

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

## Excursus 4

### *Background to Dialect, Koine and Diglossia in [Ancient Hebrew](#)*

#### *Clarification from [Colloquial Arabic](#)*

By David Steinberg

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

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

1. [Conclusions Regarding Diglossia and Dialect in PExH](#)
2. [Concepts: Dialect, Standard Language, Dialect Continuum, Diglossia, Koine and Koineization](#)
3. [Koineization in the History of the Hebrew Language](#)
  - 3.1 [Israelite settlement period](#) (c. 1200-c. 1000 BCE).
  - 3.2 [Establishment of Jerusalem Written and Spoken Dialects](#) (c. 1000-c. 900 BCE).
  - 3.3 [Samaritan Refugees Inundate Judah](#) (late eighth century BCE)
  - 3.4 [Development of Proto-Mishnaic Hebrew](#) (c. 586 BCE-c. 70 BC).
4. [Arabic Koineization a Close Analogy](#)
  - 4.1 [The formation of the colloquial Arabic dialects](#)
  - 4.2 [Two Standards](#)
5. [Language Register and Dialect in Pre-Exilic Hebrew](#)
  - 5.1 [The Origin and Nature of the Prestige Written Language](#)
  - 5.2 [Factors leading to the spread of the Prestige Written and Spoken Language in the Pre-Exilic Period](#)
  - 5.3 [Insight from Colloquial Arabic](#)
  - 5.4 [Canaanite and Aramaic Spoken Dialects](#)

[5.5 Contemporary Written Evidence of Canaanite Dialects 1000 - 586 BCE](#)

[5.6 Isoglosses of Neighboring Dialects vis-à-vis EBHP/JEH](#)

1. *Conclusions Regarding Diglossia and Dialect in PExH* - [follow this link](#).

2. *Concepts - Dialect, Standard Language, Dialect Continuum, Diglossia, Koine (Koiné) and Koineization*

a) The term [dialect](#) can be defined as<sup>1</sup>

The pronunciation, [lexis](#) (vocabulary), and [grammar](#) of a language variety, associated with a particular geographical area or social group.

b) "A [standard language](#) (also standard dialect, standardized dialect, or standardised dialect) is a particular [variety](#) of a [language](#) that has been given either legal or quasi-legal status. As it is usually the form promoted in schools and the media, it is usually considered by speakers of the language to be more "correct" in some sense than other dialects."<sup>2</sup>

c) "A [dialect continuum](#) is a range of [dialects](#) spoken across a large geographical area, differing only slightly between areas that are geographically close, and gradually decreasing in [mutual intelligibility](#) as the distances become greater. Dialects separated by great geographical distances may not be mutually comprehensible."<sup>3</sup>

#### d) *Diglossia*<sup>4</sup>

Diglossia was originally defined by Ferguson as -

Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation.<sup>5</sup>

Gary Rendsburg, basing himself on Ferguson's definition wrote<sup>6</sup> -

In short, diglossia refers to the phenomenon of two synchronic varieties of the same language, one used for colloquial and informal purposes, the other for literary and formal purposes. Ferguson presented four examples among the world's languages: spoken Arabic vs. Classical Arabic, Swiss German vs. standard German, Haitian Creole vs. standard French, and spoken Greek vs. literary Greek<sup>7</sup>. In each case, users of these languages employ the former in ordinary conversation but utilize the latter when writing or on official occasions.

In a situation of diglossia, it is quite common for the literary/prestige and vernacular forms of the language to influence each other<sup>8</sup>. This is the situation between Colloquial Arabic and MSA today. When the spoken language influences the literary dialect the process is known as "vernacularization". Vernacularization is not too apparent when writing is in the hands of a small scribal class well trained in the classical tradition. However, it becomes rampant as literacy and semi-literacy broadens. A modern example of this is Arabic. As Holes wrote-

"Even today, hardly anybody after graduation is able to write flawless Arabic, let alone extemporise in speaking, and there is a general antipathy towards 'grammar', even among those who advocate the use of Standard Arabic (i.e. MSA)."<sup>9</sup>

### ***d.1. Diglossia in the Ancient Near East***

[Diglossia](#) was the norm, not the exception in the Ancient Mediterranean world. It was a noticeable feature of Babylonian Akkadian<sup>10</sup>, [Aramaic](#), [Egyptian](#) and later of [Latin](#) and Greek. In the Ancient Near East, the literary language was usually fairly close to the prestige spoken dialect at the time of the formation of the political state, religious culture etc. that preserved or used it in future generations. However, as the generations passed the literary language diverged ever further from the current spoken form of the language. Examples of Ancient Near Eastern Literary languages are:

- 1) [Middle Egyptian](#), representing the language spoken from 2000 BC to 1300 BC remained in use as literary [standard language](#) until the 4th century CE;
- 2) Standard Babylonian, based on Old Babylonian (1950-1530 BCE) was used for literary documents by the Assyrians and the Babylonians for many centuries;
- 3) Kutscher (*Aramaic* 1970 col. 260)

Middle Aramaic, from 300 BCE to the early centuries CE.... (T)he common denominator of all these dialects is their effort to imitate [Old Official Aramaic](#), they also contain elements of [Late Aramaic](#). Most of these were apparently not spoken.

e) [Koine and Koineization](#)

Koineization is the process which leads to mixing of linguistic subsystems, that is, of language varieties which either are mutually intelligible or share the same genetically related superposed language. It occurs in the context of increased interaction or integration among speakers of these varieties. A koine is the stabilized composite variety which results from this process. Formally, a koine is characterized by a mixture of features from the contributing varieties, and at an early stage of development, it is often reduced or simplified in comparison to any of these varieties. Functionally, a koine serves as a lingua franca among speakers of the different varieties. It also may become the primary language of amalgamated communities of these speakers. A regional koine usually develops as the lingua franca of a geographical area in which different regional dialects are spoken. It often becomes expanded in form and function to become a regional standard or a literary language. An immigrant koine develops in an amalgamated immigrant community and often is the primary language of the first generation born in this community. Koineization is similar to [pidginization](#) in that both processes arise from contact between speakers of different linguistic varieties and may result in a new variety, which usually shows features of the varieties in contact and is reduced and simplified in comparison. However, the two processes are fundamentally different in other ways. The varieties in contact which lead to koineization are more typologically similar than those which lead to pidginization. Furthermore, koineization is a slow, gradual process which requires continued contact and integration among the speakers of the different varieties, whereas pidginization is a rapid process not requiring such integration. The expansion of function and form, and [nativization](#) characteristic of [creolization](#) are analogous to what may occur in koineization after the initial stage.

Quoted from [Siegel 1985](#) pp. 375-376.

The following is quoted from [Tuten 2007](#) pp. 185-190 -

The term [koineization](#)<sup>11</sup> refers to a process of mixing of dialects (or [mutually intelligible varieties of language](#)) which leads to the rapid formation of a new dialect or koine, characterized by mixing, [levelling](#)<sup>12</sup> and simplification of features found in the dialects which formed part of the original mix. Koineization generally occur over the course of three

**generations** (including first-generation adults during the 'pre-koine') and is often found in new towns, frontier region and colonies which have seen sudden in-migration followed by the establishment of a permanent community. ...

There are several types of linguistic change which have occurred regularly in case of koineization, including mixing, levelling, **reallocation**, simplification, and [interdialect](#).

*Mixing, levelling, reallocation*

**These terms are used to refer in different way to the effects of what is essentially a process of selection of forms. Mixing highlights the selection and incorporation of linguistic features from the different pre-existing dialects which contribute to the pre-koine linguistic pool (the language used by the first generation of immigrant). Levelling, on the other hand, emphasizes the reduction or elimination of [marked](#) or minority variants and the selection of high-frequency or majority variants<sup>13</sup> found in the pre-koine.... Such levelling is sometimes incomplete, with more than one dialectal variant surviving but each with a different function,**

*Simplification and interdialect*

Not all features of a koine can be found in pre-existing contributing dialect. These features generally arise through the process of speech [accommodation](#) with 'imperfect dialect acquisition ... in which speaker-learners create new forms by altering existing dialect features in their own speech. A common way in which speaker-learners generate new forms and features is by **replacing irregular forms with easy-to-generate regular or transparent forms** (such forms may also exist in some contributing dialects, making their adoption even more likely). This process known as simplification, can be defined as an increase in regularity or transparency, or as a general reduction in units and rules (particularly in **phonology** and **morphology**; phonemic merger, for example are one frequent outcome)....

Other features of koine, known as **interdialectalisms** show a special kind of mixing, which results when speaker-learners reanalyse or rearrange forms and features of the contributing dialects. In their effort to avoid [marked variants](#), they may produce intermediate or 'fudged' phonetic realizations.... They may also pair forms and functions in novel ways, as can be seen in reallocation. They may mix parts of forms together to create new hybrid forms .... And, of course speaker-learners often use a feature or form with greater frequency than it is used in any contributing dialect ( statistical [hypercorrection](#)) and it is this phenomenon which underlies the general tendency for majority (or salient) variants to grow yet more frequent and become selected in the resultant koine....

Understanding the linguistic changes which lead to the development of a new koine requires an understanding of the changing social conditions which affect the linguistic activity of

speakers, which, of course is what leads to the changes in the linguistic system. Prototypical koineization is always characterized by geographical movement of speakers of different dialects into a new town or region which is relatively unpopulated (or where the original population has been removed). Such speakers generally leave behind the more established **social networks** of their home communities and move to a new community where weak social ties and loose-knit social networks predominate, at least at first.... (S)table close-knit social networks are conservative norm-enforcement mechanisms which impede change of all types. Conversely, the loose-knit social networks and weak social ties which characterize a koineizing community favour the introduction and adoption of innovations. At the same time speakers enter into contact with speakers of other dialects, who are also removed from the constraints of their home communities. Thus, in the koineizing community all speakers become innovators *vis-à-vis* speakers of other dialects, and **variation peaks at the very time that the strength of norm-enforcement mechanisms declines to a minimum....**

(A)dult speakers attempt to accommodate to other speakers. As they work to develop new social networks, they change the way they speak so as to minimize differences. The easiest way for adult speakers to do this is by eliminating marked features of their speech (often sociolinguistic stereotypes which are likely to be noticed and even commented upon by others). However, they may also attempt to learn features used by other speakers, particularly those which they perceive to be frequent, salient, or socially valuable in some way.... Such accommodation and limited acquisition by adult speakers initiates the processes of mixing, levelling and simplification which characterize koineization....

(T)he most important accommodation between speakers probably take place not among the first generation of adult immigrants but rather among their children and grandchildren....

**If speaker-learners tend to accommodate to and learn feature of others' speech, which features do they accommodate to? First and foremost, it seems that they accommodate to and acquire the features used with greatest frequency by original members of the pre-koine speech community. The primary exception to this is the tendency to use more regular and transparent forms and features which are generated as speaker-learners eliminate marked features of their own speech, or when they are presented with so many variant irregular forms that they find it difficult to learn anyone. In other words, inconsistency of use by adults and other children makes it more difficult for speaker-learners to learn a particular form or rule, and thus favours overgeneralization of more frequent or regular forms and rules by succeeding generations of children. In general, accommodation to and overgeneralization of high-frequency forms leads to the levelling of majority forms, while overgeneralization of regular or transparent forms/features by speaker-learners leads to simplification in the**

linguistic system. **Such overgeneralization is quite obviously favoured by lack of consistent input and lack of strong norm-enforcement mechanisms**<sup>14</sup>.

There are two significant exceptions to these generalizations, however. First although speaker-learners do tend to accommodate to and overgeneralize high-frequency forms, it has been shown that at least some features are elected even though they are not majority items in the pre-koine linguistic pool. We must assume then that some forms and features tend to be perceived by speaker-learners as 'salient', that is, they are more noticed and may be reproduced with sufficient frequency to become a feature in the new koine. It is not entirely clear what make a form or feature 'salient' although high frequency certainly helps.... (I)t has become increasingly clear that forms and features ... must acquire salience through social and cultural conditioning ....

The other important exception to the above generalization terns from the fact that many speaker-learners sometimes **misanalyse - or reanalyse - the linguistic input, and therefore introduce entirely novel forms or features**. In general, such reanalyses remain a minority variant in the linguistic pool and are eliminated in the process of levelling. However, on occasion they do survive if enough speaker-learners make the same reanalysis.... (C)ontrary to popular belief ... koineization does not consist merely of reduction to a 'lowest common denominator'. Koinés are indeed compromise varieties but they may contain quite novel features....

Most scholars now agree that **focusing will normally take place over the course of three generations**: the first generation of (adult) in-migrants, the second generation (children of the first generation) and the third generation (children of the second).

### ***3. Koineization in the History of the Ancient Hebrew Language***

Koineization is a frequent occurrence in any multi-dialect language with a long history. **We can identify the following critical nexuses in the history of Hebrew in which koineization probably played a major part -**

#### **3.1 Israelite settlement period (c. 1200-c. 1000 BCE).**

This period was noteworthy for the settlement of the previously mainly empty hill country which became the heartlands of the future kingdoms of [Judah](#) and [Israel](#) -

Dever suggests that there were about 300 newly-founded small agricultural villages from lower [Galilee](#) to the [Negev](#) in the 13th-12th century BCE (usually considered the time of

Judges), all of them conspicuously absent from previous Late Bronze Age towns and settlement along the coast. The population rose from around 12,000 at the end of the Bronze Age to about 55,000 by the end of the 12th century, and rose to 75,000 by the end of the 11th century - the period of David and Solomon - with the vast majority in the north.<sup>15</sup>

There is much disagreement about the [origin of these highland settlers](#). However, it is clear that they came from different sources though all, or almost all, probably spoke closely related dialects derived from [Proto-Northwest Semitic](#). If pre-existing groups tended to settle together this would probably result in some dialect convergence. However, such normal influence between neighboring dialects is [not regarded as koineization](#). However, in cases of villages or towns, whose population spoke more than one dialect, koineization would have occurred. Lack of evidence on the specific origin of the settler population in various areas prevents any conclusion.

### **3.2 Establishment of Jerusalem Written and Spoken Dialects (c. 1000-c. 900 BCE).**

David selected the [Jebusite](#) city of [Jerusalem](#) as his capital. The situation is well described by [Noth](#)<sup>16</sup> –

“...David ... could not ...make an Israelite city such as [Shechem](#) his residence, natural centre of the land though it was, out of consideration for the Judaeans who had been the first to make him king and would hardly have forgiven him if he had moved to the kingdom of Israel. In view of the jealousy and bad feeling between the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel which he had to take into account and which was to lead to open conflict even during his reign, with the sure instinct of the wise statesman he chose a city on neutral soil between the territories of the two kingdoms. This was Jerusalem, which had not yet been conquered by the Israelite tribes and was still occupied by a group of earlier inhabitants of the country, the Jebusites. The territory of the kingdom of Judah began south of Jerusalem and that of the kingdom of Israel north of Jerusalem.... (David) conquered Jebusite Jerusalem with his mercenaries (2 Sam. v. 6-9) and made it his residence as ‘the city of David’. It was not attached to either the kingdom of Judah or the kingdom of Israel but remained a city-state and David now became the city ruler of Jerusalem as legal successor to the previous Jebusite city ruler. The city was not inhabited by either Judaeans or Israelites, but continued to be occupied by its previous inhabitants and only received the king and his entourage, his household and his mercenaries.

All these made up a considerable body of people, however, corresponding to the size of the political organisation that was now ruled from here.”

Rabin writes<sup>17</sup>,

The great turning point in the history of the Hebrew language, as in so many other cultural and religious aspects, was the brief spell (about seventy years) during which North and South were united under David and Solomon, and in particular the establishment of the administrative and religious capital in Jerusalem, a city not previously connected with any tribe. After its conquest the city was populated by David with people from different tribes. The cult, which existed in David's time, was carried on by priest from all parts of the country (1 Chron. 13:2), and of course even more so once the Temple had been established. David's army, and presumably his administration, were staffed by men drawn from different tribes. Jerusalem thus became a meeting-place for people speaking different dialects; no doubt, as is invariably the case in such circumstances, dialect mixture took place. It is also likely that the mixed speech of the capital was carried by army personnel and government officials at least into the provincial centers, and that in this way the speech of northerners took on some Judean features and that of the Judeans some northern traits

We could assume, in the absence of any information, that:

- socially leading positions would be held by **David's Judean war band** who would have come from rural Judah;
- another prominent group would have been **clan leaders from all the Israelite territories** controlled by David and Solomon;
- also prominent would have been the **priestly leadership** whose exact origin is unknown;
- it is quite likely that the initial **chancery scribes**, probably the initiators of the Israelite scribal culture<sup>18</sup>, **would have been the products of a Canaanite royal court**. The most likely candidate would be the royal court of [Jebusite Jerusalem](#) though scribes from the low-land Canaanite cities or those of the Jordan Valley, Galilee and the Shephelah could also have been drawn in. **This may have been the conduit for the entry into use in Jerusalem of the styles and techniques of Canaanite poetry as reflected in [Ugaritic poetry](#);**

- perhaps also influential might have been the language of **David's non-Israelite mercenaries** ([Cherethites and Pelethites](#));
- the dialects of the **Benjaminite and Judean peasants** who brought food into the market might also have had an influence.

We do not really have any idea:

1. how widely the spoken dialects of different groups in Jerusalem c. 970 would have varied from each other<sup>19</sup>; or,
2. [how different the spoken dialects were from the various sorts of literary Hebrew in use at the time](#). Blau<sup>20</sup>, suggests that the difference may not have been great at first but would have increased with time.

### 3.3 [Samaritan Refugees Inundate Judah](#) (late eighth century BCE)

The northern refugees were likely to have included many peasants and townsmen, some scribes and priests but few members of the political, social and military elite who had been mainly [exiled by the Assyrians](#). It is certain that such a large influx of population, though speaking very similar dialects to the native population, would have led to a process of koineization in the [spoken language](#) that likely [initiated or speeded up changes in Jerusalem Hebrew](#). Most of these changes would eventually impact on written Hebrew. However, it is very likely that educated aristocratic Jerusalem speech, especially in formal situations, would have maintained the older pronunciation at least until the chaos of the exile in the early sixth century BCE.<sup>21</sup>

### 3.4 Development of Proto-Mishnaic Hebrew (c. 586 BCE-c. 70 BC).

The [Babylonian deportations of 594 and 587 BCE](#) exiled the bulk of the elite of the [Kingdom of Judah](#), probably most of the surviving population of Jerusalem and

**many ordinary Judeans. Archaeology has clearly shown the extent and location of devastation -**

"Whereas the archaeological evidence from such sites as Jerusalem, Tel Beit Mirsim, Bethshemesh, Lachish, and Ramat Raḥel shows clear evidence of the destructions following Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns into the west, dwelling places in the northern part of Judah and Benjamin were not affected. Several cities lying north of Jerusalem, in the Benjamin area, were not destroyed at all. In contrast to sites excavated south of Jerusalem, some of these places even prospered in the late sixth century. Thus it was mainly the hill country of Judah that suffered destructions under Nebuchadnezzar. The rest of the country was left more or less intact."<sup>22</sup>

"The data on settlement and demography may lend support to the historical premise that most of the exiles to Babylon had been residents of Jerusalem.... (W)e are able to estimate the size of the settled area in Judah after the destruction of Jerusalem and throughout most of the sixth century B.C.E. Jerusalem and its environs were thoroughly razed by the Babylonians, and there is no evidence of any settlement there whatsoever until the Persian period. In contrast to the settlement picture in Jerusalem, settlement in Benjamin declined only at the beginning of the Persian period, a fact for which the archaeological data provide unequivocal evidence. It appears that settlement in this area continued unabated throughout the sixth century B.C.E., and it is even probable that population density was greater than it had been just prior to the destruction of Jerusalem.... The evidence shows that the "return to Zion" did not leave its imprint on the archaeological data.... The demographic figures from the Jerusalem region also attest that even at the height of the Persian period, the city's population was only 3,000, which is about 12% of the population of the city and its environs on the eve of the destruction. Even if all of the residents of the region were among the exiles who made the return to Zion, the returnees only amounted to several thousand. Thus, at the beginning of the Persian period, it is probable that as few thousand of the nation's elite, especially of the priestly caste, returned to Judah and settled in Jerusalem and its near environs. Nevertheless, the city remained poor.... Parallel to this, with the shift of the political and religious hub to Jerusalem, a rapid dwindling in population took place in the Benjaminite region. Apparently, part of the region's inhabitants migrated out of the province, either to the Ono-Lod area or to other parts of the Shephelah, most likely the eastern sectors.... The figure given in Nehemiah, which states that the city was populated by a tenth of the province's inhabitants (approximately 3,000 people) accords with our estimate of the total population at that time."<sup>23</sup>

Some members of the ruling elite remained to form a Babylonian sponsored local government under [Gedaliah](#). Given the untouched condition of Benjamin, it is hardly surprising that Gedaliah established his headquarters at [Mizpah-in-Benjamin](#). It is likely that the last remnant of leadership by the traditional elite ended with Gedaliah's assassination in late 586 BCE.

It is most probable that the basis of [PMH](#) was formed through a koineization process in the [area of Benjamin](#) and the adjacent (not devastated) northern areas of Judah during the period of c. 586- c. 520 BCE. It is probable that the following conditions applied:

- The breakup of the Judean state immediately resulted in **the dissolution of state scribal training**. It is quite probable that Judean scribes, who would have known Aramaic, would have been taken into the Babylonian service mainly outside Judah. However, a few might have been employed within the country;
- The dialects that would have entered into the koineization process would have included those native to Benjamin<sup>24</sup> and rural dialects from central Judah and southern Samaria. **The urban dialect(s) of Jerusalem and written Hebrew probably were almost unrepresented;**
- The **social leaders would probably have been the clan heads** in the area of Benjamin and the adjacent (not devastated) northern areas of Judah;
- Religious observance would be a continuation of popular pre-Josianic local, clan and family observance, i.e. **there was no scripture and, hence, no need to read or study a holy book;**
- [Aramaic influence](#). Just north of the territory of Benjamin lay the [most devastated area](#) of the former [Kingdom of Israel](#). After the destruction of Samaria in 722 BCE, the Assyrians had settled a mixed population from Syria and Mesopotamia. This area of mixed foreign-Israelite population would certainly have used Aramaic as the lingua franca between the different ethnic

groups and would probably have become Aramaic speaking in the main. Contact with this area to the north, would probably have been the first sustained source of spoken Aramaic influence on the PMH koine.

After the destruction of Jerusalem (586 BCE), the rump Israelite society, deprived of its ruling, priestly and scribal classes and any government to run, would probably have had little use for writing or reading and a low level of literacy. It may be that its only literacy requirement related to occasional correspondence in Imperial Aramaic with the local Persian provincial capital which would require only basically trained scribes<sup>25</sup>. Within three generations, a koine (early PMH) quite distant from BH would have been the spoken language.

The [small number of exiles returning from Babylon](#) ( 538-445 BCE) would by then have been Aramaic speaking although they would have also maintained the tradition, and necessary depth of knowledge to write fluently in Biblical Hebrew. After their return, they would probably have:

- spoken Aramaic informally among themselves;
- spoken PMH to their servants and the local bumpkins;
- written fluently both in BH and [Imperial Aramaic](#).

Due to their political and religious leadership and social prestige they would become a conduit for the gradual penetration of Aramaic into both [PCBH](#) and PMH.

In the late sixth century BCE, this group reclaimed political and religious centrality with the reestablishment of Jerusalem as a Persian provincial capital and asserted the claim that their [rebuilt Jerusalem temple](#) was the only legitimate Israelite sacrificial site. Some time during the fifth or early fourth centuries BCE, this group brought the newly completed [Torah](#) (Pentateuch) from Babylon and established early Judaism on the twin foundations of the Temple and the Torah.

The establishment of Jerusalem required scribes professionally trained for the production of imperial documents in [Imperial Aramaic](#). The centrality of the written Torah, and the need to write religious and national literature, required scribes

carefully trained in the BH literary tradition. In many cases both of these areas of activity could be filled by the same person. This would have necessitated [scribal training](#) probably under temple auspices. Eventually, scribal circles would have begun to form. When writing BH, those scribes having the most linguistic sensitivity, or belonging to the most linguistically conservative scribal circles were able to write [CBH](#) virtually indistinguishable from that written before the exile. Others, less exacting or associated with less conservative scribal circles allowed the spoken PMH and/or Aramaic to color their written BH. See [Can Biblical Texts be Linguistically Dated?](#)

#### ***4. Arabic Koineization - A Close Analogy***

##### **4.1 The formation of the [colloquial Arabic](#) dialects**

The following is quoted from [Ferguson 1959](#)<sup>26</sup>.

It is well known that there were great dialect differences in Arabia in pre-Islamic times, and it is widely accepted that **the Classical language, the ʿArabiyyah of the grammarians, was based on a standard poetic language not necessarily identical with any one dialect, but in oral use by poets and orators of many dialects** .... After the ʿArabiyyah became accepted throughout the world of Islam and was explicitly codified in the works of the grammarians, it remained essentially unchanged in phonology and morphology until the present time, when it is still accepted as the norm both for written and for formal spoken Arabic. During the centuries, however, **spoken Arabic, even at the time of Muhammad quite different from the ʿArabiyyah in many parts of Arabia, diverged increasingly from this standard.**

It is a priori quite likely that some dialect differences in Arabic today continue the early dialect differences mentioned above, but on the whole there is little evidence of such continuation on any large scale. It is the thesis of this article (1) that **a relatively homogeneous koine, not based on the dialect of a single center, developed as a conversational form of Arabic** and was spread over most of the Islamic world in the first centuries of the Muslim era, (2) that **this koine existed side by side with the ʿArabiyyah although it was rarely used for written purposes**, and (3) that most modern dialects, especially those outside Arabia, are continuations of this koine, so that their differences are chiefly borrowings or innovations which took place subsequent to the spread of the koine....

It seems highly probable that the beginnings of the koine already existed before the great expansion of Arabic with the spread of Islam, but it also seems probable that the full

development of the koine coincided with this expansion, which brought about mingling of the original dialects, caused large numbers of speakers of other languages to adopt Arabic, and required intercommunication throughout the whole world of Islam....

The basic argument is very simple. The modern dialects agree with one another as against Classical Arabic in a striking number of features. If these features can plausibly be interpreted as a natural development or 'drift' which continues early trends (e.g. loss of glottal stop, reduction of inflectional categories, increase of symmetry in the grammar) the agreement among the dialects as against Classical proves nothing, because it is perfectly possible that parallel changes of this sort could have taken place independently in the various dialects. But if some of these features are complicated, systemically isolated items difficult to account for by drift, and if there is a sizable number of such features, then the agreement among the dialects as against Classical shows that these dialects come from a common, non-Classical source. Once again it must be noted that no assumption is made here that all the features developed or became widespread at the same TIME (several may have appeared very early, before the full development of the koine), but the FACT of their existence is sufficient for the argument. It may even be true that a few of the features of the koine continued an original state while the corresponding forms of Classical were the innovations.

Fourteen features in which modern dialects agree as against the <sup>o</sup>Arabiyyah will be described here. **Each 'feature' is in fact a constellation of minimum linguistic elements which, taken together, seem likely to have functioned as a unit in the historical development of Arabic. Most of the features are morphological, but three lexical features and one phonological feature are included....**

**A striking feature of lexical difference between Classical Arabic and the dialects is the disappearance in the dialects of a group of high-frequency words such as *mā* 'what', *'ayḍan* 'also', *laysa* 'it is not'; a number of particles such as *'inna*, *'an*, *'anna* 'that'; *qad*, *sawfa* tense markers; and several prefixes such as *ka-* 'like'. The disappearance of the particles is connected with the loss of modal distinction in the verb, and their functions are carried out by other syntactic means. But words like *mā* and *'ayḍan* have various equivalents in the dialects, and no satisfactory explanation has been offered for this replacement.**

In the above I have marked in bold points that have close parallels with the situation of Hebrew if you substitute: "**BH**" for "the <sup>o</sup>Arabiyyah"; "**PMH**" for the Arabic koine; and "**MH**" for modern Arabic dialects.

## 4.2 Two Standards

לשון תורה לעצמה, לשון חכמים לעצמן

Rabbinic Hebrew is separate from the language of the Torah

Hullin 137

From the time of the [sixth century BCE koineization](#), Hebrew was fully [diglossic](#)<sup>27</sup> with [PMH](#) used as the spoken tongue and the very different BH used for literary purposes. It is unlikely that PMH was written or that BH was spoken in ordinary conversation. The situation probably resembled that of MSA and spoken Arabic dialects today.

[Current spoken Arabic](#) shows how the prestige dialect at the spoken level can attract socially aspiring speakers even in cases where the prestige spoken variety is further from the literary standard than is the speaker's own dialect.

Most researchers of Arabic sociolinguistics assume the existence of a sociolinguistic continuum with a local vernacular at the bottom and the standard variety at the top. Those researchers seem to equate the terms "prestige" and "standard"; consequently, they tend to consider Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) as the only prestige variety in all settings. This article presents evidence showing that if an adequate description of sociolinguistic variation of spoken Arabic is to be met, it is necessary to posit not only one standard speech variety, MSA, but also other prestigious local or regional varieties which act as local spoken standards competing with MSA in informal settings. It will be shown in the reported cases that in certain contexts speakers tend to switch from their local forms - though these latter may be identical to MSA - to other local features characteristic of other dominant social groups and that happen to be marked [-MSA]. These local prestigious norms act like the standard spoken norms in informal settings. (Diglossic model, prestigious varieties, stereotypes, dominant social groups, competing standards, spoken Arabic).<sup>28</sup>

### *5. Language Register and Dialect in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*

Many scholars suggest or imply that [Israelian Hebrew](#) and [Judahite Hebrew](#) existed as more or less uniform spoken dialects demarcated by the political boundaries of the kingdoms of [Israel](#) and [Judah](#) respectively<sup>29</sup>. I suspect that the unconscious source for this idea is the experience of linguistic homogenization that has taken place in the modern world where there is mass literacy, mass media, public schooling carried out in the "[standard](#)" dialect, government administrations that penetrate every town and village, and high mobility. As modern people, we must consciously focus on the realities of life in ancient Israel and Judah. Important among those realities were that the population was overwhelmingly rural and illiterate and that none of the attributes of modernity mentioned above pertained. Once we have done this, it becomes quite clear that it is extremely unlikely that a villager near [Beth-el](#), a cult center of the Kingdom of Israel, spoke more like a Gileadite or Galilean peasant than like a Judean peasant near Jerusalem 10 miles to the south.

The same logic pertains to putative regional dialects<sup>30</sup>. The following is an interesting quote<sup>31</sup> which could easily have appertained to spoken [PExH](#). All you have to do is substitute "tribe" for "parish".

Although [Jersey](#) measures, at its maximum, only 10.8 miles by 6.8, [Jèrriais](#) (Jersey Norman French) shows considerable internal variation... Although this internal division (i.e. the 7 sub-dialects) has **never been based on any administrative or other territorial boundaries** within Jersey, many of the Islanders feel it to be intrinsically linked to parish boundaries.

There are **three points that we can state with confidence**:

- that **clusters of villages forming an active social unit would have distinctive dialects** exhibiting some isoglosses from similar neighboring social units;
- that **some of these local dialects shared isoglosses with more distant dialects** similar to the scattered Arabic dialects maintaining the original [θ]

and [ð] while in surrounding dialects these have become [t] and [d] respectively.

- even in Jerusalem, there would have been some differences in [grammar](#) ([morphology](#) and [syntax](#)) and [phonology](#) between the various [registers of pre-exilic Hebrew](#). These registers are likely to have included, at least:
  - a) a **literary Hebrew** ([CBH](#)) used in court, aristocratic and Temple circles for formal literature. This would probably be recited using a clear, conservative (archaic) pronunciation. **It is this pronunciation standard that I have termed Early Biblical Hebrew** ([EBHP](#)). CBH would have had [archaizing poetic, standard poetic, prophetic poetic and standard prose forms](#);
  - b) an official **government Hebrew** - the [JEH](#) of the Arad and Lachish inscriptions;
  - c) an **elite spoken** register used in court, aristocratic and Temple circles for normal conversation;
  - d) the **urban dialect** spoken by ordinary people in Jerusalem which [may have undergone changes which appear in the literary language at a later date](#);<sup>32</sup>
  - e) the variety of **rural dialects** spoken in the countryside around Jerusalem which would be heard in the markets of the city.

[\(a\)](#) and [\(b\)](#) can be termed the 'prestige written language' and [\(c\)](#) the 'prestige spoken language'. Evidence of [\(c-e\)](#), if it exists, would be in the form of isolated words or passages in BH or JEH which deviate from the (sparsely documented) standard which may, however, be very difficult to identify. Rendsburg uses this approach to isolate evidence of both spoken Hebrew and geographical dialects preserved embedded in the [MT](#). However, the results seem quite doubtful as illustrated in [Schniedewind-Sivan 1997](#).<sup>33</sup>

Diglossia can be said to have existed<sup>34</sup>:

a) among the elite - if there was a major divergence between [\(a\)](#) and [\(b\)](#), on the one hand and [\(c\)](#) on the other. We have no idea whether this divergence was great or small; and,

b) among the general (illiterate) population of Jerusalem - if there was a major divergence between [\(a\)](#), [\(b\)](#) and [\(c\)](#), on the one hand and [\(d\)](#) on the other.

[Sáenz-Badillos](#) speaks for many scholars when he writes (p. 56) -

“Increasingly it is believed that whereas Biblical Hebrew was the language of literature and administration, the spoken language even before the exile might have been an early version of what would later become Rabbinic Hebrew.”

This sounds good but what does it mean? We must recall that:

- [PMH](#) and subsequently Mishnaic or Rabbinic Hebrew ([MH](#)) were probably descended from a [koine](#)<sup>35</sup> spoken Hebrew developed when speakers of different Hebrew dialects were thrown together by the events surrounding the Babylonian conquest. The large majority of these Hebrew speaking Judeans had lived outside Jerusalem and [many would have had roots in southern Samaria](#); and,
- most of the differences (grammar, semantics, vocabulary) between BH and MH are due to the [profound influence of Aramaic](#). Aramaic influence was probably negligible until the mid-eighth century BCE when the merchant, and scribal and ruling classes started to become familiar with [Imperial Aramaic](#). It is unlikely that major Aramaic impact on spoken Hebrew preceded the exile in the early sixth c. BCE after which the major impact would have been that of spoken Aramaic on the nascent Hebrew koine.
- If we were to be dropped on a Jerusalem street in 600 BCE it is likely that the language would have seemed more like a simplified BH than it would have resembled MH. However, [we would have heard some differences from EBHP also exhibited by MH](#).

Three other points can be looked on as probable:

- the formation of regional dialect clusters with characteristic isoglosses perhaps shared with neighboring non-Israelite peoples<sup>36</sup>;
- the close similarity, based on location, between the ordinary spoken Hebrew of Jerusalem and Samaria. By the same token, we would expect the differences between the spoken Hebrew of Samaria, Galilee and Gilead to have been substantial;
- the literary Hebrew and official government administrative Hebrew of Jerusalem and of Samaria to have been similar - probably as similar as MSA as written and pronounced in Beirut and Damascus.

At least on the spoken level, we would expect the following -

<i>Linguistic Influences on the Regions of Judah and Israel</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Neighboring Language/Dialect</i>	<i>Comments</i>  <i>See <a href="#">Isoglosses of Neighboring Dialects vis-à-vis EBHP/JEH</a></i>
<a href="#">Kingdom of Judah</a>	<i>Northern Judah</i>	<i>Dialects of <a href="#">Ephraim</a></i>	<i>N.b. <a href="#">Samaritan Refugees in Judah and Jerusalem</a></i>
	<i>Southern Judah</i>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<i>Edomite seems to have been similar to Hebrew</i>
	<i>Western Judah</i>	<i>Canaanite dialects spoken by <a href="#">the Philistines</a></i>	<i>Perhaps similar to <a href="#">Phoenician</a></i>
<a href="#">Kingdom of Israel</a>			
	<a href="#">Ephraim</a>	<i>- Dialects of <a href="#">Manasseh</a> - Dialects of <a href="#">Gilead</a></i>	
	<a href="#">Manasseh</a>	<i>- Dialects of <a href="#">Ephraim</a> - Dialects of <a href="#">Gilead</a> - Dialects of the originally Canaanite</i>	

<i>Linguistic Influences on the Regions of Judah and Israel</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Neighboring Language/Dialect</i>	<i>Comments</i>  <i>See <a href="#">Isoglosses of Neighboring Dialects vis-à-vis EBHP/JEH</a></i>
		<i>population of the <a href="#">Jezreel Valley</a>.</i>	
	<i>Southern Galilee</i>	<i>Dialects of the originally Canaanite population of the <a href="#">Jezreel Valley</a></i>	
	<i>Western Galilee</i>	<i><a href="#">Phoenician</a></i>	
	<i>Eastern Galilee</i>	<i><a href="#">Aramaic</a></i>	
	<i><a href="#">Gilead</a></i>	<i>- <a href="#">Moabite</a> - <a href="#">Ammonite</a> - <a href="#">Aramaic</a> - <i>Dialects of cis-Jordan</i> <a href="#">Manasseh</a></i>	<i>Ammonite Edomite and Moabite seem to have been similar to Hebrew</i>

### *5.1 The Origin and Nature of the Prestige Written Language*

There seem to be four possibilities, in declining order of their probable distance from the spoken Hebrew of the 8th-early 6th speech of the Jerusalem aristocratic and Temple elite:

a) ***Artificial Pan-Canaanite Lingua Franca*** - This is the option supported by Young<sup>37</sup>. This would certainly have been a real diglossic situation where the gap between elite and popular speech and the written tongue would have been substantial. Of course, this Pan-Canaanite Lingua Franca would have had no native speakers and may or may not have been grammatically or phonologically conservative. This putative dialect was clearly not used in Phoenicia. Through selective choices in vocabulary, syntax, morphology and some adjustment of phonology, the version used in Jerusalem might have been 'localized' to minimize its differences from the [spoken prestige dialect](#) used in Jerusalem ruling circles.

b) ***Educated Court-priestly Spoken Language of Solomon's Court*** (c. 950 BCE) of the [united kingdom of Israel and Judah](#). This would have grown out of a dialect mixture with probably a gradually increasing influence of rural Judean dialects after the [splitting of the kingdom](#) (c. 930 BCE). Presumably it would not have been significantly different, in grammar or phonology, from the spoken dialects in the mid tenth century BCE. I have described a likely scenario for the early development of this dialect [elsewhere](#). Rabin writes<sup>38</sup>,

The great turning point in the history of the Hebrew language, as in so many other cultural and religious aspects, was the brief spell (about seventy years) during which North and South were united under David and Solomon, and in particular the establishment of the administrative and religious capital in Jerusalem, a city not previously connected with any tribe. After its conquest the city was populated by David with people from different tribes. The cult, which existed in David's time, was carried on by priest from all parts of the country (1 Chron. 13:2), and of course even more so once the Temple had been established. David's army, and presumably his administration, were staffed by men drawn from different tribes. Jerusalem thus became a meeting-place for people speaking different dialects; no doubt, as is invariably the case in such circumstances, dialect mixture took place. It is also likely that the mixed speech of the capital was carried by army personnel and government officials at least into the provincial centers, and that in this way the speech of northerners took on some Judean features and that of the Judeans some northern traits

Under this scenario, with the splitting of the kingdom, the court of the new [Kingdom of Israel](#) would have taken over the literary dialect along with many of the administrators of the earlier united kingdom.

c) *Literary Hebrew of the Samaritan Elite of Late 8th Century BCE Brought South by Refugee Scribes* etc. After [Destruction of Kingdom of Israel](#),

Under this scenario it is probable that the literary language would have undergone some phonological adjustment (eg. [restoration of diphthongs](#)) to the Jerusalem court dialect.

d) *Educated Court-priestly Spoken Language of late 8th century BCE, Judean Court*<sup>39</sup> - This would have grown out of Judean or mixed dialects.

Under this scenario, the emergence of [CBH/JEH](#) would date from the economic and [demographic expansion consequent on the destruction of the Kingdom of Israel](#).

(I consider (b) or (d) to be most likely correct.)

## 5.2 Factors leading to the spread of the Prestige Written and Spoken Language in the Pre-Exilic Period

The territories of Israel and Judah were much cut up by mountains and valleys. It is to be expected that each village and valley would have its recognizable dialect which would share some features with nearby villages and differ from nearby dialects in ways which parallel more distant dialects. Some factors that would have made for change and the spread of linguistic innovations:

- **Mobile elements** - As with Arabic, there were some social elements who wandered through the regions and who might have spoken the prestige dialect of the capital (e.g. royal officials and possibly [Levites](#) and merchants) or possibly their own traditional dialects (e.g. [Kenites](#), [Rechabites](#)) which might have been as different and archaic as some of the Bedouin dialects of Arabic.
- **Impact of Royal Courts** - leading figures from all over the kingdoms would have been attracted to the two royal courts as were [Phoenician](#) architects and craftsmen. One may note that royal marriages with foreign princesses would bring in their train foreign dialects, personnel and practices as with [Jezebel](#). The

is also the item of hired foreign mercenaries, such as David's [Cherethites and Pelethites](#).<sup>40</sup>

- **Internal Migration** - The [tribe of Dan](#) is recorded as having moved from the south to the extreme north under [Philistines](#) pressure<sup>41</sup>. No doubt there were other population movements.
- **Intermarriage** - We do not know the scale of intermarriage with non-Israelites or Israelites from other regions. It clearly was not frowned on in pre-exilic times as the iconic leader, [Moses](#) twice married non-Israelites. His first wife was [Zipporah](#) daughter of a priest of [Midian](#) and his second wife was an unnamed Cushite woman<sup>42</sup>.
- **Trading Relations** - the Bible mentions traders from Samaria setting up shop in [Damascus](#) and visa versa<sup>43</sup> as well as innumerable, mostly tiny, commercial contacts.
- **Border Strife** - Land in [Gilead](#) and [Galilee](#) was contested between Israel and [Aram Damascus](#) as is know both from the Bible<sup>44</sup> and the [Tel Dan stele](#). This would have led to the stationing of royal troops in this vulnerable areas

### **5.3 Insight from [Colloquial Arabic](#)**

The range of dialects, and [nature of dialect development, in Iron Age Palestine](#) was probably similar to that of Levantine Arabic c. 1920 - i.e. before the recent mass urbanization and the introduction of mass communications and schooling. **Then, and now, speakers of** Levantine Arabic use(d) a standard grammatically archaic standard written language ([MSA](#)) which is tinged with the writer's native dialect<sup>45</sup>. **There are a number of prestige urban dialects (Damascus, Beirut) whose [influence is spreading](#). There also are instances of groups, or local areas using the [PC suffixes \(2 fs.\) \*i:n\* and \(3 mp.\) \*u:n\* in the midst of populations using the more usual \(2](#)**

[fs.\) / and \(3 mp.\) u](#)<sup>46</sup>. Similarly, [rural and](#) bedouin Palestinians pronounce the reflex<sup>47</sup> of Classical Arabic /θ/ and /ð/ as [θ] and [ð] while urban Palestinians pronounce them as [t] and [d] respectively<sup>48</sup>. Once again, these isoglosses are shared with distant dialects. thus Classical Arabic /θ/ and /ð/ become [t] and [d] respectively in much of [Egypt](#) and most of [North Africa](#) while being pronounced, as in Classical Arabic, as [θ] and [ð] in Tunisian, Eastern Libyan, and some rural [Algerian](#) dialects<sup>49</sup>.

There is a clear urban vs. rural contrast with regard to [vowels](#) in North Levantine. Rural dialects preserve the vowels and diphthongs (/aw/, /ay/) of [Classical Arabic](#) unchanged; whereas urban dialects reduce these diphthongs (/aw/ >/o:/, /ay/ >/e:/) using vowels similar to those of many other [modern varieties of Arabic](#). [Isoglosses](#) separate the many group and local dialects e.g. The Lebanese generally pronounce the reflex of Classical Arabic /q/ as [ʔ] a trait that they share with many other dialects such as those of [Algiers](#), [Cairo](#) and urban [Syria](#). However, the [Druze](#) living in their midst pronounce it [q] as do most rural Syrians and dialects as far removed as those of Uzbekistan and Tunis. In addition, there is a fundamental split between [sedentary and bedouin](#) dialects.

It should be noted that there is some gradual change with location - e.g. South Levantine shows closer relationship with [Egyptian Arabic](#) than does North Levantine (Syria, Lebanon). However, as noted in the case of [ʔ]/[q], religious or ethnic group or rural vs. urban location can be decisive. A very interesting case is that of the speech of the Christian and (former) Jewish minorities in Baghdad as compared to the language of the Muslim majority. [Jewish/Christian Arabic](#) Baghdadi Arabic is more similar the [dialect of Northern Iraq](#), and even [that of Syria](#), than it is to the [Baghdad Arabic](#) spoken by the Muslims of the city.

Two points need clarification:

- 1) Regional [dialects](#) in [modern Arabic](#), do exist. But they are variable within themselves and can only be defined by looking at the language system as a whole. [Isoglosses](#) can and do vary within regional dialects with some local (sub-regional) dialects being

islands of conservatism and others, often subject to [contact with other languages and dialects](#), being centers of innovation. Thus individual isoglosses can be found in widely separated, and very different<sup>50</sup>, regional dialects. It is therefore, very risky to define regional dialects on the basis of isolated isoglosses.

The situation within the broader [Canaanite language group](#), and between the regional and sub-regional dialects in pre-exilic Israel and Judah was doubtless analogous to that of Levantine Arabic. with one enormous difference. We can gather unlimited linguistic data, from living informants, on living Arabic dialects but we have no speakers of Biblical Hebrew to turn to and have significant clear linguistic evidence only concerning the pre-exilic literary dialect of Jerusalem ([Classical Biblical Hebrew](#) (CBH)).

- 2) We cannot use the fact that a root, or word, appears in a form typical of, say Aramaic, as evidence of a shared isogloss between the written dialect and Aramaic. The word may simply be borrowed. Thus in the Bible we have two roots apparently going back to [Proto-Semitic](#)  $\sqrt{m\dot{h}d}$  <mḥṣ> and <mḥ'>. The first of these shows sound shifts typical of Hebrew and the second of Aramaic. It is highly likely that the second is a loan word into [BH and anyone claiming that it represents a form having a shared isogloss - PS \[d\] → \[ʔ\]](#) would have to justify the case with further evidence.

#### ***5.4 Canaanite and Aramaic Spoken Dialects***

In 1600 BCE, in the [Southern Levant](#), you could walk from the desert to the Mediterranean and from the border of Egypt up to what is now southern Turkey and never cross a perceptible language border. From village to village and region to region [isoglosses](#) would appear to the point that villagers from far distant villages might not be able to understand each other. It is not clear how much the situation had changed by 800 BCE. However, even then this description would apply to the territory covered by [Phoenicia](#), [Philistia](#), [Judah](#), [Israel](#), [Moab](#), [Edom](#) and probably [Ammon](#).

## 5.5 Contemporary Written Evidence of Canaanite Dialects 1000 - 586 BCE

It must be stressed that the quantity of inscriptional material known is tiny<sup>51</sup>.

1) *Israelian Epigraphic Hebrew* (IEH<sup>52</sup>) - inscriptional material, unvocalized except for a few final vowels, from Beth-Shean (perhaps ninth century BCE), [Samaria](#) (8th century BCE), Tel Qasile (8th century BCE), Hazor (8th century BCE) and Nimrud (8th century BCE). These really amount in total to a few lines of [official government administrative Hebrew](#).

*Isoglosses Compared to EBHP -*

### a) Reflex of the original PS diphthong \*[ay]

i) [Samaritan ostraca](#) - In [JEH](#), probably reflecting [EBHP](#), the word for 'wine' is spelled <yyn> in both absolute and construct form. In the Samaritan ostraca IEH, the word is spelled <yn> 'wine' in both absolute and construct forms<sup>53</sup>. It seems [unlikely that the middle <y> in the JEH form is a vowel letter](#). Almost certainly the JEH form when stressed (absolute form) was pronounced [\\*\[ey\] and when unstressed, i.e. in the construct, was \[ey\] or \[ɛy\]](#)<sup>54</sup>. **The Samaritan ostraca <yn> would have been pronounced [e:] whether stressed or unstressed.**

ii) Beth-Shean - 'house of' (constr.) written <byt> as in JEH and thus probably pronounced [beyt] or [\[bɛyt\]](#). However, as this is part of a place name, and hence, may not represent the ordinary pronunciation for the time and place.<sup>55</sup>

b) *Word for 'year'* - Samaritan ostraca have <št> = [\\*\['šat\(t\)\]](#) which probably developed [\\*\['šanatu/ \(BHA phase 1\) > \\*\['šantu/ > \\*\['šattu/ \(BHA phase 2\) > \\*\['šat\(t\)\]/ \(BHA phase 3\)](#), as compared to EBHP whose development would be [\\*\['šanatu/ > \\*\['ša'natu/ > \\*\['ša'na:t/ > \\*\['ša'na:/ \\*\['še'ne:\] \(EBHP\) → /šā'nā/ \\*\['šɔ:'nɔ:\]\(TH\)](#)

c) *Divine element of Yahwist names* - The divine element written <yw> (e.g. <gdyw> = [\\*\[gəddɪyyew\]](#)<sup>56</sup>) in the Samaritan ostraca whereas in JEH and [CBH](#) it is spelled <yhw> (e.g. <'lyhw><sup>57</sup> = [\\*\['ɪli:'yehu·\]/\\*\['ɛli:'yehu·\]](#) ([EBHP/58](#))) and in [PCBH](#) <yhw> (e.g. <'lyh><sup>59</sup> = [\\*\['ɪli:'ye·\]/\\*\['ɛli:'ye·\]](#) ([EBHP/](#))).

In short, all we know of the official Hebrew of [Samaria](#) are these three facts. In spite of the common assumption, we do not know whether:

- the other important [PS](#) diphthong, /aw/ was contracted in that form of Hebrew since these contractions do not necessarily happen at the same time<sup>60</sup>; and,
- whether these isoglosses would have also obtained in the official Hebrew of the [Hazor](#) or [Jabesh-Gilead](#) during the same period.

2) *Judahite Epigraphic Hebrew* (JEH) - 9th to early 6th centuries BCE) - inscripational material, unvocalized [except for \(some? most? all?\)](#) word-final vowels. This is a much more substantial corpus than exists for Israelian Hebrew. It includes the [Siloam Tunnel inscription](#), a [proto-biblical blessing](#), [military dispatches found at Lachish and Arad](#) and many smaller inscriptions. The orthography is older than that used in the MT. To the extent we can tell, [JEH](#) was the [official government administrative Hebrew register](#) corresponding to the contemporary [literary register](#), [CBH](#). We are fortunate in having a fine grammar cum lexicon of these inscriptions as well as a number of scholarly collections of the material and reconstructed vocalization<sup>61</sup>.

3) *Phoenician* - there are many, mostly short inscriptions found in many locations over a long period. They almost entirely unvocalized and make abundant use of historical spellings - i.e. spell word as they had been pronounced centuries earlier than the date of the inscriptions - c.f. the English spelling vs. pronunciation of words such as "knight", "night".

4) *Moabite* - there is one major and one minor Moabite inscription. The major inscription is the famous [Mesha stele](#). This may have been written in Moabite or it may have been composed in an Israelian [official Hebrew](#) tinged with Moabite features. With so little material we cannot, at present, determine which.

5) [Ammonite](#) - We really have only one important text - the [Amman Citadel Inscription](#). The [Balaam inscription](#) from Deir Alla seems to have been composed in a form of Aramaic tinged with Ammonite features.<sup>62</sup>

### 5.6 Isoglosses of Neighboring Dialects vis-à-vis EBHP/JEH

#### Some Known Isoglosses

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	<u>Coastal Canaanite</u> South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
2/1 (23-24) - Reflex of <a href="#">PS</a> *[d]	<š>	No evidence	No evidence	<š>	<š>	<š>	unknown	<q> Pronunciation unknown. Probably not pronounced [q] since <a href="#">PS</a> *[t] later shifted to [c] whereas <a href="#">PS</a> *[q] remained unchanged. <sup>65</sup>
2/2. (24-26) - Reflex of <a href="#">PS</a> *[ḏ]	<z> *[z]	No evidence	No evidence	<z>	<z> [?]	<z> [?]	<z> [?]	<z> Probably pronounced *[ḏ] since it later shifted to [d]
2/3. (27-28) - Reflex of <a href="#">PS</a> *[t]	<š> *[š]	No evidence	No evidence	<š> *[š]	No evidence	<š> [?]	No evidence	<š> Probably pronounced *[t] since it later shifted to [t] whereas <a href="#">PS</a> *[š] remained unchanged.

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
<b>2/4. (28-30) - Reflex of PS</b> <b>*/θ/</b>	<š> *[š]	No evidence	No evidence	<š> *[š]	<š> [?]	<š> [?]	No evidence	<š> Probably pronounced */θ/ since it later shifted to [t] whereas PS *[š] remained unchanged.
<b>2/5 (30-32) - Reflex of PNWS stressed</b> <b>*ā[á:]</b>	<∅> *ō[ó:]	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *ō[ó:]	<∅> *ō[ó:]?	<∅> *ō[ó:]?	No evidence	<∅> *ā[á:]
<b>2/6 (32-33) - Reflex of PNWS stressed</b> <b>*ā[á] in nominal forms</b> (33-35)	<∅> *ō[ó:] (<ā[á:]<*[á'])	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *[ó:] (<ā[á:]<*[á'])	<∅> *[ó:]	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *ā[á]
<b>2/7. (33-35) - Reflex of PNWS stressed short *[á] in nominal forms</b>	<∅> *[á:]	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *[ó:] (<[á:]<*[á])	No evidence	<∅> *[á] or *[á:]	<∅> *[á] or *[á:]	<∅> *[á]
<b>2/8. (35-40) - Reflex of PS</b> <b>*[aw]</b>	<w> *[aw] possibly *[ew] when unstressed	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *[ô]	<w> *[aw]	<∅> *[ô]	<w> *[aw]	<w> *[aw]
<b>2/8. (35-40) - Reflex of PS</b> <b>*[ay]</b> (35-40)	<y> *[ay] possibly *[ey] when	<∅> *[ê]	No evidence	<∅> *[ê]	<∅> *[ê]	<∅> *[ê]	No evidence	<y> *[ay]

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
	unstressed							
2/18a. (59-60) - <b>Absolute fs. noun ending</b>	<h> <a href="#">*â[á:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<t> <a href="#">*[ót]</a>	<t> <a href="#">*[át]</a>	<t> <a href="#">*[át]</a>	No evidence	<h> <a href="#">*â[á:]</a>
2/18a. (60-61); 3/17c (125-126) - <b>3fs. SC verbal suffix</b>	<h> <a href="#">*â[a:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> <a href="#">*â[á:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<t> <a href="#">*[at]</a>
3/1a. (79-80) - <b>1cs. independent pronoun</b>	<ny> <a href="#">&lt;nky&gt;</a> <sup>66</sup>	No evidence	No evidence	<nk>	No evidence	<nk>	No evidence	<nh>
3/1b. (80) - <b>2ms. independent pronoun</b>	<?> Probably was written as in MT <th> <a href="#">*['atta(:)]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<t> <a href="#">*['atta:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<t> <a href="#">*['atta]</a> or <a href="#">*['att]</a>
3/1d. (81-82) - <b>1c. 3mp. independent pronoun</b>	<hm> <a href="#">&lt;hmh&gt;</a> <sup>67</sup>	No evidence	No evidence	<hmt>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<hm> and <hmw>
3/2a. (82-83) - <b>demonstrative pronoun ms.</b>	<zh> <a href="#">*['ze(:)]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<z> <a href="#">[?]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<znh> <a href="#">[ōna]</a> ?
3/2b. (83-84) - <b>demonstrative pronoun fs.</b>	<z't> <a href="#">*['zôt]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<z> <a href="#">[zō]</a> ?	No evidence	<z't>	No evidence	<z'> and <z't>
3/2c. (84-85) - <b>demonstrative</b>	<l'h> <sup>68</sup>	No evidence	No evidence	<l'>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<l'>

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
<b>e pronoun</b> <a href="#">cp.</a>								
<b>3/3. (85-86) - Relative Pronoun/Particle</b>	<'šr> *[a'šar] or *['ašr]	No evidence	No evidence	<'š>	<'š>	<'šr>	No evidence	<zy> *[ō:]
<b>3/4. (87) - Personal Interrogative Pronoun</b>	<my> [mi:]	No evidence	No evidence	<my> [miya, mi:]	<m> [mi:]	No evidence	No evidence	<mn> [man]
<b>3/5. (87-89) - Definite Article</b>	<h> [ha + <a href="#">geminaton</a> ]	No evidence	No evidence	<h> [ha + <a href="#">geminaton</a> ]	<h>	<h>	<h>	<-> (suffix)
<b>3/6a. (89-91) - abs. mp. noun suffix</b>	<m>	No evidence	No evidence	<m>	<m>	<n>	No evidence	<n>
<b>3/6a. (89-91) - abs. dual noun suffix</b>	<ym>	No evidence	No evidence	<m>	No evidence	<n>	No evidence	<yn>
<b>3/6b. (91-93) - Ending of mp. constr.</b>	<y> *[ay] or *[ey]	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *[ê]	<∅> *[ê] or *[']	<y> *[ê]?, *[ey]?	No evidence	<y> *[ay] or *[ey]
<b>3/6c. (93-94) - Absolute fs. noun ending</b>	<h> *[â[á:]]	No evidence	No evidence	<t> *[ót]	<t> *[át]?	<t> *[át]	No evidence	<h> *[â[á:]]
<b>3/6d. (94-96) - Absolute fp. noun ending</b>	<t> *[ó:t]	<t> *[ó:t]	No evidence	<t> *[o:t]	<t> *[o:t]	<t> *[o:t]?	No evidence	<t> *[á:t] and <n> *[á:n]
<b>3/7. (96-97) - Plural of final weak nouns</b>	<t> *[ó:t] Regular strong noun pattern e.g. <hmt> [ħo:'mo:t] 'walls'	No evidence	No evidence	<y> *[iy(y)o:t] e.g. <qšyt> [qəšiy(y)o:t] 'extremities'	unknown	<t> *[o:t] Regular strong noun pattern e.g. <hmt> [ħo:mo:t]	No evidence	<wt> *[awwa: + fp. morpheme] e.g. <mħnwt> [maħnawwa:t] 'camps of'

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
						'walls'		
<b>3/8 (97-99) - Attaching possessive suffixes to fp. nouns</b>	<a href="#">&lt;y&gt;</a> *[ay] or *[ey] As with mp. nouns diphthong precedes suffixes.	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> Probably attached directly perhaps with connecting vowel	No evidence	<∅> Probably attached directly perhaps with connecting vowel	No evidence	<∅> Probably attached directly perhaps with connecting vowel
<b>3/9b. (101-104) - 3ms. possessive suffix on s. nouns</b>	<h> <a href="#">[áhu, o:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	Following consonant <∅> *ǝ[o:] Following vowel <y> *[yu:] or *[yi:]	<h> [uh, ih]	<h> [ih]?	No evidence	<h> [ih]?
<b>3/9b. (101-104) - 3fs. possessive suffix on s. nouns</b>	<h> <sup>69</sup> <a href="#">[áh(a)]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	Following consonant <∅> *ǝ[a:] Following vowel <y> *[iya:]	No evidence	<h> <a href="#">[áh]</a>	No evidence	<h> [ah(a)]
<b>3/9c. (104) - 1cp. possessive suffix on s. nouns</b>	<n(w)> <a href="#">*[nu:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<n> *[nu:]	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<n> *[an, na]
<b>3/9d. (105-106) - 3mp. possessive suffix on s. nouns</b>	Following consonant <m> <a href="#">*[á:m]</a> Following vowel <hm> *['him]	No evidence	No evidence	Following consonant <m> *[o:m] Following vowel <nm> *[no:m]	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<hm> *['hum]
<b>3/10b. (106-109) - 3mp.</b>	<yw> <a href="#">*[á:w]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	<y> *[e:yu:, e:yi:]	No evidence	<h> *[o:h(u/i)]?	No evidence	<wh> *[awh(i)]

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
possessive suffix on pl. nouns								
3/11a. (110-112) - 3ms. objective suffix	<h> <a href="#">[áhu, o:]</a>	No evidence	No evidence	Following verb ending in consonant <∅> *ô[o:] Following vowel <y> *[yu:, yi:]	No certain evidence	<h> *[?]	No evidence	<h> *[ih]?
3/11b. (112-113) - 3mp. objective suffix	<m> *[á:m]	No evidence	No evidence	Following verb ending in consonant <m> *[o:m] Following vowel <nm> *[no:m]	No evidence	<hm> *[hum]?	No evidence	<hm> *[hum]
3/11b. (113-114) - numerals - ending of cardinal decades	<m>	No evidence	No evidence	<m>	No evidence	<n>	No evidence	<n>
3/14 (115) - Term for non-existence	<yn> *[ayn] or *[eyn]	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<'n> *[e:n]	No evidence	<lyš>
3/15a (115-116) - Form <i>nota accusativi</i>	<'t>	No evidence	No evidence	<'yt>	No evidence	<'t>	No evidence	<'yt>
3/15b (116-117) -	<'m> <hn>	No evidence	No evidence	<'m>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<hn>

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
<b>Conditional particles</b>								
<b>3/16a (116-117) <i>t</i>-stem of <i>qal</i></b>	no	No evidence	No evidence	no	No evidence	See following	No evidence	yes
<b>Passive reflexive insertion of <i>t</i> after first radical as in Arabic</b>	no	No evidence	No evidence	no	No evidence	yes	No evidence	no
<b>3/16b (120-121) Passive reflexive <i>n</i>-stem</b>	yes	No evidence	No evidence	yes	probable	No evidence	No evidence	no
<b>3/16c (122) Causative prefix</b>	<h>	No evidence	No evidence	<y>	<h>	<h>	No evidence	<h>
<b>3/17a (123-124) Inflection strong verb <a href="#">SC</a> 1c.</b>	<ty> or <t> *[ti:]	No evidence	No evidence	<t> *[ti:]	No evidence	<ty> *[ti:]	No evidence	<t> *[t, tu/i]
<b>3/18a (126) Suffix <a href="#">PC</a> 2mp. (indicative and jussive<sup>70</sup>)</b>	<w> *[u:]	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<b>indicative</b> <n> *[u:n] <b>volitive</b> <w> *[u:]
<b>3/18b (126-127) Suffix <a href="#">PC</a> 3mp. (indicative and jussive)</b>	<w> *[u:]	No evidence	No evidence	<∅> *[u:]	<n> *[u:n]	No evidence	No evidence	<b>indicative</b> <n> *[u:n] <b>volitive</b> <w> *[u:]
<b>3/18c (127-</b>	<t--n> <sup>71</sup>	No	No	No evidence	No	No evidence	No	<y--n>

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
<b>128)</b> <b>Inflection</b> <a href="#">PC</a> 3fp. (indicative and jussive)	*[t--u:]	evidence	evidence		evidence		evidence	*[y--a:n]
<b>3/19a (128-129)</b> <b>Qal inf.</b> <b>constr.</b>	<lqtl> *[liq'to:l]	No evidence	No evidence	<lqtl> *[liqto:l]	No evidence	<lqtl> *[?]	No evidence	<lqtl> *[?] and <lmqtl> *[limiqtal]
<b>3/20 (130-131)</b> <b>Qal p.p.</b>	<qtl> or <qtwl> *[qa'tu:l]	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<qtl> *[qati:l]
<b>3/21a (131-132)</b> <b>Qal/PC of</b> <b>שׂב ('sit') and</b> <b>יָדַע ('know')</b>	<yšb> *[yišib]	No evidence	No evidence	<yšb> *[?]	No evidence	<yšb> *[?]	No evidence	<yšb> *[yaθθib]
<b>3/21b (132)</b> <b>Qal inf.</b> <b>constr. of</b> שׂב ('sit') and יָדַע ('know')	<dʿt>	No evidence	No evidence	<dʿt> *[?]	No evidence	<lspt>	No evidence	No evidence,
<b>3/24a (144)</b> <b>Qal/PC of</b> <b>הִלֵּךְ ('go')</b>	<wylkw>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<w'hlk>	No evidence	No evidence √hwk was used
<b>3/24b (144-146)</b> <b>Qal imp. of</b> <b>הִלֵּךְ ('go')</b>	<lk> <sup>72</sup>	No evidence	No evidence	<hlk>?	No evidence	<lk>	No evidence	No evidence Probably √hwk was used
<b>4/4a (174-175)</b> <b>Negation of finite verb (nonprohibition)</b>	<!'>	No evidence	No evidence	<bl>	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	<->
<b>4/4b (175)</b>	< yn'>	No	No	<'y>?	No	No evidence	No	<->

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <a href="#">Garr 1985</a> ) <sup>63</sup>	<a href="#">JEH</a>	<a href="#">IEH</a>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <a href="#">Philistine</a> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<a href="#">Phoenician</a>	<a href="#">Ammonite</a>	<a href="#">Moabite</a> <sup>64</sup>	<a href="#">Edomite</a>	<a href="#">Old Aramaic</a>
<b>Negation of participle</b>		evidence	evidence		evidence		evidence	
<b>4/4c (176) Position of term for non-existence</b>	First in clause	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	postpositive	No evidence	postpositive
<b>4/7a (176) Infinitive used as imperative</b>	<a href="#">Inf. abs.</a>	No evidence	No evidence	Uncertain in standard Phoenician. <a href="#">Inf. constr.</a> functioned as imperative in Byblian.	No evidence	No evidence	No evidence	no
<b>4/7b (182-183) Infinitive in temporal clauses</b>	yes	No evidence	No evidence	no	No evidence	yes	No evidence	no
<b>4/7b (183-184) Use of inf. abs. as finite verb</b>	yes <sup>73</sup>	No evidence	No evidence	no	No evidence	no	No evidence	no
<b>4/7b (191-194) Marking of definite nominal direct object</b>	Yes mostly	No evidence	No evidence	Not usually	No evidence	either	No evidence	no
<b>"to do"</b> <sup>74</sup>	√ <sup>c</sup> śh	No evidence	No evidence	√p <sup>c</sup> l				√ <sup>c</sup> bd
<b>"lord, master"</b> <sup>75</sup>	<dn>	No evidence	No evidence	<b <sup>c</sup> l> <dn>				<mr <sup>2</sup> >
<b>"son"</b> <sup>76</sup>	<bn>	No evidence	No evidence	<bn>				 
<b>"to be"</b>	√hyh	No	No	√kwn				√hyh

<u>Feature</u> (Item number and page(s) from <u>Garr 1985</u> ) <sup>63</sup>	<u>JEH</u>	<u>IEH</u>	Coastal Canaanite South of Phoenicia (including <u>Philistine</u> cities 1000-600 BCE)	<u>Phoenician</u>	<u>Ammonite</u>	<u>Moabite</u> <sup>64</sup>	<u>Edomite</u>	<u>Old Aramaic</u>
		evidence	evidence					

-

<sup>1</sup> From Llamas, Mullany, Stockwell 2007 p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard\\_language](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_language) .

<sup>3</sup> Quoted from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialect\\_continuum](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialect_continuum) .

<sup>4</sup> See Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008 chapt. 7.

<sup>5</sup> C. A. Ferguson, "Diglossia", *Word* 15, 1959 p. 326.

<sup>6</sup> Rendsburg Diglossia p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> See "Diglossia and the Present Language Situation in Greece: A Sociological Approach to the Interpretation of Diglossia and Some Hypotheses on Today's Linguistic Reality" by Anna Frangoudaki, *Language in Society*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Sep., 1992), pp. 365-381

<sup>8</sup> See *Ancient Egyptian literature: history and forms* by Antonio Loprieno Contributor Antonio Loprieno, BRILL, 1996, pp 515-6.

<sup>9</sup> Holes 2004 p 184. See also "Knowing standard Arabic: testing Egyptians' MSA abilities" by Dilworth B. Parkinson in *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics: Papers from the Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics Volume V*, Edited by Mushira Eid and Clive Holes, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Utah and University of Cambridge, 1991

<sup>10</sup> Prestige dialect Standard Babylonian.

<sup>11</sup> "Siegel (Siegel's 1985) explains these stages as follows (1985:373-74). The **PREKOINE** stage is where "various forms of the varieties in contact are used concurrently and inconsistently. Leveling and some mixing has begun to occur ... but few forms have emerged as the accepted compromise."

**STABILIZATION** occurs when new norms have been "distilled," and a new compromise subsystem - i.e. a variety related on one or more linguistic levels - has emerged, but it is not used for in-group communication. **A koine may become a literary language or a standard**, in which case it is said to be **EXPANDED**. Finally, it may become **NATIVIZED**, in which case it acquires all the functions of a normal

**first language**; it may be subject to further elaboration, **as well as to changes that are not ascribable to the dialect mixture**. Importantly, the two middle stages can be bypassed altogether.... Siegel's framework can be taken as **a partial model of the time variable in koineization....**". Quoted from [Kerswill and Williams 2000](#).

<sup>12</sup> "(W)e take "leveling" to refer to the reduction in the number of variants (usually originating in different dialects) of a particular phonological, morphological, or lexical unit.... "Simplification" refers to an increase in morphological regularity, an increase in invariable word forms, and a decrease in the number of morphological categories. In addition, "simplification" covers morphological and lexical transparency ....". Quoted from [Kerswill and Williams 2000](#) p. 85.

<sup>13</sup> " Majority forms found in the mix, rather than minority forms, win out. This principle and the following one ("Marked regional forms are disfavored") have similar effects, in the sense that the stock of variants for a given linguistic unit - phonological, morphological, or lexical - as they occur in the immediate post-settlement period, is reduced to just one, or to a very small number...." Quoted from [Kerswill and Williams 2000](#) p. 85.

<sup>14</sup> "Outcomes in post-contact varieties: (1) Majority forms found in the mix, rather than minority forms, win out. (2) Marked regional forms are disfavored. (3) Phonologically and lexically simple features are more often adopted than complex ones. The migrants and the first generation of native-born children: (4) Adults, adolescents, and children influence the outcome of dialect contact differently. (5) The adoption of features by a speaker depends on his or her network characteristics. The time scale of koineization: (6) There is no normal historical continuity with the locality, either socially or linguistically. Most first and second generation speakers are oriented toward language varieties that originate elsewhere. (7) From initial diffusion, focusing takes place over one or two generations." Quoted from [Kerswill and Williams 2000](#) p. 84.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_Ancient\\_Israel\\_and\\_Judah#Population\\_changes\\_and\\_the\\_history\\_of\\_Judah\\_and\\_Israel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Ancient_Israel_and_Judah#Population_changes_and_the_history_of_Judah_and_Israel) .

<sup>16</sup> *The History of Israel* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) by Martin Noth, Adam & Charles Black, London 1958, pp. 190-191. See also *A history of Israel* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) by John Bright, Westminster, Philadelphia, 1972, pp. 195-196

<sup>17</sup> "The Emergence of Classical Hebrew,". Less convincing is Young's hypothesis of a "Canaanite prestige language" based in part on comparisons with the dialect of the Amarna letters (Diversity in Pre-exilic Hebrew, 7-10). It is too specific to say, as Young contends, that Biblical Hebrew "carries on the Canaanite literary dialect that lies behind the Amarna letters" (75). And, there is no reason to believe that specifically Jerusalemite Hebrew carried on this dialect (see Young, Diversity, 28).

<sup>18</sup> The establishment of a royal government would have necessitated facilities for the training of scribes to carry on chancery work. These scribal circles were doubtless responsible for the official [Lachish](#) and [Arad](#) letters and were probably the authors of much of the [Hebrew Bible](#). The spoken Hebrew of these scribes might have had little impact on the grammar and orthography of the literary dialect they were trained to write but would have had some impact on their pronunciation particularly in informal situations.

<sup>19</sup> See [Harris 1939](#) for the general background.

<sup>20</sup> [Blau 1997](#).

<sup>21</sup> A very close parallel would be Literary Arabic (MSA) in which the original diphthongs are both written and pronounced when reading aloud and in formal speech over a thousand years after they had uniformly contracted in normal speech. Thus [MSA](#) *'mawt* = "death" and *'bayt* = "house" vs. [spoken Arabic](#) *'mōt* = "death" and *'bēt* or *'bīt* = "house".

<sup>22</sup> Quote from [Barstad 2003](#), p.6.

<sup>23</sup> Quote from [Lipschits 2003](#), pp. 364-366.

<sup>24</sup> Blau ([Blau 1997](#) P. 29, note 45) suggests that PMH is descended from the dialects of the region of Benjamin or possibly that of the Negev.

<sup>25</sup> See [van der Toorn 2009](#) pp. 98 ff. on the nature and levels of scribal education.

<sup>26</sup> pp. 616-618, 628. **Bolding** my own. See also [Versteegh 1985](#)

<sup>27</sup> [Blau 1997](#) suggests that Hebrew should not be seen as having been diglossic in the post-exilic period. However, he reaches this conclusion by a rather extreme definition of diglossia. In substance and my own re. post-exilic period are similar.

<sup>28</sup> Quote from [Abd-El-Jawad 1987](#) p. 359.

<sup>29</sup> "... the extent to which we can expect to find a Northern Hebrew dialect also depends on the assumptions that we make about the emergence of SBH and its relationship with "Judæan Hebrew." Rendsburg, for example, places Judæan and Israelian Hebrew in counterpoint. In fact, there is not necessarily any reason to assume this dichotomy. After all, the center of the Judæan kingdom was the Benjaminite city of Jerusalem which up until the time of David was a foreign city." [Schniedewind-Sivan 1997](#) p. 336.

<sup>30</sup> Note the discussion in [Schniedewind-Sivan 1997](#) p. 306.

<sup>31</sup> Jersey Norman French: a linguistic study of an obsolescent dialect by Mari C. Jones, Philological Society (Great Britain), Wiley-Blackwell, 2001, ISBN 0631231692, 9780631231691, pp. 24-25.

<sup>32</sup> "Increasingly it is believed that whereas Biblical Hebrew was the language of literature and administration, the spoken language even before the exile might have been an early version of what would later become Rabbinic Hebrew." [Sáenz-Badillos](#) p. 56.

<sup>33</sup> It is noteworthy that the outstanding Arabist Alan Kaye, in a review (*AJS Review*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1993), pp. 105-108 Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Association for Jewish Studies) of Rendsburg's [Diglossia](#) wrote -

I recommend the book as a careful, thoroughly researched, polished contribution to Semitic historical linguistics. It shows, once again, that linguists can often confidently reconstruct linguistic (pre-) history using the available evidence which has come down to us.

<sup>34</sup> See the writings of [Gary Rendsburg](#), in particular, [Rendsburg 1990-diglossia](#).

<sup>35</sup> Note also the earlier dialect mixes in [the early tenth](#) and [late eighth centuries](#) BCE.

<sup>36</sup> "... complete isogloss maps ... would have shown the formation of linguistic areas resulting not from the genetic affiliation of the dialects involved, but merely from their geographic proximity. There are indeed linguistic features that may be transferred and spread within contiguous dialects and languages without any reference to their genetic affiliation." [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 96.

<sup>37</sup> [Young 1993](#). This hypothetical lingua franca would have some of the characteristics of the Formal Spoken Arabic (FAST) taught to US foreign service personnel as described below..

" Faced with the problem of diglossia, the authors have not taken the usual route, that is, teaching the colloquial Arabic of a given urban center or a "simplified" or "middle" version of Modern Standard Arabic. Instead, they have chosen the "Formal Spoken Arabic" or "Educated Spoken Arabic" of the Levant or eastern Mediterranean. **It is based on the register of colloquial Arabic used by speakers from this region on formal occasions and to communicate with speakers from other regions. FSA resembles Modern Standard Arabic in phonology and the internal morphology of verbs. Its inflectional morphology and syntax, however, are those shared by the major urban dialects, as is much of its lexicon...**". Elizabeth M. Bergman's review of *Formal Spoken Arabic: FAST Course* by Karin C. Ryding and Abdelnour Zaiback (Washington, D.C.: GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1994), *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 118, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1998), p. 417. Published by: American Oriental Society Formal Spoken Arabic: FAST Course. By KARIN C. RYDING and ABDELNOUR ZAIBACK.

See also [Ryding 1991](#)

<sup>38</sup> "The Emergence of Classical Hebrew,". Less convincing is Young's hypothesis of a "Canaanite prestige language" based in part on comparisons with the dialect of the Amarna letters (Diversity in Pre-exilic

Hebrew, 7-10). It is too specific to say, as Young contends, that Biblical Hebrew "carries on the Canaanite literary dialect that lies behind the Amarna letters" (75). And, there is no reason to believe that specifically Jerusalemite Hebrew carried on this dialect (see Young, Diversity, 28).

<sup>39</sup> "Certainly, SBH should be associated with the city of Jerusalem. Rabin points to the critical period of David and Solomon. Another critical period of literary activity in ancient Israel was during the reign of Hezekiah. At this time, there was a surge in the population of Jerusalem, partially due to disenfranchised people coming into Jerusalem from the northern kingdom.<sup>39</sup> In addition, Hezekiah apparently encouraged the collection and editing of various literary materials (cf. Prov 25:1); this literary activity was undoubtedly prompted by the destruction of the northern kingdom, and perhaps also the crisis surrounding Sennacherib's invasion. From the historical, archaeological as well as linguistic evidence then, we would expect that SBH as a cosmopolitan literary dialect. This being the case, the question is how much the literary dialect of Northern Hebrew differed from that which developed in Jerusalem. Given the similarity of the northern prophetic books such as Hosea and Amos to SBH (e.g., both use *ʾašer* and not *-še*) and the limited evidence for Northern Hebrew in the Elijah-Elisha narratives studied here, there is still little evidence for significant differences in the literary dialects of Samaria and Jerusalem. The evidence actually suggests that the main differences were in the spoken dialects of the northern and southern kingdoms." [Schniedewind-Sivan 1997](#) pp. 336-337. Nb. this article is to be commended for its methodology and conclusions

<sup>40</sup> 2 Sam. 8, 2 Sam 15, 2 Sam 20 1 Kings 1.

<sup>41</sup> Judges 18.

<sup>42</sup> Numbers 12;1.

<sup>43</sup> 1 Kings 20:34.

<sup>44</sup> E.g. 1 Kings 22.

<sup>45</sup> See [Holes 2004](#) pp. 86-89.

<sup>46</sup> "Verb endings and the historical moods. The mood system of Classical Arabic, in which the indicative, the subjunctive and the jussive are formally marked, is discontinued in Arabic dialects. As to these forms of the imperfect in which the indicative differs from both the subjunctive and the jussive in having a *-na* ending, namely the second person fem, sing. and the second and third person masc. plur., Arabic dialects can be classified into two groups. Most of the dialects have the vowels *īū* as the endings, while certain ... have an *īn/ūn* ending. The former reflect in their final morpheme a structural feature of the subjunctive/jussive of Classical Arabic, while the latter are modelled after the indicative.

In BH the aforementioned forms are historically patterned, as the case is in most of the Arabic dialects, after the subjunctive/jussive. Forms with a final *n* (historically patterned after the indicative) do occur, their statistical status being, however, marginal." Quoted from Classical Arabic dialects: [Morag 1989](#) p. 103.

<sup>47</sup> in [linguistics](#), a reflex is a corresponding [phoneme](#) in a [daughter language](#).

<sup>48</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Levantine\\_Arabic\\_Dialects](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Levantine_Arabic_Dialects).

"The old Proto-Biblical Hebrew interdentalals  $\underline{t}$  and  $\underline{d}$  are represented in BH by  $\underline{\text{š}}$  and  $\underline{z}$ . Arabic dialects do not disclose a homogeneous picture with regard to the reflexes they possess of  $\underline{t}$  and  $\underline{d}$  of Classical Arabic and may be classified into three main groups:"

- (a) dialects which have maintained the interdental articulation, mostly Beduin and rural, but also some urban.
- (b) dialects in which the interdentalals have become dental stops ( $\underline{t} > t$ ,  $\underline{d} > d$ ). This shift took place mostly in urban dialects.
- (c) dialects in which the interdentalals have become sibilants ( $\underline{t} > s$ ,  $\underline{d} > z$ )."

Most of Arabic dialects belong to the first two groups. Phonetically, the shift that BH evidences differs from that disclosed by the dialects which belong to group (b). In Hebrew, the base of articulation, but not the mode of articulation, changed (interdentals into sibilants) while in these Arabic dialects, like in Aramaic, the mode of articulation changed (fricatives into stops). " - quoted from [Morag 1989](#) pp. 98.

<sup>49</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Varieties\\_of\\_Arabic\\_dialects#Phonetic\\_variation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Varieties_of_Arabic_dialects#Phonetic_variation).

<sup>50</sup> E.g. the very different [Western](#) and Eastern Arabic dialects.

<sup>51</sup> See the important points made in [Huehnergard 1987](#).

<sup>52</sup> [Gibson 1971](#) pp. 5-20; relevant pages. I am excluding the [Gezer Calendar](#) for the reasons outlined in [Freedman 1992](#) p. 4.

<sup>53</sup> [Gogel](#) p. 335.

<sup>54</sup> Note, in reconstructed [EBHP] transliterations and sound files -

1. there is no spirantization of the *bgdkpt* consonants - [http://www.houseof david.ca/anc\\_heb\\_tequ.htm#bgdpt](http://www.houseof david.ca/anc_heb_tequ.htm#bgdpt);
2. vowel qualities are outlined here - [http://www.houseof david.ca/anc\\_heb\\_6.htm#ebhp\\_vow\\_qual](http://www.houseof david.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>55</sup> See [Gogel](#) sect. 2.3.3.

<sup>56</sup> [Gibson 1971](#) p. 11.

<sup>57</sup> 1 Kings 17:1.

<sup>58</sup> See *Phones and Phonemes* - [http://www.houseof david.ca/anc\\_heb\\_6.htm#phone\\_phonym](http://www.houseof david.ca/anc_heb_6.htm#phone_phonym).

<sup>59</sup> Ezra 10:21.

<sup>60</sup> See [Blau 1995](#)

<sup>61</sup> [Gogel](#), [Kang](#), [Dobbs-Allsop](#), [Davies1991](#), [Hoftijzer and Jongeling](#), [Renz](#), [Donner and Röllig](#), [Gibson 1971](#), [Young 2004](#), pp. 276-311, [Young, Rezetko, Ehrensverd 2008](#). chapt. 6. For the vocalization of these epigraphs see [Richter 1999](#) with the usual caviats.

<sup>62</sup> See [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 96.

<sup>63</sup> 2/2. (24-26) stands for chapter 2, item 2, pp. 24-26.

See also the reviews of this work by: André Caquot (*Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Feb., 1989), pp. 109-110); [Izre'el](#); Carleton T. Hodge (*Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Fall, 1985), pp. 319-326); [Huehnergard](#), Menahem Zevi Kaddari (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, Vol. 51, No. 2 (1988), p. 317).

<sup>64</sup> See [Jackson 1983](#).

<sup>65</sup> See also [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 95.

<sup>66</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>67</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>68</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>69</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>70</sup> IN BH (EBHP and LBHP) THE JUSSIVE (PC<sub>jus</sub>), COHORTATIVE (PC<sub>coh</sub>), IMPERFECT (PC<sub>imp</sub>) AND PRETERITE (PC<sub>pret\_sim</sub>/PC<sub>pretWC</sub>) are, in some forms, distinguished by the placement of syllabic stress when not carrying object suffixes. See -

- [http://www.adath-shalom.ca/history\\_of\\_hebrew3a.htm#indic\\_jus](http://www.adath-shalom.ca/history_of_hebrew3a.htm#indic_jus) AND

- [http://www.adath-shalom.ca/history\\_of\\_hebrew3a.htm#Prefix\\_Conjugation](http://www.adath-shalom.ca/history_of_hebrew3a.htm#Prefix_Conjugation)

<sup>71</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>72</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>73</sup> Not found in EH

<sup>74</sup> [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 95.

<sup>75</sup> [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 95.

<sup>76</sup> [Izre'el 1988](#) p. 95.