

English Abstracts

Particularities in Noun Patterns in the *Mishna*

While describing and analyzing the noun patterns in the language of the *Mishna*, one often comes across a noun or nouns that reflect particular phenomena. This article deals with three such cases:

1. דַּפֶּק דּוּפְקִים and similar syntagms. I believe this combination reflects a total dissimilation: דּוּפֶק דּוּפְקִים > דַּפֶּק דּוּפְקִים, in which the original form is reduced to a shorter one, which did not exist in the language and is found only in this context.
2. שְׁלִגְלִג (<שִׁלְגִלְג) – the word reflects two different phenomena: (a) the omission of one / out of three as a result of haplology; (b) the existence of the variant לִג along with the familiar form לָג (לוּג).
3. a series of consonantal and vocalized forms of the nouns טַפִּי, טַפִּיחַ meaning a container for liquids.

W. Randall Garr

Ruth 2:7

The last four words of Ruth 2:7 are the most difficult in the book. Many scholars consider them incomprehensible. Others consider the text corrupt. This study argues that these words, spoken to Boaz by his foreman, are purposely elliptical. They are intended to plead Ruth's case and deferentially motivate Boaz to act on her behalf. The foreman suggests that Ruth, a poor alien widow living in the local community (זֶה הַבַּיִת) with barely any family from whom she can draw support (מֵעַט), qualifies for the law of the שְׂכָחָה (Deut 24:19).

Isaac B. Gottlieb

Introductory Formulae in the Pentateuch

In this paper we follow three lexical phrases and one syntactical construction that mark the beginning of a literary unit in the Torah. The lexical expressions are generally noted in biblical studies as idiomatic to a particular source or document. In the case of the syntactic construction *vav* + subject + predicate (*qāṭal*), it has been studied in relation to the tense system in biblical narrative. However, the fact that these phrases or grammatical patterns serve to mark the opening of literary units needs further emphasis.

Of particular interest are those phrases or syntactical patterns that currently appear in the midst of a narrative rather than at its inception. In these cases, it is quite possible that the phrase originally signaled a new pericope, which was later merged with another text for a host of reasons. We offer five examples where the literary unit may be parsed differently, as against the current understanding of its limits. In this way, opening expressions can contribute to the literary and textual history of the Torah.

Further, a study of these phrases shows that the beginning of a literary unit does not always correspond to the Massoretic marking of *parashot*, or to the chapter divisions. While the distribution of certain formulae corresponds to the critical division of the pentateuchal sources, this is not so for all the phrases we cited. Finally, some of the introductory expressions also serve as colophons.

Edward L. Greenstein

The Poetic Use of Akkadian in the Book of Job

The poetry of Job abounds in Semitic words and forms that appear to derive from languages other than Hebrew. Most of the Semitic forms that stand out against the Hebrew of the Job poem are Aramaic. In an earlier study the author explained the wide use of Aramaic in Job in two ways.

On the one hand, the use of Aramaic serves a variety of poetic functions, including wordplay, punning, double entendre, and rhetorical allusions. On the other hand, and in line with an insight of H. L. Ginsberg and others, the Joban poet places Aramaic words and forms in the mouths of Job and his companions in order to reinforce their characterization as Easterners. (See E. L. Greenstein, “The Language of Job and Its Poetic Function”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 [2003], pp. 657–672.)

In the present study the author adduces seven examples in which, it has been suggested, the poet of Job employs expressions deriving from or influenced by Akkadian. The poet demonstrates a general acquaintance with Babylonian literature and a specific familiarity with *Enūma eliš*; compare Job 26:12–13 with *Enūma elish* IV 95 and Job 38:8–10 with *Enūma eliš* IV 139. It is therefore plausible that the multilingual poet made use of Akkadian language. It is herein suggested that the use of Akkadian serves the poetic function of producing double entendre by means of puns and polysemy. The following examples are treated in detail: (1) רוב/רובים from Akkadian *rābu* “to shudder” in Job 4:3, 14; 33:19; (2) שפרה from Akkadian *saparru* “net” in Job 26:13; (3) ספר from Akkadian *siparru* “bronze” in Job 19:23; (4) בול from Akkadian *būlu* “wild animals” in Job 40:20; (5) החביר from Akkadian *ḥabāru* “to be contentious” in Job 16:4; (6) נמרץ/המרץ from Akkadian *šumrušu* “to provoke” in Job 6:25; 16:3; and (7) טפל from Akkadian *ṭapālu* “to denounce” in Job 13:4 (and compare תפלה in 1:22). In all these instances but the second the Akkadian enables the poet to produce a double meaning.

Victor Avigdor Hurowitz

As His Name, So is He: Word Play in Akkadian Writings

The use of word play is a hallmark of many great works of literature, permitting the author to add meanings to the text by introducing intra- and inter-textual connections beyond those enabled by the lexicon, grammar and syntax. Word play in Akkadian literature has been studied

in several works including *Enūma eliš*, the Gilgamesh Epic, Atrahasis, Erra, and the Poor Man from Nippur. It has also been detected in non-literary compositions such as magical instructions, prayers, omen compendia and monumental inscriptions. Nonetheless, there are few systematic studies of the phenomenon. This paper will re-examine some word plays already suggested, and adduce several hitherto unnoticed examples. It will stress the contribution of word play identification to exegesis of the texts in which they appear. It will also address the criteria for identification of true word plays, namely those intended by the author rather than those just perceived by the reader. The examples studied will be from the realms of symbolic names, *Midrash* of names, divination, sympathetic/associative magic, and *Leitwörtern* and puns.

Rivka Halevy

Case Alternations in *Swarm*-Class Verbs in Hebrew and the Meaning of *Tamyiz*

This paper explores the complex relationship between the meaning of predicates and the morphosyntactic expression of their arguments as manifested in the *swarm*-class alternation and related verbs in Hebrew, as shown, e.g., in Biblical Hebrew: (a) וּלְכֹל נֶפֶשׁ הַשְּׂרָצָה עַל הָאָרֶץ (Lev 11:46); (b) וְשָׂרַץ הַיָּאֵר צְפֹרְדַּיִם (Exod 7:28).

The question of how to analyze such alternations has been widely discussed in non-Semitic languages, especially on the basis of English. The existing analyses of the phenomenon do not provide, however, a complete and satisfying account of what motivates either the subject selection or the alternative patterning in general. Furthermore, in terms of the grammatical and semantic role of the semi-circumstantial complement in variant b (e.g., צְפֹרְדַּיִם), realized in most Indo-European languages in the instrumental case, the analyses generally fail to capture its meaning and function.

My analysis argues for the notion of viewpoint as an event-structuring concept and elaborates the idea of vantage point from which the event is presented as one motivator of semantic prominence. Viewpoint is argued

to be a potential semantic correlate of grammatical subjecthood, distinct from the discourse category of topic. In this approach, *swarm*-class alternations are considered as voice-like shifts. Semantically, it is argued that the motivation behind the two alternate ways of coding the same “objective” piece of reality lies a different naming function.

It is argued that the *tamyiz* complement (i.e., the “accusative of specification”) in Semitic languages currently found with *verba copiae*, *verba induendi* and *verba inopiae* and constituting part of their lexical meaning corresponds directly to the viewpoint and naming function of variant b in the *swarm*-class alternation.

Menahem Haran

The Kuntillet ‘Ajrud Inscriptions and Hosea 14:9

Wellhausen (*Die kleinen Propheten*³, Berlin 1898 [1963], p. 134) suggested that Hosea 14:9: **אני עניתי ואשורנו**, which is incomprehensible as it is, should be read: **אני ענתו ואשרתו**. This amendment found unexpected substantiation with the discovery of the Kuntillet ‘Ajrud inscriptions, in which the name Asherah occurs with the suffix of the third person, referring to Yahweh, e.g. **יהוה שומרון ואשרתו**. The question which caused controversy was how the substantive Asherah should be defined. If it is a proper name it cannot have a suffix, while if it is a generic noun its inflection is unparalleled in the Bible. The proposal that in these inscriptions Asherah designates a cultic object is also inadmissible since the reference to “Yahweh and his Asherah” is preceded by stating “I blessed you of Yahweh (cf. Gen 14:19)... and his Asherah”, which makes Asherah Yahweh’s partner, depicting her as a divine source of blessing as well. The author’s contention is that, in the inscriptions, the inflected form **אשרתו** functions as both the name of Yahweh’s consort (not Baal’s as in the Bible) and as a generic noun. In the Bible, the name Baal corresponds in its usage, to a certain extent, to that of Asherah. The name Anat does not occur in Kuntillet ‘Ajrud, but it does present itself in an Ugaritic text in inflected and dual forms. For all that, the Hosea 14:9 passage does not express a belief in Anat and Asherah. The claim, in

God's name, that "I am his [Ephraim's] Anat and Asherah" denies the validity of the two, for only the Lord is God. The denial is polemic, even if it is presented in a rather simplified manner.

Yair Zakovitch

On Interchanges of *Dalet* and *Ṣade* in Biblical Hebrew

Biblical scholarship seems to have ignored the phonetic similarity between *dalet* and *ṣade* in Biblical Hebrew. In this article, examples are noted in which a rare and unknown word is explained in the light of the interchange of the two consonants.

Abraham Tal

Hebrew and Holy Language in Judea and Samaria

The name of the language in which Scripture is transmitted never occurs in biblical literature. The term "Hebrew" is known from extra-biblical sources, its first occurrence in the prologue of Ben-Sira's nephew to the Greek translation of his uncle's book: ἑβραϊστί. Similar references to Hebrew occur in somewhat later compositions, such as Philo, Josephus, the Gospels, etc. Contemporary Jewish literature prefers לשון הקודש as the term for the language of Scripture, as well as of other manifestations of Hebrew, such as references to the primordial language, etc. However, עברית is also found, though much less frequently. It has not been recognized that Samaritan medieval liturgy uses the same terms when quoting certain portions of the Pentateuch, and also when referring to both the primordial language and the eschatological language, viz., the language readopted by humanity at the end of days.

Shemaryahu Talmon

Hosea 10:2: “Their heart is divided(?) now they shall be found faulty”

The author suggests to understand the difficult root *hlq* in the expression *ḥālaq libbām* (Hos 10:2) by employing an intertextual rabbinic method designated by the catch phrases “his companion shall bear witness for him” (Job 36:33) or “she brings food from afar” (Prov 31:14).

The Hebrew root *hlq* has two distinct meanings: (I) “to divide”, and (II) “to be smooth”, often used figuratively, to indicate “to lie, to cheat” (cf. Ezek 12:24; Ps 5:10; Prov 2:16; 5:3; 6:24; 7:5, 21; 26:28). All ancient translators, as well as Jewish medieval commentators, explained the expression *ḥālaq libbām* by the first meaning of the root, “to divide”. The interpretation of the verse on the basis of the second meaning of *hlq* was rejected in the past because in this meaning the root never occurs connected with the noun *lēv*. Interpreters suggested different emendations of the text to get around the difficulty which inheres in the root *hlq*.

The present author proposes a new interpretation of *hlq* next to the noun *lēv* in Ps 12:3–4 and Ps 55:22. The application of *hlq* (II), as some interpreters did in the past, leads both to a more comprehensive reading of these verses and to important conclusions with regard to Hos 10:2. Based on evidence brought “from afar”, the expression *ḥālaq libbām* appears to be a known, although possibly uncommon idiom. This expression signifies deceit, and refers to the Israelites’ double tongued reverence of their God. This interpretation of the idiom *ḥālaq libbām* fits the main themes of the book of Hosea.

David Talshir

בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים ‘Prison’

The interchange of *ketiv* בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים / *qere* בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים (Judg 16:21, 25) was explained by Gordis (recently followed by Cohen) as a stylistic variant, since there is no substantial difference between אֲסוּרִים (adj.) and

אָסִירִים (noun). However, we have reasons to believe that the difference is both chronological and lexical.

While בית האסירים/ן never occurs in Rabbinic Hebrew, בית האסירים is the common term that designates ‘prison’ in Rabbinic Hebrew. Therefore, it would seem that the *ketiv* preserves the older form, while the *qere* probably reflects the form customary in Rabbinic Hebrew (specifically the western type of Mishnaic Hebrew and the Yemenite tradition of Rabbinic Hebrew).

In addition, Rabbinic literature preserves another variant of the phrase, בית האסורין, which might be vocalized as either בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִין/הָאֲסוּרִין or בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִין. Now in Biblical Hebrew, אֲסוּרִים/אָסוּרִים means “fettters”, as does אָסוּרִין in Aramaic. The literal meaning of בית האסורין is therefore “the house of fetters” rather than “the house of the imprisoned”, and the difference is lexical rather than stylistic.

Finally, Rabbinic literature attests an additional variant, בית היסורין, which probably evolved from בית האסורין, and similarly carries the meaning of “prison”. It occurs also in Targumic Aramaic בית ייסורין (note that in Modern Aramaic the meaning of פִּסְוּאָה is “fetter”).

In sum, the ancient Hebrew phrase בית האסירים developed into בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים (literally, “house of fetters”), whose variants in late Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew are בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים, בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִין, בֵּית הָאֲסוּרִין, and בֵּית הַיִּסּוּרִין.

Shamir Yona

Syntactical and Stylistic Analysis of Three Subjects in the Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar in Their Relationship to Israelite Wisdom Literature

Most of the studies concerning the Aramaic version of the Proverbs of Ahiqar deal primarily with the content and the language and only to a very small extent with the stylistic patterns and rhetorical and syntactical structures. The present study seeks to fill this gap and to offer a linguistic and literary analysis. This analysis is based upon the author’s holistic study of the Ahiqar corpus of aphorisms. This holistic analysis makes it

possible to determine the full meaning of the proverbs. In this study I deal with three subjects, in which the particular ideas of didactic wisdom literature stand out. These are (1) the education and training of slaves; (2) personal experience; (3) keeping secrets and exercising discretion in speech.

Jan Joosten

Aspects of the use of *wayhi* in Biblical Narrative

In the debate on the development and history of the Hebrew language in the Biblical period, many syntactical features remain to be described in detail. In the present paper, one such feature, the narrative use of *wayhi* followed by a temporal phrase and a main clause is analyzed. Narrative *wayhi* occurs in both Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew, but there are characteristic differences.

In LBH, narrative *wayhi* is numerically less prominent than in CBH. In parallel passages, the feature is sometimes lacking in Chronicles where it is found in Samuel–Kings. The receding use of *wayhi* was well known to earlier Hebraists. In addition, however, a few syntactical differences between the two corpora can be pointed out, notably in the construction of the temporal phrase. In LBH the temporal phrase following *wayhi* is never constructed with *ki*. Moreover, the elegant construction where the temporal phrase takes the form of a circumstantial clause (e.g., Gen 42:35), well represented in CBH, is practically unattested in LBH.

The facts brought to light indicate that LBH authors knew narrative *wayhi* from the study of CBH texts but that it was not an organic component of their language. Thus, the analysis of this feature strengthens the chronological approach to Biblical Hebrew that Avi Hurvitz has so ably defended during his entire academic career.

More Examples of “False Friends”:
Regular Meanings of Words in Modern Hebrew
which Originated Erroneously

This article is a continuation of my previous article on this subject which was published in *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, Volume 1, Jerusalem 2007, pp. 27–43. There I dealt with the following five terms: 1) רגל meaning originally “time” rather than “holiday”; 2) תל-אביב meaning originally “mound of destruction from the time of the Flood” rather than “hill of spring-time”; 3) אשת חיל meaning originally “a treasured woman (not necessarily married)” rather than “an efficient diligent woman”; 4) ברלח meaning originally “type of fragrant plant resin (bdellium)” rather than “crystal”; 5) העתיק meaning originally “move on, transfer” rather than “copy”. In the present article, I deal with the following additional five terms: 6) לפת meaning originally “to touch lightly, gropingly” rather than “to seize forcefully”; 7) מרץ meaning originally “to be severe, to be difficult” (according to the semantic development “to be sick” > “to be severe”) rather than “to act energetically”; 8) עפעפים meaning originally “eyes” (or more precisely “pupils”) rather than “eyelids”; 9) פסה II meaning originally “to protect” rather than “to pass over, to jump” (and subsequently חג הפסה should be translated “Holiday of Divine Protection” rather than “Passover”); 10) תנין meaning originally “snake” rather than “crocodile”. Two other terms are discussed in the introduction to this article: the phrase כברת ה(א)רץ as the origin of modern Hebrew כברת דרך meaning originally “a relatively short distance of 10.8 kilometers” (derived from Akkadian *bēr qaqqari*) rather than “a very long distance” (derived from Biblical Hebrew כביר); the noun שתן “urne” (attested first in Rabbinic Hebrew) could well be derived from a Biblical Hebrew root שתן as a by-form of the root שין (just as both roots occur in Akkadian) and therefore should *not* be considered a term which originated erroneously.

The Number of David's Psalms (11QPs^a 27:4–5): A New Proposal

The so-called *David's Compositions* passage (11QPs^a 27:2–11) attributes various kinds of poetic works to David and lists their specific quantities. Most of these works have a clear cultic function, and their numbers evidently reflect the 364 calendar, so typical of the Qumran sect. The sole exception is the first item, which mentions “3,600 psalms”. This number does not fit in easily with the calendrical background of the other items, and its meaning as well as its origin remain obscure. Various interpretative solutions offered to this problem are widely viewed as unsatisfying.

A detailed literary analysis of this passage demonstrates that it depends on specific biblical texts. In terms of structure, *David's Compositions* is modeled after a biblical passage which enumerates Solomon's sapiential works (1 Kgs 5:9–14). In terms of its thematic and ideological content, it follows the Chronicler's description of the Davidic and Solomonic eras. The Chronicler, who tends to alter or omit various allusions to Solomon's wisdom (originally appearing in the book of Kings), substituted the list of Solomon's compositions with a reference to his preparatory actions for the sake of the Temple building. One such action was the appointing of “3,600 supervisors” to the construction workers (2 Chr 2:1, 17). A linguistic analysis of the Hebrew term used to denote the “supervisors” in Chronicles (מְנַצְּחִים) shows that it is attested some 55 times in the titles of the Psalms (where it is usually translated as “[to/of the] director”), and was interpreted in antiquity as a generic title of a kind of psalm. This understanding of the term stands in contrast to the meaning of its root in Late Biblical Hebrew (“to supervise”) and in Rabbinic Hebrew (“to fight, win, succeed”).

The combination of literary and linguistic data therefore allows one to conclude that the exegetical link between “3,600 supervisors” (2 Chr 2:1, 17) and “3,600 psalms” (11QPs^a 27:4–5) reflects a pseudo-classicism, that is, an archaizing usage of a biblical lexeme, as found elsewhere in post-Classical Hebrew, most notably in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Michael E. Stone

A Hebraism in the Armenian Version of 4 Ezra

The article discusses the translation of infinitive absolute + finite verb in the Armenian version of 4 Ezra. In the Armenian text occur a number of instances in which we find the Armenian reflex corresponding to the Greek translations of this Hebrew construction. These Armenian instances are divided into two groups: (a) those instances in which this Armenian construction is supported by a corresponding reading in one of the other versions of 4 Ezra (Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, and Arabic). (b) instances in which there is no corresponding reading in another version. Some of these reverse the order of the two elements involved. It is concluded that these are cases of biblicizing translation on the part of the Armenian version, a phenomenon previously unobserved.

Shalom M. Paul

Do Not Wake or Disturb the Dead

The warning not to disturb the departed resting in their graves is attested in the Bible (1 Sam 28) and in several different Phoenician inscriptions (Tabnit, Šipiṭba'al, and one from Byblos) – all of which employ the verbal root ʾḡḡ. Another way this “disturbance” is expressed is by the verbal root ʾwʾ, “to awaken”, found in Isa 14:9 and its interdialectal semantic equivalents: *dekû* in Akkadian (found in neo-Assyrian inscriptions discovered in 1989) and *ḥt* in Ugaritic (found in the Aqhat epic).

Frank H. Polak

The System of Relative Tenses and Classical Biblical Narrative

The tense system of Classical Biblical Hebrew is best understood in terms of relative tenses, implying that the time reference of the finite verb (V) is dependent on the position of three ‘points’ on the time line: the point of departure (R), the speaker’s time (S) and the event interval (E). For *waYYiQToL* the connection with R has been noted explicitly by Ewald and Driver, viewing its time reference as dependent on the time reference of the preceding clause; the use of *QaTaL* as pluperfect is similarly conditioned (see Driver, Zevit). Our study indicates that in CBH time reference always is dependent on such point of departure, even though, unlike in, e.g. English, this dependence is not expressed formally.

Thus the time reference of V moves to past, present and future in accordance with the position of R on the time line.

In this perspective *YiQToL* (including *waYYiQToL*) can consistently be construed as a *posterior* tense, relative to R, whereas *QaTaL* (including *weQaTaL*) can always be viewed as an *anterior* tense, with respect to R. The common definition of *QaTaL* as perfect and *YiQToL* as present-future is conditional: it is valid if and only if speaker’s time is identical with the point of departure. *WaYYiQToL* is only preterite, if R belongs to the past (precedes S), whereas *QaTaL/weQaTaL* only refers to expected events if S precedes R.

Michael V. Fox

The Dating of the Composition of Proverbs 10–29

This article considers the dating and social-historical context of the central (and probably earliest) collections of the book of Proverbs: 10:1–22:16; 22:17–24:22; 24:23–34; 25:1–29. There are no linguistic, thematic, or ideological features to distinguish among these collections. Taken as a whole, they belong to the period of the Judaeen monarchy, probably in

the eighth to seventh centuries BCE. (This is not to deny some verses may have been subsequently inserted.) This is the standard dating of these chapters; the present article seeks to strengthen the arguments for it.

The first argument is from social setting. The most securely locatable and datable proverbs are the “royal proverbs”, twenty-four sayings that deal with the king and his court. The royal proverbs are clearly grounded in the monarchy, probably in Jerusalem. The evidence for this is not merely the mention of the king, but, more significantly, the perspective of the authors and implied audience. Moreover, these collections promote a royalist ideology. Since it is unlikely that other social groups would compose, transmit, and insert royal proverbs, these proverbs help us identify the court as the locus of the editorial activity that shaped the collections.

The second argument is linguistic. These collections include a number of lexical usages characteristic of CBH, ones that are rare or non-existent after the exile. There are no distinctly LBH features.

Distinctive CBH usages: (1) preference for the verbal suffix (84x) over **תא** + suffix (0x); (2) the asseverative **אך**, meaning “indeed” (5x); (3) the imperatival use of the infinitive absolute (4x); (4) the gerundival use of the infinitive absolute (8x); (5) the order of the pair “silver and gold” (3x); (6) use of the earlier member of several lexical contrast pairs.

There are several Aramaisms at a greater frequency than in most pre-exilic writings:

Aramaisms: (1) **אזל** “depart”; (2) **אלף** “learn”; (3) **בהל** “hurry”; **בחר** “assay”, “test”; (4) **בקר** “examine”; (5) **בעל** + abstract noun, indicating possessor of a certain quality; (6) **חסן** “strength”; (7) **חסר** “disgrace”; (8) **מותר** “advantage”; (9) **מלה** “word”; (10) **הערה** “remove”; (11) **קבל** “receive”; (12) **קשט** “truth”; (13) **רב** “many” before the modified noun; (14) **רע** “thought”; (15) **שכין** “knife”.

The Aramaisms in this case do not indicate a post-exilic setting. Rather, they accord well with a dating in the late-eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E., when Aramaic was the lingua franca and known to some of the Jerusalem elite (2 Kgs 18:26–27) – the very group that was cultivating wisdom literature. This setting would also account for the borrowings from the Aramaic Ahiqar (for which a seventh-century origin is probable) and also Amenemope which, I hypothesize, could most plausibly have reached Israel in Aramaic form.

Steven E. Fassberg

Pdr in Ugaritic and Its Semitic Congeners

Pdr is attested in three Ugaritic texts: the Ba'al cycle (CAT 1.4), the Kirta legend (CAT 1.14,16) and a fragmentary list (CAT 4.19). On the basis of its parallelism to 𐤒 "city", scholars translate it "town" or "city". The etymology of the lexeme is not certain. Some have sought a non-Semitic origin comparing similar forms in Mycenaean and Urartian. Svi and Shifra Rin remarked tersely that Ugaritic *pdr* and Hebrew *przwt* "open, unwalled town" and *przym* "occupants of open, unwalled towns" might be cognates from * < p̄ḏr, if the Ugaritic d is a reflex of Proto-Semitic ḏ.

This article supports a common Semitic etymology for *pdr* and *przwt/przym* based on semantic and phonological considerations. It is suggested that the two nouns are related to Proto-Semitic < *p/bḏr "spread out, disperse", attested in the Semitic languages in the roots *pzr*, *bḏr*, *bdr*, and *bzr*. One may speculate that the original meaning of Ugaritic *pdr* and Hebrew *przwt* is a rural area either spread thin with population or spread out among the fields.

Shamma Friedman

What is *Qiyyum* (*Tosefta Bava Batra* 11:4)?

Tosefta Bava Batra (11:4, p. 168) uses the word *qiyyum* in a sense unknown elsewhere in Talmudic literature:

And what is its *qiyyum*? "I, So-and-so, borrowed from So-and-so and So-and-so borrowed from him". If he tied it above and the witnesses [signed] below, it is valid.

Clearly the standard meaning of *qiyyum štarot*, where the court validates an earlier document, does not apply here. This is a *Schlussklausel* in which the borrower accepts obligation to the transaction.

Saul Lieberman (*ad loc*) attested to the uniqueness of the usage here, and proposed a definition based on Christian Palestinian Aramaic: "The

meaning would appear to be ‘what is the summary of the tied document’, and its *qiyyum* means essence, as in Palestinian Christian Aramaic, namely, ὑπόστασις, substantia”. However, there is nothing in Schulthess’s entry in his *Lexicon Syriopalaestinum* referred to which can substantiate a technical usage of *qym*’ as a *Schlussklausel* of summation.

A functional parallel to the clause cited above occurs in the *Yerushalmi* (and elsewhere in the *Tosefta*): “I, So-and-so, accept upon myself all that is written in it above”. A clause of this nature is common in the Aramaic and Hebrew deeds found near the Dead Sea. Furthermore, the specific style in the Dead Sea formulary solves the above crux. This is the wording and translation of the editor:

וקים עליהם וביניהם כל מה שמלמעלה (!) [=שמלמעלה] כתוב

And it is accepted by them and between them all that is written above

It is here proposed that the standard use of קים in the *Schlussklausel* of these deeds was the basis for the *terminus technicus* for these clauses: *qiyyum*. The archaic use of *qym* as “accept (a legal obligation)” rather than “fulfill” is reflected in Esther 9:27 (קימו וקבלו) and in the fact that קים in the Dead Sea deeds is updated to מקבל in Talmudic citations of the deed formulary. The earlier usage gave the *Schlussklausel* of acceptance the name *qiyyum*.

Alexander Rofé

Gōren Haššē‘ōrîm in Ruth 3:2 – Rabbinic Hebrew in a Biblical Book

Gōren in Biblical Hebrew, like *grn* in Ugaritic, has the well established meaning of “threshing floor”. The same can be said about ʿiddār, ʿiddrāʾ in Aramaic. A clear semantic shift occurred in Rabbinic Hebrew (and perhaps already in Qumranic Hebrew): *gōren* here means “crop”, “harvest”, “harvest time”. Consequently, *gōren* in Rabbinic Hebrew took the place of Classical Hebrew *yēbûl*, which all but disappeared from Rabbinic sources.

The older meaning of *gōren* does show up in Ruth 3:3,6,14. However, in Ruth 3:2 *gōren haśśē‘ōrîm* appears to mean “the harvest of barleys”. This can be taken as additional indication of the late diction and the recent date of composition of the book of Ruth.

Anson F. Rainey

Ghost Forms in Massoretic Toponymy

Avi Hurvitz wrote an article early in his career dealing with the geographical name Ekron and showed that it was originally ‘Aqqaron. He did not explore the demographic problem, viz. that no Hebrew speaker ever lived at a site called Ekron. This is illucidated herein and other toponyms from the Massoretic Text are discussed with the same demographic problems. Among them are Migdal/Migdol, Madon, Shimron, Meiron, and Jerusalem/Yerushalaim.

Gary A. Rendsburg

The Jubilee Pericope (Lev 25:8–24) as a Northern Composition

The vast majority of the Torah is written in Judahite Hebrew (= standard Biblical Hebrew). An exception occurs in Lev 25:8–24, the Jubilee pericope; these 17 verses contain four Israelian Hebrew features. They are: (1) the use of the infinitive absolute *קנה* in place of a finite verb in v. 14; (2) the form *מַעַט* in v. 16, reflecting the phonetic shift of *a > o*, well known from Phoenician; (3) the conditional particle *הִן* “if” (instead of *אִם*) in v. 20, well known from Aramaic; and (4) the verbal form *עָשָׂה*, reflecting Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew (and possibly Moabite) morphology. This concentration of linguistic features in this short section of the Torah demonstrates that the law of the jubilee originates in northern Israel, even if no immediate explanation for why this is so is readily forthcoming.