהִי)

Exod. 2:2 x2 (וַתַּהַר, וַתֵּרֶא), 5 (וַתֵּרֶא), 6 (וַתִּרְאֶהוּ), 23 (וַתָּעַל); 8:2 x2 (וַתַּעַל, וַתְּכַס), 13 (וַתְּהִי), 14 (וַתְּהִי); 12:30 (וַתְּהִי); 15:21 (וַתַּעַן); 16:13 x2 (וַתְּכַס, וַתַּעַל), 14 (וַתַּעַל); 39:32 (וַתֵּכֶל)

Num. 16:33 (וַתְּכַס); 20:11 (וַתֵּשְׁתְּ); 22:23 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתֵּט), 25 (וַתֵּרֶא), 27 (וַתֵּרֶא), 33 x2 (וַתִּרְאֵנִי, וַתֵּט); 24:2 (וַתְּהִי); 31:16 (וַתְּהִי), 36 (וַתְּהִי), 43 (וַתְּהִי); 36:12 (וַתְּהִי)

Judg. 3:10 (וַתְּהִי); 4:10 (וַתַּעַל), 18 (וַתְּכַסֵּהוּ), 19 (וַתַּשְׁקֵהוּ, וַתְּכַסֵּהוּ); 6:21 (וַתַּעַל); 11:29 (וַתְּהִי), 38 (וַתֵּבְךְּ), 39 (וַתְּהִי); 14:16 (וַתִּבְךְּ), 17 (וַתֵּבְךְּ), 20 (וַתְּהִי); 16:18 (וַתֵּרֶא); 19:2 (וַתְּהִי)

1 Sam. 1:15 (וַתֹּאמֶן), 20 (וַתַּהַר), 24 (וַתַּעֲלֵהוּ); 2:17 (וַתְּהִי), 21 (וַתַּהַר); 4:10 (וַתְּהִי); 5:9 (וַתְּהִי), 12 (וַתַּעַל); 7:13 (וַתְּהִי); 14:14 (וַתְּהִי), 15 x2 (וַתְּהִי, וַתְּהִי); 19:9 (וַתְּהִי), 13 (וַתְּכַס), 20 (וַתְּהִי), 23 (וַתְּהִי); 25:23 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 41 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 42 (וַתְּהִי); 28:12 (וַתֵּרֶא), 21 (וַתֵּרֶא), 24 (וַתִּפְּהוּ)

2 Sam. 2:17 (וַתְּהִי); 3:1 (וַתְּהִי); 6:16 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתִּבֶז); 8:2 (וַתְּהִי), 6 (וַתְּהִי); 11:5 (וַתַּהַר), 27 (וַתְּהִי); 12:3 (וַתְּהִי), 30 (וַתְּהִי); 13:39 (וַתִּכַל); 14:4 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 19 (וַתָּעַן); 18:6 (וַתְּהִי), 7 (וַתְּהִי), 8 (וַתְּהִי); 19:3 (וַתְּהִי); 21:10 (וַתִּטְּהוּ), 15 (וַתְּהִי), 18 (וַתְּהִי), 19 (וַתְּהִי), 20 (וַתְּהִי); 23:11 (וַתְּהִי); 24:9 (וַתְּהִי)

1 Kgs. 1:4 (וַתְּהִי), 16 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 31 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 2:15 (וַתְּהִי); 5:10 (וַתִּרֶב); 10:4 (וַתִּרְאֶ), 13 (וַתִּפֶן); 13:6 (וַתְּהִי), 24 (וַתְּהִי); 14:4 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

2 Kgs. 3:15 (וַתְּהִי); 4:17 (וַתַּהַר), 21 (וַתַּעַל), 37 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ); 5:2 (וַתְּהִי); 8:2 (וַתַּעַשׂ); 11:14 (וַתֵּרֶא)

Isa. 5:25 (וַתְּהִי); 8:3 (וַתַּהַר); 9:5 (וַתְּהִי); 23:3 (וַתְּהִי); 29:11 (וַתְּהִי), 13 (וַתְּהִי); 59:15 (וַתְּהִי)

Jer. 3:6 (וַתִּזְנִי), 8 (וַתִּזֶן); 20:17 (וַתְּהִי); 23:10 (וַתְּהִי); 44:22 (וַתְּהִי)

Ezek. 1:3 (וַתְּהִי); 3:3 (וַתְּהִי), 22 (וַתְּהִי); 5:6 (וַתֶּמֶר); 17:6 x2 (וַתְּהִי, וַתַּעַשׂ); 19:3 (וַתַּעַל), 5 (וַתִּרְאֶ), 11 (וַתִּגְבַּהּ), 14 (וַתְּהִי); 23:5 (וַתִּזֶן), 10 (וַתְּהִי), 11 (וַתִּרְאֶ), 14 (וַתֵּרֶא), 18 x2 (וַתִּגֶל, וַתִּגֶל); 32:27 (וַתְּהִי)

Hos. 1:3 (וַתַּהַר), 6 (וַתַּהַר), 8 (וַתַּהַר); 2:15 (וַתַּעַד)

Jon. 4:7 (וַתַּךְ), 8 (וַתַּךְ)

Zech. 9:3 (וַתִּצְבָּר)

Ps. 44:19 (וַתֵּט), 55:6 (וַתְּכַסֵּנִי); 69:11 (וַתְּהִי); 106:17 (וַתְּכַס)

Job 5:16 (וַתְּהִי); 17:7 (וַתִּכְהֶ)

Prov. 31:13 (וַתַּעַשׂ)

Ruth 1:18 (וַתֵּרָא); 2:10 (וַתִּשְׁתַּחוּ), 18 (וַתֵּרֶא); 3:6 (וַתַּעַשׂ), 7 (וַתִּגַל); 4:13 (וַתְּהִי), 16 (וַתְּהִי)

Lam. 3:37 (וַתְּהִי)

Esth. 2:15 (וַתִּקַּח); 4:5 (וַתְּצַוֵּהוּ), 10 (וַתְּצַוֵּהוּ); 5:7 (וַתַּעַן); 7:3 (וַתַּעַן); 8:3 (וַתֹּסֶף)

Neh. 5:1 (וַתְּהִי); 8:17 (וַתְּהִי)

1 Chr. 2:26 (וַתְּהִי); 4:17 (וַתַּהַר); 7:23 (וַתַּהַר), 24 (וַתִּבֶן); 11:13 (וַתַּעֲמֹד); 15:29 x2 (וַתֵּרֶא, וַתִּבֶז); 20:2 (וַתִּקַּח), 5 (וַתְּהִי), 6 (וַתְּהִי)

2 Chr. 9:3 (וַתֵּרֶאןָ); 18:34 (וַתַּעֲמֹד); 23:13 (וַתֵּרֶא); 24:13 (וַתַּעַל); 30:26 (וַתְּהִי)

A 2.9 OCCURRENCES OF LONG FORM OF THE III-Y VERBS IN THE WAYYIQTOL:

2ND MASCULINE SINGULAR

1 Kgs. 14:9 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה)

2 Kgs. 22:19 (וַתִּבְכֶּה)

Jer. 32:20 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה)

Hab. 1:14 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה)

2 Chr. 21:13 (וַתִּזְנֶה)

3RD MASCULINE SINGULAR

Deut. 33:21 (וַיֵּתֵא)

Josh. 10:40 (וַיַּכֶּה); 19:50 (וַיִּבְנֶהָ)

1 Sam. 7:9 (וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ); 17:42 (וַיַּרְאֵהוּ)

2 Sam. 23:15 (וַיִּתְאַוֶּה)

1 Kgs. 16:17 (וַיַּעֲלֵה), 25 (וַיַּעֲשֶׂה); 18:32 (וַיִּבְנֶה), 42 (וַיַּעַל); 19:8 (וַיִּשְׁתְּ); 22:24 (וַיַּכֶּה), 34 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ), 54 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ)

2 Kgs. 1:10 (וַיַּעַן); 2:8 (וַיַּכֶּה), 14 (וַיַּכֶּה, וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 3:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 5:21 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ); 6:23 (וַיִּכְרֹת); 8:21 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ); 13:11 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 16:15 (וַיְצַוֵּהוּ)

Isa. 37:36 (וַיַּכֵּהוּ)

Jer. 10:13 (וַיַּעַל); 20:2 (וַיַּכֶּה); 36:5 (וַיְצַוֵּה), 26 (וַיְצַוֵּה); 37:21 (וַיְצַוֻּהוּ); 38:10 (וַיְצַוֵּה); 52:27 (וַיַּכֵּם)

Ezek. 18:14 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ), 19 (וַיַּעַשׂ), 28 (וַיִּרְאֵהוּ)

Job 42:16 (וַיִּרְאֵ)

Lam. 3:33 (וַיָּגֶהּ)

2 Chr. 16:12 (וַיֶּחֱלָא); 26:6 (וַיִּבְנֶה)

3RD FEMININE SINGULAR

Judg. 19:2 (וַתִּזְנֶה)

1 Sam. 1:7 (וַתִּבְכֶּה)

1 Kgs. 10:29 (וַתַּעֲלֶה); 17:15 (וַתַּעֲשֶׂה); 22:35 (וַתַּעֲלֶה)

Isa. 57:3 (וַתִּזְנֶה)

Jer. 3:7 (וַתֵּרֶא); 44:21 (וַתַּעֲלֶה)

Ezek. 16:36 (וַתִּגְלֶה); 23:19 (וַתַּרְבֶּה)

A 2.10 OCCURRENCES OF SHORT FORM OF THE III-Y VERBS IN THE WAYYIQTOL IN THE NON-BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN:

2ND MASCULINE SINGULAR

1QpHab 5:12 (ותעש)

1QH[a] 10:37 (ותפד); 22:31 (ותגל); 23:5 (ותגל)

4QD[a] 11:10 (ותתעם)

4QDibHam[a] 1-2 R III:7 (ותרבנו)

3RD MASCULINE SINGULAR

CD 1:15 (ויתעם), 21 (ויחר); 3:2 (ויעל), 8 (ויחר), 19 (ויבן); 5:16 (ויחר)

1QpHab 1:8 (יהֹי[וי]); 6:14 (ויעננ)

1QH[a] 13:33 (ויהם); 14:27 (ויהם); 22:32 (ויהם)

1QApocrProph frg. 1:3 (וירא)

4QRP[a] frg. 4:4 (ויעל)

4QOrdinances[a] frg. 2-4:3 (ויצו)

4QVisSam frg. 1:4 (ויען)

4Q174 frg. 1-2 i:15 (ויהי)

4Q176a frg. 1-2:2 (ויהי)

4Q200 frg. 5:5 (וירא)

4Q252 1:5 (ויהי), 12 (ויהי), 22 (וירא)

4Q253 frg. 5-6:1 (ויט)

4Q266 frg. 2 i:18 (ויתעם), iii:5 (ו]חר)

4Q268 frg. 1:7 (ויגל)

4Q299 frg. 2:2 (ו]יגל)

4Q301 frg. 2b:3 (וירד)

4Q364 frg. 3 ii:7 (וירא); frg. 9a-b:3 (ויט)

4Q365 frg. 3:2 (ויה]י); frg. 6a i:11 (ויה]י), 12 (ויט); frg. 12a i:1 (ש[יע]ו), 4 (ויעש)

4Q370 frg. 1 i:7 (ויעש)

4Q377 frg. 2 ii:3 (ויען), 10 (ויכס)

4Q385 frg. 2:6 (ויה]י); 6:13 (ויה]י), 14 (ו]הי); 18ia-b:7 (ויצום)

4Q385a frg. 18 ii:4 (ויהי)

4Q385b frg. 1:1 (ויהי)

4Q386 frg. 1 i:5 (ויהי)

4Q388a frg. 2:3 (ויה]י)

4Q389 frg. 2:8 (ויהי)

4Q419 frg. 1:8 (ויצו)

4Q429 frg. 4 ii:4 (ויהם)

4Q434 frg. 1 i:2 (ויט), 9 (ויגל), 12 (ויחן)

4Q458 frg. 1:9 (ויד)

4Q463 frg. 1:3 (ויהי)

4Q481a frg. 2:3 (ו]יעל)

4Q577 frg. 1:3 (ויהי)

5Q22 frg. 1:3 (ויהי)

11Q5 24:16 (ויענני); 26:15 (ויעל); 27:2 (ויהי), 9 (ויהי), 10 (ויהי)

11Q12 frg. 7:1 (וירבֿ); 9:2 (ויהי)

3RD FEMININE SINGULAR

1QH[a] 13:30 (ותהי); 17:24 (תהי)

4QpIsa[C] frg. 15-16:2 (ותהי) // Isa. 29:11

4QTNaph frg. 1-3:4 (ותהר)

4QRP[B] frg. 1a-b: 5 (וֹתְהִי) // Gen. 25:20

4QH[c] frg. 2:11 (ותהי) // 1QH[a] 13:30

A 2.11 OCCURRENCES OF LONG FORM OF THE III-Y VERBS IN THE WAYYIQTOL IN THE BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN:

3RD MASCULINE SINGULAR

4QExod[c] 3:15 (ויטה) = MT Exod. 10:13 (וַיֵּט)

4QSam[a] frg. 61ii+63-64a-b+65-67:20 (ויבנה) = MT 2 Sam. 5:9 (וַיִּבֶן)

1QSam frg. 4:2 (ויכה) = MT 2 Sam. 23:10 (וַיַּךְ); 4:3 (ויע[ש]ה) = MT 2 Sam. 23:10 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 4:5 (ויכה) = MT 2 Sam. 23:12 (וַיַּךְ)

1QIsa[a] 4:13 (ויבנא) = MT Isa. 5:2 (וַיִּבֶן); 4:14 (ויעשה) = MT Isa. 5:2 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 4:16 (וישה) = MT Isa. 5:4 (וַיַּעַשׂ); 16:24 (ויעני) = MT Isa. 21:9 (וַיַּעַן); 30:19 (ויעלה) = MT Isa. 37:14 (וַיַּעַל); 31:23 (ויבכא) = MT Isa. 38:3 (וַיִּבְךְ); 32:16 (ויחיה) = MT Isa. 39:1 (וַיְחֱזֶק)

4QJer[c] frg. 6:2 (ויעלה) = MT Jer. 10:13 (וַיַּעֲלֶה)

3RD FEMININE SINGULAR

4QExod^{b} frg. 3i-4:5 (וֹתראה) = MT Exod. 2:6 (וַתִּרְאֶהוּ).

1QIsa^{a} 5:13 (ותהיה) = MT Isa. 5:25 (וַתְּהִי); 23:19 (ותהיה) = MT 29:11 (וַתְּהִי); 23:23 (ותהיה) = MT 29:13 (וַתְּהִי).

1QIsa^{f} frg. 8:1 (תהיהֿ[ו) = MT Isa. 5:25 (וַתְּהִי)

A 2.12 OCCURRENCES OF COMPLEX ADDING NUMERALS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE AND QUMRAN:

DECREASING ORDER

Gen. 4:24 (שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה); 6:3 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 17:24 (תִּשְׁעִים וָתֵשַׁע); 18:28 (אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה); 46:15 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשָׁלֹשׁ), 26 (שִׁשִּׁים וָשֵׁשׁ); 50:22 (מֵאָה וָעֶשֶׂר), 26 (מֵאָה וָעֶשֶׂר)

Exod. 38:24 (שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים), 25 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים), 26 (אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים), 28 (וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 29 (אַלְפַּיִם וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת)

Num. 1:21 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף), 23 (שִׁשָּׁה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת), 25 (תִּשְׁעָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 27 (שִׁבְעָה), 29 (אַרְבָּעָה וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 31 (וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 33 (חֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים), 35 (אַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 37 (וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 39 (שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וּמָאתָיִם), 41 (שְׁלֹשָׁה וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 43 (אֶחָד וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 46 (אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעָה וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף); 2:4 (שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 6 (מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁמֹנִים אֶלֶף), 8 (אַרְבָּעָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 9 (שִׁבְעָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 11 (וְשֵׁשֶׁת־אֲלָפִים וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת), 13 (שִׁשָּׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 15 (תִּשְׁעָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת), 16 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 19 (מְאַת אֶלֶף וְאֶחָד וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים אַרְבָּעִים), 21 (אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת מְאַת אֶלֶף), 23 (שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 24 (חֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וּמָאתָיִם), 26 (וּשְׁמֹנֶת־אֲלָפִים וּמֵאָה שְׁלֹשָׁה), 28 (שְׁנַיִם וְשִׁשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת), 30 (אֶחָד וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 31 (וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים), 32 (מְאַת אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת), 34 (שְׁמֹנֶת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת), 28 (שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת); 3:22 (וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים אַלְפַּיִם וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת); 4:40 (שְׁנַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף שְׁלֹשָׁה וְשִׁבְעִים וּמָאתָיִם), 43 (שְׁנַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים אָלֶף), 39 (וּמָאתָיִם

(אַלְפַּיִם וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת) 7:85 ;(שְׁמֹנַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וּשְׁמֹנִים) 48 ,(וּשְׁלֹשָׁה שִׁמֹּנַת אֲלָפִים וּמָאתָיִם) 44 ,88
(שְׁלֹשָׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים) 26:7 ;(אַרְבָּעָה עָשָׂר אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת) 17:14 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה) 14
(שִׁשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 22 ,(אַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 18 ,(שְׁנַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף וּמָאתָיִם) 25 (אַרְבָּעָה
שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים) 37 ,(שְׁנַיִם וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת) 34 ,(שִׁשִּׁים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 27 ,(וְשִׁשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת
שְׁלֹשָׁה) 47 ,(אַרְבָּעָה וְשִׁשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת) 43 ,(חֲמִשָּׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 41 ,(אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאָה
שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשֶׁת־) 31:32 ;(חֲמִשָּׁה וְאַרְבָּעִים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת) 50 ,(וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת
אַלְפִים) 36 ,(שְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 39 ,(שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 45 ,
(אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 7 ;(שְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 35:6

Deut. 2:14 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה); 31:2 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 34:7

Josh. 7:5 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה); 14:10 (אַרְבָּעִים וְחָמֵשׁ); 19:30 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 21:41 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה); 24:29
(מֵאָה וְעֶשֶׂר)

Judg. 2:8 (מֵאָה וְעֶשֶׂר); 7:3 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנַיִם אֶלֶף); 8:10 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 14 (שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה), 26 (אֶלֶף
וּשְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת); 10:2 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ), 3 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 16:5 (אֶלֶף וּמֵאָה); 17:2 (אֶלֶף וּמֵאָה), 3 (אֶלֶף־וּמֵאָה);
20:21 (שְׁנַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 35 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֶלֶף וּמֵאָה), 46 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֶלֶף)

1 Sam. 4:15 (תִּשְׁעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה)

2 Sam. 2:31 (שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים); 5:5 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשָׁלֹשׁ); 8:4 (אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת), 5 (עֶשְׂרִים־וּשְׁנַיִם אֶלֶף);
21:20 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבַּע); 23:39 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁבְעָה)

1 Kgs. 2:11 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשָׁלֹשׁ); 5:30 (שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת); 7:3 (אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה); 8:63 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים
אַרְבָּעִים) 15:10 ;(אַרְבָּעִים וְאַחַת), 21 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 14:20 (מֵאָה וּשְׁמֹנִים אֶלֶף); 12:21 (אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת)
(וְאַחַת), 33 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבַּע); 16:8 (עֶשְׂרִים וָשֵׁשׁ), 10 (עֶשְׂרִים וָשֶׁבַע), 15 (עֶשְׂרִים וָשֵׁשׁ), 23 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַחַת),
שְׁלֹשִׁים) 20:1 ;(אַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 22 (אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים) 18:19 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם ;שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 29 x2
וּשְׁנַיִם), 16 (שְׁלֹשִׁים־וּשְׁנַיִם), 30 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשִׁבְעָה אֶלֶף); 22:31 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁנַיִם), 42 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ ;
וְחָמֵשׁ)

2 Kgs. 2:24 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנַיִם); 8:17 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם), 26 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 10:14 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנַיִם), 36 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה); 12:7 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ); 13:1 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשָׁבַע), 10 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ); 14:2 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ; וְתֵשַׁע), 13 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה), 8 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם), 2 (עֶשְׂרִים וָשָׁבַע); 15:1 (אַרְבָּעִים וְאַחַת), 23 (וְתֵשַׁע), 17 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וָתֵשַׁע), 27 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם), 33 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ); 18:2 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וָתֵשַׁע; עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ); 21:1 (חֲמִשִּׁים וְחָמֵשׁ), 19 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 22:1 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַחַת); 23:31 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ), 36 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ); 24:18 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשִׁבְעָה; שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשָׁבַע); 25:27 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַחַת)

Isa. 7:8 (שִׁשִּׁים וְחָמֵשׁ); 52:1 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַחַת), 23 (תִּשְׁעִים וְשִׁשָּׁה), 28 (שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וְעֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 30 (אַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת); 31 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה; שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשָׁבַע)

Ezek. 4:5 (שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת וְתִשְׁעִים), 9 (שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת וְתִשְׁעִים); 8:16 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה); 11:1 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה); 29:17 (עֶשְׂרִים וָשָׁבַע); 40:1 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ), 13 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ), 29 (עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ); 45:12 (עֶשְׂרֵה וַחֲמִשָּׁה)

Hag. 1:15 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה); 2:1 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד), 10 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 18 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 20 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה)

Zech. 1:7 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה)

Job 42:16 (מֵאָה וְאַרְבָּעִים)

Dan. 8:14 (אַלְפַּיִם וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת); 9:25 (שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם), 26 (שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם); 10:4 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 13 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד)

Ezr. 1:10 (אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת וַעֲשָׂרָה), 11 (אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת); 2:8 (חֲמֵשׁ אֲלָפִים וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת), 9 (תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת וְאַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 24 (חֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה), 22 (תִּשְׁעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 20 (מֵאָה וּשְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר), 18 (תִּשְׁעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה), 16 (מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים), 35 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וְעֶשְׂרִים), 32 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁנָיִם), 29 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וְאַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 25 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 39 (שֵׁשׁ־רִבְאוֹת וְאֶלֶף), 40 (שִׁבְעִים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 69 (אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר); 8.3 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 9 (מֵאָה וַעֲשָׂרָה), 12 (עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה), 11 (מֵאָה וְשִׁשִּׁים), 10 (מָאתַיִם וּשְׁמֹנֶה עָשָׂר), 20 (וְעֶשְׂרִים), 26 (שִׁשִּׁ־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים), 35 x2 (שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁשָּׁה; תִּשְׁעִים וְשִׁבְעָה)

Neh. 5:14 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם), 17 (מֵאָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים); 6:15 x2 (עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה; חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם); 7:14 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וְעֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 31 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 28 (תִּשְׁעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 25 (תִּשְׁעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה), 21 (וְשִׁשִּׁים), 33 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 62 (שִׁבְעִים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 43 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וְעֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד), 37 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וְעֶשְׂרִים), 35 (וּשְׁנָיִם)

(וּשְׁנֵיִם, 67 (וְאַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 69 (מָאתַיִם וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 70 (שִׁלֹּשִׁים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 71 (אַלְפַּיִם וּמָאתָיִם); 9:1 שִׁשִּׁים וְשִׁבְעָה); 13:6 (שִׁלֹּשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם); 13:6 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה)

1 Chr. 2:22 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלוֹשׁ); 3:4 (שִׁלֹּשִׁים וְשָׁלוֹשׁ); 5:18 (אַרְבָּעִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים); 7:7 עֶשְׂרִים) 40 ,(שִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר אֶלֶף וּמָאתַיִם) 11 ,(עֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף וּמָאתַיִם) 9 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנֵיהֶם אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַרְבָּעָה) מָאתַיִם) 22 ,(אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים) 13 ,(תֵּשַׁע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה) 9 ,(שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת וְתִשְׁעִים) 9:6 (וְשִׁשָּׁה אָלֶף ,28 (אַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 27 ,(שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וּמֵאָה) 26 ,(שֵׁשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וּשְׁמוֹנֶה מֵאוֹת) 25 ,(וּשְׁנֵים עָשָׂר 36 ,(שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת) 29 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם) 31 ,(עֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף וּשְׁמוֹנֶה מֵאוֹת) 35 ,(שִׁלֹּשִׁים וְשִׁבְעָה אָלֶף) מֵאָה וּשְׁנֵים) 10 ,(מֵאָה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים) 7 ,(מָאתַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים) 6 ,(מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים) 15:5 (עֶשְׂרִים־וּשְׁמוֹנֶה אֶלֶף וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) ,(שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמוֹנֶה אָלֶף) 23:3 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבַּע) 20:6 (עֶשְׂרִים־וּשְׁנַיִם אֶלֶף) 18:5 (שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁמוֹנֶה) 16:38 (עָשָׂר 4 (אֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת) 30 ,(שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם) 26:8 (מָאתַיִם שְׁמוֹנִים וּשְׁמוֹנֶה) 25:7 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אֶלֶף) עֶשְׂרִים) 5 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אֶלֶף) 4 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אֶלֶף) 2 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 27:1 (אַלְפַּיִם וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה) 10 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 9 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 8 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 7 ,(וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה) 14 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 13 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 12 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף) 11 ,(אָלֶף אַלְפַּיִם), 15 (עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה אָלֶף); 29:7 (שִׁלֹּשִׁים וְשָׁלוֹשׁ) 27 ,(רִבּוֹ וּשְׁמוֹנַת אֲלָפִים)

2 Chr. 1:14 (אֶלֶף וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת); 2:1 (שִׁלֶּשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 16 ,(מֵאָה וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֶשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ 7:10 ;(מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 5:12 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְחָמֵשׁ) 15 ,(מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 3:4 (שְׁלֶשֶׁת אֲלָפִים וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 17 ,(מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים) 11:21 ;(שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים וָשֵׁשׁ) 13 ,(מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים) 9:9 ;(אַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים) 8:18 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה) ;(וּשְׁמוֹנֶה) 12:3 ;(שְׁלֹשִׁים וְחָמֵשׁ) 15:19 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנַיִם) 13:21 ;(אַרְבָּעִים וְאַחַת) 13 ,(אֶלֶף וּמָאתַיִם) 16:1 שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים ;(שְׁבַעַת אֲלָפִים וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת) 17:11 x2 ;(אַרְבָּעִים וְאַחַת) 13 ,(שְׁלוֹשִׁים וָתֵשַׁע) 12 ,(שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשֵׁשׁ) ;(וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת) 20:31 x2 ;(שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם) 20 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ ;(שְׁלֹשִׁים וְחָמֵשׁ) 21:5 ;(חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם) 12 ,(אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁתַּיִם) ;(מֵאָה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים) 24:15 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְתֵשַׁע ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ) 25:1 x2 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ) 8 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ) ;(שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וְשִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת) 27:1 ;(אַלְפַּיִם וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 13 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁתַּיִם) 21 ,(חֲמִשִּׁים וְחָמֵשׁ) 33:1 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְתֵשַׁע ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ) 29:1 x2 ;(שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַחַת) 34:1 ;(עֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ) 11 ,(עֶשְׂרִים וְאַחַת) ;(אַלְפַּיִם וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת) 36:5

1QM 6:10 (אלף וארבע מאות)

3Q15 3:4 (שש מאות ותשעה)

4Q216 7:4 (עשרים ושנים)

4Q252 1:1 (ארבע מאות ושמונים), 2 (מאה ועשרים), 6 (עשרים וששה)

4Q268 f1:13 (שלוש מאות ותשעים)

4Q320 f6:3 (אלפים ושש[מאות), 4 (אלפים ושמנ]ה מאות)

4Q325 f1:2 (עשרים וחמשה), 3 (עשרים וששה), 5 (עשרים ושלושה)

4Q365 f28:2 (שמונת אלפים וחמש מאות וששים)

4Q365a f2ii:2 (ש]לש[מאות), f2ii:4 (שלוש מאות וששים), 5 (שש ושלושים), 6 (שמונה ועשרים)

4Q389 f1:6 (שלו]שים וששׁ)

11Q5 27:5 (שלושת אלפים ושש מאות), 10 (ארבעת אלפים וחמשים)

INCREASING ORDER

Gen. 5:3 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת), 17 (חָמֵשׁ וְתִשְׁעִים), 18 (שְׁתַּיִם וְשִׁשִּׁים), 20 (שְׁתַּיִם וְשִׁשִּׁים), 21 (חָמֵשׁ וְשִׁשִּׁים), 23 (שֶׁבַע), 25 (חָמֵשׁ וְשִׁשִּׁים), 26 (שֶׁבַע וּשְׁמֹנִים), 27 (שְׁתַּיִם וּשְׁמֹנִים), 30 (חָמֵשׁ וְתִשְׁעִים), 31 (שְׁתַּיִם וּשְׁמוֹנִים); 7:24 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמְאַת); 8:3 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמְאַת), 13 (אַחַת וְשֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת), 14 (שִׁבְעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 11:12 (חָמֵשׁ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים), 16 (וּשְׁלֹשִׁים), 20 (אַרְבַּע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים), 24 (תֵּשַׁע וְעֶשְׂרִים); 47:9 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת), 28 (וְאַרְבָּעִים וּמְאַת)

Exod. 6:16 (שֶׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת), 18 (שָׁלֹשׁ וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת), 20 (שֶׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת); 7:7 (שָׁלֹשׁ וּשְׁמֹנִים); 12:18 (אֶחָד וְעֶשְׂרִים); 26:2 (שְׁמֹנֶה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 30:23 x2 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָיִם; חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָיִם); 36:9 (שְׁמֹנֶה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 38:24 (תֵּשַׁע וְעֶשְׂרִים)

Lev. 25:8 (תֵּשַׁע וְאַרְבָּעִים)

Num. 3:46 (הַשְּׁלֹשָׁה וְהַשִּׁבְעִים וְהַמָּאתָיִם), 50 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וָאָלֶף); 7:13 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 19 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 25 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 31 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 37 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 43 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 49 (

(וּמֵאָה), 55 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 61 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 67 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 73 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 79 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 85 (הַחֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם), 35 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים); 8:24 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה), 86 (שְׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 25:9 (אַרְבָּעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); 26:10 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם), 62 (שְׁלֹשָׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); 31:33 (שְׁבַע וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף), 34 (אֶחָד וְשִׁשִּׁים), 39 (שְׁבַע וְשִׁבְעִים), 35 (שִׁשָּׁה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף), 38 x2 (שְׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף), 40 (שְׁבַע וּשְׁלֹשִׁים), 44 (שִׁשָּׁה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף); 33:39 (שָׁלֹשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמְאַת)

Judg. 12:6 (אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנַיִם אֶלֶף); 20:15 (עֶשְׂרִים וְשִׁשָּׁה אֶלֶף)

1 Kgs. 5:12 (חֲמִשָּׁה וָאֶלֶף); 9:23 (חֲמִשִּׁים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת); 10:29 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה)

Isa. 37:36 (מֵאָה וּשְׁמֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אֶלֶף)

Jer. 25:3 (שָׁלֹשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים)

Ezek. 40:21 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים), 25 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים), 30 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים), 33 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים), 36 (חֲמֵשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים); 41:6 (שָׁלוֹשׁ וּשְׁלֹשִׁים); 45:1 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 3 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 5 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 6 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים), 10 x2 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 9 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 12 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים); 48:8 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 16 x4 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 15 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 13 x2 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת ;חֲמֵשׁ חמש מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים ;חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים), 17 (אַלְפַּיִם), 20 x2 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם ;חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם ;חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתַיִם), 30 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף ;חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 21 x2 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף), 32 (חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים), 34 (חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים), 33 (חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת וַאַרְבַּעַת אֲלָפִים)

Esth. 1:1 (שֶׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמֵאָה), 4 (שְׁמוֹנִים וּמְאַת); 8:9 (שֶׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמֵאָה); 9:16 (חֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף), 30 (שְׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים וּמֵאָה)

Ezr. 1:9 (תִּשְׁעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים)

1 Chr. 5:21 (מָאתַיִם וַחֲמִשִּׁים אֶלֶף); 7:2 (עֶשְׂרִים־וּשְׁנַיִם אֶלֶף וְשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת), 4 (שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה אֶלֶף), 5 (שְׁמוֹנִים); 12:38 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); 19:7 (שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף); 21:5 (אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת וְשִׁבְעִים אֶלֶף); 24:17 (וְשִׁבְעָה אֶלֶף); 25:28 (אֶחָד וְעֶשְׂרִים), 29 (שְׁנַיִם); 18 x2 (אַרְבָּעָה וְעֶשְׂרִים ;שְׁלֹשָׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים), 31 (שְׁנַיִם וְעֶשְׂרִים ;אֶחָד וְעֶשְׂרִים x2), 30 (וְעֶשְׂרִים)

2 Chr. 1:17 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה); 7:5 x2 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אָלֶף ;עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנֵימ אָלֶף); 8:10 (חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָיִם); 11:1 (מֵאָה־וּשְׁמוֹנִים אֶלֶף) 18 ,(מָאתַיִם וּשְׁמוֹנִים אָלֶף) 17:15 ;(מֵאָה וּשְׁמוֹנִים אֶלֶף); 14:7 (מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים אֶלֶף); 36:2 (שָׁלוֹשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים)

1QSa 1:12 (חמש ועשרֿים)

1QM 2:1 (שנים וחמשים), 2 (ששה ועשרים), 6 (שלוש ושלושים), 9 (חמש ושלושים), 10 (עתש ועשרים); 6:10 (שש מאות וארבעת אלפים), 14 (חמש וארבעים.); 7:3 (חמש ועשרים); 9:4 (שמונה ועשרים אלף)

4Q200 f7ii:5 (שמונה וחמשֹ[ים)

4Q216 7:15 (ש<נ>ים ועשרים)

4Q219 2:35 (שלושה ואֹרֹ[בעים)

4Q249e f1i 3:8 (חמ]ש ועשרֹי[ם)

4Q252 1:7 (חמשים ומאת); 2:1 (אחת ושש מאותֹ)

4Q266 f8iii:6 (חמש [ו]עֹשרים)

4Q270 f5iv:17 (ח]מֹשֹ וֹעשרים)

4Q317 f1+1aii:27 (אחד ועשרֹי[ם), 32 (שלושה ועשרֹי[ם), 33 (חמשהֹ ועשרֹי[ם)

4Q321 1:3 (שלושה וע[ש]רֹיֹם); 2:6 (שֹנֹ[י]ם וֹעשרים); 4 (שנים ועשרים), 5 (תשעה ועשֹ[רים), 7 (ת]שֹעהֹ ועשֹרֹים), 8 (שמונה ועשרים); 3:4 (שֹנים ועשֹ[רים); 4:1 (ארֹ[בעה] ועֹ[שרי]ם), 2 (שלושה ועשרים)

4Q321a 1:6 (שמו]נה וֹעֹשרים); 3:7 (שנים ועשרֹ[ים]); 5:7 (תשעה ועשרים)

4Q334 f2 4:3 (שנ]יֹם וארבעֹ[ים)

4Q365a f2ii:3 (ששים ושלוש מאות), f5i:5 (א]רבע ועשרים)

4Q440: f1:2 (ת]שֹעה וארבעים)

4Q494 f1:3 (שנים וחמשים)

11Q5 27:6 (ארבעה וששים ושלוש מאות), 7 (שנים וחמשים), 9 (ששה ואבעים וארבע מאות)

A 2.13 OCCURRENCES OF THE ASYNDETIC CONSTRUCTION BETWEEN THE FIRST TWO CONSTITUENTS OF THE COMPLEX ADDING NUMERALS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE AND QUMRAN:

Num. 4:36 (אַלְפַּיִם שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים); 26:51 (שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וָאֶלֶף שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים); 31:37 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר אֶלֶף שְׁבַע־מֵאוֹת), 52 (שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אֶלֶף שְׁבַעַת אֲלָפִים וַחֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת), 43 (חָמֵשׁ וְשִׁבְעִים וַחֲמִשִּׁים)

1 Kgs. 10:14 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁשִּׁים וָשֵׁשׁ); 20:15 (מָאתַיִם שְׁנַיִם וּשְׁלֹשִׁים)

2 Kgs. 19:35 (מֵאָה שְׁמוֹנִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה אָלֶף)

Jer. 52:29 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 30 (שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁנָיִם)

Dan. 12:11 (אֶלֶף שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁלֹּשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 12 (אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם וְתִשְׁעִים)

Ezr. 2:3 (אַלְפַּיִם מֵאָה שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 4 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 5 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וְשִׁבְעִים), 6 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 7 (שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת וּשְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר), 10 (אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם חֲמִשִּׁים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 11 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים), 12 (אַרְבַּע אַלְפַּיִם חֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה), 13 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה), 14 (אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 15 (וּשְׁלֹשָׁה מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 17 (מֵאוֹת חֲמִשִּׁים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 19 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 21 (מָאתַיִם עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 23 (מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנָה), 26 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד), 27 (מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 28 (מָאתַיִם עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 30 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת), 31 (מֵאָה חֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה), 33 (אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם חֲמִשִּׁים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 34 (שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 36 (אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 37 (תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה), 38 (אֶלֶף חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁנָיִם), 41 (אַרְבָּעִים וְשִׁבְעָה), 42 (מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנָה), 58 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת תִּשְׁעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 60 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת חֲמִשִּׁים), 64 (וּשְׁנַיִם), 65 (אַרְבַּע רִבּוֹא אַלְפַּיִם שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת שִׁשִּׁים), 66 x2 (שְׁבַע שִׁשֶּׁת אֲלָפִים שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁבְעָה), 67 x2 (מָאתַיִם אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה; אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים)

Neh. 7:8 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁנָיִם), 9 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 10 (אַלְפַּיִם מֵאָה וְשִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 11 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת שִׁשָּׁה עָשָׂר), 12 (אַלְפַּיִם וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת שְׁמֹנֶה עָשָׂר), 13 (אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם חֲמִשִּׁים וְאַרְבָּעָה), 15 (שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 16 (מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמֹנָה), 17 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם), 18 (שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת אַלְפַּיִם שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנָה), 19 (שִׁשִּׁים וְשִׁבְעָה), 20 (אַלְפַּיִם שִׁשִּׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה), 22 (שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנָה), 23

(מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 27 ,(מֵאָה שְׁמֹנִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 26 ,(מֵאָה שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר) 24 ,(שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבָּעָה) 29
(אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם חֲמִשִּׁים) 34 ,(מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה) 32 ,(שֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד) 30 ,(שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁלֹשָׁה)
תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת שִׁבְעִים) 39 ,(שְׁלֹשֶׁת אֲלָפִים תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת וּשְׁלֹשִׁים) 38 ,(שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אַרְבָּעִים וַחֲמִשָּׁה) 36 ,(וְאַרְבָּעָה
מֵאָה אַרְבָּעִים) 44 ,(אֶלֶף שְׁבְעָה עָשָׂר) 42 ,(אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם אַרְבָּעִים וְשִׁבְעָה) 41 ,(אֶלֶף חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁנָיִם) 40 ,(וּשְׁלֹשָׁה
,(אַרְבַּע רִבּוֹא אַלְפַּיִם שְׁלֹשׁ־מֵאוֹת וְשִׁשִּׁים) 66 ,(שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת תִּשְׁעִים וּשְׁנָיִם) 60 ,(מֵאָה שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 45 ,(וּשְׁמֹנֶה
שֵׁשֶׁת אֲלָפִים שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת ;אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה) 68 x2 ,(שִׁבְעַת אֲלָפִים שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשִׁבְעָה) 67
(שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם) 12 ,(תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 8 ,(אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 11:6 ;(וְעֶשְׂרִים) 13
(מֵאָה שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם) 19 ,(מָאתַיִם שְׁמֹנִים וְאַרְבָּעָה) 18 ,(מֵאָה עֶשְׂרִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה) 14 ,(מָאתַיִם אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁנָיִם)

4Q252 2:3 (שלוש מאות ששים וארבעה)

3.1 OCCURRENCES OF THE NOUN שָׁנָה IN THE CONSTRUCT STATE FOLLOWED BY A CARDINAL NUMERAL:

בִּשְׁנַת שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה	Gen. 7:11
וּבִשְׁנַת שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה	1 Kgs. 15:1
וּבִשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים	1 Kgs. 15:9
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם	1 Kgs. 15: 25
בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ	1 Kgs. 15:28
בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ	1 Kgs. 15:33
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנָה	1 Kgs. 16:8
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשֶׁבַע	1 Kgs. 16:10
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה	1 Kgs. 16:15
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וְאַחַת שָׁנָה	1 Kgs. 16:23

בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה שָׁנָה	1 Kgs. 16:29
בִּשְׁנַת אַרְבַּע	1 Kgs. 22:41
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁבַע עֶשְׂרֵה	1 Kgs. 22:52
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם	2 Kgs. 1:17
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁמֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה	2 Kgs. 3:1
וּבִשְׁנַת חָמֵשׁ	2 Kgs. 8:16
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתֵּים־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 8:25
וּבִשְׁנַת אַחַת עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 9:29
בִּשְׁנַת־שֶׁבַע	2 Kgs. 12:2
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 12:7
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 13:1
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 13:10
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם	2 Kgs. 14:1
בִּשְׁנַת חֲמֵשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 14:23
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים וָשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:1
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁמֹנֶה שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:8
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וָתֵשַׁע שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:13
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וָתֵשַׁע שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:17
בִּשְׁנַת חֲמִשִּׁים שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:23
בִּשְׁנַת חֲמִשִּׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 15:27
בִּשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים	2 Kgs. 15:30
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם	2 Kgs. 15:32
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁבַע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה	2 Kgs. 16:1
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה	2 Kgs. 17:1

2 Kgs. 18:1	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ
2 Kgs. 18: 10 (x2)	בִּשְׁנַת־שֵׁשׁ שְׁנַת־תֵּשַׁע
2 Kgs. 24:12	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁמֹנֶה
2 Kgs. 25:8	שְׁנַת תְּשַׁע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה
Jer. 52:12	שְׁנַת תְּשַׁע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה
Jer. 52:28	בִּשְׁנַת־שֶׁבַע
Jer. 52:29	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה
Jer. 52:30	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ וְעֶשְׂרִים
Hag. 1:1	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם
Hag. 1:15	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם
Zech. 1:1	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם
Zech. 1:7	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם
Zech. 7:1	בִּשְׁנַת אַרְבַּע
Esth. 1:3	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלוֹשׁ
Esth. 2:16	בִּשְׁנַת־שֶׁבַע
Esth. 3:7	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה
Dan. 1:1	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹושׁ
Dan. 1:21	שְׁנַת אַחַת
Dan. 2:1	וּבִשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם
Dan. 8:1	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹושׁ
Dan. 9:1	בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת
Dan. 9:2	בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת
Dan. 10:1	בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹושׁ

Dan. 11:1	בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת
Ezr. 1:1	וּבִשְׁנַת אַחַת
Ezr. 7:7	בִּשְׁנַת־שֶׁבַע
Neh. 1:1	שְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים
Neh. 2:1	שְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים
Neh. 5:14 (x2)	מִשְׁנַת עֶשְׂרִים שְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם
Neh. 13:6	בִּשְׁנַתְּ שְׁלֹשִׁים וּשְׁתַּיִם
2 Chr. 3:2	בִּשְׁנַת אַרְבַּע
2 Chr. 13:1	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה
2 Chr. 15:10	לִשְׁנַת חֲמֵשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵה
2 Chr. 15:19	שְׁנַת־שְׁלֹשִׁים וְחָמֵשׁ
2 Chr. 16:1	בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלֹשִׁים וָשֵׁשׁ
2 Chr. 16:12	בִּשְׁנַתְּ שְׁלוֹשִׁים וָתֵשַׁע
2 Chr. 16:13	בִּשְׁנַת אַרְבָּעִים וְאַחַת
2 Chr. 17:7	וּבִשְׁנַת שָׁלֹושׁ
2 Chr. 34:8	וּבִשְׁנַת שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵהּ
2 Chr. 36:22	וּבִשְׁנַת אַחַת

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aejmelaeus, A.

2007 Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account. Pp. 107-22 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus, Leuven: Kok Pharos.

2012 Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1. Pp. 1-17 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*, eds. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano Morales, Leiden: Brill.

Aḥituv, S.

2008 *Echoes from the Past*. Jerusalem: Carta.

Andersen, F. I. and Forbes, A. D.

1986 *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Anderson, J. E.

2013 The Rise, Fall, and Renovation of the House of Gesenius: Diachronic Methods, Synchronic Readings, and the Debate over Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kings 18–20. *Currents in Biblical Research* 11.2: 147-67.

Arentsen, N.

2019 Diachrony and Second Isaiah: The Preposition את and Aramaisms. *VT* 69: 511-25.

Assefa, D., Delamarter, S., Jost, G. and R. Lee

2020 The Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project (THEOT). Goals and Initial Findings. *Textus* 29.1: 80-110.

Avigad, N. and Sass, B.

1997 *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Barthélemy, D.

1963 *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. Leiden: Brill.

Barthélemy, D., Gooding, D. W., Lust, J., and Tov, E.

1986 *The Story of David and Goliath*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

Bauer, H. and Leander, P.

1922 *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Bekins, P.

2014 *Transitivity and Object Marking in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Benzinger, I.

1899 *Die Bücher der Könige*. Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B Mohr.

Bergey, R. L.

1983 The Book of Esther - Its Place in the Linguistic Milieu of Post-Exilic Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Study in Late Biblical Hebrew. PhD dissertation. Dropsie College of Cognate Learning.

Birdsall, J. N.

1972 Traces of the Jewish Greek Biblical Versions in Georgian Manuscript Sources. *JSS* 17: 83-92.

Bloch, Y.

2007 From Linguistics to Textual Criticism and Back: "Wayyiqtōl" Constructions with Long Prefixed Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew. *Hebrew Studies* 48: 141-70.

Bogaert, P.-M.

1996 L'importance de la Septante et du «Monacensis» de la Vetus Latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (chap. 35–40). Pp. 399-428 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction-Reception-Interpretation*, ed. M. Vervenne, Leuven: Leuven University Press.

2021 Vetus Latina (Old Latin). Pp. 623-38 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, eds. A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bolozky, S.

2013 Elision of Consonants: Israeli Hebrew. In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, ed. G. Khan, Leiden: Brill.

Block, D. I.

1997 *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 1-24*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brettler, M. Z.

1995 *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel*. London: Routledge.

Brock, S.

1996 *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel*. Turin: Silvio Zamorani.

Brockelmann, C.

1908 *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Vol. I). Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.

Brooke, G. J.

1992 The Temple Scroll and LXX Exodus 35–40. Pp. 81-106 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, eds. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Browne, G. M.

1978 The Sahidic Version of Kingdoms IV. *Illinois Classical Studies* 3: 196-206.

Brueggemann, W.

2000 *I & II Kings*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.

Bruni, A. M.

2016 Georgian Translations. §1.4.8 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et. al., Leiden: Brill.

2016a Samuel – Kings. §3-5.2.6.1 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et. al., Leiden: Brill.

2016b Old Church Slavonic Translations. §1.4.10 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et. al., Leiden: Brill.

2018 The Old Serbian Version of the *Antiochene Recension* of Samuel-Kings. Some Preliminary Issues in Textual Criticism. Pp. 203-214 in *Contributi italiani al XVI Congresso Italiano degli Slavisti*, eds. M. C. Ferro, L. Salmon, and G. Ziffer, Firenze: Firenze University Press.

2019 The Second Church Slavonic Translation of 1-4 Kingdoms: A Witness to the Proto-Lucianic Text. *Textus* 28: 21-44.

Burney, C. F.

1903 *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Carr, D. M.

1992 What Can We Say about the Tradition History of Isaiah? A Response to Christopher Seitz's *Zion's Final Destiny*. *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers* 583-97.

Catastini, A.

1982 Le varianti greche di II Re 18-20. *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 5:75-91.

1983a Le varianti greche di Isaia 36-39. *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 6:209-34.

1983b Osservazioni filologiche sulla cosiddetta 'meridiana di Achaz' (Isaia 38:8 – II Re 20:11). *Henoch* 5:161-78.

1989 *Isaia ed Ezechia. Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18-20 // Is. 36-39*. Roma: Università degli Studi "La Sapienza".

Chiesa, P.

1978 *L'Antico Testamento ebraico secondo la tradizione palestinese*. Torino: Bottega D'Erasmo.

Christensen, D. L.

1989 The Identity of King Sô in Egypt (2 Kings XVII 4). *VT* 39.2: 140–53.

Cogan, M.

2001 *I Kings*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cogan, M. and Tadmor, H.

1988 *II Kings*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cohen, C.

1979 Neo-Assyrian Elements in the First Speech of the Biblical Rab-Šāqê. *Israel Oriental Studies* 9: 32-48.

Cohen, O.

2013 *The Verbal Tense System in Late Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.

Cook, J. A.

2013 Actionality (*Aktionsart*): Pre-Modern Hebrew. Pp. 25-8 in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics. Volume I (A-F)*, ed. G. Khan, Leiden: Brill.

Cowe, S. P.

1992 *The Armenian Translation of Daniel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Cox, C. E.

2002 The 'Song of Zion' in Armenian. Pp. 33-59 in *The Armenian in Jerusalem and the Holy Land*, eds. M. E. Stone, R. R. Ervien, and N. Stone, Leuven: Peeters.

2006 *Armenian Job*. Leuven: Peeters.

2014 The Armenian Bible: Status Quaestionis. Pp. 227-46 in *Armenian Philology in the Modern Era*, ed. V. Calzolari, Leiden: Brill.

2016 Armenian Translations. §1.4.7.4 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Cronauer, P. T.

2005 *The Stories About Naboth the Jezreelite*. New York: T&T Clark.

Cross Jr., F. M.

1964 The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. *The Harvard Theological Review* 57: 281–99.

Davies, D. M.

1944 The Old Ethiopic Version of Second Kings. A Critical and Comparative Study of Its Provenance. PhD Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary.

Davies, G. I.

1991 *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance*. *Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2004 *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance*. *Volume 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, J.

1992 The Problem of "Sô, King of Egypt" in 2 Kings XVII 4. *VT* 42.3: 289–301.

De Vries, S. J.

2004 *1 Kings*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Delamarter, S., Niccum, C. and Lee, R.

2016 Ethiopic Translation(s). §1.4.3 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Deutsch, R.

2003 *Biblical Period Hebrew Bullae. The Josef Chaim Kaufman Collection*. Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center Publications.

2011 *Biblical Period Epigraphy. The Josef Chaim Kaufman Collection: Seals, Bullae, Handles*. Tel Aviv: Archaeological Center Publications.

Dillmann, A.

1871 *Veteris Testamenti Aethiopici Tomus Secundus, sive Libri Regum, Paralipomenon, Esdrae, Esther. Fasciculus Secundus, quo continentur Libri Regum III et IV*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Driver, S. R.

1890 *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.

1892 *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ehrensvärd, M.

2003 Linguistic Dating of Biblical Text. Pp. 164-88 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Young, I., London: T&T Clark.

Ehrlich, A. B.

1900 *מקרא כפשוטו* (Vol. II). Berlin: Papfeloyer.

Eskhult, M.

2000 Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew. Pp. 84-93 in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*, eds. Muraoka, T. and Elwolde, J. F., Leiden: Brill.

Everson, D.

2016 Samuel – Kings: Vulgate. §3-5.1.7 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Ewald, H.

1881 *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Eynikel, E.

1996 *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leiden: Brill.

Fassberg, S. E.

2006 Sequences of Positive Commands in Biblical Hebrew: לֵךְ אֱמֹר, לֵךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ, הָלוֹךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ. Pp. 51-64 in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting. Typological and Historical Perspectives*, ed. S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2008 The Infinitive Absolute as Finite Verb and Standard Literary Hebrew of the Second Temple Period. Pp. 47-60 in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period. Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira*, ed. J. Joosten and J.-S. Rey, Leiden: Brill.

2010 *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Challa*. Leiden: Brill.

Feder, F.

2016 Coptic Translations. §1.4.2 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Fernández Marcos, N.

1994 *Scribes and Translators. Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings*. Leiden: Brill.

Fernández Marcos, N. and Busto Saiz, J. R.

1989 *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega II. 1-2 Samuel*. Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC.

1992 *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia griega II. 1-2 Reyes*. Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC.

Fischer, B.

1986 *Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Bibeltexte*. Freiburg: Herder.

Friesen, C. J. P.

2015 Translating Misfortune: The Textual Problem of 1 Samuel 1.15 in the MT and the LXX. *Vetus Testamentum* 65/4: 649-53.

Fritz, V.

1998 *Das zweite Buch der Könige*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Fullerton, K.

1925 The Original Text of 2 K. 20:7-11 = I. 38:7, 8, 21 f. *JBL* 44.1-2: 44-62.

Garbini, G.

2012 *I Filistei*. Brescia: Paideia.

Gesenius, W.

1815 *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, Leipzig.

1821 *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia.* Vol. 1. Leipzig: Vogel.

Gesundheit, S.

2016 Introduction: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Linguistic Dating. Pp. 295-302 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, eds. J. C. Gertz, B. M. Levenson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Goldenberg, G.

1991 On Direct Speech and the Hebrew Bible. Pp. 79-96 in Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday, eds. K. Jongeling, H. Murre-van den Berg, L. van Rompay, Leiden: Brill.

Gray, J.

1964 *I & II Kings. A Commentary*. London: SCM Press.

Gustavs, A.

1913 Hethitische Parallelen zum Namen אוּרִיָה. *ZAW* 33: 201-5.

Hendel, R. S. and Joosten, J.

2018 *How Old Is the Hebrew Bible*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hoffer, V.

1992 An Exegesis of Isaiah 38.21. *JSOT* 56: 69-84.

Holmstedt, R. D.

2012 Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew. Pp. 97-124 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, eds. C. L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2013 The Nexus between Textual Criticism and Linguistics: A Case Study from Leviticus. *JBL* 132.2: 473-94.

Hornkohl, A.

2014a *Ancient Hebrew Periodization and the Language of the Book of Jeremiah*. Leiden: Brill.

2014b Her Word versus His: Establishing the Underlying Text in 1 Samuel 1:23. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133/3: 465-77.

2016 Transitional Biblical Hebrew. Pp. 31-42 in *A Handbook of Biblical Hebrew*, eds. W. R. Garr and S. E. Fassberg, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2017 All Is Not Lost: Linguistic Periodization in the Face of Textual and Literary Pluriformity. Pp. 53-80 in *Advances in Biblical Hebrew Linguistics: Data, Methods, and Analyses*, eds. A. Moshavi and T. Notarius, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Huffmon, H. B.

1965 *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts; a Structural and Lexical Study*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Hurvitz, A.

1973 Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts. *Hebrew Abstracts* 14: 74-9.

1982 *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem*. Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{te}.

1997 The Linguistic Status of Ben Sira as a Link between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographical Aspects. Pp. 72-86 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde, Leiden: Brill.

2014 *A Concise Lexicon of Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.

Hutzli, J.

2007 *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Isaksson, B.

2015 The so-called we-qatal conjugation in Biblical Hebrew once again. *KUSATU* 19: 71-117.

Jastrow, M.

1926 *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Mishnaic Literature*. New Yourk: Verlag Choreb.

Jeremias, C.

1971 Zu Jes. XXXVIII 21 f. *VT* 21: 104-11.

Jones, G. H.

1984 *1 and 2 Kings*. Michigan: Eerdmans.

Joosten, J.

2009 Diachronic Aspects of Narrative *Wayhi* in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 35/2: 43-61.

2010 The New Testament and Rabbinic Hebrew. Pp. 335-50 in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, eds. R. Bieringer, F. García Martínez, D. Pollefeyt, P. J. Tomson, Leiden: Brill.

2012 *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose*. Jerusalem: Simor.

2012a Textual History and Linguistic Developments: The Doublets in 2 Kgs 8:28-29 // 9:15-16 in Light of 2 Chr 22:5-6. Pp. 133-45 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*, eds. A. Piquer Oter and P. A. Torijano Morales, Leiden: Brill.

2013 Linguistic Clues as to the Date of the Book of Job: a Mediating Position. Pp. 347-57 in *Interested Readers. FS David Clines*, ed. J. K. Aitken, J. M. S. Clines and C. Maier, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

2016 Diachronic Linguistics and the Date of the Pentateuch. Pp. 327-44 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. J. C. Gertz et al., Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2019 The Linguistic Dating of the Joseph Story. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 8.1: 24-43.

Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T.

2016 *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press.

Kahn, D.

2018 The Fall of Samaria: An Analysis of the Biblical Sources. Pp. 229-50 in *The Last Days of the Kingdom of Israel*, eds. S. Hasegawa, C. Levin, and K. Radner, Berlin: De Gruyter.

2020 *Sennacherib's Campaign Against Judah. A Source Analysis of Isaiah 36-37*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, O.

1969 Die Verkündigung des Propheten Jesaja im Jahre 701. *ZAW* 81.3: 304-15.

Kantor, B.

2019 Where Does 'ayyē Come From? Proclisis and Affix Pleonasm in the Biblical Hebrew Interrogatives 'ē and 'ayyē. *JSS* 64.2: 377-99.

Kartveit, M.

2014 The Date of II Reg 17, 24-41. *ZAW* 126.1: 31-44.

Kauhanen, T.

2012 *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

2013 Lucifer of Cagliari and Literary Criticism in Kings. *ZAW* 125.3: 418-32.

2018 *Lucifer of Cagliari and the Text of 1-2 Kings*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

2021 The Proto-Lucianic and Antiochian Text. Pp. 537-51 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, eds. A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khan, G.

1999 *A Grammar of Neo-Aramaic. The Dialect of the Jews of Arbel*. Leiden: Brill.

2002 *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh*. Leiden: Brill.

2004 *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja*. Leiden: Brill.

2008 *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Barwar. Volume 1: Grammar*. Leiden: Brill.

2008 *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Urmi*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.

2009 *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sandalaj*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.

2020 *The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

2021 The Coding of Discourse Dependency in Biblical Hebrew Consecutive *Weqaṭal* and *Wayyiqṭol*. Pp. 299-354 in *New Perspectives in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew*, ed. A. D. Hornkohl and G. Khan, Cambridge: University of Cambridge & Open Book Publishers.

Kim, D. H.

2013 *Early Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Linguistic Variability*. Leiden: Brill.

Kim, J.-H.

2009 *Die hebraischen und griechischen Textformen, der Samuel- und Konigebucher. Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1 ‑19,9*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kitchen, K.

2003 *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kittel, R.

1900 *Die Bücher der Könige*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Knauf, E. A.

2016 *1 Könige 1-14*. Freibug: Verlag Herder.

2019 *1 Könige 15-22*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder.

Koch, K.

1988 Aschera als Himmelskönigin in Jerusalem. *UF* 20: 97-120.

König, F. E.

1897 *Historisch-Comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Kreuzer, S.

2008 Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and Kaige Recension). Pp. 239-53 in *XIII Congress of the IOSCS*, ed. M. K. H. Peter, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

2009 Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns'. *BIOSCS* 42: 34–51.

2013 'Lukian Redivivus' or Barthélemy and Beyond? Pp. 243-61 in *XIV. Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki 2010*, ed. M. K. H. Peters, Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kropat, A.

1909 *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen*. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann.

Kutscher, E. Y.

1962 לשונן של האיגרות העבריות והארמיות של בר כוסבה ובני דורו: מאמר שני: האיגרות העבריות. *Lešonenu* 26: 7-23.

1963 'בבואה של הארמית בעברית'. *Tabriz* 33: 118-30.

1974 *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa[a])*. Leiden: Brill.

1982 *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Lambert, M.

1893 'Le *Vav* Conversif'. *Revue des Études Juives* 26: 47-62.

Lange, A.

2009 'They Confirmed the Reading' (y. Taʿan. 4:68a): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period. Pp. 29-80 in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday*, eds. A. Lange, M. Weigold, and J. Zsengellér, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

2010 The Textual Plurality of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pp. 43-96 in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. N. Dávid and A. Lange, Leuven: Peeters.

2016a Samuel – Kings: Ancient Hebrew Texts. §5.3 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

2016b Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts. §1.2.2 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Law, T. M. and Kauhanen, T.

2010 Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer. *BIOSCS* 43: 73–87.

Le Boulluec, A. and Sandevoir, P.

1989 *L'Exode*. Paris: Éditions du cerf.

Leichty, E.

2011 *The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC)*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Levias, C.

1900 *A Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom Contained in the Babylonian Talmud*. Cincinnati: Bloch.

Levin, C.

2008 Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda. Pp. 129-68 in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, eds. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen, Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society.

2019 In Search of the Original Biblical Record of the Assyrian Conquest of Samaria. Pp. 251-66 in *The Last Days of the Kingdom of Israel*, eds. S. Hasegawa, C. Levin, and K. Radner, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Longacre, R. E.

1994 *Weqatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Discourse-modular Approach. Pp. 71-84 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Machinist, P.

2000 The Rab Šāqēh at the Wall of Jerusalem: Israelite Identity in the Face of the Assyrian 'Other'. *Hebrew Studies* 41: 151-68.

McCarter, P. K.

1980 *I Samuel*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

1984 *II Samuel*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McKenzie, S. L.

2019 *1 Kings 16 – 2 Kings 16*. Stuttgart: Kolhammer.

Meyer, R.

1959 Auffallender Erzählungsstil in einem angeblichen Auszug aus der 'Chronik der Könige von Juda'. Pp. 114-23 in *Festschrift: Friedrich Baumgärtel zum 70. Geburtstag 14. Januar 1958*, ed. L. Rost, Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen.

1969-1992 *Hebräische Grammatik* (4 vols). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Mishor, M.

2006 On the Language and Text of Exodus 18. Pp. 225-30 in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*, ed. S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz, Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Mizrahi, N.

2011 The History and Linguistic Background of Two Hebrew Titles for the High Priest. *JBL* 130.4: 687-705.

2017 Linguistic Change through the Prism of Textual Transmission: The Case of Exodus 12:9. Pp. 27-53 in *Advances in Biblical Hebrew Linguistics: Data, Methods, and Analyses*, eds. A. Moshavi and T. Notarius, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Montgomery, J. A.

1934 Archival Data in the Book of Kings. *JBL* 53.1: 46-52.

1986 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Moomo, D. O.

2005 The Imperfective Meaning of *weQatal* in Biblical Herbew. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 31/1: 89-106.

Moore, G. F.

1918 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Morag, S.

1974 On the Historical Validity of the Vocalization of the Hebrew Bible. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94-3: 307-15.

Moreno Hernández, A.

1992 *Las glosas marginales de* Vetus Latina *en las Biblias Vulgatas españolas: 1-2 Reyes*. Madrid: CSIC.

Morrison, C. E.

2016 Samuel – Kings: Peshitta. §3-5.1.4 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Muraoka, T. and Porten, B.

1998 *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic*. Leiden: Brill.

Na'aman, N. and Zadok, R.

1988 Sargon II's Deportations to Israel and Philistia (716-708 B.C.). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 40: 36-46.

Napirkowska, L.

2015 *A Grammar of the Christian Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Diyana-Zariwaw*. Leiden: Brill.

Naveh, J.

1985 Writing and Scripts in Seventh-Century B.C.E. Philistia: The New Evidence from Tell Jemmeh. *IEJ* 35: 8-21.

Niccum, C. and Prather, J.

2016 Samuel – Kings: Ethiopic Translation(s). §3-5.2.3.3 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Nöldeke, T.

1875 *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhausen.

Norin, S.

1982 An Important Kennicott Reading in 2 Kings XVIII 13. *Vetus Testamentum* 32-3: 337-8.

Olivero, V.

2021 On the Emergence of the Short Ending יה- in Hebrew Names. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21.2: ?.

Orlinsky, H. M.

1939 The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story. *JQR* 30.1: 33-49.

Person, Jr., R. F.

1997 *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

1999 II Kings 18-20 and Isaiah 36-39: A Text Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Book of Isaiah. *ZAW* 111: 373-79.

Pat-El, N.

2017 Israelian Hebrew: A Re-Evaluation. *VT* 67.2: 227-63.

Piquer Otero, A.

2012 What Text to Edit? The Oxford Hebrew Bible Edition of 2 Kings 17,1–23. Pp. 227-243 in *After Qumran: Old and modern editions of the biblical texts: The historical books*, eds. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters.

2021 Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic Versions. Pp. 671-690 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, eds. A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piquer Otero, A., Torijano Morales, P., and Trebolle Barrera, J.

2008 Septuagint Versions, Greek Recensions and Hebrew Editions. The Text-Critical Evaluation of the Old Latin, Armenian and Georgian Versions in *III-IV Regnorum*. Pp. 251-81 in *Translating a Translation. The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*, eds. H. Ausloos, J. Cook et al., Leuven: Peeters.

Polak, F. H.

1998 The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose. *JANES* 26: 59–105.

2003 Style Is More Than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture and the Distinction between Written and Oral Narrative. Pp. 38–103 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. M. Young, London: T. & T. Clark.

2005 Sociolinguistics and the Judean Speech Community in the Achaemenid Empire. Pp. 589–628 in *Judah and Judaeans in the Achaemenid Period*, eds. O. Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and M. Oeming, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2012 Language Variation, Discourse Typology, and the Sociocultural Background of Biblical Narrative. Pp. 301-38 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, eds. C. L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2016a Oral Platform and Language Usage in the Abraham Narrative. Pp. 405-42 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, eds. J. C. Gertz, B. M. Levenson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

2016b Storytelling and Redaction – Varieties of Language Usage in the Exodus Narrative. Pp. 443-77 in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, eds. J. C. Gertz, B. M. Levenson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Polzin, R.

1976 *Late Biblical Hebrew. Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Missoula: Scholars Press.

Potts, D. T.

1990 Lock and Key in Ancient Mesopotamia. *Mesopotamia* 25: 185-92.

Qimron, E.

1986 *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

2018 *A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jerusalem: Yad Yizhak Ben-Zvi.

Redford, D. B.

1981 A Note on II Kings 17,4. *The Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 11.2: 75–6.

Rendsburg, G.

1991 *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

1992 Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew. Pp. 65-88 in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. W. Bodine, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

2002a *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*. Bethesda: CDL Press.

2002b Some False Leads in the Identification of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Cases of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2:27-36. *JBL* 121.1: 23-46.

Reymond, E. D.

2014 *Qumran Hebrew*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Rezetko, R.

2003 Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. Pp. 215-50 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. Young, New York: T&T Clark.

Richelle, M.

2010 *Le testament d'Élisée. Texte massorétique et Septante en 2 Rois 13.10-14.16*. Paris: Gabalda.

Rofé, A.

1976 סיפור אירוסי רבקה (בראשית כד). *Eshel Beer-Sheva* 1: 42-67.

1981 La Composizione di Gen. 24. *Bibbia e Oriente* 23: 161-5.

1988 The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story. *VT* 38.1: 89-104.

1990 An Enquiry into the Bethrotal of Rebekah. Pp. 27-39 in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschriftfiir Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. E. Blum, C. Macholz, and E. W. Stegemann, Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.

2014 *סיפורי הנביאים: הסיפורת הנבואית במקרא – סוגיה ותולדותיה*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.[2]

Rooker, M. F.

1990 *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Sacchi, P.

1973 Analisi quantitativa della tradizione medievale del testo ebraico della Bibbia secondo le collazioni del De Rossi. *Oriens Antiquus* 12: 1-14.

Sacchi, P. and Chiesa, B.

1980 La *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* e recenti studi di critica del testo dell'Antico Testamento Ebraico. *Henoch* 2: 201-20.

Sáenz-Badillos, A.

1993 *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salvesen, A. G.

2013 Textual and Literary Criticism and the Book of Exodus: The Role of the Septuagint. Pp. 37-51 in *Biblical Interpretation and Method: Essays in Honour of John Barton*, ed. K. J. Dell and P. M. Joyce, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samet, N.

2020 Non-Accusative *'t* and the Syntactic Profile of Late Biblical Hebrew. *VT* (forthcoming).

Šanda, A.

1912 *Die Bücher der Könige* (Vol. 2). Münster: Aschendorffsche.

Schenker, A.

2004 *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schniedewind, W. and Sivan, D.

1997 The Elijah-Elisha Narratives: A Test Case for the Northern Dialect of Hebrew. *JQR* 87.3: 303-37.

Schorch, S.

2021 *The Samaritan Pentateuch, Volume 1: Genesis*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Screnock, J.

2018a The Syntax of Cardinal Numerals in Judges, Amos, Esther and 1QM. *JSS* 63/1: 125-54.

2018b The Syntax of Complex Adding Numerals and Hebrew Diachrony. *JBL* 137/4: 789-819.

2020 Some Oddities of Ancient Hebrew Numeral Syntax. *Hebrew Studies* 61: 23-44.

Segal, M. H.

2001 *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.

Seitz, C. R.

1991 *Zion's Final Destiny*: *The Development of the Book of Isaiah: A Reassessment of Isaiah 36–39*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Shenkel, J. D.

1968 *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Skehan, P. W. and Di Lella, A. A.

1987 *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. New York: Doubleday.

Skinner, J.

1910 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Smelik, K. A. D.

1986 Distortion of Old Testament Prophecy: The Purpose of Isaiah 36 and 37. Pp. 70-93 in *Crises and Perspectives: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology, and Intertestamental Literature*, ed. J. C. de Moor, Leiden: Brill.

1992 *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography*. Leiden: Brill.

Smelik, W.

2016 Samuel – Kings: Targum. §3-5.1.4 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Snaith, N. H.

1954 *I and II Kings*. New York: Abingdon Press.

Sokoloff, M.

1992 *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.

Spieckermann, H.

1982 *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stade, B. and Schwally, F.

1904 *The Books of Kings*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Stegemann, H. and Shuller, E.

2009 *1QHodayot[a], with Incorporation of 1QHodayot[b] and 4QHodayot[a-f] (DJD 40)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stipp, H.-J.

1987 Narrativ-Langformen 2. und 3. Person von zweiradikaligen Basen nach qalY im biblischen Hebräisch. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 13: 109-49.

Suciu, A.

2016 Samuel – Kings: Coptic. §3-5.2.2.2.4 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et al., Leiden: Brill.

Tadmor, H.

1985 מלחמת סנחריב ביהודה: בחינות היסטוריוגראפיות והיסטוריות. *Zion* 50: 65-80.

Tekoniemi, T.

2018 Between Two Differing Editions: Some Notable Text-Critical Variants in 2 Kings 17. Pp. 211-27 in *The Last Days of the Kingdom of Israel*, eds. S. Hasegawa, C. Levin, and K. Radner, Berlin: De Gruyter.

2019 A Game of Thrones: Textual History of 2 Kings 17 in Light of the Old Latin', PhD dissertation, University of Helsinki.

Thackeray, H. St. J.

1907 The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings. *Journal of Theological Studies* 8: 262-78.

Thenius, O.

1873 *Die Bücher der Könige*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Tigay, J. H.

1986 *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Lights of Hebrew Inscriptions*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Torijano Morales, P.

2012 Textual Criticism and the Text-Critical Edition of IV Regnorum: The Case of 17, 2-6. Pp. 195-211 in *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books*, eds. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters.

2016 Vetus Latina: Samuel – Kings. §3-5.2.1.2 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et. al., Leiden: Brill.

2017 How Much Hexaplaric Material Entered into the Antiochene Textual Tradition? Pp. 69-119 in *The Legacy of Barthélemy*, eds. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

2021 Armenian, Georgian, and Church Slavonic Versions. Pp. 639-54 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, eds. A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tov, E.

2012 *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

2019 *Textual Developments. Collected Essays, Volume 4*. Leiden: Brill.

Trebolle Barrera, J.

1980 *Salomón y Jeroboan: historia de la recensión y redacción de I Reyes 2-12, 14*. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia.

1981 La Caida de Samaria: Critica Textual, Literaria e Historica de 2 Re 17, 3–6. *Salmanticensis* 28: 137–52.

1983 Dos textos para un relato de resurreccion: 2 Re 13,20-21 TM LXXB / LXXL VL. *Sefarad* 43.1: 3-16.

1984 *Jehú y Joás: texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11*. Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo.

1987 La expedicion de Senaquerib contra Jerusalem. Reflexiones en torno a un libro reciente. *Estudios Biblicos* 45:7-22.

1988 Le texte de 2 Rois 7,20-8,5 à la lumiere des decouvertes de Qumrân (6Q4 15). *RevQ* 13: 561-68.

1989 *Centena in Libros Samuelis et Regum: Variantes Textuales y Composición Literaria en los Libros de Samuel y Reyes*. Madrid: CSIC.

1992 Light from 4QJudg[a] and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings. Pp. 315-24 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, Leiden: Brill.

1995 Histoire du texte des livres historiques et histoire de la composition et de la redaction deutéronomistes avec une publication préliminaire de 4Q481A, "Apocryphe d'Élisée". Pp. 327-42 in *Congress Volume: Paris 1992*, ed. J. A. Emerton, Leiden: Brill.

2010 Qumran Fragments on the Books of Kings. Pp. 19-39 in *The Book of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*, eds. A. Lemaire, B. Halpern, and M. J. Adams, Leiden: Brill.

2012 Yahweh's Spirit of Deceit. Textual Variants that Make a Difference. *RQ* 25/100: 635-75.

2016 Vetus Latina. §1.4.1 in *Textual History of the Bible 1A*, eds. A. Lange, E. Tov, et. al., Leiden: Brill.

2020 *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings. Collected Essays by Julio Trebolle Barrera* (ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano), Leiden: Brill.

2020a The Text-Critical Value of the Old Latin in Post-Qumranic Textual Criticism (1 Kings 18:26–29, 36–37). Pp. 247-63 in *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings. Collected Essays by Julio Trebolle Barrera*, ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano, Leiden: Brill.

2020b Two Texts for a Story of a Resurrection: 2 Kings 13:20–21 (MT LXXB/LXXL OL). Pp. 152-62 in *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings. Collected Essays by Julio Trebolle Barrera*, ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano, Leiden: Brill.

2020c From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10:23-25). Pp. 211-20 in *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings. Collected Essays by Julio Trebolle Barrera*, ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano, Leiden: Brill.

2020d Textual Affiliation of the Old Latin Marginal Readings in the Books of Judges and Kings. Pp. 233-46 in *Textual and Literary Criticism of the Books of Kings. Collected Essays by Julio Trebolle Barrera*, ed. A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano, Leiden: Brill.

Tsumura, D. T.

2007 *The First Book of Samuel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2019 *The Second Book of Samuel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Turkanik, A. S.

2008 *Of Kings and Reigns*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tur-Sinai, H.

1938 *Lachish I: The Lachish Letters.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VanderKam, J. and Milik, J.

1994 Jubilees. Pp. 1-187 in *Qumran Cave 4, VIII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1 (DJD 11)*, ed. E. Tov, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Kooij, A.

1984 Zur Exegese von II Reg 17, 2. *ZAW* 96: 109–12.

2006 The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isa 2:22 and 36:7. Pp. 377-86 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, ed. P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam, Leiden: Brill.

Van Keulen, P. S. F.

1996 *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists: The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1-18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History*. Leiden: Brill.

Van Peursen, W. Th.

2004 *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. Leiden: Brill.

Waltke, B. K. and O'Connor, M.

1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Weinfeld, M.

1992 *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weissert, E.

2011 Jesajas Beschreibung der Hybris des assyrischen Königs und seine Auseinandersetzung mit ihr. Pp. 287-309 in *Assur – Gott, Stadt und Land. 5. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 18.-21. Februar 2004 in Berlin*, ed. J. Renger, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Wellhausen, J.

1871 *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wenham, G. J.

1979 *The Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

1994 *Genesis 16-50*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Wevers, J. W.

1948 A Study in the Hebrew Variants in the Books of Kings. *ZAW* 61: 42-76.

1952 Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1 – 4 K. 25:30). *CBQ* 14.1: 40-56.

Williamson, H. G. M.

1994 *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1996 Hezekiah and the Temple. Pp. 47-52 in *Texts, temples, and traditions: a tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. M. Haran and M. V. Fox, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Wright, R. M.

2005 *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source*. London: T&T Clark International.

Young, I.

1995 The 'Northernisms' of the Israelite Narratives in Kings. *ZAH* 8: 63-70.

2001 Observations on the Third Person Masculine Singular Pronominal Suffix *-h* in Hebrew Biblical Texts. *HS* 42:225-42.

2002 The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology? *DSD* 9: 364–90.

2003 Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions. Pp. 276-311 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. New York: T&T Clark.

Young, I. and Rezetko, R.

2014 *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Young, I., Rezetko, R. and Ehrensvärd, M.

2008a *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: Volume 1*. New York: T&T Clark.

2008b *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: Volume 2*. New York: T&T Clark.

Zevit, Z.

1983 A Chapter in the History of Israelite Personal Names. *BASOR* 250: 1-16.

2012 Not-So-Random Thoughts on Linguistic Dating and Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew. Pp. 455-89 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, eds. C. L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Ziegler, J.

1939 *Isaias*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.