

E-book - [History of the Ancient and Modern Hebrew Language](#)

E-book - [Biblical Hebrew Poetry and Word Play - Reconstructing the Original Oral, Aural and Visual Experience](#)

By David Steinberg

[David.Steinberg@houseofdavid.ca](mailto:David.Steinberg@houseofdavid.ca)

Home page <http://www.houseofdavid.ca/>

## TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND LINGUISTIC SYMBOLS

### 1. Abbreviations

abs. - absolute state (*status absolutus*) of a noun or adjective as opposed to the [construct](#) and [pronominal](#) states.

acc. - [accusative case](#)

adj. - adjective

a.p. - active participle

BCE - Before Common Era = BC; CE – Common Era = AD

BH - Biblical Hebrew, the language of the Hebrew Bible. Typologically it can be divided into [ABH](#), [CBH](#) and [PCBH](#). Its [registers](#) include prose and [poetic](#) varieties.

BHA - [Biblical Hebrew](#), its antecedents and the development of the Biblical Hebrew reading tradition of the Tiberian Masoretes ([BHA phase 1](#) - [Phase 6](#)).

C - [consonant](#)

C<sub>(1, 2, 3, 4)</sub> - (first, second, third, forth) [consonant](#)

C<sub>x</sub>(C<sub>x</sub>) - a given (same) [consonant](#)

constr. - [construct](#) state (*status constructus*) of a noun or adjective as opposed to the [absolute](#) and [pronominal](#) states. In transcription constr. is indicated by [the secondary stress marker](#) , .

cp. - common plural

cs. - common singular

du. - dual

f. - feminine

fp. - feminine plural

fs. - feminine singular

gen. - [genitive](#)

imp. - imperative

inf. abs. - [infinitive](#) absolute

inf. constr. - [infinitive](#) construct

m. - masculine

MCS - [Masoretic cantillation](#) signs

ML - [Matres Lectionis](#)

mp. - masculine plural

ms. - masculine singular

MSA - [Modern Standard \(or literary\) Arabic](#)

MT - [Masoretic Text](#)

n. - (foot)note

N<sub>1</sub>...N<sub>2</sub> - first noun ... second noun

nom. - [nominative case](#)

obl. - [oblique case](#)

part. - participle(s)

PC - [Prefix Conjugation](#)<sup>1</sup>

PC<sub>coh</sub><sup>2</sup> - [cohortative](#).<sup>3</sup> This is the [volitive mood](#) of the first person of the [PC](#) ("I would like to..."; "let's..."). "(T)he cohortative has a *direct* use, e.g. *May I kill, I wish to kill!*, and an indirect or subordinated use (with ׀), e.g. *in order that I might kill* (וְאֶקְטֹל)." <sup>4</sup>

PC<sub>imp</sub><sup>5</sup> - [imperfect](#). Its range meanings - [present, future and past durative](#).

PC<sub>imp\_inj</sub> - imperfect used as injunctive<sup>6</sup>. "The imperfect in this usage is differentiated from the jussive with its prohibitive in that the imperfect is negated by אֵל while the (jussive) prohibitive has אֵלָּא. The commandments formulated in the imperfect often show the archaic long plural suffix and frequent reinforcement by the infinitive absolute. The emphasis in this kind of injunction is

not on the will of the speaker (as it is in the jussive and (jussive) prohibitive) but on the action enjoined or forbidden."<sup>7</sup>

PC<sub>imp\_prfut</sub> - imperfect in its most common present, future meaning.

PC<sub>imp\_pdur</sub> - imperfect in its less common past durative meaning.

PC<sub>jus</sub><sup>8</sup> - [jussive](#). This is the [volitive mood](#) of the second and third person of the [PC](#).<sup>9</sup> "The [jussive is used to express all the nuances of will](#): from a superior to an inferior: command, exhortation, advice, invitation, permission; - from an inferior to a superior: wish, prayer, request for permission etc. The jussive is often followed by the entreating particle [אֵל](#), especially in requests for permission."<sup>10</sup>

PC<sub>pret</sub> - preterite i.e. the original past tense that preceded the development of the [SC](#) as a verbal tense.

[PC<sub>pret\\_sim</sub>](#)<sup>11</sup> - the simple *yaqtul*/preterite i.e. used without the augmented conjunction,... *waw* plus gemination. This is moderately common in poetry and used sporadically in prose usually where the context makes the time reference unambiguous.

[PC<sub>pretWC</sub>](#)<sup>12</sup> - "In prose the *yaqtul* (preterite) has been restricted to the role of a narrative past tense expressing a sequence of actions. In narrative sequences of this nature, it is at the head of the clause, always introduced by the augmented conjunction,... *waw* plus gemination...."<sup>13</sup> [PC<sub>pretWC</sub>](#) is a regular feature of BH prose and is used sporadically in BH poetry.

pl. - plural

PMT - [Proto-Masoretic text](#) - the [consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible](#) inherited by the Tiberian Masoretes. Their addition to this text form of the [MCS](#) and vowel signs (pointing) produced the [Masoretic Text](#).

p.p. - passive participle

pro. - pronoun, pronominal

PS - [Proto-Semitic language](#)<sup>14</sup>

s. - singular

SC - [Suffix Conjugation](#)<sup>15</sup>. [GK](#) (§106) gives a global overview of the non-[waw conversive](#) SC - "(It) serves to express [actions, events, or states](#), which the speaker wishes to represent from the point of view of completion, whether they belong to a determinate past time, or extend into the present, or, while still in the future, are pictured in their complete state."

SC<sub>hyp</sub> - "Hypothetical conditions or unrealizable wishes"<sup>16</sup>

SC<sub>past</sub> - past tense. Normally non-durative<sup>17</sup>. This is the normal usage and accounts for the great majority of non-*waw conversive* instances of the SC.

SC<sub>pre</sub> - A performative action that occurs by means of speaking.

נָתַתָּ אֶתְּ הָאָרֶץ כָּלָהּ עַל־לִאְרֵי מִצְרָיִם

I *appoint* you over all the land of Egypt.<sup>18</sup>

SC<sub>prec</sub> - *precativ perfect* i.e. to articulate a request (rare and only found in Psalms).<sup>19</sup>

SC<sub>prof</sub> - prophetic perfect presenting the future as if it was already reality<sup>20</sup> (rare).

SC<sub>state</sub> - state of affairs or condition. Mainly with [stative](#) verbs.<sup>21</sup> Nb. [GK](#) (§106g) "(The SC can) represent actions, events, or states, which, although completed in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present...."

SC<sub>timeless</sub> - *gnomic perfect* describing actions or events that are not time-bound (rare).<sup>22</sup>

SC<sub>wc</sub> - [waw conversive](#) form of SC carrying the range of meanings of [PC<sub>imp</sub>](#). Used regularly in narrative prose and irregularly in poetry.

sp. - pronominal state (*status pronominalis*)<sup>23</sup> of nouns governing pronominal suffixes contrasting with the [absolute](#) and [construct](#) states. Sp. resembles the construct both in function and form but exhibits a shift of stress which in EBHP rests on the pronominal suffix or the vowel "connecting" it with the noun except for the always stressed "heavy" suffixes כֹּם, כֵּן, הֵם, הֵן, מֶם.

V - [vowel](#)

V(1, 2) - (first, second) [vowel](#)

V<sub>x</sub>(V<sub>x</sub>) - a given (same) [vowel](#)

## 2. Linguistic Terms and Symbols<sup>24</sup>

[Anceps vowels /ā/, /ī/, /ū/](#)

Colloquial Arabic - [current spoken varieties of Arabic](#)

Energic Mood - 'Found in [Classical Arabic](#) and various other [Semitic languages](#), the energetic mood expresses something which is strongly believed or which the speaker wishes to emphasize, e.g. *yaktubanna* يَكْتُبَنَّ ("he certainly writes")' - source [Wikipedia](#).

Epigraphic Hebrew (EH) - the extra-biblical Hebrew inscriptions of Palestine which have been attributed to the period between the tenth and the sixth century BCE.

Fientive or action verb designates an action of movement or change of state in which the subject performs the action.

## Koine, Koineization

## Phonemes - consonants

## Phonemes - vowels

Phonologically distinct or phonological - refers to phonic differences capable of distinguishing meaning in a given language. Essentially it has the same meaning as 'phonemic'

Vowel Letters or *Matres Lectionis* (Latin for "mothers of reading") – abbreviation ML - א ה ו י - when used to represent a vowel. For details see [these boxes](#).

' Primary (or Main) stress (occasionally phonemic) - this symbol is placed immediately before the syllable carrying primary stress with the stressed syllable itself marked bold e.g. \*/'a'da:m/.

, Secondary stress<sup>25</sup> Phonemic in [EBHP/LBHP](#) in such cases as: /'sūs/ = "horse"; /,sūs/ (constr) = "horse of -". This symbol is placed immediately before the syllable carrying secondary [stress](#).

- For [EBHP](#) I assume that nouns in the construct have a secondary stress on the syllable which in the absolute case would carry the primary stress.
- For [TH](#) syllable:
  - In the case of nouns in the construct case, all syllables marked by Tiberian stress indicating accents are assumed to carry secondary stress<sup>26</sup>.
  - In all other cases all syllables marked by Tiberian stress indicating accents, other than the final one in the word, are assumed to carry secondary stress.

N.b. - In TH, originally short vowels are found in closed syllables carrying primary or secondary stress, and are pronounced long.<sup>27</sup>

. Syllable break - a.a (used where necessary for clarity)

/t/ *virgules* mark [phoneme](#) boundaries

: colon placed between two words indicates [phonological contrast](#) minimally, a [minimal pair](#)

[t] *square brackets* mark [phonetic/allophone](#) boundaries.

<ph> [graphemes](#)

? Indicates that it is impossible to decide between alternatives based on current data.e.g. /'ħiʃy/ ([EBHP?](#)) > /'ħiʃî/ ([EBHP?](#)) means the pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew (BH) phonemic pronunciation was either /'ħiʃy/ or its later derived form /'ħiʃî/.

/ [slash](#) separates contrastive or variant items, categories, etc.

√ root eg √gdl or גדל√

{ } encloses morphemic element, morphemic, element, morphemic junction or root.

( ) in transcriptions encloses: (a) an element included in an alternative reconstruction; or, (b) an omissible or optional element. Thus [EBHP](#) /qa'talta(:)/ indicates that the pronunciation was either /qa'talta/ or /qa'talta:/ or that either was an option at that time.

< 'derives from ...'

<< morphophonemic shift

← 'derives from...' omitting one or more intermediate stages.

> 'leads to ...'

>> morphophonemic shift

→ abridged shift (i.e. without intermediate stages).

# terminal pause.

Ø zero.

~ 'both forms exist(ed) synchronically'.

≈ by analogy to

≈hyp. cor. [hypercorrections](#) or pseudo-correction. [Example forms such as באַר /bə'êr/](#)

± 'with or without' or 'indifferent to'.

## 2.1 Symbols Denoting Vowels - see [Vowel Phonemes](#)<sup>28</sup>

### a) Vowel Length

- Transcribing diachronic examples -
  - I. [Irreducible Historically Long Vowels](#) i.e. vowels that seem to have been long as far back as we can reconstruct even if their quality has changed -
 

/ī/, /ē/ ([ē] or [ē]<sup>29</sup>), /ā/<sup>30</sup>, /ō/<sup>31</sup>, /ū/.

N.b. Such vowels can be gained by analogy as in the case of the [1cs. independent pronoun](#).
  - II. [Irreducible Long Vowels](#) which lengthened due to contraction and assimilation -
 

/î/, /ê/ ([ê] or [ê]), /â/, /ô/, /û/.
  - III. [Long Vowels](#) originating from [PH anceps](#) vowels, vowels lengthened due to stress

([tonic and pretonic lengthening](#)), long vowels whose origin is unclear, and long vowels in foreign names etc. e.g. [פָּרָעַ](#) /par'ɔ:/, [סָרָא](#) /si:sə'ra:/ -

/i:/, /e:/ ([ɛ:] or [ɛ:]), /a:/, /ɔ:/, /o:/, /u:/.

IV. Vowels carrying primary stress when not otherwise marked -

í, í, é, é, á, ɛ́, ó, ɔ́, ú.

V. Vowels carrying secondary [stress](#) in [TH](#) when not otherwise marked -

ì, ì, è, è, à, ɛ̀, ò, ò, ù.

- Phonetic transcription and transcribing reconstructed text

- I generally use IPA symbols, thus historic /ō/, /ô/ and /o:/ (see above) are all transcribed [o:] in [\\*\[EBHP\]](#).
- [TH qāmeš](#) is transcribed [ɔ] in [\\*\[TH\]](#) regardless of [its origin](#);

- [Word-final Vowels of intermediate or uncertain length](#)

I use the IPA symbol ˙ for transcribing reconstructed [\\*\[EBHP\]](#) word-final vowels in two situations:

- when it is uncertain whether a word-final vowel was pronounced short or long e.g. [TH](#) [חָלָה](#) which was a reflex of [/EBHP/](#) \*/qa'ṭalta(:)/ i.e. \*/qa'ṭalta:/ or \*/qa'ṭalta/; reconstructed pronunciation [\[EBHP\]](#) \*[qe'ṭelte˙]
- when a historically long word-final vowel is unstressed and [hence probably shortened in pronunciation](#) as in many Arabic dialects e.g. [TH](#) (3fs. *SC*) [חָלָה](#) which was a reflex of [/EBHP/](#) \*/qa'ṭalâ/<sup>32</sup>; [\[EBHP\]](#) \*[qe'ṭele˙]

b) *Restored Vowels* -

*a, i, u* in [/EBHP/](#) (*e, i, u* or *ɐ, ɪ, ʊ* in my reconstructed [\[EBHP\]](#))<sup>33</sup> are used to indicate originally short vowels, which have been reduced to *ə/Ø* ([חָ](#)), *ɛ̃* ([חָ](#)), *ɛ̃* ([חָ](#)) or *ɔ̃* ([חָ](#)) in [TH](#).

Their pronunciation in [\[EBHP\]](#), in descending order of probability -

/a/ [[e](#)], [[ɛ̃](#)], [[ɛ](#)], [[ɛ̃](#)], [[ɔ](#)], [[Ø](#)]

/i/ [ɪ], [ĩ], [e], [ě], [ə], [Ø]

/u/ [ʊ], [ũ], [ö], [ɔ], [ō], [ə], [Ø]

c) *Notes* -

- in diachronic examples, the TH phoneme /ɔ/ is transcribed /q/<sup>34</sup> \*[ɔ] when it originated from short *u*, and /â/ \*[ɔ:] when it immediately originated from long *a*.
- in quotations from other authors I have generally kept their notation unless otherwise noted.

a - *furtive pataḥ*, Hebrew term *pataḥ g'nuvah*

2.2 *Gemination*<sup>35</sup>

Were Word-Final Geminated Consonants Maintained in EBHP?

Long continuants

Long stops

Symbols for long vowels and consonants

List of words with final gemination

2.3 *Stages of the Hebrew Language* <sup>36</sup>

a) PNWS - Proto-Northwest Semitic (*BHA phase 1*)

b) PH - Proto-Hebrew (*BHA phase 2*). The Canaanite dialects (c.1200-1000 B.C.E.) that would develop into Hebrew with the loss of the case endings. Pattern of long and short vowels and consonants carry on Proto-Semitic pattern. Vowel and consonant quality and length phonemic. Stress uniformly penultimate thus not distinct. Sources - see Harris 1939, Hendel-Lambdin-Huehnergard, Sáenz-Badillos.

c) AH - Ancient Hebrew<sup>37</sup> - All the Canaanite dialects written and spoken in the territory described in the Bible as being settled by the tribes of Israel, and later the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, from about 1000 BCE until the extinction of Hebrew speech with the suppression of the Bar Kochba rebellion in the mid-second century CE (*BHA phase 1* - *Phase 4*).

c.1) PreExH - *Pre-Exilic Hebrew* (*BHA phase 3*). This encompasses both Judean and Israelian Hebrew i.e. all the dialects spoken and written in the villages and towns of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel c. early 10th to early sixth centuries BCE i.e. in the First Temple Period.

*Israelian Hebrew* (some scholars call *Northern* or *Israelite Hebrew*<sup>38</sup>) (*BHA phase 3*) - This is not a dialect; it is a catchall term for all the dialects spoken and written in the



villages and towns of the [Kingdom of Israel](#) c. 1000 BCE until at least the late eighth century BCE. It does not imply that these dialects had more in common with each other than many of them had to some of the dialects spoken in the Kingdom of Judah and hence classed under the rubric *Judahite Hebrew*. It is possible that the major areas of the kingdom ([Samaria](#), [Galilee](#), the [Coastal Plain](#) and [Gilead](#)) developed recognizable regional dialects.

IEH - *Israelian [Epigraphic Hebrew](#)*

\*[EBHP<sub>Isr</sub>] a possible reconstruction of Samaritan Hebrew [when probably at variance from EBHP](#).

*Judahite Hebrew* (some scholars call *Southern* or *Judean Hebrew*) ([BHA phase 3](#)) - This is not a dialect; it is a catchall term for all the dialects spoken and written in the villages and towns of the [Kingdom of Judah](#) during the [First Temple Period](#). The [spoken dialects ancestral to MH](#), falls under this rubric. Use of the term *Judahite Hebrew* does not imply that these dialects had more in common with each other than many of them had to some of the dialects spoken in the Kingdom of Judah and hence classed under the rubric *Israelian Hebrew*.

ABH - *Archaizing Biblical Hebrew* - The language of a few important poems<sup>39</sup>. These poems could have been authored at any time after 1000 BCE<sup>40</sup> probably using a standard set of archaizing features<sup>41</sup>.

CBH - *Classical Biblical Hebrew* ([BHA phase 3](#)) - The literary dialect of [Jerusalem](#) c.950-586 B.C.E ([First Temple Period](#)) as recorded in the passages of the Hebrew Bible reasonably dated to the pre-exilic period. It is represented by the [PMT](#), of these passages, minus non-word final vowel letters. This is the only widely attested form of *Judahite Hebrew*. It is clear that: (1) CBH shows very little if any internal development<sup>42</sup> suggesting later revision of any early texts, (2) all CBH biblical texts were [transferred to the Aramaic script, modernized in orthography](#) and possibly linguistically and/or textually revised in the post-exilic period. (3) CBH continued to be written, alongside [PCBH](#), well into the Persian period<sup>43</sup>. In the post-exilic period the author/editors would have used [PMH](#) or Aramaic as their daily speech and have written the very different CBH and PCBH in the way that modern Arabs write MSA, Iron Age Babylonian scribes composed in Standard Babylonian<sup>44</sup> or as medieval Italians wrote Church Latin. N.b. the language of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, while being substantially CBH, show some PCBH features.

\*EBHP - *Early Biblical Hebrew [Pronunciation](#)*

[/EBHP/](#)<sup>+45</sup> - This reconstruction includes -

- the [phonemic transcription](#) of reconstructed CBH (/EBHP/) recovering, as closely as possible, the pronunciation that a scribe in Jerusalem 700-600 BCE would have used in reading poetry and other literature to upper class Judeans or members of the king's court. Vowel and consonant quality and length and word stress phonological. N.b. It is quite possible that *Early Biblical Hebrew Pronunciation* continued to be used in some circles for formal literary reading of [CBH](#) and [PCBH](#), alongside [LBHP](#), well into the Persian period;
- the occasionally phonemic placement of [primary word stress](#);
- the non-phonemic placement of [secondary word stress](#); and,
- the non-phonemic distinction between the long vowels of various origins e.g. [ī, î, ï](#).

[EBHP]<sup>46</sup> a [phonetic transcription](#) of reconstructed *Early Biblical Hebrew Pronunciation*.

/EBHP+/ more probable of alternative reconstructions.

/EBHP-/ less probable of alternative reconstructions.

/EBHP?/ possible reconstruction usually used when it is impossible to decide, based on current data, between an earlier and later form.

/EBHP<sub>sam</sub>/ possible reconstruction of Samaritan pre-exilic Hebrew [when probably at variance from Jerusalem dialect](#).

JEH - *Judahite Epigraphic Hebrew* (see [A Note on Epigraphic Hebrew](#)) - inscriptions contemporaneous with pre-exilic [CBH](#). Scribes trained in [Jerusalem 700-586 BCE](#) were likely the authors of the bulk of surviving JEH e.g. [Siloam Inscription](#), [Lachish ostraca](#), [Arad ostraca](#). For their orthography see [Matres Lectionis in Hebrew](#). The same circles were likely the composers and/or transmitters of most of the pre-exilic biblical texts. Epigraphic Hebrew documents have been preserved in their original language and orthography and, [within limits](#), can serve as a guide to pronunciation. Except for archaisms used in poetry, the original orthography of the pre-exilic biblical texts would very likely to have conformed to the norms of JEH.

I am working on the assumption that in JEH -

- all final stressed vowels were long and generally marked by vowel letters;

- final unstressed long vowels were generally marked by vowel letters; and,
- final unstressed short vowels, were unmarked i.e. were not marked by vowel letters or in any other way.

c.2) PostExH - [\*Post-Exilic Hebrew\*](#) (*BHA phase 4*)

PCBH - *Post-Classical Biblical Hebrew* (*BHA phase 4*) - A literary dialect of Jerusalem c.500 B.C.E.- 70 CE. It is a direct continuation of, and very similar to [CBH<sup>47</sup>](#) and like CBH texts the language of PCBH biblical passages shows [no discernable internal development](#).. However, it shows internal linguistic developments that were probably influenced by Aramaic<sup>48</sup> and contemporary spoken Hebrew. PCBH diverged increasingly from spoken Hebrew and should be considered a [diglossic](#) prestige language.<sup>49</sup> In the post-exilic period the author/editors would have used PMH or Aramaic as their daily speech and have written the very different CBH and PCBH in the way that modern Arabs write MSA or as medieval Italians wrote Church Latin<sup>50</sup>. *Sources* later books of the Bible such as [Chronicles](#).

LBHP /[LBHP](#)/ (*Late Biblical Hebrew Pronunciation*) - [Phonemic](#) transcription of reconstructed reading tradition of BH c.500 BCE - 200 CE. Naturally it would have changed considerably over that period. It was increasingly affected by Aramaic and spoken Hebrew.

[[LBHP](#)] a [phonetic transcription](#)<sup>51</sup> transcription of reconstructed Late Biblical Hebrew *Pronunciation*.

QH - Qumran Hebrew i.e. the Hebrew of the non-biblical [Dead Sea Scrolls](#) (see [Qimron 1986](#)). Opinions differ as to whether it should be considered a highly idiosyncratic and Aramaized form of [PCBH](#) or a separate line of development<sup>52</sup>. Most scholars consider it to have been a literary language probably spoken in formal situations much like [MSA](#) today in the Arab world. For the relation between BH and QH see [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008](#) chapt. 10.

PMH - Proto-Mishnaic or Proto-Rabbinic Hebrew - see [Development of Proto-Mishnaic Hebrew](#) (c. 586 BCE-c. 70 BC).<sup>53</sup>.

MH - [Mishnaic, Middle or Rabbinic Hebrew](#) - Basically the spoken Hebrew of some areas of rural Judah of the first and early second centuries C.E. Its population base was destroyed with [the suppression of the Bar Kochba rebellion](#). *Source* - Tannaitic Literature especially the [Mishnah](#). For the relation between BH and MH see [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008](#) chapt. 9.

d) MidH - [Medieval Hebrew](#). Various forms of Hebrew c. 1000-c. 1850 C.E.

e) IH - [Israeli Hebrew](#). Spoken and written Hebrew Palestine (1900-1947)/Israel (1948-present).

[/IH/](#) Phonemic transcription of IH.

[\[IH\]](#) Phonetic transcription of IH. Note [Vowel System - Modern Israeli Hebrew](#).

#### 2.4) Proto-Tiberian, Tiberian and Other Traditions of Reading Biblical Hebrew

a) PTH - Proto-Tiberian Hebrew ([BHA Phase 5](#) - c.150-c.500 C.E.). This is the developing traditional pronunciation of some circles of Aramaic speaking Palestinian scholars when reading the [Proto-Masoretic text](#) of the Hebrew Bible.

This tradition underlies TH and is largely deduced from the phonology of TH.

[/PTH/](#)<sup>54</sup> This reconstruction includes -

- the [phonemic](#)<sup>54</sup> transcription of reconstructed [PTH](#) ([/PTH/](#));
- the occasionally phonemic placement of [primary word stress](#);
- the non-phonemic placement of [secondary word stress](#);
- the allophonic [spirantization of the bgdkpt consonants](#) (*dagesh qal* (Hebrew) or [dagesh lene](#) (Latin) - b/b, g/g, d/d, p/p, t/t; and,
- the non-phonemic distinction between the long vowels of various origins e.g. [ī](#), [î](#), [î̇](#).

[\[PTH\]](#) [Phonetic](#)<sup>55</sup> transcription of reconstructed PTH.

b) TH - [Tiberian Hebrew](#) ([BHA Phase 6](#) - c.850 C.E.). TH [masoretic cantillation](#) and vowel points basically reflect the final development of [PTH](#) as it continued to develop from the fifth to the ninth centuries CE (see [Tiberian Vowel System](#)). Compared to [EBHP](#) there was a [decrease in the number of consonantal phonemes](#) and an [increase in the number of vowel phonemes](#). Short vowels remain only in closed unstressed syllables. [Vowel length non-phonological](#), consonant gemination carries light phonemic load. Vowel and consonant quality and word stress phonological.

As described in [Khan 1987](#) (pp. 24-25) -

"Although the Tiberian vocalization system marks all the major qualitative distinctions between the vowels, it gives only partial indication of relative vowel quantity. The reason for this is that ... vowel quantity was not phonemic. The vocalization system was concerned primarily with the phonemic quality oppositions. The few indications of

allophonic distinctions of both quality and quantity were made by the Masoretes out of their desire to preserve correctly the phonetic details of the reading tradition."

/TH/⁺ In order to include the full range of word-level information provided by MT this includes:

- the [phonemic](#) transcription of TH (/TH/);
- the occasionally phonemic placement of [primary word stress](#);
- the non-phonemic placement of [secondary word stress](#); and,
- the largely partly or largely allophonic -
  - *vocal šwa* and [hataf/hatep vowels](#)<sup>56</sup>
  - [spirantization of the bgdkpt consonants](#) (*dages qal* (Hebrew) or [dagesh lene](#) (Latin) - b/b̥, g/g̥, d/d̥, k/k̥, p/p̥, t/t̥).

[TH]<sup>57</sup> [Phonetic](#) transcription of [reconstructed](#) TH assuming that vowels that the were as in the table [Tiberian Vowel System](#).

#### c) Other Written Traditions of Reading Biblical Hebrew<sup>58</sup>

BH<sub>Qum</sub> - Biblical Hebrew as reflected in the orthography of [biblical Dead Sea Scrolls](#) (2nd c. BCE-1st c. CE)<sup>59</sup>.

[BH<sub>Pal</sub>](#) - Biblical Hebrew pointed with Palestinian Vocalization (from c. 7th c. CE)<sup>60</sup>.

[BH<sub>Bab</sub>](#) - Biblical Hebrew pointed with Babylonian Vocalization (from late c. 9th c. CE)<sup>61</sup>.

BH<sub>Gk-Lat</sub> - Biblical Hebrew as reflected in Greek<sup>62</sup> and Latin<sup>63</sup> transcriptions (mainly 3rd c. BCE-4th c. CE)<sup>64</sup>.

[BH<sub>Sam-nik</sub>](#) - Biblical Hebrew pointed with Samaritan Vocalization (from c. 10th c. CE).

#### d) Modern Pronunciation Traditions Used in Reading BH

1. BH<sub>SAM</sub><sup>65</sup> - Modern [Samaritan traditional pronunciation](#) used in reading the (unpointed) [Samaritan Pentateuch](#). There are four vowel lengths maintained in the Samaritan tradition of Torah reading but vowel length is not phonological<sup>66</sup>.
2. BH<sub>IH</sub> = [BH<sub>IH</sub>] = [IH] - The [reading of the MT using Israeli Hebrew pronunciation](#). Stress mainly follows [TH](#) accents and the phonemic structure is set by the [TH](#) graphemes. [Influence of European Languages](#). No long consonants or vowels, no [emphatic consonants](#), no [gutturals](#) except occasional [h]. For the sound system of Israeli Hebrew see [Glinert](#) p. 9 see also [Berman](#).
3. BH<sub>AH</sub> = [BH<sub>AH</sub>] - The [reading of the MT using traditional Ashkenazi Hebrew pronunciation](#). Stress penultimate and the [phonemic structure is set by the TH graphemes](#) thus any

- [variations in vowel length are non-phonological](#). [Influence of European Languages](#). No long consonants or vowels, no [emphatic consonants](#), no [gutturals](#) except [h].
4. BH<sub>MIZ</sub> = [BH<sub>MIZ</sub>] - The [reading of the MT using traditional Mizrahi \(Arabic speaking excluding Yementie\) Hebrew pronunciation](#). Stress mainly follows [TH](#) accents and the [phonemic structure is set by the TH graphemes](#) thus any [variations in vowel length are non-phonological](#). Somewhat variable due to the influence of different Arabic dialects. Pronunciation includes long consonants and vowels, [emphatic consonants](#), [gutturals](#).
  5. BH<sub>SEP</sub> = [BH<sub>SEP</sub>] - The [reading of the MT using traditional Sephardi Hebrew pronunciation](#). maintained in the [Ladino](#) speaking communities. Stress mainly follows [TH](#) accents and the [phonemic structure is set by the TH graphemes](#) thus any [variations in vowel length are non-phonological](#). [Influence of European Languages](#). No long consonants or vowels, no [emphatic consonants](#), no [gutturals](#) except occasional [h].
  6. BH<sub>YEM</sub><sup>67</sup> = [BH<sub>YEM</sub>] - The [reading of the MT using the traditional Yemeni Hebrew pronunciations for scriptural reading and recitation](#). Stress mainly follows [TH](#) accents and the [phonemic structure is set by the TH graphemes](#) thus [variations in vowel length are non-phonological](#) (There are four vowel lengths maintained in the Yemenite tradition of reading the MT. <sup>68</sup>) Somewhat variable due to the influence of different Yemeni Arabic dialects.
  7. TH<sub>CST</sub> = /TH<sub>CST</sub>/ [Conventional Scholarly Transcription of TH](#). Stress mainly follows [TH](#) accents and the [phonemic structure, including stress, is set by the TH graphemes](#). The most widely used standard for TH<sub>CST</sub> is TH<sub>SBL</sub> - [Society of Biblical Literature](#) (SBL) *Academic Translation Style*<sup>69</sup>.

[TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub>] - This represents the way English-speaking scholars, familiar with the pronunciation of IH, tend to pronounce TH. Frequently, in writing scholars use TH<sub>CST</sub> for transcription, they ignore the transcription substituting BH<sub>IH</sub> in oral pronunciation modified, in some cases, where English speaking habits are closer to \*[TH] than to [IH]/BH<sub>IH</sub>. Some examples<sup>70</sup> -

(a) *Šêrê* in [TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub>] is usually pronounced with its historic Tiberian pronunciation *ē* (IPA [e]) not as in IH [ɛ] - cf. the English contrast bet:bait;

(b) ך in [TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub>] is usually actualized as [ɕ] as in English and \*[TH] not as in BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH [ɕ];

(c) consonantal ה in BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH is usually silent or a glottal stop while in [TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub>] English speakers tend to realize it, in positions in which consonantal [h] appears in English, as the original [h] - cf. the English contrast hat:at. Some examples -

- "the door" הַ דֶּלֶת

/TH/ /had.'dɛ.lɛt/ [TH] \*[hed.'dɛ:.lɛθ]

BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH [ɛ.'dɛ.lɛt]

TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub> [hɛ.'dɛ.lɛt]

- BUT, English not being comfortable with a consonantal [h] following a vowel at the end of a syllable הָלַלְתָּ

/TH/ /hal.lu.'yãh/ [TH] \*[hel.lu:.'yɔ:h]

BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH [ɛ.lɛ.lu.'yɛ]

TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub> [hɛ.lɛ.lu.'yɛ]

- Perhaps the most important example of English pronunciation rules distorting a key word is יהוה EBHP *\*yah'wé* TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub> [ya'wɛ]

(d) in IH *yod* quiesces when followed by a *hîreq* at the beginning of words thus שָׁרַע is [yisrɛ'ɛl] in [TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub>] but [sɛɛ'ɛl] in BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH. Similarly, רָחַם is [yiv'xɛr] in TH<sub>CSP IS-ENG</sub> but [iv'xɛr] in BH<sub>IH</sub>/IH.

It must be stressed, that this practice, of modeling pronunciation on [IH], completely obscures important [Ancient Hebrew](#) distinctions - vowel and consonantal length, [emphatic](#) vs. unemphatic consonants, the range of gutturals. This is in addition to changes between EBHP and TH (see [The Pronunciation of Hebrew Changed Substantially Between EBHP and the Time of the 8<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> CE Masoretes Who Vocalized the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible](#)).

---

<sup>1</sup> See [Blau 2010](#) §4.3.3.3. For range of meanings of PC see [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) § 113 and [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.

<sup>2</sup> Nb. In /EBHP/ PC<sub>coh</sub> was distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> and PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub>, in forms, not carrying object suffixes, by the unstressed suffix *a(:)*, and usually from PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub> by placement of stress.

<sup>3</sup> A good outline of the meanings and use of the cohortative is in [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §45, 114, 116. "Orlinsky recognized that once the [syntagma](#) was understood as requiring the cohortative for the first person and the jussive for second and third, then all verb forms in such a chain of purpose clauses after an imperative or an exclamation were by definition cohortative/jussive whether or not they exhibited any morphological distinction. ([Rainey 1985](#) p. 10.)

<sup>4</sup> From [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §45b.

<sup>5</sup> Nb. In /EBHP/ PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub>/PC<sub>jus</sub> were distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> in [some forms, when not carrying object suffixes, by placement of stress](#).

<sup>6</sup> [Williams 1976](#):32.

<sup>7</sup> [Rainey 1985](#) p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Nb. In /EBHP/ PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub>/PC<sub>jus</sub> were distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> in [some forms, when not carrying object suffixes, by placement of stress](#).

<sup>9</sup> A good outline of the meanings and use of the cohortative is in [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §46, 114, 116.

<sup>10</sup> [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §114h.

<sup>11</sup> Nb. In /EBHP/ PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub>/PC<sub>jus</sub> were distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> in [some forms, when not carrying object suffixes, by placement of stress](#).

<sup>12</sup> Nb. In /EBHP/ [PC<sub>pretWC</sub>](#) was distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> and PC<sub>jus</sub> by the germination of the prefix consonant. Additionally, [PC<sub>pretWC</sub>](#) was distinguished from PC<sub>imp</sub> in [some forms, when not carrying object suffixes, by placement of stress](#).

<sup>13</sup> [Rainey 1985](#) pp. 5-6.

<sup>14</sup> "long vowels were shortened in closed syllables in Proto-Semitic and Proto-Hebrew." [Blau 2010](#) §4.3.3.3.2.

"...in Proto-Semitic (and in Pre-Hebrew) no long vowels were tolerated in closed syllables." [Blau 2010](#) §3.5.12.2.14n.

<sup>15</sup> For range of meanings of SC see [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §112 and [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.

<sup>16</sup> [Van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.1.c.iii. Note the following "... מִּ with the perfect (Gn 21:7, Nu 23:10, I S 26:9, Is 53:1, & etc.) or participle ... expresses a rhetorical question ...." [GK](#) §151.a.1

<sup>17</sup> See [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.1.

<sup>18</sup> From [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.3.

<sup>19</sup> See [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.5i.

<sup>20</sup> See [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.5ii.

<sup>21</sup> See [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.2.

<sup>22</sup> See [van der Merwe et al.](#) § 19.2.4.

<sup>23</sup> See [Blau 2010](#) §4.4.3.2.

<sup>24</sup> See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/IPA#Suprasegmentals>.

<sup>25</sup> See [Blau 2010](#) §3.4.5.5n, 3.4.2.6, 3.5.7.1.5, 3.5.7.4.2n.



---

<sup>26</sup> An unusual case is ָּוּ [ˈʕa:l] (Ex. 4:20 see [Khan 1994](#) p. 133).

<sup>27</sup> Egs.

- the second vowel of ָּוּ /qāʔal/ [qɑːʔe:l]
- constr. form יָד ʔ 'hand of-' - /,yad/ [ˌyeːð]

Note [Blau 2010](#) §3.5.7.1.2.

<sup>28</sup> Order follows the natural scale of vowel qualities (see. [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §6b).

<sup>29</sup> Quite rare but found, for example, in /mēt/ 'dead' (see [Gibson 1965](#) p. 37).

<sup>30</sup> See [Did the Proto-Semitic Long Vowel ā Persist into Pre-Exilic Biblical Hebrew \(BH\)?](#).

<sup>31</sup> Resulting from [Canaanite Shift](#)

<sup>32</sup> See [Blau 2010](#) §3.5.7.2.1.

<sup>33</sup> I use *e*, *i*, *u* when placed beside /EBHP/ transliterations which clearly mark the restored vowels. Where this is not the case I use *ē*, *ī*, *ū*.

<sup>34</sup> See [Blau 1976](#) p. 10.

<sup>35</sup> For gemination see [Lipinski 1997](#) pp. 179-184; [Joüon-Muraoka 1991](#) §18; and [Hoffman 2004](#) pp. 99-101. The symbol for gemination is either the consonant written twice e.g. *dibber* or written to indicate that the consonant is long e.g. *dibːer*. Also [Wikipedia](#).

T. F. Mitchell, in *Colloquial Arabic: the Living Language of Egypt*, describes gemination in Egyptian Arabic – “Any Arabic consonant may be doubled. Except when final, a doubled consonant must be pronounced at least twice as long as its single counterpart and is characterized by greater muscular tension in the articulating organs... Consonants which are pronounced long occur in English at the junction of words or of affixes and words ; for example, *black king* (contrast *blackening*), *misspelt*, unnecessary, but, of course, the double letters of English spelling in such words as *better* and *butter* are pronounced as single sounds. The single-double distinction is a very important feature of Arabic and the *ss* of *kassar* he smashed, for example, must always be pronounced considerably longer than *s* in *kasar* he broke.... Doubled consonants are usually pronounced shorter when final.”

<sup>36</sup> In transliterating consonantal [phonemes](#) I use the [Society of Biblical Literature](#) (SBL) *Academic Translation Style* ([THSBL](#)). I generally to use the [IPA](#) system to transliterate consonantal [phones](#).

<sup>37</sup> "Outside of closed unstressed syllables, which excluded long vowels, Ancient Hebrew had a contrast between long and short vowels. However, between the Tannaitic period (c. 73-200 CE) and the time of the Masoretes, short vowels in stressed syllables lengthened, erasing the contrast in those syllables.." [Steiner 1997](#) p. 149.

<sup>38</sup> See [Schniedewind-Sivan 1997](#) p. 304 footnote.

<sup>39</sup> See [Archaic or Archaizing Poetic Texts](#).

<sup>40</sup> See [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008](#) chapt. 12; [Vern 2008](#).

<sup>41</sup> See [Sáenz-Badillos](#) §3.3; [Kutscher 1982](#) p. 79 ff.

<sup>42</sup> From [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008](#) p. 57.

(W)e agree with Hurvitz that it is impossible to discern linguistic development within EBH (my CBH) or within LBH (my PCBH).... For example, on the basis of language, we cannot date alleged preexilic EBH texts to the tenth as opposed to the seventh century, nor can we date possible sources within supposed preexilic books, such as Genesis or Samuel, to particular points in time. More explicitly, alleged preexilic EBH texts written over a potential span of hundreds of years (eg. 1000-600 BCE) do not reflect any discernible chronological linguistic variations.

<sup>43</sup> See [Ehrensverd 2004](#). The following is quoted from [Kofoed 2006](#) pp. 98-99 -

If there is ever any truly sharp division between two historical stages of a language over a relatively short time period, then it is an accident. Catastrophic change in language is not the norm. Current theory rebuts, therefore, the argument (often stated *ex silentio*) that only one kind of Hebrew was being used at any one time, and Davies is therefore right in arguing that one cannot automatically convert linguistic typology into linguistic chronology. A range of synchronic factors must be taken into consideration before a diachronic explanation can be settled: dialect, colloquial language, idiolect, sociolect, archaizing language, etc. This is also true for periods where such differing grammars are unattested in the written sources. Since writing is secondary to speech, vernaculars and dialects must by necessity have existed alongside the written *Hochsprache*. Before jumping to diachronic explanations of linguistic difference one must acknowledge, therefore, that the dark side of the moon is just as real as the visible, and that the existence of additional contemporary grammars may account better for the linguistic differences than diachronic ones.

Furthermore, since language change is influenced by a number of unpredictable factors (time, society, and the individual) no linear development can be ascribed automatically to any language. Modern linguistic theory has, for the same reason, dismissed the idea that language change is governed by an internal "biological clock" that makes it possible for the historical linguist to reconstruct prior stages and to predict future developments of a given language....

<sup>44</sup> From [Kofoed 2006](#) p. 103 -

The obvious choice of a comparative case study would of course be to pick a well-documented contemporary linguistic case in the same literary genre and from the same cultural stream. The closest match in that regard is probably the Babylonian "literary" language or "Standard Babylonian," which remained so stable that even distinguished scholars erroneously dated compositions late that later were proved to stem from Old Babylonian times.

---

<sup>45</sup> See [Phones and Phonemes](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_6.htm#phone_phonym..) - [http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc\\_heb\\_6.htm#phone\\_phonym..](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_6.htm#phone_phonym..)

<sup>46</sup> Note, in reconstructed [EBHP] transliterations and sound files -

1. there is no [spirantization of the \*bgdkpt\* consonants](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_tequ.htm#bgdpt) - [http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc\\_heb\\_tequ.htm#bgdpt](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_tequ.htm#bgdpt);

2. [vowel qualities are outlined here](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_6.htm#ebhp_vow_qual) - [http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc\\_heb\\_6.htm#ebhp\\_vow\\_qual](http://www.houseofdauid.ca/anc_heb_6.htm#ebhp_vow_qual);

3. I use the most probable form. Where no one form stands out as most probable, I select the one closest to the MT vocalization.

4. when multiple forms are possible, the form used is underlined.

<sup>47</sup> See [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensvärd 2008](#) chapt.5.

<sup>48</sup> From [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensvärd 2008](#) p. 50 "Polzin minimises the influence of Aramaic on LBH emphasising instead the inner development or natural evolution of BH ([Polzin 1976](#): 2; cf. 13-14)."

<sup>49</sup> See [Ehrensvärd 2004](#).

<sup>50</sup> From [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensvärd 2008](#) p. 48.

First it has been recognized for a long time that the relative homogeneity of BH may be explained by its *function as a standard literary language* (e.g. [Chomsky 1957](#): 30-31, 46-49; [W. Weinberg 1993](#): 13). In other words BH was an artificial construct, a *Bildungssprache* or 'language of education', that was written by many scribes at many times and places, and whose linguistic differences may be due to proficiency and/or style. Ehrensvärd's reference to Arabic present in some respects a fair analogy. It shows that it is possible for a language to stay the same for many centuries. Also, Blau points out that 'there were Arabic authors who wrote in a late period in a purely classical style and succeeded in avoiding not only neo-Arabic forms, but also post-classical forms ([Blau 1997](#): 28). In the same article he refers to the twelfth-century scholar Usama bin Munqidh who wrote his memoirs in Middle Arabic, i.e. heavily influenced by vernacular Arabic, but also wrote poetry in perfect Classical Arabic ([Blau 1997](#): 26 n.30).

<sup>51</sup> It seems likely that in LBHP: /t/ was pronounced as [t̤] ([pronunciation](#)); /s/ as [s̤]; and, /q/ as [k̤] (see [What was the Nature of the "Emphatic Consonants" in EBHP?](#)). However, for simplicity's sake, I will use the following equivalences in my [EBHP] transcriptions:

/t/ = [t̤]; /s/ = [s̤]; and, /q/ = [k̤].

<sup>52</sup> From [Morag 1988](#) -

In describing General Qumran Hebrew (GQH) as essentially a continuation of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH), one would not do justice to this type of Hebrew. Although some of the features examined in this article constitute a continuation of LBH ... GQH as a whole possesses a number of prominent grammatical traits that are not related to the fabric of LBH. These traits probably represent a continuation of an old dialectal variation.... To our mind, the impact of stress variation is evident... It is thus clear that the proposition that

GQH was a literary continuation of LBH can hardly be sustained. Literary continuation as well as archaization are to be found in the level of style-but typologically a language cannot be defined on the basis of stylistic evidence. As observed above, in a number of its features GQH does indeed continue LBH, but such a continuation need not necessarily be literary. However, what we have attempted to stress is the weight that must be assigned in defining the nature of GQH to those features that disclose no continuation of LBH. These features of GQH are too numerous and too grammatically salient to be assigned a secondary standing. Such phenomena as the contraction of the final diphthong *aw* (feature no. 2), the dissimilation CC>nC (feature no. 3), or the morphophonemic and morphological structures created by variations in the stress patterns (features nos 5 and 6), are all to be ascribed to phonological processes. Processes of this kind must, needless to say, come into being in a living, spoken, language. It would be difficult to envisage their coming into existence in a language whose character is literary. The same holds good for the morphological features dealt with above: the long forms of the pronouns (*hw'h*, *hy'h*: feature no. 7; the *-mh* ending of the second person masculine plural in the perfect and in the suffixed pronouns: feature no. 9). Such features, as well as several others that have not been dealt with here, can in no way be regarded as having been originated in a literary, archaizing, language, which had BH as its model of writing, or as indicating a linear development of LBH. They are part and parcel of the morphological structure of certain Hebrew dialects of the Qumran period.

<sup>53</sup> See [Yadin et. al. 2002](#); [Kutscher 1971a](#) col. 1590; *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, IV, 237-238, 1971..

<sup>54</sup> A case can be made that the PTH reflex of the TH *vocal šwa* /ə/ is not phonemic (cf. [Gibson 1965](#) pp. 41-42). However, for clarity I will assume its phonemic status in PTH.

<sup>55</sup> It seems likely that in PTH: /t/ was pronounced as [t'] ([pronunciation](#)); /š/ as [s']; and, /q/ as [k'] (see [What was the Nature of the "Emphatic Consonants" in EBHP?](#)). However, for simplicity's sake, I will use the following equivalences in my [EBHP] transcriptions:

/t/ = [t']; /š/ = [s']; and, /q/ = [q].

<sup>56</sup> [Blau 2010](#) §3.5.6.5.3. states -

It is clear that *ḥaṭaf qamaš* stands in phonemic opposition to *ḥaṭaf pataḥ/mobile šwa* (which, according to Tiberian tradition, were pronounced identically)

See also [Blau 1976/93](#) §3.5.

<sup>57</sup> It seems likely that in TH: /t/ was pronounced as [t'] ([pronunciation](#)); /š/ as [s']; and, /q/ as [k'] (see [What was the Nature of the "Emphatic Consonants" in EBHP?](#)). However, for simplicity's sake, I will occasionally use the following equivalences in my [EBHP] transcriptions:

/t/ = [t']; /š/ = [s']; and, /q/ = [q].

<sup>58</sup> See [A Note on the Use of Post-Exilic Evidence Regarding the pronunciation of BH](#)

<sup>59</sup> See [Qimron 1986](#); [Kutscher 1971](#), [Kutscher 1979](#), [Sáenz-Badillos](#) pp. 86-94; [Manuel 1995](#) pp. 130-146.

<sup>60</sup> See [Revell 1970 and 1970a](#); [Morag 1972](#); [Sáenz-Badillos](#) pp. 86-94; [Manuel 1995](#) pp. 168-198; [Harviainen 1977](#). In most features this tradition is fairly close to the Tiberian - see [Ben-Hayyim 1954](#). In the words of Sáenz-Badillos (p. 90)

Revell ... argues that the Palestinian tradition represents a more developed and, therefore, later form of language than the Tiberian, although they share a common origin. In his view, the consistent (TH) use of different graphemes for the *a* and *e* vowels is a feature of an earlier period, which tended to disappear later on. Vowel changes within the Palestinian system, according to Revell, correspond to processes known from a less developed stage of the Tiberian tradition, and some times represent the endpoint of a process begun there. The Tiberian tradition has adopted a well-preserved, archaic, pronunciation, whereas the Palestinian is based on 'vulgar' biblical texts and expresses a less well-preserved form of the language that has been more affected by outside influences and colloquialisms. As a system of pointing, the Palestinian must have been created before, or in isolation from, the Tiberian.

I tend to agree with Revell on this. However, Sáenz-Badillos argues for the Palestinian pointing preceding the Tiberian Masoretic with presumably shared origins at some point in the past.

<sup>61</sup> See [Yeivin](#); [Sáenz-Badillos](#) pp. 94-105; [Manuel 1995](#) pp. 199-225. In most features this tradition is fairly close to the Tiberian - see [Ben-Hayyim 1954](#). The pronunciation on which it is based must, of course, have originated in Palestine but have undergone a long period of semi-isolated development in southern Babylonia in a totally Eastern Aramaic speaking environment.

<sup>62</sup> See most importantly [Janssens 1994](#) (re. [Secunda](#)) and [Knobloch 1995](#) (re. LXX), and their bibliographic references. See also [Brønno 1968](#) (re. Secunda).

<sup>63</sup> See [Barr 1967](#) and the references in his footnotes; [Harviainen 1977](#).

<sup>64</sup> [Sáenz-Badillos](#) pp. 80-86; [Manuel 1995](#) pp. 130-167; [Hoffman](#) pp. 85-117; [Ben-Hayyim 1954](#). As noted by [Sáenz-Badillos](#) (p. 80) - (n.b. bolding my own)

The numerous Greek and Latin transcriptions of Hebrew names and other expressions, which date from the third century BCE to the fourth century CE, undoubtedly provide first-hand information.... Because we know far more about the phonology and pronunciation of Greek and Latin than of the Semitic languages, these transcriptions represent an invaluable witness to the Hebrew of this period. On the other hand, it has to be recognized as well that there are considerable difficulties involved. In the first place, the phonology of Greek and Latin is very different from that of Hebrew, and these languages do not possess graphemes that can exactly represent the sounds of Hebrew. And although we do not know what judgements were actually made when transcribing so different a language, the authors of the transcriptions would certainly have approached Hebrew from the phonological perspective of their own language. The variation of place and time is also a problem, as we cannot simply accept that BH, which had already ceased to be a living language, underwent a unified development in places as diverse as

Alexandria and Palestine. Neither do we know if the data afforded by the transcriptions correspond to the standard, more or less official, pronunciation of Hebrew in this period or to dialect or substandard forms. On top of all these difficulties is the fact that the transcriptions have to be studied in manuscripts that are frequently late and defective, presenting many variants and corruptions in names that the copyists found completely alien.

<sup>65</sup> For details on the Samaritan traditions of Hebrew see [Ben-Hayyim 2000](#). For examples of the use of BH<sub>SAM</sub> for the understanding of BH see [Ben-Hayyim 1954](#). Short description [Sáenz-Badillos](#) §5.3. See also [Brønno 1968](#).

<sup>66</sup> See [Ben-Hayyim 2000](#) sect. 1.2.

<sup>67</sup> For details on the Yemenite traditions of Hebrew see [Morag 1963](#).

<sup>68</sup> See [Morag 1963](#) chapt. 20.

<sup>69</sup> From *The SBL Handbook of Style For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* by Patrick H. Alexander, Hendrickson Publishers, 1999 sect. 5.1.1.

<sup>70</sup> Interestingly, in the cases of ט (no *dagesh*) and נ (no *dagesh*) scholars do not use the MT sounds ( [ð](#) and [θ](#) respectively) even though these sounds are wide-spread in English. It is also doubtful if many, familiar with Israeli Hebrew, pronounce the waw according to TH [w] rather than IH [v].