

Chapter Title: Notes

Book Title: A Social History of Hebrew

Book Subtitle: Its Origins Through the Rabbinic Period

Book Author(s): WILLIAM M. SCHNIEDEWIND

Published by: Yale University Press. (2013)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vm6sc.15>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*Yale University Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *A Social History of Hebrew*

## Notes

### Chapter 1. Language, Land, and People

1. Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology*, 162.
2. Ibid., 7.
3. Sapir, *Language*, 219.
4. See Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology*, 23–50; Duranti is informed by Claude Lévi-Strauss, Roman Jakobson, and especially Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*.
5. Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 113.
6. See, e.g., Morgan, “Speech Community,” 3–22.
7. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*; Hadas-Lebel, *Histoire de la langue Hébraïque*; and Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*. Kutscher passed away before completing his book, and it was constructed from his notes by his son Raphael Kutscher and published posthumously.
8. C. Rabin, *Short History*.
9. Horowitz, *How the Hebrew Language Grew*, and Hoffman, *In the Beginning*.
10. The scope of this study is similar to Clines (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, which covers the Hebrew language up to 200 C.E., that is, preceding the editing of the Mishnah. Although the 200 C.E. delimitation is a convenient practical terminus, I am employing the social and demographic terminus—namely, the use of Hebrew in ancient Palestine.
11. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 51–52. I take exception to Sáenz-Badillos’s contention that the revitalization of Israeli Hebrew “breaks the pattern of the language’s natural development” (52). If anything, it is the gradual disuse of Hebrew as a spoken language during the rabbinic period (second to sixth centuries C.E.) that breaks its natural development, hence the eclectic nature of medieval Hebrew. The revitalization of the language—at least from a sociolinguistic perspective—is a much more natural process.

12. See, e.g., Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages*, and the literature cited therein.
13. A variety of scholars have wrestled with the notion of Jewishness; see, e.g., S. Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*.
14. Clines (ed.), *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 1:7.
15. See Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 119–46.
16. Irvine and Gal, “Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation,” 35–36.
17. See, e.g., the entry in Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, which defines Ἑβραϊστί as “Hebrew/Aramaic.”
18. For a general discussion, see Rogers, *Writing Systems*, 13–17.
19. Coulmas (and citing Saussure), *Writing Systems*, 16.
20. For the use of this term with respect to Hebrew, see Rendsburg, *Diglossia*.
21. This term was coined by P. Daniels to distinguish alphabets like Greek, which include consonants and vowels, from systems like Hebrew, Phoenician, or Arabic, which do not regularly write vowels. See Daniels, “Study of Writing Systems,” 3–17.
22. See, e.g., Hendel, “Sibilants and šibboleṭ,” 69–76, or Woodhouse, “Biblical Shibboleth Story,” 271–90.
23. Ullendorff, “Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?” 3–17.
24. Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 89.
25. Prince, “Segments,” 384–87. See the discussion by Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 89–108.
26. Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 184.
27. Webster, *Essay on the Necessity*.
28. Specifically on script choice, see Unseth, “Sociolinguistics of Script Choice,” 1–4.
29. For a convenient summary, see Rendsburg, “Linguistic Variation,” 177–90.
30. *Ibid.*, 179.
31. As quoted by Sampson, *Writing Systems*, 11.
32. *Ibid.*, 13.
33. Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 44.
34. Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 184.
35. *Ibid.*, 292.
36. Ullendorff, “Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?” 7.
37. See Humboldt, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues*, 26.
38. Peter Daniels even questioned whether the Phoenician alphabet should be characterized as a true alphabet because it lacked vowels, but Coulmas’s critique of Daniels is well taken—namely, that all alphabets are incomplete representations of the sounds of a language. See Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 113–14. Note further the study of Faber, “Phonemic Segmentation,” 111–34, which calls into question the primacy of the alphabet itself as a transcription system for speech.
39. See Diakonoff, “Ancient Writing,” 99–121.
40. Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, “Studying Language, Culture, and Society,” 532–45.
41. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 23. Also see Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, “Studying Language, Culture, and Society,” 532–45.
42. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 183.
43. Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 33.
44. *Ibid.*, 9.
45. A summary of their contributions may be found in Lucy, *Language Diversity and Thought*, 11–68.
46. Sapir, *Language*, 8.
47. Lucy, *Language Diversity and Thought*, 66.
48. *Ibid.*, 127–87.

49. More recently, the approach of “generative grammar” has dominated the American academy. The Saussurian revolution paved the way for the concept of language universals and generative grammar advocated by Noam Chomsky. Chomskian linguists have emphasized that language is innate in the human brain. Consequently, they find language universals that generate linguistic phenomena across the whole spectrum of languages, although their work has tended to focus on a few European languages. This approach to linguistics, usually called “generative grammar,” has limited application to classical Hebrew because it emphasizes language universals. If language systems are universal, there is little reason to focus on Hebrew in particular. Although “universal grammar” maintains a stranglehold on the American linguistic academy (less so on the European academy), there have been challenges and even cracks in the consensus. Perhaps most notable is the work of Daniel Everett, “Cultural Constraints,” 621–46. Steven Pinker, perhaps the most articulate defender of Chomsky’s theory of language, argues that language (or more precisely, grammar) is part of the circuitry of the human brain, but Pinker also admits that language is partly social: “Language inherently involves sharing a code with other people” (Pinker, *Language Instinct*, 243).
50. Grimm’s Law was the first law of systematic sound change to be discovered in linguistics and, as such, was a turning point for historical and comparative linguistics. It is illustrated, e.g., in the changes from /p > f > ph/, /t > th/, /k > ch/, /b > p/, which may be seen by comparing words like Greek *pous* with English *foot* or Latin *tertius* with English *third*. See further the discussion and examples in Bloomfield, *Language*, 347–55.
51. Bloomfield, *Language*. Bloomfield writes, “Writing is not language, but merely a way of recording language by means of visible marks” (21). For a review and critique of Bloomfield’s postulates for linguistic science, see Silverstein, review of Hockett’s *View from Language*, 235–53.
52. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 252.
53. See Nichols, “Functional Theories of Grammar,” 97–117.
54. See the observations of Labov, “Study of Language in Its Social Context,” 152–56.
55. Kroskrity, “Regimenting Languages,” 5; emphasis added.
56. Romaine, *Language in Society*, ix.
57. See Toubouret-Keller, “Language and Identity,” 315; contra Schwartz, “Hebrew and Imperialism in Jewish Palestine,” 54.
58. *Ibid.*, 58.
59. From “Why Can’t the English?” in *My Fair Lady*, Alan J. Lerner and Frederick Loewe’s musical adaptation of George Bernard Shaw’s play *Pygmalion*.
60. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 260.
61. Joüon, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*; Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*.
62. Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*.
63. Harris, *Development*.
64. C. Rabin, “Historical Background,” 144–61.
65. C. Rabin describes it as follows: “The tendency of this book is sociological, and approaches somewhat the methods of the science of sociolinguistics, without any pretense at either sociological profundity or the scientific evaluation of detailed facts as practiced by that science” (*Short History*, 5).
66. C. Rabin, “Emergence,” 71–78.
67. Garr, *Dialect Geography*.
68. Rendsburg, *Diglossia*, 166.
69. *Ibid.*, 166–67. Rendsburg points here to the work of Saussure, though Saussure is by no means the main proponent of sociolinguistic analysis.
70. Young, *Diversity*.

71. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 275.
72. Titunik, "Formal Method," 181.
73. Polak, "Sociolinguistics," 115–62; Polak, "Style Is More Than the Person," 38–103.
74. Also see Sanders's own book, *Invention*.
75. See Cross, "History of the Biblical Text," 177–95.
76. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*.
77. Gianto, "Historical Linguistics and the Hebrew Bible," 1553–71.
78. See Saussure, *Writings in General Linguistics* and the original, *Écrits de linguistique générale*; see also Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (*Cours de linguistique générale*).
79. The ḥābiru-Hebrew connection was already raised by F. J. Chabas in 1862. After the discovery of the Amarna letters in 1887, this identification became quite commonplace. Note the classic studies by Bottéro, *Le Problème des Ḥābiru*, and Greenberg, *Ḥāb/ḥiru*.
80. See CAD H, 84.
81. See Na'aman, "Ḥābiru and Hebrews," 271–88.
82. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 33.
83. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 274.
84. *Ibid.*, 275.
85. Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change*, 514.
86. *Ibid.*, 516.
87. *Ibid.*
88. *Ibid.*, 34.
89. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 83.
90. Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, 19. V. Ivanov argued that Voloshinov's works were actually authored by his colleague Mikhail Bakhtin (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, ix). Bakhtin himself never denied the attribution.

## Chapter 2. The Origins of Hebrew

1. For discussion and examples, see Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 24–34.
2. Although the Amarna letters reflect, for the most part, a unified grammar, there are some indications of local dialects, most notably in the tablets from Gezer; see Izre'el, "Gezer Letters," 13–90.
3. See Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names*; also note Izre'el's analysis of the Amurru Amarna letters, *Amurru Akkadian*, 11–14.
4. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names*.
5. It is worth pointing out that Ezek. 16:3 must be understood as more than mere polemic. The polemicizing aspect of the text is the mention of the Canaanites, which obviously carried a strong negative connotation. The Amorites and the Hittites are irrelevant to exilic/postexilic audiences. The Amorites, e.g., disappear from the biblical narrative in the pre-monarchic period, and they are essentially unknown in Neo-Babylonian and Persian literature. The Hittites do not fare much better, though at least they last into the David/Solomon stories and then disappear (appropriately enough). In order for something to work as a polemic, it has to resonate with something that is known to the writer's or speaker's contemporary audience. The core of Ezek. 16:3 is a neutral proverb reflecting cultural memory with specific details that had little meaning to Ezekiel's contemporary audience, namely, "Your father was an Amorite, and your mother a Hittite." The prophet then takes this, contemporizes it, and offers a polemical interpretation: "Your origin and your birth were in the land of the Canaanites."
6. Houston, "Archaeology of Communication Technologies," 235.
7. The Middle Bronze (MB) Age extends from ca. 2200 to 1530 B.C.E. and is divided into two parts, an "interlude" period called MB I, extending from 2200 to 1900 B.C.E., and MB II,

- from 1900 to 1530 B.C.E. Scholars quibble about the precise dates for the transitions between the Early, Middle, and Late Bronze Ages. There is also discussion about the correct label for the MB I period; see, e.g., Mazar, *Archaeology*, 152.
8. Horowitz and Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan*.
  9. See the summary in Pedersén, *Archives*.
  10. Malamat, “Mari and Hazor,” 66–70.
  11. Horowitz and Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan*, 12.
  12. See the corpus of texts from Hazor in *ibid.*, 65–87.
  13. See the discussion by Daniels, “Scripts of the Semitic Languages,” 16–45.
  14. Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 113–14.
  15. *Ibid.*, 89–108.
  16. See the summary of these classical sources by Lemaire, “Spread of the Alphabetic Scripts,” 46.
  17. See the *editio princeps* by Darnell et al., “Two Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from the Wadi el-Hôl,” 73–124.
  18. Houston, “Archaeology of Communication Technologies,” 239.
  19. See J. Allen, *Middle Egyptian*, 224.
  20. See Hamilton, *Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet*.
  21. See Goldwasser, “Canaanites Reading Hieroglyphs,” 151–53; contra the hypothesis of Hamilton in *Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet*.
  22. For a convenient catalog of early alphabetic inscriptions, see Hamilton, *Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet*, 323–400.
  23. Cross, “Invention and Development of the Alphabet,” 77–78. See the critique of this position by Rollston (“Scribal Education in Ancient Israel,” 47–74), who downplays the differences between learning the cuneiform writing system and learning the linear alphabet.
  24. See Allen, *Middle Egyptian*, 26.
  25. See Lambdin, “Egyptian Loanwords,” 145–55.
  26. For a summary of the scribes’ curriculum, see the Sumerian text “The Dialogue between an Examiner and a Student” (COS 1.186), and the edition by Civil, “Sur les ‘livres d’écolier,’” 67–78.
  27. See Goldwasser, “Egyptian Scribe from Lachish,” 248–53; Aharoni, “Use of Hieratic Numerals,” 13–19.
  28. Goldwasser and Wimmer, “Hieratic Fragments,” 39–42, and the bibliography cited there.
  29. See Allen, “Craft of the Scribe,” 9–14 (§3.2); note especially lines 18:7–22:2.
  30. See, e.g., Overland, “Structure in the Wisdom of Amenemope,” 275–91; Ray, “Egyptian Wisdom Literature,” 17–29; N. Shupak, *Where Can Wisdom Be Found?* 297–311.
  31. On the Ugaritic script, see Dietrich and Loretz “Ugaritic Script,” 81–89, and Stieglitz, “Ugaritic Cuneiform and Canaanite Linear Alphabets,” 135–39.
  32. Albright, cited in the discussion section of Kraeling and Adams, *City Invincible*, 123 (critically cited by Rollston, “Scribal Education in Ancient Israel,” 48).
  33. See Seymour, “Early Reading Development,” 296–315; Share and Levine, “Learning to Read and Write,” 89–111.
  34. See the useful general discussion by Rollston, “Scribal Education in Ancient Israel,” 48–50; and see the modern theoretical discussion by Ehri, “Phases of Acquisition,” 7–28.
  35. This example may be found in *KTU* 5.6. There is also evidence for another order, best known in Old South Arabian but also in alphabetic cuneiform; see Dietrich and Loretz, “Ugaritic Script,” 81–90.
  36. Curiously, however, Ugaritic uses the *h* for its pronouns, whereas in all other Semitic languages the causative prefix and the pronoun are related; e.g., Akkadian *šafel* and 3ms

- proun *šuatī*. This leads us to question whether the use of the *šin* causative prefix is an Akkadianism and does not reflect the actual phonetic realization.
37. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, 17.
  38. Kaufman, "Classification," 41–57.
  39. Rainey, "Kingdom of Ugarit," 102–25.
  40. Romaine, *Language in Society*, 1–32.
  41. Ginsberg, "Phoenician Hymn," 472–76; see also Avishur, *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms*, 39–110.
  42. Albright, review of Gordon's *Ugaritic Grammar*, 438. Albright returned to this topic repeatedly in his own writings; see, e.g., "Old Testament and Canaanite Language," 5–31; "Psalm of Habakkuk," 1–20; and *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*.
  43. For example, Dahood, *Psalms 101–150*.
  44. See the discussion of Dahood's approach in the review of literature by Avishur, *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms*, 21–24.
  45. See Gevirtz, *Patterns*; Freedman, "Counting Formulae," 65–81; Roth, "Numerical Sequence," 300–311.
  46. See Polak, "Epic Formulas," 437–89. Polak cites the classic work of Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies*, as first calling attention to these parallels, as well as Frank Moore Cross's seminal work, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. See most recently Polak, "Linguistic and Stylistic Aspects," 285–304.
  47. On the language of the Amarna letters, see the comprehensive treatment of Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*. See further the approach of Von Dassow, "Canaanite in Cuneiform," 641–74.
  48. Izre'el, *Canaanite-Akkadian*, 20–23 (page numbers refer to electronic version).
  49. See *ibid*.
  50. See further Rainey, "Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation," 1–19, and Rainey, "Prefix Conjugation Patterns," 407–20; Van de Sande, *Nouvelle perspective*.
  51. It is a mistake to reduce the Hebrew verbal system to the issue of either tense or aspect. Most languages have verbal systems that are a combination of both. Hebrew undergoes a transition from an aspectual system in West Semitic toward a tense system in Rabbinic Hebrew.
  52. See Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*, 2:181–94.
  53. Von Dassow, "Canaanite in Cuneiform," 641.
  54. Izre'el, *Canaanite-Akkadian*, 16.
  55. See Rainey, "Whence Came the Israelites?" 41–64; Rainey, "Redefining Hebrew," 37–56; Rainey, "Inside, Outside," 45–50, 84.
  56. See Emerton, "New Evidence," 255–58; Muraoka, "Linguistic Notes," 19–21; and Sasson, "Some Observations," 111–27.
  57. See Killebrew, *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity*, and Faust, *Israel's Ethnogenesis*.

### Chapter 3. Early Hebrew Writing

1. C. Rabin, "Emergence," 73.
2. See, e.g., the popular work by Finkelstein and Silberman, *David and Solomon*. For a more radical critique, see Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*.
3. See Halpern, "Two Views," 77–83.
4. I first developed this in my 1999 book, *Society and the Promise to David*, but I discuss it more fully in *How the Bible Became a Book*, 64–117. Finkelstein and Silberman borrow the concept in "Temple and Dynasty," 259–85.
5. For this dating see Mazar, "Debate," 15–30; Bruins et al., "Groningen Radiocarbon Series," 271–93; Bruins and Mazar, "End of the 2nd Millennium BCE," 77–99.

6. Particularly useful is the analysis of Byrne, "Refuge of Scribalism," 1–31. Byrne summarizes this transitional period as follows: "Unlike the Late Bronze and Iron II epigraphic corpora, which reflect the dimensions of state interests, the Iron I evidence suggests a culture of scribalism that survived largely through circumstantial appeal to elite patronage" (3).
7. See Blau, *On Polyphony*, and Blau, *Phonology*, 73–76.
8. The problem of Hebrew homographs is further compounded by the lack of vowel letters in ancient Hebrew. There are more than seventeen hundred examples of homographs in Hebrew, representing about 20 percent of biblical Hebrew vocabulary. Most of these are the result of the lack of vowels in the earlier stages of Hebrew writing that began to be remedied with the introduction of vowel letters by the eighth century B.C.E. and continued much later with the introduction of vowel pointing.
9. This point is made quite eloquently by Sanders, *Invention*, 36–75.
10. Garr, *Dialect Geography*, 231.
11. See, e.g., Trudgill's observations on spelling in various European languages (*Sociolinguistics*, 135–46); and, more generally, Eira, "Authority and Discourse," 171–224.
12. For a general account of the use of cuneiform in the Levant during the second millennium B.C.E., see Horowitz and Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan*, 10–19.
13. *Ibid.*, 15–22.
14. On Egyptian administration in the Levant at the end of the second millennium B.C.E. (particularly during the Nineteenth Dynasty), see Morris, *Architecture of Imperialism*, 386–504.
15. See Allen, "Craft of the Scribe," COS §3.2.
16. See, e.g., Goldwasser and Wimmer, "Hieratic Fragments," 39–42; Wimmer, "Prince of Saft?" 37–48.
17. Scholars have usually argued that there was a major break in Egyptian scribal culture, presumably in the early twelfth century B.C.E., and then a resumption of Egyptian scribal influence again in the tenth century B.C.E. This scenario is quite unlikely given the archaeological evidence of cultural continuity from the Bronze Age into the Iron Age.
18. See Lambdin, "Egyptian Loanwords," 149. The spelling of the Hebrew word apparently reflects the orthographic interchange between *dalet* and *resh*.
19. Goldwasser, "Egyptian Scribe from Lachish," 248–53.
20. Contra Kletter, *Economic Keystones*, 146. My thanks to Professor Jacco Dieleman for his insights into the development of hieratic and demotic scripts and numerals.
21. See Lambdin, "Egyptian Loanwords," 145–55.
22. Possible Egyptian influence on ancient Israelite scribes has also been suggested for biblical wisdom literature, particularly Ps. 104 and Prov. 22:17–24:22; however, it is difficult to date such general traditions, as it is clear that there was a revival of Egyptian influence in Judah during the late eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E.; see Ash, *David, Solomon and Egypt*.
23. See de Vaux, "Titres et fonctionnaires," 394–405. A wide variety of alternative suggestions has been offered, but none have the simplicity and elegance of the Egyptian explanation, especially when viewed in the context of other Egyptian loanwords, the use of hieratic numerals, and the history of Egyptian administration in the region.
24. It has been suggested that Shisha be derived from the Hurrian name Šawa-šarri, but this derivation is quite fanciful and begins with the presumption that this figure was originally part of the old Hurrian/Jebusite administration (see Cogan, *1 Kings*, 200–201). See also Cody, "Le titre égyptien," 381–93.
25. As suggested by Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials*, 29–30. Mettinger also argued that the name Elihoreph is a Hebraized Egyptian name, in which *hp* represents the god Apis (note that the Greek transliterations show no evidence of a *resh*).
26. See Goldwasser, "How the Alphabet Was Born," 36–50, 74.



27. See especially the arguments by Hamilton, *Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet*.
28. Mendenhall, "Hebrew Conquest," 66–87.
29. Compare the situation with Latin; see Pulgram, "Spoken and Written Latin," 458–66.
30. Brent, "Problem of the Placement," 105–6.
31. See Moran, "Hebrew Language," 59–84.
32. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes*, 76–77.
33. See Mendenhall, "Hebrew Conquest," 66–87; Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*.
34. See Dever, *Who Were the Israelites . . . ?* 101–28.
35. Mendenhall, "Social Organization," 132–51.
36. Collections of ancient Hebrew inscriptions may be found in Renz and Röhlig, *Die althebräischen Inschriften*, and Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions*.
37. For an overview of the stele and the secondary literature, see Hasel, "Israel in the Merneptah Stele," 45–61.
38. It is also important to note that many early inscriptions were not discovered in controlled excavations, and their authenticity is therefore open to question. See especially the general observations of Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs I," 135–93; Rollston, "Non-Provenanced Epigraphs II," 57–79.
39. Sanders calls these inscriptions "an unstandardized Canaanite" (*Invention*, 105).
40. See Kochavi, "Ostrakon," 1–13; Cross, "Newly Found Inscriptions," 1–20.
41. Grant, "Découverte épigraphique," 401–2, pl. xv.
42. Maier et al., "Late Iron Age I / Early Iron Age II Old Canaanite Inscription," 39–71.
43. Stager, "Inscribed Potsherd," 45–52.
44. See the discussion and literature cited by Garfinkel and Ganor, "Khirbet Qeiyafa," 67–78. The initial report was published in Garfinkel and Ganor, *Khirbet Qeiyafa*. The reconstructions by Galil and Puech require much imagination; see Puech, "L'Ostrakon de Khirbet Qeiyafa," 162–84; Galil, "Hebrew Inscription," 193–242.
45. I concur here with the opinion of Rollston; see especially his article "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel," 47–74.
46. For the original publication, see H. Misgav, Y. Garfinkel, and S. Ganor, "The Khirbet Qeiyafa Ostrakon," in *New Studies in the Archaeology of Jerusalem and Its Region*, ed. D. Amit, G. D. Stiebel, and O. Peleg-Barkat (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority and the Institute of Archaeology, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2009), 111–23 (Hebrew).
47. See Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions*, 156–65.
48. It has even been suggested that this written sign was borrowed from Egyptian; see J. B. Segal, "YRH in the Gezer 'Calendar,'" 212–21.
49. Tappy et al., "Abecedar," 5–46.
50. Mazar, "Three 10th–9th Century B.C.E. Inscriptions," 171–84.
51. See Schniedewind, "Problems in the Paleographic Dating," 405–12.
52. Sanders, *Invention*, 49.
53. The most extensive recent study is the example from the city of Emar studied by Y. Cohen, *Scribes and Scholars*. More generally, see Rollston, *Writing and Literacy*, 115–26.
54. See, e.g., A. George, "In Search of the é.dub.ba.a," 127–37.
55. See van Soldt, "Written Sources," 40–41.
56. See, e.g., Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence*.
57. See Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, §§53–56, 111.
58. See the classic study of Hummel, "Enclitic Mem," 85–107, which gives a comprehensive, though overstated, list of possible enclitic *mems* in the biblical corpus. See also Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §9.8.
59. Note, e.g., the interesting mixed forms of the passive  $\sqrt{yld}$ , "to be born," in the LBH text of 1 Chron. 3:5 and 20:8, reflecting both the old passive *qal/pu'al* and contemporary use

of the *nip'al* conjugation. The existence of a *qal* passive is indicated wherever a verb exists in the *qal* and *pu'al*, but not the *pi'el* conjugation, as is the case with  $\sqrt{yld}$ .

60. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §11.2.10i. A related phenomenon is the asseverative *l-*; see Schniedewind and Sivan, "Letting Your 'Yes' Be 'No,'" 209–26.
61. See lists of vocabulary in Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, §§115–16; Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 56–61.
62. Greenfield, "Amurrite, Ugaritic and Canaanite," 99–100.
63. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §8.2e.

#### Chapter 4. Linguistic Nationalism and the Emergence of Hebrew

1. This point is nicely developed by Sanders, *Invention*.
2. See Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 127–46.
3. Fishman, *Language and Nationalism*, 44.
4. In particular, see Rendsburg, "Linguistic Variation," 177–90.
5. See the discussion of Samr 119 by Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions*, 496–97.
6. The term *Israelian* was coined by H. L. Ginsberg in *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism*. The term was adopted and has become mainstream because of the writings of Gary Rendsburg (e.g., *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*).
7. Knauf suggests, "The main problem of Israelite Hebrew is its bad attestation and, secondarily, that more than one language was spoken in the Kingdom of Israel" ("Bethel," 312). The former is certainly a limitation. The latter, though certainly true, does not pose as much of a problem, as we really must limit our inquiry to the written language, and dialectal differences do not necessarily translate directly into writing systems. Rather, it is likely that a uniform writing system for IH was circumscribed by the administrative and political centers of Israel (namely, Shechem and then Samaria). Influence of the Israelian vernaculars would have followed the wave of refugees from the north—that is, in the late eighth century B.C.E. (and not the sixth century B.C.E., as Knauf proposes).
8. See the classic study by Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text*. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew*, adopts a larger corpus to include all the northern narratives in the book of Kings.
9. For a more maximalist list, see Rendsburg, "Comprehensive Guide," 8.
10. See Rendsburg, "Linguistic Variation," 177–90.
11. It is noteworthy that Shalmaneser III (r. 858–824 B.C.E.) fought frequently in the open field, which suggests a perceived parity between opponents. By the time we reach the end of the eighth century, in contrast, Assyrian monarchs are more usually involved with siege warfare, suggesting their relative superiority; see Eph'al, "On Warfare," 88–106; Kühne, "Urbanization," 55–84.
12. The original publication on this topic was Broshi, "Expansion," 21. I developed this argument further in several places (see "Jerusalem," 375–93, and most recently, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 64–90). Although this position was critiqued by Na'aman, "When and How . . . ?" 21–56, a thorough rejoinder was made by Finkelstein, "Settlement History," 499–515.
13. Finkelstein, "Archaeology of the Days of Manasseh," 173.
14. See the chapter "Hezekiah and the Beginning of Biblical Literature" in Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 64–90.
15. Rendsburg, "Comprehensive Guide," 8–9.
16. I have discussed this at length in *How the Bible Became a Book*, 64–117, but also see my review of van der Toorn's *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*.
17. Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, clxxiii.
18. Note the observation by Y. Kutscher, *Words and Their History*, 34.

19. See, in general, Grosby, *Biblical Ideas*.
20. These periods are conceptualized with a view to the archaeology, changes in material culture, and changes in scribal institutions.
21. On the Assyrian alphabetic scribes, see Pearce, “Sepîru,” 355–68.
22. See the articles by Hurvitz, “Chronological Significance,” 234–40; Hurvitz, “Hebrew and Aramaic in the Bible,” 79–94.
23. This point is made by C. Rabin, “Foreign Words,” *EM* 4:1075 (Hebrew).
24. See Schwartz, “Language, Power and Identity,” 3–47.
25. *Ibid.*, 10.
26. *Ibid.*, 12.
27. See Myers-Scotton, “Code-Switching,” 217–37. The study of code-switching is especially associated with John J. Gumperz; see his *Discourse Strategies*. Also note the work of M. Heller, e.g., *Codeswitching*.
28. See Schürer, *History*, 1:603–5.
29. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy*, 35.
30. See Cross, “Paleography,” 393–409.
31. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy*, 37–41.
32. *Ibid.*, 42–46.
33. Rollston does acknowledge “the pronounced elongation present in the Phoenician script of subsequent centuries,” and he goes on to say that “it is very difficult to consider elongation to be a distinctive feature of Old Hebrew” (*ibid.*, 33).
34. See Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion*.
35. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 118–46.
36. Porter, “Language, Audience and Impact,” 60.
37. Fales, “Use and Function,” 118; emphasis added.
38. The old translation by Luckenbill (*Ancient Records*, 2:65–66) is cited prominently in Sparks, *Ethnicity and Identity*, 35. See also the more recent edition of the inscription in Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II*.
39. CAD A, 1:189–92.
40. Unfortunately, there are some minor problems with Luckenbill’s translation. To begin with, Luckenbill translates the Akkadian word *aklu* as “scribes,” but the word never has this nuance. Rather, *aklu* means “overseer,” usually one in charge of a group of soldiers, workers, or craftsmen (see CAD A, 1:277–80). In the original publication of the cylinder, D. G. Lyon suggested that the Akkadian term *šāpîru*, which Luckenbill translated as “sheriff or superintendent,” actually referred to a “Schriftgelehrte,” that is, some sort of scribe. Lyon thought that the word was connected with the Aramaic term for scribe, *sāprā’* (e.g., Ezra 4:8).
41. Cited in CAD T, 152.
42. Tadmor, “Aramaization,” 451.
43. Fales, “Use and Function,” 89–124.
44. It is noteworthy that the term *sepîru* does not appear until the Neo-Babylonian period, whereas the logogram A.BA is common in the Neo-Assyrian period. More generally, the Neo-Babylonian scribes routinely wrote out logograms syllabically, in this case giving us a syllabic rendering for the neologism that the Neo-Assyrian administrative bureaucracy created for Aramaic/alphabetic scribes.
45. See the edition by Lindenberger, *Aramaic Proverbs*, and the general discussion by Greenfield, “Wisdom of Ahiqar,” 43–52.
46. Tadmor, “Aramaization,” 459; Pearce, “Sepîru,” 361.
47. Deller, “Das Siegel,” 151.
48. *PRU* 3, 212:12–14 (see Pearce, “Sepîru,” 361).
49. See Kiernan, “Languages and Conquerors,” 191–210.

50. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 127.
51. On the anthropology of refugees and its application to the study of ancient Israel, see Burke, "Anthropological Model," 41–56.
52. See most recently Finkelstein, "Settlement History," 499–515.
53. Bethel itself diminished in the wake of the Assyrian invasions and did not revive until the Hellenistic period; see Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz, "Reevaluating Bethel," 33–48; contra Knauf, "Bethel," 291–349.
54. Finkelstein and Silberman, "Temple and Dynasty," 268, citing Finkelstein, Lederman, and Bunimovitz, *Highlands*, 898–909.
55. See Burke, "Coping with the Effects," 263–87.
56. The most extensive work on the northern dialect of Hebrew had been done by Gary Rendsburg; see, e.g., Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew*, and Rendsburg, "Comprehensive Guide," 5–35.
57. For a discussion of the unique case of the Elijah-Elisha narratives as well as some methodological caveats for discerning Israelian Hebrew, see Schniedewind and Sivan, "Elijah-Elisha Narratives," 303–37.
58. Northern immigrants are also indicated by the appearance of *yw-* prefixes, which are also northern (e.g., used frequently in the Samaria ostraca), in a few Judean seals (note particularly the seven impressions of the seal of "Menachem, (son of) Jobana," excavated at Lachish, Ramat Rahel, Gibeon, and Jerusalem; see Avigad and Sass, *Corpus*, no. 678; also note another Judean seal [*Corpus*, no. 663] as well as names in the Samaria ostraca 36:3, 45:3, 111:1 (see Dobbs-Allsop, *Hebrew Inscriptions*, 423–97).
59. The historical and linguistic features are discussed in detail in Rendsburg and Schniedewind, "Siloam Tunnel Inscription," 188–203.
60. It should be noted that the term *mwzħ* does have a more typically Judean spelling, which would usually be read as a contracted diphthong /*\*môzâ* < *\*mawzâl*.
61. Cross and Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, 42–43. Garr argues, "Although the Mesha inscription reflects a dialect in which diphthongs had, for the most part, contracted, vestigial uncontracted forms do appear" (*Dialect Geography*, 38).
62. Dearman, *Studies in the Mesha Inscription*, 119.
63. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 299.
64. *Ibid.*, 300.
65. See Rendsburg, *Diglossia*, 20, citing Malamed, "Conversation," 28.
66. Rendsburg, *Diglossia*, 20–21.
67. Linguists now recognize that writing is not merely a system for the representation of speech but has its own logic that differs from speech; see, e.g., Coulmas, *Writing Systems*, 16–17.
68. See Grosby's discussion of the application of nationalism to antiquity, *Biblical Ideas*, 13–51.
69. A most helpful study of nationalism in Hasmonean Israel is provided by Mendels, *Rise and Fall*. Mendels is careful to acknowledge the problems of applying modern definitions to ancient societies but rightly sees the utility in many of the categories.
70. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 44.
71. See Woolard, "Language Ideology as a Field," 16–17.
72. See Grosby, "Religion and Nationality," 229–65.
73. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods*; Tigay, "Israelite Religion," 157–94. Tigay probably overstates the religious implications of the onomasticon for monotheism; see e.g., Binger, *Asherah*, 30–35.
74. The data is available in Avigad and Sass, *Corpus*.
75. Grosby, "Borders," 6.
76. Grosby, "Kinship," 3–18.
77. See Aharoni, *Land of the Bible*, 64–80.

78. For the original publication, see Biran and Naveh, “Tel Dan Inscription,” 1–18; for a discussion of the meaning of the expression “house of David” in the historical and linguistic context, see Rendsburg, “On the Writing בִּית־דָּוִד,” 22–25.
79. Although the phrase “house of David” must be partially restored, the reading is quite convincing; see Lemaire, “House of David,” 30–37.
80. See COS 2:113A.
81. See Williamson, *Israel in the Book of Chronicles*.
82. See COS 2:117D.
83. See COS 2:119B.
84. See the essays in Carsten, *Cultures of Relatedness*.
85. E.g., G. Rendsburg, “Geographical and Historical Background,” 105–15.
86. A comprehensive list of possible northernisms in biblical literature may be found in Rendsburg, “Comprehensive Guide,” 10–31.
87. Rendsburg and Schniedewind, “Siloam Tunnel Inscription,” 188–203.

### Chapter 5. The Democratization of Hebrew

1. E. Stern, *Archaeology*, 169.
2. See Kletter, *Economic keystones*.
3. Shoham, “Hebrew Bullae,” 29–57.
4. *Ibid.*, seals B1, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 33, 34, 37, 41, and 44.
5. See discussion and literature cited by Shoham, “Hebrew Bullae,” 33.
6. Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae*, 121.
7. See *ibid.*, 122; Crowfoot and Crowfoot, *Early Ivories*, 2, 88.
8. Reich, Shukron, and Lerna, “Recent Discoveries,” 156–60.
9. Millard, “Uses,” 106.
10. Shoham, “Hebrew Bullae,” 47–48.
11. *Ibid.*, 53.
12. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy*, 92–94.
13. Deutsch and Heltzer, *New Epigraphic Evidence*, 92–103.
14. The *editio princeps* was done by H. Torczyner (*Lachish I*). The present discussion draws upon my article “Sociolinguistic Reflections,” 157–67.
15. Translation by Parpola, “Man without a Scribe,” 315–24. Also see Fuchs and Parpola, *Correspondence*, 17.
16. Charpin, *Reading and Writing*, 63.
17. This text is frequently mistranslated, e.g., NRSV, “he shall have a copy of this law written for him.” However, the Hebrew verb *ktb*, “to write,” is clearly active, not passive, and the king, who is the implied subject of the verb, is writing. See, e.g., Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 168; however, I do not agree that this active verb can have the meaning “have written” (168 n. 76). This is a case of special pleading based on a targumic translation.
18. Brettler, “Structure,” 87–97.
19. Isserlin, “Epigraphically Attested Judean Hebrew,” 197; Young, *Diversity*, 110.
20. Schniedewind, “Sociolinguistic Reflections,” 157–67.
21. E.g., Cross, “Literate Soldier,” 45. He reads it as a *casus pendens*. This assumes that a subject + verb + objective (SVO) sentence is (in Cross’s words) “unusual.” What is especially unusual is not the SVO order but the nonstandard epistolary opening.
22. Pardee et al., *Handbook*, 85.
23. Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 114–27.
24. Cross, “Literate Soldier,” 45.
25. E.g., Lehman, “Forgotten Principle,” 93–101. Dahood applied this example to extensively rewrite the psalter in his commentary; see *Psalms 101–150*, 371–72.

26. Pardee, *Handbook*, 86.
27. See Judg. 20:28; Ezek. 31:11; Ps. 89:28; 2 Chron. 7:20.
28. The original publication was Naveh, “Hebrew Letter,” 129–39. Also see Naveh, “Some Notes,” 158–59; Talmon, “New Hebrew Letter,” 29–38; Dobbs-Allsopp, “Genre of the Mesad Hashavyahu Ostrakon,” 49–55.
29. An example of this type of verbal construction in SBH also appears in direct speech, 1 Sam. 17:34, *rō'eh hāyā* (רֹאֵה הָיָא), “But David said to Saul, ‘Your servant was shepherding.’” See discussion by Ahituv, *Echoes*, 160. In RH, the periphrastic is more typically *hyh* followed by the participle, as opposed to the participle followed by *hyh*, although both constructions are attested (see *b. Pe'ah* 2:4; *b. Shevu'ot* 8:10; *b. Shabbat* 1:9).
30. Note, e.g., the common expression in RH, *wmr hyh* (וַיֹּמַר הָיָה), or more commonly, *hyh wmr* (הָיָה וַיֹּמַר), “he used to say.” See further Greenfield, “Periphrastic Imperative,” 199–210; Muraoka, “Participle,” 188–204.
31. This inscription was initially published by Dever, “Iron Age Epigraphic Material,” 139–204. There have been several attempts to understand these inscriptions, and a good summary may be found in Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions*, 405–20. Note also the treatment by Ahituv, which includes several other inscriptions from the antiquities market that allegedly come from the vicinity (*Echoes*, 220–33).
32. The tombs date to the end of the Judean monarchy, in spite of some suggestions that they might be later; see Naveh, “Old Hebrew Inscriptions,” 74–92; Lemaire, “Prières,” 558–68.
33. The inscriptions were originally published by Naveh, “Old Hebrew Inscriptions,” 74–92. Ahituv summarizes the three major attempts to decipher the five inscriptions (*Echoes*, 233–36).
34. Originally published by Barkay, “Priestly Benediction,” 139–91.
35. The paleographic dating of the amulets has been the subject of some discussion. Unfortunately, much of the earlier discussion was based on early photographs and consequently inaccurate drawings; see Barkay et al., “Amulets,” 41–71.
36. See also Fishbane, “Form and Reformulation,” 115–21.
37. See the survey of the discussion by Gogel, *Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*, 49–74.
38. On the Assyrian alphabetic scribes, see Pearce, “Sepīru,” 355–68.
39. Cross and Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, 58–59.
40. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes*, 107–10.
41. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, 185.
42. See Barr, *Variable Spellings*, and Andersen and Forbes, *Spelling*.
43. Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 2.
44. Van Gelderen, *History*, 13.
45. Millard, “Variable Spelling,” 106–15.
46. See Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, 8–9.
47. Rollston, *Writing and Literacy*, 85–89; Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 85–114; also see the classic work by A. Lemaire, *Les Écoles et la Formation de la Bible dans L'ancien Israël*.
48. See Horowitz and Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan*, 19–22.
49. See Parker, *Mechanics*; Kühne, “Urbanization,” 55–84.
50. Latacz, *Homer*, 18.
51. Young, “Israelite Literacy,” 240.
52. See Goody and Watt, “Consequences of Literacy,” 304–45; Goody, *Domestication of the Savage Mind*; Goody, *Logic of Writing*; Ong, *Orality and Literacy*; Ong, “Writing Is a Technology,” 23–50; Havelock, *Literate Revolution*.
53. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*.
54. *Ibid.*, 15.

55. Ibid., 17.
56. Bowman and Woolf, “Literacy and Power in the Ancient World,” 9–10.
57. This point is nicely made in Niditch’s recent work, *Oral World*.
58. See, e.g., Machinist, “Question of Distinctiveness,” 196–212.
59. Ibid., 196–97. See, e.g., Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas*, or Wright, *Old Testament*.
60. Machinist, “Question of Distinctiveness,” 210–11.
61. There is considerable debate among scholars as to the dating of the book of Kings as well as of Isaiah. I regard this text as dating to the Hezekian (i.e., late eighth century B.C.E.) redaction of the book of Kings favored by several scholars. See Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 73–90, and my summary in “Problem with Kings,” 22–27.
62. See the general discussion by G. Schramm, “Hebrew,” *ABD* 4:203–14.
63. Skoss, *Saadia Gaon*.

### Chapter 6. Hebrew in Exile

1. For the definition of a speech community, see Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology*, 72–83.
2. I discussed this at length in an earlier work; see Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 139–64.
3. Knauf, “Bethel,” 291–349.
4. Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz, “Reevaluating Bethel,” 33–48. Early archaeological work had postulated 597 and 586 B.C.E. destruction levels (with Bethel supposedly conquered in 597 B.C.E.), but more-recent work has confirmed that the Assyrians were responsible for the earlier destruction (usually assigned to Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E., although earlier Neo-Assyrian campaigns [e.g., 721, 712 B.C.E.] are possible, depending on the site).
5. E. Stern, *Archaeology*, 303. See also E. Stern, “Babylonian Gap,” 45–51, 76.
6. Zorn, “Mizpah,” 28–38, 66; Stipp, “Gedalia,” 155–71. On the Babylonian administration of Judah, see Vanderhooft, *Neo-Babylonian Empire*, 104–10.
7. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 289.
8. Torrey’s work also resurfaced in the volume of essays from the European Seminar in Historical Methodology: Torrey, *Leading Captivity Captive*. See Carroll, “Exile!” 77.
9. R. Carroll, “Israel, History of: Post-Monarchic Period,” *ABD* 3:567–76; emphasis added.
10. Barstad, *Myth*, 18–19; also see Barstad, “On the History,” 25–36.
11. See the essays by Oded, “Where Is the ‘Myth . . .?’” 55–74, and Japhet, “Periodization,” 75–89.
12. See, e.g., Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes*, 321–26.
13. See D. Smith, *Religion*; Smith-Christopher, “Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact,” 7–36, and Smith-Christopher, *Biblical Theology*.
14. Lipschits, “Demographic Changes,” 332.
15. Ibid., 333. These statistics actually suggest an even more precipitous decline than the older statistics in studies by Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes*, 62, and Carter, *Emergence*, 114–213.
16. Lipschits, “Demographic Changes,” 334–38.
17. Ibid., 338–41.
18. Ibid., 341–45.
19. See the summary by Mazar, *Archaeology*, 458–60.
20. Lehmann, “Trends,” 21–32. Lehmann’s work utilizes the new archaeological data to update Ephraim Stern’s classic work that had pointed to some continuity in the material culture between the Iron and Persian periods; see E. Stern, *Material Culture*, 229.
21. See Vanderhooft, *Neo-Babylonian Empire*, 61–114.
22. Vanderhooft, “Scribes and Scripts,” 535.
23. Ibid., 539.

24. Weidner, "Jojachin," 923–28; Albright, "King Jehoiachin," 49–55. The Neo-Babylonian archives, including this particular archive, are discussed in Pedersén, *Archives*, 183–84.
25. As suggested by J. Berridge, "Jehoiachin," *ABD* 3:661–63; also see Albright, "King Jehoiachin," 49–55.
26. On the Babylonian linguistic influence, see the classic work by Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter*. Although Zimmern's book represents an early period of the field of Assyriology, and certainly overstates the extent of Akkadian influence, it remains a valuable resource.
27. Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords*, 9; also see the earlier works by Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences*; Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words*; C. Rabin, "Foreign Words," *EM* 4:1070–80. Finally, the lexicon edited by Koehler and Baumgartner, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, is an essential resource for historical etymology.
28. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 59–178.
29. Moran, "Ancient Near Eastern Background," 77–87.
30. Hurvitz, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Biblical Period," 24–37.
31. See Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study*; Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew*.
32. E.g., Rooker, "Dating Isaiah 40–66," 303–12.
33. See especially the analysis by Talshir, "Habitat and History of Hebrew," 251–75.
34. See especially Cryer, *Divination*, 192. Cited by Young and Rezetko, *Linguistic Dating*, 1:47.
35. Contrast, e.g., Young, *Diversity*. Some of the leveling of Hebrew may also be ascribed to the transmission process, however this too is uneven; note, e.g., the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran with the Masoretic text (see Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*).

### Chapter 7. Hebrew under Imperialism

1. This is the term that Naveh uses in his *Early History of the Alphabet*, 162–74.
2. Tadmor, "Aramaization," 449–70.
3. Vernacularization was also a dialectic in the formation of the Hebrew Bible, particularly books like Deuteronomy (see my discussion, *How the Bible Became a Book*, 111–17).
4. Pollock, "Cosmopolitan," 592.
5. For an account of the demise of cuneiform, see Geller, "Last Wedge," 43–95.
6. Fitzmyer, "Phases," 57–84.
7. See Kiernan, "Languages and Conquerors," 191–210.
8. *Ibid.*, 195.
9. Naveh and Greenfield, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period," 116.
10. See summary by Eph'al, *Archaeology*, 360–66, 535–70. Also see Eph'al and Naveh, *Aramaic Ostraca*.
11. Eph'al, *Archaeology*, 362.
12. C. Rabin, "Historical Background," 152.
13. Lindenberger, *Aramaic Proverbs*. More generally, see Beyer, *Die aramaischen Inschriften*.
14. See Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaica*.
15. See Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book*, and Schniedewind, "Aramaic, the Death of Written Hebrew," 137–48.
16. Schaper, "Hebrew," 17.
17. *Ibid.*, 16.
18. Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change*, 503.
19. See Kahn, "Neo-Aramaic Dialect," 213–25; also see the anecdotal account in Sabar, *My Father's Paradise*.
20. Lipschits, "Achaemenid Imperial Policy," 27.
21. See E. Stern, *Archaeology*, 353–60; Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 645–87.



22. This is also the position of Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 112–13.
23. In his defense of MH as a living language, M. Segal underplayed the significance of Aramaic influence on MH (see especially the introduction to *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 1–20). Segal's point, namely, that Mishnaic Hebrew was based on a living language, was well taken; however, his minimizing of the impact of Aramaic should be understood in retrospect as merely a rhetorical device of his argument.
24. See, e.g., P. Kroskity's study of the Arizona Tewa Indians, "Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech."
25. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 128.
26. Schaper, "Hebrew," 15–26.
27. A. Saldarini, "Scribes," *ABD* 5:1013, cited by Schaper, "Hebrew," 18.
28. *Ibid.*; also see Naveh and Greenfield, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period," 115–29. Contrast Schniedewind, "Aramaic, the Death of Written Hebrew," 137–48.
29. Schaper, "Hebrew," 17.
30. *Ibid.*, 22.
31. See Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 55–56; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 89–90.
32. I regard the site of Ramat Rahel, a royal administrative site located between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, as an ideal candidate for the site of Jabez. A town of "scribal families" should be associated with the royal administration in Jerusalem, and Ramat Rahel would be a plausible candidate.
33. This is underscored by the close relationship between the Proto-Masoretic text known from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the later Masoretic tradition; see, e.g., Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 21–79. For an exhaustive analysis of the Masoretic tradition, see Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah*, and Yeivin, *Hebrew Language*.
34. Joosten, "Pseudoclassicisms in Late Biblical Hebrew," 146–59.
35. Joosten, "Evolution of Literary Hebrew."
36. See J. Blau, "Hapax Legomena," *EncJud* 8:337.
37. On the importance of loanwords for dating biblical texts, see Eshkult, "Importance," 8–23.
38. C. Cohen, *Biblical Hapax Legomena*; also see Greenspahn, *Hapax Legomena*.
39. See further Schniedewind and Sivan, "Letting Your 'Yes' Be 'No,'" 209–26.
40. See Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*, 3:195–200 (esp. 200); also Brown, "HL in Northwest Semitic," 218–19.
41. For a comparison of the versions, see Grill, "Die alten Versionen," 277–78. Note the emendations proposed by Skinner, *Genesis*, 336–38.
42. This is the only example of the word לְאִמֶּר not being immediately followed by a direct quote in the entire Hebrew Bible. לְאִמֶּר is commonly employed in the phrases לְאִמֶּר . . . וַיֹּאמֶר, לְאִמֶּר . . . וַיִּדְבֹּר, לְאִמֶּר . . . וַיִּצַּד, לְאִמֶּר . . . וַיִּקְרָא, and many other variations to introduce direct quotes. The direct quote invariably follows the use of לְאִמֶּר.
43. See, e.g., Skinner, *Genesis*, 337.
44. For more examples, see Schniedewind and Sivan, "Letting Your 'Yes' Be 'No,'" 213–26.
45. Hummel, "Enclitic Mem," 85–107.
46. See the lengthy discussion by Avishur, *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms*, 39–110 (esp. 91–95). The original observation was made by H. L. Ginsberg; see generally Ginsberg, "Phoenician Hymn," 472–76, and specifically his Hebrew book, *Kitve Ugarit*, 130.
47. Still, the Greek translator struggled with the meaning, translating "Lebanon" as a part of a construct phrase, "like the calf of Lebanon."
48. See Joosten, "Distinction between Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew" 337–38. This phenomenon was already pointed out by Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 197–99.
49. Joosten, "Distinction between Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew," 337–38.
50. See Heaton, *School Tradition*, 107–14.
51. See also Deut. 8:1; 11:9; 16:20; 19:10, 14; 21:23; 24:4.

52. Naveh and Greenfield, "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period," 119.
53. Avigad, *Bullae and Seals*.
54. S. Schwartz argued that vernacular Hebrew disappeared in the Persian period, citing inscriptional evidence that points primarily to Aramaic (see "Hebrew and Imperialism in Jewish Palestine," 53–84). Yet, the survival of vernacular Hebrew during the Second Temple period would have been in speech communities that were not necessarily literate. Moreover, his suggestion that shared language as a component of group identity is "simplistic" (54) flies in the face of basic sociolinguistic theory. In the words of the sociolinguist Peter Trudgill, "Language is a signal of group identity" (*Sociolinguistics*, 130). Schwartz seems to want to make a special case for ancient Jews, suggesting that language (and especially Hebrew) was not critical for their group identity. Yet the use of Hebrew in *symbolic* ways (coins, religious ceremonies) indicates otherwise. The problem of how pervasive Hebrew was as a vernacular is a different problem, but its importance for group identity cannot be dismissed.
55. The word is sometimes associated with the Greek for drachma.
56. For a comprehensive study and catalog of the Yehud inscriptions, see Lipschits and Vanderhooft, *Yehud Stamp Impressions*.
57. The initial publication was by Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C.," 41–62; also see Avigad, *Bullae and Seals*.
58. See Silverstein's critique of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* in "Worfianism and the Linguistic Imagination," 85–138.
59. See Fried, "Silver Coin," 65–85; Barag, "Some Notes on a Silver Coin," 166–68; Betlyon, "Provincial Government," 633–42; Root, "Coinage, War, and Peace," 131–34.
60. Betlyon, "Provincial Government," 641.
61. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 129.
62. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, 136–44; Eira, "Authority and Discourse," 171–224.
63. The small changes in the Hebrew script between the seventh and first centuries B.C.E. makes the differences almost imperceptible to all but trained epigraphers. This became clear when two biblical scholars (Rogerson and Davies, "Was the Siloam Tunnel Built . . . ?" 138–49) suggested redating a late eighth-century B.C.E. Hebrew inscription (the Siloam Tunnel inscription) to the second century B.C.E. Although trained epigraphers (see, e.g., Hackett, "Defusing Pseudo-Scholarship," and the other articles in *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23, no. 2 [1997]) quickly corrected this mistake, it illustrated how little the Hebrew script had changed over the centuries.
64. This follows the observations of Talshir, "Habitat and History of Hebrew," 251–75. See also E. Axel Knauf, who notes, "400 becomes a more likely date for the BH/LBH divide than 586 ("Bethel," 311).
65. See Hurvitz, "Date of the Prose Tale of Job," 17–34.
66. Although the poetic aspects of these latter works have suggested to some scholars that they are Israelian Hebrew, it seems more likely that the idiosyncrasies of this literature result from its register (i.e., poetry) rather than its origin (i.e., Samaria).
67. See, e.g., Hurvitz, "Once Again," 180–91. This work has been critiqued in recent works (e.g., Young and Rezetko, *Linguistic Dating*), but the critiques are not entirely convincing (see, e.g., the review by Joosten in *Bibel und Babel*).

### Chapter 8. Hebrew in the Hellenistic World

1. As cited by Bowman and Woolf, *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, 11.
2. See Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 112–210; Alexander, "How Did the Rabbis Learn Hebrew?" 72–89.
3. See Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*.

4. C. Rabin claimed that fragments of Hebrew literature from the later Second Temple period have been preserved in rabbinic literature, including the Account of King Yannai (*b. Qid-dushin* 66a) and the Account of Simeon the Just (Sifre for Num. 22); see Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 128 n. 51. However, these are short and problematic linguistic sources.
5. Naveh, "Hebrew and Aramaic Inscriptions," 9–10.
6. *Ibid.*, 10.
7. See, e.g., Weitzman, "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" 35–45; Schniedewind, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," 245–55.
8. See Beentjes, *Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*.
9. Later tradition suggests that all seventy-two translators came up with precisely identical translations, thus proving the inspiration of the Greek Bible (e.g., Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* §3.21.2).
10. Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change*, 514.
11. The idea that Hebrew was a divine and even primordial language is especially developed in some of the literature from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Of course, the book of Jubilees itself seems to have been an important text in the sectarian literature, with at least fifteen copies found in the Qumran caves. Note the inclusion of Jubilees in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 196–98.
12. Purvis, *Samaritan Pentateuch*.
13. *Ibid.*, 50–52.
14. Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 31–32; Meshorer and Qedar, *Samaritan Coinage*.
15. Ben-Hayyim, *Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew*, 1.
16. *Ibid.*, 23–28.
17. *Ibid.*, 335.
18. See Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Qimron's volume, alongside Kutscher's masterful *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, provides a serviceable description of QH. For a survey of QH, see Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 130–46, and the literature cited there.
19. See Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, and Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*.
20. In the words of Judith Irvine ("When Talk Isn't Cheap," 250), who obviously borrows from Durkheim.
21. Devorah Dimant has distinguished between "documents employing terminology connected to the Qumran Community" and "works not containing such terminology." She estimates that approximately 40 percent of the Cave 4 manuscripts should be classified among those "not containing terminology connected to the Qumran Community" ("Qumran Manuscripts," 32).
22. For a survey of recent studies on language ideology, see Woolard and Schieffelin, "Language Ideology," 55–82.
23. C. Rabin, "Historical Background," 146.
24. Such a belief would lend more support to Schiffman's argument for the Proto-Sadducean origins of the Qumran community; see Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 83–89.
25. The reference to a metaphorical source (בְּקִינָה) suggests that the Qumran sectarians associated this term with the verb קָיָה in its meaning "to gather water," and the related noun בְּקִינָה (e.g., Gen. 1:9–10, where God gathers the primordial waters). It might be fruitful to pursue the relationship between this concept and the "well" motif; see Fishbane, "Well of Living Water," 3–16.
26. See Clements, *Isaiah 1–39*, 165, 228, and the literature cited there.
27. Talmon, "Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel," 200–43.
28. Talmon, "What's in a Calendar?" 25–58; see S. Stern, "Qumran Calendars," 179–86.

29. This is a term used by Irvine and Gal in their methodologically important study "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation," 35–83.
30. Frank Moore Cross, for instance, characterizes these as a "survival of Old Canaanite"; Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," 4.
31. This issue has been particularly important in recent studies in sociolinguistics; e.g., Gal, "Codeswitching and Consciousness," 637–53; Irvine, "When Talk Isn't Cheap," 248–67; Heller, *Codeswitching*. Also see the classic study by Voloshinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, 9–15.
32. Romaine, *Language in Society*, 148.
33. See Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage," 235–52, and the further comments by Rendsburg, "Qumran Hebrew," 217–46.
34. Halliday, "Anti-Languages," 571. Notably, Halliday considers the early Christian community an antisociety and to a certain degree its language an antilanguage (575). All the more so the *yahad* community.
35. Ormsby-Lennon, "From Shibboleth to Apocalypse," 72–112; also see N. Smith, "Uses of Hebrew in the English Revolution," 51–71.
36. Irvine, "When Talk Isn't Cheap," 253. The principle is actually a general sociolinguistic pattern, as Labov observes (*Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 314), but it appears to be exaggerated in sharply bounded groups.
37. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 251; emphasis added.
38. Linguistic diversity among the scrolls also becomes an occasion to argue that Qumran Hebrew is an "artificial" language, independent from both LBH and RH. See, e.g., Meyer, "Das Problem der Dialektmischung," 139–48, and Meyer, "Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen," 39–48. Antilanguages, however, are not artificial. From sociolinguistic and functionalist perspectives, there is no such thing as an artificial language. Qumran Hebrew is not artificial, but it does arise out of a countersociety.
39. Tov, "Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls," 31–57; Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert," 5–37; Tov, *Scribal Practices*.
40. Indeed, the proximity of the site to the scroll caves had always made this an obvious inference, and the discovery of three inkwells in the excavations at Khirbet Qumran further solidified the argument. The scientific tests showing that the ink on some scrolls was made using water from the Dead Sea should put an end to this question; see I. Rabin et al., "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll," 97–106.
41. Note the critique of Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society," 72–81, as well as Tov's response, "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper," 360–61.
42. See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, 5–8; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.
43. M. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 32; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §200.15.
44. See Tov, "Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls," 31–57, and Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert," 5–37.
45. Tov, "Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls," 36.
46. See especially Tov, "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper," 360–61.
47. Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 88.
48. Pfann, "Cryptic Texts," 515–74.
49. See Eira, "Authority and Discourse," 171–224.
50. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, 19.
51. See Ben-Hayyim, "Traditions in the Hebrew Language," 200–214.
52. See Tov's critique ("Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls," 38–39) of Siegel, *Severus Scroll and 1QIsa*.
53. Tov, "Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls," 39.

54. Neither can we accept Norman Golb's argument that all the scrolls came from outside the community, because there are too many scribal hands evidenced in the scrolls; see Golb, "Problem of Origin and Identification," 1–24.
55. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, 292.
56. Other clear examples include 1QH 15:29; 4Q175 5, 6, 18; 4Q185 5; 4Q378 frag. 3 1:8; 4Q417 frag. 1 2:7; 4Q504 frag. 1–2R 5:5; 11QT 34:9; 59:10. I wish to express thanks to Martin Abegg for supplying me a complete list of supralinear letters and final letters in medial position in the Qumran texts.
57. See Eira, "Authority and Discourse," 171–224.
58. See Pfann, "Writings in Esoteric Script from Qumran," 177–90.
59. Pfann, "4Q298," 216–21.
60. *Ibid.*, 225.
61. Halliday writes, "An anti-language is the means of realization of a subjective reality: not merely expressing it, but actively creating and maintaining it" ("Anti-Languages," 576).
62. See Weitzman, "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" 35–45.
63. Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 100.
64. *Ibid.*, 135–41.
65. C. Rabin, "Historical Background," 146.
66. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew," 149.
67. Bar-Asher, "Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic in Qumran Hebrew," 15–19.
68. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, 23.
69. *Ibid.*, 24.
70. For this reason, the analysis of I. Young is particularly misguided, focusing as it does on lexical items that are largely generated by the language ideology of QH (Young, "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Peshet Habakkuk").
71. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew," 149.
72. See M. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 146. See examples cited in Clines (ed.), *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 1:432–33.
73. C. Rabin, "Historical Background," 146–48.
74. See M. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, §169.
75. Other examples include 1QS 1:13, 14, 15, 17; 3:10; 6:11; 9:16; CD 2:16; 7:2; 1QH 15:15; 18:15; 20:24; 1QH frag. 2 1:12; 1QH frag. 5 1:14; 4Q287 frag. 8 1:13; 4Q396 frags. 1–2 4:6, 7; 4Q397 frags. 6–13 1:12; 11QT 50:2.
76. See Judg. 1:19; Isa. 30:5; Jer. 4:11; Amos 6:10; Dan. 6:9, 16; Ezra 6:8; 1 Chron. 5:1; 15:2; 2 Chron. 12:12.
77. See Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, 20.
78. In spite of M. Segal's objections (*Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 164–65), it seems obvious that the use of the periphrastic construction in Mishnaic Hebrew is the result of Aramaic influence. Even Segal concedes that the periphrastic construction occurs mainly in LBH, not SBH. On its use in biblical Hebrew, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §37.7; Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*, §121g; there are substantive differences between Joüon's original discussion and Muraoka's translation and revision in *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*.
79. The elongated form *hw'h* is known from Dead Sea Scrolls biblical manuscripts copied using Qumran scribal practice (e.g., 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, 1Q4, 2Q13, 4Q27, 4Q128, 4Q138).
80. Some examples include 1QS 10:12, 16, 25; 1QpHab 6:12; 1QM 13:12, 13; 14:13; 1QH 5:26; 7:13; 9:23; 10:30; 12:39; 14:6, 7; 17:8, 9, 13, 14; 18:16, 20, 31, 34; 19:6, 20, 23; 20:2, 3; 22:9, 10; 1Q34bis frag. 2+1 i, 3; 4Q427 frag. 1 1:3, 4; 2:4; frag. 4 1:1; frag. 8 1:2; 4Q491 frags. 8–10 1:10; 4Q503 frags. 7–9 4:3; 11QT 29:8; 30:1; 54:10; 55:4; 56:13.
81. See M. Segal, *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, 72, 153–55.
82. Revell, "Pausal Forms in Biblical Hebrew," 168.

83. See, e.g., 1QS 3:18; 4:17; 11:7; 1QpHab 6:1; 7:1. My observations here are first of all indebted to a graduate seminar paper at UCLA by Roger Good, entitled “Changes in the Use of the Prefix and Suffix Conjugation of the Verb in the Different Types of Qumran Literature.” Also see M. Smith, “Converted and Unconverted Perfect and Imperfect Forms,” 1–16; Thorion-Vardi, “Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents,” 65–88; Montaner, “Some Features of the Hebrew Verbal Syntax,” 273–86.
84. See Qimron and Strugnell, “Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 400–407.
85. *Ibid.*, 405.
86. Halliday, “Anti-Languages,” 576.
87. See Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 43–46.

### *Chapter 9. The End and the Beginning of Hebrew*

1. See, e.g., Heinrichs, *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, xi–xv.
2. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 56.
3. See, e.g., Shinan, “Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean Jewry,” 244–45.
4. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 171.
5. See E. Y. Kutscher, “Hebrew,” *EncJud* 8:640.
6. This point is made by Alexander, “How Did the Rabbis Learn Hebrew?” 74–75.
7. Unfortunately, most references to Jewish education come from much later texts, such as the Talmud, and cannot be relied upon for understanding education in the first couple of centuries C.E. Citations here will be limited to earlier (i.e., contemporary) sources.
8. Josephus, *Against Apion*, 2.204.
9. Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba*, 181.
10. See Yadin and Naveh, *Masada I*, 8–9.
11. Bar, “Population, Settlement and Economy,” 311.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, 244; emphasis added.
14. Sáenz-Badillos, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 161–62.
15. Cited, e.g., by Chomsky, “What Was the Jewish Vernacular . . . ?” 194.
16. As was pointed out by E. Y. Kutscher, “Hebrew Language, Mishnaic,” *EncJud* 8:639–50.
17. See *ibid.*, 640–42.
18. Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 75.
19. See the discussions by Blau, *Phonology and Morphology*, 3–4; Pérez Fernández, *Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 104–10; Mishor, “Tense System in Tannaitic Hebrew.”
20. Yadin et al., *Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period*, 14–15.

### *Chapter 10. Epilogue*

1. See the account by J. Fellman, *Revival of a Classical Tongue*.

*This page intentionally left blank*