Recensions

Joshua Blau. *Phonology and morphology of Biblical Hebrew*: *An introduction*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010. XIV, 369 p.; 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-1-57506-129-0 (hardback). (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic; 2)

Although not strictly a reference grammar, it is difficult to imagine anyone with a serious interest in Biblical Hebrew morphophonology not having constant recourse to this volume as a supplement to the standard reference grammars. The linguistic detail is set within an often discursive and easily-assimilable style, which will facilitate use of the volume as, for example, a textbook for graduate courses in Biblical Hebrew grammar.

The work is an updated and revised English version of *Torat ha-hege ve-ha-ṣurot* (Tel Aviv: Universiṭat Tel Aviv, 1965), translated, in collaboration with the author, by Michael O'Connor and (after his death in 2007) Cynthia Miller. The major sections of the two main chapters (3: Phonology; 4: Morphology) are as follows: Hebrew and the Proto-Semitic consonants (pages 72-76); Consonants (76-95); Semi-consonants (96-105); Vowels (105-55); Pronouns (158-86); Verbs (187-260); Nouns (260-279). Other sections include: linguistic introduction (1-62); brief introduction to the basic concepts of morphology (156-58); phonetics (63-71); short remarks on the numerals, prepositions, and *waw* conversive (279-86); verb paradigms; bibliography; indices of authors, biblical passages, and topics. Unfortunately, there is no index of Hebrew forms cited.[1]

---

1. The review up to this point also appears in *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 58 (2013), followed by various examples of Blau's use and helpful illustration of concepts and princi-

The first chapter is an introduction to theoretical linguistic principles, especially from the field of historical linguistics, focusing on Semitic, although

---

ples derived from historical linguistics, to which may be added the following statements: (1) Biblical Hebrew … [is] a 'differential' dialect, one that preserves *a* in positions in which *i/u* are omitted (§ 4.2.2.3.2, on אַתְּ and אַתָּה); (2) [O]ne of the fundamental weaknesses inherent to historical linguistics; logically built theories, ingeniously conjectured and reflecting profound knowledge of the subject, very often remain beautiful hypotheses, without any possibility of verification (§ 4.5.1.1, introducing a presentation of three different explanations of the apparent gender discord found in numerals); (3) It may be possible to explain in some way the **preservation of the *y* in** מָתַי 'when?' … from *mātáya (with the final adverbial accusative ending -*a*). In Arabic, *matā* [with final *ya*] has to be derived from *mataya as well, since *matay would not have changed. The Hebrew pausal form was מָתָי, with preservation of the *y* following long *ā*, lengthened owing to its pausal position. The contextual form was *mātā, reflecting the shift *aya* > *ā*. … Since מָתָי was frequent in pausal position and in exclamation, it was pausal מָתַי that prevailed and the new contextual form מָתַי was derived from it. (§ 3.4.5.7); (4) [In] הִצְטַדֵּק < *hiṣtaddeq 'he justified himself' … the assimilation is apparently grammatically conditioned, since it is limited to the *hitpa‘‘el* only. Through the impact of the directly preceding emphatic *ṣ*, *t* became emphatic as well, i.e., it shifted to *ṭ*. In this case too, the assimilation is continuous, but it is only partial (the *t* has not become *ṣ*) and progressive, because it was the preceding sound that assimilated to the following one. … This account depends on the assumption that this assimilation is later than the metathesis of the first-radical sibilant and the *t* of the *hitpa‘‘el*. If it is so, then *hiṣtaddeq first became *hiṣtaddeq and only then did the *t* become *ṭ*. If the assimilation occurred earlier than the metathesis, the assimilation is regressive: *hiṣtaddeq became *hiṣṭaddeq and then by metathesis הִצְטַדֵּק. This, however, is less likely, since then one would have expected the *t* of the *hitpa‘‘el* to be assimilated to a following *q* as well, which is not the case (cf. הִתְקַדֵּשׁ 'he was hallowed'). (§ 1.19.3); (5) Since in the 1s, 1p and 2ms of the suffix-tense the final vowel has been preserved …, they are stressed on their penult, in accordance with the general penultimate stress that once prevailed. The final stress in the 2fs …, 3ms …, and the 2p … attests to the elision of the final vowels. (§ 4.3.5.2.2.4); (6) According to the medieval Arabic grammarians …, patterns are, so to speak, 'weighed,' and the more additional letters a pattern has, the 'heavier' it is. In the 3ms of the *qal* suffix-tense, the verbal theme is characterized by the absence of additional letters (affixes); therefore it was regarded as 'light', *qal*. (§ 4.3.5.2.1.1); (7) In considering the forms רֹאשׁ and מָצָאתָ, note the different development of the *a* preceding the *aleph* in these two words: מָצָאתָ reflects only the shift *a'* > *ā*, whereas in רֹאשׁ this *ā* has shifted to *ō* (according to the Canaanite shift …). This means that the Canaanite shift was still operating at this period, because only this can explain the *ō* of רֹאשׁ. The form מָצָאתָ *maṣā́ṭā*, rather than *maṣōṭā, seems to be due to the paradigmatic pressure of third-person forms that did not have the *'* in syllable-final position and therefore preserved it: **maṣa'at*, **maṣa'ū*. The elision of the *'* in מְצָאתֶם, where the vowel preceding the *aleph* was not stressed, is due to the influence of מָצָאתָ, etc. (§ 3.3.4.2.3n); (8) The preservation of the *n* preceding laryngeals/

with examples often drawn from the linguistic study of other languages as well. Reflecting on the 'family-tree' and 'wave' models of how languages emerge, Blau concludes (§ 1.7.16):

> a realistic model for … Semitic languages has to allow not only for their splitting off from a common stock, but also for mutual contact *and* parallel development.

Eblaite is excluded from the study because of uncertainty about its classification (§ 1.6.3n). In two places, in connection with Hamito-Semitic, the concept of ergativity is discussed (§§ 1.8.3, 4.4.4.2n). In the second chapter Blau provides a brief survey of the linguistic principles of articulatory phonetics, stress, and syllabification, with, of course, special reference to the various traditions of Hebrew, discussing, for example (§ 2.7), the relationship of the Ashkenazi affricate realization of *ṣade* to a supposed emphatic (later glottalized or velarized) original.

The first chapter has a richly-exemplified introduction to "Sound Shifts and Relative Chronology" (§ 1.9) and "Etymology and Sound Shifts" (§ 1.10). Here (and elsewhere) Blau makes frequent reference to Ugaritic, comparing, e.g., שְׂכִיָּה 'ship' with *ṯkt* (noting that the *sin*, rather than *shin*, in the Hebrew form might suggest that both words were derived from Egyptian), שֻׁלְחָן 'table' with *ṯlḥn*, and זֶרַע 'seed' with *dr'/dr'* and זָרַע 'sow' with *dr'*, rather than the expected **ḏr'*; Blau suggests that *dr'* might have arisen from "contamination" by, or "blending" with, "the related agricultural term" *ḏrw/y* (זָרָה) 'winnow'.

With regard to סִבֹּלֶת at Judg 12:6, Blau (§ 1.10.3.21) defends the idea that the Ephraimites did not have *shin*, despite the fact that "no known Northwest Semitic language lacks th[is] phoneme" and against the proposal that the first consonant of שִׁבֹּלֶת actually represents a *ṯ* (cf. TgPsJon at Gen 41:5: תובלי).

In the first of the two main chapters, ch. 3 on phonology, Blau provides a helpful presentation of the issues surrounding the origins and use of a single letter for *sin* and *shin* (and the relationship of *sin* to *samekh*) (§ 3.2-3; see also § 3.3.1.5, on צָחַק and שָׂחַק 'laugh'), and discusses the correspondence of *ḥet* to

---

pharyngeals [in I-*n* verbs] does not establish the existence of the weakening [of the laryngeals/pharyngeals] at an early period …. The inclination toward refraining from doubling laryngeals/pharyngeals … is widespread even in languages in which [such] doubling … has been preserved. Thus, in the official reading of the *Qurʾān*, the *tajwīd*, there is a tendency to assimilate a final *n* to the first consonant of the following word [unless] it begins with a laryngeal/pharyngeal (§ 4.3.8.3.1n).

the Arabic voiceless pharyngeal and postvelar fricatives and of *ʿayin* to Arabic *ʿain* and *ghain*.

After listing the assumed original consonant inventory of pre-exilic Hebrew and classifying it by point of articulation, etc., and providing other helpful notes (e.g., § 3.3.1.9, on the various conditions in which *nun* is, or is not, assimilated), Blau goes on to discuss at some length the *bgdkpt* consonants and "Stop-Spirant Contrast" (§ 3.3.2), explaining, for example, why spirantization sometimes occurs after *resh* and why it sometimes does not happen when word-initial *kaf* or *bet* is preceded by a vowel but followed by another *kaf* or *bet*. He then moves on to the problems raised by *shewa medium*, the disappearance of automatic stop-spirant alternation, and the "tendency to reduce double consonants followed by mobile *šwa* to simple consonants followed by quiescent *šwa*", except in the case of *bgdkpt*. Blau, accordingly, rejects Kahle's theory that "the double pronunciation [of *bgdkpt*] was a Masoretic creation" and Kahle's claim that the LXX transcriptions support a uniquely spirant pronunciation. In connection with the laryngeals and pharyngeals (§ 3.3.3) and their lack of gemination, Blau cites E. Qimron's Dead Sea Scrolls grammar on the omission of *resh*; he also suggests (§ 3.3.3.2.1n) that "[t]he term *pataḥ furtivum* 'stolen *pataḥ*' may be a mistranslation of *pataḥ gənūbā*, which may have meant 'the *pataḥ* of the stolen (i.e., inserted letter)', as if א were introduced before the laryngeal or pharyngeal". Particular attention is paid to the development of *he* as a vowel letter (§ 3.3.5.2), its elision (including in I-*h* verbs) and assimilation; semi-consonants, diphthongs, triphthongs, and monophthongization.

Occasionally, Blau accepts that the complexity or irregularity of the material defies the type of clear solution based on phonological developments over time (sound shifts) that elsewhere he is able to defend. For example, noting that in Hebrew "*mawit does not become *mōṭ but מֵת 'he died'", Blau concludes that II-*w/y* (hollow) verbs are:

> a blend of (a) original biradical roots with a short vowel …, (b) original biradical roots with a long vowel …, and (c) triradical roots with *w*, *y* as second radical. Since sound shifts affecting *w/y* gave rise to forms that were identical to forms derived from biradical roots, by proportional analogy original biradical roots became *II-w/y* roots (with consonantal *w*, *y*) and vice versa. (§ 3.4.7.2-3)

Blau's comments on the Masoretic pronunciation of *shewa* will come as a surprise to some:

> According to the Masoretes … [it] was, as a rule, pronounced as a very short *ă*, in principle not different from *ḥaṭaf pataḥ*. When preceding a laryngeal-pharyngeal, it is pronounced in accordance with the vowel of the laryngeal-pharyngeal.

Thus וּבָקְעָה 'and it will hatch' Isa 34:15 is pronounced … *ubɔqɔ́ʕɔ*; תְּבַקְּעֵם 'it will tear them' Hos 13:8, … *tăḇaqqĕʿem*. When preceding *y*, it is pronounced *ī*, e.g. תְדַמְּיוּנִי 'you will liken me' Isa 40:25, is pronounced … *ṭăḏammĭyuni*. (§§ 3.5.1.2, 3)

These rules of pronunciation help explain variant forms (and readings in mss) of the type תֹאכֲלֶנָּה (Gen 3:17; Ezek 4:12), תֹאכְלֶנָּה 'you will eat it', אֹרְרֶיךָ, אֹרֲרֶיךָ 'those who curse you' (Num 24:9), and וָאֶשְׁמְעָה, וָאֶשֱׁמֲעָה (Dan 8:13) (§ 3.5.1.4).

Blau discusses (§§ 3.5.2, 4) the Tiberian vowels, their (inadvertent) representation of length, and their relationship to the *matres lectionis*. On length, Blau comments:

> The **Tiberian vocalization** is a rather exact one, in some cases marking sub-phonemic variations, like … the alternation of *qamaṣ (qaṭan)* and *qibbuṣ* in closed unstressed syllables. Is it conceivable that the Tiberian Masoretes would have used the same sign for long *qamaṣ* … and short *qamaṣ* …, had they wanted to mark quantitative differences? The only possible explanation … is that they did not attempt to mark quantitative differences …, because they **had ceased being phonemic** [and] … were [instead] automatic consequences of stress and syllable structure … [that is to say] vowels in stressed or open syllables were **automatically pronounced long**. (§ 3.5.4.1-3)

Blau goes on to discuss (§ 3.5.6) the "phonemic structure of the Tiberian vowel system" (arguing, for example, that *seghol* often has allophonic rather than phonemic value), with special attention to the *shewa* (see also the comments on two consecutive mobile *shewa'im*, at § 3.5.7.6.4-9), and from there proceeds to "The History of the Vowels" (§ 3.4.7), starting with "short vowels in closed syllables" and arguing that:

> the vowel of [אַף and of similar nouns derived from geminate roots] was always in a closed syllable, even before the loss of case endings. … Other monosyllabic nouns would have, at an earlier stage, had an open syllable preceding the case ending (*yadu). In *yadu, as compensation for the dropping of the final vowel, the preceding vowel was lengthened: יָד … [S]ince the *a* in *ʾappu was in a closed syllable, it remained short even after the dropping of the final short vowels. (§ 3.5.7.1.4)

Blau suggests that final vowels were dropped first from construct nouns "because the main stress … is borne by the [following] absolute noun." For verbs, "[on] the face of it, the simplest proposal seems to be that the final short vowels … were redundant and, accordingly, more prone to drop." (§ 3.5.7.1.5)

"[T]he occurrence of *qamaṣ* in absolute nouns versus *pataḥ* in construct and finite verbal forms is due to the fact that":

> in the absolute the *qamaṣ* is due to compensatory lengthening (for the omission of the final case vowel), a process that occurred in open syllables only; construct and final verbal forms had already lost their final short vowels earlier, so that at the time of the compensatory lengthening the *pataḥ* already occurred in closed syllable [*sic*]. (§ 3.5.7.1.9)

After presenting more cases of compensatory lengthening of *a*, Blau goes on to examine "The Problem of Pretonic Lengthening" in absolute nouns (§§ 3.5.7.4-5; 3.5.7.6.12), noting that "Pretonic gemination" is a parallel phenomenon, with the same end, "preservation of the pretonic syllable". Blau argues (§ 3.5.7.5.12-15) that in the Second Temple period, "when Hebrew was still a living tongue, yet had already undergone decisive Aramaic influence", "speakers of Hebrew were anxious to preserve (originally short) vowels in open pretonic syllables and thus maintain a contrast with Aramaic. Later on, after pretonic lengthening had ceased operating, Aramaic influence had become so strong that newly emerging pretonic syllables containing *a* were reduced." (See also § 3.5.12.2.9.) Blau also discusses attenuation (of *a* to *i* or *shewa* in some closed unstressed syllables [§§ 3.5.7.6.4, 13]) and Philippi's Law (shift of *i* to *a* in some closed stressed syllables [§ 3.5.8.5-10]), and "the so-called Canaanite vowel shift" (of stressed *ā* to stressed *ō*).

The origins of each of the Tiberian vowels in Proto-Semitic are discussed (§ 3.5.10) as are the linguistic functions of *daghesh* (also *mappiq*, *metheg*, and *maqqef*) (§ 3.5.11). With regard to *dagesh forte*, Blau claims that in a consonant with *shewa* the *dagesh* will often merely indicate the vocalic character of the *shewa* (rather than lengthening or doubling of the consonant, e.g., הַשְּׁמֵנָה "'(is it) fat?' Num 13:20"), or, on some occasions, stress on the preceding syllable (e.g. אֵ֫לֶּה).

In § 3.5.12, there is a helpful survey of the Biblical Hebrew stress system (albeit omitting detailed discussion of the *ṭeʿamim*). Starting from the premise that forms such as "הָלְאָה 'out there', הָאֹהֱלָה 'into the tent'" do not reflect antepenultimate stress, Blau argues on the basis of words like קִיטוֹר, לָשׁוֹן, and שׁוֹמֵר, in which the "*ō* ... arose from stressed *ā*", that "words containing long vowels were originally stressed on the long vowel nearest to the ultima [*lašā́nu, *qīṭā́ru, *šā́miru]" (here Blau also invokes the evidence of western Arabic dialects) but that later:

> since words with ultimate stress have lost their final vowel ..., penultimate stress was once all-embracing ... [and at that] stage ... could not have been phonemic, since its place was automatically fixed. ... [At a later] stage **final short vowels**

dropped … [and in such] words … the stress, though not moving, came to stand on the ultima. … At this point we encounter phonemic oppositions of stress, e.g. קָמָה 'standing up (F participle); standing grain', from original *qāmátu, and קָ֫מָה, 'she stood (suffix-tense)', from basic *qāmat*. … The evidence of contextual forms [with ultimate stress as against the penultimate stress of the corresponding pausal forms, which retain the earlier vocalic shapes of the words in question] leads us to posit another stage …: **originally paroxytone words in context with stressed short vowels in open syllables shifted their stress to the ultima** … [due to the fact that by then] words with ultimate stress, which arose by the omission of [final] short vowels, far outnumbered those with penultimate stress.

Blau goes on to show how these changes relate to the development of the "short prefix-tense" (§ 3.5.12.2.14-15). When there was general penultimate stress,

the opposition between the regular prefix-tense (*yišmóru …) and the short one (*yíšmor) was redundantly marked, not only by the presence or absence of the *-u* ending, but also by the difference in stress position. … [W]ith [the] dropping of the final short vowels, the difference in stress position remained (in most cases) the only mark of the opposition, and thus stress became phonemic … Later, the stress in the short prefix-tense also shifted to the closed ultima …, and both prefix-tense forms converged upon יִשְׁמֹר. Nevertheless, the penultimate stress of the prefix-tense after "conversive" *waw* has been preserved in many of its occurrences where the penultimate syllable was open: וַיֵּאָסֵף 'and he was gathered' (alternating with וַיֵּאָסֵ֫ף); וַיֹּאמֶר …; וַיֵּ֫שֶׁב.

A significant result of this understanding of the development is that:

There was no "recession" of the stress in the prefix-tense after "conversive" *waw*; instead, the original stress was retained … [at least] in open syllables (§ 3.5.12.2.15).

    The assumption of general penultimate stress allows us to explain **the vocalization of the "conversive"** *waw* preceding the prefix-tense [as *pataḥ*] … [which, p]receding a stressed syllable … was … preserved … [by] pretonic gemination (§ 3.5.12.2.16; see also § 4.3.2.2.1n).

Although in general "[Pausal forms] often maintain **a more archaic stress pattern and preserve syllables dropped in context**" (§ 3.5.13.2; see also § 3.5.12.2.11, on pausal אָנֹ֫כִי and contextual אָנֹכִי),

Archaic stress is sometimes preserved in the contextual form … [and] the pausal form with ultimate stress is later. The stress of contextual וַיֹּאמֶר … is original, since penultimate stress is primary in words that have not lost final short vowels,

including the short prefix-tense form; from the beginning they terminated in a consonant. The stress in the pausal form וַיֹּאמַר is later. (§ 3.5.13.4)

(See also § 4.3.8.7.4.2, on ultimate and penultimate stress in forms of I-*y* verbs in the *Hifʿil* and in II-*w/y* and *mediae geminatae* verbs in other *binyanim*.)

At § 4.4.6.4, Blau shows how the differences between LXX transcriptions, e.g. Γαθερ for גֶּתֶר, and those of Origen, e.g. Χεσλ for כֶּסֶל, relate to:

> the opening of the [final consonant] cluster … simultaneously with the omisssion of final short vowels; however, the syllable formed by the anatyptic vowel [*seghol*] did not count phonemically, and so these nouns remained phonemically monosyllabic. The Septuagint reflects a phonetic transcription …, whereas Origen provides a phonemic [one].

(Similar comments apply to the *pataḥ furtivum*; see § 4.4.6.4n.)

In the second of the two major sections of the book, ch. 4 on morphology, Blau mentions in his introductory comments the possibility of analysing many Hebrew forms in terms of interacting discontinuous morphemes: a consonantal 'root' and a vowel 'pattern'.

With regard to the personal pronouns, Blau argues (in part against Bauer's 'mixed language' thesis) that the original form of the first person singular pronoun was *ʾanā, to which the suffix *-*kū* was attached; in the case of the 2fs pronoun, Blau points out (§ 4.2.2.3.1) that "in the early books of Judges and Kings" the *ketiv* אַתִּי "has to be interpreted as preserving the early form *ʾanti attested in other Semitic languages" whereas "in later books (Jeremiah and Ezekiel), in all likelihood [it] mirrors Aramaic influence."

Blau reviews theories relating to the use of *š*- or *h*- at the beginning of 3ms and 3fs pronouns, concluding that the *š*- and the *h*- are simply "different pronominal elements …, such variation [being] characteristic of pronouns in general" (§ 4.2.2.4.2; see also § 4.3.5.7.3 on *Hifʿil* and *Shafʿel*).

The short section on "Dual Independent Pronouns" (§ 4.2.2.5) discusses the origins of the dual and its use in Hebrew, drawing attention to "pseudo-duals" or "ex-duals" of the type שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפַיִם, and the absence of dual pronouns in Hebrew as against their presence in Classical Arabic and Ugaritic.

The earliest form of the first person plural pronoun in Hebrew was נַחְנוּ (< *niḥnū) (§ 4.2.2.6.1; Blau does not mention that this rare biblical form was 'revived' in some mediaeval genres). With regard to the genuineness of the 2ms possessive ending in -*əkā* rather than -*āḵ*, Blau (§ 4.2.3.3.5) adduces the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls כה- ending as well as בֹּאֲכָה (Gen 10:19) against

the various arguments of Kahle to the contrary. The development of the various 3ms suffixes is well explained:

> The **third-person masculine singular** suffix derives from the same base as the independent personal pronoun הוא. Its original form, -*hū*, has been preserved after long vowels, as attested in פִּיהוּ (alongside פִּיו) …, שְׁמַרְתִּיהוּ …, שְׁמַרְנוּהוּ, שָׂדֶהוּ …, רָאֵהוּ …, יִרְאֶהוּ … Since the 3ms of the suffix-tense originally terminated in *a* …, which in pause became lengthened, הו- was preserved in pause after long *ā* (e.g. שְׁמָרְהוּ). But after short *a* the *h* was elided and the emerging diphthong *aw* was monophthongized to וֹ-: **šamarahū* > **šamaraw* > שְׁמָרוֹ. It is this וֹ- that serves as the usual pronominal suffix of the 3ms after singular nouns … After the dual/plural -*ay* ending … the *h* was elided and -*āw* arose: **šīrayhū* > *šīrayw* > שִׁירָיו, pronounced *šírɔw*. If the suffix is directly preceded by a consonant, the *h* is progressively assimilated to this consonant … [as in] the case … [of] the so-called *nun energeticum* (… יִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ < **yišmərænhū*; אֵינֶנּוּ < **’ēnénhū*), or … -*at*, the 3fs form of the suffix-tense (as גְּנָבַתּוּ 'she stole it'). (§ 4.2.3.4.1-2)

Drawing attention to forms like הַיּוֹם, הַלַּיְלָה, and הַלָּז, Blau argues that the definite article "originated in a demonstrative pronoun" (§ 4.2.4.1.3; cf. §§ 4.2.1.2, 4.2.4.2.3, § 4.2.5.3-4, where Lihyanite *ha-* [*han* before laryngeals/pharyngeals] and Ugaritic *hn* are referred to). The demonstrative pronoun זאת "consists of three demonstrative elements *ḏ* + *aleph* + *t*", the last of which was later reinterpreted as a feminine marker. "This interpretation is corroborated by, e.g., Arab. *ḏāta yawmin* 'one day', where *ḏāta* certainly cannot be interpreted as feminine, because *yawmin* is masculine." (§ 4.2.4.5.2)

With regard to שֶׁ and אֲשֶׁר, Blau thinks that the former:

> reflects the vernacular of Northern Palestine, which was, as a rule, avoided … because it was not considered standard by the Judean scribes and redactors. … [T]here is no etymological connection between these two relative pronouns, since a sound etymological basis may be established for each of them. שֶׁ … is a well-known demonstrative element. אֲשֶׁר may be related to … Aram. אֲתַר 'place' … [and] originally introduced local clauses denoting 'where …' (attested in Ugaritic and Akkadian), and the semantic shift from 'where' to relative pronoun, though marginal, is well founded. (§ 4.2.6.2.1-2)

Somewhat similarly, the demonstrative pronouns זו/זֹה/זֶה also came to be used as relatives. Blau compares as well the Arabic *’alladī*, a relative pronoun, with its Hebrew cognate הַלָּזֶה, a demonstrative (§§ 4.2.6.2.3, 4); he also notes *that* in English as well as the effective use in Hebrew of interrogative pronouns as relatives ('who?'/'the one who'; 'what?'/'that which', i.e. מָה/מִי for מִי אֲשֶׁר / מָה אֲשֶׁר) (§§ 4.2.6.3; 4.2.7.3).

In marking determination in demonstrative pronouns Blau argues (§ 4.2.4.3.3) that four historical stages may be distinguished: (1) "no definite article is atttached to either the head or the … pronoun: אִישׁ זֶה [, a] construction [that] is … the rule in Rabbinic Hebrew[; a]s is sometimes the case with late dialects, they may preserve archaic features … lacking in early dialects"; (2) "the definite article is added to the substantival head only: הָאִישׁ זֶה*[,] … exceptional in Biblical Hebrew … [but] the rule … when the pronoun serves as an attribute to nouns determined by pronominal suffixes …: אֹתֹתַי אֵלֶּה 'these signs of mine' Exod 10:1"; (3) "the definite article is added to both the substantival head and the demonstrative pronoun …[,] the usual Biblical Hebrew construction"; (4) "[i]n the last stage of development, occurring only sporadically in Biblical Hebrew, the definite article is attached to the adjective only: יוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי."

In the interrogative pronoun, Ugaritic *mh*, Arabic *mahmā* 'whatever', and the gemination of consonants following מַה in Biblical Hebrew all suggest that the *he* was once consonantal, although "[f]orms like בְּמוֹ, … לְמוֹ, … כְּמוֹ … reflect prepositions followed by original *mā*, which by the Canaanite shift developed into *mō*" (§ 4.2.7.2).

With regard to the possible original biradical nature of Semitic forms, Blau notes "the archaic formation of the plural by doubling" (§ 4.3.1.3) in פִּיפִיֹּות and מֵימֵי (see also § 4.4.5.6). On the other hand, "[While a]t first sight … one might claim that both *pṣy* 'to open' and *pṣṣ* 'to break' derive from the same biradical root *pṣ* … it is possible to *prove* with the help of other Semitic languages that *pṣy* reflects *pṣ₁y*, but *pṣṣ* reflects *pṣ₃ṣ₃*." (§ 4.3.1.6)

Blau sets out his position that "the Hebrew verbal system indicates tense, and [not] aspect" (§ 4.3.2.1): "verbal forms in biblical narrative prose do refer to tenses in a very consistent manner in the vast majority of cases. The only complicating factor … involves a **double set of tenses**, because of … the tenses … opening with the so-called conversive *waw*" (§ 4.3.2.2.1), which, Blau notes (§ 4.3.2.2.1n), "from the historical point of view … should have been called "preserving *waw*," since after *waw* the archaic usage of the tenses has been preserved." "[I]n … narrative … the forms with "conversive" *waw* are used in a syntactic environment in which it is possible to apply connective *waw*. Otherwise, the simple forms occur" (§ 4.3.2.2.2):

> The number of deviations in which *waw* … is followed by the simple-tense is comparatively small [in the Bible, as also in the Arad inscriptions]. It stands to reason that such an extreme application of *waw*-tenses whenever it is possible to use 'and' has to be considered a literary feature. (§ 4.3.2.2.3)

In a limited way, however, aspect also finds a place in Blau's system:

the **simple prefix-tense** (and, when the use of 'and' is possible, *waw* + suffix-tense) may not only be used for marking present/future but also **iterative** or **continuous past**, thus reflecting a combination of tense and (the imperfective) aspect, which describes the situation as still continuing: e.g., וְהִכָּה … כָּכָה יַעֲשׂוּ 'and (every time) he thrust … so they were (always) doing' 1 Sam 2:14. (§ 4.3.2.2.4)

Moreover:

the verbal system is not only temporal and partly aspectual … but also modal … To the **modal system** belongs the volitive, which consists of three heterogenous elements: the first person is expressed by the lengthened prefix-tense (the so-called cohortative), the second by the imperative and short prefix-tense (functioning as jussive), and the third by the short prefix-tense. … The modal structure becomes even more intricate because of the optional use of ("conversive") *waw* + suffix-tense in modal sense: לֵךְ וְנִקְרְבָה … וְלַנּוּ 'come and let us draw near … and let us lodge (/ to lodge)' Judg 19:13. Even more important is the fact that the ordinary prefix-tense (often preceded by the connective *waw*) … may be used in a modal sense, frequently paralleling lengthened/short prefix-tense …: הָבָה־נָּא אָבוֹא אֵלַיִךְ 'come now, let me come in unto you' Gen 38:16 (§ 4.3.2.2.6).

As Blau notes (§ 4.3.2.2.7) there are many cases in which one cannot on the basis of form alone distinguish modal and non-modal usage. With regard to the cohortative, Blau suggests that:

the preservation of the final *-a* … was also due to the fact that the cohortative frequently precedes נָא 'pray', as in אָרוּצָה נָּא 'let me run' 2 Sam 18:19 … [perhaps] influenced by the energic prefix-tense *ʾārūṣānā, which was decomposed into two words: ʾărūṣā nā (§ 4.3.2.2.6n).

After noting that "the use of the *waw*-tenses … fell into desuetude after the destruction of the First Temple … [and] in the late books of the Bible … 'conversive' *waw* with the *lengthened* [my emphasis] prefix-tense … became more frequent" (§ 4.3.2.2.8), Blau goes on to discuss (§§ 4.3.2.2.10-17) the overall development of the tenses in Biblical Hebrew, starting with the question "How has it happened that the same form marks both jussive and past?". Blau suggests the following background:

Perhaps one could assume that in the earliest stage of Proto-Semitic, besides the imperative and timeless nominal clauses (as a rule referring to the present), the **short prefix-tense** (derived from the imperative) emerged to serve as the marked term in the opposition short prefix-tense : nominal clause … This opposition was twofold …[] the short prefix-tense [coming] to mark the past (the tense opposition), and contrary to nominal clauses that, as a rule, expressed statements, …

serv[ing] as a jussive (the modal opposition). Later, the **indicative present/future** *yaqṭulu* was derived from the short prefix-tense *yaqṭul* …

The **suffix-tense was originally** outside the tense system proper, since it represented conjugated adjectives, as is the case with the Akkadian stative and also with … stative verbs in Biblical Hebrew referring to the present … In the West Semitic languages the ordinary suffix-tense was derived from this stative to mark … a state in the present resulting from an action in the past. So, two tenses referred to past, the short prefix-tense *yaqṭul* and the suffix-tense. Because of the similarity of *yaqṭul* to the ordinary prefix-tense *yaqṭulu* (especially in languages in which the final short vowels were dropped), its function as a past tense disappeared, and only residues of it survived in Biblical Hebrew, especially after *waw*. The suffix-tense, in somewhat rare cases, referred to **the future**, e.g., in wishes, which were described as if the thing wished for had already been fulfilled … [, and] in prophecies … This was, it seems, one of the sources of the use of *waw* with the suffix-tense in the sense of the prefix-tense …

In this regard, Blau notes "[t]he use of the *waw* + suffix-tense was later than that of *waw* + prefix-tense. An even later feature occurring in the *waw* + suffix-tense was the final stress of וְשָׁמַרְתֶּ֫ם, וְשָׁמַרְתִּ֫י. Were the stress original, the *qamaṣ* of the first syllable would have been reduced."

As for "the tense system in poetry", Blau emphasises an "extreme alternation of verbal forms" reflecting, he believes, "some sort of *licentia poetica* not to pay attention to time differences".

Blau briefly examines (§ 4.3.2.3) the "elegant, straightforward, and logical" theory of H. Bauer, which, however,

cannot be accepted, especially for the following two reasons: (a) … in both Akkadian *iparras* and Gʿez *yǝqattǝl* the doubling of the second radical is an essential part of the forms[, which], of course prevents the identification of *iparras* with West Semitic *qatal(a)*[;] (b) … the Akkadian stative, in both form and meaning, is identical to the suffix-tense of Biblical Hebrew …, which was derived from the stative verb[; a]ny theory of the West Semitic tenses has to take this feature into consideration.

Blau claims (§ 4.3.2.4) that an aspectual approach "assumes … that the employment of the verbal forms depends completely on the speaker's subjective viewpoint … Accordingly, we do not possess any objective criteria for verifying the theory …". Moreover, "one can[not] discard the use of the "conversive" *waw* and regard forms with and without *waw* as identical." Although this dismissal of what might well be the dominant approach in Hebrew scholarship

is perhaps too cursory, we have seen that in fact Blau does concede that apect is reflected to some extent in the Hebrew verbal system.

Blau starts his presentation of specific forms of the verb with imperatives, which:

> [t]hrough the influence of the (ordinary) prefix-tense … behave as if they had [once] terminated with a vocalic ending [instead of with the last radical]: they are stressed on their last syllable, as if they had omitted a final vowel (according to the assumption of a general penultimate stress) (§ 4.3.3.3.1.1).

With regard to the fem. pl. imperative ending in -*nā*, Blau points out both that "very rarely … the vocalization attests to [its] omission …: שְׁמַעַן 'hear' Gen 4.23" and that there are also traces of an -*a* ending (attested in other Semitic languages): רְגָזֶה בֹּטְחוֹת פְּשֹׁטָה וְעֹרָה וַחֲגוֹרָה (Isa 32:11). Blau's detailed discussion of this feature (§ 4.3.3.1.2n; cf. § 4.3.3.4.10) may be compared with the cursory note in GKC, § 48i that these imperatives "are to be explained as aramaizing forms of the 2nd plur. fem."

Whereas most person markers in the prefix-tense seem to have a background in the corresponding pronouns or the feminine noun ending -*(a)t*, "the etymon of the *y*- of the 3ms is opaque" (§ 4.3.3.2.2). Blau does not discuss the loss of the initial consonant (or, better, the replacement, at a phonological level, of *yod* by *aleph*) in some traditions of pronunciation of the *yi*- of the prefix-tense 3ms (and in proper nouns formed from this) or why, for example (and relatedly), the *Qal* 1cs prefix-tense is *ʾeqṭol* rather than *ʾiqṭol (see GKC, § 24b[n], 47b; Bergsträsser, *Hebr. Gramm.*, § I.17s-t; I.28o; II.17f).

In the third fem. pl., the earlier form in *y*- (rather than *t*-) has sometimes been retained (e.g. in וַיֵּחַמְנָה at Gen 30:38) or reflects influence from Aramaic, "where the *y* prefix has been preserved" (וַתֵּעֲמֹדְנָה … יַעֲמֹדְנָה [Dan. 8:22]). The origins of the plural suffixes in -*īn* (second fem.) and -*ūn* (second masc.) are also discussed (§ 4.3.3.2.2, 4).

Cohortatives in -*a* are compared with the *yaqṭula* form in the Amarna letters, which "corresponds to a quite surprising degree to that of the biblical cohortative (though it is not restricted to the first person)", and with the Arabic subjunctive *yaqṭula*. "Originally, it seems, this form in West Semitic had a modal sense and occcurred in all persons", as also suggested by lengthened imperatives (e.g. שָׁמְרָה) (§ 4.3.3.3.4).

In § 4.3.3.4, Blau presents and discusses the endings of the suffix-tense in the light of the assumed Proto-Semitic forms of the personal pronouns, Akkadian, G'ez, Arabic, and Aramaic, paying particular attention to the origins

of the vowel preceding the affixes, the loss of final *-t* in the 3fs., the tendency of feminine plural forms to disappear, and their sporadic retention (1 Sam 4:15: וְעֵינָיו קָמָה; Deut 21:7[Kt]: יָדֵינוּ לֹא שפכה [§ 4.3.3.4.10]).

In the prefix-tense, Blau notes that:

> Preceding pronominal suffixes, the characteristic *a* was lengthened (in the pre-Tiberian period) to *ā* by pretonic lengthening, whereas pretonic characteristic *e/o* were reduced …: יִשְׁמָעֵנִי in contrast to יִשְׁמְרֵנִי/יִתְּנֵנִי (§ 4.3.5.2.3.5).

Although the infinitive construct can have a clearly verbal usage (Blau cites Num 35:6: לָנֻס שָׁמָּה הָרֹצֵחַ [§ 4.3.4.2.3]), its originally substantival character is reflected by the presence of a lengthened final vowel both in "the comparatively frequent *plene* spelling … even in early books, such as לֶאֱסוֹר … Judg 15.10" and in III-laryngeal/pharyngeal verbs (שְׁלֹחַ, הִשָּׁבַע), where the second vowel is preserved "instead of changing it into *pataḥ*, which is usual outside pause in genuine verbal forms, illustrated by the imperatives שְׁלַח, הִשָּׁבַע" (§ 4.3.4.2.1).

"The infinitives …שְׁפַל, …שְׁכַב [, which] contain (short) *pataḥ* … reflect the influence of Rabbinic Hebrew, in which the (construct) infinitive was re-structured by analogy with the prefix-tense" (§ 4.3.4.2.1). (See also § 4.3.5.2.6.1n, where "לְקַח 'to take'" is also cited, "in the wake of the prefix-tense יִקַּח". The influence of Rabbinic Hebrew might also lie behind a form like לִנְפֹּל, as against כִּנְפֹּל, בִּנְפֹּל, where "the ל [has] bec[o]me integrated into the infinitive … [and the resulting form] correspond[s] to the vocalization of the prefix-tense" [§ 4.3.4.2.2].) "[F]eminine forms [of the infinitive construct] … have been preserved mainly in the weak verbs (לַעֲשׂוֹת …, לָרֶדֶת …, לָתֵת …), where they were favoured because they gave sufficient "body" to the shortened form of these verbs" (§ 4.3.5.2.6.2).

Blau prefers to compare the intensifying function of the infinitive absolute with a similar Ugaritic structure, marked by an adverbial ending, rather than with the Arabic internal-object structure, in which the infinitive follows the finite verb (in contrast to Hebrew). He notes that "absolute infinitives may develop into veritable adverbs, as in מַהֵר 'quickly', הַרְבֵּה 'much'" (§§ 4.3.4.3.2, 3).

Blau discusses "vestiges of the **internal passive of** *qal*", noting that "[t]he *qal* passive was recognized already by medieval Spanish Jewish grammmarians", presenting his evidence and arguments in a particularly clear manner:

> Generally speaking, whenever a verb used in *qal* has an apparent *puʿal* passive form in the suffix-tense [e.g. Gen 37:33: טֹרָף], without a corresponding active

form in *piʿel* and without a corresponding *yəfuʿʿal* in the prefix-tense, it has to be considered the passive of *qal*. … Similarly, if an apparent *hofʿal* form in the prefix-tense [e.g. Isa 28:27: יוּדַשׁ] is derived from a verb having an active *qal*, but there is no corresponding active form in the *hifʿil* and no corresponding *hofʿal* in the suffix-tense, it has to be analyzed as an original passive of *qal* … If יוּדַשׁ were a strong verb, it would no doubt have been vocalized according to the *nifʿal* pattern. Nevertheless, the consonantal text did not enable this vocalization. (§§ 4.3.5.1.2, 3)

After examining the "special participial formation" of the *Qal* passive (Judg 13:8: יוּלָד; 2 Kgs 2:10: לֻקָּח), Blau notes *t*-forms of the *Qal*, "preserved in the Tiberian vocalization [only] in the root *pqd*" (Judg 20:17: הִתְפָּקְדוּ; 21:9: וַיִּתְפָּקֵד) and of the *Hifʿil* (2 Sam 22:27: תִּתְבָּרָר; Exod 2:4: וַתֵּתַצַּב) (§§ 4.3.5.1.5-8).

In the prefix-tense (as in the suffix-tense) Blau notes (§ 4.3.5.2.3.1) vestiges of an *a* : *i/u* opposition, with *a* "characteristic of verbs of state, *i/u* of verbs of action" (in contrast to the situation in the suffix-tense):

> [C]lear residues of the original opposition *yifʿal* : *yafʿul/yafʿil* have survived in Biblical Hebrew in some verbal classes … [e.g.] **yaḥšub* > יַחְשֹׁב 'he will think' in contrast to **yiḥdal* > יֶחְדַּל 'he will cease'…; … **yasubb* > יָסֹב 'he will turn' … in contrast to **yiḥam* > יֵחַם 'it will be warm' …; and in … יָקוּם 'he will rise' / יָשִׁיר 'he will sing', reflecting *yafʿul/yafʿil* in opposition to *yifʿal* **yibāš*, which, by the Canaanite shift *ā* to *ō* … shifted to יְבוֹשׁ 'he will be ashamed'. …
>
> The *yafʿil* pattern has disappeared … to a large extent … and has been preserved in weak verbs only: יֵרֵד 'he will go down' (with assimilation of the prefix vowel to the characteristic vowel, instead of the expected **yāreḏ*), יִתֵּן 'he will give' (§ 4.3.5.2.3.2).

Blau goes on to cite a number of verbs in which this *Qal* structure has eventually been analysed as *Hifʿil* (יָבִין, יָגֵן) or in which a particular meaning is shared by *Qal* and *Hifʿil* (יַזְכִּיר/יִזְכֹּר 'mention'; here Blau cites Jer 20:9, לֹא־אֶזְכְּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא־אֲדַבֵּר עוֹד בִּשְׁמוֹ, and Ps 77:4). Mixing of conjugations is also mentioned in connection with the *Qal* participle בָּרוּךְ as against the *Piʿel* בֵּרַךְ, found elsewhere in this verb (§ 4.3.5.2.5.3).

The *Qal* imperative, Blau says (§ 4.3.5.2.4.1), was probably "originally disyllabic as in Akkadian and Ugaritic …, the same vowel being repeated after the first and second radicals …[,] only later … [being] restructured according to the prefix-tense" (which "also influenced the stress of the imperative", which otherwise would have been **kútub* [§ 4.3.5.2.4.2]), although he notes that the "identifi[cation of] imperative *qal* with the short prefix-tense without the prefix … is only correct synchronically":

Historically, because of its archaic character, the imperative could not have been derived from the (short) prefix-tense. On the contrary, it appears that the prefix-tense stems from the imperative.

In stative verbs, the 3ms suffix-tense forms predate their non-stative counterparts, in which no compensatory lengthening (of the *pataḥ*) took place when final vowels were elided. (§ 4.3.2.5.2.3.3.4). The stative participle, although apparently identical to the suffix-tense 3ms, had, in the pre-Tiberian period, a long vowel in the second syllable (as against a short one in the suffix-tense):

[I]n strong verbs … these … participles were being superseded by the פּוֹעֵל of action verbs (just as the stative suffix-tense was being replaced by *pāʿal*). In some cases *pāʿel* and *pōʿel* coexist: שׁוֹכֵחַ/שָׁכֵחַ … זוֹעֵף/זָעֵף … In other cases *pōʿel* alone serves as a veritable participle, *pāʿel* being clearly relegated to nominal function: שׁוֹכֵן 'inhabiting' in contrast to שָׁכֵן 'inhabitant'. Sometimes, however, *pāʿel* has totally disappeared: from שָׂנֵא 'he hated', only the participle שֹׂנֵא survived. (§ 4.3.5.2.5.1)

(Here Blau makes no mention of the difficulties in interpreting שָׂנֵא at Mal 2:16; see my article in *JNSL* 37 [2011] 95-111.)

Blau notes (§ 4.3.5.2.5.3) that the passive participle is:

sometimes … derived from intransitive verbs with neuter stative meaning and is thus more or less identical to the active participle. … This stative use of פָּעִיל/פָּעוּל is, it seems, even more archaic than their passive application, since it is characteristic of the Akkadian stative, from which the passive usage developed later in West Semitic. In Rabbinic Hebrew פָּעוּל has developed into a sort of present perfect … (as נֵר דּוֹלֵק ordinary present participle 'a burning lamp', נֵר דָּלוּק 'a lamp that has been lit').

In connection with the *Nifʿal*, Blau notes, e.g., "original" forms, "not to be derived from any other verbal theme: נִרְדַּם 'he slept', נִשְׁאַר 'he remained'"; compares the "alternation of *n* followed by a (short) vowel … [in] the … suffix-tense and participle and vowelless *n-* (as exhibited by Arab. *ʾinqatala* and the [Hebrew] prefix-tense and imperative…)" with the alternation of Hebrew בֵּן, שֵׁם and Arabic *ʾibn, ʾism* (see also § 4.3.5.6.3); and notes that: "The *h* of the imperative/infinitive is somewhat surprising (as in the case of the *hitpaʿʿel* as well), since one would have expected prosthetic *aleph*. Is it due to the impact of the *hifʿil?*" (§ 4.3.5.3.1, 2n, 3)

With regard to the *Piʿel*, Blau tries to distinguish between 'qualitative' (the "intensity" of an action: שִׁבֵּר "he broke entirely") and 'quantitive' (רִקֵּד "he leaped again and again", קִבֵּר "he buried [several persons]"), citing Gen 15:10:

וַיְבַתֵּר אֹתָם ... וְאֶת־הַצִּפֹּר לֹא בָתָר, and between "factitive" *Pi'el*, "i.e. causing someone to have a certain quality" (e.g. אִבַּד "make … extinct, … destroy", חִדֵּשׁ "renew") and causative *Hif'il*, i.e. "to cause someone to do something"; Blau also notes the privative use of the *Pi'el* in such forms as חִטֵּא "remove … sin" and שֵׁרֵשׁ "remove the … root" (§ 4.3.5.4.1). The variation between *pataḥ* and *ṣere* after the second radical reflects "**two basic forms** from which the **suffix-tense** of the active D-stem must be derived, one with *a–a*, as preserved in Arabic and Gʿez, and one with *i–i*, corresponding to the *u–u* stative in Akkadian." (§ 4.3.5.4.2; see also § 4.3.5.7.4, for related phenomena affecting the *Hitpa'el* and *Hif'il*).

"In the **prefix-tense** [of the *Pi'el*]":

> The Proto-Semitic vocalization of the **prefix** is *u*, as demonstrated by Akkadian and Classical Arabic on the opposite edges of Semitic. Since, however, after the emergence of the internal passive, *u* was felt to mark the passive, in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic *u* was eliminated and *a* substituted for it, as demonstrated by BHeb אֲבַקֵּשׁ (rather than *אֻבַקֵּשׁ) and Ugaritic *ʾabqt* 'I will ask'). (§ 4.3.5.4.4)

The passive *Pu'al* "arose, it seems, from **yupā'al(u)* … [but] the *u* in the prefix was reduced in open unstressed syllables and … [the pattern] was restructured to יְפֻעַל with *u* … as the mark of the passive. … עֻנּוֹתוֹ 'his being afflicted' Ps 132:1 perhaps reflects a construct infinitive." (§ 4.3.5.5.2).

In the *Hitpa'el*, "*ṣere* has penetrated the whole paradigm …; however …, vestiges of the original *pataḥ* are well attested (הִתְאַנַּף … Deut 1:37; וְנִתְחַזַּק … 2 Sam 10:12; וְהִתְעַנַּג … Ps 37:4) … [and] *qamaṣ* prevailed in Tiberian vocalization in pause" (§ 4.3.5.6.4).

In the *Hif'il*, Blau notes (§ 4.3.5.7.1) a rare privative usage, e.g. הוֹרִישׁ 'disinherit'. In connection with morphophonology, he notes the omission of the prefix *h-* after the prefix-tense and participial prefixes but does not note its elision after the *lamed* of the infinitive in later forms of Hebrew.

> The **long** *ī* after the second radical is very surprising indeed, since it appears in syllables that were open in Proto-Hebrew in contradistinction to all the other Semitic languages. … Since [it] can only be accounted for in *II-w/y* verbs (הֵקִים, יָקִים), its occurrence in strong verbs can only be explained by the assumption of analogy with *II-w/y* verbs. (§ 4.3.5.7.5)

In the *Hof'al*, "the evidence from Classical Arabic … [suggests] that the original form of the suffix-tense was **ʾupʿila* with *i* in the second syllable. The Hebrew *a* … (הָכְבַּד) is, it seems, partly due to the analogical pressure of the prefix-tense and partly to the influence of Philippi's Law." (§ 4.3.5.8.2).

In connection with "Rare Verbal Themes" (§ 4.3.6.1), Blau claims that:

הִשְׁתַּחֲוָה 'he bowed down' … reflect[s], at least synchronically, the repetition of the last radical *w* (the root is שׁחו; one *w* is represented by וֹ, the second by the final הָ- …). On the other hand, the same verb in Ugaritic synchronically reflects the *hištafʿel* of *ḥwy*. Historically, however, the related Biblical Hebrew verb *šḥḥ* 'to be bowed down' attests that the *š* was radical rather than afformative.

Among the rules underlying the vocalization of I-*laryngeal/pharyngeal* verbs, Blau notes (§ 4.3.7.1.2) that (in the *Nifʿal* and *Hifʿil*):

The vowel preceding the laryngeal/pharyngeal with *ḥaṭaf* is not lengthened, although it now stands in an open syllable. It seems that this opening belongs to a late period in which short vowels could stand in open syllables, presumably because no quantitative differences between vowels obtained and all classes of vowels were able to stand in every kind of syllable [although i]t is also possible that the preservation of the short vowel is due *to some extent* to the impact of forms … with quiescent *šwa*, which alternated with the *ḥaṭaf* forms. Forms with lengthening of the preceding vowel are attested rarely, as in … הֶעֱבַרְתָּ Josh 7:7; וַתַּעֲלוּ … Ezek 36:3; הֶעֱלָה … Judg 6:28.

In II-*laryngeal/pharyngeal* verbs, "*i* is sometimes preserved even when preceding *aleph*: נֵאֵץ …; with *a*, *pataḥ* and *qamaṣ* alternate: מְנָאֲצֵי/מְנַאֲצֵי …". Due to regressive and progressive assimilation respectively, "[t]he characteristic vowel of the prefix-tense … is … *a*" as is the vowel preceding the laryngeal/pharyngeal, "rather than … *i* as usual: שַׁחֲטוּ … שַׁאֲלִי … (in contrast to כִּתְבִי; הִרְגוּ …)" (§ 4.3.7.2.1-4).

III-laryngeal/pharyngeal verbs:

are vocalized with *ḥaṭaf* only preceding pronominal suffixes, perhaps because of the shift of the stress …: וִישַׁעֲכֶם … 1 Sam 16:1; אֶשְׁלָחֲךָ … Ps 35:25, … בִּלְעָנוּהוּ … Isa 35:4. … In the 2FS of the suffix-tense an anaptyctic vowel *a* develops, which does not, however, turn the following *t* into a spirant …: נִשְׁלַחַתְּ …; שָׁלַחַתְּ; לָקַחַתְּ … Through the influence of the laryngeal/pharyngeal, a preceding *ṣere*, when it represents an originally short vowel (in the pre-Tiberian period), has a propensity to **shift to *a*** … On the other hand, the *ṣere*, whenever originally long, tends to be preserved …[:] יִשְׁמֵעַ [pausal] in contrast to יִשְׁמַע in context … and the infinitive הִשָּׁמֵעַ in contrast to the imperative הִשָּׁמַע …. Nevertheless, exceptions frequently occur in the construct infinitive, such as לִשְׁלֹחַ alongside לְשַׁלַּח, and הוֹכִיחַ … [as well as] הַלְהוֹכַח (§ 4.3.7.3.2, 3, 4).

I-*aleph* verbs sometimes occur in both regular forms (as I-*laryngeal/pharyngeal*) and weak forms in the prefix-tense: "וַתִּֿחָז ... alongside וַיֶּאֱחֹז, תֹּסֶף ... in contrast to תֵּאֱסֹף." (§ 4.3.8.2.3)

In I-*n* verbs there is occasional assimilation of *nun* and *ḥet* (וַתִּנָּחַת alongside נָחַם; תֵּחַת):

This fact provides an additional indication that *ḥ* lost the ability to be doubled comparatively late (a conclusion also supported by the rarity of compensatory lengthening of the vowel preceding a *ḥ* that should have been doubled). (§ 4.3.8.3.1n)

Forms in which the *nun* has not been assimilated, such as יִנְצֹֿרוּ (Deut 33:9), probably reflect no more than a general tendency to increase length in pause (§ 4.3.8.2). In the infinitive construct the loss of the *nun* is compensated for by the use of feminine forms: גֶּֿשֶׁת, תֵּת (§ 4.3.8.2; see also §§ 4.3.8.4.13, 4.3.8.6.4.1, on a similar feature in *I-y/w* and *III-y* verbs). The verb נָתַן is:

the only [one] in which the *n* as the third radical is assimilated to an immediately following consonant: נָתַֿתִּי, נָתַֿתָּ. These forms conform to the general sound shift according to which *n* was assimilated to an immediately following consonant in every position ... As a rule, however, in *III-n* **verbs** the *n* was restored when it immediately preceded a consonant: שָׁכַֿנְתִּי, הֶאֱמַֿנְתִּי by analogy to forms in which *n* was not immediately followed by a consonant and therefore survived (שָׁכַן/שָׁכְנָה ..., הֶאֱמִין/הֶאֱמִֿינָה ...). (Verbs were especially liable to be affected by analogy because of their uniformity and regularity [in contrast to nouns, e.g. בַּת, אֱמֶת].) (§ 4.3.8.3.4)

Blau discusses (§§ 4.3.8.3.6, 7) possible reasons for "the elision of the *n* in the *qal* imperative and construct infinitive" but its preservation in the imperative, and suggests that elision of the *lamed* of לקח is a vestige of the same assimilation in all I-*lamed* verbs (and, as Blau notes, in the Arabic article *'al-*), where, however, the *lamed* has been restored by analogy with other forms in which such assimilation cannot take place.

After discussing the evidence for the possible biradical origin of I-*y* and I-*w* verbs, Blau presents reasons for the tendency of *y* to replace *w* in the various forms of these verbs (see also on III-*y* verbs [§§ 4.3.8.6.1, 3]), exceptions being *Hitpaʿel* forms such as הִתְוַדָּה, הִתְוַכַּח, and, strikingly, הִתְוַדַּע (even though the verb here is originally I-*y*) and a number of *Hifʿil*, *Hofʿal*, and *Nifʿal* forms. Blau notes (§ 4.3.8.4.6) that "[o]nly one verb has *y* in the [*Nifʿal*] prefix-tense: יִיָּרֶה Exod 19:13".

In connection with I-*y/w* verbs that "elide their first radical in the prefix-tense, the imperative, and the construct infinitive", Blau notes that "the second radical ... is followed by historical *i*", except in II/III-laryngeal/pharyn-

geal verbs, where this "original *i* … [has] shifted to *a* by assimilation to the following or preceding pharyngeal/laryngeal", and draws attention to the variants דֵּעָה and דַּעַת (§ 4.3.8.4.11); he then briefly discusses the preservation of the prefix-tense prefix vowel *ṣere* "even when the stress is remote: יֵדְעֶ֫נּוּ Jer 17:9" (§ 4.3.8.4.12). Blau notes (§§ 4.3.8.4.18, 19) that "[s]ome verbs vacillate between [I-*y/w*-eliding and -preserving] classes: יִירַשׁ …, but imperative רֵשׁ, in pause רָשׁ, construct infinitive רֶשֶׁת".

Five III-*aleph* verbs (שָׂנֵא, צָמֵא, מָלֵא, יָרֵא, טָמֵא), notes Blau (§ 4.3.8.5.3), "preserv[e] the *e* before prefixes beginning with a consonant, because the *aleph* was elided before Philippi's Law started acting".

Blau outlines the phonological changes that resulted in the Tiberian forms of III-*y* (*lamed-he*) verbs, noting (§§ 4.3.8.6.4.1, 2) that:

> The 3FS form *hoglayat > הָגְלָת … reflects the archaic form of the feminine ending, still preserving its *t* (which, it seems was elided only after short *a* …) …, [t]he usual ending … ־תָה … [being] due to the analogical adaptation of the structurally exceptional forms *galāṯ*, *gillāṯ*, *hoḡlāṯ* to the structure of the strong verb.

In "[t]he **short prefix-tense** (as well as the imperative of *pi''el*, *hiṯpa''el*, and *hif'īl*)":

> the elision of the final ה־ makes the shortened forms terminate in a consonantal cluster …, which as a rule is opened: the resulting forms are similar to the *segolate* nouns …, as in, e.g., … וַיִּ֫פֶן …, וַנֵּ֫פֶן; וַיַּ֫עַשׂ … Because the final vowel derived from a triradical *III-y* root should have been long and accordingly preserved, the omission of the final syllable in the apocopated forms, *prima facie*, hints at the biradical origin of these forms. (§ 4.3.8.6.7)
>
> [F]orms … such as יִשְׁלָיוּ … (rather than *יִשְׁלוּ) … [a]pparently … represent ancient pausal structures in which the *y*, owing to pausal lengthening, was preceded by a long vowel and accordingly preserved. Since the differences between these pausal and contextual forms were too big …, however, these pausal forms with *y* were superseded by the contextual forms, … used in the pause as well. (§ 4.3.8.6.10)

With regard to II-*w/y* verbs, Blau suggests (§ 4.3.8.7.2.5) that "*ō* for expected *ū* in יָבוֹא … reflects an original jussive, which was especially frequent in this verb … and … prevailed over the ordinary prefix-tense." In contrast, the imperatives קוּם and שִׂים for *qom, *śem, reflect the influence of the prefix-tense (ibid.). Moreover:

> Since the prefix-tense forms of … *II-y* verbs are identical to the *hif'īl*, they are apt to be **transferred** to the *hif'īl* of *II-w* verbs, and thus they diminish more and

more (cf., e.g., … *qal* בָּנְתָּה, יָבִין, alongside *hifʿīl* הֵבִין [although here it is possible that the *hifʿīl* is original and the *qal* is secondary]). (§ 4.3.8.7.2.8)

In the *Nifʿal* of II-*w/y* verbs, Blau notes (§ 4.3.8.7.3.2) the alternation of *ō* and *ū* in the participle (נְבֹכִים, נְבוֹנִים) and elsewhere (מָתוֹק, מְתוּקָה; מָנוֹס, מְנוּסָה), and also observes (§ 4.3.8.7.3.3) that:

> In the first and second persons of the suffix-tense of *nifʿal* and *hifʿīl* … the "**connective**" vowel *ō* [was retained, as its] omission … and the resulting closing of the preceding syllable would have caused extensive shortening of the verbal forms (as is, indeed, attested in the *hifʿīl*, e.g., הֲנִפֹּתָ in contrast to הֲנִיפֹתִי …).

(See also 4.3.8.8.6n, on "connective *ō* in the suffix-tense first and second persons" in *mediae geminatae* verbs).

Blau considers:

> [r]ather remarkable … the *ṣere* of the prefix *h* in the suffix-tense [and participle] of the *hifʿīl*: הֵקִים … [, which] must not be interpreted as being due to the impact of *I-y* verbs (such as הֵימִין …), because in *I-y* verbs the *ē* does not change, whereas in הֵקִים, etc., it is reduced by the shift of stress (הֲקִימֹותִי). It appears that this *e* attests to an original *i*, which corresponds to Akkadian *u*" (§ 4.3.8.7.4.1).

In the *Hofʿal*:

> [The] *ū* preceding the first radical … has to be attributed to the analogy of *I-w* verbs: in II-*w/y* and *mediae geminatae* verbs, short *u*, the characteristic vowel of the *hofʿal*, stood in an open syllable and, being unstressed, would have been elided, leaving *hofʿal* without distinct marking. (§ 4.3.8.7.4.3)

Blau notes (§ 4.3.8.7.5.1) three ways of forming the *Piʿel* (and *Puʿal*, *Hitpaʿel*) of II-*w/y* verbs: (1): as strong verbs, e.g. קַיַּם, "exceptional and … characteristic of late Biblical … and … Rabbinic Hebrew"; (2) "doubling [of] the first and third radicals: וַתִּתְחַלְחַל … Esth 4:4"; (3) "As a rule, however, these verbal themes are built with *ō* **after the first radical and the repetition of the third radical,** as in: הִתְקוֹמֵם, קוֹמַם, קוֹמֵם."

The diachronic morphophonological relationship of *mediae geminatae* verbs to II-*w* verbs is discusssed at some length in § 4.3.8.7.5.3 (where Blau concludes: "it may be surmised that … these patterns have multiple origins, partly stemming from *pālel*, etc., partly from *pawlel*, etc."). These two classes of verbs are developed in similar ways, although:

> it is possible that the higher frequency of … "normal" forms [(1) above] has its roots in defective spelling, which did not mark the *ō*, and so originally the percen-

tage of *ō*-formations [(3) above] was higher than is reflected in biblical vocaliza-
tion. … It is possible that, e.g., כָּתַּת 'he crushed' was originally *kōtat.
(§ 4.3.8.7.5.2)

In II-*w/y* verbs that are also III-*y* (*lamed-he*) "the second radical regularly
behaves as a 'strong' consonant: חָיָה …, הָיָה …, קִוָּה …, צִוָּה …, לָוָה", but apart
from these very few II-*w/y* verbs fall into category 1, above (אָיַב, צָוָה, גָּוַע) and
Blau thinks they are probably late (§ 4.3.8.7.5.4).

   "At least some" *mediae geminatae* verbs (§ 4.3.8.8.1) "have to be **derived
from biradical roots.** This is especially conspicuous in the *qal* of stative verbs
…[,] such as קַל 'to be light', [which] in the suffix-tense קַלּוּ, קָלְלָה clearly behave
as conjugated adjectives and have not yet been adapted to the triradical scheme
(… קָלְלָה*, *קָלְלוּ; in contradistinction to action verbs such as סָבְבָה, סָבְבוּ)". A
biradical origin is also indicated, Blau claims, by "[t]he fact that four different
kinds of formation are attested in these verbs": duplication of second radical
(סַבּוֹתִי, תָּסֹבּוּ, הֲסִבּוֹתִי); duplication of first radical ("the so-called "Aramaic"
formation": יִדַּל, וַיִּקְדוּ, וַיִּקֹּד); absence of duplication (יָזְמוּ [for יָזֹמּוּ], נָבְלָה [for
נָבְלָה]); duplication of first and second radical (וַיַּסֵּבּוּ, יֻכַּתּוּ). Blau notes
(§ 4.3.8.8.4) that:

> [The form] יָגֵן 'he defends' must be interpreted historically as the *i(e)*-prefix-
> tense of the *qal*, which was synchronically understood as *hifʿīl* … Thus, the
> prefix-tense of the *qal* conforms to Barth's Law [presented and discussed in some
> detail in § 4.4.1, in connection with the morphological relationship between verbs
> and nouns]: *yifʿal* (יֵקַל) as against *yafʿul/yafʿil* (יָגֵן, יָסֹב).

The absence of doubling of the second radical when not followed by a
vowel (תְּסֻבֶּנָה) "is difficult to interpret … historically. It may be … due to the
effect of *II-w/y* verbs (תְּקֻמֶנָה), or a result of the intention to avoid a deviant
form (*tāsebbənā does not conform to any pattern)[; or] it may be original, re-
flecting an archaic biradical formation." (§ 4.3.8.8.5)

Blau's treatment of nouns is fairly brief. He notes (§ 4.4.6.2), for example,
that:

> In a **synchronic** classification of noun patterns, it seems appropriate not to
> classify nouns according to the absolute only … [but also according to] the form
> of the singular preceding "heavy" suffixes … [e.g. דְּבַר-, דְּבָר] because it reflects
> the most far-reaching changes and is often identical to the construct.

Stress or lack of it in construct nouns, with and without *maqqef*, is discus-
sed at § 4.4.3.1n. The stress on the -*kā* suffix with a singular noun is second-

ary, whereas "[t]he original penultimate stress has … been preserved in pause (יָדֶ֑ךָ) and in plural nouns (יָדֶ֫יךָ)." (§ 4.4.3.2n)

The accusative *-a* is reflected in the 'connective' vowel in forms like לָ֫נוּ and עִמָּ֫נוּ (§ 4.4.4.7).

In adverbs such as הֵנָּה or יוֹמָם the final consonant does not represent mimation as a purely phonetic phenomenon but an adverbial ending *-mi*, with elision of the final vowel (cf. El-Amarna *riqami*) (§ 4.4.4.12). The same adverbial ending is reflected in the apparent duals צָהֳרַיִם, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, and חוֹרֹנַיִם (§ 4.4.5.6, where מַיִם and שָׁמַיִם are also discussed). Although "the use of the dual is not always productive even for paired body parts …; cf., e.g., וַתְּאַמֵּץ זְרֹעוֹתֶ֫יהָ … Prov 31:17", it "was so frequent" with parts of the body that "it was used even when it referred to more than 'two', as in שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפַ֫יִם … Isa 6:2" (§ 4.4.5.2), and the dual endings actually took over from plural ones in the masculine plural construct: "־סוּסֵי < **sūsay-* … instead of the expected *sūsī, and סוּסֵיכֶם instead of the expected *sūsīkæm. … [T]he *-ay* [ending] … is preserved only with the 1s pronominal suffix, because originally the *y* was doubled: **sūsay-ya > סוּסַי" (§ 4.4.5.7.1).

The unstressed ־ָה in *he-locale* and other forms represents an originally consonantal *he*, as indicated by Ugaritic (§ 4.4.4.13). The origin of the construct *-i* and *-o* endings (בְּנֹ בְעֹר, בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ, etc.) is uncertain (§ 4.4.4.14) as is an explanation for the alternation of the suffixes *-ān* and *-ōn*, in nouns like כִּבְשָׁן, קָרְבָּן (§ 4.4.6.6).

In discussing the correlation of substantival and adjectival forms and gender Blau notes that "[a]djectives that apply to feminine only may exceptionally not exhibit feminine gender, such as דֹּב שַׁכּוּל '(female) bear robbed of offspring' 2 Sam 17:8" (§ 4.4.1), and that "[m]asculine nouns with the feminine ending are exceptional" (§ 4.4.2.5); here Blau draws attention to אָמְרָה קֹהֶ֫לֶת (Eccl 7:27), "where the grammatical ending has prevailed over the sense", and מוֹרָה לֹא־יַעֲלֶה at 1 Sam 1:11. "The fact that masculine-plural and feminine-plural suffixes on adjectives always denote masculine and feminine gender … is no doubt a late analogical feature, since the addition of plural endings to adjectives is itself a late feature, which arose by attraction to the substantive that the adjective modifies." (§ 4.4.5.7.3n)

In structures with the *-ī* ending, which "forms the relative adjective (also called by the Arabic term *nisba*) … the feminine ending is omitted", as, e.g., in יְהוּדִי (§ 4.4.6.8).

Also noted is the suggestion that the 'feminine' *-at* ending originally marked *nomina unitatis* as against 'masculine' zero-ending forms, which represented collectives (§ 4.4.2.1; see also § 4.4.5.7.3, on חִטִּים חִטָּה, יוֹנִים; יוֹנָה, etc.)

and the tendency to use *-t* (rather than *-at* or *-ā*) in the construct (מַמְלֶכֶת‎ >
*mamlakt) and with suffixes (מַמְלַכְתִּי‎) (§ 4.4.2.5).

"The beginnings of some broken plurals can be discerned …: e.g., יֵרָאֶה כָּל־‎
זְכוּרְךָ‎ … Exod 23:17 …, though verbs preceding plurals may occur in the sin-
gular. … [T]he comparatively late date of broken plurals is proven by their in-
variably triradical (or quadri-radical) forms, whereas the plurals formed by the
addition of suffixes sometimes preserved biradical formations." (§ 4.4.5.9)

The endings *-ūt* and *-īt* consist of the feminine marker "added to nouns
from *III-w* roots terminating in *-ū*" and to verbal nouns from *III-y* roots, but
were reinterpreted as feminine endings, which were "added to other roots as
well (such as מַלְכוּת‎ 'kingdom')." (§ 4.4.6.9). *III-y* roots also led to other
'metaanalytic' formations, such as עָשֹׂו‎, instead of עָשָׂיו‎, from עֹשִׂים‎
(§ 4.4.6.10).

With regard to the numerals (§ 4.5), Blau notes, inter alia, that "the gemi-
nated *š* of חֲמִשָּׁה‎ 'five' is not original, since it is absent from the other Semitic
languages[, but] arose by analogy to the following number, viz., שִׁשָּׁה‎", the or-
dinal form of which, שִׁשִּׁי‎, "has been newly derived from שֵׁשׁ‎ … because his-
torical *šədīšī was too different from the cardinal שֵׁשׁ‎" (in contrast to *sitt* and
sādis in Arabic). One would have predicted the number two to have been in
the feminine *šin > *šintáyim > *šittáyim, as in the Samaritan tradition (note
also the ordinal, שֵׁנִי‎); "[i]n the Tiberian tradition …, however, it was restruc-
tured according to [the masculine] שְׁנַיִם‎", giving rise to "the only case of initial
[consonant] cluster in Biblical Hebrew" (שְׁתַּיִם‎). Somewhat similarly, שִׁבְעִים‎
and תִּשְׁעִים‎, for the expected *שְׁבָעִים‎ and *תְּשְׁעִים‎, might be "formed accord-
ing to the pattern of עֶשְׂרִים‎", itself perhaps changed from a dual, *עֶשְׂרַיִם‎, by
"attraction to the following multiples of 10s" (§ 4.5.1.11).

Blau also argues (§ 4.5.2.2) that:

> [T]he notion 'first' was introduced into the various Semitic languages separately,
> as proven by the use of different words in them … In Proto-Semitic, as still pre-
> served in Ugaritic, the concept … was expressed by the counted noun, e.g., *lk ym*
> *w ṯn ṯlṯ rbʿ ym* … Vestiges of this usage persist in Biblical Hebrew: וַחֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה‎
> אַמָּה קְלָעִים לַכָּתֵף ... וְלַכָּתֵף הַשֵּׁנִית חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה קְלָעִים‎ Exod 27:14-15. A later devel-
> opment is the … use of the cardinal אֶחָד‎ instead of the ordinal …, as in Gen-
> esis 1 יוֹם אֶחָד ... יוֹם שֵׁנִי‎, etc.

Blau notes (§ 4.5.2.2n) that at Exod 28:17, אַרְבָּעָה טוּרִים אֶבֶן טוּר אֹדֶם פִּטְדָה‎
וּבָרֶקֶת הַטּוּר הָאֶחָד‎, "[t]he wording … is remarkable, [because] טוּר‎ and טוּר‎
אֶחָד‎ … alternate, i.e., the more archaic usage alternates with the less archaic
usage."

With regard to prepositions, Blau notes (§ 4.4.4.1):

> Historically, most prepositions were nouns in construct in adverbial function …
> Therefore, prepositions themselves originally stood in the adverbial accusative,
> the nouns governed by them (being originally nouns governed by the construct)
> in the genitive. This construct function of the prepositions is reflected even in
> their vocalization; cf., e.g., לְעֻמַּת.

(see also § 5.1.1, where this topic is developed and parallels drawn with Arabic
usage).

In his discussion of specific prepositions, Blau notes (§ 5.1.2) that -כְּ is:

> [t]he only preposition … that does not originate in a noun … [but] seems to be re-
> lated to the deictic element **ka*, which occurs in כֹּה, כָּכָה 'thus' … and perhaps
> Rabbinic Hebrew כָּאן 'here'. This different origin is perhaps reflected by the fact
> that it does not govern pronominal suffixes; forms such as כָּהֵמָּה, כָּהֵנָּה, כָּהֶם, on
> the face of it, reflect *k* + independent pronoun.

The מוֹ-, which sometimes follows -כְּ, especially before other pronominal
suffixes, has parallels in Arabic and Ugaritic.

"The origins of -לְ … and -בְּ … are opaque … [and t]he connection … with
אֶל 'to' is not clear, nor is that … with -בַּיִת 'house, inside'." (§ 5.1.3) Earlier
forms of the prepositions אֶל and עַל:

> have been preserved in (archaic) poetry: אֱלֵי/עֲלֵי < ***'alay(a)/*'ilay(a)* [*sic*] …,
> originally terminating in radical *y*, rather than in the plural suffix … As usual
> in *III-y* nouns …, the forms preceding pronominal suffixes are externally iden-
> tical to plural forms: עָלֶיךָ, אֵלֶיךָ. By back formation, through proportional anal-
> ogy, the forms אֶל, עַל were derived from them (עָלֶיךָ : יָד = יָדֶיךָ : x; x = עַל, etc.)
> and thus עָלֶיךָ, אֵלֶיךָ, etc., became plural forms of אֶל, עַל synchronically. The
> plural suffixes of תַּחְתֶּיךָ arose through contrastive analogy with its antonym עַל.
> (§ 5.1.4)

Blau claims that at Gen 26:28 the feminine form is inclusive in contrast to
the masculine, which conveys exclusion: תְּהִי נָא אָלָה בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ בֵּינֵינוּ וּבֵינֶךָ "a co-
venant will be between us (including both parties, inclusive), between us (one
party, exclusive) and you". "This plural formation of בֵּין … [was] triggered by
the quite frequent repetition of this preposition (e.g. בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחֹשֶׁךְ …
Gen 1:4)" (§ 5.1.4n).

The quality and readability of the English of this largely technical volume
is generally excellent, despite a few 'foreignisms' and other stylistic lapses, e.g.:
"actual" for 'present-day' (§ 3.5.1.4n [twice]; § 3.5.7.6.11); "told" for 'mentio-

ned' or 'stated' (§ 4.3.2.2.2); "to be at loss" (§ 4.3.8.7.5.3); "pretension", for 'pretence' (§ 4.3.5.6.1); "such as" for 'just like' (§ 4.3.8.7.2.3); "big" for 'large' or 'great' (§ 4.3.8.6.10); "even new forms were coined" for 'new forms were even coined' (§ 4.3.8.6.10); "a result of the intention to avoid" for 'a result of trying to avoid' (§ 4.3.8.8.5); "they [pronouns] have not been transferred to triradicalism" (§ 4.2.1.1; contrast § 4.3.1.8, where "adapted" is, more appropriately, employed).

At § 4.3.8.6.10 (quoted above), the second occurrence of "these pausal forms" would be better as 'the pausal forms' and "in the pause" should dispense with the article. At § 4.3.5.2.5.3, "a Proto-Semitic form together with its pendant", 'pendant' presumably means 'minor variant' or 'by-form'. 'Which' and 'that' could have been more profitably distinguished; note, e.g., § 3.1.3: "the shortest elements which differentiate meaning".

A few declamatory statements appear (in English at least) to have been lifted directly from the lecture medium: "Such is our inclination" (§ 3.4.8.5); "So why should it mark such a difference in this case?" (§ 3.5.11.7n); "In Hebrew pay attention to …" (§ 4.2.2.7.4n; similarly at § 4.3.8.4.18n); "The -*niya* form is tricky" (§ 4.2.3.2.1n).

I noticed very few typographic errors: "book", for 'books' (§ 3.5.12.1.4), and "froms", for 'forms' (§ 3.5.12.2.11); the word אֲשֶׁר appears to be missing from the sentence beginning "This gap is bridged …" (§ 4.2.6.3.2), and a comma is needed between the second and third Hebrew forms at § 4.3.3.2.3. At § 4.3.8.2.3, "2 Sam 20:7" should be "2 Sam 20:9", and at § 4.2.3.4.2n, "Job 21:16" should be "Job 21:18". § 4.4.1.1n is effectively a slightly shorter variant of what is stated at greater length in § 4.4.1.7, so the note could have simply referred to that section.

I was unable to find in *BHS* the following forms cited by Blau (although in some cases at least ms. variants are probably correctly represented): הֶאֱמִינָה (§ 3.5.1.4), מְנָאֵצִי (§ 4.3.7.2.1), כְּתָבִי (§ 4.3.7.2.4), תֹּאכְלֶנָּה (§ 4.3.8.3.4), נְבוּכִים (with *shuruq*) (§ 4.3.8.7.3.2); הֲנִיפֹֿתִי (§ 4.3.8.7.3.3; Job 31:21 has *holem-waw*).

J. F. Elwolde
Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya
jfelwolde@gmail.com