6. Excursus: The Linguistic Profile of V

with Na'ama Pat-El

One aspect of the Valediction of Moses that has not received substantial attention is its linguistic profile.[1] Indeed, the language of V includes a number of peculiar features with the potential to either challenge or substantiate the assessment of the manuscripts' authenticity and dating as outlined in Dershowitz's *ZAW* article[2] and above in the present volume.

The primary treatment of V's language, prepared by Adolf Neubauer in 1883, was cursory and is by now quite outdated. Neubauer found the texts to be ungrammatical and to deviate from the biblical standard.[3] This assessment proved influential and has since been cited as evidence of the manuscripts' inauthenticity.[4] In this section, we offer an analysis of these dispositive features, and our conclusions are diametrically opposed to those of Neubauer.

Objections to any renewed interest in the manuscripts have been based in part on the absence of the objects themselves. The multiple extant copies of the manuscripts, however, provide us with more than enough material to analyze the text's language and orthography. We find the text of V to reflect a dialect of Hebrew that differs somewhat from Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH) prose but is generally consistent with pre-exilic Hebrew, especially as reflected in the epigraphic corpus. Several epigraphic analogues for features found in V were unknown in the nineteenth century and therefore could not have served as models for forgery

---

[1] This chapter benefited from the helpful comments and references provided by Tania Bhattacharyya, Steven Fassberg, Jan Joosten, Geoffrey Khan, Maria Metzler, Tamara Morsel-Eisenberg, Paris Spies-Gans, and Shani Tzoref.

[2] Idan Dershowitz, "The Valediction of Moses: New Evidence on the Shapira Deuteronomy Fragments," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 133, no. 1 (2021).

[3] Neubauer described V's constituent passages as "most illogical," "blunders," and "an ignorant amalgamation […] as incorrect as only school-boys can make it." Neubauer concluded: "Let us hope […] that there will soon be an end of the publication of these forged texts and their useless commentaries, unless they are intended as exercises for beginners in Hebrew, for whom practice in the correction of bad grammar may be desirable" (Adolf Neubauer, "The Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," *The Academy* 590 [August 25, 1883], 130).

[4] See, for example, Rabinowicz: "It was the voice of Professor Neubauer, and his extensive analysis in the Academy, that sounded the death knell for the Shapira fragments. He proved the unclassical and ungrammatical nature of the Hebrew text as reproduced by Dr. Ginsburg" (Oskar K. Rabinowicz, "The Shapira Forgery Mystery," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47, no. 2 [1956]: 170–83, at 179).

at that time. We also find no evidence of Second Temple or modern linguistic features. We conclude that the linguistic evidence does not support either the claims of modern forgery or those of Hellenistic composition. The linguistic evidence, rather, accords with the main thesis of this book, namely that V is a very ancient precursor to Deuteronomy.

In what follows, we review V's orthography, verbal morphosyntax, nominal syntax, and lexicon in the light of comparative linguistics, internal biblical evidence, and the epigraphic record. We address Neubauer's principal arguments in detail and also discuss features that we or others have identified as potentially diverging from biblical Hebrew norms. We conclude with some methodological comments.

6.1. Orthography

The orthography of V differs dramatically from that of the Masoretic Text (MT) and all known Hebrew manuscripts. Instead, it has much in common with epigraphic Hebrew. By Masoretic standards, V's spelling is extremely defective; final vowels are typically indicated, but medial vowels are far less likely to be marked by *matres lectionis* in V than in MT. However, just as in many First Temple–era inscriptions, such as the Arad and Lachish ostraca and the Siloam tomb inscription, medial vowels are occasionally indicated with a *yod* or *vav*.[5]

6.1.1. Diphthongs

In some cases, V's defective orthography is not merely conservative but rather reflects possible phonological variants vis-à-vis MT, especially in the realm of monophthongization. James Barr has noted that with very few exceptions $*ay > \bar{e}$ in MT is written with a *yod*, while $*i > \bar{e}$ is not.[6] For example, the construct forms *bēt* בֵּית "house," *yēn* יֵין "wine," the interrogative *ʾēk* אֵיךְ "how," and the negative existential *ʾēn* אֵין, among others, are always written with a *yod*, while *ḥēṣ* חֵץ "arrow," *qēn* קֵן "nest," and *šēn* שֵׁן "tooth" are never written with a *yod*. Many words whose counterparts in MT are typically written with a historical *vav* or *yod* lack these *matres* in V. This is true not only when MT pointing and other evidence suggests monophthongization, such as עוֹד (in V: עד) or מוֹתוֹ (in V: מתו), but also when MT pointing reflects a shift to hiatus. For example, where MT has דְּלָתַיִם,

---

[5] See further in Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language,* trans. John Elwolde (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 66.

[6] James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 138ff.

שָׁמַיִם, and אֶפְרַיִם, V has דלתם, שמם, and אפרם.[7] In addition, V has ללה against MT's diphthonged לַיְלָה. Some words show contraction in their inflected forms; עין but ענך (cf. Deut 19:13 עֵינְךָ).[8] Another example is בין (E 1:6, 8) "between," which is inflected as בנכם.[9]

Variation in the spelling of diphthongs is well attested in the epigraphic record. The word בית is always spelled with a *yod* in Hebrew inscriptions (although not in Moabite, Phoenician, etc.), but יין "wine" is always spelled ין in the Samaria ostraca.[10] Likewise, the Hebrew inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud contain the spelling תמן for תימן "south."[11]

-w 3ms Suffix on Plural Nouns (A 1:4 [שכנו], et passim)

In V, the 3ms pronoun on plural nouns is always spelled -*w* (e.g., שכנו), whereas the common spelling in MT is -*yw* (e.g., שכניו).

Early scholars thought that -*yw* was the older of the two forms. For example, Bauer and Leander suggested that the glide in the original form *$*$-*ay-hū* was contracted, giving way to a new form, *$*$-*a-hū* > *$*$-*aū* > -*aw*.[12] They pointed to the nominal base with the 3mp possessive suffix as evidence of the originality of *$*$-*ay*-, e.g., *dibrē-hem*. According to this theory, the spelling -*yw* represents the older form, while the Masoretic vocalization (-*aw*) and the spelling -*w* – which appears occasionally in MT – represent innovations. The suggestion of a contraction of the glide in this context is, however, ad hoc and is otherwise unattested in Hebrew. As the decades passed and inscriptions featuring the spelling -*w* were discovered, the position that the short form was a late development became increasingly untenable. (See Lachish 3:18, אנשו "his men"; cf. Mhsh 1:13, אלו "to him.") Consequently, Cross and Freedman suggested that the singular ending, *$*$-*a-hū* > *$*$-*aw* >

---

[7] מים, on the other hand, is written with a *yod* in V (D 3:7, E 2:5). While this discrepancy may seem unusual at first, Ugaritic presents precisely the same state of affairs: "water" is *my* in the singular and *mym* in the plural; heaven is *šmm*. Since מים is not attested in V in any inflected form, we cannot know if the *yod* would have been contracted in such a context.

[8] Similar to V, in Isa 3:8 a construct plural is spelled עֵנֵי.

[9] There are two possible instances of בין without a *yod* in MT: Job 16:21 (וּבֶן אָדָם לְרֵעֵהוּ; the pointing of בֶן with a *segol* reflects an apparent attempt to make sense of the defective spelling) and in some Masoretic manuscripts of Hos 13:15 (בֶּן אַחִים יַפְרִיא). See James Barr, "Some Notes on *bēn* 'between' in Classical Hebrew," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 23, no. 1 (1978): 1–22. Numerous manuscripts, including the Aleppo Codex, have the plene spelling for the Hosea passage; for Job, the plene is attested in Kennicott 1 and 147.

[10] The diphthong in construct בית, like analogous forms, is contracted in the Masoretic and Samaritan reading traditions but not in the written text. (The absolute form of בית also reflects monophthongization in the Samaritan oral tradition.) In V, the *yod* is elided.

[11] Outside Hebrew, we find variant spellings in, e.g., the Mesha inscription, where "his house" is spelled בתה in line 7 and ביתה in line 25.

[12] Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1918–22), §25ℓ.

ō, was generalized to the plural.[13] According to their analysis, the plene spelling *-yw* represents a northern variant with a diphthong collapse *-*ayhū* > *-*ēhū* > -*ēw*, and the MT represents a Judahite variant -*aw*.[14] While Cross and Freedman took *-*ay-hū* to be the original form in Northwest Semitic, they emphasized that, given the consistent spelling in the epigraphic material, *-*aw* must be a very early Judahite form.[15] Garr similarly proposed that the original nominal ending before the suffix was -*ay*, and that the 3ms suffixed form developed into -*aw* already in the second millennium BCE via the following series of changes: *-*ay-hū* > *-*aw-hū* > *-*aw-wū* > *-*aw-w* > -*aw [āw]*.[16]

In a later work, Cross argued for the existence of an old Semitic plural ending -*aw*, a reflex of which was retained in Hebrew before pronouns: thus, *-*aw-hū* > *-*awhu* > *-*aw-h* > -*aw*.[17] Wilson-Wright, however, argues that -*aw* was clipped from the broken plural form of III-weak nouns, like *ʾ*abaw* (< *ʾ*bw*) and reanalyzed as a plural morpheme.[18] This innovation took place in West Semitic, since -*aw* is attested as a plural morpheme in Geʿez, Syriac, and Arabic, but not in Akkadian and Eblaite.

There is additional evidence for the primacy of the spelling -*w*: on the hundred-odd occasions that this spelling appears in the MT *ketiv*, the marginal *qere* – which routinely features secondary forms – consistently has -*yw*. For example, in Lev 16:21, the *ketiv* is ידו (שׁתי) while the *qere* has the expected form, ידיו. The common spelling -*yw* in MT can be explained as a later graphic leveling on analogy to the other forms in the paradigm (e.g., 3fs *ay-hā > -*ehā*, spelled -*yh*), rather than an improbable proto–Northwest Semitic atavism.

It is now clear that the spelling -*w* is very ancient and that -*yw* came to replace it in the Masoretic orthographic tradition. But since nineteenth-century scholars believed -*w* to be a relatively late innovation, we might have expected a contemporary forger attempting to simulate a First Temple–era text to include the

---

[13] Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 1952), 47, 54.

[14] Note that Albright treats a final -*w* (*yrḥ-w*) in the Gezer calendar as representing -*ēw* (W. F. Albright, "The Gezer Calendar," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 92, no. 1 [1943]: 16–26, at 22). He assumed that -*aw* was influenced by Aramaic (ibid., n27).

[15] Ibid., 68.

[16] Randall W. Garr, *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000–586 BCE* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 108. The same process accounts for the Byblian form ימו, according to Garr (ibid., 106).

[17] Frank Moore Cross, "Some Problems in Old Hebrew Orthography with Special Attention to the Third Person Masculine Singular Suffix on Plural Nouns [-*âw*]," in *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook: Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy*, HSS 51 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 351–56. See also Rebecca Hasselbach, "External Plural Markers in Semitic: A New Assessment," in *Studies in Semitic and Afroasiatic Linguistics Presented to Gene B. Gragg*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2007), 123–38.

[18] Aren Wilson-Wright, "Father, Brother, and Father-in-Law as III-w Nouns in Semitic," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 79, no. 1 (2016): 23–32.

seemingly historical *yod*. The fact that V never has these *yod*s is consistent with what we now know to be the CBH convention, but not with what earlier scholars believed that convention to be.[19]

6.1.2. Word Division

Throughout the manuscripts, the text of V is written *scriptio continua*, with no spaces or marks between words. The only exception is the Decalogue, where words are terminated by dots and statements by paragraph breaks (*petuḥot*). Therefore, our ability to infer how the scribe perceived word divisions is limited to the lexical repertoire of V's Decalogue. There we find that two words are consistently treated as prefixes: לא and את.

Notably, both of these words are attested in the epigraphic record as prefixes. In Ugaritic and Aramaic inscriptions, לא is often written without an *aleph* and appended to the following word. However, in some cases, the negation appears with the *aleph* and is nevertheless prefixed, as it is in V.[20] In MT, לא is frequently prepended to the following word with a *maqqeph*, and it has been proposed that the written tradition of MT preserves cases of preformative aphetic לא.[21] Similarly, in several documents from the Judean desert, the *nota accusativi* is contracted to a *tav* and treated as a prefix.[22] First Temple–era inscriptions provide some support for the existence of this practice at an even earlier date. For instance, although word-separating dots are quite common in the Arad ostraca, it appears that the *nota accusativi* and לא are never followed by one.[23]

In the Mesha Stele, upon which the Shapira manuscripts are often said to have been modeled, the word division scheme differs from both the *scriptio continua* of most of V and the demarcation scheme found in its Decalogue. In Mesha, את is consistently followed by a word-separating dot,[24] and sentences are divided by

---

[19] It is worth noting that the form in V also differs from the Moabite convention attested in the Mesha Stele, which allegedly served as a blueprint for forgery. There we find -*h* in the same context. For instance, ימה "his days" (Mesha 8) and רשה "his commanders" (Mesha 20).

[20] See Eleazar L. Sukenik, "An Epitaph of Uzziahu King of Judah" (Hebrew), *Tarbiẓ* 2 (1931): 288–92, 382, at 290.

[21] See, especially, Raphael Weiss, "On the Use of the Negative לא in the Bible" (Hebrew), *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978): 148–54. Weiss also notes (148n1) that other short negations are sometimes treated as prefixes in the Hebrew Bible.

[22] See Mur22, 5/6Hev44, 5/6Hev46. An analogue may be found in Punic and Neo-Punic, where the *nota accusativi* is often written as a proclitic *tav* when followed by a definite article (which is usually, but not always, elided). See Charles R. Krahmalkov, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 281. The same phenomenon is also attested in spoken modern Hebrew. See, e.g., Rina Ben-Shahar, "The Phonetic Representation of Spoken Language in Modern Hebrew Literature," *Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 8, no. 2 (1995): 249–73, at 262.

[23] For the *nota accusativi*, see Arad 5, 12, 16, 24 (the semantics of the *ʾet* in line 19 are disputed), 40, 111 (?). The one instance of negative לא in the Arad ostraca (16:10) likewise has no visible dot following it.

[24] See, e.g., Mesha line 5 (ויענו.את.מאב), line 6 (אענו.את.מאב), and line 9 (ואבן.את.בעלמען).

means of vertical strokes. Nevertheless, both schemes found in V are supported by epigraphic and biblical evidence.

6.1.3. Miscellaneous Orthographic Features

יששכר *(G 3:11)*

The name Issachar appears once in V (G 3:11), where it is spelled with a single *sin*; in MT, the name is almost always spelled with two *sin*s. V's orthography is, however, attested in 4Q522, as well as in some Masoretic manuscripts of 1 Chr 2:1.[25] It is also reflected in MT's standard *qere perpetuum* of the name, in which one *sin* is unpointed, and in LXX's transliteration of the name (Ισσαχαρ), which suggests a single elongated consonant in this position, which would ordinarily be represented by a sole Hebrew grapheme.[26]

אנך *(E 1:3, et passim)*

Throughout V, the independent 1cs pronoun is written as אנך. This may be contrasted with the Hebrew Bible, where we find either אָנֹכִי or אֲנִי. On the other hand, אנכי with a *yod* is unattested in Hebrew and Moabite inscriptions[27] and is found only in a small minority of Phoenician inscriptions.[28] The spelling אנך is, therefore, the standard form throughout the Northwest Semitic epigraphic record.

Regarding the pronunciation of Moabite אנך, Aḥituv writes:

The absence of a final י could mean that the vocalization was ʾanōḵ but the 1 common singular suffix on the *qatal* verbal pattern suggests that the first common singular independent pronoun may also have been vocalized ᵃnōḵī as in Hebrew. The verbal person marker is probably on analogy with the independent pronoun where the shift took place first: ʾanâḵu > *ʾanōḵu > *ʾanōḵi > ʾanōḵī.[29]

---

[25] See note in BHS ad loc.

[26] Cf., e.g., צִלָּה (Σελλα) and חַנָּה (Αννα).

[27] In Lachish 6, line 8, the letters אנכ can be made out, but the area to the left of the *kaph* is not legible. It is therefore unclear whether or not the word was spelled with a *yod* here. See Shmuel Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period* (Jerusalem: Carta, 2008), 80.

[28] This does not mean that the Phoenician 1cs pronoun did not end with a high vowel. Poenulus transcribes 1cs perfects with a final *-thi* (e.g., Poen 940a/930). The change of the perfect ending from *-tŭ to *-tĭ reflects an earlier rounding and raising in the pronoun from ʾanākŭ to ʾanōkŭ to ʾanōkĭ (see Naʾama Pat-El and Aren Wilson-Wright, "The Features of Canaanite: A Reevaluation," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 166 [2016]: 41–55, at 42–43). The spelling אנכי is also attested in Samalian alongside אנך (KAI 215:19; cf. KAI 214:1; see Josef Tropper, *Die Inschriften von Zincirli: Neue Edition und vergleichende Grammatik des phönizischen, samʾalischen und aramäischen Textkorpus* [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1993], 189).

[29] Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past*, 395. On the Phoenician and Punic pronunciations of the pronoun, see Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, 38–40.

In addition, *a-nu-ki* is attested in the Canaanite of the Amarna letters.[30] אנך in V may therefore be a purely orthographic variant, rather than reflecting a different pronunciation of the pronoun. Be that as it may, this spelling is entirely without parallel in the known manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible and is instead in line with the epigraphic norm.

ותשתחו *(D 2:8)*

In V, we find the plural form ותשתחו where we might expect to find ותשתחוו with two *vav*s. This anomalous orthography for the plural is, in fact, attested four times in the *ketiv* of MT: Gen 27:29a, 43:28; 1 Kgs 9:9; Neh 8:6. In each case, the *qere* reflects the conventional form.[31] Similarly, most MT manuscripts of 1 Sam 1:28 have וישתחו, even though its antecedent must either be plural or feminine singular. Several Hebrew manuscripts read וישתחוו with two *vav*s;[32] the Syriac, Vulgate, and Lucianic recension of LXX all reflect the plural as well.[33]

Also notable is the widely attested tendency in biblical Hebrew orthography to avoid two consecutive *vav*s. For example, the plural of מצוה appears 123 times in MT in its various inflections. Despite the feminine plural suffix almost always being written plene (ות), a full 122 occurrences of these 123 are written defectively: מצות. The sole exception is found in a decidedly Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) context – the book of Nehemiah (9:14).[34] V's defective spelling of ותשתחו is consistent with this orthographic convention.[35]

הוא *(D 2:6, et passim)*

Throughout V, the independent third-person singular pronoun is written הוא. This is true irrespective of the gender of the referent. Notably, this orthography differs from that of V's supposed model – the Mesha Stele – where the word is

---

[30] Anson F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan, Vol. 1: Orthography, Phonology, Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Pronouns, Nouns, Numerals* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 48.

[31] This is hardly an isolated phenomenon. The form עתה appears more than 400 times in MT, whereas the common spelling in the epigraphic record is עת. The archaic form is attested twice in the *ketiv* (Ezek 23:43; Ps 74:6); in both cases, the *qere* provides the conventional form. For more on the modernizing tendency of the *qere*, see Maimon Cohen, *The Kethib and Qeri System in the Biblical Text* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2007), 312–13; Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 67.

[32] Kennicott 4, 95, 173.

[33] In 4Q51, the word in the position of וישתחו is mostly illegible, while an additional verb, seemingly ותשתחוו, appears nearby: |הו שם ותשתח|ו...|.

[34] We thank Geoffrey Khan for bringing this phenomenon to our attention.

[35] See also the *ketiv* ויצו (*qere* וַיְצַוּ) in Judg 21:20. In MT, the tendency to avoid dual *vav*s is even more prominent in medial positions. Compare, for instance, תְּצֻם in Deut 32:46 and תְּצַוֻּנִי in Isa 45:11 with וַיַּכּוּם וַיַּכְּתוּם in Num 14:45.

spelled הא. The defective spelling is also found in all other known inscriptions prior to the fifth-century BCE Aramaic Elephantine papyri.[36]

In most of the books of the Hebrew Bible, we find הוא for masculine and היא for feminine, with almost no exceptions. In the Masoretic text of the Pentateuch, on the other hand, the pronoun pointed as *hī* is spelled with a medial *vav* 192 times vs. 19 times with a *yod*. (In SP, these are almost always spelled היא.)

In a recent article, Steven Fassberg provides new evidence that feminine/common הוא reflects an early dialectal feature. He concludes:

> Because the 3fs *Kethiv* הוא is for all intents and purposes limited to the Pentateuch, and because the Pentateuch crystallized earlier than the Prophets and the Writings, one must deduce that the *Kethiv* הוא is evidence for an early dialectal form that later disappeared in Biblical Hebrew.[37]

The presence of the form הוא for both male and female in V is consistent with Fassberg's analysis.[38] This spelling is not attested in known Hebrew inscriptions from the First Temple period. However, in the Old Aramaic inscription from Bukân, which Lemaire dates to ca. 700 BCE, we find a single instance of plene הוא alongside three examples of defective הא.[39]

לקראת (D 1:2, 2:1, 7; H 1:7)

Most scholars believe the preposition לקראת is derived from the root *qry*.[40] The word is attested only once in the epigraphic record, where it is written without an *aleph* (Siloam 4, אש לקרת רעו). In all known versions of the Hebrew Bible, it is written systematically with an *aleph*.[41] The orthography in V here is thus consistent with that of Biblical Hebrew, but not with the sole attestation of the word in the ancient epigraphic corpus.

---

[36] The spelling in the Elephantine corpus is almost always הו for male and הי for female.

[37] Steven E. Fassberg, "The Kethiv/Qere הִוא, Diachrony, and Dialectology," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller and Ziony Zevit (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 171–80, at 177–78.

[38] That הוא was used for both male and female referents in antiquity was suggested at least as early as 1861. See William Henry Green, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language* (New York: John Wiley, 1861), 96. For more literature, see the history of research cited in Fassberg, "The Kethiv/Qere הִוא," 171–73.

[39] See André Lemaire, "Une inscription araméenne du VIIIe siècle av. J.-C. trouvée à Bukân (Azerbaïdjan iranien)," *Studia Iranica* 27, no. 1 (1998): 15–30, at 21, et passim. The plene instance is at the end of a sentence, while the other three are not.

[40] See, e.g., BDB and HALOT, ad loc.

[41] 1QIsaᵃ typically includes the *aleph*, with Isa 14:9 being the single exception. In the Masoretic vocalization scheme, this *aleph* is not articulated.

6.2. Verbal Morphosyntax

In this section we discuss various verbal morphosyntactic features in V that differ from the norm in the Hebrew Bible.

6.2.1. The *wəqāṭal* Construction

In D 2:6–3:3, V has a series of *wəqāṭal* forms indicating what appears to be the simple/narrative past tense, which is more commonly indicated by a *wayyiqṭōl* verb in CBH:

וְיָצְאוּ בעת ההוא בנת מאב ונשי מדין [...] **וחרה** אף אלהם עלכם וינף בכם בעת ההוא מנפה גדלה • **ושלחתי** מכם אנשם ללחם את המדינם **והכתם** אתם לפי חרב **ושבתם** מאתם שבי הרבה למאד ותעצר המגפה •

At that time, the daughters of Moab and women of Midian **came out** [...] Elohim's anger then **burned** against you, and he inflicted upon you at that time a great plague. I **sent** from among you people to fight the Midianites, and you **smote** them by the sword's edge, and you **took** from them a great many captives. The plague then ended.

Likewise, in E 3:2, we find the *wəqāṭal* verb ושבתי in a context in which we might have expected either שבתי השבעי וביום or ואשבת:[42]

• [כי • ש]שת • ימם • עשתי • את השמם • ואת הארץ • וכל • אשר • בם • **ושבתי** • ביום • השבעי •

[For in s]ix days I made the heaven and the earth and all that is in them, and I **rested** on the seventh day.

The use of non-iterative simple past *wəqāṭal* is very rare in LBH, and nonexistent in postbiblical Hebrew.[43] Joosten argues that non-iterative past tense *wəqāṭal* is an internal Hebrew innovation that concludes in the Hellenistic period, and accordingly *wəqāṭal* and *wayyiqṭōl* "must be regarded as free variants representing different, though overlapping, periods of the Hebrew Bible."[44] Therefore, the appearance of *wəqāṭal* in V to express non-iterative simple past may appear to be late, or even modern.[45]

The use of *wəqāṭal* to indicate non-iterative simple past is, however, attested in the Hebrew Bible, as noted by a number of scholars, including Joosten, who

---

[42] Cf. Exod 20:11 (וַיָּנַח [...] עָשָׂה יָמִים שֵׁשֶׁת וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים עָשָׂה) and Exod 31:17 (שָׁבַת וַיִּנָּפַשׁ). The suffix conjugation ושבת could in fact be a perfect form preceded by a *vav*, rather than a simple past *wəqāṭal*. The verbs used in the passages leading up to the Decalogue in Deuteronomy also use the suffix conjugation (דִּבֶּר ... כָּרַת).

[43] Jan Joosten, *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose*, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 10 (Jerusalem: Simor, 2012); Kasper Siegismund, "Anterior *Weqatal* in the Hebrew Bible and the Qumran Documents," *Hebrew Studies* 58 (2017): 199–220.

[44] Joosten, *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 225.

[45] Adolf Neubauer, "The Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," *The Academy* 589 (August 18, 1883), 116; Rabinowicz, "Shapira Forgery Mystery," 179; Jan Joosten, personal communication. Neubauer also argued ("Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116) that the verb שבת is semantically inapt here: "The root *shaboth* does not mean 'to rest' but 'to cease from work,' and in this sense only it is found in the Old Testament. The forger made a blunder in not leaving the root *noah*

observes that *wəqāṭal* can indicate a single event in the past.[46] The following are examples of *wəqāṭal* being used for the simple past in biblical narration:[47]

וְהוּרַד הַמִּשְׁכָּן **וְנָסְעוּ** בְנֵי גֵרְשׁוֹן וּבְנֵי מְרָרִי נֹשְׂאֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן:

And the tabernacle **was taken down**, and the Gershonites and the Merarites, carriers of the tabernacle, **set out.** (Num 10:17)

וַיָּבֹא עַד הָאֹהֶל וַיַּכֵּהוּ וַיִּפֹּל וַיַּהַפְכֵהוּ לְמַעְלָה **וְנָפַל** הָאֹהֶל:

It came to the tent and hit it. It turned it upside down, and the tent **collapsed.** (Judg 7:13)

There is some internal biblical evidence that past-tense *wəqāṭal* is a comparatively early feature that was displaced in later stages. One such example is found in 2 Kgs 18:36, which has *wəqāṭal* וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ:

וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ הָעָם וְלֹא עָנוּ אֹתוֹ דָּבָר כִּי מִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ הִיא לֵאמֹר לֹא תַעֲנֻהוּ:

And the people **kept silent** and did not answer a word, for the king's command was, "Do not answer him."

In the parallel passage in MT Isa 36:21, we find the standard *wayyiqṭōl* – וַיַּחֲרִישׁוּ – in what is likely an instance of linguistic updating:

וַיַּחֲרִישׁוּ וְלֹא עָנוּ אֹתוֹ דָּבָר כִּי מִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ הִיא לֵאמֹר לֹא תַעֲנֻהוּ:

And they **kept silent** and did not answer a word, for the king's command was, "Do not answer him."

The ancient editor responsible for this emendation in MT Isaiah may have shared the evaluation of Bernhard Stade, who wrote in 1886: "וְהֶחֱרִישׁוּ הָעָם וְלֹא עָנוּ

---

as in the received text." Neubauer may have overlooked Gen 2:2–3 and especially Exod 31:17, in both of which the verb שבת is applied to YHWH/Elohim in precisely the same context. In the latter of these two, שבת takes no complement (e.g., מִכָּל מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה) and is fully analogous to V's version. If the text in Exod 31:17 is not a blunder, then neither is that of V. Furthermore, as noted in all modern lexicons, שבת can indeed mean "rest," rather than "cease" – especially in relation to the Sabbath.

[46] Joosten, *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 223–25. See also Arie Rubinstein, "The Anomalous Perfect with Waw-Conjunctive in Biblical Hebrew," *Biblica* 44, no. 1 (1963): 62–69, at 68n2: "It is difficult to accept Driver's view that our anomalous construction [*wəqāṭal*] occurs only on 'exceedingly rare occasions' in the early books of the O. T. According to his own enumeration (*Tenses*, pp. 161–62), the construction occurs 36 times in the early books of the O. T. The two articles by Stade contain at least another 12 certain instances of the anomalous construction in 2 Kings. [...] We thus obtain a total of 49 in the early books, which is not by any means a negligible number. Nor is our enumeration exhaustive (cf. GK, loc. cit.)."

[47] Other examples are Gen 15:6, 21:25, 31:7, 38:5; Exod 39:3; Num 10:17–18, 21–22, 25; Judg 16:18, 19:8; 1 Sam 1:12, 17:38; 2 Sam 13:18, 12:31, 13:18.

[ist] eine barbarische Construction."[48] 1QIsa[a], for its part, shows no sign of such updating:

ותחרישו ולוא ענו אותוה דבר כיא מצות המלך היה לאמור לוא תענוהו:

The version in 2 Kings provides clear precedent for the forms we find in V, and the Isaiah version illustrates how the biblical text undergoes updating. One can only speculate how many early and uncommon biblical Hebrew forms are unknown to us due to this process. Additional support for the existence of anterior *wəqāṭal* in Hebrew may be found in the epigraphic record. For instance, Arad 16, an early monarchic text, contains a temporal clause referring to a single past event followed by a *wəqāṭal* verb:

כצאתׄי מֵבֵיתך • ושלחתי את ספ[ר] זכה •

When I left your house, I **sent** a written receipt.[49]

In biblical Hebrew, when past events are described, the temporal clause is never followed by a past-tense *wəqāṭal*, as it is in Arad 16:3.[50] See the following biblical examples, where the temporal clause is followed by a *wayyiqṭōl* verb indicating a single event in the past.

כִּשְׁמֹעַ עֵשָׂו אֶת דִּבְרֵי אָבִיו וַיִּצְעַק צְעָקָה גְּדֹלָה וּמָרָה עַד מְאֹד וַיֹּאמֶר לְאָבִיו בָּרֲכֵנִי גַם אָנִי אָבִי:

When Esau heard his father's words, he **cried out** a terribly great and bitter cry, and he said to his father, "Bless me too, father!" (Gen 27:34)

'5

וַיְהִי כְּהוֹצִיאָם אֶת הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה אֶל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל כָּל אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל קְצִינֵי אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה הֶהָלְכוּא אִתּוֹ קִרְבוּ שִׂימוּ אֶת רַגְלֵיכֶם עַל צַוְּארֵי הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה

When they brought out these kings to Joshua, Joshua **called** all the Israelites, and he said to the chiefs of the warriors who had gone with him, "Come hither and put your feet on the necks of these kings." (Josh 10:24a)

Another non-biblical example of anterior *wəqāṭal* is found in the Yavne-Yam ostracon, lines 4–5:[51]

---

[48] Bernhard Stade, "Miscellen," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 6 (1886): 122–89, at 183.

[49] Arad 16:3–5. Transcription and translation following Anat Mendel-Geberovich et al., "A Brand New Old Inscription: Arad Ostracon 16 Rediscovered via Multispectral Imaging," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 378 (2017): 113–25, at 114–18. See discussion of tense in ibid., 117.

[50] When *wəqāṭal* is used, it is modal and refers to future actions. See, for example, Jer 51:61: וַיֹּאמֶר יִרְמְיָהוּ אֶל שְׂרָיָה כְּבֹאֲךָ בָבֶל וְרָאִיתָ וְקָרָאתָ אֵת כָּל הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה "And Jeremiah said to Seraiah: When you come to Babylon, see that you read all these words."

[51] Mhsh 1:5. Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past*, 159.

ויקצר עבדך ויכל **ואסם** כימם • לפני שבת

And your servant harvested and finished/measured and **stored** in the granary as always before the Sabbath.

A number of scholars have struggled to explain the form ואסם. Naveh proposed that it is a 1cs imperfect form, but the shift from third person (ויכל, ויקצר) to first makes this interpretation unlikely.[52] Dobbs-Allsopp et al.[53] suggested that this is either an infinitive absolute[54] or a conjunction with the suffix conjugation, namely *wəqāṭal* for a single past event.

Rainey and Aḥituv argue for a different explanation. Rainey takes the verb ואסם to be a third-person suffix conjugation, but he interprets the verbal string as "measure in order to store."[55] According to this understanding, the *wəqāṭal* does not follow chronologically upon the preceding *wayyiqṭōl*. Aḥituv elaborates upon this idea:

There is no biblical verb from this root [...] The attested form in this present text [...] is most likely third person form [*sic*] of the suffix conjugation, joined by the simple conjunction to the preceding verb וְאָסַם. By this means the forms represent an action that is coeval with the measuring. One measured in order to store. The storing was not looked upon as a further step in the process but as part of the same process (cf. Gen. 2:6).[56]

Rainey and Aḥituv both appear to be struggling here with the possibility that *wəqāṭal* might indicate anteriority, considering the widespread view that this function is reserved exclusively for *wayyiqṭōl* in Classical Biblical Hebrew. This interpretation is, however, improbable. There is no reason to suggest that the act of storing is coeval with the act of measuring (or with the completion of harvesting). The activities indicated in the inscription are successive actions in the past: "your servant harvested, measured, and stored."

The use of *wəqāṭal* to indicate simple past is not surprising from a comparative Semitic point of view. Past-tense *qāṭal* is an innovation of West Semitic[57] and is

---

[52] Joseph Naveh, "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.," *Israel Exploration Journal* 10 (1960): 129–39.

[53] F. W. Dobbs-Allsop et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 361.

[54] Following Frank Moore Cross, Jr.„ "Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B. C.: II. The Murabbaʿât Papyrus and the Letter Found near Yabnehyam," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 165 (1962): 34–46, at 44n43.

[55] Anson F. Rainey, "Syntax and Rhetorical Analysis in the Hashavyahu Ostracon," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 27, no. 1 (2000): 75–79, at 78.

[56] Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past*, 161. Rainey ("Syntax and Rhetorical Analysis," 78) similarly interprets the verbal string as "measure in order to store."

[57] John Huehnergard and Naʾama Pat-El, "Introduction to the Semitic Languages and Their History," in *The Semitic Languages*, ed. John Huehnergard and Naʾama Pat-El, 2nd ed. (Milton: Routledge, 2019), 1–21, at 7.

attested in related languages as well as in our earliest Canaanite records,[58] and as shown above, it is also found in Classical and epigraphic Hebrew. The use of *wəqāṭal* for iterative past is likely an internal Hebrew development.[59] Past-tense *wəqāṭal* is, therefore, not necessarily a sign of lateness, but rather it can indicate conservativeness.

Neubauer suggested that V's use of *wəqāṭal* for past tense was evidence of forgery, writing sarcastically: "Evidently the Moabite writer did not make use of Dr. Driver's excellent work on the Hebrew tenses."[60] True enough. Neither did the author of Arad 16, for that matter, or those of the other ancient texts in which past-tense *wəqāṭal* is found.

6.2.2. The *(wə-)yiqṭōl* Construction

V's use of *wəqāṭal* where MT would typically have *wayyiqṭōl* is mirrored in its use of *(wə-)yiqṭōl* where the Masoretic norm is *wəqāṭal*. In MT, future events (whether indicative or subjunctive) are typically indicated with *wəqāṭal* verbs in initial position. For instance, in Gen 13:16 we find: וְשַׂמְתִּי אֶת זַרְעֲךָ כַּעֲפַר הָאָרֶץ "I *will make* your offspring like the dust of the earth," and in Isa 11:1: וְיָצָא חֹטֶר מִגֵּזַע יִשָׁי "A shoot **shall come out** from the stump of Jesse." This is generally true also for the Hebrew of V, as in the following example:

ועגו כל העם|ן ואמרו אמן

And all the peo[ple] shall call out "Amen." (G 4:1, et passim)

Nevertheless, there are several cases in which V instead has *(wə-)yiqṭōl* for future events:

ויספו הלוים ויענו ויאמרו בקל |רם]

The Levites **shall continue** and **call out** in a [loud] voice.[61] (G 4:10–11)

---

[58] In Amarna, statives of transitive verbs are used to mark the past, which is not their function in Akkadian (William L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets" [PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1950], 51). In the Deir 'Alla inscription, which dates to the ninth or eighth century BCE, we find a series of *wəqāṭal* verbs that are understood to be preterites: ואמרו • מועד • שדין • ונצבו • אתיחדו • אל|ה]ן "The go[d]s congregated; SHDYN stood in assembly. And they said…"

[59] See Jan Joosten, "The Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System," in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 135–48, at 136–37 for a possible path.

[60] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116.

[61] It is not impossible that ויספו is *wəqāṭal* וְיָסְפוּ, but the other verbs are unambiguously prefix conjugation. Furthermore, in serial verb chains with two finite verbs, such as these, all verbs typically agree in form. It is, therefore, likely that all verbs in this example are in fact prefix conjugation.

ויתרך אלהם רק לטבה על האדמה |הטבה אשר אלהם אלהי או|בתכם נתן לכם

Elohim **will make you abound** only in goodness upon the [good] land [that Elohim, god of your fa]thers, is giving you. (G 5:6–7)

ויסבו הלוים את פנהם נגד הר עב|ל| **ויענו ויאמרו** בקל רם

The Levites **shall then turn** to stand opposite Mount Eb[al] and **call out** in a loud voice. (G 5:7–8)

ויספו הלוים לקרא בקל רם **ויאמרו**

The Levites **shall continue** calling out in a loud voice and **say…** (H 1:7)

Fortuitously, these passages have counterparts in Deuteronomy, allowing us to straightforwardly compare the forms. Indeed, where V has *(wə-)yiqṭōl*, Deuteronomy has *wəqāṭal*:[62]

וְעָנ֣וּ הַלְוִיִּ֗ם וְאָֽמְר֛וּ אֶל־כָּל־אִ֥ישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל ק֥וֹל רָֽם׃

The Levites **shall then call out** in a loud voice to all the Israelites. (Deut 27:14)

וְהוֹתִֽרְךָ֩ יְהוָ֨ה לְטוֹבָ֜ה בִּפְרִ֣י בִטְנְךָ֗ וּבִפְרִ֧י בְהַמְתְּךָ֛ וּבִפְרִ֥י אַדְמָתֶ֖ךָ עַ֣ל הָאֲדָמָ֑ה אֲשֶׁ֨ר נִשְׁבַּ֧ע יְהוָ֛ה לַאֲבֹתֶ֖יךָ לָ֥תֶת לָֽךְ׃

YHWH **shall make you abound** in goodness, in the fruit of your womb, in the fruit of your livestock, and in the fruit of your ground in the land that YHWH swore to your ancestors to give you. (Deut 28:11; cf. Deut 30:9)

The functional overlap between *wəqāṭal* and *(wə-)yiqṭōl* in MT is well documented. Joosten notes not only the various functions these two forms share, but also the fact that they often co-occur.[63] Since the two are never in functional opposition, he concludes that they are allomorphs, occupying different positions in the sentence: "WEQATAL occupies the first position in the clause, YIQTOL in

---

[62] It must be noted that the first in the series of four speech acts by the Levites in V appears with *wəqāṭal* verbs, unlike the following three. Deuteronomy, which lacks the list of blessed behaviors and puts the blessings and curses themselves in Moses's mouth, preserves only one of the four Levitical speech acts.

[63] Jan Joosten, *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose* (Jerusalem: Simor, 2012), 263.

principle a non-first position."[64] There are, however, examples of initial future
(wə-)yiqṭōl in MT. For instance:

וְעָשׂוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת הַפָּסַח בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ:

The Israelites **shall keep** the passover at its appointed time. (Num 9:2)

וְשָׁמְעוּ הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְכֹל יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ וְנָסַבּוּ עָלֵינוּ וְהִכְרִיתוּ אֶת שְׁמֵנוּ מִן הָאָרֶץ וּמַה תַּעֲשֵׂה לְשִׁמְךָ הַגָּדוֹל:

The Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the land **will hear** of it, and surround us, and
cut off our name from the earth. Then what will you do for your great name? (Josh 7:9)

וְיִתֵּן יְהוָה גַּם אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל עִמְּךָ בְּיַד פְּלִשְׁתִּים וּמָחָר אַתָּה וּבָנֶיךָ עִמִּי גַּם אֶת מַחֲנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִתֵּן יְהוָה בְּיַד פְּלִשְׁתִּים:

YHWH **will give** Israel along with you into the hands of the Philistines; and tomorrow you
and your sons shall be with me; YHWH will also give the army of Israel into the hands of
the Philistines. (1 Sam 28:19)

וְיִתְּנוּ לָנוּ שְׁנַיִם פָּרִים וְיִבְחֲרוּ לָהֶם הַפָּר הָאֶחָד וִינַתְּחֻהוּ וְיָשִׂימוּ עַל הָעֵצִים וְאֵשׁ לֹא יָשִׂימוּ וַאֲנִי אֶעֱשֶׂה אֶת הַפָּר הָאֶחָד וְנָתַתִּי עַל הָעֵצִים וְאֵשׁ לֹא אָשִׂים:

Two bulls **shall be given** to us; **they shall choose** one bull for themselves, *they shall cut it*
in pieces, and *they shall lay it* on the wood, but put no fire to it. I will prepare the other
bull and lay it on the wood, but put no fire to it. (1 Kgs 18:23)

וּבָא שֹׁדֵד אֶל כָּל עִיר וְעִיר לֹא תִמָּלֵט וְאָבַד הָעֵמֶק וְנִשְׁמַד הַמִּישֹׁר אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה:

The destroyer **shall come** upon every town, and no town shall escape; the valley shall
perish, and the plain shall be destroyed, as YHWH has spoken. (Jer 48:8)

וְאֶתְּנֵךְ לְחָרְבָּה וּלְחֶרְפָּה בַּגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר סְבִיבוֹתָיִךְ לְעֵינֵי כָּל עוֹבֵר:

I **will make** you a desolation and an object of mocking among the nations around you, in
the sight of all that pass by. (Ezek 5:14)

That the future/modal semantics of both *yiqṭōl* and *wəqāṭal* forms is to be
dated to proto-Hebrew is not in question.[65] Notarius demonstrates that most oc-
currences of *yiqṭōl* in archaic biblical poetry express the "imperfective," which
covers present/immediate future.[66] In any case, occurrences of prospective fu-
ture, and future more generally, are not very common in the MT.[67] Like MT, V

---

[64] Ibid., 264.

[65] Tania Notarius, "Prospective 'weqatal' in Biblical Hebrew: Dubious Cases or Unidentified
Category?" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 34, no. 1 (2008): 39–55; Bo Isaksson, "The
So-called we-qatal Conjugation in Biblical Hebrew Once Again," *Kleine Untersuchungen zur
Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 19 (2015): 71–117.

[66] Tania Notarius, *The Verb in Archaic Biblical Poetry: A Discursive, Typological, and Histor-
ical Investigation of the Tense System* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 282. Notarius further argues that
the prospective uses of *qāṭal* in her corpus (e.g., in Deut 32:22) is discourse conditioned, for
example, within a prophetic poetic speech (ibid., 268).

[67] Notarius, "Prospective 'weqatal,'" 41.

preserves some archaic functions of these forms. And although *yiqṭōl* is not common in V, it nevertheless appears in contexts where MT would generally have a *wəqāṭal* verb.

Already in LBH, the use of *yiqṭōl* increases at the expense of *wəqāṭal*, foreshadowing the disappearance of *wəqāṭal* in Mishnaic Hebrew. The first semantic feature to be lost was iterative *wəqāṭal*,[68] followed by the decline and subsequent disappearance of modal and prospective *wəqāṭal* in postbiblical Hebrew.[69] In Mishnaic Hebrew, *yiqṭōl* and *qāṭal* are in functional opposition; *wəqāṭal* does not indicate futurity/modality, but rather a combination of the coordinating particle *wə-* and a following past tense verb.[70] The only context in which *qāṭal* can have non-past reference in Mishnaic Hebrew is in conditional sentences.[71]

It is worth noting that the use of *yiqṭōl* for future is attested in the epigraphic record. For example:

וברח אל בר[...] **וימסן** הרם [...] **וידקן** גבנם

When El rises [...] the mountains **shall melt** [...] the peaks **shall be crushed**. (Kuntillet ʿAjrud 15:1–3)

Were this a biblical (MT) text, we would expect to find ונמסו הרים, etc., in the *wəqāṭal*. For instance, Isa 34:2 contains the very same idiom, reading: וְחַלְלֵיהֶם יֻשְׁלְכוּ וּפִגְרֵיהֶם יַעֲלֶה בָאְשָׁם וְנָמַסּוּ הָרִים מִדָּמָם "Their slain shall be cast out, the stench of their corpses shall rise, and the mountains shall melt from their blood."[72]

Since the future semantics of *yiqṭōl* and verb-first word order are both West Semitic features, it is possible that the prevalence of the non-initial position of *yiqṭōl* in MT is an innovation of standard Biblical Hebrew.

In summary, V's use of the *(wə-)yiqṭōl* is somewhat anomalous in an MT context but is plausible for a First Temple–era text.

---

[68] Joosten, "The Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL," 135–48.

[69] Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959), 269; Uri Mor, *Judean Hebrew: The Language of the Hebrew Documents from the Judean Desert* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2015), 280–81; Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 369–70.

[70] Moses H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 150.

[71] Moshe Azar, *The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1995), 7.

[72] See also Samaria 111:3. In many cases, V has *yiqṭōl + (wə-)yiqṭōl*, where the familiar Hebrew Bible manuscripts would have *yiqṭōl + wəqāṭal*. Compare H 1:3–4 (אֱ**ויש** יחמד אשר האיש ארר רעהו אל אשת אלׁ "Cursed is the man who *desires* and *lusts after* the wife of his fellow") and Josh 6:26 (אָרוּר הָאִישׁ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר **יָקוּם וּבָנָה** אֶת הָעִיר הַזֹּאת אֶת יְרִיחוֹ "Cursed before YHWH is the man who *rises* and *builds* this city, Jericho"). Cf. also G 4:1–2 vs. Lev 20:18 and H 2:2 vs. Isa 27:6. There are no conclusive examples of *yiqṭōl + wəqāṭal* in the epigraphic record. (See Sandra Landis Gogel, *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998], 262–63.)

6.2.3. ללחם (D 3:1)

In V (D 3:1), we find ללחם in the G-stem (*qal*), not the expected N-stem (*niphal*) להלחם.[73] The use of G in the Hebrew Bible for this root (in the sense "to do battle") is exclusive to BH poetry (Pss 35:1; 56:2, 3). This is consistent with the form being an ancient one, considering that even late poems often preserve archaic forms, due to the conservative nature of the genre.[74] More direct evidence is found in the epigraphic record: the G is attested in the ninth-century BCE Phoenician KLMW inscription,[75] while the Gt is attested in the ninth-century BCE Mesha Stele[76] and apparently also the Aramaic Tel Dan inscription, which dates to the same period.[77] In LBH, the root is always in N, with the exception of one or two G forms in Qumran.[78] Typically, N has been seen as originally a middle or reflexive stem, which acquired a passive meaning as the G passive became increasingly rare and eventually disappeared. Since the N-stem produces low transitivity verbs,[79] the preference for G in V, if it is diachronically meaningful, could be an indication of the early use of this stem.[80]

---

[73] We thank Peter Machinist for bringing this example to our attention.

[74] Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 58–59.

[75] בת אבי • בי • במתכת • מלכם • אדרם • וכל • שלח • יד ללן|חם "My father's house was in the midst of great kings, and each of them was about to fight" (KLMW 5–6). We find the suggestion that לחם here refers to bread or eating unlikely. (See Terence Collins, "The Kilamuwa Inscription: A Phoenician Poem," *Die Welt des Orients* 6, no. 2 [1971]: 183–88, at 184n8.) The KLMW inscription was discovered during the 1888–1902 German expedition to Samʾal, after V was already known in Europe. KLMW shares other features with V: 1cs pronoun אנך, contracted diphthong in בת, word-separating dots, etc.

[76] ואהלך • בללה • בללה • ואלתחם • בה • מבקע • השחרת • עד • הצהרם (l. 15), "I went by night and fought against it from the crack of dawn till noon."

[77] אבי • יסק |יסק • עלוה • בהן|תלחמה, "my father went against him as they did battle" (Tel Dan 2).

[78] There is one certain and one potential instance of G among the Dead Sea Scrolls: 4Q468g f1 2:4–5 (|] -- לחם את הכרכים|) and 4Q161 f5 6:10 (בני קטורא פלטתן | בעלותו מבקעת עכו ללחם בי). An elision of the aspirant of the N infinitive may explain the latter example (for more on this phenomenon, see Eric D. Raymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013], 100ff.; Elisha Qimron, *A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Jerusalem: Yad Yizhak Ben-Zvi, 2018], 178–80), but the verb לחם (4Q468g f1 2:4–5) must be G. While aspirant elision cannot be ruled out for KLMW, this would seem to be uncharacteristic for the period. Such elision would likewise be out of place in V's orthographic/phonological scheme. Be that as it may, the forms in V and KLMW are identical, against MT's 43 instances of להלחם and zero instances of ללחם.

[79] Øyvind Bjøru, "Transitivity and the Binyanim," in *Proceedings of the Oslo-Austin Workshop in Semitic Linguistics*, ed. Lutz Edzard and John Huehnergard (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014), 48–63, at 55ff.

[80] According to Staps's recent survey of the biblical evidence on לחם (Camil Staps, "A Case Study of Reciprocal Middles in Biblical Hebrew: The Niphal of לחם," *Orientalia* 87, no. 2 [2018]: 159–87), direct objects designating humans are found exclusively with the *qal* form of the verb (ibid., 163). The same correspondence is evident in V; the *qal* verb לחם is followed by the direct object marker את, rather than the preposition *bə*- that is found with the N-stem (*niphal*) verb

6.2.4. Negation of the Jussive

In V, we find לֹא negating the jussive, rather than the typical BH אַל. For example, V has לא תצרם ולא תתגר בם מלחמה (D 1:6–7; cf. C 1:2, 6–7), whereas the corresponding Deuteronomic passage has אַל תְּצֻרֵם וְאַל תִּתְגָּר בָּם (Deut 2:19; cf. 2:5, 9). Since the jussive is typically negated with אַל, the use of לֹא could be seen as problematic for the claim that V is an ancient Hebrew text.[81]

The jussive is, however, attested with לֹא in CBH. See, for example, לֹא תָשֵׁב (Gen 24:8), לֹא תָחֹס (Deut 7:16), and וְלֹא יָמֵר (Ezek 48:14).[82] While some instances of the jussive in MT have been claimed to be a result of reanalysis,[83] others – such as the aforementioned three examples – are unlikely to be mispointed indicatives.[84] The possible usage of both אַל and לֹא with the jussive is noted in a number of grammatical works.[85] Joosten notes that "there is a certain amount of amalgamation" between the indicative and jussive.[86] He mentions the use of the negation לֹא with jussive forms, against expectations, as one of the clear signs of this merger.

Furthermore, the negation of the volitive jussive in LBH is אַל, although the syntax is freer: while negated jussives in CBH are overwhelmingly clause-initial, in LBH they are clause-internal in 50 percent of cases.[87] This is essentially the only context in which the jussive is kept functionally distinct from the indicative; in other positions they are largely conflated. In that sense, the syntax of the negated volitive subjunctive in V differs from LBH and is more similar to the syntax of CBH.

נלחם in the Hebrew Bible. It is possible that orthographic ambiguity allowed some *qal*s to be reinterpreted in MT as *niphal*s, e.g., וילחם את אפרים in Judg 12:4 and וילחמו את יואב in 2 Sam 11:17. (Both the verb forms and the את particles in these examples are ambiguous.)

[81] Thus Jan Joosten, personal communication.

[82] There are significantly more examples than are acknowledged in Ahouva Shulman, "The Function of the 'Jussive' and 'Indicative' Imperfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose," *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 13, no. 2 (2000): 168–80, at 169n7). Others are found in Gen 4:12; Deut 7:16, 13:1, 9, 18:16; 1 Sam 14:36; 1 Kgs 2:6; Hos 9:15; Ezek 5:11, 48:14; Joel 2:2. Most of these are listed in Gesenius, along with non-negated jussives for which the indicative is expected (§109d).

[83] At least some C-stem forms of the root *ysp* (יסף) are assumed to be an original *qal* imperfect indicative (**yawsup*), which through a series of sound changes ended up merging with the C-stem indicative *yōsip* (Gesenius §109d).

[84] All three verbs are written defectively, despite being hollow roots; plene spelling is typical for such roots in the indicative.

[85] E.g., Gesenius §109d; Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 567d; Joosten, *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 156–57; Steven E. Fassberg, *An Introduction to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2019), 77 (§170).

[86] Joosten, *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 334–35.

[87] Jan Joosten, "The Syntax of Volitive Verbal Forms in Qoheleth in Historical Perspective," in *The Language of Qohelet in Its Context: Essays in Honour of Prof. A. Schoors on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Angelika Berlejung and Pierre van Hecke (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 47–61, at 53.

6.2.5. Verbal Forms Following עד "Until"

There are a number of instances in V where the particle is followed by a conjugated verb:[88] עד תמו (B 1:9); עד אבד יאבד (G 1:6); and possibly עד לא השאר לו שרד (D 1:3, 2:1–2).[89] In CBH, the particle עד is typically followed by an infinitive construct.[90] There are, nevertheless, a number of instances of a conjugated verb in this position in CBH, similar to the usage exhibited in V. For example: עַד שָׁבוּ הָרֹדְפִים (Josh 2:22; cf. עַד שׁוֹב הָרֹדְפִים in 2:16) and עַד יָבוֹא (Hos 10:12).[91] Already in BH, and even more so in later Hebrew chronolects, the tendency is for a relative pronoun to follow עד when a conjugated verb is used; the use of עד with a conjugated verb and no relative particle in LBH is very rare. The syntax of the particle in V is thus consistent with CBH usage, but not with Second Temple or later Hebrew.[92]

6.2.6. ונכה עד (D 1:3)

The phrase ונכה עד לא השאר לו שרד lacks the expected accusative suffix or אותו and may therefore seen as problematic. (The corresponding passage in Deut 2:33 has וַנַּךְ **אֹתוֹ**.)

The absence of accusative suffixes, however, is well attested in all Semitic languages when the referent is recoverable from context.[93] For instance, in 2 Kgs 7:8, we find: וַיִּשְׂאוּ מִשָּׁם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב וּבְגָדִים וַיֵּלְכוּ **וַיַּטְמֻנוּ**, where we might have expected וַיַּטְמְנוּם. See also the *ketiv* in 1 Sam 7:9: ויעלה עולה; the *qere*, וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ, may reflect a "correction." The same phenomenon is found in the Yavne-Yam ostracon, a First Temple–era text:[94]

כאשר כל [ע]בדך את קצר **ואסם** כימם...

When your [se]rvant had measured <his> harvest and **stored** <it> in the granary as always...

---

[88] The form עד תם in B 1:7 is ambiguous due to the defective spelling in V and can be read as either a suffix-conjugation *tām* or an infinitive *tōm*.

[89] Cf. MT בִּלְתִּי הִשְׁאִיר (Deut 3:3) but LXX μη καταλιπειν with an aorist infinitive. The orthographic form השאר is ambiguous; it can be read as either *hišʾir* (hiphil, 3ms pf) or *hašʾēr* (hiphil, infAbs).

[90] Joüon and Muraoka §166k; Williams §311.

[91] See also KAI 224:6: והן לינ[שב]ן בארקך רקו שם **עד אהך** אנה וארקהם "And if they [do] not [dwell] in your land, *placate* (them) there, **until I come** and *placate* them." (See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1995], 136–37. Italics in original; boldface ours.)

[92] For more on the antiquity of this construction, see Naʾama Pat-El, "Historical Syntax of Aramaic: A Note on Subordination," in *Aramaic in Its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, ed. Holger Gzella and M. L. Folmer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 55–76, at 60.

[93] See Kyoji Tsujita, "The Retrospective Pronoun as Direct Object in Relative Sentences in Biblical Hebrew," in *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Alan S. Kaye (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 1577–82.

[94] Mhsh 1:5. Aḥituv, *Echoes from the Past*, 159–60.

6.2.7. לתת מפת (E 1:6)

Dershowitz reconstructs וְהָיוּ לְטֹטָפֹת בֵּין in E 1:6 (cf. Deut 6:8, והיו לתת מֹפֹת בין עינך
עֵינֶיךָ).[95] The position of the infinitive construct directly after the verb היה is un-
usual. A more typical formulation is found in יְהִי מְאֹרֹת בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַיּוֹם
וּבֵין הַלָּיְלָה (Gen 1:14), for instance, where a noun phrase precedes the infinitive.
Similar constructions are, however, found in MT. For example, וְהָיְתָה לִהְיוֹת לָהֶם
(Num 8:1).[96] וְהָיוּ לַעֲבֹד אֶת עֲבֹדַת יְהוָה (Exod 40:15) and מָשְׁחָתָם לִכְהֻנַּת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתָם
In addition, Dershowitz's reading produces a parallel in V between אות and מפת:
"Tie them as an אות upon your arms, and they shall serve as a מפת between your
eyes." אות and מוֹפֵת are a common word-pair in the Hebrew Bible – particularly in
Deuteronomy[97] – and the pair also appears elsewhere in V (B 1:2). It is notewor-
thy that נתן is the standard verb in the context of מופת. For example, **וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אוֹתֹת**
וּמֹפְתִים גְּדֹלִים וְרָעִים בְּמִצְרַיִם (Deut 6:22).[98]

6.3. *Nominal Morphosyntax*

In this section we review features of nominal morphosyntax that are unusual or
may reflect an erroneous use of Hebrew.

6.3.1. בלתי טפכם (B 1:5)

In MT, בלתי may occur with an infinitive as a negation of purpose or result clause
(e.g., לְבִלְתִּי שַׁלְחָם in Exod 19:17), in which case it is equivalent to the simple nega-
tion, לֹא.[99] However, it can also negate nouns directly as a privative negation (e.g.,
בִּלְתִּי כָלֵב בֶּן יְפֻנֶּה הַקְּנִזִּי וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּן נוּן in this passage's analogue in Num 32:11–12).
The same usage is also documented in Phoenician (בלתי אנך, KAI 13:5). This is
likely the original function of the preposition; it is neither a late innovation nor
is it erroneous.[100]

---

[95] Previous reconstructions were לתתוֹכֹת (Guthe) and לתתוהת (Shapira and Ginsburg). For
more, see the note on this phrase in the critical edition in chapter 7, 141n91.

[96] See also Num 7:5, 24:22; Deut 19:3; Judg 3:4, etc.

[97] Exod 7:3; Deut 4:34, 6:22, 7:19, 13:1–2, 26:8, 28:46, 29:3, 34:11; Isa 8:18, 20:3; Jer 32:20–
21; Pss 78:43, 105:27, 135:9; Neh 9:10.

[98] See also Exod 7:9; Deut 13:1; 1 Kgs 13:3, 5; Isa 8:18; Ezek 12:6; Joel 2:30; Neh 9:10; 2
Chr 32:24. Cf. Deut 28:46, where it is said of those who are cursed for not keeping the laws: וְהָיוּ
בְךָ לְאוֹת וּלְמוֹפֵת. We discuss the semantics of אות and מ(ו)פת in V and the Hebrew Bible in a future
article.

[99] This is its only function in Deuteronomy.

[100] Naʾama Pat-El ("On Negation in Phoenician," in *Linguistic Studies in Phoenician*, ed.
Robert D. Holmstedt and Aaron Schade [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013], 47–67, at 56
and 63, table 2) suggests that בלתי is a derivation from the negation particle *bal* with a final
t, which is resolved in proto-Hebrew as **bilt*, and in construct can assume the form *biltī*. The
particle *bal* is attested in all branches of Semitic as a nominal negation.

6.3.2. למאר (D 3:2; E 1:2–3)

This complex adverb occurs only in 2 Chr 16:14, where the preposition *lə-* is part of the complex preposition *'ad lə-* (עַד לְמְאֹד וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ לוֹ שְׂרֵפָה גְדוֹלָה "they made a large fire for him").[101] The adverb does not occur in the immediate subsequent Hebrew chronolects.[102]

　　While למאר is a hapax legomenon, the combination of the preposition *lə-* with an adverb is not uncommon in biblical texts from any period. See, for example, לְכֵן "therefore," לְאַט "gently, slowly," לְמָחָר "tomorrow," לְמַטָּה "below," and לִבְלִי "without." The same phenomenon is attested in Northwest Semitic inscriptions as well.[103] The combination of adverbs with prepositions is natural, and the use of למאר in V is not diachronically significant.

6.3.3. בעת הזאת (E 1:9)

A common biblical phrase for far temporal deixis, whether past or future, is בעת ההוא, and this is found several times in V (D 2:6, 10; D 3:3; G 2:2, 3). There is also a single instance of בעת הזאת in V: ואנך עמדת בין אלהם ובנכם בעת הזאת כי פחדת מפני האש (E 1:8–9). In the corresponding passage in Deuteronomy, we find אָנֹכִי עֹמֵד בֵּין יְהוָה וּבֵינֵיכֶם בָּעֵת הַהִוא (Deut 5:5; cf. Deut 10:10). Is בעת הזאת then a non-CBH feature? Hardly. Temporal phrases are not referential in the same way that nouns are, and זה and זאת function as both distal and proximal demonstratives almost interchangeably. For example, היום הזה and היום ההוא are used in comparable contexts: בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה בָּאוּ מִדְבַּר סִינָי (Gen 15:18) vs. בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא כָּרַת יְהוָה אֶת אַבְרָם בְּרִית (Exod 19:1; cf. Gen 7:11). Likewise, for instances such as וַיְהִי בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם (Exod 12:51) one might have expected בעצם היום ההוא, just as we would have expected בעת ההוא in V E 1:9. Similarly, there is no semantic difference between וַיִּכְבֵּד פַּרְעֹה אֶת לִבּוֹ גַּם בַּפַּעַם הַזֹּאת וְלֹא שִׁלַּח אֶת הָעָם in בפעם הזאת (Exod 8:28) and בפעם ההיא in וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֵלַי גַּם בַּפַּעַם הַהִוא (Deut 9:19, 10:10).[104]

6.3.4. Plural of אב "Father"

According to some reports, the two manuscripts of V diverge on the form the plural of אב "father" takes in E 4:2, with Vᵇ containing the unexpected form אבם

---

[101] The book of Chronicles is replete with the *'ad lə-* construction, which is absent in V. Indeed, 21 of 28 examples of *'ad lə-* in MT are found in Chronicles.

[102] This adverb is attested in the Palestinian *piyyut* literature (Michael C. Rand, *Introduction to the Grammar of Hebrew Poetry in Byzantine Palestine* [Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006], 376), but as a verbal modifier, unlike the syntax of the adverb in V.

[103] E.g., in Phoenician: אל יכן לם שרש למט ופר למעל "They shall not have a root below nor fruit above" (KAI 14:11–12; early 5th c. BCE).

[104] בעת הזאת appears only once in MT, and it is in an LBH text: Esth 4:14. The usage there is not comparable, however. Unlike V, where the phrase means "then" (far deixis), in Esther it means "now" (near deixis).

ăbīm and Vᵃ the typical אבת *ʾăbōt*.[105] The latter is the attested plural of this noun in all stages of Hebrew. The noun "father" is marked with a "feminine" plural in many other Semitic languages, including Aramaic (e.g., BibA *ʾăbāhātā*, Qumran *ʾbht*) and Sabaic (*ʾbwt* "elders" /*ʾabawāt*/?).[106] The only exceptions are Akkadian *abbū*[107] and Syriac, which allows a less common form *ʾabāhe* – likely a backformation from *ʾabāhātā*. While it is possible that אבם too is a backformation, it is not unlikely that it is erroneous, either a mistaken reading on the part of modern transcribers[108] or possibly an ancient scribal error.

6.3.5. Plural of Ethnonyms

In V, we find two plural construct chains in which an ethnonym is pluralized: נשי המדינם (D 2:9) and ערי הפרזם (D 2:3). For the first example, "Midianite women," one would expect either נָשִׁים מִדְיָנִיּוֹת or נְשֵׁי מִדְיָן (cf. Num 31:9). The second example requires some unpacking. In MT, the *resh* is pointed with a *qamets*, פְּרָזִי, giving us a phrase meaning "unwalled cities." However, in all but one of its other 24 occurrences in MT, פרזי unambiguously refers to the Perizzites and is pointed פְּרִזִּי.[109] One of these occurrences is particularly instructive; Josh 17:15 includes the phrase "the land of the Perizzites and the Rephaites":

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אִם עַם רַב אַתָּה עֲלֵה לְךָ הַיַּעְרָה וּבֵרֵאתָ לְךָ שָׁם בְּאֶרֶץ **הַפְּרִזִּי וְהָרְפָאִים** כִּי אָץ לְךָ הַר אֶפְרָיִם:

And Joshua said to them, "If you are indeed a large people, go up to the forest, and clear an area for yourselves there in **the land of the Perizzites and the Rephaites**, since the hill country of Ephraim is too narrow for you."

Compare this with D 2:3–5 in V:

לבד **מערי הפרזם** הרבה מאד וכל ערי המשר וכל הגלעד וכל הבשן עד סלכה ואדרעי • **ארץ רפאם** יִקְרֵא גם הוא כי עג מלך הבשן מיתר הרפאים נשאר

Besides the **פרזם** cities, very many, and all the towns of the tableland, the whole of the Gilead, and all of the Bashan, as far as Salecah and Edrei. (It too is called a **land of Rephaites**, for Og, King of the Bashan, had been one of the last remaining Rephaites.)

---

[105] See, e.g., Ginsburg, who wrote: "Instead of אבת […] one recension seems to have אבם" (Christian David Ginsburg, "The Shapira Ms. of Deuteronomy," *The Athenæum* 2911 [August 11, 1883], 178). For more on the two manuscripts of V, see critical edition of V (chapter 7).

[106] The plural is not attested in Ugaritic.

[107] For the gemination, see Wilson-Wright, "Father, Brother, and Father-in-Law," 28.

[108] Hermann Guthe (*Fragmente einer Lederhandschrift enthaltend Mose's letzte Worte an die Kinder Israel, mitgeteilt und geprüft von Hermann Guthe* [Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1883], 79) considers אבם but opts for the reading אבך with a *kaph*. Shapira wrote in a letter that the genesis of the reading אבם was an erroneous transcription on his part (BL Ms. Add. 41294 [Papers relative to M. W. Shapira's forged MS. of Deuteronomy], 28r).

[109] Gen 13:7, 15:20, 34:30; Exod 3:8, 17, 23:23, 33:2, 34:11; Deut 7:1, 20:17; Josh 3:10, 9:1, 11:3, 12:8, 17:15, 24:11; Judg 1:4–5, 3:5; 1 Kgs 9:20; Ezra 9:1; Neh 9:8; 2 Chr 8:7. The exception is 1 Sam 6:18. For similar forms, see Judg 5:7,11; Ezek 38:11; Zech 2:8; Esth 9:19.

V here places "the cities of the פרזם" in the list of conquered territories in a "land of the Rephaites."[110] In light of Josh 17:15, it seems likely that ערי הפרזם does not mean "unwalled cities," but rather "Perizzite cities," even if the Perizzites may themselves have been associated with unfortified settlements.[111]

Having determined that the pluralized head nouns in both ערי הפרזם and נשי המדינם are ethnonyms, we may compare them to the biblical Hebrew norm. Since head nouns in such construct chains are typically singular in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., לְבַד מֵעָרֵי הַפְּרָזִי in Deut 3:5), V's pluralized forms may be seen as curious.[112] But plural ethnonyms are, in fact, attested in the Bible, including in comparatively early texts. Examples include אֶרֶץ הָעִבְרִים (Gen 40:15), אֶרֶץ הַחִתִּים (Josh 1:4; Judg 1:26), עָרֵי הַלְוִיִּם (Lev 25:32–33; Josh 21:41), and מַלְכֵי הַחִתִּים (1 Kgs 10:29; 2 Kgs 7:6; 2 Chr 1:17).[113] V's forms are thus consistent with CBH.

6.3.6. Disagreement of Suffixed Pronoun with Its Referent

D 3:5 has ולא תגרעו **ממנו** לא תספו אל **מצותי**. The expected form is מהן, considering that the pronoun refers to the feminine plural מצותי. However, in the Hebrew Bible, the suffixed pronoun on ממנו does not always agree with its referent in terms of gender and number. See, for instance:

וְאֶת **מַתְכֹּנֶת הַלְּבֵנִים** אֲשֶׁר הֵם עֹשִׂים תְּמוֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם תָּשִׂימוּ עֲלֵיהֶם לֹא תִגְרְעוּ **מִמֶּנּוּ** כִּי נִרְפִּים הֵם עַל כֵּן הֵם צֹעֲקִים לֵאמֹר נֵלְכָה נִזְבְּחָה לֵאלֹהֵינוּ:

And their previous **quota of bricks [fs]** you shall impose upon them; do not lessen **it [ms]**, for they are slackers. This is why they cry, "Let us go sacrifice to our god." (Exod 5:8)

כֵּן תָּרִימוּ גַם אַתֶּם **תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה מִכֹּל מַעְשְׂרֹתֵיכֶם** אֲשֶׁר תִּקְחוּ מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּנְתַתֶּם **מִמֶּנּוּ** אֶת תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן:

In this way you too shall set apart the gift for YHWH from all **your tithes [fp]** that you take from the Israelites; from **it [ms]** you shall give the gift for YHWH to Aaron, the priest.[114] (Num 18:28)

Although we have seen that the same phenomenon is attested numerous times in MT, the Deuteronomic passages corresponding to this V text (Deut 4:2, 13:1)

---

[110] Gen 15:20 also juxtaposes the Perizzites with the Rephaites.

[111] It has been suggested that "Perizzites" originally denoted people living in exposed towns. See, e.g., Tomoo Ishida, "The Structure and Historical Implications of the Lists of Pre-Israelite Nations," *Biblica* 60, no. 4 (1979): 461–90, at 478–79 and the literature cited therein.

[112] Jan Joosten, personal communication. Note that the singular construction is also found in V (נשי מדין D 2:7).

[113] Note that we are only referring to plural of the ethnonym in a construct. For evidence that the pluralization of head and dependent is attested in other Northwest Semitic languages, see Stanley Gevirtz, "Of Syntax and Style in the 'Late Biblical Hebrew' – 'Old Canaanite' Connection," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 18 (1986): 25–29, at 28.

[114] See also Exod 25:15; Lev 6:7–8; Num 18:28; Josh 1:7, 23:14. The pattern לא/אל ... ממנו, which is found in the V passage, is also overrepresented in these biblical examples. We thank Noah Feldman for this observation.

have masculine singular דבר, rather than the feminine plural מצות found in V. It is possible that these are instances of linguistic updating, bringing the somewhat anomalous text of V in line with the contemporary norm.

6.4. Lexicon

In the following we offer comments on possible instances of lexical deviation from normative Classical Biblical Hebrew.

6.4.1. הון (E 3:8)

הון "wealth" occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in exilic and post-exilic contexts (Ezek 27:12; Prov 1:13). Its appearance in V has thus been cited as evidence that it cannot be a pre-exilic composition.[115]

However, we have no reason to assume a priori that the word's attestation in the exilic book of Ezekiel marks its *terminus post quem* in the Hebrew language. The etymology of this word is unclear; Koehler-Baumgartner's suggestion that it is related to Aramaic *hawn* "mind" is unlikely. Despite their superficial consonantal similarity, the lexemes have nothing in common semantically, calling into question the etymological association.[116] This lexeme also appears in Qumran Hebrew prose,[117] but is not attested in other post-Biblical Hebrew chronolects and the date of its entrance into the lexicon cannot be confidently determined.[118] It, therefore, cannot be used as a mark of late texts, as its origin and distribution remain a desideratum.

6.4.2. יבעל עם כל בהמה (G 5:12)

There are two potential issues with the use of the verb בעל in this phrase. First, the verb is transitive in MT, but in V it occurs with the preposition עם. Second, most dictionaries suggest that the primary meaning of the word is "to own," with a secondary meaning of "to marry, to take possession of a woman."[119] In V, on

---

[115] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116; Jan Joosten, personal communication.

[116] See Benjamin J. Noonan (*Non-Semitic Loanwords in the Hebrew Bible: A Lexicon of Language Contact* [University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2019]), who does not list הון as a borrowed lexeme.

[117] Joosten ("The Evolution of Literary Hebrew in Biblical Times: The Evidence of Pseudo-classicisms," in Miller and Zevit, *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, 286) lists הון as a poetic biblical lexeme, which alternates with the more common מָמוֹן in Qumran.

[118] הון is not listed as a late term in Avi Hurvitz, *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Innovations in the Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 160 (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

[119] Koehler-Baumgartner, vol. 1, 142b.

the other hand, בעל carries an evident sexual connotation, which is similar to its use in post-biblical Hebrew.

Regarding the first matter, free alternation of direct object and the preposition "with" is well attested for a number of Hebrew verbs, such as דִּבֶּר.[120] Notably, the same is true for the verb שָׁכַב, the common biblical verb denoting "to lie with." This verb can occur with either a direct object (e.g., Gen 34:2; Lev 15:18; Num 5:19, etc.) or the preposition "with" (Gen 39:7; Exod 22:15; Deut 22:22).[121] The MT parallel to G 5:12 uses a similar construction to V, but with the expected biblical verb: אָרוּר שֹׁכֵב עִם כָּל בְּהֵמָה (Deut 27:20). It is, therefore, likely that the verb בעל could occur with the same syntactic alternates.

As for the semantics of the verb, there are several passages in the Hebrew Bible in which בעל likely has a sexual implication, as it clearly does in V. An example is found in the slave laws of Deut 21:10–14:

כִּי תֵצֵא לַמִּלְחָמָה [...] וְרָאִיתָ בַּשִּׁבְיָה אֵשֶׁת יְפַת תֹּאַר וְחָשַׁקְתָּ בָהּ וְלָקַחְתָּ לְךָ לְאִשָּׁה: וַהֲבֵאתָהּ אֶל תּוֹךְ בֵּיתֶךָ [...]
וְיָשְׁבָה בְּבֵיתֶךָ [...] יֶרַח יָמִים וְאַחַר כֵּן תָּבוֹא אֵלֶיהָ **וּבְעַלְתָּהּ וְהָיְתָה לְךָ לְאִשָּׁה**:

When you go to war [...] should you notice among the captives a beautiful woman and desire her and take her to be a wife, you shall bring her to your house [...] and she shall stay in your house [...] for a month, after which you shall draw near to her and **have sex with her; then she shall become your wife**.

This passage discusses the legal procedure by which an Israelite man could acquire a captive woman for sexual purposes. According to this law, she must first be allowed to mourn her old life for a month, after which the man has sex with her (וּבְעַלְתָּהּ), and she becomes his wife or concubine (וְהָיְתָה לְךָ לְאִשָּׁה).[122] It thus appears that וּבְעַלְתָּהּ is not synonymous with וְהָיְתָה לְךָ לְאִשָּׁה. Rather than denoting marriage, בעל here suggests the *consummation* of marriage.

Another possible example is found in Deut 22:22–24, where two cases of extramarital sex are discussed. In the first, the man lies with "a בְּעֻלַת בַּעַל woman"; in the second, the woman is defined as נַעֲרָ בְתוּלָה מְאֹרָשָׂה לְאִישׁ "a virgin betrothed to a man." The difference between these cases appears to be that in the first, the woman has already had sex with her husband, while in the second, the marriage

---

[120] Aren Wilson-Wright, "A Reevaluation of the Semitic Direct Object Markers," *Hebrew Studies* 57 (2016): 7–15, at 10–11.

[121] Mishnaic Hebrew only allows direct objects with this verb.

[122] אִשָּׁה does not always refer to a legal wife. (See Bernard S. Jackson, "The 'Institutions' of Marriage and Divorce in the Hebrew Bible," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 56, no. 2 (2011): 221–51, esp. 234–35.) The inferior status of the woman is clear from v. 14, which specifies that if the man decides to end the relationship, he should set the woman free rather than sell her. Relying in part on this passage, Jay Caballero has recently argued that in the Deuteronomic law code, concubinage is possible only for unmarried female slaves, but not for debt slaves (Jay Caballero, "When a Man Wrongs a Woman: Slavery, Concubinage, and Divorce in the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy" [paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA, November 2019]). The verb עִנָּה is used elsewhere in Deuteronomy in reference to forced sex (Deut 22:24, 29).

has not yet been consummated, and the woman is still a virgin when she has illicit (but presumed consensual) intercourse.[123] That intercourse, rather than marriage, is the distinguishing factor between the cases is inferable from the fact that the second woman, who is said to be מְאֹרָשָׂה לְאִישׁ "*betrothed* to a man," is also described as אֵשֶׁת רֵעֵהוּ "the *wife* of his fellow" (v. 24). As Tigay writes: "she is considered her fiancé's wife (v. 24), and sexual relations with another man are considered adulterous."[124]

These examples suggest that one need not turn to rabbinic or later literature to find *comparanda* for V's usage of the verb בעל.

6.4.3. הֶחֱרַתְךָ (E 2:1)

The root חרר is only attested in nominal forms in MT (1 Kgs 21:8, 11; Isa 34:12; Jer 27:20, 39:6; Eccl 10:17; Neh 2:16, 4:14, 19, 5:7, 6:17, 7:5, 13:17). The absence of any biblical instances of this root in verbal forms has been cited as evidence for the forgery of V.[125] There are two objections to this assessment. First, the morphology of the verb in V is what we would expect for a Hebrew geminate root in the C-stem (*hiphil*). Furthermore, it is likely that verbs derived from this root were in use in Hebrew without being attested in MT, since in Mishnaic Hebrew the root is found as a *qal* participle (חרור "freed slave"; e.g., m. Qidd. 4:1), a *pual* participle (מחורר "free asset"; baraita cited in b. Ketub. 51b), and in various derivations of *šifʿel* (e.g., m. Yebam. 11:5). This diverse usage indicates that the root was quite active in some Hebrew dialects with a meaning associated with the nominal forms found in MT.[126] Second, the root is productive in other Semitic languages, including Arabic (*ḫurrun*), Ethiopic (*ḥarrāwī*), and Aramaic (*ḥērē*),[127] and is therefore likely a shared inheritance. Therefore, the root and its inflection should be considered native Hebrew.

---

[123] Bruce Wells (personal communication) suggests that the verb בעל in Prov 30:23 (תַּחַת שְׂנוּאָה כִּי תִבָּעֵל) also means sexual relations. He notes that שׂנואה typically refers to the lower ranking wife (Gen 29:31; Deut 21:15). Thus, in the upside-down world described in Prov 30:21–23, the detested wife becomes sexually desirable. (Cf. DCH, which includes the definition "take woman as sexual partner.")

[124] Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 207. Tigay adds that "the same view is found in Mesopotamian law" (ibid.).

[125] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116; Rabinowicz, "Shapira Forgery Mystery," 179.

[126] Semantically, V's version corresponds to Deut 7:8 (וַיִּפְדְּךָ מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים), Deut 13:6 (וְהַפֹּדְךָ מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים), and Mic 6:4 (וּמִבֵּית עֲבָדִים פְּדִיתִיךָ).

[127] See Carl Brockelmann ("Semitische Analogiebildungen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 67, no. 1 [1913]: 107–12, at 108) for the Aramaic form, and Chaim Rabin ("The Nature and Origin of the *šafʿel* in Hebrew and Aramaic," *Eretz-Israel* 9 [1969]: 148–58, at 149) for חרר in Semitic.

6.4.4. ‏וכל אשר לך/לו‎ (E 3:3–4, 4:6–7)

Neubauer, who believed the Shapira manuscripts to be clumsy forgeries, argued as follows: "The expressions 'and all thou hast' [‏וכל אשר לך‎] and 'anything that is his' [‏וכל אשר לו‎] are not classical Hebrew."[128] It is unclear what Neubauer found troubling about these ordinary CBH formulations. Both are attested in the Bible with identical forms and syntax, complete with pronominal suffixes and initial *vav* conjunctions. Some Pentateuchal examples follow:

וְעַתָּה הָשֵׁב אֵשֶׁת הָאִישׁ כִּי נָבִיא הוּא וְיִתְפַּלֵּל בַּעַדְךָ וֶחְיֵה וְאִם אֵינְךָ מֵשִׁיב דַּע כִּי מוֹת תָּמוּת אַתָּה **וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לָךְ**׃

Now return the man's wife, for he is a prophet. He will pray for you, and you will live. But if you do not return her, know that you will surely die – you **and all that you have**. (Gen 20:7)

וַיִּבְרַח הוּא **וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לוֹ** וַיָּקָם וַיַּעֲבֹר אֶת הַנָּהָר וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת פָּנָיו הַר הַגִּלְעָד׃

And he fled – he **and all that he had**. He started and crossed the river, and he set his face toward the hill country of Gilead. (Gen 31:21)

וְכִלְכַּלְתִּי אֹתְךָ שָׁם כִּי עוֹד חָמֵשׁ שָׁנִים רָעָב פֶּן תִּוָּרֵשׁ אַתָּה וּבֵיתְךָ **וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לָךְ**׃

I will provide for you there, for there remain five years of famine, so that you, your house-hold, **and all that you have** will not become destitute. (Gen 45:11)

וַיִּסַּע יִשְׂרָאֵל **וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לוֹ** וַיָּבֹא בְּאֵרָה שָּׁבַע וַיִּזְבַּח זְבָחִים לֵאלֹהֵי אָבִיו יִצְחָק׃

Israel set out with **all that he had**, then he arrived in Beer-sheba, and he offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac. (Gen 46:1)

Indeed, even the canonical Decalogues include the idiom, with only the complement following the *lə-* preposition differing:

לֹא תַחְמֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ לֹא תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ וְשׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ **וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ**׃

You shall not covet your fellow's house; you shall not covet your fellow's wife, or his male slave, or his female slave, or his ox, or his donkey, **or anything that is your fellow's**. (Exod 20:17)

וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אֵשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְלֹא תִתְאַוֶּה בֵּית רֵעֶךָ שָׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתוֹ שׁוֹרוֹ וַחֲמֹרוֹ **וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ**׃

And you shall not covet your fellow's wife, and you shall not desire your fellow's house, his field, or his male slave, or his female slave, his ox, or his donkey, **or anything that is your fellow's**. (Deut 5:21)

More generally, the use of אֲשֶׁר to nominalize a prepositional phrase is very common in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., וַאֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ בַּתֵּבָה [Gen 7:23], וְאֵל כָּל אֲשֶׁר עִמּוֹ [Gen

---

128 Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116.

35:2]).[129] These expressions are attested in many Semitic languages, including Classical Hebrew, Aramaic, Akkadian, and Arabic.[130]

6.4.5. עדת שקר (E 4:4; H 1:2)

In the biblical versions of the Decalogue, we find לֹא תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁקֶר (Exod 20:16) and וְלֹא תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֲךָ עֵד שָׁוְא (Deut 5:20). V, on the other hand, has עדת שקר in this context (E 4:4; H 1:2). The word in question has been parsed by scholars as the abstract noun עֵדוּת. This, in turn, was deemed by Neubauer to be impossible in a pre-rabbinic context.[131] Neubauer wrote: "The word *eduth*, עדות, is […] a rabbinical form."[132] This is incorrect; the form עדות appears in the Hebrew Bible, as well as in Sirach (see below). Others have made a more nuanced claim, namely that while the form עדות is attested in the Bible, it never conveys "testimony" in that corpus, as it commonly does in post-biblical Hebrew (e.g., פסולי עדות "unfit for testimony" Ket. 2:3), but rather connotes "covenant," "law," etc. Martin Heide, for instance, writes: "עדות in the general meaning of 'evidence' or 'testimony' occurs for the first time in post-biblical Hebrew, such as Sirach utters [sic] the invitation תן עדות למראש מעשיך 'give evidence of your deeds of old' (Sir 36:15)."[133] According to this interpretation, V uses an abstract noun "testimony," whereas MT prefers the concrete noun "witness." The ostensible fact that the meaning "testimony" is unattested in early texts has similarly been cited as evidence that the Shapira manuscripts are forged.

We suggest that this matter is moot; the word in question should be read as עֲדַת (construct of עֵדָה) "judgment, judicial decision," and not עֵדוּת "testimony."[134] The prohibition in V is against perverting court decisions by a presiding judge, not perjury by a witness. There are several internal and external lines of support for this position.

---

[129] That the relative particle can introduce an independent clause is quite well established. See Gesenius §138e.

[130] Naʾama Pat-El and Alexander Treiger, "On Adnominalization of Prepositional Phrases and Adverbs in Semitic," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 158, no. 2 (2008): 265–83.

[131] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116; Rabinowicz, "Shapira Forgery Mystery," 179. For a critique of this argument, see also Menahem Mansoor, "The Case of Shapira's Dead Sea (Deuteronomy) Scrolls of 1883," *Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters* 47 (1958): 183–225, at 211–12.

[132] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116.

[133] Martin Heide, "The Moabitica and Their Aftermath," in *New Inscriptions and Seals Relating to the Biblical World*, ed. Meir Lubetski (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 193–241, at 226.

[134] This noun should be kept distinct from the עֵדָה "congregation," which is derived from the root יעד, not עוד. The pattern of the proposed noun עֵדָה is *qitl* > *qīl* for II-weak roots > *qil(-at)* (cf. גֵּר) > Hebrew *qēl*, fs. *qēlā*.

First, the cursed man corresponding in V to E 4:4 reads as follows: ארר לקח
שחד להן|עד] עדת שקר בעמתו (H 1:2–3).[135] Courtroom bribery is consistently associated in the Bible with judges, not witnesses.[136] This curse also appears to include the same construct noun, עדת, but a different verb, the causative of עוד.[137] Typically, verbs (like nouns) derived from the root עוד are assumed to mean "to be a witness." The causative stem, however, often describes the acts of judgment or commandment, in the sense of giving law, rather than the act of testifying. See, for example, שִׂימוּ לְבַבְכֶם לְכָל הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מֵעִיד בָּכֶם הַיּוֹם (Deut 32:46), where הַדְּבָרִים refers to the law, which is elaborated in the second part of the verse as כָּל דִּבְרֵי הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת. Another example is עַל כִּי יְהוָה הֵעִיד בֵּינְךָ וּבֵין אֵשֶׁת נְעוּרֶיךָ (Mal 2:14), where "judge" is a far better fit than the common interpretation "witness," especially considering that the concomitant preposition is בֵּין.[138] In Exod 19:23, we find וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל יְהוָה לֹא יוּכַל הָעָם לַעֲלֹת אֶל הַר סִינָי כִּי אַתָּה הַעֵדֹתָה בָּנוּ לֵאמֹר הַגְבֵּל אֶת הָהָר וְקִדַּשְׁתּוֹ, with הַעֵדֹתָה meaning "commanded." 2 Kgs 17:15 is clearer still: וַיִּמְאֲסוּ אֶת חֻקָּיו וְאֶת בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת אֶת אֲבוֹתָם וְאֵת עֵדְוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר הֵעִיד בָּם "They despised his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their ancestors, and the commandments that he commanded them."[139]

This brings us to the noun עֵדָה in the Hebrew Bible. This lexeme is attested in MT only in the plural עֵדְוֹת/עֵדֹת.[140] Lexicographers disagree on the form and

---

[135] While V's blessings and curses (better: lists of blessed and cursed men) clearly correspond to the ten proclamations, it is worth noting that the behaviors listed in the former are not always precise fulfillments/transgressions of the laws included in the latter. For example: לא תשנא את אחך בלבבך (E 4:8) vs. ברך] האיש אשר יאהב את רעהו (G 4:8–9); one can refrain from hating his fellow without loving him. Likewise, the blessed man corresponding to לא תענו באחך עדת שקר (E 4:4) is ברך האיש אשר לא יכחש ולא י|שקר ברעהו (G 4:5–7), which is not necessarily an instance of either false testimony or false judgment.

[136] Exod 23:6–8; Deut 10:17–18; 16:17–20; 1 Sam 8:1–3; 2 Chr 19:5–7. Similar prohibitions are known from other ancient Near Eastern law codes. In Egyptian sources, judicial corruption was punishable at the same level as conspiracy to assassinate the king. (See Russ VerSteeg, *Law in Ancient Egypt* [Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2002], 154–55.) In Mesopotamian sources, judges who mishandled cases were penalized with disbarment and a heavy fine. (See Raymond Westbrook, "Judges in the Cuneiform Sources," *Maarav* 12, no. 1–2 [2005]: 27–39; Samuel Greengus, *Laws in the Bible and in Early Rabbinic Collections: The Legal Legacy of the Ancient Near East* [Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011], 280–81.)

[137] Also, within V, the prohibition against false witness may be covered by לא תשבע בשמי לשקר (E 4:1) and the corresponding curse ארר האיש אשר ישבע בשמו לשקר (H 1:1–2). If court testimony was taken under oath, then the prohibition in E 4:4 is redundant.

[138] See also, especially, Gen 43:3; Exod 19:23; Jer 6:10; 11:17; 32:10, 25, 44; Zech 3:6–7. In 1 Sam 8:9 (כִּי הָעֵד תָּעִיד בָּהֶם וְהִגַּדְתָּ לָהֶם מִשְׁפַּט הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר יִמְלֹךְ עֲלֵיהֶם), Samuel is instructed to impart the royal decree, i.e., law (משפט), rather than bear witness. (The familiar translation "warn" is never as apt as "command.")

[139] Timo Veijola ("Zu Ableitung und Bedeutung von *hēʿîd* im Hebräischen: ein Beitrag zur Bundesterminologie," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976): 343–51, at 349, et passim) makes a very similar argument.

[140] See previous note. A possible instance of singular עדת from the root עוד may be found in Ps 82:1. That psalm is set in a (divine) courtroom, and the counterpart of בעדת אל is the verb

meaning of עֵדֹת: HALOT assumes that it is a variant of עֵדֻת and translates "testimony," accordingly. BDB acknowledges that the underlying form is a singular עֵדָה but still translates "testimony." DCH, on the other hand, offers the meaning "statute."[141] Support for this meaning can be restored from the context in which the lexeme is used. The plural עֵדֹת occurs with one or both nouns חֹק "statute" and מִשְׁפָּט "judgment, law." For example, מָה הָעֵדֹת וְהַחֻקִּים וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְכֶם (Deut 6:20).[142] In addition, the repeated use of this as the object of verbs such as שָׁמַר (e.g., 2 Kgs 23:3) and נָצַר (e.g., Ps 119:2) is illogical if we assume the lexeme means "testimony." Note especially the following where the noun is paired with "covenant": כָּל אָרְחוֹת יהוה חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת לְנֹצְרֵי בְרִיתוֹ וְעֵדֹתָיו (Ps 25:10). The lexeme should, therefore, be understood in both MT and V as "decree," which – like the noun מִשְׁפָּט – refers to a judiciary decision or law, not to the statement of a participant in a legal process.[143] The proposed noun עֵדָה "decree" is therefore semantically grounded in both MT and V.

We thus see that the form עדת in V is appropriate in its context; it simply means something other than what has been presumed.

6.4.6. חנהן (D 2:7–8)

In D 2:8, sacrifices are referred to using the common term זבח, which is inflected as מזבחהן. Just a few words earlier, however, we find a partially reconstructed word that may have read מחנהן. This reading is uncertain; Shapira and Ginsburg both transcribe מזבחהן there too. Guthe's reading, מחֹנֵן[*]הן, has the benefit of being the *lectio difficilior*. Guthe himself notes in his comments that such usage is unattested.[144] It may well be that Guthe's tentative reconstruction is incorrect. Nevertheless, it should be noted that חנ is occasionally used in the Hebrew Bible to mean "sacrificial animal." See especially Exod 23:18 (לֹא תִזְבַּח עַל חָמֵץ דַּם זִבְחִי וְלֹא

יִשְׁפֹּט.

[141] See also David Talshir ("אָחוֹת and עֵדוֹת in Ancient Hebrew," *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 15–16 [2002–3]: 108–23), who argues that the form עֵדוּת derives secondarily from עֵדוֹת, a *plurale tantum*, which means "decrees." Talshir also argues that the change of עֵדֹת to עֵדֻת is late. This is supported by the ancient translations, which do not distinguish between עֵדֹת and עֵדֻת and translate both as עֵדֻת. Talshir further shows that the original עֵדֹת was reanalyzed at a later point as עֵדֻת.

[142] Deut 4:45, 6:7; Ps 99:7.

[143] See also Ps 119:2, 22, 146, 167, 168; 132:2. David Talshir ("Is the Jehoash Inscription Genuine? A Philological Analysis" [Hebrew], *Leshonenu La'am* 54, no. 1 [2003]: 3–10, at 8–9) argues that all occurrences of עדת in MT have this meaning, whereas the meaning "testimony" is not biblical. Elisha Qimron ("Waw Denoting a Glide" [Hebrew], in *Homage to Shmuel: Studies in the World of the Bible* [Hebrew], ed. Zipora Talshir, Shamir Yona, and Daniel Sivan (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2001), 362–75, at 375) demonstrates that the /ū/ is more likely to be represented plene, while the opposite is true for /ō/, which is far more likely to be written defectively. He therefore suggests that the spelling עדת should be read עֵדֹת throughout, and not עֵדֻת.

[144] Guthe, *Lederhandschrift*, 81.

יָלִין חֵלֶב חַגִּי עַד בֹּקֶר "You shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice with anything leavened, or let the fat of my *offering* remain until the morning;" cf. Exod 34:25), Mal 2:3 (וְזֵרִיתִי פֶרֶשׁ עַל פְּנֵיכֶם פֶּרֶשׁ חַגֵּיכֶם וְנָשָׂא אֶתְכֶם אֵלָיו "I will strew dung upon your faces, the dung of your *offerings*, and you shall be carried out to it"), and Ps 118:27 (אִסְרוּ חַג בַּעֲבֹתִים עַד קַרְנוֹת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ) "bind the *offering* with cords to the horns of the altar").[145]

6.4.7. שארתך (G 5:1 [?]; H 1:9)

MT uses a nominal derivation with a prefix *m*-, מִשְׁאֶרֶת "kneading trough" (Deut 28:5, 17). The word found in this position in V, שְׁאֶרֶת, is common in MT, although the meanings of biblical שְׁאֵרִית and מִשְׁאֶרֶת are quite different, raising the distinct possibility that V refers in these verses to something other than vessels. Be that as it may, V's form is likely a derivation from a nominal pattern without the preformative. Variants with and without preformative *m*- are well attested in Hebrew, and the noun without the preformative is sometimes older.[146]

We should note that nominal derivations from II-ʾ roots show reduction of the medial glottal stop in Hellenistic and post-biblical Hebrew,[147] and the word שארית is often spelled שרית.[148] V reflects the earlier orthography.

6.4.8. גם (E 3:3)

In V, the reasoning for the Sabbath law is given as follows (E 2:8–3:4):

[כי • שׁ]שׁת • ימם • עשׂתי • את השׁמם • ואת הארץ • וכל • אשר • בם • ושבתי • ביום • השׁביעי • על • כן • תשׁבת • גם • אתה • ובהמתך • וכל • אשר • לך •

[For in s]ix days I made the heavens and the earth and all that is in them, and I rested on the seventh day. Therefore you too shall rest, along with your livestock and all that you have.[149]

Neubauer argued that this is problematic: "The word *gam* ought to be repeated according to classical Hebrew."[150] That is, Neubauer's view of correct Hebrew is

---

[145] Cf. Kennicott 131, 133, 681; T-S AS 110.121; BL Or. 5557A.74 – all of which read על, rather than MT's עד, rendering: "Bind the חג with cords to the horns of the altar."

[146] One such example is early דֵּעָה or דַּעַת vs. LBH מַדָּע. This word is likely a loan from Aramaic or is at least influenced by the Aramaic nominal pattern (Hurvitz, *Concise Lexicon*, 159–60). Another such example is חֹשֶׁךְ vs. מַחְשָׁךְ "darkness." The propensity to replace simple nouns and adjectives with *m*-prefixed ones is also related to the increase in the use of the *pual* participle in post-biblical Hebrew (e.g., CBH רַב vs. PBH מְרֻבֶּה).

[147] Qimron, *Grammar of the Hebrew*, 322–33.

[148] Viz. שְׁרִית in 1 Chr 12:39 (LBH), ושריתו in 1QIsaᵃ (MT Isa 44:17 וּשְׁאֵרִיתוֹ), and שרית in 1QS, 1QHᵃ, 4Q158, 4Q280, 4Q374, 4Q381, 4Q427, 4Q431, and 4Q496. The other noun in this pair, מְנָא, is regularly spelled without the *aleph* in Rabbinic Hebrew (מני). In V the spelling matches MT.

[149] The translations in this section render Hebrew גם literally as "also."

[150] Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 116.

that גם should precede not only אתה but also בהמתך and כל אשר לך.[151] As proof, he cited Exod 12:31–32:[152]

וַיִּקְרָא לְמֹשֶׁה וּלְאַהֲרֹן לַיְלָה וַיֹּאמֶר קוּמוּ צְּאוּ מִתּוֹךְ עַמִּי **גַּם** אַתֶּם **גַּם** בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּלְכוּ עִבְדוּ אֶת יְהוָה כְּדַבֶּרְכֶם: **גַּם** צֹאנְכֶם **גַּם** בְּקַרְכֶם קְחוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתֶּם וָלֵכוּ וּבֵרַכְתֶּם גַּם אֹתִי:

And he summoned Moses and Aaron at night and said, "Get up and withdraw from amidst my people, **also** you and **also** the Israelites. Go, worship YHWH, as you said. Take **also** your flocks and **also** your herds, as you said, and leave. And bless me too."

But verses where the syntax of גם is similar to V's are quite frequent in the Bible.[153] Contra Neubauer, it is not necessary to repeat the conjunction before each constituent as in Exod 12:31 above. For example:

וְגַם עֵרֶב רַב עָלָה אִתָּם **וְצֹאן וּבָקָר** מִקְנֶה כָּבֵד מְאֹד:

Also a mixed multitude went up with them, **and sheep and cattle**, very heavy livestock. (Exod 12:38)

וַתִּגַּשׁ גַּם לֵאָה **וִילָדֶיהָ** וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ וְאַחַר נִגַּשׁ יוֹסֵף וְרָחֵל וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ:

Also Leah **and her children** drew near and bowed down; finally Joseph and Rachel drew near and bowed down. (Gen 33:7)

וְגַם תֶּבֶן גַּם מִסְפּוֹא יֵשׁ לַחֲמוֹרֵינוּ וְגַם לֶחֶם **וָיַיִן** יֶשׁ לִי וְלַאֲמָתֶךָ וְלַנַּעַר עִם עֲבָדֶיךָ אֵין מַחְסוֹר כָּל דָּבָר:

We have also straw and also fodder for our donkeys, and also bread **and wine** for me and your handmaiden and the pageboy with your servants. Nothing is lacking. (Judg 19:19)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו דָּוִד מֶה הָיָה הַדָּבָר הַגֶּד נָא לִי וַיֹּאמֶר אֲשֶׁר נָס הָעָם מִן הַמִּלְחָמָה וְגַם הַרְבֵּה נָפַל מִן הָעָם וַיָּמֻתוּ וְגַם שָׁאוּל **וִיהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ** מֵתוּ:

And David said to him, "What happened? Tell me!" And he told him how the people had fled the battle, and also many of the people had fallen and died, and also Saul **and his son Jonathan** were dead. (2 Sam 1:4)

The syntax of גם is altogether more flexible than Neubauer suggests. For instance, גם is not necessarily positioned before the first constituent in a sequence, either:

וְאִם שׁוֹר נַגָּח הוּא מִתְּמֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם וְהוּעַד בִּבְעָלָיו וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ וְהֵמִית אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה **הַשּׁוֹר** יִסָּקֵל **וְגַם** בְּעָלָיו יוּמָת:

And if it is a goring ox from before, and its owner has been warned but has not guarded it, and it kills a man or a woman, **the ox** shall be stoned, **and also** its owner shall be executed. (Exod 21:29)

The variation highlighted above obscures a contextual factor, which provides additional support for the absence of the word גם before בהמתך and כל אשר לך.

---

[151] On Neubauer's objection to the phrase כל אשר לך, see §6.4.4.

[152] Erroneously given as Exod 17:31–32.

[153] Waltke and O'Connor (*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 663) note that the use of גם and other coordinators is much more flexible than the roles typically assigned to them in Hebrew grammars.

When גם does appear in biblical texts, it often creates an appositional structure. In the aforementioned example from Gen 33:7, for instance, גם precedes the phrase לֵאָה וִילָדֶיהָ to indicate that not only the handmaidens and their children (who are mentioned in the previous verse) bowed before Esau, but Leah and her children did as well. The operative units in that passage are [mother-cum-children]. Had a גם appeared before יְלָדֶיהָ, it would have changed the emphasis; rather than juxtapose [handmaidens-cum-children] with [Leah-cum-children], it would instead have inaptly juxtaposed [Leah] with [children]. Likewise, the relevant units in V's Sabbath law are Elohim, on the one hand, and [man-cum-possessions], on the other. Breaking up the latter unit with additional גם particles would therefore have been particularly gratuitous.

6.4.9. מעלם (C 1:4, 8; D 1:8)

It has been suggested that V's use of מעלם where Deuteronomy has לפנים is problematic. Thus, Lemaire writes:

The text contains variants from the standard Hebrew text known as the Masoretic text that are easily explained as having been made under the influence of the Mesha Stele. For example, in the Shapira strips *Deuteronomy 2:12* reads "The Horites lived in Seir from of old (*M'LM*)," instead of the Masoretic text's "at one time (*LPNYM*)." This is based on line 10 in the Mesha Stela, which reads "The men of Gad lived in the land of Ataroth from of old (*M'LM*)."[154]

There is some circularity to this argument. True, if V is a modern forgery and the forger used the Mesha Stele as a template, he or she might have copied מעלם from that document. But מעלם is an archaic phrase. In addition to the Mesha Stele, the term appears in biblical passages from all periods,[155] and it is apparently attested also in eighth-century BCE Aramaic.[156] If V is a genuine ancient text, we should not be surprised by the appearance of an attested ancient form in precisely the place context calls for it.

The use of the phrase מעלם in V is thus not an aberration. The suggestion that its presence in this text is due to the influence of the Mesha Stele *presupposes* that the Shapira manuscripts are forgeries; it is not *evidence* of inauthenticity.

---

[154] André Lemaire, "Paleography's Verdict: They're Fakes!" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23, no. 3 (1997): 36–39, at 38. See also Neubauer, "Shapira Mss. of Deuteronomy," 130.

[155] Gen 6:4; Josh 24:2; 1 Sam 27:8; Isa 42:14, 46:9, 57:11, 63:16, 19; 64:3; Jer 2:20, 5:15, 7:7, 25:5; Ezek 26:20; Pss 25:6, 90:2, 93:2, 103:17, 119:52; Prov 8:23; 1 Chr 29:10.

[156] KAI 224:23–24. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1995), 160. ותלאי|ם וכפריה ובעליה ונבלה לאבי ול|ביתה **מן עלם** "[Tal'ay]im, its villages, its lords, and its territory (once belonged) to my father and to [his house **from] of old**." The preposition מן is reconstructed.

6.5. Summary

The linguistic evidence discussed here accords with the conclusions of Dershowitz's literary-critical analysis of the Shapira Deuteronomy manuscripts in this volume and corroborates a monarchic date for V.

According to the principle of consilience, as recently laid out by Hendel and Joosten,[157] a given claim regarding the date of a text is validated by the convergence of diverse lines of evidence. They write, "Consilience in our scholarly models is the best we can achieve, and it is enough,"[158] commenting on their own argument that "the linguistic and historical inferences are consilient, indicating the correctness of the theory."[159] Similarly, the linguistic and literary data in the case of V are convergent, attesting to the likely correctness of the hypothesis that it antedates the biblical Deuteronomy.

Furthermore, nothing in the language of the Valediction of Moses is suggestive of either forgery or Hellenistic composition. On the contrary, the language of V is consistent with pre-exilic Hebrew, especially as attested directly in the epigraphic corpus. Moreover, the text includes no obvious late features or Aramaisms, which is especially notable, considering how difficult it would have been for anyone educated in Hebrew in the Hellenistic period (or the nineteenth century) to do so.[160] Since the 1960s, research on Late Biblical Hebrew has exposed a large number of lexical, orthographic, and morphosyntactic features that first appear in Persian period texts, and our understanding of the grammar of LBH and post-biblical Hebrew has likewise expanded and changed. These post-exilic features and their relevance for dating biblical texts were largely unknown to scholars in the nineteenth century, yet V contains none of them. This weighs strongly against the possibility of a forgery.

The orthography of V is also significant. Almost no Hellenistic period manuscripts are orthographically conservative, and post-biblical texts consistently present fuller and more liberal spelling practices than their MT parallels.[161] V, on the other hand, presents an orthography that is considerably more conser-

---

[157] Ronald S. Hendel and Jan Joosten, *How Old Is the Hebrew Bible? A Linguistic, Textual, and Historical Study* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018), 98–125.

[158] Ibid., 122.

[159] Ibid., 125.

[160] Aramaic had a significant impact on the lexicon and syntax of LBH (Avi Hurvitz, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period: The Problem of 'Aramaisms' in Linguistic Research on the Hebrew Bible," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, JSOT-Sup 369 [London: T&T Clark, 2003], 24–37) and postbiblical Hebrew (Frank H. Polak, "Sociolinguistics and the Judean Speech Community in the Achaemenid Empire," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. Oded Lipschits [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006], 589–628; Talya Shitrit, "Aramaic Loanwords and Borrowing," *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, ed. Geoffrey Khan et al. [2013]).

[161] Aaron Hornkohl, "Hebrew Diachrony and the Linguistic Periodisation of Biblical Texts: Observations from the Perspective of Reworked Pentateuchal Material," *Journal for Semitics* 25, no. 2 (2016): 1004–63, at 1025.

vative and defective than MT, and it is similar, with only minor variations, to the monarchic epigraphic material. This too constitutes a strong counterargument to claims of a Hellenistic composition.

Despite many similarities outlined above, the Hebrew of the Valediction of Moses nevertheless deviates from that of the Masoretic Text in various ways and appears to reflect a dialect other than standard CBH. This is to be expected, especially if the Shapira manuscripts are pre-exilic artifacts, which would leave little opportunity for V to have undergone the sort of linguistic updating that is so prevalent in the texts of later Hellenistic, let alone Masoretic, biblical manuscripts. When the apparent linguistic anomalies in V correspond to attested ancient usage – particularly when this ancient usage was not known to nineteenth-century scholars – it militates against forgery. Furthermore, we should be careful before concluding that a feature is anachronistic just because it is otherwise attested only in later texts. To illustrate, Arad 1:4 and 5:2, both of which date to the First Temple period, contain the noun עוד "surplus." This noun is never found in the Hebrew Bible, even in LBH texts, but it is attested later in Mishnaic Hebrew (m. Ter. 4:7). Surely our conclusion should not be – and indeed is not – that the Arad ostraca are modern forgeries. Rather, these ancient inscriptions add a new piece of information to the unfolding story of Hebrew.

A similar cautionary lesson may be learned from previously unverified texts that have stood the test of time, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1953, Solomon Zeitlin argued *on linguistic grounds* that a Bar Kokhba letter could not be ancient:

The letter begins with the word משמעון "from Simon." This opening word of address proves beyond any shadow of doubt that this letter was neither written by Simon the leader of the revolt against the Romans, nor by any one of that period. We have a considerable number of letters which have come down to us from antiquity [...] None of them has the prefixal *mem* to indicate "from." [...] The letter *mem* prefixed to the author's name came into use in the Middle Ages. Hence we may say with certainty that the word משמעון "from Simon" shows that this letter was written in the Middle Ages.[162]

Zeitlin may well have been correct that prefixed *mem*s were unattested in the relevant period, but the conclusion he drew from this fact was dramatically wrong, as we now know. Given the severe paucity of data regarding early Hebrew, countless features that were alive and well at the time – many of which are attested in later Hebrew chronolects – are unknown to us due to accidents of history. Occasionally, we are lucky enough to make discoveries that, if not incautiously disregarded, fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge.

The Valediction of Moses – being neither a late forgery nor a Hellenistic composition, but rather a pre-biblical book – is of immense value for establishing the early history of the Hebrew language. The work we have done here on V's linguistic character is preliminary; we expect that future linguistic studies will shed much light on the both the Valediction of Moses and Classical Biblical Hebrew.

---

[162] Solomon Zeitlin, "The Fiction of the Recent Discoveries near the Dead Sea," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 44, no. 2 (1953): 85–115, at 89–90.