INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

S. Greenberg
6/4/99
Returned
6/8/99

AUTHOR LAURA SUZANNE LIEBER

TITLE An Ephramite Yankee in King David's Court:
Dialect in the Book of Judges

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [X]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [X]) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. X yes ___ no

2/26/99
Date

Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed 7.23.99
Date

R. Goldberg
Signature of Library Staff Member

AN EPHRAMITE YANKEE IN KING DAVID'S COURT:

Regional Dialect in the Book of Judges

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Rabbinical Ordination

by

Laura Suzanne Lieber

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati
1999

Referee, Prof. Stephen A. Kaufman

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Without the help and support of numerous people, it would not have been possible for me to write this thesis.

First of all, I would like to thank Professor Stephen Kaufman, who directed this thesis. As an editor, he was both patient and extraordinarily conscientious, reading over numerous drafts without delay and providing substantive and clear commentary. As a teacher, he was always accessible and supportive. Most importantly, as an advisor, he helped me negotiate those moments of despair and self-doubt which invariably accompany a project such as this. I hope that someday I will be able to emulate the brilliance of his insight and the breadth of his knowledge.

It would also have been impossible to write this thesis without the support and friendship of people too numerous to name. The friends I have made at HUC-JIR have been and, I pray, always will be, among the best friends I could ever have. I would like to single out Howard, Annie, and Emilie Voss-Altman, Judy and Lizzie Spicehandler, Audrey Korotkin and Don Clippinger, Mark and Sharon Holland, Joseph Meszler, Professor Susan Einbinder, John Brolley, Noni Rudavsky (and family), Jonathan Blake, and Ting Wang. Thanks to their friendship, I not only finished this project with my sense of humor intact, but I also was reminded that seeing the sun, seeing movies, and seeing human beings were all important parts of student life. I also owe a great debt of gratitude and an abundance of love to Jennifer Howard, who has been my best friend through every crisis and has never failed to support my dreams and aspirations. I would also like to thank Andrea Lieber, who is not just a cousin, but a friend, and someone who has been a role-model to me both in life and in scholarship. Furthermore, I will always remember the faculty members at the College-Institute for their devotion to texts and students of text, for their knowledge, insightfulness, and sense of *menschlikeit*. They have shaped my image of all that a rabbi can and should strive to be.

Finally, I would like to thank my family--Mom, Dad, Ken, and Debbie--for all their patience and love. I depended on them for unconditional, 24-hour support, and they were always there--whether I needed cheerleading, comforting, an audience for thinking aloud, or someone to help me put things in perspective. I dedicate this thesis to them.

Abstract

As a composition, the Hebrew Bible spans both centuries and geographical regions. It features characters as exalted as the deity and as lowly as lepers and slaves. And yet, until comparatively recently, it was assumed that the Hebrew spoken by characters in the context of Biblical narrative was, roughly, homogenous. Only in the last few decades have scholars begun to question the role of the Masoretes in "harmonizing" the language of the Bible and begun to study the text in a rigorous way, looking for examples of diglossia (formal and informal speech), "early" and "late" Hebrew, and regional language.

This thesis deals with the subject of regional speech variation. The corpus is limited to the reported speech found in the book of Judges. I have chosen to focus on reported speech in order to test the hypothesis that the redactors of the Hebrew Bible engaged in dialect-switching (the intentional use of different dialects depending on speaker and audience). The research is organized according to three major linguistic categories: morphophonetic evidence, lexical evidence, and syntactic evidence. At each level, different pericopes (specifically, characters within pericopes) contain evidence which indicates the possible presence of regionally-distinctive speech. The greatest concentration of dialectal speech (across the three categories) is found in passages spoken by Philistines and Samson (Judg. 13-16), although there is also evidence pointing towards regionalisms in the speech of Gideon (chs. 6-8), Jephthah and the Ephramites (11-12), and Micah (chs. 17-18). The place in which there is the most striking absence of dialectal speech is in the prose account of Deborah (ch. 4). Based on the evidence reported here, there seems to be some indication that the editors of the Hebrew Bible attempted to accurately report the non-Judahite speech patterns of tribes from the north and the trans-Jordan, as well as the foreign, coast-dwelling Philistines.

While a study such as this must be accompanied by repeated reminders that the evidence is, at best, merely an indication of potential and all conclusions tentative, the results of this study indicate that additional studies, both of Judges and of other Biblical texts, employing a similarly cautious methodology, could yield results which confirm or augment the conclusions presented here.

Introduction

"An Ephramite Yankee in King David's Court:"
Arguments for Regional Dialect in the Book of Judges

Dr. Katz, the fictional cartoon psychotherapist on cable television, ponders in one episode: How would it change our perception of Christianity if we imagine Jesus speaking like an "effeminate Southerner"? When the scene cuts from the therapist's office to a generic depiction of Jesus addressing his disciples, the regionally-tinged dialogue makes clear how strongly a character's way of speaking can affect his entire persona. As this segment of animation makes abundantly clear, dialect-switching (the self-conscious use of dialect by an editor or author) can be an impressive interpretive and performative device. It's amazing how inflection can change perception.

Part of the humor in this "Dr. Katz" segment derives from the implied sacrilege of a divine figure speaking in a non-mainstream manner--a stock comic trope employed by the likes of Monty Python and Mel Brooks. The idea of God speaking in any dialect (Southern, Boston Brahmin, Brooklyn, Surfer-Dude, etc.) is for some reason inherently funny. We intuitively extrapolate from this reaction that the entirety of the Bible--being a religious book--"ought not" have any kind of dialect, for if it did, the "Holy Book" might itself be implicitly sacrilegious, or at least something other than wholly serious. God does not speak slang, therefore God's prophets do not record it; and if the Israelites aren't prophets, they are the children of prophets. Therefore, the "revealed word" should be written (and, by extension, translated into) only in the most standard--and, by implication, formal--kind of language. Dialect, because it can be so sly and self-consciously funny, does not seem to fit the criteria of a suitable linguistic style for a sacred history. But why should our self-imposed rules limit the contents of an ancient text? Why should we not at least look for dialect in the Bible? As humorous as the use of dialect can be, and as important for Biblical scholarship as recognition of comedic aspects of the Bible is, dialect in the Bible could prove to be of far-ranging significance. Self-conscious use of regional language can be funny, but it doesn't have to be; it can also be a sophisticated

tool in the arsenal of a skilled author or editor. The presence of dialect, particularly if intentionally used, would render the Bible that much more complex and intriguing a document. The inspiration for this thesis comes from what seemed like an epiphany, courtesy of Chanan Brichto: the Bible might have a sense of humor, a self-aware playfulness. This realization affected my entire perception of the text. Suddenly the Bible became a sophisticated document in literary as well as editorial ways. Might not the language of the Tanakh reflect a finely tuned ear for spoken dialect as well as metaphor, irony, and other standard "macro" literary tropes?

So, perhaps there are dialects in the Bible. What kind of case can be made for their existence? Common sense tells us that Hebrew must have differed depending on time and location; the assertion that there were "Northern" and "Southern" (or, to use the terminology Rendsburg prefers, "Israelian" and "Judahite") varieties of Hebrew complements our own daily linguistic experiences. We only have to look to Aramaic for a comparable situation (Western and Eastern Aramaic). Likewise, the idea that dialect can greatly affect the meanings and reception of a "text" may seem to be self-evident--it being a device employed by Aristophanes in his depiction of Spartans in *Lysistrata*, Chaucer's ridicule of the Prioress' bad French accent, and Shakespeare's attempts to capture the irregularities Welsh-English in his Histories, not to mention a host of modern-period authors such as Stephen Crane and William Faulkner. Despite the plausibility of the supposition that there were dialects of Hebrew in Biblical times which could have been used in a literary context (orally or in written form), it has generally been taken for granted that the Bible does not reflect regionalisms or colloquialisms. Until scholars began looking for it, evidence of dialect was easily ignored or explained by alternate hypotheses.

Explanations other than dialect--including the automatic late-dating of Aramaicized texts and the categorization of problematic passages as corrupt--dominated the study of the Hebrew Bible's text until recent times. Only in the last twenty-five years have scholars seriously considered the question of whether the Hebrew Bible contains passages in dialect. Especially for readers raised in a monolingual society, the idea that there are dialects in foreign languages at all may be less than obvious. When the

language at hand is no longer a living language, as is the case with Biblical Hebrew, the presence of subtle variations in nuance--the phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactical clues to the presence of a dialect--may easily escape even attentive readers. Indeed, scholars cannot agree on the existence of Hebrew dialects in the Bible at all, let alone what kind. Specific methods of text study drawing on linguistics and comparative Semitic philology give the modern scholar tools with which to scrutinize the text for clues of regionalism and colloquialism. Once these tools have bolstered arguments in favor of the basic premise that Biblical Hebrew does preserve a variety of dialects, further questions arise: Does the text record dialogues which, say, reflect a Northern origin? Are "Aramaisms" clues to regionalism within the discourse rather than later origin of a passage? Can grammatical forms and constructions traditionally seen as "variants" or scribal errors be, in fact, clues to something of greater semantic importance? A search for dialects in the Hebrew Bible offers the chance to study old cruxes with new methods, and could cast familiar passages in a new light.

Scholarly Background to the Project

Before going any further with this pro-dialect line of argument, it is important to survey the general status of this kind of inquiry, which began in earnest the 1960s, and gained true momentum in the mid- to late-1980s. While, as stated above, there is no consensus that dialects of Biblical Hebrew even exist, certain texts provide strong bases in favor of just such an argument. At the turn of the century, C.F. Burney commented on the possible presence of dialect in both Judges and Kings; he could be credited with the discovery of dialect in Biblical Hebrew. H.L. Ginsberg, over his long career, continued Burney's work, classifying Deuteronomy, Hosea, Micah 6-7, Psalms 47, 77, 80, and 81, and Proverbs as "North Israelite texts" (25-38). P. Machinist has commented on the subject of code-switching in the speeches of the prophets.[1] Gary Rendsburg, perhaps the most prolific advocate of the existence "Israelian Hebrew" classifies stories in Judges

[1] C.F. Burney, The Book of Judges (1918) and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (1903), republished in one volume (New York: Ktav, 1970). H.L. Ginsberg, The Israelian Heritage of Judaism. New York: JTS, 1982. P. Machinist, "Assyria and Its Image in the first Isaiah," JAOS 103 (1983), 719-37.

dealing with northern and Transjordanian heroes "non-Judahite," as well as material from Kings dealing with the history of the Northern kingdom, the prophet Hosea, Nehemiah 9, psalms in addition to those cited by Ginsberg, and the last words of King David.[2] D.N. Freedman considers Job both northern and early; Kaufman has remarked on the dialectal significance of both Proverbs and the story of Balaam (Num. 22-24).[3] This last example is particularly significant because it highlights the role of extra-Biblical sources in this field of research. One can argue that the Biblical account of Balaam reflects a northern (more accurately, trans-Jordanian) linguistic influence based on its similarities in language, rhetorical style, and content to the Deir 'Alla Plaster Texts (which may be Aramaic or Canaanite--there is no consensus). Texts such as Deir 'Allah, as well as the corpus unearthed at Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra) and inscriptions in Phoenician, Moabite, Ammonite, Aramaic, and (epigraphic) Hebrew provide modern scholars texts in languages in varying degrees of proximity to Biblical Hebrew to which Biblical Hebrew may be compared. Such comparisons may shed light on the Hebrew of the Bible, which in turn can bolster arguments in favor of dialects. Here scholars must deal carefully with questions of how a dialect is defined, and justifications for the presence of a dialect when arguments other, equally strong arguments can be raised in favor of other explanations.

Amidst all this argument for and expansions of the idea of "Northern/Israelian Hebrew," it should be noted that some scholars, including Daniel Fredricks, remain skeptical about the entire enterprise. Objections raised by Fredricks and others (including myself) will be addressed in this study. For instance, Fredricks''s suggestion that much of what Rendsburg has called "northern" is actually colloquial raises an important

[2] Cf. Rendsberg's articles: "Israelian Hebrew Features in Genesis 49," Ma'arav 8 (1992), 161-170. "The Northern Origin of 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam. 23, 1-7)," Biblica 69 (1988), 113-21. "Additional Notes on 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23, 1-7)," Biblica 70 (1989), 403-408. "The Northern Origin of Nehemia 9," Biblica 72 (1991), 348-66. "Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew," Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew. Ed. W. R. Bodine. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 1992, 65-88. Also, his monograph: Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms. Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1990.

[3] See Freedman, "Orthographic Peculiarities in the Book of Job," Eretz-Israel 9 (1969), 35-44 and Kaufman, "The Classification of the North West Semitic Dialects of the Biblical Period and Some Implications Thereof," in Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Panel Sessions: Hebrew and Aramaic Languages; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988), 41-57.

point.[4] In attempting to explain anomalous features in a passage, it can be difficult to distinguish among factors such as levels of formalism/colloquialism, heightened emotional rhetoric and "emphasis," and regional dialect--not to mention the occasional corrupt text. The limited size of the Biblical corpus restricts our ability to come to definitive conclusions. It is the hope of this study to show how the evidence can point towards the presence of dialect in certain pericopes; I cannot hope to "prove" its existence in any context.

Despite such criticisms, however, the endeavor of finding evidence of dialect in the Hebrew Bible seems to be well under way, if not unquestioned. The current questions are, however, not so much "if" but "where" and "by what method." It is my contention in this paper that one of the "where"-questions can be answered "in the book of Judges." While a respectable number of texts have been scrutinized for the presence of dialect, Judges has been, comparatively speaking, a neglected document (aside from Burney's comments, despite reference to it by Rendsburg). Hence, it is my hope to apply the methods of close text study and comparative philology to this relatively overlooked text. I believe that this approach to the text of the Bible can yield new knowledge in a variety of cognate fields.

The insights into the text's language and style gained from a study of dialect in the Hebrew Bible will also reveal new information regarding the emergence of the text as we have it--the kind of Hebrew in use in Biblical times and the editors' skill and literary sensitivity. After all, a good author or editor uses only those literary devices which would be understood and appreciated by his (or her) audience. Hence, if dialectal passages are found in the Biblical text, one may assume that, at some point, the Biblical audience would have been aware of the subtlety. It is this keen sensitivity which has been lost on modern ears until recent times. Modern scholarship offers us a chance to

[4] Daniel C. Fredricks, "A North Israelite Dialect in the Hebrew Bible? Questions of Methodology." Hebrew Studies 37 (1996). 7-20. Fredricks does not support his argument with the marvellous passage in Eruvin 53a-b, where Rav notes: "The Judeans, who are careful in regard to their language--their learning is sustained. The Galileans, who are not careful with regard to their language--their learning is not sustained." The passage goes on to explain how the Judeans were in the habit of being exact in their use of language (orally) while the Galileans slur their gutterals and speak incomprehensibly. The Judean opinion of Galilean speech is summed up: גלילאה שוטה!

recapture an appreciation of such nuances. I believe that the study of dialect and related issues in Biblical Hebrew can offer modern readers a new appreciation of the texture within the language of Scripture, as well as provide clues to the context and development of Biblical Hebrew as a language.

Summary of Goals of the Thesis

In this paper, I propose to examine the direct speech (which means I am *excluding* chapter 5, the Song of Deborah, and all narrative prose) in book of Judges for evidence of dialect, in general, and dialect-switching, in particular. Why Judges? There is something of a consensus (if such things exist) among scholars that Judges is a composite work, knitted together by a Redactor (or Redactors) but with visible "seams." The "rough," unpolished nature of this text, especially given the diverse regions in which the episodes are set and the number of specific tribes and nationalities involved, makes the book a strong candidate for preservation of dialect. The "shibboleth" test (Judg. 12:5-6), for instance, comes to mind as one important passage in which the text consciously presents us with dialectal differences between two tribes. The numerous direct-discourse passages in this book, upon which I will focus my analysis, may represent a record of oral literature, or written literature trying to reproduce orality. Furthermore, on the basis of the data collected, we must ask: if we find indications of regional language, do we also assume that our evidence points towards "code-switching" or do we suppose that the whole pericope is Northern in origin and preserves dialect unintentionally? The tentative answers given to these questions will suggest the overall enrichment of our understanding of the Bible that a dialect-conscious approach to the text affords. The book of Judges represents a promising--but, as noted above, neglected--testing ground for this methodology. (A dialect-focused study could also lead to further advances in other, more "macro" level studies of the text, such as folklore- and orality-based research, as well as enriching the parent fields of linguistics and comparative Semitics.) Given these factors, the text of Judges presents an appropriate challenge for a testing of the hypothesis that there are dialects of Hebrew in the written text of the Bible.

Procedures

The methodology employed in the quest for evidence of dialect must be careful and multivalent. Regional dialects of a language can be present at many different levels: *morphophonetic* (compare "y'all" and "you all"--both informal; "warsh" and "wash"--both generally *spelled* the same; "burnt" and "burned"--either can be found at a variety of formality levels); *lexical* ("soda," "pop," "coke" or even "phosphate"--depending on regional preference); and *syntactical* (the Appalacian "I'm a-fixin' to..."). Of course, we have an advantage with examples in English--we know English well and have a vast corpus of spoken and written language to study. The Hebrew of the Bible presents a different case. As a linguistic corpus, it is limited and entirely written; we can't ever hear it (to determine if Ephramites said the equivalent of "park the car in Harvard yard" or "pahk the cah in hahvahd yahd"). We must also decide what level of credibility to assign to the Masoretic text (consonantal and vocalized). Furthermore, the Bible was repeatedly edited and redacted over a period of centuries, with the result that distinctive features may have been blurred, harmonized, or lost. Finally, it can be difficult to distinguish levels of formality and issues of stylistics from dialect studies--does an unusual word or structure represent an elevated speech style (the formal "deem" vs. the common "think"), a necessity of the larger syntactic context (as will be examined in the case of the redundant pronoun in chapter 3), or a geographic variation. In particular, scholars have too often neglected the differences between Hebrew poetry and prose as it related to syntax and word-choice. None of these factors--archaicism/lateness, formality/colloquialism, northern/southern, textual error--be separated into tidy packages. As Fredricks notes, "If standard literary Hebrew has some colloquialisms, but supposed northern texts have significantly more, perhaps this is due to a difference in professional scribal conventions which were more or less tolerant of the vernacular interrupting the literary style" (10). Northerners and southerners both undoubtedly used formal and colloquial varieties of Hebrew. A late text can archaicize in an attempt to sound ancient.

The issue of poetry deserves special attention. As Fredricks points out, the majority of texts upon which Rendsburg builds his case for the existence of dialect are poetic: Job, Proverbs, Song of Songs, the Song of Deborah, thirty-six psalms,

Ecclesiastes, Hosea, Amos, Jeremiah. He has limited his prose texts to stories concerning northern kings, judges, and heroes (including Elijah and Elisha). The conventions of different poetic genres make it likely that Hebrew poets would employ a larger vocabulary (as necessitated by parallelism) and work within a more formal (and conservative) rhetorical scheme.[5] Poetic diction is not standard spoken or written language; if anything, poetry tends to crystallize the standard language of an earlier period, either representing actual archaic language or intentionally archaicizing its rhetoric.[6] It is for these reasons that I have chosen to exclude the Song of Deborah from my study of dialect; I am interested specifically in reported speech, not in poetry, which presents a different genre.

However, I disagree with Fredricks' suggestion that what Rendsberg terms characteristics of "Israelian Hebrew" are merely colloquialisms. Fredricks argues that the features to which Rendsburg points are colloquial rather than northern (differing in formality rather than region) and criticizes Rendsburg preference for studying poetic texts. But poetry is the antithesis of *colloquial*. If anything, the shared presence of unusual words, forms, and structures in direct speech and poetry indicates something unusual about the speech--either the prose text is archaic (in reality or in form), or its poetic vocabulary suggests that the speaker is drawing from a "non-normative" (i.e., Northern/Israelian) language base. Furthermore, should this study concur with Fredricks that northern texts are more "porous to colloquialisms" (10) than Judahite texts, we would have discovered something valuable and distinctive about regional differences in Biblical language. In any case, level of formality and connection to poetry are two important issues to keep in mind during this study--the first in reference to syntax, the second to lexicography--but they are not issues that should be brought together this directly.

Given the numerous variables and alternate explanations affecting the study of reported speech in Judges for evidence of dialect, I divided my research into several

[5] With regard to poetic genres, poetic prophecy will be handled particularly carefully. As Machinist and Kaufman both note, prophets from any region can employ code-switching--the affectation of an "accent" when speaking to non-locals (either Israelite or foreign).

categories, each with its own methodology and caveats. The first chapter will address issues of phonology and morphology; the second, lexicography; the third, syntax. Morphology is the area where Masoretic vocalization is most suspect and scribal error the likely source of the interesting feature at hand. Lexical attempts to locate dialect present different difficulties. In particular, we have to try to avoid circular reasons, e.g., I decide Ecclesiastes is a northern text, and then cite shared vocabulary between Judges and Ecclesiastes--have I proven anything? Evidence from other Northwest Semitic texts helps correct this kind of error. Finally, in the field of syntax, we must be careful to distinguish those constructions which may look unusual at first but, in fact, serve specific, specialized rhetorical functions within the larger context. Certain features may be distinctive to reported speech rather than dialect, and we must be careful to distinguish aspects of language such as emphasis and formality. After all, it is one thing to suggest that different regions prefer certain words and idioms; it is another to suggest their syntax differs (recall the recent debate about Ebonics). In the chapter on syntax, the primary question will be: how else could this have been said? Throughout this study, the criteria Rendsburg calls "distribution" (Linguistic Evidence 15), the distinct clustering of certain lexemes, and "opposition," (16) where a common Judahite word could have been used in place of the more unusual word, will be employed, in addition to the comparative evidence. Once these three areas have been surveyed, we will see what more extensive conclusions can be drawn regarding the presence (or absence) of regional language in the reported speech in the book of Judges. What will emerge will not be conclusive, but it will hopefully display how the "*gestalt*" of evidence when taken together indicates the presence of dialect in the reported speech of Judges.

The purpose of this study, again, is not to provide answers but rather to help frame questions in a way that will make further study in the field of dialect more productive. With this warning in mind, we turn our attention to the first chapter: morphology.

Chapter One

"Funny, You Don't Sound Like You're From These Parts:" Phonological and Morphological Evidence for Regionalism

Gary Rendsburg notes that "for the purposes of linguistic classification, the morphological evidence remains primary" ("Morphological Evidence" 70). While this sentiment should not be pushed too far--phonological, lexical, and syntactical evidence have a significant place in any discussion of regional variation--no study of dialect would be complete without a study of morphology. By "morphology" I mean both morphophonemic and morphsyntactic material. For purposes of this chapter, we will accept (at least for the moment) the Masoretic text as-is, both consonants and vowels (the subject of textual emendation will be addressed in the course of the discussion). Due to the small number of interesting morphological cases in the reported speech of Judges, I have also decided to include in this chapter the few phonological peculiarities which occur. As Rendsburg notes, "Phonological differences between Israelian and Judahite Hebrew no doubt existed" (70). This chapter will suggest a few places where such distinctions could be found.

As a starting point for my analysis, I have taken the various morphological categories studied by Rendsburg. It can--and has--been argued that Rendsburg's classification is too broad; however, I intend to cast my net wide and then evaluate all my "catch." The book of Judges is a short corpus; the amount of reported speech is still smaller. I would, therefore, rather take the time to winnow the "wheat" from the "chaff" than restrict my body of evidence.

Before we can begin studying the book of Judges for evidence of dialect at any level, however, we have to address a thorny issue: what constitutes an "Israelian" or "Northern" source, *a priori*? How do we know how to classify those texts to which we are comparing the text of Judges?

To a great extent, I have employed the same textual classifications as Rendsburg, as outlined in Linguistic Evidence. This means that first of all, we take into consideration setting and character--stories set in the Northern kingdom or prominently featuring non-Judahite speakers are significant. This means that Num. 22-24 (with strong Aramaic

and Trans-Jordanian influence visible in the language Balaam and Balak, possibly as a result of code- switching), pericopes set in Shiloh and Shechem, the Elijah and Elisha cycles, the Laban cycle in Genesis, as well as the stories of Northern kings will all be considered "northern" texts. As Rendsburg notes:

> An examination of the language of these pericopes reveals that these stories include a disproportionate number of grammatical and lexical items which are non-standard within BH but which often have parallels in Phoenician, Moabite, Aramaic, etc." (9).

On the basis of the linguistic features of these passages and comparison with cognate languages, Rendsburg has identified 2 Sam. 23:1-7 (David's last words) as Israelian. Using similar methodology, other scholars, notably Dahood, have argued that Ecclesiastes is heavily influenced by Phoenician (9-10 nn. 36-38). Similarly, the other major works of "wisdom literature" (Proverbs and Job, as well as the "wisdom tropes" in the prophets) can also be classified as "Northern" on the basis of the exceptional amount of Aramaic and Trans-Jordanian influence evident in their language.[1] Other books classified as non-Judahite include Song of Songs and Hosea.[2] Avishur has also noted significant commonalities in word-pairs between Ugaritic and Deut. 32 (440). C. Rabin has written on the unusual aspects of the langauge of Amos and Hosea, which leads Rendsburg to include them as samples of IH as well.[3] We should also consider stories and poetry dealing with prominent Northern figures as potential respositories of Northern language and tradition (i.e., the blessings of the tribes, excluding Judah and Simeon, in Gen. 49; stories centering on Joseph, whose progeny form the Northern kingdom; and the story of the Gold Calf--symbol of the North--which may have once been a positive narrative told in praise of Aaron). Rendsburg also includes Neh. 9 as Northern (12). Finally, we should remember that Ginsberg went so far as to classify Deuteronomy as of "Israelian Origin:"

> It can be shown that Deuteronomy is strongly influenced both in primary and in secondary passages by the diction of the Israelian book of Hosea, that it also

[1] See S.A. Kaufman, "Classification," 54-55, for remarks on both Proverbs and Job.

[2] Avishur, Word-Pairs, 440.

[3] C. Rabin, „לשונם של אמוס והושע," in עיונים בספר תרי עשר (ed. B.Z. Luria; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1981). 117-136.

adopts Hosean ideas, and that it even legislates measures in response to Hosean denunciations...If this is demonstrated, it will follow that Proto-Deuteronomy arose in a different area from Isaiah...in other words, in the kingdom of Israel between about 740 and about 725 B.C.E. (19).

I would also like to refer the reader the discussion of the term "בני ישראל" in Jud. 1:1 (below, in Ch. 2).

In addition to texts of direct Northern origin, we should also note that late (exilic and post-exilic) texts, such as Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and Chronicles, as well as 2 Isaiah, may well preserve features similar to IH, in that they are likely to have a greater tendancy to Aramaicize. Also, as Rendsburg notes, it is likely that Israelians continued to live in the north after 721 BCE and were mingled with the returnees of all backgrounds under Ezra and Nehemiah (12-13). Another category to include is that of code-switching. By "code switching," I am referring to the phenomenon of speakers who color their speech according to the language of the group they are addressing; specifically, I have in mind 1 Isaiah and Jeremiah (who both address the nations), as well as Obadiah (who address Edom), Micah (addresses the North), and Nahum (addresses Assyria).[4] I will note in my discussion when I cite passages from the prophets addressing the nations or the kingdom of Ephraim.

Finally, we should list those Psalms which Rendsburg classifies as "Israelian" in the course of his analysis: 9-10, 16, 29, 36, 45, the Korah psalms (42-49, 84-85, 87-88), 53, 58, 74, the Asaph psalms (50, 73-83), 116, 132, 133, 140, and 141. I will consider these texts as non-Judahite for the purposes of this study. In particular, comparisons with Joshua, a text with which Judges shares many lexemes, and even extended stories, will be important.

As this extensive list makes clear, there is a large but definable body of potentially Israelian Hebrew within the Masoretic text. These texts form the background against which the langauge of the reported speech in Judges will be compared. The texts outlined above will be refered to as samples of "IH," while all the other texts in the Hebrew Bible will be considered examples of "JH." Distinctions regarding prose and poetry, as noted in the introduction, will also be maintained.

[4] See, for instance, what P. Machinist has to say on the subject in his article, "Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah," JAOS 103 (1983), 719-37.

With these basic premises governing our study as a whole, let us turn and examine specifically the unusual phonetic and morphological features within the reported speech of the book of Judges and see what patterns, if any, emerge.

מָה Before Non-Laryngeal Consonants

In chapter 16 of Judges, there is a striking cluster of an atypical vocalization: „בָּמָּה" before a non-laryngeal, where one would expect the normal „בַּמָּה" (16:5*bis*, 16:6*bis*, 16:10, 13, and 15). Normally, we find dissimilation of this sort only before a word beginning with ה, ע, ח; in the instances cited below, we appear to have dissimilation in contexts not requiring such a shift. Rendsburg notes twenty-eight similar instances of „מָה" (either alone or with a preposition attached) where standard Masoretic vocalization would be „מָה" ("Morphological" 71; Linguistic Evidence 25-6). For those scholars who choose to set aside the vocalization of the Hebrew text because of its late date, this irregularity poses no problem. However, if we assume that the Masoretes had some tradition behind their vocalization, these occurrences merit investigation.

Limiting our survey of this irregularity to prose texts (i.e., excluding the twelve poetic occurrences from our study), it is possible to detect a regional bias in the feature. Within Judges, all occurances of this vocalization are in the speeches of Philistines (including Delilah). Similarly, in 1 Sam. 4:6, 6:2, and 29:4, the speaker using the form is Philistine. In 1 Sam. 1:18 (three times!), the speaker is Elkanah, an Ephramite, while in 4:14, Eli, the priest of the shrine in Shiloh, uses the form. Samuel--raised in Shiloh--uses the form in 1 Sam. 15:14. In 1 Ki. 22:16 and 2 Chron. 18:15 (identical texts), we find Ahab (a northern king) speaking, and in 2 Ki. 1:7, his son Ahaziah. Elisha uses the unusual form in 2 Ki. 4:13 and 4:14. If we consider Proverbs "prose" (debatable), then we have examples from 4:10 (which falls in the heavily Phoenician first ten chapters) and in 31:2 (the mother of Lemuel, king of Massa).[5] Also from wisdom literature, we have one such usage in Job (7:21). This leaves only two prose instances unexplained: Ex. 22:26 (divine speech) and 33:16 (Moses). If we relegate these two instances to percentage of distribution, we still have a majority of cases in favor of dialect.

Aside from the two cases in Exodus, it appears that in prose contexts this form

[5] Israel Eph'al places Massa in the Syrian desert in The Ancient Arabs (Jerusalem: Magnes/Leiden: Brill, 1982. pp. 218-19). Rendsburg accepts this opinion.

occurs only in direct speech and in the mouths of characters with a strong connection to the north (Eli, Elkanah, Ahab, Ahaziah, Elisha, and the mother of Lemuel) or the central coast (the Philistines and Delilah). None of the characters who uses the unusual form ever speaks using the anticipated מָה- (with or without preposition) in the expected places.[6] Given the simultaneous usage of the regular construction side-by-side with these anomalous forms, we can suggest that this reflects an instance of dialect-switching, reflecting the real or perceived way speakers from the coastal and northern regions spoke. Indeed, by eliminating poetry from consideration, Rendsburg's conclusion can be stated with even greater certainty: "On the basis of this evidence, one may postulate an isogloss stretching from Philistia in the southwest through central and northern Israel to Massa in the northeast" ("Morphological" 71).[7] It seems that in Israelian Hebrew, dissimilation could occur in words preceding non-laryngeals. If this strikes us as unusual, it may be the author's way of telling us, Those people talk a little funny.

So-Called Inflected Participles

Rendsburg notes that eight times in the Bible, we find participles (active and passive) inflected as if they were finite verbs ("Morphological" 82-84). He suggests that this feature should be considered a category of what Gesenius calls "*hiriq compaginis*" (§91n). Gesenius explains that inflection lends the participle "more dignity" (253), suggesting that in some contexts, it stems from a close relationship to the word that follows (the form implying a kind of "construct" relationship--hence its inclusion in a section dealing with remants of case endings; it could be a remnant of the old genitive suffix). In other contexts, the suffix serves "as an ornamental device of poetic style" (ibid.).

The one instance (occurring twice) of such a "portmonteau" word in Judges, however, fails to gain the attention of either author above. As it happens, it is a case not involving the *hiriq compaginis*, but I cite Rendsburg and Gesenius because the form in Judges could be considered "mixed." Due to the lack of the *hiriq*, it has been easy for readers made uncomfortable by the mixed form to simply emend the text's vocalization

[6] Interestingly, Saul (a Benjamite) does *not* use the dissimilated form where we would normally expect it: וַיֹּאמֶר שָׁאוּל נִגְּשׁוּ הֲלֹם כֹּל פִּנּוֹת הָעָם וְדָעוּ וּרְאוּ בַּמָּה הָיְתָה הַחַטָּאת הַזֹּאת הַיּוֹם (1 Sam. 14:38).

[7] I would suggest that Philistia be considered central rather than southern.

and move on. Indeed, I am reluctant to place too much weight on a single word! However, it presents an interesting case. Our text is: כִּי הִנָּךְ הָרָה **וְיֹלַדְתְּ** בֵּן וּמוֹרָה לֹא-יַעֲלֶה עַל-רֹאשׁוֹ כִּי-נְזִיר אֱלֹהִים יִהְיֶה הַנַּעַר מִן-הַבָּטֶן וְהוּא יָחֵל לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד פְּלִשְׁתִּים (Jud. 13:5). In the A-part of the verse (angelic speech), we have the construction beginning with הנה completed by the unusual combination of *vav* + f.s. participle + 2.f.s perfect suffix.[8] When Manoach's wife reports the prophecy of Samson's birth to her husband, she duplicates the construction although her retelling deviates from the angel's words in other ways (13:7). Now, if we choose to revocalize the text, we simply change the *holom* of the participle to a *qamatz*, and we are left with a perfect-consecutive. This emendation would render the phrase a result clause: "[For your are pregnant,] and then you will bear a son." BHS suggests this emendation, citing the 2.f.s. perfect in vs. 3. However, a result clause does not make the best sense in this particular case. The other option for this form is to regard it as an alternate vocalization of the Tiberian participle: וְיֹלֶדֶת. This harmonizes the two verbs in the overall construction (הָרָה is a f.s. participle). Both of these suggestions attempt to preserve the consonantal text while freely emending the vocalization in order to make it conform to standard Biblical Hebrew rules.

Rendsburg cites eight cases of what he considers mixed (portmonteau) forms. Three of these anomolies occur in prose: Gen. 31:39 (twice), Jacob speaking to Laban; and 2 Ki. 4:23, uttered by a Shunamite man in Issachar). The other five are in *ketiv/qere* situations, where the Masoretes themselves found the consonantal situation problematic. Most of these cases result from the fact that the consonantal suffix found is -תי, the archaic 2.f.s. perfect suffix (the *qere* effectively deletes the *yod* but three times--twice in Jer. 22:23, once in 51:13--it creates the mixed perfect-participle form found in Judges 13). There is no syntactic context linking the different occurances of the form forms; i.e., we cannot claim that this form is somehow linked to a particular type of result clause. Thus if we were to venture a creative guess, aside from the suggestion of regionalism, we could suggest that the Masoretes used this mixed vocalization to preserve a mixed tradition--one employing the participial vocalization, one the perfect consecutive. This suggestion, however, is neither more nor less credible than that of dialect.

[8] The exact same phrase, הִנָּךְ הָרָה וְיֹלַדְתְּ בֵּן, is found in Gen. 16:11, where an angel informs Rebecca of the two nations struggling in her womb. Does the angel inflect his language to benefit Rebecca, sister of Laban the Aramean?

Perhaps, rather than seeing this form as a synthetic solution to a textual problem (the attempt to reconcile two traditions, one with participle and one with the perfect), we should view it, as noted above, as an alternative vocalization of the participle. It is not an "inflected participle" at all, but a bi-form of the standard participle. The f.s. participle is, in fact, a segolate, and was originally probably something like *יוֹלֶדֶת. Now, according to Phillipi's Law, short /i/ can become short /a/ in certain environments. Specifically, short /i/ or /a/ in a stressed, doubly-closed (but not geminate) syllable becomes short /a/ in Tiberian Hebrew. What we have in Jud. 13:5 is a case where the segolate of the participle appears to have been resolved according to this rule (the last syllable being stressed and doubly-closed) rather than formed as a standard segolate. As is known from other dialects of Hebrew and Aramaic (the Babylonian vocalization of the text, the Samaritan Pentateuch), the speakers of Semitic languages do not always distinguish between segol and patah. This form could represent an alternative evolution of the f.s. participle, rather than an archaic perfect construction.

Can this morphological irregularity clue us in to the existence of dialect? Not independently. First of all, in Judg. 13:5 (as in Gen. 16:11), it is found in divine speech (though repeated by Manoach's wife, presumably a Danite). We could argue that the angel is engaging in code-switching--affecting a Danite accent when speaking to a Danite woman--but that is quite a bit of weight to put on one vowel. Furthermore, the form of the participle found in Judg. 13:5 differs from the kinds of forms with which Rendsburg deals. Rendsburg supports his categorization of the *hiriq compaginis* form as "Israelian" by citing parallel constructions in Aramaic, including examples from Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targum to Ketuvim--both texts, it should be noted, written in late Jewish literary Aramaic--and the Babylonian Talmud, also a very late (and an Eastern) text ("Morphological" 83).[9] The form in Judges seems to complement the category of *hiriq compaginis*, but does not belong to the same class. We cannot, of course, have epigraphic evidence of this form, as the epigraphic texts lack vowels. Finally, while the three prose instances cited by Rendsburg occur in contexts in which we might anticipate northern speech features, the sample remains small and cannot really a satisfy the demands of "distribution" as a category. Nevertheless, if we assume the Masoretes had

[9] Rendsburg bases his references to Aramaic on works by Dalman, Margolis, and Epstein--names not noted for their radical interpretation of data.

some reason for vocalizing a word in this unusual way (here and in the other instances), we can attach some significance to this unusual form of the participle.

Doubled Plurals

Rendsburg disusses this construction several times in his study of Psalms, citing as examples phrases such as בני אלים (Ps. 29:1), בנות מלכים (45:10), נדיבי עמים (47:10), ראשי תנינים (74:13), שנות עלמים (77:6), מלאכי רעים (78:49), and ארצות החיים (116:9); in fact, he concludes that the doubled plural is an "element of I[sraelian] H[ebrew]" (Linguistic Evidence 84). The doubled plural is one in which the *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum* of a construct are in the plural. As Rendsburg notes, Gevirtz--citing Phoenician inscriptions, the Amarna letters from Byblos, and the Song of Deborah (which Gevirtz, like many others since Burney at the turn of the century, considered "northern")--was the first to consider the doubled plural an element of northern style (35-36). It can also be found in late Biblical texts such as Chronicles.

While Gevirtz and Rendsburg both remark on the presence of this construction in the Song of Deborah, there are two instances of this construction in the prose of Judges (neither cited by Rendsburg). The first passage is as follows: וַיֹּאמֶר אֲדֹנִי-בֶזֶק שִׁבְעִים מְלָכִים בְּהֹנוֹת יְדֵיהֶם וְרַגְלֵיהֶם מְקֻצָּצִים הָיוּ מְלַקְּטִים תַּחַת שֻׁלְחָנִי כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי כֵּן שִׁלַּם-לִי אֱלֹהִים וַיְבִיאֻהוּ יְרוּשָׁלַם וַיָּמָת שָׁם (Jud. 1:7). These words are in the mouth of Adoni-Bezek, a Canaanite king. The suspect phrase is „בהונות ידיהם ורגלים מקצצים"--the words for "digits" and "hands/feet" all being plural. The phrase is unusual for several reasons. We might, first of all, expect some kind of disjunctive particle before the word "digits" (most likely -ב, i.e., "*with* the digits of his hands and feet cut off"). We might also expect the word for "digits" to be repeated in each construction. Secondly, the word בהונות is unusual; the word אצבעות is the standard term. In fact, the phrase וְאֶצְבְּעוֹת יָדָיו וְאֶצְבְּעוֹת רַגְלָיו שֵׁשׁ וָשֵׁשׁ occurs in 2 Sam. 21:20; similarly, in the Aramaic of Daniel we find the phrase חֲסַף [וּמִנְהֵין] פַּרְזֶל וּמִנְהֵון [מִנְהֵין] וְאֶצְבְּעָת רַגְלַיָּא מִנְהֵון (2:42). These concerns, however, are lexical and syntactical, not morphological. In all these cases, the double plural construction is employed, regardless of which lexeme appears.

While Rendsburg considers this kind of phrase "Israelian," I cannot see how the singular could be used in this particular construction (for that matter, putting either *nomen* in, say, בני אלים into the singular radically changes the meaning). Both "digits"

and "hands/feet" need to be plural, for multiple toes/fingers were cut off of dual hands and feet. (The examples from Samuel and Daniel also employ the double plural; it is an unavoidable feature, semantically.) This, I suspect, is the reason why Rendsburg does not cite this particular example to support his argument that the double plural is a feature of Israelian Hebrew, despite the fact that it is found in the speech of a non-Judahite.

The second example of the doubled plural, however, offers perhaps a more tantalizing opportunity to see evidence for dialect. In 14:12-13, Samson makes a bet with the Philistines of Timnah that he can propound a riddle they cannot solve. Whoever wins the bet will receive from the loser "שְׁלֹשִׁים סְדִינִים וּשְׁלֹשִׁים חֲלִפֹת בְּגָדִים"-- "thirty linen tunics and thirty sets of clothing." While it is difficult to imagine another way in which this concept could be expressed (although בגד--singular and plural--by itself occurs 218 times), the only other place where this specific phrase is used is in 2 Ki. 5 (vss. 5, 22, 23), the story of the Aramean general Naaman and the prophet Elisha.[10] It is striking that all five occurances of this doubled plural are in the Samson story and the Naaman story. It seems possible, at least, that we have here an example of a Northern turn of phrase, shared by Samson the Danite and Naaman the Aramean.

Prepositions -ב *and* -ל *for "from"*

Rendsburg, following in the footsteps of Dahood, notes that sometimes the prepositions -ב and -ל can mean "from," a function normally associated with the preposition (מן).[11] Until the discovery of Ugaritic, which uses -ב and -ל to mean "from" in certain contexts, scholars were sometimes tempted to emend the -ב and -ל to -מ. Caution must be used in the translation of -ב and -ל as "from," however; rather than viewing the prepositions as independent morphemes, we must recognize them as being part of a

[10] Take, for instance, the English phrase "pair of pants:" the original "pant" was an individual leg, made into a "pair" by lacing two of them together. Now, however, we hear in advertising the phrase "elegent men's pant." Similarly, it is possible that the terms "clothes" (בגדים) and "pairs of clothes" (חלימות בגדים) could be bi-forms for expressing the same concept.

[11] Rendsburg pp. 80-81. As Dahood stated: "The simple fact that b and l both denote 'from' in Ugaritic opens up untold possibilities for reaching the meaning of the Biblical text" (Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology, Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1965, p. 26). Dahood's translation of Psalms in the Anchor Bible series reflects this attitude. It is interesting to note that as early as Rambam it was well-known that sometimes 'mn' had to be translated as if it were 'b' (see Ramban on Gen. 8:21).

syntactic package with the verb that governs them.[12] One text from Judges offers an object lesson regarding this danger. In Judg. 7:10 we have a construction where a cursory reading might cause the reader to wonder why we find -ל in a context where we might expect -מ. The verse at hand involves the root ירא in the sense of "to be afraid of doing something." Generally, we expect Semitic-language speakers to fear "from" things, and the root ירא does favor the preposition מן. However, in the context of Judg. 7:10 (and also Gen. 19:30, 26:7; Num. 12:8; and 2 Sam. 1:14, 10:19, and 12:18), the syntactic package ירא ל- can easily be translated as "to be afraid *to do* something." The use of -ל poses no problem at all; no recourse to Ugaritic is required. Furthermore, the other instances of this particular construction offer no support for the classification of ירא ל- as northern or Israelian--the speakers involved are all classifiable as "Judahite" (King David, the narrator of Genesis and the Succession Narrative, and--arguably!--God). If anything, this particular phrase is good *Judahite* Hebrew.

I offer this brief discussion not as an attempt to prove the presence of dialect but rather as a methodological caution against the hasty application of any classification system. This admonition made, there is, in fact, an example of the preposition -ל meaning "from" in the book of Judges--in 17:2, the speech of Micah the Ephramite. This verse states: וַיֹּאמֶר לְאִמּוֹ אֶלֶף וּמְאָה הַכֶּסֶף **אֲשֶׁר לֻקַּח-לָךְ** וְאָתְּי [וְאַתְּי] אָלִית וְגַם אָמַרְתְּ בְּאָזְנָי הִנֵּה-הַכֶּסֶף אִתִּי אֲנִי לְקַחְתִּיו וַתֹּאמֶר אִמִּי בָּרוּךְ בְּנִי לַיהוָה. The phrase אשר לקח לך must be translated as "which was taken *from you*." This example is so striking I only wonder how it escaped Rendsburg's notice. Judg. 17:2 does, in my opinion, contain a usage of the preposition -ל which is likely to be dialectal (this usage of the pronoun being known from Phoenician and, as Rendsburg notes, Biblical Hebrew in Israelian contexts).

This concludes the discussion of those constructions identified by Rendsburg as indicating dialect which are found in the book of Judges. There are, however, a few noteworthy aspects of the text of Judges involving features not discussed by Rendsburg. I will outline these items briefly. It is possible that further research into these features--

[12] I am not accusing Rendsburg of sloppiness on this account! I am just reminding the reader that prepositions must always be translated in context. For a full discussion of the need to translate Ugaritic prepositions in conjunction with their governing verbs, see the article by Dennis Pardee, "The Preposition in Ugaritic," UF 7 (1975), pp. 329-378.

particularly work drawing on comparative semitics--could reveal or confirm the regional significance of these features.

Phonological Variations

Let us know turn our attention from morphosyntactic issues to those of phonetics.[13] A well-known--possibly the best-known--passage in the book of Judges directly addresses this issue: the famous "shibboleth" test (12: 6). David Marcus, Gary Rendsburg, A.F.L. Beeston, and P. Swiggers have all approached the task of defining and interpreting the word "shibboleth" from a comparative Semitics perspective.[14] These scholars debate not only the meaning of the word itself (is it from the proto-Semitic **sblt*, meaning "ear of corn"? or perhaps related to the Hebrew שְׁבִיל, "roadway, course"?--to name a few of the most common options, both of which and more are cited in BDB) but also argue about what sounds, exactly, the Hebrew letters of the Biblical text are supposed to represent. What is the sound of the dialect which the Gileadites are mocking, and what, linguistically, can account for the phonetic changes between the two tribes? Swiggers (like Speiser) argues that the Gileadites still had the Proto-Semitic *ṯ* which the Hebrew alphabet represented with שׂ (no diacritical point); the Ephramites at that time pronounced the proto-semitic *ṯ* as *s*, but our text could not represent both sounds with the same consonant, or the story would lose its meaning. Hence a scribe resorted to the letter שׂ "probably because this sibilant [s] was articulatorily the nearest to s" (207). Rendsburg and Beeston also approach this text with reference to the confusion of *s*, *š*, and *ṯ*. Marcus rejects the theories of these scholars, however. Instead, he argues that the entire episode exists simply to satirize the Ephraimites. "As part of this satire, the shibboleth episode ridicules the Ephraimites who are portrayed as incompetent nincompoops who cannot even repeat a test-word spoken by the Gileadite guards...Instead of saying 'God save the Queen!' they say 'God shave the Queen!'"

[13] Rendsburg addresses phonology in Linguistic Evidence, but he does not discuss the specific phonetic variations involved here.

[14] See A.F.L. Beeston, "Hebrew *Sibbolet* and *Sobel*," JSS 24 (2), Autumn, 1979, 175-7 and "*Sibbolet*: A Further Comment," JSS 33 (2), Autumn, 1986, 259-61. David Marcus, "Ridiculing the Ephramites: the *Shibboleth* Incident (Judg. 12:6)," Ma'arav 8 (1992), 95-105. P. Swiggers, "The Word *Sibbolet* in Jud. XII.6," JSS 26 (2), Autumn, 1981, 205-207. And Rendsburg, "More on the Hebrew *sibbolet*," JSS 33 (2), Autumn, 1986, 255-8.

(100-101). The scholarly debate (usually good-natured) shows no signs of resolution.

I do not aim to solve the riddle of the shibboleth here; such is not the purpose of this chapter. Rather, the episode in Judg. 12:6 and the ensuing academic debate make it clear that the Ephramites spoke Hebrew differently than did the Gileadites; the "problematic consonant" was a problem for northern speakers. The exact nature of the difference is in the realm orthography, however; what cannot be denied is that this passage comes to teach us specifically that different tribes sounded different when they spoke Hebrew, and the tribes were aware of this regionalism and could even exploit it. If anything, the shibboleth incident is the most explicit example of consciously employed, regional speech variation in the whole Tanakh.[15]

Another example from Judges falls into the category of phonological variation, although it is less clear-cut.[16] In 16:25, the Philistines say: ...וַיֹּאמְרוּ קִרְאוּ לְשִׁמְשׁוֹן וְיַשַּׂחֶק-לָנוּ. The important word here is יְשַׂחֵק, from the root שׂחק. In the concluding part of the verse, where the narrative tells us how this commandment was fulfilled, we are told: וַיִּקְרְאוּ לְשִׁמְשׁוֹן מִבֵּית הָאֲסוּרִים [הָאֲסִירִים] וַיְצַחֵק לִפְנֵיהֶם.. The narrative voice uses the root צחק. The words clearly mean the same thing--one verb anticipates the action completed by the other. However, the author of this passage chose to put one form in the mouth of the Philistines while reserving the other form for the narrative. The root שׂחק is also used two verses later (in 16:27) to describe Samson's "sporting" in front of the Philistine crowd. This switch in roots may or may not have dialectal significance. On the one hand, the root שׂחק occurs frequently in poetic texts classified as non-Judahite (Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes account for seventeen of thirty-seven occurrences); non-"northern" poetic texts (Jeremiah in situations not likely to contain code-switching; Habbaukuk; and Psalms 2, 37, 52, 59, and 104) yield another nine; and "late" texts generally categorized as Exilic or post-Exilic and hence more influenced by Aramaic and Galilean Hebrew (1 and 2 Chronicles, Zechariah) provide another four.[17] The remaining

[15] A similar phenomenon can be found in Samaritan, which appears to have preserved שׁ but not שׂ (e.g., Gen. 24:2, where we find שׁים-נא in the Samaritan instead of the Tiberian שׂים-נא).

[16] In the speech in Jud. 10:11-14, God uses first the root צעק (vs. 12) and then זעק (vs. 14). Whatever the reason for the switch in root, it cannot be dialect.

[17] The influence of nothern Hebrew on late Biblical Hebrew was first postulated by C.H. Gordon in "North Israelite Influence on Post-Exilic Hebrew," IEJ 5 (1955), 85-88. As Rendsburg notes, Y. Kutscher accepted this view in his History of the Hebrew Language, Jerusalem: Magnes, 1982. Of course,

cases of the root occur in 1 and 2 Samuel (all verses dealing with David and his dancing before God) and in the verses from Judges cited here. The root צחק, by contrast, occurs eleven times in Genesis, in the patriarchal narratives dealing with the birth of Isaac (hardly coincidence!) and in the Joseph Story. It can also be found once in Exodus and in the narrative portion of Jud. 16:25. It also happens that שחק/סחק prevails in Rabbinic Hebrew (which may have Galilean origins and was certainly influenced by Aramaic). In Rabbinic times, however, the root צחק was still used occasionally.

Is this information conclusive? Possibly. One can argue that שחק is favored by "northern" and "late" texts, and account for the presence of the root in Davidic passages on the basis of lexical difference.[18] The word does fit the pattern mentioned in the introduction--it is a "poetic" word found in narrative (צחק being a strictly prose root). However, the distribution within prose is not overwhelmingly "northern." We should note that this root has an extremely complex phonetic history. The proto-semitic root is *d-h-k or *d-h-q; all three letters are extremely unstable (d manifesting as *shin*, *tṣade*, *ayin*, *gayin*, *alef*, or quiescing entirely; h resolving as h or h; and the final letter being either k or q). This instability means that this original root has yielded not just the roots צחק/שחק but also גחך (Aramaic, occuring in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Talmudim, meaning "to laugh," but in the Targum to Ketuvim with sexual connotations) and even חיך/חוך (incorrectly considered onomatopeia by Jastrow, found in most Aramaic dialects with the meaning of "to laugh, to jest," as well as in modern Hebrew where it means "to smile"). It is interesting to note that this root appears so heavily concentrated in Aramaic, the various transformations of the root resulting from heavy usage in those areas (whereas only two forms are found in Biblical Hebrew). We can, therefore, let these various factors point us towards the idea that the lexeme „שחק" is evidence of "Philistine" dialect (and, if we follow this suggestion, we accept the idea of dialect-switching), though skepticism must be retained. (More of this kind of study will follow in Chapter 2, which deals with lexicography.)

Bi-form אתי *for* את *(2fs pronoun)*

it is notoriously difficult to date most Biblical texts, so the dangers of circular reasoning here are great.

[18] "Lexical difference" on the basis of the fact that the root seems to have specifically sexual connotations in the Davidic narrative (cf. Gen. 26:8, the Isaac and Abimelech narrative).

In BDB, this rare form of the 2fs pronoun (occuring seven times in the *Ketiv*, always "corrected" by the Masoretes in the *Qere*) is classified as "older & more original form of את *thou* (fem.), preserved, prob. dialectically" (61). In Judg. 17:2, we find this form when Micah addresses his mother directly. The other six occurances are found in: 1 Ki. 14:2 (Jeroboam); 2 Ki. 4:16 (Elisha) and 23 (husband of Shunnamite woman), 8:1 (Elisha); Jer. 4:30 (to Jerusalem); and Ezek. 36:13 (against Edom). All the prose usages are, in fact, in classically northern contexts (Micah the Ephramite, Jeroboam the northern King, and in the Elisha cycle). The occurance in Ezekiel is both against Edom and in the context of a proverbial saying, which may reflect a non-normative or archaic kind of language (e.g., frozen forms or "outdated" word-choice). Finally, the usage in Jeremiah, while "Judahite" in both speaker and audience, is poetic. The use of this pronoun in the Micah story therefore seems to be a striking example of intentional dialect-switching on the part of the author--a dialectal feature preserved but "corrected" by the Masoretes.

Suffixed forms of יש

The particle יש with pronominal suffix occurs nine times in the Bible. It has a verbal connotation ("You are," "he is," etc.) and occurs only in direct speech. Three of those times are in Genesis. Abraham's servant uses it twice when recounting to Laban how he came to meet Rebecca at the well (24:42, ישך; 24:49, ישכם). Judah uses the particle when addressing his father in 43:4 (ישך). The word ישכם occurs in Deut. 13:4 (in divine speech), while ישנו is found in 29:14. The form ישנו also occurs twice in 1 Sam. (14:36; 23:23--both times in speeches made by Saul) and once in Esther (3:8--when Haman the Aggagite is slandering the Jews to the king).[19] Finally, in Judges, Gideon says: אִם-יֶשְׁךָ מוֹשִׁיעַ בְּיָדִי אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ (6:36).

No clear case can be made for regionalism on the basis of distribution. We can argue that the servant's speeches to Laban may reflect dialect (either on account of code-switching, as he addresses Laban the Aramean, or because we place weight on the traditional identification of the servant as Eliezer the Damascene). Similarly, Saul's

[19] GKC considers יֶשְׁנוֹ "textually very doubtful" and follows the suggestions of Stade and Haupt that it be emended to יֶשְׁנוּ. This affects four of the nine cases, although the general construction--particle plus pronominal suffix--remains. At issue is vocalization and how one interprets the evolutionary history of this form. (GKC §100o-p)

speech patterns could reflect his Benjaminite background (as noted above). Esther is late and its language frequently inclined towards Aramaic influence. However, Judah's speech in Genesis and the passages in Deuteronomy are difficult to account for. Furthermore, we do not find the form in texts such as Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, the northern histories, or other texts generally considered to signal northern provenance (prose or poetic).

Gideon's use of the form is interesting, but it is part of a more complex situation than might appear to be the case. To explain the suffixed form of יש, we must first clarify the fact that "to be" has two distinct nuances in English: "to be equal to" (copulative function; usually expressed in Hebrew by היה) and "to exist" (not generally copulative; expressed in Hebrew by יש *in the present tense*). The differences between these two types of "being" is visible only in the present tense. The suffixed forms of יש seem to indicate that there are moments in the Hebrew Bible where the "existential" form of "to be"--יש--has taken over the copulative/equative functions of היה in the present tense. The question is, Where do we find this phenomenon? Does it seem to be related to region, date, or level of formality?

On the basis of comparative evidence, we can note the absence of this construction in Biblical Aramaic but its presence in both Jewish Palestinian Aramaic and the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, as well as in Rabbinic Hebrew (including forms not evidenced in the Bible, such as the particle with the f.s. suffix, ישנה, in Kidd. 48a). Sokoloff notes that there are also parallel constructions in Syriac (Dictionary 56n). We can tentatively suggest, therefore, that the suffixed form of יש, used as a copulative rather than "existentially" may represent some sort of dialectal variant either slightly more common in the north (perhaps it represents one of Fredricks' colloquialisms) which became somewhat more common in later Hebrew and Aramaic.

בינותינו *as bi-form of* בינינו

The general distribution of suffixed forms of בין is unusual: of the ninety-three occurrences, thirty-seven are in Genesis (five in the rest of the Torah); eleven are in Joshua; twelve in 1 Samuel; seven in Ezekiel; and four in Job. The remaining nineteen are distributed among Judges, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Malachi, Ruth, Lamentation, Daniel, and 2 Chron. Closer study could reveal significance to in this

pattern (most likely something to do with making treaties and swearing oaths), but the specific concern at hand is morphology and Judges.

The one occurance of a suffixed form of בין in Judges (11:10--the elders of Gilead addressing Jephthah) involves a particularly unusual form: בינותינו instead of the anticipated בינינו. The long form of the 1cp suffix occurs once elsewhere, in a phrase which may help clarify form's meaning. In Genesis 26:28, we have the statement: וַיֹּאמְרוּ רָאוֹ רָאִינוּ כִּי-הָיָה יְהוָה עִמָּךְ וַנֹּאמֶר תְּהִי נָא אָלָה בֵּינֵינוּ וּבֵינֶךָ וְנִכְרְתָה בְרִית עִמָּךְ -- "Then they [the Philistines under Abimelech's rule] said, 'We can't help but see that Adonai is with you, so we thought, Let there be a sworn oath between the two of us--between us and you--so let us make a pact with you." The combination of בינותינו and בינינו in this verse indicates that בינותינו means "between the two of us," rather than just "between us (on the one hand)" (the form regularly used in tandem with ביניכם). This interpretation was first noted by M. Lambert and is cited approvingly by GKC (§103p[1]).

The specific meaning "between the two of us" explains the passage in Judges, as well: וַיֹּאמְרוּ זִקְנֵי-גִלְעָד אֶל-יִפְתָּח יְהוָה יְהִיֶה שֹׁמֵעַ בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ אִם-לֹא כִדְבָרְךָ כֵּן נַעֲשֶׂה (11:10). The single suffixed preposition takes the place of the semantically equivalent phrase בינינו ובינך (which occurs in that exact form only in Gen. 26:28; בינינו ובינכם occurs three times in Joshua [22:25, 22:27, 22:28]). However, we must note that in the other cases of treaty-making and oath-taking where the particle בין is employed, בינינו is used to convey "between us," even in cases when there is no complementary particle (i.e., בינינו is used to mean "between the two of us"). But an interesting sub-pattern emerges when we single out בין with a 1cp suffix--or 1cs suffix (where the final connotation *in context* is "between us")--in a context of negotiations/oath-taking.[20] Four times, no complementary particle of any sort is used. Of these four instances, one is the already-cited verse in Judges; the other three include Gen. 31:53, where Laban says, "May the God of Abraham and the god of Nahor judge between us (בינינו)" and two instances in Job (9:33--Job; and 34:4--Elihu) which likewise use בינינו . It seems that the distinctive nature of the construction in Judges is not simply the form of the particle (the unusual suffix) but its solitary use in the context of deal-making. By contrast, the thirty-five instances of the doubled suffixed participle construction (where the first participle is in the 1st person, the second participle

[20] Thus eliminating another common meaning of בין, "between, in the midst of" in the physical sense.

in the 2nd person, either singular or plural) are all in "Judahite" passages.

Can any conclusion be drawn from these examples? While we lack comparative evidence, both distribution and opposition lead us in an interesting direction. We should first note that the anomalous constructions (בין + 1cp suffix without second particle completing the idea) all occur in places one could argue dialect is present: in the mouth of an Aramean (Laban), in the book of Job, and in the speech of Gileadites in Judges. Furthermore, the only other use of the unusual suffix is put in the speech of Philistines. (Unfortunately, in the rest of Judges as well as the books of Samuel, we lack any other instances where Philistines use the particle.) While this body of evidence is small, it does not seem far-fetched to suggest that Israelian Hebrew used the particle בין in the 1cs/cp differently in deal-making than Judahite Hebrew. On the syntactic level, we can argue that the solitary use of בין in deal-making contexts reflects Israelian preference while the doubled particle is the favored Judahite construction. Within the "Israelian" category of particle usage, we can further suggest that there was regional variation of the suffix used, with certain dialects using the standard 1cp suffix while the Gileadites and Philistines prefer the longer suffix. The word's meaning in both cases is the same, since בינינו in Gen. 31:53, Job 9:33 and 34:4 all must mean "between the two of us," just as was posited in GKC for בינותינו.

Conclusions

What conclusions can we draw from the evidence examined above? On the basis of morphology, there is some tantalizing but ambivalent evidence of the use of dialect in Judges. Particularly, we have two interesting clues towards a Philistine dialect--the use of בַּמָּה and the phonological variation of ש/צ, as well as the particle בינותינו used by Philistines (not here, but in Genesis 26:28). We also have two indications of traits of "Ephramite" Hebrew--Micah's use of the preposition -ל to mean "from" and his use of the unusual 2fs pronoun אתי in addressing his mother. The phonological variation of shibboleth/sibboleth clearly indicates that there were differences in pronunciation among the Israelite tribes (certain tribes employing phonemes other tribes did not distinguish). Conclusions based on the inflected participle and suffixed-יש are more difficult to reach. Finally, the doubled plural can, in one case, be eliminated as a false lead but in the case

of the Samson story may be a legitimate case of dialectal speech. Clearly, to attempt to prove the presence of regional dialect within the book of Judges, the net must be cast beyond phonology and morphology into the realms of lexicography and syntax. As many of the conclusions reached in this chapter have indicated, in order for our study of dialect to be sufficient, we must examine not merely morphology, but lexicography and syntax as well.

Chapter Two

"'*Round here we call them 'jimmies'*:"
Lexical Elements of Hebrew Dialect in Judges

Perhaps one of the best clues for locating where you are, regionally, is the local choice of words. For instance, in the United States, if you're offered an "orange coke" and, upon acceptance, handed an orange NeHi, you are receiving hospitality from a true southerner. Similarly, if the clerk asks if you want "jimmies" on your ice cream sundae, you are probably in New England. Generally in the north, parents take a cranky infant for a drive, while southern parents would "ride her around" (that's "ride" in the *hifil*). Similar kinds of lexical differences distinguish American from British English (does a spare tire go in the "boot" or the "trunk"? is it affixed by means of a "spanner" or a "wrench"?); comparable preferences can be found in High and Low German (terms referring to geography, not diglossia), European and Mexican Spanish, and other languages as well. An hypothesis emerges: geographic regions, sharing a common language but distinguished by historic and cultural borders (not to mention out-right physical boundaries), can develop preferences for certain lexemes over others. It is my goal in this chapter to examine the lexicon of the reported speech in the book of Judges for just such preferences.

A study of regional lexical preference is, by necessity, more tentative than analysis focusing on other linguistic features. As W. Randall Garr notes:

> Whereas phonology, morphlogy, and syntax are employed in the dialectal analysis, it is impossible to analyze the lexicon for this purpose. Although such an analysis is potentially valid for first-millenium NWS, the extant texts do not offer sufficient lexical material to make possible an interdialectal analysis.... Although a lexical analysis may be used in the future, with the discovery of additional texts, it is not feasible at present. (Dialect Geography 6)

Indeed, a lexical study of dialect in Biblical Hebrew cannot ignore the ever-present danger of circular reasoning. Nevertheless, although a study of word-choice may not be conclusive, it can still have value. While Rendsburg privileges morphology in his research, he has not ignored lexical evidence for dialect. Similarly, H. L. Ginsberg

considers preferences for certain words over others among the evidence he has amassed in his study of "Israelian" Hebrew. With regard to Judges, C. F. Burney and Robert Boling both find significance in the unusual lexemes found there in certain pericopes.

The goal of this chapter, therefore, is not to "prove" the presence of dialect on the basis of lexicography. I believe, however, that a careful scrutinizing of vocabulary within the distinct pericopes of the text will reveal an "impression" (pointilist, if you will) of unusual preferences clustered in distinct locations. This evidence, combined with that of morphology and syntax, will strengthen any arguments for the presence of dialect in certain passages. Lexical analysis represents a significant aspect of an holistic approach to dialect study.

What criteria can effectively be used in such a study? The significance of lexemes for dialect can be determined several ways.[1] First, we should look for the heavy concentration of specific vocabules in texts generally assigned non-Judean provenance (cf. the previous chapter). Secondly, we can see if the word we are studying is found in "Judean" contexts but in the mouths of characters who could conceivably be speaking with non-Judean accents ("dialect-switching," also noted above). Furthermore, we can consider the hypothesis that poetic *b-words* (the second word in a poetic pair) represent the non-normative word-choice. The b-word in Hebrew poetry is often the standard word in other NW Semitic languages (e.g., the poetic Hebrew alternative for זהב is the common Phoenician word חרץ). Hence, if a character in Judges speaks using a lexeme known primarily as a b-word in Hebrew poetry, we can assert that that character's word-choice is non-standard. I emphasize that this chapter initiates what could potentially be a significantly expanded project. I would also like reiterate the fact that the focus of this research is upon dialect *in speech*; there are numerous instances where unusual lexemes can be found in the prose passages of Judges surrounding direct speech, but this evidence for regional origin of the story as a whole does not factor into this study. Finally, while

[1] This methodology is indebted not only to that which Rendsburg outlines in Linguistic Evidence, but also that of Avi Hurvitz in "Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew," Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics, 4 (195), 1-10. While Hurvitz aims to demonstrate the lateness of certain lexemes through the application of distribution, linguistic contrast (i.e., how else could this have been said?), and extra-Biblical sources, the same methods translate well into dialect-focused study. I should note, however, that I am not striving to be quite as rigorous as either Rendsburg or Hurvitz; I am seeking *tendancies* towards dialectal language, not necessarily absolute proof of a lexeme's northern origin. The dialect-continuum model posits, of necessity, a certain amount of "blurriness."

this thesis concentrates on the reported speech within the book of Judges, I am not limiting my lexicographical data to reported speech, as that would constrict the data-base beyond utility. I will, therefore, note when a word is used in speech (as opposed to narrative or poetry), but will consider lexemes found in all categories.

With this theoretical framework to support our study, we must now attempt to clarify how the lexemes studied here have been chosen. What makes these lexemes special? The methodology employed in sifting the data was thorough, if somewhat old-fashioned. It consisted of combing over the text, examining every word of reported speech in Judges, in order to ascertain if the word at hand was common and regular in its usage (and therefore excluded from the study entirely) or unusual in some way--rare in and of itself, common but used in an irregular way, a familiar root used in an unfamiliar משקל or other morphosyntatic structure, or a fairly common word (occuring roughly fifteen times or more in the Hebrew corpus) which shows striking concentration in non-Judahite texts. As guides in my scouring of the text, I used concordances (including computer-based programs *Accordance* for MacIntosh and the Davka *Judaic Classics Library II*) as well as the Brown, Driver, and Briggs *Lexicon* [BDB], Gesenius' *Grammar* [GKC], and modern Biblical commentaries as noted. To help clarify the methodology used here, I have included some lexemes which are most likely *not* reflective of dialectal speech but which were unusual for one or more of the reasons listed above. I realize, however, that my eye is far from perfect and it is possible some important words may have been overlooked in the course of this study.

The following research is organized according to pericope of text.

Introduction (Chs. 1:1-2:5)

Before delving into the textual irregularities of the introduction to the book of Judges, several remarks need to be made. First of all, the text is not necessarily whole-cloth. Boling classifies the first chapter (as well as the last three chapters) "Deuteronomistic," dating it to the 6th century BCE (30). He considers 2:1-5 "Deuteronomic" (7th cent.). The remainder of the second chapter is considered part of the "pragmatic" collection, which Boling dates to the 8th century. Burney, for his part, considers 1:1-2:5 to be the work of a "post-exilic editor of the Priestly school of thought" (1)--a date even later than that of Boling. Judg. 2:6-3:6 forms what Burney considers the

original introduction as written by the Redactor (52). Other scholars, however, while agreeing that 1:1-2:5 form a distinct textual unit disagree over the late-dating of the whole pericope. Edward Crowley considers the prologue "an ancient document, or derived from one" (NEB 250 n. 1). For the purposes of this study, we will acknowledge both positions: Judg. 1:1-2:5 is probably a late add-on intended to connect the synthetic body of Judges to Joshua just preceeding. However, the comparative lateness of the addition does not negate the possibility that the appended text reflects an older tradition or contain dialectal speech. As long as the northern kingdom remained a living memory, it is reasonable to assume authors would be familiar with the most stereotypical Israelian modes of speech. And so we can and should set aside the issue of comparative within Judges dating which so interests source critics and focus our attention on the evidence of which we can be certain: the words of the text.

בני ישראל (1:1)--This common phrase (it occurs 636 times in the Tanakh) can be understood as the ultimate generic term for "Israelites," i.e., any descendants of any of the twelve tribes tracing their origins back to Jacob. However, as Ginsberg notes, "'(The) Israelians' would...be a good rendering of *bne yisrael* in Hos. 2:1-2 -- especially in 2:2, where it is explicitly coordinated with *bne yehuda*...where an antithesis to the Judahites is implied" (1). In a context where the Judahites are singled out, we need not assume that בני ישראל refers to all tribes; it can just as easily be seen as singling out those tribes which allied with the north when the united kingdom split. We should note, therefore, that the author of Judg. 1:1-2:5 singles out the Judahites three times (1:8, 9, 16) while telling us that other active participants are בני ישראל. Thus words found in the mouths of בני ישראל, in contexts where they are distinguished from the Judahites, are candidates for Northern--"Israelian"--dialectal preference.

בהונות (1:3)--The phrase in which this word occurs (1:7) was discussed above, in chapter one. At issue here is the choice of בהונות as opposed to אצבעות. The singular בהן occurs exclusively in "priestly" contexts (Ex. 29:20; Lev. 8:23, 24; 14:14, 17, 25, 28); in those passages, it appears in construct with יד/רגל (always paired and suffixed, but variously in plural and singular). The plural בהונות, vocalized differently from the singular and hence possibly a distinct lexeme (broken plural), occurs only in Jud. 1:6-7 (in construct with suffixed forms of ידים/רגלים). The alternative, אצבע, occurs much more frequently (thirty-four times) and in a variety of contexts--predominantly in Leviticus

(thirteen times), but also in Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Daniel. Five times it is the poetic b-word for יד (Is. 2:8, 17:8, 59:3; Ps. 144:1; Prov. 7:3, Cant. 5:5). In the plural construct, however, אצבע occurs only in 2 Sam. 21:20 and Dan. 2:42 (Aramaic). Even this numerical imbalance, however, is inconclusive, as the distribution of אצבע is such that were it not for the lexeme בהונות, we might be tempted to view אצבע as regional. This argument is bolstered by the fact that אצבע occurs in Aramaic, while בהן does not.[1] As it is, the word בהונות, particularly if seen as distinct from the singular בהן, could be a distinctive "Canaanite" b-word for fingers (the lack of national identification may be significant). The speech of Adoni-Bezek, the Canaanite king, could possibly reflect a distinct dialect or be poetic. Gaster considers the brief speech to have an Ugaritic flavor but does not single out this lexeme in his argument (MLC 416-18; 528-9).

יהב (1:15)--This is the standard Aramaic word for "give," and it is employed by a speaker (Achash bat Caleb) who uses the standard Hebrew root נתן in the second part of her request. Outside of the Aramaic portions of the Bible, it occurs 34 times. The majority of these occur in contexts where non-Judahite Hebrew has been found or could be considered appropriate (the Laban narratives and the speech of Egyptians in Genesis; Boaz speaking to Ruth in Ruth; and in poetry, particularly Ps. 29, Proverbs, Job, and Hosea).[2] Furthermore, Jos. 15:19 contains a parallel rendition of this story in which the word תנה is used.

גלות מים (1:15)--As Burney notes, the Hebrew word גלה in the context of a water-source, outside of the narrative here and its parallel version in Jos. 15:19 (the meaning of "bowl, basin"), is "otherwise unknown" (13). Burney suggests that it is either an old Canaanite word or a proper name of foreign origin, as suggested by the terms "upper and lower Gullot" in both Jos. 15 and here (Burney notes that these names are probably Canaanite [14]). The meaning determined from context is "spring" (basin, in the sense of "pool" also makes sense) but other familiar lexemes--including באר, בור, ברכה, or מעין--are not used here. The phrase גל נעול from Cant. 4:12 (where גל is parallel to מעין) is perhaps the closest cognate to גלות מים.

מבוא העיר (1:24)--This term, literally "the entryway of the city" is not rare, but

[2] Gen. 11:3, 4, 7; 29:21; 30:1; 38:16; 47:15, 16; Ex. 1:10; Deut. 1:13, 32:3; Jos. 18:4; Jud. 1:15; 20:7; 1 Sam. 14:41; 2 Sam. 16:20; Hos. 4:18; Zech. 11:12; Ps. 29:1, 2; 60:13; 96:7, 8; 108:13; Job 6:22; Prov. 30:15; Ruth 3:15; 1 Chron. 16:28, 29.

מבוא (occuring 35 times) is less common than the lexeme שער (which, in the construct alone, occurs 85 times). The most significant passages for the classification of this phrase, however, are Prov. 8:3 and Ezek. 26:10, where מבוא is used as the poetic parallel for שער. It is thus possible to suggest that while both lexemes can be found in northern and southern contexts (for instance, Ezekiel uses both the phrases מבוא העיר [26:10] and שערי העיר [48:31]), מבוא העיר is the more unusual word-choice. Hence it is significant that the scouts from the tribe of Joseph are depicted as using this construction.

מוקש (2:3)--This lexeme, as is the case with many interesting words, seems to show a slight bias towards "Israelian" texts, but crops up in very Judahite texts, as well. In Jud. 2:3, this way of saying "snare" is put in the mouth of a divine being to the Israelites (בני ישראל). In Ex. 10:7, Egyptians use the term, which is also employed by the narrator of the Gideon cycle (8:27), Saul's speech (1 Sam. 18:21), Elihu's words (Job 34:40) and when God speaks to Job (40:24). It also occurs eight times in Proverbs (12:12, 13:14, 14:27, 18:7, 20:25, 22:25, 29:6, 29:25). Most other instances of the term can be found in "poetic direct speech" passages credited to both northern and southern authors (Is.8:14--southern; Amos 3:5--northern; six times in Psalms, southern and Israelian [18:6, 64:6, 69:23, 106:36, 140:6--IH, 141:6--IH]; and 2 Sam. 22:6--southern). The choice of this lexeme could reflect "dialect switching" on the part of God (who is speaking to Israelians, according to Ginsberg's scheme--if prophets can engage in dialect switching, why shouldn't God?), or this could just be an instance of "Why this word? Why not?" The body of evidence is intriguing, but not conclusive.

The only direct speech in the latter part of Ch. 2 is in vss. 20-21. No significantly interesting lexemes occur in those verses which, as with 2:1-5, represent divine speech.

Ehud (Ch. 3)

Reported speech in ch. 3 occurs only in the course of the Ehud narrative. There are a few unusual lexemes in those passages, but we can do little more than remark on their presence--the interesting words are too isolated to provide a sufficient database for conclusive statements. For instance, the phrase „חדר המקרה" occurs only in Judg. 3:24 (unique both as a construction, and המקרה by itself), and it is spoken by servants of the Moabite king. It could potentially be the specific Moabite term for "bathroom."

However, it may just as easily be that this is the only time anyone in the Tanakh has reason to say "bathroom" explicitly. One case does not suffice to build an argument.

Also ambiguous is the case of „הס" (3:19), an interjection used by the king of Moab. It does not occur often: Amos 6:10, 8:3; Hab. 2:20; Zeph. 1:7; Zech. 2:17; and, as a verb, in Neh. 8:11 (*qal*) and Num. 13:30 (*hif*). However, while distribution alone could indicate a northern preference for this way of saying "hush" (all the prophetic usages, regardless of date and context, being poetic, while Nehemia is post-Exilic and a candidate for northernisms--leaving only Caleb's use in Numbers unexplained), the word can also be understood as onomonopaeia, unconnected to region.[3]

The only other questionable lexeme in the Ehud narrative is the use of „ירדפו" by Ehud in vs. 28, in the sense "to follow" (a meaning unattested elsewhere). Burney, following the Greek, emends the word to „ירדו" (74); others simply translate the Hebrew according to context without altering the text, implying that the lexeme has greater semantic range than Burney admits. It could be that Ehud's word-choice reflects a specifically northern or Benjaminite nuance of a common Hebrew word; however, were that the case, we would expect more occurances of the root רדף with the meaning "to follow" in non-Judahite contexts. Lacking any such corroborating evidence, we are again left building a case on a single lexeme.

As it stands, in the Ehud narrative, we have an extremely limited body of speech--four verses in all, and none of them lengthy. Of these passages, the three words noted above stand out: two unusual lexemes in the speech of Moabites, and one non-normative meaning of a familiar word in the speech of Ehud the Benjaminite. Independent of other evidence, these three words cannot determine the presence of dialect; however, in conjunction with other factors, they could prove significant.

Deborah (Ch. 4)

[צבא] שר (4:6)--This title refers specifically to military commanders. The linguistic history of שר is well-known (it is cognate to the Akkadian *šarru*). While other terms exist for military leader (see, for example, the titles offered to Jephthah in Judg.

[3] However, while all Americans understand "hush," that lexeme does have a "southern" feel compared to the harsher, Yankee "shhh"--but I'm not aware of any studies comparing the distribution of these two English lexemes.

11), this one may reflect Aramaic-influence. The title describes Abimelech's chief officer in Gen. 21:22, 21:32 and 26:26; it is used in Judges in reference to Sisera, a Canaanite general, and in the retelling of this episode in 1 Sam. 12:9. The title is used regularly in reference to Saul's army commander Abner (1 Sam. 14:50, etc.), who becomes army commander in the north. Omri is called "army commander" in 1 Ki. 16:16, before he is crowned king of the northern kingdom. Furthermore, שר צבא is a title bestowed upon explicitly foreign figures, including Shobach, Hadadezer's general (2 Sam. 10:16) and Naaman (2 Ki. 5:1). However, the title seems to have been used in both Israel and Judah, according to 1 Ki. 2:32, which refers to "Abner son of Ner, the army commander of Israel, and Amasa son of Jether, the army commander of Judah." David's general, Joab also bears this title (cf. 1 Ki. 1:19). Distribution suggests that this term is a northernism, perhaps borrowed from Aramaic, adopted into Judahite parlance.[4] It seems that the authors of the Judges text were familiar with the Canaanite/Aramean system of titles and applied the correct apellations to the proper officials in the Israelite military. We must also consider the possibility that it is a late term projected back onto older narratives, or simply the specific term used throughout the Israelite world (north and south) for a specific military position.

המון (4:6)--Within prose texts, this lexeme shows a particular preference for Israelian contexts. In Jud. 4:6, Deborah is referring specifically "troops." Similar usages can be found in 1 Ki. 20:13 and 20:28 (prophets addressing Ahab regarding the Arameans). The same meaning may hold for the term in 2 Ki. 7:13 (Elisha cycle). If we extend the meaning to "multitude" or "rumbling" (the origin of the word most likely lies in the noises associated with crowds, and troops are a specialized subset of crowd), the nothern bias remains (cf. 1 Sam. 4:14 [Eli] employs the term; 1 Ki. 18:41 [Elijah]; Job 31:34 and 39:7; Eccl. 5:9). In most other contexts, the lexeme appears to be poetic--it is used most often in the prophecies of Isaiah (14 times) and Ezekiel (24 times), as well as by Amos (5:23) and Joel (4:14). It is also common in 1 and 2 Chronicles, where it is used ten times, and in the Aramaic portions of Daniel--both of these facts indicating an Aramaic, and hence possibly northern, origin for the term, even when it is found in earlier texts.

[4] This may or may not be similar to the American-English use of the French title "lieutenant" instead of the British-English "leftenant."

אפס [כי] (4:9)--This phrase occurs four times in the Tanakh with the meaning "however, save that:" in Num 13:28 (the report of the scouts); 2 Sam. 12:14 (Nathan to David); Amos 9:8 (a southerner addressing the north). This distribution does not indicate geographic preference for use of this phrase, but it does reveal that Deborah chose an unusual way of saying "however" (which would most likely be expressed by a disjunctive clause or the particle „אך" which occurs 161 times).

תפארת (4:9)--In general, this word is found primarily in poetic contexts, notably in the prophecies of Isaiah (17 of 49 occurances are found in First Isaiah, plus ten times in the later chapters). It can refer to the abstract concept of glory or to physical items of adornment. In the Tanakh, we find תפארת as both a- and b-word in Psalms (where it is generally paired with "glory" types of words, such as „הוד והדר" in Ps. 96:6) and Proverbs (where it is more often synonymous with „עטרת"--crown, an item symbolizing glory--e.g. 4:9, 16:31, and 17:6). We also find it in Esther, Lamentations, and twice in Exodus (28:2,40), where it is paired with כבוד (in the phrase לכבוד ולתפארת). We have here another example of Deborah, who is identified as a northerner and traditionally considered a poet (cf. the Song of Deborah in ch. 5), employing in her direct speech poetic vocabulary with a northern/non-Judahite flair.[5]

Gideon (Chs. 6-8)

לחץ--see Ch. 10:11

הלז (6:20)--This demonstrative, used with the already-poetic term for "crag" (סלע), is "a rare synonym of זה or הזה" (BDB 229). Its closest cognates come from Arabic; the Hebrew word seems to be formed from the definite article (זו/זה) with the insertion of the demonstrative particle (-ל). It thus is equivalent to "הזה." In Dan. 8:16, we find להלז (= לזה). The lexeme "הלז" occurs a total of seven times in the Hebrew Bible: here in Judg. 6:20; in 1 Sam. 14:1 (Jonathan) and 17:26 (David); in 2 Ki. 4:25 (the Elisha cycle) and 23:17 (Josiah); in Zech. 2:8; and in Daniel. The feminine form, הלזה, occurs in Gen. 24:65 (Abraham's servant to Rebecca) and Gen. 37: 19 (Joseph's brothers' words). As this distribution indicates, a lexeme's rarity does not automatically imply that it has significance for dialect. For almost every usage which could suggest regional

[5] The related word, תפארה, occurs in Is. 28:5 and Jer. 48:17. The alternate משקל does not seem to indicate dialect, either.

significance for the lexeme--Elisha, Jonathan, Abraham's servant, Daniel--we a text in a strong Judahite context, particularly David and Josiah. Thus this word does nothing to inform our search for dialect. I am more inclined to agree with Boling's assertion that the use of these terms represents deliberate archaicizing rather than dialect (133).

מרק (6:20)--Another rare lexeme, this noun occurs three times in the Tanakh: in Judg. 6:19 and 6:20, and Is. 65:4 (where it is a *qere*, the *ketiv* being פרק). As it happens, Biblical Hebrew possesses one other way to express a similar concept: the closest term is נזיר ("stew, pottage"). On the basis of this meager data (neither word can be called "common"), it is impossible to conclude whether this lexeme is unique to the north (or, specifically, to Gideon's tribe). We should note, however, that מרק is extremely common in Mishnaic Hebrew. If one accepts Rendsburg's argument that Mishnaic Hebrew has its origins in the Galilee, this fact is significant. Still, in the Biblical corpus we have only three cases where this lexeme is used, one of those dubious due to being *ketiv/qere*. The data is, therefore, inconclusive.

ספר (6:13, 7:13)--This verb seems to have poetic nuance, akin to the English "to rehearse, to recount." In the *piel*, the root occurs sixty-seven times; thirty of those times are in Psalms alone, not to mention the usages in poetic texts such as Job (15:17, 28:27, 38:37--this probably a misvocalization of a *qal*), Isaiah (43:21, 26), and Jeremiah (23:27, 28, 32; 51:10). Its distribution within prose is interesting as well. In Genesis, the lexeme is used eight times--twice in the Laban-cycle (24:66 and 29:13) and six times in the Joseph story (37:9, 10; 40:8, 9; 41:8, 12); only 41:12 is in speech (an Egyptian). In Exodus, only God speaks using this root (9:16, 10:2); in its other two occurances (18:8, 24:3), it is used in non-spoken narrative portions. It also has a connection to "spying"--this lexeme is used to describe how spies reported back to Moses and Aaron in Num. 13:27 and to Joshua in Jos. 2:23. In 1 and 2 Ki. the term is limited to two stories involving northern characters (the old man living in Bethel in 1 Ki. 13:11; in regard to Elisha in 2 Ki. 8:4, 8:5, and 8:6). As far as late texts, we find this word twice in Esther (5:11 and 6:13) and once in 1 Chron. 16:24. The only other usages are the two found in Judges, cited above, in verses spoken by Gideon to the angelic being.

Given the poetic predominance of this word, and its use in the speech of powerful beings (Pharaoh, God, kings, etc.) I feel it is just as possible that this is a "formal" lexeme (diglossia) as it is likely to be regional. I will, therefore, note the distribution of this

lexeme but argue the point no further.

דל (6:15)--The distribution of this lexeme seems to point very strongly towards regionalism or a connotation of "foreign." In Gen. 41:19, Pharaoh uses this term in recounting his dream. Also in narrative, Boaz (a Judahite speaking to a Moabite) employs the lexeme in Ruth 3:10. We find it in Hannah's song (1 Sam. 2:8) and also in "Judahite" poetic prophecy (First Isaiah five times, Jeremiah twice, and once in Zephaniah) and "Israelian" (four times in Amos). Looking at other poetic texts, we find it four times in Psalms (41:2, 72:13, 82:3, 113:7--only Ps. 82 is considered "Israelian" by Rendsburg), six times in Job, and a remarkable fifteen times in Proverbs. There are, however, examples of this lexeme being used in prose difficult to classify as "dialectal:" particularly legal texts (Ex. 23:3, 30:15, Lev. 14:21, and 19:15) and Davidic narratives (2 Sam. 3:1 and 13:4).[6] We can safely assert, however, that this lexeme is less common than עני (which occurs eighty times, compared to the 48 times דל is used), and only six of those times are both prose and Judahite. It seems to be a poetic term, used in both Judahite and Israelian prophecy; we may consider, then, the possibilities that it represents either poetic/formal diction in Judg. 6:15 (Gideon is, after all, addressing the deity) or was the preferred nothern way of saying "poor."

-ש (6:18)--This lexeme has striking distribution: we find it 142 times in the Hebrew Bible; a full seventy of those times are in Ecclesiastes. Thirty-two are in Song of Songs. Twenty-one are in Psalms. A few other books have examples of this term: God uses it in Gen. 6:3 (limiting the life-span of man). In Judges, it occurs five times (always in speech or poetry): twice in a verse in the Song of Deborah (5:7) and three times in the Gideon cycle (6:17, 7:12, and 8:26). The king of Aram uses the lexeme in 2 Ki. 6:11. In Jonah, the sailors, the prophet, and God each use the term once (1:7, 1:12, and 4:10); it is absent *entirely* from any other prophetic text. Gesenius (§36) considered this particle a sign of lateness in a text. This classification is based, in part, on the frequency of -ש in Mishnaic Hebrew. However, we have cognate particles from Akkadian (*sa*) and Phoenician (-ש/אש), so it is certainly possible that certain strains of older Hebrew used this alternative to אשר as the standard lexeme. BDB supports this conclusion, defining the particle as "syn. with אשר but in usage limited to late Heb., and passages with N.

[6] The verbal form of this root, דלל, may occur in Ugaritic omen texts (KTU 3.4-5).

Palest. colouring" (979). Sometimes this particle is used in texts where the longer lexeme אשר also occurs. For instance: in Ecclesiastes, we have אשר 89 times in addition to the 142 usages of -ש. In Song of Songs, however, אשר occurs only in the introductory verse. Furthermore, many late books--Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles--use אשר exclusively. The vocalization of this particle with a *qamatz* in Gideon's speech is also noteworthy; similar unusual vocalizations occur in Gen. 6:3 (Divine speech), Judg. 5:7 (twice), Song 1:7, and Job 19:29. It certainly seems that Gideon's use of the lexeme, particularly with its interesting vocalization, should be considered noteworthy.

גזה (6:37, 38, 39, 40)--This lexeme occurs only in these four instances. It could be that this is the preferred "Gideonite" way of referring to the part of the sheep-skin under discussion. Note that Is. 1:18 and Ps. 147:16 use צמר alone (Isaiah having it in parallel with שמים). BDB suggests that צמר in Judges is a gloss explaining the meaning of גזה. The database is too small to justify a conclusion, but the possibility that this lexeme is dialectal remains open.

חרב (6:37, 39)--This lexeme, meaning "dryness," occurs five times in the Tanakh: Judg. 6:36, 37, and 40; Jer. 50:11 (parallel with יבש in a prophecy against Babylon); and in Zech. 11:17 (exilic). The word seems altogether unusual, but, as is often the problem, the sample of texts we have is too small to allow us to draw substantial conclusions.

יצג (8:27)--This verb (occuring only in the *hifil*) is, according to BDB, "a vivid and forceful synonym of שים" (426). It is also somewhat rare, employed only sixteen times in the entire corpus. The distribution is interesting. In Judges, it occurs three times--once in speech--all in the Gideon cycle (6:37, 7:5, 8:27). We find it once in the Jacob/Laban cycle (30:38), once in the speech of Esau (Gen. 33:15), and twice in the Joseph story (Gen. 43:9 and 47:2). It occurs once in Deuteronomy, in poetry (28:56). In 1 Sam. 5:2, it is used in a narrative set in Philistine territory, but in 2 Sam. 6:17 (and in 1 Chron. 16:1), it describes actions taking place in David's presence. Jeremiah uses the term as he describes what Babylon will do to Judah (51:31). Hosea (2:5) and Amos (5:15) also both use the lexeme, as does Job (17:6). Aside from the two occurances in Davidic settings, the distribution is strongly in the Israelian camp. The concentration within Judges seems particularly noteworthy--three usages would be rare enough, but three usages scattered throughout a distinct pericope does not appear accidental.

כרע--see Ch. 11:35

צליל לחם (7:13)--This phrase occurs only here, in the speech of a Midianite soldier. As it happens, the word צליל is unique to this verse, as is the *ketiv*, צלול. BDB cites a possible Ethiopic cognate but leaves the word's etymology in doubt. As we lack a Midianite textual corpus for comparison, we can simply note with interest that this *hapax legomenon* occurs in the mouth of a foreign speaker (and one likely to be depicted using colloquial, as well as regional, speech).

צפר (7:3)--As BDB succinctly puts it, this lexeme is "wholly uncertain." In Burney's words, "if [it] is original, it stands alone in Heb. as used in the present connexion" (207). Burney interprets it according to a possibly-related Arabic root (*dafara*--"to go quickly") and adopts the meaning "decamp" (Boling follows Burney here), while JPS bases its translation on a noun of the same root [ציפור] and renders the phrase "as a bird flies [from Mount Gilead]." It is also possible that what we have is either a corruption of ויעבור or the root צרף (in vs. 4). BHS, preferring the latter hypothesis, suggests the whole phrase be read „ויצרפם גדעון" (supplying "Gideon" in place of "Mount Gilead"). Lacking any other examples of this root in Biblical Hebrew and unable to find cognates in related languages (for certain), this word can neither help nor hinder the thesis of this paper.

צרף (7:4)--The lexeme צרף, as a verb, occurs in prose only in Jud. 7:4 and 17:4, and in Dan. 11:35 and 12:10 (all instances in reported speech).[7] The other twenty-eight occurances are all in poetry: 2 Sam. 22:31 (=Ps. 18:31); Is. 1:25, 40:19, 41:7, 46:6, 48:10; Jer. 6:29, 9:6, 10:9, 10:14, 51:17; Zech. 13:9, Mal. 3:2 and 3:3; Pss. 12:7, 17:3, 26:2, 66:10, 105:19, 119:140; and Prov. 25:4 and 30:5. Of these texts, only Proverbs could possibly be considered "Israelian." It seems clear, therefore, that this lexeme is poetic, not Northern (perhaps, as Boling suggests, punning on the root צפר from the previous verse). God has chosen an elevated variety of metaphor for the process or weeding out Gideon's forces by means of the strange "lapping water" test. (The entire exhange could easily have humorous overtones).

ככר לחם (8:5)--In addition to צליל לחם, above, and פת לחם, below, we have here a third term for some kind of serving of bread. The phrase ככר לחם, spoken in Judges by Gideon himself, occurs six other times in the Hebrew Bible. We find it in Ex. 29:23 (a

[7] I'm excluding instances where the participle is used to mean "smith" in Neh. 3:8 and 3:32.

levitical kind of passage describing cultic practice). It is twice in 1 Samuel: in 2:36 (the "man of God" to Eli; in 10:3 (Samuel to Saul). It is also used in Jer. 37:21 and 1 Chron. 16:3. The only "poetic" use is in Prov. 6:26. This distribution does not seem strikingly clustered around any region.

חרף (8:15)--In Judges, we find this root here (Gideon's speech) and in the Song of Deborah (5:18). It is not a rare lexeme, occuring forty times as a verb in the Hebrew Bible. We find it five times in direct speech 1 Sam. 17: 17:10 (speech of a Philistine), 17:25 (an Israelite man), 17:26 and 45 (David). It is also used in 2 Sam. 21:21 (= 1 Chron. 20:7, the alternate narrative of the Goliath story) and 23:9. In 2 Ki. 19, the verb occurs four times in the sense of "to blaspheme," (in 19:4 and 16 [Hezekiah]; in vss. 22 and 23 [prophecy against Assyria]). As it happens, the root is used five times in First Isaiah (18;6, 37:4, 37:17, 37:23, and 37:24) and once in Second Isaiah (65:7)--all poetry. The only other prophet to use this lexeme is Zephaniah (2:8 and 2:10--speaking against Ammon and Moab). It is interesting to note that in the 2 Chron. 32:17, a version of 2 Ki. 19, in a passage not found in 2 Kings, Sennacherib uses the lexeme in a letter to Hezekiah. In Neh. 6:13, Nehemiah uses the word. In non-prophetic poetic works, the root occurs fifteen times, in Pss. 42:11, 44:17, 74:10 and 18, and 79:12 [IH] and in Pss. 55:13, 57:4, 69:10, 89:52, 102:9, and 119:42 [JH]. We find it once in Job (27:6) and three times in Proverbs (14:31, 17:5, and 27:11).

Of all these usages, the ones with meanings closest to that in Judg. 8:15 are those from 1 Sam. 17 and 2 Sam. 21. This distribution is inconclusive, involving the speech of Gideon in Judges; Philistines, Israelites, and David's men in 1 Samuel; and in a most-likely ancient anecedote in 2 Samuel (it being a non-Davidic Goliath fable). It is impossible to tie this lexeme to any region or date, nor does it seem to have a fixed formal/informal nuance, despite its common presence in poetry.

דוש (8:7)--This lexeme, meaning "to thresh," occurs a total of seventeen times in the Hebrew Bible. It refers to a specific activity for which we have no other Hebrew lexemes (aside from גרן, "threshing floor"--which is never used as a verb). The instance here (in Judg. 8:7) is the only instance where this root (in the *qal)*, having taken a direct object marked by את, is followed by a second prepositional phrase using את to mean "with, by means of." In vs. 16, the preposition used is בהם, a significant variation if one accepts the emendation of וידע as וידש. As far as likely Israelian sources go, we find the

root used in 2 Ki. 13:7; Is. 28:27 and 28 (prophecies against Assyria in the "three... four..." trope of wisdom literature) Jer. 50:11 (against Babylon); Hos. 10:11; Amos 1:3 ("wisdom literature" sequence); Micah 4:13 (addressing the North); and Job 39:15. We also find the term in late texts: Is. 41;15, Dan. 7:23, and 1 Chron. 21:20. We have the lexeme in ambiguous texts as well: Deut. 25:4 ("Israelian"?), Is. 25:10 (where Moab will be threshed), and Hab. 3:12. This distribution does not inspire an overwhelming sense of regional bias. We can, therefore suggest that this lexeme appears where it does because it is a highly specialized term which one would not expect to be common or because it is somehow more formal. Dialect is, however, a reasonable a suggestion.

נזם (8:24)--The word for "earring" occurs only seventeen times in the Tanakh; this is likely to be because there are only select occasions when jewelry is mentioned at all. Nevertheless, the distribution of this lexeme is interesting. In Genesis, we find it three times in the story of Abraham's servant (24:22, 24:30, 24:47) and also in the Laban cycle (35:4--where earrings are linked to alien gods). Earrings played a role in the Golden Calf episode (Ex. 32:2, 3); they are also mentioned in Ex. 35:22. In Judges, we find the term only in this story, where earrings a characteristic of "Ishmaelites" (8:24, 25, 26). In poetry, we find the term used in Hos. 2:15, Job 42:11, Prov. 11:22 and 25:12. Is. 3:21 (a prophecy against the daughters of Zion) is the lone example of the term in Judahite poetry, while Ezek. 16:12 is the only "late" usage of the lexeme. The distribution of this lexeme is, as demonstrated, very biased towards a northern classification--but does this imply a northern preference for earrings, or a greater "fashion consciousness" in Israelian writing? Or does it simply mean that these verses are the only times when "earrings" were relevant and worth mentioning?

Abimelech (Ch. 9)

This chapter is full of interesting words and structures. However, I have decided to eliminate vss. 8-15 (the parable of the trees) from consideration as they are, mostly likely, poetic in nature, if not actually poetry. The language of those verses would therefore not be representative of Jotham's normal "speech."

-בעלי (multiple times)--This word has a striking presence in the ninth chapter of Judges. Fifteen of the twenty-five occurances of this lexeme (specifically, the plural in construct) can be found in this single pericope. If we rule out phrases such as בעלי-ברית

(Gen. 14:13) and בעלי-חצים (Gen. 49:23), selecting specifically for the meaning "citizens," we are left with only five examples outside of Judges 9. These instances are: Num. 21:28 (*in words of the bards of Heshbon*); Jos. 24:11; 1 Sam. 23:11 and 23:12 (David); and 2 Sam. 21:12. These non-Judges examples do not suggest a regional conclusion; as tempting as it is to cite the usage of the term in Amorite poetry (Num. 21:28) and the usage of the passage in Joshua's covenant *at Shechem*, the other passages are all Judahite. However, the extraordinary clustering of the lexeme in this chapter (75% of all occurances) suggests that something unusual is reflected in the language of this brief pericope. It is, perhaps, a trace of the Shechemite dialect.

ארב (9:32)--This verb, meaning "to ambush, to lie in wait" shows up frequently in texts considered to have a northern origin, although not exclusively in such locations. In the Torah-proper, it occurs only in Deut. 19:11. In Judges, it is used four times in Ch. 9 (in speech, once), but also in 16:2, 9, and 12 (Samson), and in 20: 29, 33, 36, 37, 38, and 21:20 (the concluding pericope). Within the Saul narratives, it can be found in 1 Sam. 15:5, 22:8 and 22:13. As far as later texts, it can be found once in Ezra (8:31) and 2 Chron. 20:22. The only prophets who use the term are Jeremiah (51:12--against Babylon) and Micah (7:2). It occurs a striking seven times in Jos. 8. In non-prophetic poetry, the term is used in Pss. 10:9 and 59:4, Job 31:9, Lam. 3:10 and 4:19, and often in Proverbs (1:11, 1:18, 7:12, 12:6, 23:28, and 24:15). Aside from the significant cluster in Joshua, one could argue that the lexeme has a regional flavor, particularly since it is so concentrated in specific pericopes (Jud. 9, 16, 20-21; Saul narratives in 1 Samuel) and in northern-classified texts (particularly Proverbs, but also Ps. 10 and Job). In particular, we should note that other options for expressing the idea of "ambush" exist. Some involve the nominative forms of the root ארב (rare--and also in dialectal contexts, such as Hosea 7:6 and Job 37:8 and 38:40, as well as the poetic passage Jer. 9:7). Other constructions employ unrelated lexemes, such as צפה (to hide), במסתר (adv., "in secret"--Hab. 3:14), or קשר (to conspire). Nevertheless, the concentration of this lexeme in Joshua should give us pause ("ambush" is, after all, a specific kind of conspiracy), and it may be accuracy-of-nuance, not regionalism, which determines the usage of this verb.

טבור (9:37)--This term occurs only here (in the speech of Gaal, a Shechemite) and in Ezek. 38:12. Burney notes the cognate words in Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic, both meaning "navel" (283). The two verses use the lexeme differently--in Judges, it seems to

mean "hilltops," while in Ezekiel the term means "center of the earth" (methaphorically). Two examples, however, do not suffice to prove much of anything.

מאס ב- (9:38)--Interestingly, this syntagm is used only in direct speech or poetic speech, never in prose. It is found primarily in poetic texts: Is. 33:15; Jer. 4:30, 6:19, 31:37; Pss. 78:67, 106: 24; Job 19:18. In narrative contexts, we find it only in Num. 14:31 and here in Judges 9:38. While rare and poetic, this syntagm's distribution is too small to suggest a classification of regional bias.

פשט על (9:33)--This syntagm occurs only three times in the Hebrew Bible: twice in Judges (9:33 and 9:44) and in Job 1:17 (the prose introduction to the poem). With other prepositions, the verbal root shows no strong geographic preference (occuring in both strongly Judahite narratives about David as well as in Hosea and Nahum). This lead is another which fails to provide enough data for any solid conclusions.

Interlude (Ch. 10)

לחץ (10:11)--The amount of direct speech in this chapter is small: six verses total, and none of them lengthy. Furthermore, all but one of these verses is spoken by the deity (10:2 is spoken by the בני ישראל). Given the premise that God probably speaks normative (i.e., Judahite) Hebrew unless engaging in dialect switching, it is not surprising that only one lexeme stands out as unusual in this chapter. The verb לחץ, however, is distinctive. Within the Torah, it occurs three times in Exodus (3:9, 22:20, 23:9--divine speech) and once in Num. 22:25. It also occurs five times in Judges (1:34, 2:18, 4:3, 6:9, and here) but never once in Joshua. In 1 Sam. 10:18, Samuel uses the lexeme; Isaiah (19:20), Jeremiah (30:20), and Amos (6:14) use it as well. Amos, in particular, may be speaking with a northern lilt, while Isaiah and Jeremiah use the term in poetic speech (as is the case with Ps. 56:2 and 106:42). The lexeme לחץ is also used three times in 2 Kings (6:32, 13:4, and 13:22 [IH]). Thus, while hardly a water-tight case, it seems arguable that this lexeme is a northernism. What is more unclear is whether this text depicts the deity speaking non-normatively (i.e., does this example of divine speech originate in the north?) or consciously depicted as dialect-switching.

Jephthah (Chs. 11-12)

האמין את (11:20)--This is the only instance of this root occuring in the *hifil* with

the preposition את (it usually takes -ב or -ל, as is the case with its occurances in Job, Proverbs, and poetry). We can't build much of an argument on one syntagm, but it is important not to overlook this kind of detail.

כרע (11:35)--This verb's distribution points to a possible "Israelian" classification. Within the Torah, it is found in Gen. 49:9 (but *Judah's* blessing) and in Num. 24:9. Also in IH poetry, we find the verb used three times in Judg. 5:27 (Song of Deborah) and three times in Job (4:4, 31:10, 39:3). Within potentially Israelian prose texts, the root can be found in Judg. 7:5 and 7:6. It also occurs in 1 Sam 4:19; 1 Ki. 19:18; 2 Ki. 1:13 and 9:24 [all Israelian]. It is also found in later texts, including Esther (3:2 and 3:5), Ezra (9:5), and 2 Chron. (7:3 and 29:29). However, despite the freqency of this root's appearances in such non-Judahite contexts, it also occurs in Judahite passages. In poetry, it is found in 2 Sam. 22:40 (= Ps. 18:40), frequently in Isaiah (10:4, 45:23, 46:1, and 65:2), often in Psalms (17:12, 20:9, 22:30, 72:9, 78:31, and 95:6). We find it only once, however, in Judahite prose: 1 Ki. 8:54. The prose use of this root (rather than any of the other ways of saying "bow down, fall down, prostrate oneself") indicates a northern air in Jephthah's speech.

עכר (11:35)--This is another example of a lexeme which is not absolutely northern in distribution, but which seems to occur more frequently in texts where the Hebrew is somewhat non-standard. In addition to the occurance here in Jephthah's speech, we find it in the language of Jonathan (1 Sam 14:29), as well as that of Ahab (2 Ki. 18:17) and Elijah (2 Ki. 18:18). It also occurs in 1 Chron. 2:7 (describing a grandson of Judah's whose name is a pun on this root; in Jos. 7 his name is *Achan*, not *Achar*). In JH (prose), we find the root in Gen. 34:30 and twice in Joshua (6:18 and 7:25). Within poetry, we find it four times in Proverbs (11:17, 11:29, 15:6, and 15:27) and in Ps. 39:3. The presence of the root in "standard" texts means we cannot emphatically state that this root is an "Israelian lexeme;" we can, however, detect a preference for this way of expressing "trouble" in the north.

רעיות (11:37)--It is striking that, including the *ketiv/qere* variations, the only other occurances of this lexeme are in Song of Songs (1:9, 1:15, 2:2, 2:10, 2:13, 4:1, 4:7, 5:2, and 6:4).

פצה (11:35, 36)--This is a more unusual way of saying "to open" than פתח. Here it is used as part of the idiom "to open (one's mouth)," in the sense of "to make a vow."

A similar usage occurs in Is. 10:14, Job 35:16 and in Ps. 66:14 (where we find שפתי instead of פי; the idiomatic use of the root פצה occurs in apposition to דבר). The root שבע is a much more common way of conveying this idea. The lexeme פצה occurs primarily in poetry (Pss. 22:14, 66:14, 144:7, and 144:10; Lam. 2:16 and 3:46; and also the noted usages in Job and Isaiah). In prose, it often seems to have a formal quality: God employs the term in His curse upon Cain (Gen. 4:11); Moses uses it in describing the punishment of Korah (Num. 16:30; Deut. 11:6), though the narrative fulfillment of the curse uses the root פתח; and God uses the root when He commands Ezekiel to eat the scroll in Ezek. 2:8. The connotation of "to vow" seems to align well with the formal usage of the idiom (vowing being, at least in some sense, a formal activity). What is interesting is that Jephthah uses this formal way of saying "to vow" in a highly emotional outburst (he forgets the direct-object marker את, which his daughter, in the next verse, remembers). Furthermore, despite the fact that the entire Jephthah tragedy stems from a rashly spoken vow, he never uses the common root שבע. We may suggest that the idiom ...לפצות פה אל is a normative for some dialects of Hebrew to express "to take a vow." Much in the way that standard lexemes from dialects and cognate languages become "poetic" in Judahite Hebrew, the same has happened with this phrase.

No lexemes in Ch. 12, aside from שבולת/סבולת and צעק/זעק (discussed above, in chapter one of this thesis) stand out as strikingly unusual words.

Samson (Chs. 13-16)

משפט (13:12)--While this nominal lexeme is common enough in the Tanakh (it occurs 422 times), in this verse it has the specific and unusual meaning of "character." The only other instance of the word משפט having this exact connotation can be found in 2 Ki. 1:7 (Ahazia's enquiring about Elijah). We can, however, broaden the database by expanding the meaning of the Hebrew to the idea of "manner." "Manner," a word with more extensive semantic range than "character," occurs in Gen. 40:13 (Joseph); Ex. 21:9; Judg. 18:7 [g]; 1 Sam 2:13 [g], 27:11; 1 Ki. 18:28 [g]; 2 Ki. 11:14 [g], 17:23 [g], 26 (resettled population in Samaria), 27 (king of Assyria), 34 [g]; and Ps. 119:132. A number of these cases, however, seem to be glosses (labelled [g]), explaining what was the custom in former days. Excluding the glosses (which may reflect later Hebrew, possibly JH), we find the lexeme "משפט" with the meaning "manner" in both northern

and southern contexts, with a slight prevalence in the north. Treatment of the glosses, however, require further study.

פלאי (13:18)--This root occurs frequently in its nominal and verbal incarnations, but as an adjective we find it only twice: here and in Ps. 139:6 (in the feminine). Burney cites similar meanings conveyed by the root in the *nifal* (in the sense of "surpassing understanding") in Ps. 131:1, Prov. 10:18, and Job 42:3 (349). These are all poetic texts. It is possible, therefore, that this nuance of the lexical root פלא is a northernism in prose. However, for an angelic being to employ a poetic term in self-reference would not be inexplicable (although the context is perhaps comical--one can read great exasperation into the angel's words).

כעת (13:23)--This combination of preposition and noun, "at the time, now," while common in its morphsyntax, is rare in actual usage. The only similar passages Burney locates are Judg. 21:22 and Num. 23:23. These two instances may suggest a dialectal nuance to the phrase; furthermore, if one broadens the data to include all usages of כעת, there seems to be a suggestion that the syntagm has an Israelian "sound." In addition to the usages cited by Burney (both of which are textually problematic, as is Is. 8:23, below), we have the phrase in a number of northern prose contexts: 1 Sam. 4:20 (Shilonite girls), 9:16, and 20:12; 1 Ki. 19:2 (Jezebel) and 20:6 (Ben Hadad's words); 2 Ki. 4:16 (Elisha), 4:17 (Elisha cycle), 7:1 (Elisha), 7:18 (Elisha cycle), 10:6 (Jehu). In late texts, we find it in 2 Chron. 21:19 and Dan. 9:21 (Hebrew). We also find the phrase in Job 39:18 and in Is. 8:23 (addressing the north). Ezekiel also uses the term when he tells the Israelites they will have to bear "the mockery of the daughters of Aram...the daughters of Philistia" (16:57). The most "problematic" (i.e., not likely dialectal) uses of the term can be found in Gen. 18 (vss. 10 and 14--predictions of the birth or Isaac), in a story that parallels the Samson birth-narrative, as well as the divine speech in Ex. 9:18 and Jos. 11:6. The bulk of the evidence, however, suggestions that this syntagm rests more easily on the northern tongue.

חוד (14:12, 13, 16)--This root occurs a total of twenty-one times in the Tanakh, and eight of those instances are found within eight verses of each other in the Samson cycle. Verbally, this root occurs only here and in Ezek. 17:2. Nominally, however, we can cite a number of occurances: this is the term for what kind of test the Queen of Sheba imposed upon Solomon (1 Ki. 10:1; 1 Chron. 9:1); it can be found in Hab. 2:6;

Pss. 49:5 and 78:2; Prov. 1:6; Dan. 8:23 (Hebrew); and also in Num 12:8. It is certainly not a common word, but "riddling" is not the most common concept. As Burney notes, the lexeme has a distinct meaning here: "trivial conundrum," as opposed to the "hard questions" of 1 Ki. 10:1 or the perplexing ethical dilemmas of the Psalms and Proverbs (361). Nonetheless, I do not consider this root a good candidate for dialectal usage. It is, rather, a highly specialized word used in specific, rare circumstances.

פתי (14:15, 16:5)--In the Samson saga, this word is spoken twice, both times by Philistines. Elsewhere in the Bible--though not exclusively--this lexeme occurs in non-Judahite contexts. This is the lexeme Michaiah uses repeatedly in 1 Ki. 22 (vss. 20, 21, and 22; repeated in 2 Chron. 18:19-21). Hosea also uses the term in 2:16 and 7:11. It occurs three times in Job (5:2, 31:9, and 31:27), as well as numerous times in Proverbs (1:10, 16:29, 20:19, 24:28, and 25:15). It also crops up in Ps. 78:36 [IH]. With regard to non-Israelian texts, the term is used primarily in poetry (Gen. 9:27; Jer. 20:7, 10), but does occur in prose in Ex. 22:5, Deut. 11:16, and Ezek. 14:9. Other lexemes can, of course, be used to convey related ideas (e.g., סות, "to seduce;" certain syntagms involving the root נשא in the *hifil*). The distribution is inconclusive, but does weigh towards a dialectal valuation of this lexeme.

מרע (14:20; 15:6)--This lexeme (a nominal bi-form of ריע, meaning "companion") occurs only eight times in the Hebrew Bible; half of those times are in the Samson cycle and either spoken by Philistines or in Philistine-centered narrative (14:11, 20; 15:2, 6). The term is applied to Abimelech's company in Gen. 26:26, and is also used in Job 6:14 and Prov. 19:7. Only in 2 Sam. 3:8 do we have a case where the term is linked explicitly to Judah--but even there it is spoken by Abner son of Ner, Saul's army commander (who is often linked in the text with both Benjamin and Israel), when he is addressing Saul's son. This seems a likely candidate for classification as a northern lexeme. This is a good example of potential dialectal significance of a familiar word occuring in a distinctive משקל.

מסכת (16:13, 14)--This term (meaning "a web of unfinished stuff") occurs only here, although it is familiar to anyone at all aware of Mishnaic Hebrew. A variant, מסכה ("woven stuff, a web"--same root, different משקל), occurs in Is. 25:7, 28:20, and 30:1. As with the previous word, if one considers that a difference of משקל is more likely to be distinctive of dialect than a totally different lexeme, this is a good candidate for

regionalism.

כזבים (16:10, 13)--This term is one of several Hebrew ways of saying "lie, deceive." Here the term is used nominally, and both times it is spoken by the Philistine Delilah. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, we find it in non-Israelian prophetic poetry (seven times in Ezekiel, twice in first Isaiah, and in Zeph. 3:13), as well as in "Israelian" texts such as Hos. 7:13 and 12:2, and Amos 2:4. We find it nine times in Proverbs (6:19, 14:5, 14:25, 19:5, 19:9, 19:22, 21:28, 23:3, and 30:8). It can be found in Ps. 58:4 [IH], but also in other psalms (5:7, 40:5, 62:5, 62:10). It is often paired with the much more common nominal lexeme שקר (which occurs over 100 times in the Bible). Its distribution in IH texts as well as in poetry in general, and its presence as a b-word in parallelism suggest that this lexeme could be considered a northernism.

כפעם בפעם (16:20)--This idiom, which means "like every time before," can be found in a few, select locations, including: Num. 24:1 (Balaam); here in Delilah's speech; Judg. 20:30 and 31; 1 Sam. 3:10 and 20:25. The instances in Numbers, Judges, and 1 Sam. 3 all lend themselves to a dialectal interpretation. The final occurance, found in the Saul cycle, could go either way--it is narrative featuring both David and Saul. It is important to contrast the distribution of this phrase with that of "כתמול שלשום" (another way of expressing the same basic idea). This alternative expression occurs seven times in the Tanakh, five times in "Judean" contexts (Gen. 31:2, 5; Jos. 4:18; 1 Sam. 21:6; and 2 Ki. 13:5). The final two times are in the mouths of Egyptians (Ex. 5:7 [Pharaoh], 5:14 [Egyptian taskmasters])--perhaps dialectal contexts, but not necessarily Israelian. Overall, כפעם בפעם has a northern nuance (we do not expect Delilah to speak with an Egyptian "accent").

Micah and the Danites (Chs. 17-18)

אלה (17:2)--This verbal root is used by Micah (an Ephramite) to describe his mother's reaction to the missing silver. The only other usages of the term occur in 1 Sam. 14:24 (Saul); 1 Ki. 8:31 (Solomon) and 2 Chron. 6:22 (the recap); Hos. 4:2 and 10:4; and Joel 1:8. This is not a very large distribution for a verbal root, and it is certainly less common than other Biblical ways of saying "to swear" (e.g. -להשבע ב--see the Jephthah section regarding "פצה פה"). If we accept the premise that Saul's speech could be dialectal (especially in those sources more positive towards him), then only the

Solomonic text argues against a regional classification of this lexeme.

פסל ומסכה (17:3, 14; 18:14)--This word-pair, very similar to אפוד ותרפים with which it is paired once (in 18:14, where *both* phrases are used--one possibly a gloss on the other, as Boling suggests [264]), occurs only five times in the Tanakh. It is found in Deut. 27:15, three times here, and once in Nahum 1:14 (oracle against Nineveh). Aside from the appearance in Deuteronomy, the few attestations of this pair suggest dialectal usage. It is interesting to note that the Judges usages are the only "colloquial" (non-poetic, non-oath context) examples.

מחיה (17:19)--This term occurs only eight times in the Hebrew Bible. The regional nature of the distribution is not clear. It occurs in Gen. 45:5 (Joseph); twice in Lev. 13 (vss. 10 and 24); in Jud. 6:4 (Gideon) and here; twice in Ezra 9 (Hebrew); and in 2 Chron. 14:12. Of all these passages, only those in Judges have the meaning of "sustenance;" all the others have related, but distint, nuances. In Genesis, the implication is one of "preservation of life." The Levitical references all refer to raw flesh. In Ezra, the term is used to refer to a surviving remnant. The Chronicler seems to use the term to mean "recovery." As a result of this wide semantic range, it is arguable how we should classify the lexeme in terms of dialect; the use within Judges, however, is consistent. We can, therefore, draw out the implication that this is a word whose meaning seems determined by speaker--and here the speaker is most clearly a Danite.

אב/כהן (17:10, 18:19)--These two words are paired only here. It it possible that this pairing results not from regional religious langauge but from irony. The person being offered the position of "father and priest" is, after all, also described as a נער (which may or may not connote "youth"--if he is young, it would be odd for him to be considered an *elder* statesman) and, while of Levitical (even Mosaic) descent, he is clearly *not* Aaronide. These appellations may, therefore, simply be a wry editorial comment on his *lack* of qualifications for either post or honorific. However, it is worth noting that youths can, in fact, serve in honored posts (e.g., Samuel's call, the coronations of Saul and of David, etc--this is a common folk-motif). Furthermore, the terminology of „אב" appears to apply to women, as well. Deborah (whose age is indeterminate) is described as אם בישראל in Judg. 5:7. Hence, the terms may be used in ironic ways, but the specific lexemes chosen to express the irony may reflect the region in which the expression was employed. (E.g., in Flatbush, a person's rhetoric may be criticized as

excessively "Talmudic" while in another neighborhood, the same logic may be decried as "Jesuitical"--context, not argument, having changed.)

חקר (18:2)--Compared to most of the other words selected for examination in this chapter, this verbal root is comparatively common (it occurs twenty-seven times). Not every instance is necessarily a candidate for classification as "northern" or "Israelian," but many are. In particular, an Ammonite uses the term in 2 Sam. 10:3 and, in Jud. 18:2, the term is employed by a Danite commander. Furthermore, it occurs three times in Psalms (Pss. 44:22 [IH], 139:1, 23); six times in Job (5:27; 13:9; 28:3, 27; 29:16; and 32:11); four times in Proverbs (18:17; 23:30; 25:2; 28:11); once in Eccl. 12:9 and in Lam. 3:40. It also is used twice in Jeremiah (31:37 and 46:23) and twice in Chronicles (1 Chr. 19:3 and 2 Chron. 4:18). These are all texts considered to contain traces of regional language, are very late, or are poetic and reflect a non-standard vocabulary. There is also one occasion where this root is employed in Deuteronomy (13:15). In 1 Sam. 20:12, Jonathan uses the root when speaking to David. This leaves only the reference to Solomon's Temple in 1 Ki. 7:47 clearly Judahite. It is interesting to note that the narrative portions surrounding the speech discussed here (Judg. 18:2) consistently uses the term לרגל to describe the spies' activity. The verb לרגל has a significantly wider distribution throughout the Tanakh than לחקר. It may be, therefore, that the word-choice in Judg. 18:2 reflects intentional dialect-switching on the part of the author.

חשה (18:9)--This verb ("to be silent, still) shows a distinctive regional bias in its distribution. In addition to the Danite speech reported here, it occurs in markedly northern contexts involving kings of Israel and the prophet Elisha (1 Ki. 22:3; 2 Ki. 2:3, 5, 7:9). It can also be found in Psalms (28:1, 39:3, 107:29) and Eccl. 3:7--poetic texts. It is also used six times by Second Isaiah and once in the Hebrew portion of Nehemiah. Though the data-pool is, as is often the case, somewhat small, this lexeme seems yet another likely candidate for indication of regional language in the form of word-choice.

עצל (18:9)--Here we have a very likely example of dialectal word-choice. Judg. 18:9 is the only instance in which this lexeme is used verbally (meaning "to be lazy"). Every one of the fourteen adjectival usages occurs in Proverbs (6:6, 9; 10:26; 13:4; 15:19; 19:24; 20:4; 21:25; 22:13; 24:30; 26:13, 14, 15, 16), while Eccl. 10:18 has a related form, "עצלתים" ("slothfulness"). The root, however, is known from Mishnaic Hebrew, as well as in Syriac and Arabic. As encouraging as this evidence is, we must

also look for alternatives which could have been used. One possibility, "שפלות," is found only in Eccl. 10:18. The root "בטל" ("to cease") occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Eccl. 12:3, although we find it five times in the Aramaic of Ezra (4:21, 23, 24; 5:5; 6:8). In Aramaic (Talmud Bavli *Ned.* 31b, 32a) we find the root "רשל" used in a *braita* with the meaning "to be weak;" in modern Hebrew, we have the related word, "רשלנות," which Alkalai renders "laziness." Similarly, we have the Hebrew root "רפה" ("to relax"), which is the most common of any of these roots cited thus far, occuring fifty-five times. With the sense of "relaxing (of hands) from work" (rather than fear or despair, more common idioms) however, we can refer only to Neh. 6:9. The weight of the evidence, therefore, seems to indicate that the lexeme used in Judges does have dialectal significance. Or, alternatively, only the Wisdom schools and the Danites ever specifically mention laziness.

מחסור (18:10)--This nominal form of the root חסר is employed by the Danite spies in their description of the northern territory (it lacks nothing). This term's distribution is interesting and specific: in addition to this occurance, it occurs in Deut. 15:8; Judg. 19:19 and 19:20 (once by a Judahite and once by an Ephramite); Ps. 34:10; and Prov. 6:11 [// רָאש], 11:24, 14:23, 21:5, 21:17, 22:16, 24:34 [// רֵיש], and 28:27. The heavy concentration in Proverbs (eight of thirteen appearances--all verses with interesting vocabulary) could be an indication that this word was the preferred term in certain regions. Only the usage in Deuteronomy challenges this classification, and one exception does not necessarily suffice to disprove the hypothesis.

אפוד ותרפים (18:14)--This word-pair occurs only here in Judges (first in a narrative description of Micah's temple in 17:5, and also in a Danite's speech) and in Hos. 3:4. The words, individually, occur in a variety of contexts: אפוד--forty-nine times; ותרפים--fifteen times. [The distribution of ותרפים is, in itself, potentially regionally significant: it occurs three times in the Laban cycle (Gen. 31:19, 34, 35); seven times in the Micah narrative (Judg. 17:5; 18:14, 17, 18, 20); three times in 1 Sam. (15:23--Samuel's speech; 19:13, 16--Michal in narrative); and once each in 2 Ki. 23:24 (Josiah narrative); Ez. 21:26; and Zech. 10:2.] Given the distribution of the word-pair specifically, this phrase seems a likely candidate for classification as a northern idiom although the database is, as is too often the case, miniscule.

Conclusion (Chs. 19-21)

פת לחם (19:5)--This term (as opposed to variants including ככר לחם and צליל לחם, noted above) occurs only a few times in the Tanakh, although it is common in Rabbinic Hebrew. In the Bible, we find the phrase five times in addition to this instance: in Gen. 18:5; 1 Sam. 2:36 (Eli); 1 Sam. 28:22 (the witch of Endor); 1 Ki. 17:11 (Elijah); and Prov. 28:21. This body of evidence is really too small to be conclusive. However, we can note that four of these instances involve contexts for which we could argue non-Judahite language--words spoken by a divine messenger to Eli, by the witch (of unknown ethnicity) to Saul, by Elijah, and in Proverbs. However, we also have the evidence provided by Genesis and the passage here, where the phrase „פת לחם" is spoken by a Judahite. I would argue that the term connotes not regionalism, but formalism (except for the Proverbs example). Five of the six occurances involve extensions of or requests for hospitality. Regionalism seems to be unrelated to this word-choice.

רחוב (19: 15, 17, 20)--This term, rendering the English "street, avenue" in modern Hebrew, seems to mean something more along the lines of "public square" in Biblical parlance. Within the Biblical corpus, it is much more common in *Nevi'im* and *Ketuvim* than in the Torah proper. In fact, it is used only twice in the Torah--once in Gen. 19:2 (Lot, speaking in the Sodom story, which pertains directly to the story in Judg. 19) and once in Deut. 13:17 (רחוב specified as the cite where the material possessions of an idolatrous town shall be burned). In Judges, it is used several times but is limited to ch. 19. Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah use it twice, while Jeremiah uses it three times. Amos (5:16) and Nahum (2:5) use it once each. In *Ketuvim*, we find it in Ps. 55:12 and 144:14, as well as Job 29:7; Prov. 1:20, 5:16, 7:12, 22:13 and 26:13; Cant. 3:2; Lam. 2:11 and 2:12; Est. 4:6, 6:9 and 6:11; 2 Chron. 29:4 and 32:6 and in the Hebrew portions of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah (Dan. 9:25, Ezr. 10:9, Neh. 8:1, 8:3, and 8:16). This distribution is not overwhelmingly "northern" in flavor, although the concentration of the word in poetic texts, especially in Proverbs, Amos, Nahum, Lamentations, and Song of Songs argue for a regional identification in prose. It is often paired with more common words such as דרך and חוץ, though in Song of Songs it parallels שווקים (it is never parallel to the word אורח). The term also seems to be more common in later texts (Chronicles, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah). Any statement about this word's dialectal qualities

would have to be tentative, at best, although taken with other evidence, it could contribute to the developing picture.

ערב (19:9)--This root, in the sense of "to become evening" occurs only three times in the Tanakh. BDB suggests two of these instances be emended. The first instance in the one here, which BDB. following the Greek, emends to לָעֲרֹב (Burney also cites this emendation). The second can be found in Is. 24:11 (emended to עָבְרָה--"has passed away"). The final example, unemended, comes from 1 Sam. 17:16 (infitive absolute in the prelude to David's meeting with Goliath). These examples are too few and too problematic to allow us to extrapolate any meaningful conclusions.

מסלות (20:32; 21:19)--This word is a somewhat rare synonym for דרך, usually translated as "highway." Four of its twenty-four occurances are in the concluding pericope of Judges (20: 31, 32, 45; 21:19; it also appears in 5:20). In speech, it is used by Benjaminites (20:32) and Israelites (21:19). In prose, it also appears in Num.20:19; 1 Sam. 6:12; in 2 Sam. 20:12-13; in 2 Ki. 18:17.[8] The final prose usages are both in 1 Chron 26 (vss. 16 and 18). The use of the term in 2 Chr. 9:11 is widely regarded as a textual error (see BDB 700). In poetry, the term is found chiefly in prophetic texts (Is. 19:23, 33:8, 40:3, 49:11, 59:7, 62:10; Jer. 31:21; Joel 2:8), but also in Ps. 84:6.

This distribution does not really favor a regional classification; if anything, the use of the term in first Isaiah and the Succession Narrative suggest a Judahite preference, but this classification is mitigated somwhat by the use of the term in "foreign" contexts (verses dealing particularly with Assyria) and its presence in explicitly poetic passages as a b-word to דרך. Hence my conclusion: inconclusive.

דמה (20:5)--As BDB and Burney both note, this rather common root is used with an unusual meaning--"to think"--in this verse (a meaning carried over into Rabbinic Hebrew and known in Eastern and Western Aramaic, as well). This same meaning can be found in 2 Sam. 21:5 (Gibeonites), Num. 33:56, and Est. 4:13. In Judges, the word is found in the speech of a Judahite man speaking to *Israelites* (בני ישראל). In poetry, we find examples in Is. 10:7 (describing Assyria), and in Ps. 50:21 and 48:10 (both [IH]). While this evidence is spartan--this meaning appears seven times in all--the Biblical and extra-Biblical evidence indicates a northern source for this nuance.

[8] A similar passage also using מסלות occuring in Is. 36:2; in Is. 7:3 (describing the same location as in 2 Ki. 18) and 11:16 and 19:23 (in the context of alliances with Assyria and Egypt).

יהב--see above (1:15)

ארב--see above (9:32)

כעת--see above (13:23)

חטף (21:21)--This root, as a verb, occurs only here (in the speech of Israelites) and in Ps. 10:9 ([IH]). Two occurances, one in speech and one in poetry, are insufficient for any conclusion to be drawn.

Conclusions

As demonstrated in the studies above, I have cast my net wide in the search for lexemes which could be considered reflective of a northern "accent." None of the lexemes discussed can be classified as undoubtedly "Israelian;" for many, we can construct alternative explanations--diglossia, late date, uniqueness of meaning, or the limitations of the corpus itself--for why a word may have unusual distribution in the Hebrew Bible.

Nevertheless, we can draw some tentative conclusions on the basis of the "pointilist" portrait extracted from the data above. Some pericopes have more "likely candidates" than others; in particular, the introduction (1:1-2:5), the Jephthah narrative, the Samson cycle, and the Micah story seem to have particularly noteworthy clusters of unusual lexemes in direct speech. This is not necessarily what one would expect, given the general late-dating of the introduction, in particular. As noted in the introduction to my study of that pericope, however, dating of a text does not necessarily have any bearing on dialect-switching. It is possible for a later author to have a better ear, a more sensitive tradition, or a simple preference for the use of dialect in direct speech.

Despite the quantity of words scrutinized within the Gideon pericope, I am reluctant to classify chapters 6-8 as preserving dialect. On the one hand, it contains some lexemes which strongly suggest an awareness of dialect in speech (in particular, -ש, דל, יצג, כרע, and the variety of ways of saying "loaf of bread"). On the other hand, given the length of the pericope, I had hoped to find *more* words, and clearer examples. It is still possible to say that the Gideon story contains lexical evidence of dialect-switching, but this section of text is no more clear-cut than the other passages which are also likely candidates.

Most of the other passages are, at best, inconclusive. The data from the Ehud story, the Abimelech section, the "interlude" in ch. 10, and the concluding pericope (chs. 19-21) are either too limited in size (either the amount of speech within the passage itself, or the number of times the interesting word appears in the Hebrew corpus) or too ambiguous in its distribution. This is not to say there aren't interesting leads which further study could clarify (particularly on the basis of external evidence). In particular, it is tempting to see some of the lexemes in the conclusion as having dialectal significance. The concluding pericope has a number of tempting but inconclusive words, and it would be nice if the end of the book reflected the same sensitivity to language as the introduction. However, the examples are simply less strong, and so I refrain from classifying the lexical features of chs. 19-21.

The langauge of the Deborah story is also inconclusive. Deborah does seem to posses a distinctive vocabulary. There seems to be a linkage to Aramaic and, not surprisingly, a tendancy towards "poetic" word-choice. The distribution of her unusual lexemes, however, does not strongly support a regional classification of her speech patterns. We can suggest, therefore, that the author of Deborah's speeches in ch. 4 gave her a distinctive lexicon, but one perhaps more influenced by her reputation as a poet than her origins in the northern parts of Israel.

The lexical study above and the conclusions tentatively drawn on the basis of the results are far from definitive. My standards for inclusion have not been as rigorous as those demanded by Rendsburg and Hurvitz. I hope the amount of data included will help each reader draw independent conclusions. Nevertheless, in conjunction with the morphophonoetic and syntactical data provided in the other chapters of this thesis, I believe the lexical information above can contribute to our ability to determine whether specific pericopes in Judges preserve dialectal language or not.

Chapter Three

"Me, Myself, and I:"
A Test-Case for Syntactic Evidence of Dialect

Morphological and lexical aspects of dialect, as covered in the first two chapters of this thesis, have had clear and easy-to-note parallels from English and other languages. Syntax is a much more difficult facet of dialect to study. While Rendsburg notes "it would not be surprising to find syntactic distinctions" between IH and JH (Linguistics, 70), no study specifically of dialectal features of Hebrew syntax has yet been attempted. The primary difficulty in employing syntax as "proof" of dialect lies in the fact that Hebrew syntax is, overall, extraordinarily succinct. Variations in syntax can generally be seen as indicating specific semantic nuances rather than dialect.

To see how (or if) syntax may be utilized in the study of dialect in Biblical Hebrew, I have selected as a test-case the redundant pronoun (other possible areas of study will be noted at the end of this chapter). "Redundant pronoun" refers to the explicit use of the personal subject pronoun in combination with an already-marked finite verb form.[1] We will see how, precisely, such a syntagm is used for specific rhetorical effects in the book of Judges.

Since Erich Auerbach published "Odysseus' Scar"--if not before--academic discussion of Biblical Hebrew rhetoric has accepted the idea that the Bible does not waste words as a basic premise.[2] What can be said in four words, the Hebrew text will say in four, or maybe three. The terseness of Biblical Hebrew language contributed (in inverse proportion) to the vastness of second-generation legend evident in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim traditions, authoritative and folk. The volume of commentary on the Hebrew Bible underlines a basic fact: any careful reader of the work invariably discovers that the text tells us less than it could have, and often less than we really need to know.

Granting this general tendency of Biblical Hebrew narrative style, any deviation from rhetorical minimalism merits attention. Translating one of the fundamental

[1] This, of course, means that I am excluding from consideration here cases of pronoun + participle, because the participle is marked for number and gender but not person; the pronoun supplies the *missing* information. As such, it is far from redundant!

principals of Rabbinic exegesis ("there is no such things as redundant language") into modern scholarly terms, any extra words--any *wasted* words, כביכול--must be present for a reason. The "redundant pronoun" is a classic case of a seemingly superfluous word whose presence in the text must be explained. Bandstra notes that the seeming redundancy of the redundant pronoun "is not a grammatical slip so much as a discourse device ("Word Order and Emphasis," Linguistics 122). Muraoka deals with this construction under the rubric of "emphasis." After summarizing and critiquing prior scholarship dealing with the "pleonastic" use of the pronoun with finite verb, which too vaguely applied the term "emphasis," Muraoka states:

> Over against the confused picture briefly sketched above, I shall attempt to show that the personal pronoun with verbum finitum serves to express an intense concern with, special interest in, or concentrated, focused consciousness of, the object referred to by the pronoun on the part of the speaker or writer. (48)

Muraoka's study is thorough, and he explains the large majority of cases in which we find the redundant pronoun construction.[2] Since it is not my contention that Northern Hebrew is more "emphatic" than Judean Hebrew, we must focus our attention on those cases where Muraoka's analysis does *not* seem to account for the presence of the extraneous pronoun. Given the complexity of syntax as a category (morphemes and lexemes, examined in the prior chapters, are simpler and more self-contained than syntagms, which involve multiple words and issues of word-order and contextual sequence), I believe it will be profitable examine in-depth a single construction as a test-case for the use of syntax in the study of dialect. Here, as above, distribution will be a category of particular importance in our attempt to classify syntagms as dialectal. We will begin by examining all the "normal" (syntactic and semantic) usages of the redundant proun. We will then study the feature in the reported speech of Judges, in order to determine whether any usages in these passages are anomalous in a way which might indicate the presence of regional speech variation.

---

[2] Mimesis (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1957). 1-20. As noted below, Rabbinic exegetes also regarded every word of the Biblical text as "meaning-full;" modern scholarship has, in a way, borrowed more than a bit from this Rabbinic attitude, in spite of the differences which separate the religious and academic endeavors.

General Analysis of the Construction

At first glance, it may seem that any use of the personal pronoun with a finite verb would be redundant. After all, if לקחתי means (roughly!) "I have taken, I took, I did take" (the elements "I," "take," and a nuance of completion all being present) why would we ever need to say אני לקחתי? What information does the pronoun contribute? A closer examination of such a syntagm *in context*--not just within the individual clause or sentence, but in the larger narrative sequence--reveals that often the pronoun is essential to our understanding of the text. Such non-extraneous pronouns fall into four classes: those involving complementary particles such as גם and אף; those occurring paired with a compound subject, e.g. לקחתי אני ודוד or הלך דניאל וכל חבריו; "unmarked" pronouns necessary for syntactic reasons (particularly in disjunctive constructions, where either a pronoun or a proper noun is required to "interrupt" the flow of the normal sequence); and those needed for semantic reasons ("emphasis").[3]

1. *Additive Particle*: In the first case, an additional particle (with an additive function) distinguishes the construction גם אני לקחתי from אני לקחתי.[4] "I, likewise, took" does not mean the same thing as "I took." The inclusion of "likewise" or "also" or "too" comes to inform the reader that something additional must be understood within the larger context of the action. The pronoun is necessary as part of the construction involving "גם," in order to specify what is being emphasized as additional. We should note that there are numerous examples of the additive particles without redundant pronouns. Examine, for instance, Gen. 17:16: „וגם נתתי ממנה לך בן" ("And furthermore, I hereby grant you a son by her"). The inclusion of the pronoun in such a construction would change the location of the emphasis from the notion of simple addition ("moreover...") to the subject („וגם אני נתתי ממנה לך בן"*--"And furthermore, *I* will give you a son by her"). The extra verbiage is, thus, not extraneous. The passage would have

[3] As will become clear in the course of this discussion, my analysis of the redundant pronoun depends heavily on Muraoka's succinct and convincing writing on the subject. The major differences between his analysis and mine is that, as in the previous chapters, I have distinguished between poetry and prose (Muraoka examines both together). Also, beyond the case for "emphasis," I am seeking to uncover possible dialect variations in ways of speaking emphatically.

[4] Prof. J. MacDonald in "Some Distinctive Characteristics of Israclite Spoken Hebrew" (*BO* 32 [3/4], 1975, pp. 162-175) includes constructions with additive particles in his study of this construction (166-168), which focuses on reported speech in Samuel.

a different nuance without it.

2. *Compound Subject*: The compound subject involving a pronoun and another noun linked by a copulative-*vav*, likewise, performs a distinct function in Hebrew syntax.[5] Gesenius notes as a general rule: "The predicate *preceding* two or more subjects may likewise be used in the plural (Gn 40[1], Jb 3[5], &c.); not infrequently, however, it [the verb] agrees in gender and number with the first, as being the subject nearest to it" (§146f, p.468). The examples involving two nouns are plentiful; take, for example, Gen. 7:7-- „ויבא נח ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו". The verb agrees with נח in person, number, and gender, despite the fact that it governs a subject which is, technically speaking, both masculine and feminine, and definitely plural. In cases where the compound subject precedes the verb/predicate, the verb is generally plural, but unless every noun in the subject is feminine, the predicate will have a masculine inflection. Here, Gesenius cites Gen. 18:11, „אברהם ושרה זקנים" (§146d) where the predicate is plural (reflecting the plurality of the subject) but masculine, despite the proximity of the feminine proper noun.

A quick glance at this kind of construction reveals a basic fact of Hebrew grammar: if the proper nouns נח and אברהם were not part of those compound subjects, *something* would have to fill that syntactic space. That "something" is either a noun or a pronoun. The statement „ויבא ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו" makes no sense. Were one to say, „ויבא הוא ובניו ואשתו ונשי בניו," however, coherence is restored. The pronoun is hardly redundant--it is essential! We find in Judges 7:18 a verse which exemplifies the necessity of the "redundant" pronoun in both additive and compound-subject contexts: "ותקעתי בשופר אנכי וכל אשר אתי ותקעתם בשופרות גם אתם סביבות כל המחנה ואמרתם ליהוה ולגדון„. For syntactic reasons, we must have the first pronoun-- "Then I, and all who are with me, will blow on the shofar." It just happens that the verb's inflection reflects the nearest noun/pronoun, and as a result it is in the 1cs. The pronoun is, in fact, not at all redundant; it is an essential part of the compound subject. The second pronoun, attached to גם, explains what everyone else will be doing simultaneously while

[5] MacDonald, correctly, excludes this construction from his study.

Gideon and his men are trumpeting away: "...you, too, all around the camp, will also blow upon horns." The events being described are both cumulative and simultaneous. The syntax conveys this information.

A second category of compound subject should also be mentioned here, although it does not occur in Judges and is, as a result, more peripheral to this particular study. I am referring to a construction I'll term the "reflexive-compound subject." By this, I refer to the construction „אני יהוה דברתי" (common in prophetic literature; cf. Jer. 34:24) or „אני קהלת הייתי מלך על ישראל בירושלים" (Eccl. 1:12). The combination of pronoun and noun functions almost as a nominal sentence which, secondarily, becomes the subject of the verbal clause. The whole clause serves the function of specifying who the pronoun is--lest the pronoun have an unclear referent. Thus "I, Kohelet, was king over Israel in Jerusalem" functions almost as if it were "I am Kohelet; I was king over Israel in Jerusalem." The speaker wants to make sure that his identity is unambiguous. The result is an extremely formal style, much as we find in our own Constitution: "We, the people..." This is not "normal" speech but an elevated, literary style of writing.

3. *Disjunctive Syntax*: The final category of "syntactically necessary redundant" pronoun derives from the structure of the disjunctive clause in Hebrew. Both circumstantial or alternative clauses share the structure of *vav* + noun/pronoun. Circumstantial clauses express an action contemporaneous with the main clause; this kind of clause is introduced, in English, by the word "while" (in the temporal sense). As Gesenius notes, "[not] infrequently such a *circumstantial clause* indicates at the same time some contradictory fact, so that ו is equivalent to *whereas, whilst, although*" (§141e, italics original). This is the "meanwhile, back at the ranch..." construction. Alternative clauses express contrast: "David built a house, while Jonathan built a palace" (the contrast here being between house and palace). This kind of clause can be introduced by "but" (explicitly disjunctive and contrastive) or by "while" (in the distinguishing sense, rather than temporal).[6]

[6] Many cases of the pronoun being used to heighten contrast--a major use of the pronoun in Muraoka's scheme (54-58)--employ these kinds of construction as part of making the

The two kinds of clauses resemble each other closely in structure and sense. Furthermore, both circumstantial and alternative clauses are disjunctive in the sense that they interrupt the sequential flow of the narrative, either to describe simultaneous action or explicate contrast. Semitic syntax demands that both kinds of clauses be structured in such a way that sets them off from the rest of the narrative. In general, the way this disjunction is accomplished is by fronting the clause with a *vav* and a noun or pronoun. For instance, in Num. 32:6 Moses rebukes the tribes of Gad and Reuben: „והאחיכם יבאו למלחמה ואתם תשבו פה"--"Are your brothers to go to war *while you stay here*?" Of the three categories of redundant pronoun constructions, this variety is the one most likely to occur in non-speech passages, where the narrative's needs to place action in the foreground and background requires the ability to manipulate time-sequence in just this way. In sum, when we come across a phrase fronted by a *vav* and a noun or pronoun,[7] we mostly likely have a circumstantial or alternative clause. Were the pronoun not used in such a case, another noun would have to be substituted.

4. *Emphasis*: These three categories (pronoun with additive particle, pronoun in compound subject, and pronoun in disjunctive clause) account for all the instances in which syntax requires the presence of a pronoun. The redundant pronoun does occur in other contexts, however. In such cases, an explanation other than syntax must be found. According to Muraoka, some form of the concept of "emphasis" can be used to explain the presence of such pronouns. In his conclusions, Muraoka categorizes the various forms of the redundant pronoun as indicative of mediating ego (particularly in Kohelet--a form I classified as "reflexive-compound subject" above); signifiers of emotional elevation, intensified self-consciousness, self-assertion, special interest, or attention; passages where such emotional elevation can be found tend to be in contexts of rebuke, indignation, penitence, boasting, promise, conclusion of contract, or

contrast. "X does Y *while* A does B..." The function of contrast cannot be assigned to the pronoun alone in such cases, as syntax requires either a noun or pronoun in this construction.

[7] It should be noted that the attached word can be from the predicate, as well as the subject, e.g., when Delilah says, "How can you say 'I love you' ולבך אין אתי *while your heart is not with me*" (16:15). The combination of *vav* and non-verbal-phrase is enough to mark disjunction.

narration of strange event (such as a dream). These usages all tend to be primarily in the first and second person (as indicated by terms such as *self*-awareness) and in direct speech (58). Finally, Muraoka states that "as far as the emphasizing function is concerned, the position of the pronoun is irrelevant; it can either precede or follow the verb" (59).

These four classifications of the redundant pronoun account for the majority of usages of this construction in the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, Muraoka's schematization is broad enough that it is possible to classify almost all non-syntactically required instances of redundant pronouns as "emphasis." (This fact returns us, admittedly with greater awareness and sophistication, to the original problem of such a catch-all term). It is thus the project of the rest of this chapter to see if, *given* the emphatic classification rubrics of Muraoka, there is still room within the Hebrew syntactic system for dialectal variation.

The Book of Judges

The "redundant pronoun" of the "emphatic" type (i.e., not type 1-3) occurs twenty-eight times in the reported speech of Judges. I have focused on these "unmarked" occurrences because they are the least clearly defined in terms of function, aside from "emphasis." In the following analysis, we will examine all twenty-eight instances according to Muraoka's categorizations.

Syntagm #1: Disjunctive vav + pronoun + inflected verb not in circumstantial or alternative clauses

Several verses contain clauses which may look, at first glance, as if they were simple circumstantial or alternative clauses. Upon closer examination, however, such simple classification turns out to be misleading.[8] Judg. 11:27 (וְאָנֹכִי **לֹא-חָטָאתִי** לָךְ וְאַתָּה עֹשֶׂה אִתִּי רָעָה לְהִלָּחֶם בִּי יִשְׁפֹּט יְהוָה הַשֹּׁפֵט הַיּוֹם בֵּין בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) and 35 (וַיְהִי כִרְאוֹתוֹ אוֹתָהּ וַיִּקְרַע אֶת-בְּגָדָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֲהָהּ בִּתִּי הַכָרֵעַ הִכְרַעְתִּנִי וְאַתְּ הָיִית בְּעֹכְרָי וְאַתְּ בֵּין בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן)

[8] For all his fine and detailed analysis, Muraoka does not address the specific issue of the role of the *vav*-disjunctive in his analysis of the redundant pronoun. The study which follows attempts to correct this oversight. When examples cited by Muraoka are employed, the issue of the disjunctive-*vav* is likewise kept in mind.

וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ **וְאַתָּה הָיִיתָ** בְּעֹכְרִי **וְאָנֹכִי פָּצִיתִי**-פִּי אֶל-יְהוָה וְלֹא אוּכַל לָשׁוּב), as well as 17:10 (מִיכָה שְׁבָה עִמָּדִי וֶהְיֵה-לִי לְאָב וּלְכֹהֵן **וְאָנֹכִי אֶתֵּן**-לְךָ עֲשֶׂרֶת כֶּסֶף לַיָּמִים וְעֵרֶךְ בְּגָדִים וּמִחְיָתֶךָ וַיֵּלֶךְ הַלֵּוִי) and 21:7 (מַה-נַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לַנּוֹתָרִים לָנָשִׁים **וַאֲנַחְנוּ נִשְׁבַּעְנוּ** בַיהוָה לְבִלְתִּי תֵּת-לָהֶם מִבְּנוֹתֵינוּ לְנָשִׁים) contain phrases which follow the pattern of *vav* + pronoun + inflected verb. Verses 16:5 (וַיַּעֲלוּ אֵלֶיהָ סַרְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים וַיֹּאמְרוּ לָהּ פַּתִּי אוֹתוֹ וּרְאִי בַּמֶּה כֹּחוֹ) and 17:2 (וַיֹּאמֶר לְאִמּוֹ גְּדוֹל וּבַמֶּה נוּכַל לוֹ וַאֲסָרֵנֵהוּ לְעַנֹּתוֹ **וַאֲנַחְנוּ נִתֵּן**-לָךְ אִישׁ אֶלֶף וּמֵאָה כֶּסֶף אֶלֶף וּמֵאָה הַכֶּסֶף אֲשֶׁר לֻקַּח-לָךְ **וְאַתְּי אָלִית** וְגַם אָמַרְתְּ בְּאָזְנַי הִנֵּה-הַכֶּסֶף אִתִּי אֲנִי לְקַחְתִּיו וַתֹּאמֶר אִמּוֹ בָּרוּךְ בְּנִי לַיהוָה) do as well. The first three instances (in vss. 11:27 and 35) all occur in the Jephthah cycle. The instance in 11:27 connotes self-assertion, not "alternation;" in fact, the "alternation" occurs in the b-part of vs. 27, where we find *vav* + pronoun + participle. In vs. 17:10 (Danites) the emphatic force of the pronoun seems to derive from the context of negotiation (Muraoka's "conclusion of contract" [58]--except the contract here is being offered, not concluded). Similarly, the construction in 16:5 derives its emphatic force from the context of "negotiation" between the Philistines and Delilah. Three cases of *vav* + pronoun + inflected verb fall into the classification I have termed "woe" (11:35*bis* and 21:7). "Woe" is not a classification enumerated by Muraoka but one which could fit into his schematization of emphatic nuances). Two of these "woe" constructions occur in 11:35, where both "redundant pronoun" constructions follow one after the other. I would consider this outburst by Jephthah to be a combination of emphatic speech and colloquial syntax (given that, in each phrase, a particle such as כי could have substituted for the pronoun with no loss of "sense"--but with great loss of emotional impact). Similar colloquialism marks the speech of Micah in 17:2. In place of the phrase "ואתי אלית" (*vav* + pronoun + perfect) we might expect a consecutive construction: "*so that* you swore." What we have here, however, seems to be a re-creation of the way real people speak in real life, which is not always the grammarian's ideal.[9] None of these phrases should be translated as a standard circumstantial or alternative clause. We note, for the moment, that these seven unusually-nuanced variations of the familiar syntagm occur in the speech of Jephthah (indignation and colloquial-woe),

[9] For a similar sort of colloquial language in a northern context, I refer the reader to 2 Ki. 4:7 (Elisha); Ruth 3:4 (Naomi) and 4:4 (Boaz).

Philistines and Danites (negotiation), Micah (colloquial), and "בני ישראל" (woe). This distribution, particularly with regards to the concentration in Jephthah, seems particularly noteworthy.

Syntagm #2: imperative + subject pronoun

Having examined one syntagm (*vav* + pronoun + inflected verb) for its distribution, let us now turn our attention to another syntagm: those constructions consisting of imperative + pronoun (always, obviously, second person). This construction occurs in 8:21 (Zebah and Zalmunna); 9:10, 12, 14 (Jotham's parable of the trees); and 10:15 (Israelites). In all but the last instance, the pronoun functions to specify the recipient of the command. In 8:21, the captured foreign generals Zebah and Zalmunna request that Gideon *himself* and not his young son enact the execution, as the youth may lack the strength to finish them off properly. In the parable of the trees (probably poetic), the redundant pronoun signifies the new choice of ruler. The pronoun is not used, nor is it necessary, in 9:8 when the trees approach the olive tree as their first choice of ruler; as the first to be approached, the olive needs no further specificity. After the olive tree's refusal, each subsequent recipient of the offer of the crown is specified by the pronoun: "*You* rule over us."

The final instance, however, in 10:15, is a little different. It is the only case in the Hebrew Bible of mortals addressing the deity in this way (imperative + pronoun); one would normally expect people to address God in a more formal, elevated way (the use of longer forms, honorifics such as אדני or the tetragrammaton, and particles such as "נא" which is used at the end of the verse) and not by a straightforward command. Furthermore, the function of this syntagm does not seem to be to specify. The Israelites are speaking in response to a statement by God. The content of their response is that of communal confession: "We have sinned! You do to us anything that is right in Your eyes--only please save us on this day!" The pronoun could signify implicit contrast (*you* do things--just don't let our enemies be the active ones today). The pronoun also seems to indicate some kind of desperation (although we might have expected the pronoun with the confessional element--חטאנו--rather than the request). In any case, verse

10:15 is unusual in regards to its context (address to deity in a very direct, unadorned way) and its use of the pronoun in this context. The other uses of this syntagm (all for specificity) are, conversely, required by context and therefore have no inherent dialectal significance.

Miscellaneous Emphatic Structures

In this final section of the study, I will abandon the organizational scheme of syntagm analysis in order to question Muraoka's conclusion that "the position of the pronoun [in a clause with the redundant pronoun] is irrelevant" (59). In the course of the following analysis, we will see if word order, in fact, plays no role. The following analysis divides the remaining occurrences of the redundant pronoun in the direct speech of Judges by "emphatic category," roughly according to Muraoka's analysis.

Parallelism: By "parallelism," I mean those cases of the redundant pronoun where the structure of the phrase demands something fill the space of the subject in order to create or maintain symmetry in the larger verse. For instance, in this classification we have Judg. 7:4 (divine speech), where the phrase "הוא ילך" occurs first in the positive, in order to mirror the initial phrase "זה ילך," and then again, indentically, in the negative. As was the case with certain other redundant pronoun constructions, parallelism functions to specify. Similar parallelism occurs in 8:23, where Gideon uses the pronoun in reference to himself. He does so both to emphasize the fact that he most certainly will not accept the crown and to mirror the emphatic structure of the peoples' request that he accept the crown. The verse to which Gideon responds reads: וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל-גִּדְעוֹן מְשָׁל-בָּנוּ גַּם-אַתָּה גַּם-בִּנְךָ גַּם בֶּן-בִּנֶךָ כִּי הוֹשַׁעְתָּנוּ מִיַּד מִדְיָן (8:22); the additive particle requires the use of the pronoun. Gideon replies: וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם גִּדְעוֹן לא-אֶמְשֹׁל **אֲנִי** בָּכֶם וְלא-יִמְשֹׁל **בְּנִי** בָּכֶם **יְהוָה** יִמְשֹׁל בָּכֶם (8:23). Hence Gideon's use of the first-person singular pronoun in a similar structure echoes the initial speaker's address of him by the second-person singular pronoun. Furthermore, by placing God's name before the verb at the end of vs. 23, Gideon emphasizes specifically

who the true ruler of Israel is, lest his audience have any doubts.[10] Each verse employs a different, but related, variety of emphatic structure. This symmetrical pattern of repetition has the sound of elegant style, and is a sign of good syntax, not dialectal speech.

Contrast/Irony: In this category, we include those instances where the redundant pronoun is not necessary for syntactic reasons, but serves instead to emphasize tensions between parties or ironic contrasts between two subjects in a specific context. Our first two examples come from the speech of Joab, father of Gideon, confronting the townspeople in 6:31: וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹאָשׁ לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר-עָמְדוּ עָלָיו **הַאַתֶּם** תְּרִיבוּן לַבַּעַל אִם-**אַתֶּם** תוֹשִׁיעוּן אוֹתוֹ אֲשֶׁר יָרִיב לוֹ יוּמַת עַד-הַבֹּקֶר אִם-אֱלֹהִים הוּא יָרֶב לוֹ כִּי נָתַץ אֶת-מִזְבְּחוֹ. In this case, the redundant pronoun underlines the irony that the people are quarrelling on behalf of Baal, a god. In Joab's opinion (as the syntax makes clear), Baal should be able to stand up for himself. One can almost preface his sarcastic remarks with an English phrase such as: "[Let me get this straight:] *you* are contending for *Baal*? *you* have to rescue *him*?" Samson also expresses irony in vs. 15:18: וַיִּצְמָא מְאֹד וַיִּקְרָא אֶל-יְהוָה וַיֹּאמַר **אַתָּה** נָתַתָּ בְיַד-עַבְדְּךָ אֶת-הַתְּשׁוּעָה הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת וְעַתָּה אָמוּת בַּצָּמָא וְנָפַלְתִּי בְּיַד הָעֲרֵלִים. It is as if Samson is clarifying just what a waste it would be for God to have gone through all the fuss of raising him up as a great hero, just to let him die of something as mundane as thirst. The pronoun acts as sort of a verbal nudge, reminding God of who He is, how powerful He is, and how He should really follow through on the planned salvation of Israel. Samson expresses a milder form of contrast in 14:3, where he implicitly compares the charms of the girl from Timnah with the local girls his parents prefer: וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ הַאֵין בִּבְנוֹת אַחֶיךָ וּבְכָל-עַמִּי אִשָּׁה כִּי-אַתָּה הוֹלֵךְ לָקַחַת אִשָּׁה מִפְּלִשְׁתִּים הָעֲרֵלִים וַיֹּאמֶר שִׁמְשׁוֹן אֶל-אָבִיו אוֹתָהּ קַח-לִי כִּי-**הִיא יָשְׁרָה** בְּעֵינָי.[11] The implication is, "She is proper (and no, the others just won't do)." Jephthah uses the redundant pronoun to emphasize the irony of his being offered a position of

[10] The parallelism in Gideon's response is somewhat incomplete, in that he does not refer to his grandson; however, the pattern of three is maintained. The initial request is "both you, and your son, and also your son's son;" these three individuals are mirrored by "neither I, nor my son, *but rathe*r God...."

[11] Muraoka cites this verse specifically under his subheading "implicit contrast" (55).

tribal leadership by the Gileadites when he reminds them: וַיֹּאמֶר יִפְתָּח לִזְקְנֵי גִלְעָד הֲלֹא **אַתֶּם שְׂנֵאתֶם** אוֹתִי וַתְּגָרְשׁוּנִי מִבֵּית אָבִי וּמַדּוּעַ בָּאתֶם אֵלַי עַתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר צַר לָכֶם (11:7). Muraoka comments on this verse twice, first seeing it as "a poignant expression of the tension between two parties," and further on stating, "Jephthah cannot help giving vent to his indignation at the selfish Gileadites" (50). I would suggest that it is also possible that Jephthah is relishing the irony of the situation: those who ousted him and treated him so horribly have now come crawling back to him. Jephthah uses the redundant pronoun to underline the reversal. Finally, one can hear the bitterness (with, no doubt, a somewhat malicious self-righteousness) in the divine voice when God tells the sinful Israelites: לְכוּ וְזַעֲקוּ אֶל-הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתֶּם בָּם **הֵמָּה יוֹשִׁיעוּ** לָכֶם בְּעֵת צָרַתְכֶם (10:14). It is clear to all involved (including the Israelites, who beg God to save them in 10:15) that to "let *them* save you" would have disastrous consequences, as the "they" have no more power now than Baal did in 6:31--or ever will.

Because "emphasis" with the specific nuance of contrast or irony serves to explain the syntax in all these passages, it does not seem possible to credit regional language differences for the presence of the redundant pronoun.

Climactic: In 9:28, we have a vigorous anti-Shechemite speech made by Gaal bcn Eved. His rhetoric derives part of its potency from his repeated use of the verb, "נעבדנו" (which functions as something of an inclusio). Rather than simply repeating the word, however, Gaal ben Eved augments the second use of the verb with a "redundant" pronoun. In effect, he underlines the ringing finale of his speech: וַיֹּאמֶר גַּעַל בֶּן-עֶבֶד מִי-אֲבִימֶלֶךְ וּמִי-שְׁכֶם כִּי נַעַבְדֶנּוּ הֲלֹא בֶן-יְרֻבַּעַל וּזְבֶל פְּקִידוֹ עִבְדוּ אֶת-אַנְשֵׁי חֲמוֹר אֲבִי שְׁכֶם וּמַדּוּעַ **נַעַבְדֶנּוּ אֲנָחְנוּ**. The addition of the pronoun seems to emphasize the subject ("so why should *we* serve him?") and possibly the object as well ("why should *we* serve *him*?"). The only convincing way to determine the presence of such a nuance, however, involves exploring other ways emphasis of subject (and subject/object) could be conveyed in such a syntagm. It turns out that there are no instances in the Hebrew Bible of the construction *vav* + pronoun + interrogative particle (e.g., *ואנחנו מדוע נעבדנו), a subject-fronted construction which might seem the most natural way to emphasize subject alone. If one searches for a pattern like that in Judg. 9:28 (*vav* + interrogative particle +

pronoun), we find three additional examples: 1 Sam. 28:9 (the witch of Endor to Saul), "ולמה אתה מתנקש;" 2 Ki. 2:22 (Solomon to Bathsheba), "ולמה את שאלת;" and Eccl. 2:15, "ולמה חכמתי אני." None of these cases bears enough similarity to Judg. 9:28 to be of use, however. The examples from Samuel and Kings both involve participles, a part of speech for which the pronoun is required, not redundant. The phrase from Ecclesiastes likewise sheds little light on the speech of Gaal ben Eved, because the verb used in Eccl. 2:15 is stative and cannot take a direct object. Furthermore, the rhetorical purposes of the Ecclesiastes and the Judges passages differ greatly (ironic self-reflection versus incendiary political rhetoric). Nor does the speech of Kohelet does employ repetition in the same was as the speech in Judges. It is reasonable to suggest that both verses, Judg. 9:28 and Eccl. 2:15, use the redundant pronoun for "emphasis," but the specific nuance of that emphasis remains unclear. (Gaal's speech may, in fact, be considered a "proletarian" version of the next category, "royal self-assertion.")

Royal Self-Assertion: The only example of this emphatic nuance in Judges can be found in 6:8, where God (the "King of king of kings") is quoted by a divinely-inspired prophet: וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה אִישׁ נָבִיא אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם כֹּה-אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל **אָנֹכִי הֶעֱלֵיתִי** אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם וָאוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים. This construction is strikingly similar to those used by King Mesha of Moab in the Mesha stele: אנך בנתי קרחה. // אנך בנתי שעריה ואנך בנתי מגדלתה (ll. 21-22). In fact, the Mesha stele contains a total of twelve such syntagms (1cs pronoun + perfect) in its thirty-four lines. Such lines also occur in the Hebrew Bible in regard to royal perrogatives (cf. Ps. 2:6, 1 Chron. 29:17, 2 Sam. 12:7, Is. 45:12) and also in the common phrase "אני יהוה," which occurs 201 times in the Hebrew Bible. The pronoun here seems indicative of this specific trope-of-power. Although the connection with Moab is interesting, the distribution of the other Hebrew texts prevents a dialectal classification of this syntagm. Rather, Hebrew and Moabite share this syntactic way of conveying majesty in speech.

Negotiation: One instance of negotiation was cited above (16:5) as an unusual usage of what appeared, at first glance, to be a circumstantial clause. In Judges, we have two additional verses which can be classified as "negotiatiative" in nuance. Both unusual variants of standard *conditional* constructions. Judg.

11:9 (Jephthah) follows a very rare pattern of conditional statement: אם + participle in the protasis; pronoun + imperfect in the apodosis. [12] That is: וַיֹּאמֶר יִפְתָּח אֶל-זִקְנֵי גִלְעָד **אִם-מְשִׁיבִים** אַתֶּם אוֹתִי לְהִלָּחֵם בִּבְנֵי עַמּוֹן וְנָתַן יְהוָה אוֹתָם לְפָנָי **אֲנֹכִי** אֶהְיֶה לָכֶם לְרֹאשׁ. In general, we would expect in the protasis an imperfect (indicating an unreal condition) or a perfect (indicating "real") followed by an apodosis beginning with a perfect-consecutive. Something like this expected form is found in Samson's boast in 14:13, which states: וְאִם-לֹא תוּכְלוּ לְהַגִּיד לִי **וּנְתַתֶּם אַתֶּם** לִי שְׁלֹשִׁים סָדִינִים וּשְׁלֹשִׁים חֲלִיפוֹת בְּגָדִים וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ חוּדָה חִידָתְךָ וְנִשְׁמָעֶנָּה. Here it is the redundant pronoun which is unexpected. If one combs the Tanakh for the same pattern (אם + inflected verb in the protasis; perfect consecutive + pronoun in the apodosis), we find four other cases: Ex. 12:4 (reference to Passover in Egypt); Lev. 27: 10 and 33 (identical phrases regarding substitution in a sacrificial context); and Isaiah 14:24 (against Babylon--and the only case where the verb in the protasis is in the perfect). Regarding both cases of negotiation in Judges, the construction of the conditional is clearly non-normative. The inclusion of the pronoun can, of course, be ascribed to "emphasis"--in Jephthah's case, it serves to underline who, precisely, will be in charge. The fronted pronoun emphasizes the subject explicitly. In the second case, the pronoun functions as if to say "you, for your part," emphasizing the two-way nature of a bet such as Samson is waging. And yet, given the scarcity of these precise syntagms, it may be legitimate to suggest that beyond "emphasis," these constructions may be specific to certain regions. Given the distribution of those constructions similar to Jephthah's statement, regional variation would seem to be a particularly likely explanation of that structure.

Oath: In 15:12, Samson adjures the Judahites who have come to take Samson prison not to hurt him in the process, he states: וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ לֶאָסְרְךָ יָרַדְנוּ לִתְּתְךָ בְּיַד-פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם שָׁמְשׁוֹן הִשָּׁבְעוּ לִי פֶּן-**תִּפְגְּעוּן** בִּי **אַתֶּם**. This phrase stands out for

[12] This construction also occurs in Jer. 42:13 (addressing the Israelites facing Babylonian attack); Hos. 4:15 (Northern); and Joel 4:4 (addressing Philistia). A protasis consisting of אם + participle (regardless of how apodasis is formed) occurs only twenty-two times, a significant number of those in "northern" contexts. Cf. Gen. 27:46, Jud. 7:10, 1 Sam. 6:3 (Philistines), 2 Ki. 10:23, Jer. 49:1 and 9 (against the nations), Ob. 1:5 (against Edom); Mic. 4:9 (addressing north), and Ruth 3:12 (Boaz).

several reasons. For the root פגע in the Qal taking the preposition -ב, this is the only instance where the imperfect has the archaic long ending (-ן instead of -ו). With the sense of "to attack, to encounter in a hostile manner," this is the only occurrence where the redundant pronoun is used (compare to Num. 35:19, the laws of the blood avenger). Used in conjunction with the particle "פן," we have this root in the Qal four times, including this verse: Ex. 5:3 (Moses addressing the Egyptians); Jos. 2:16 (Rahab); and Judg. 18:25 (Danites). All this data suggests that the verse here attributed to Samson is highly unusual--archaic, dialectal, and uniquely emphatic. While Muraoka correctly identifies "oath" as a context in which one might expect an emphatic pronoun, the other factors contributing to this verse's uniqueness suggest that nonetheless a classification of regionalism, as well as emphasis, may be made.

Colloquialism: As noted above, colloquialsims are a type of speech where, whether or not the rules of syntax demand a pronoun or some other means of emphasis, the speaker may use a construction such as the redundant pronoun. Two further such cases need to be covered under the rubric of colloquialism. In 17:2, we have already seen how Micah uses what appears, at first, to be a circumstantial clause in the a-part of the verse. The clause turns out to be, however, part of a long, elliptical introductory phrase. The b-part of the verse (after the *etnachta*), "אני לקחתיו," is the main body of the sentence. The "redundant" pronoun is necessary to clarify the subject after the muddle which came before--a complex mixture including *casus pendans* with a nominal sentence inserted between the pending object and the resumptive pronoun, a passive verbal phrase, and a clause with "you" as the subject. The entire verse is colloquial speech, and just as in colloquial English we sometimes need to use additional verbiage to untangle the excessively complicated verbal "hole" we have dug ourselves into, so Micah needs the clarity of the simple sentence, "I took it," to make sense out of all which he just said.

The phrasing of 21:22--the last reported speech in the book of Judges, spoken by Israelites giving instructions to Benjaminites--does not help clarify the unclarity which precedes it (nor that which comes immediately after). The verse states: וְהָיָה כִּי-יָבֹאוּ אֲבוֹתָם אוֹ אֲחֵיהֶם לָרוֹב [לָרִיב] אֵלֵינוּ וְאָמַרְנוּ אֲלֵיהֶם חָנּוּנוּ אוֹתָם כִּי לֹא

לָקַחְנוּ אִישׁ אִשְׁתּוֹ בַּמִּלְחָמָה כִּי לֹא אַתֶּם נְתַתֶּם לָהֶם כָּעֵת תֶּאְשָׁמוּ. As the JPS translation notes, this verse is "unclear." Commentators, including Burney and Boling, resort to emendation; the notes in BHS are extensive. Aside from Burney's translation of the pronoun into italics, however, no one has commented on the pronoun. It is possible that the pronoun implies contrast: we couldn't take wives because of the war, while *you* (for your part) would have incurred guilt if you had given them to us. The syntax does seem to demand some sort of specificity. It is on the basis of the syntax of the rest of this verse, convoluted as it is, that I have classed this pronoun as "colloquial." Neither here nor in the instance in 17:2 does the nature of the colloquialism imply regional variation; it seems, instead, to capture the way "real" Israelites (from any region) might speak "on the fly." (It may also be the result of the fact that the conclusions of Biblical books receive less careful editing than the initial chapters.)

Self-Consciousness: The final example of the redundant pronoun in the reported speech of Judges occurs in 6:18, where the angelic messenger seeks to reassure Gideon that he will wait for Gideon to return: אַל-נָא תָּמֻשׁ מִזֶּה עַד-בֹּאִי אֵלֶיךָ וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶת-מִנְחָתִי וְהִנַּחְתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ וַיֹּאמַר **אָנֹכִי** אֵשֵׁב עַד שׁוּבֶךָ. Regarding this verse (and others like it), Muraoka writes: "[At] the moment of making a response or promise, the speaker's self-consciousness is especially deepened. This is all the more so in he case of solemn oath" (54). The pronoun here does seem to serve a purpose of underlining the subject of the promise, although it could also have a function like that of the "royal" pronoun noted above. What is interesting to note is that the verses cited by Muraoka as other examples of this variety of emphasis (the syntax, pronoun + imperfect, is hardly unique) show a pattern of northern bias. The verses are: Gen. 21:24 (Abraham to Abimelech), 38:17 (Judah to Tamar), 47:30 (Joseph); Ex. 8:24 (Pharaoh); 1 Sam. 20:24 (Jonathan), 26:6 (Abishai, brother of Joab); 2 Sam. 3:13 (Abner); 1 Ki. 2:18 (Bathsheba), 5:22 (Hiram); 2 Ki. 6:3 (Elisha); Ruth 4:4 (Boaz); and 2 Chron. 18:20 (Michaiah to Ahab). While some of the speakers listed above would be classified as Judahite, the majority have a strong possibility of speaking in an Israelian dialect. This distribution may mean that this, of all syntagms studied above, has the strongest "nuance" of regionalism, within a simple and not obviously unusual syntactic

category.

Conclusions

As the study above suggests, uncovering dialectal significance for any syntagm is an even more difficult endeavor than finding similar evidence for structures at the morphological and lexical level. Hebrew syntax generally demands such tight sentence structure that a simple change in word order, verb form, or clause construction changes meaning, and hence "bi-forms" at the syntagm-level are much harder to find. This said, it does seem that there is sketchy evidence that some regions employed certain constructions differently. The rules of syntax may be been just as rigid, but the meanings implied by those constructions may have varied. While no dialectal significance could be argued for alternative or circumstantial clauses, or for parallelism, irony/contrast, climactic speech, or royal self-assertion, we did find unusual patterns in other places. In particular, the syntagm of *vav* + pronoun + inflected verb used in a non-circumstantial way could represent simple colloquial speech (not of dialectal significance), but also woe (in the speech of Jephthah and of "Israelites") and contexts of negotiation (Philistines and Danites). In fact, negotiation seemed to have special syntax elsewhere in the speech of Jephthah and Samson (a Danite, we should remember). Samson's adjuration of the Judahites makes use of an unusual oath formulation, as well. The Israelites employ somewhat unusual syntax in their use of the imperative + pronoun in 10:15. Finally, there seems to be a strong dialectal flavor to the angelic being's reassurance of Gideon in 6:18.

The pattern that emerges from these anomalies is clear: we have unusual syntax in the speech of Jephthah the Gileadite, Danites (including Samson), Philistines, angelic address of Gideon (which may reflect a case of dialect-switching), and among the בני ישראל. The bias of all these regions is non-Judahite, with Dan and the Philistines being on the coast (and Dan, later, in the far north), Gilead in the trans-Jordan, Gideon and the Israelites in the North. We may have here our first evidence for "Israelian Hebrew syntax," as Rendsburg predicts should exist. Only after arguments on the basis of syntactic necessity were examined (including nuances of emphasis) could such conclusions be drawn.

While no one has formally studied Hebrew syntax in search of evidence of dialect outside of this paper (which, itself, represents only a preliminary study), it seems that a close study of specific syntagms could prove fruitful in the search for dialectal Biblical Hebrew. Syntax is a complex subject. Other syntagms which could possibly indicate the presence of dialect include unusual constructions appearing in the text (such as the one studied here) as well as the absence of anticipated features. For instance, the absence of the direct object marker, or the unusual use of "כי" could be evidence of dialect, as could a bias for specific syntagms which may more consistently preserve archaic forms (as in Samson, whose speech elsewhere does not use archaic forms). It is my hope that this chapter, which goes where other scholars have resisted treading, will result in further study in the field of dialect and syntax.

Conclusion

"A Faint Echo from the North?"

The preceding chapters have focused on the study of dialect at discrete levels: morphology and phonology; lexicography; and syntax. Each level of linguistic structure has resulted in different conclusions, signifying the presence of dialectal speech in some pericopes and the absence of regionalisms in others. On the basis of these independently-conducted studies, we shall now seek to discover whether any larger patterns of dialect can be found in the speech patterns of the characters who inhabit the tapestry of texts known, collectively, as Judges.

The specific evidence for the presence of dialect aside, certain regions emerge as "dialect prone." At the level of phonology and morphology, the strongest cases for regionally inflected speech was found in the speech of the Philistines and Samson, and that of Micah, although there was also evidence in the speech of Gideon and, of course, inter-tribal differences as revealed by the "shibboleth" incident. If we change the search field to lexicography, we again find evidence of dialectal variation in the Samson and Micah cycles, and also in the Jephthah story and the introductory pericope. Finally, at the syntactic level, the strongest evidence for dialect can be found in the speech of Jephthah, Samson and the Philistines, the "Israelites," and the angelic address of Gideon.

As this summary of the intermediate conclusions makes clear, the most consistent evidence for regionally inflected speech can be found in Judg. 13-16 (the Samson cycle) in the speech of both Samson the Danite and the Philistines. Only this pericope displays evidence for dialect at all three linguistic levels. While the data at hand is too sparse to allow for certainty in any conclusions, it is interesting to speculate on the fact that Samson's speech patterns most closely match those of the Philistines in our text--perhaps an attempt to reflect Danite language while the tribe of Dan still dwelled on the coast, before their migration north in ch. 18 of Judges. Were the attempt to replicate a "later" (far northern, rather than coastal) Danite "sound," we might expect more similarities with Aramaic. Of course, we must also allow the possibility that both Samson and the Philistines are simply depicted speaking non-Judahite Hebrew--i.e., "talking funny"--and that their speech patterns reflect a general attempt to depict "accent," rather than specifically coastal Hebrew or extreme northern Hebrew.

The next strongest case for dialectal speech comes from the Micah story. Micah's speech contains several unusual forms, and the lexicon of the pericope is distinctive. The syntax, while more likely "colloquial" than "northern," is also unusual. The Jephthah cycle, for its part, offers examples of dialectal word choice and syntax, but contains no strikingly unusual morphological or phonetic constructions.[1] The evidence for dialect in the spoken portions of the Gideon cycle is spartan, though there is some; we have only the inflected יש used as a copulative and a possible case of dialect-switching in angelic speech to Gideon. Given the length of the Gideon cycle and the amount of speech it contains, we would have expected these chapters to be among the most fruitful, and yet such has not proven to be the case. We also have trace amounts of evidence for dialectal speech among the בני ישראל in the introductory pericope (lexical) and the concluding story (syntactical). While the small size of the data pool should not lead us to rule out the possibility that the text means to convey an accented sound in the speech of both Gideon and the Israelites, the speech in the Samson, Micah, and Jephthah cycles does so more frequently and on more levels. We could attribute this to different authorship, or to different needs on the parts of the stories--or to different speech patterns. It is certainly possible the Danites and Ephramites had stronger accents than the people from Gideon's area or stock "Israelite" figures, just as a speaker in southern Ohio may sound more "southern" than a person from Cleveland--but neither sounds like a New Yorker. Still, given the number of foreigners (particularly Midianites) whose speech is reported in Judg. 6-8, we had reason to expect more dialectal speech than was found.

We must also note those places where little or no evidence for dialectal speech has been found. Strikingly, the prose account of Deborah (ch. 4) shows no evidence for regional speech, although the Song of Deborah (ch. 5) is considered a major source of Israelian Hebrew. The lexicon of ch. 4 is unusual and poetic, perhaps reflecting an awareness of Deborah's reputation as poetic; it does not show any conscious effort to replicate her accent as a member of a northern tribe. Nor do we have evidence for dialect in the speech of Ehud (ch. 3); however, that pericope is extremely short and a very small

[1] The main syntactic irregularity in Jephthah's speech occurs in 11:18, where we find a narrative preterite but with a long ending: וַיִּחֲנוּן. Clearly some sort of consecutive verbal form is required by the syntax of the passage. I did not judge this textual problem as one likely to indicate dialect, however, as there are other 3mp narrative preterites which do not have the long ending (cf. 11:22).

data base for our purposes. It is also surprising to note that there seems to be no evidence of dialectal speech (according to those features studied here) in ch. 9, the story of Jotham, despite the number of verses spoken by Shechemites.

Nevertheless, in a book which one would anticipate would be rich in dialectal forms, it does seem that this study has uncovered some evidence of dialectal speech. The methodology employed here has been as rigorous as possible while also striving for inclusiveness of data. Even the strongest cases made here, such as for Samson, are still tenuous; the limits discussed in the introduction to this thesis are still obstacles in the study of dialect. Furthermore, constrained as we are to a written text, unable to detect inflections of tone or cadence as would be present in spoken Hebrew, only the most obvious dialectal cues are "audible" to modern scholars. Thus the ability to find clear evidence for the conscious use of regionally inflected speech should serve as an impetus for further study. It is my hope that the kind of study done in this thesis will serve as a basis for the search for dialect and dialect-switching in other Biblical texts, as well as more extensive work with Judges.

Works Cited

Auerbach, E. "Odysseus' Scar," Mimesis. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1057. 1-20.

Avishur, Y. Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Literatures. AOAT 210, 1984.

Beeston, A.F.L. "Hebrew *Sibbolet* and *Sobel*," JSS 24 (2) 1979, 175-7.

---. "*Sibbolet*: A Further Comment," JSS 33 (2) 1986, 259-61.

Boling, R.G. The Anchor Bible: Judges. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Burney, C.F. The Book of Judges and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings. New York: Ktav, 1970.

Dahood, M. Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1965.

Eph'al, I. The Ancient Arabs. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Fredricks, D.C. "A North Israelite Dialect in the Hebrew Bible? Questions of Methodology," Hebrew Studies 37 (1996), 7-20.

Garr, W.R. Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E. Philadelphia: U of Penn Press, 1985.

Gaster, T. Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East. New York: Gordian, 1975.

Ginsberg, H.L. The Israelian Heritage of Judaism. New York: JTS, 1982.

Hurvitz, A. "Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew," Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics 4 (1995), 1-10.

Kaufman, S.A. "The Classification of the North West Semitic Dialects of the Biblical Period and Some Implications Thereof," Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Panel Sessions: Hebrew and Aramaic Languages). Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1988. 41-57.

MacDonald, J. "Some Distinctive Characteristics of Israelite Spoken Hebrew," BO 32 (3/4) 1975, 162-75.

Machinist, P. "Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah." JAOS 103 (1983), 719-37.

Marcus, D. "Ridiculing the Ephramites: The *Shibboleth* Incident (Judg. 12:6)," Ma'arav 8 (1992), 95-105.

Muraoka, T. Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

The New English Bible with Apocrypha (Oxford Study Edition). New York: Oxford

UP, 1972.

Pardee, D. "The Preposition in Ugaritic," UF 7 (1975), 329-78.

Rabin, C. „לשונם של אמוס והושע" in עיונים בספר תרי עשר. Ed. B.Z. Luria. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1981. 117-36.

Rendsburg, G. "Additional Notes on 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23, 1-7)," Biblica 70 (1989), 403-408.

---. "Israelian Hebrew Features in Genesis 49," Ma'arav 8 (1992), 161-170.

---. Linguistic Evidence for the Norther Origin of Selected Psalms. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

---. "More on the Hebrew *sibbolet*," JSS 33 (2) 1986, 255-8.

---. "Morphological Evidence for Regional Dialects in Ancient Hebrew," Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew. Ed. W.R. Bodine. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992. 65-88.

---. "The Northern Origin of Nehemia 9," Biblica 72 (1991), 348-66.

---. "The Northern Origin of 'The Last Words of David' (2 Sam 23, 1-7)," Biblica 69 (1988), 113-21.

Sokoloff, M. A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan UP, 1992.

Swiggers, P. "The Word *Sibbolet* in Jud. XII.6," JSS 26 (2) 1981, 205-207.