

Journal: [Westminster Theological Journal](#)

Volume: [WTJ 58:2 \(Fall 1996\)](#)

Article: Dating Isaiah 40-66: What Does the Linguistic Evidence Say?

Author: [Mark F. Rooker](#)

Dating Isaiah 40-66: What Does the Linguistic Evidence Say?

Mark F. Rooker

[An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Society in Kansas City, November, 1991.]

Christopher Seitz of Yale Divinity School has recently stated that the division of the book of Isaiah into two or three Isaiahs is “in many ways the greatest historical consensus of the modern period.”¹ It is certainly true that most critical scholars have taken this to be axiomatic arguing that Isaiah 40–66 was composed in the exilic period or the post-exilic times. The major reasons offered in favor of the late dating for Isaiah 40–66 are: (1) The references to Judah as ruined and deserted with the temple destroyed (e.g., 44:26b; 58:12; 61:4; 63:18; 64:10f), (2) The difference of language and style between chapters 1–39 and 40–66, (3) The advanced theological ideas in chapters 40–66, and (4) the occurrence of the name Cyrus (Isa 44:28; 45:1).²

Many conservatives, on the other hand, have rejected the division of Isaiah and argued for the eighth century provenance of Isaiah 40–66, during the lifetime of Isaiah the prophet. Arguments for the early date include: (1) The references to the widespread practice of idolatry (which was eradicated in the exilic and post-exilic period), (2) The apparent Palestinian setting of the geographical and topographical references (44:14; 41:19), (3) The unlikelihood that the esteemed author of chapters 40–66 would forever remain anonymous, and (4) New Testament passages that explicitly refer to texts from Isaiah 40–66 as coming from the prophet Isaiah.³

But what can be gleaned from the study of linguistic evidence, especially the diachronic study of the Hebrew language which has proven itself to be trustworthy and objective in dating Biblical texts?

The diachronic study of language is based upon the finding, universally acknowledged among linguists today, that languages are subject to change

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 304

over time. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to expect that the Hebrew language reflected in the Old Testament experienced change from its earliest appearance in the second millennium B.C.

The diachronic analysis of Biblical Hebrew was developed primarily through the work of Arno Kropat in his work on the syntax of Chronicles early in the twentieth century.⁴ Kropat carefully analyzed the language of the Books of Chronicles and compared his findings with the synoptic texts of Samuel/Kings. The language of the Chronicles exhibited changes that were consistent with other books of the post-exilic period specifically Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

The methodology used in diachronic or historical analysis involves the execution of two linguistic principles: linguistic contrast, and linguistic distribution.⁵ Linguistic contrast is concerned with verifying the substitution or replacement of an earlier linguistic phenomenon by a later one, while linguistic distribution makes note of the diffusion of the linguistic development in literature known to be late. The simultaneous employment of these two principles is a sufficient control by which we can determine when linguistic change takes place. It is my purpose to examine Isaiah 40–66 in light of the conclusions of current diachronic research. Special attention will be given to the linguistic status of Isaiah 40–66 in contrast to the Hebrew of Ezekiel and later Biblical texts, texts which are generally accepted to have their provenance in the exilic and post-exilic periods respectively. This comparison will provide a further criterion in the debate of whether Isaiah 40–66 should be viewed as originating in the eighth century B.C. or from the time of the Babylonian exile or later in

the Persian period.

To illustrate how diachronic analysis works observe the occurrence and frequency of the two Hebrew words translated “kingdom,” מַלְכוּת and מְמַלְכָה. The first indication that there may be a historical relationship between the terms may be observed from the Chronicler’s preference for מַלְכוּת in texts where the parallel text of Samuel employed the term מְמַלְכָה. Note the following examples:⁷

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 305

2 Sam 5:12 וְכִי נָא מְמַלְכָתוֹ

1 Chron 14:2 כִּי־נִשְׂאֵת לְמַעַלָּה מְלָכוֹתוֹ

2 Sam 7:12 וְהִכִּינוֹתִי אֶת־מְמַלְכָתוֹ

1 Chron 17:11 וְהִכִּינוֹתִי אֶת־מְלָכוֹתוֹ

2 Sam 7:16 וּמְמַלְכָתִי עַד־עוֹלָם לְפָנָיִךְ

1 Chron 17:14 וּבְמְלָכוֹתִי עַד־הָעוֹלָם

Later biblical writers and post-biblical writers clearly preferred מַלְכוּת. Most notably in the book of Esther, in the nine references to “kingdom,” only מַלְכוּת is used. This trend continues in the Dead Sea Scrolls where מַלְכוּת occurs fourteen times while the earlier term מְמַלְכָה occurs only once.⁸ In the writings of Mishnaic Hebrew, only מַלְכוּת is used. The usage and distribution of the terms מְמַלְכָה and מַלְכוּת illustrate how diachronic analysis operates.

I will now apply the diachronic method in discussing four examples. In this study it will become apparent that the evidence from diachronic analysis overwhelmingly supports a pre-exilic date for Isaiah 40–66. First, an example from orthography from the spelling of the personal name “David.”

I. דָּוִד < דָּוִד

It has long been recognized that one characteristic feature of the orthography of the Chronicler, in contrast to the orthography of Samuel/Kings, is the Chronicler’s insistence in writing דָּוִד with the plene spelling.⁹ The plene spelling is completely absent from Samuel, and occurs in Kings only on three occasions (1 Kgs 3:14; 11:4, 36).¹⁰ Thus of the 671 cases of the occurrence of the name “David” in Samuel/Kings, only three are written plene while the remainder are defective. By contrast, in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, the name “David” occurs 271 times, all of which have the plene spelling. Just a few illustrations are sufficient to indicate the dia chronic nature of this orthographic shift:¹¹

2 Sam 7:26 וַיֵּתְּ עֲבָדְךָ דָּוִד יְהוָה נֶכֶן לְפָנָיִךְ

1 Chron 17:24 וַיֵּתְּ דָּוִד עֲבָדְךָ נֶכֶן לְפָנָיִךְ

1 Kgs 7:51 דָּוִד אָבִיו | וַיֵּא שׁוֹמָה אֶת־קִדְי

2 Chron 5:1 וַיֵּא שׁוֹמָה אֶת־קִדְי־דָּוִד אָבִיו

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 306

The same trend of late Biblical Hebrew toward the plene spelling of the personal name דָּוִד is evident in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This tendency can best be demonstrated by looking at occurrences of דָּוִד in the biblical

manuscripts of Samuel and Isaiah from Qumran which are always plene, against the corresponding passages in Isaiah and Samuel from the MT which are always defective:¹²

Isa 29:1 קרית חנה דוד

1QIsa^a 29:1 קרית חנה דויד

Isa 55:3 חסדי דוד הנאמנים

1QIsa^a 55:3 חסדידויד הנאמנעם

2 Sam 3:1 דוד

4QSam^a 3:1 דויד

In the Book of Ezekiel, while the name דוד occurs only four times, it is significant that one of these spellings is plene, identical to the pattern in the post-exilic works (34:23). Ezek 34:23 provides an early attestation to this trend, and we may conclude that this tendency to write the name of דוד as plene was beginning to increase in frequency in the exilic period. Ezekiel thus might appear to occupy an intermediate or transitional status in the דוד < דויד shift.¹³ This is what David Noel Freedman concluded in his article on the name “David”:

The viewpoint propounded here is that the books of the Hebrew Bible which contain the name of David reflect, in the predominant spelling of each book, the period during which they were compiled and formally published. Thus the books containing the three letter spelling should be assigned to the First Temple period, the books with the four letter spelling to the Second Temple period, and those with mixed spelling to the transitional period between the two others.¹⁴

In Isaiah 40–66, the name “David” occurs only one time, in Isaiah 55:3 where we find the defective spelling which is more harmonious with the pre-exilic period.

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 307

Though not too much should be made from an isolated example, if Freedman is correct so-called Second Isaiah fits well with the pre-exilic literature as reflected in Isaiah 1–39, not in the period of the exile or the post-exilic period. We will now turn to further evidence involving a morphological shift of the Hiphil stem of קו to the Piel stem.

II. קים < קים

A linguistic phenomenon which began apparently shortly after the destruction of the first temple was the increased use of the Piel stem.¹⁵ This phenomenon was accompanied by an incremental tendency to consonantalize the middle radical of hollow verbs.¹⁶

This shift can be illustrated by the use of the root קום which occurs in the Hiphil stem in Early Biblical Hebrew but began to be replaced by the Piel stem in later biblical texts:¹⁷

2 Kgs 23:24 למען הקים את־דברי התורה הכתבים על־הספר

Esth 9:32 ומאמר אסם דברי הפרים הלה ונכתב בר

Post biblical writers continue to favor the Piel:

CD 20:11–12¹⁸ קימו בארח דמשק

m. Sôebu. 3:6 לקיים את המצוה ולא קיים פטור

Num. Rab. 36b¹⁹ יכופו אותו כדי לקיים דבריו

The Piel stem of קום is especially prominent in the Aramaic Targum where it was expanded to translate several different Hebrew verbs. With specific regard to the קים < קים shift, note the following passages with their translations:²⁰

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 308

Gen 26:3 וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת־הַשְּׂנֵעָה אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאַחֲהֶם

Tg. Onq. ואקיים ית קימא דקיימית

Deut 27:26 אָרוּר אֲשֶׁר וְאִי־קִים אֶת־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹכָה־

Tg. Onq. דלא יקיים ית פתגמי

The increased use of the Piel of the root continued in post-biblical literature. In the Mishnah, the occurrence of קום was all but restricted to the Piel stem.²¹ Now note that this trend was already occurring in the Book of Ezekiel.

1 Kgs 2:4 לְמִן יְקִים יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ

Ezek 13:6 וַיְחַלּוּ לְקִים דְּבַר

Thus, this shift appears to be taking place as early as the writing of Ezekiel in the exile. In the phrase לְקִים דְּבַר, Ezekiel portrays an affinity with late Biblical Hebrew and the post-biblical literature of the Second Temple period. Ezekiel 13:6, in fact, is not only the first recorded occurrence of the Piel stem of this root in the Bible, as noted by Ehrlich, Joüon, and Cooke²² but constitutes the earliest attestation of the consonantalization of hollow roots in Hebrew as noted by Wagner.²³

The Hiphil of the root קום consistent with the pre-exilic practice occurs on three occasions in Isaiah 44:26 49:6, 8 :

Isa 49:6 לְהַקִּים אֶת־שְׂבִי יַעֲקֹב

The piel of קום does not occur at all in Isaiah 40–66. This evidence supports the position that the language of Isaiah 40–66 is pre-exilic. We next turn to the results of diachronic research in the area of vocabulary where there is evidence of different words being preferred in different chronological periods.

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 309

III. קָצַף/חָכָה אָף < קָעַס

In the Early Biblical Hebrew two expressions were used for the connotation of expressing anger, קָצַף and the expression חָכָה אָף.²⁴ In Late Biblical Hebrew this was expressed by use of the root קָעַס in the Qal stem.²⁵ Observe the pre-exilic or Early Hebrew practice contrasted with what we see in Late Biblical Hebrew as demonstrated by the Book of Chronicles:

Gen 30:2 וַיַּחַר־אַף יַעֲקֹב בְּכָל

Hos 8:5 וַיִּחַ עֲגָרָה שְׂמֵרוֹן חֲכָה אֶפְי בָּם

Deut 9:19 קִצַּף יְהוָה עֵינֵיכֶם לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶתְכֶם

2 Chron 16:10 וַיִּכְעַס אֲסָא אֶל־הָרָאָה

The tendency to use כָּעַס for “expressing anger” continued in post-biblical literature, particularly in Rabbinic literature.²⁶ Observe how the same concept expressed in classical Hebrew occurs in post-biblical Hebrew with the verb כָּעַס:

1 Sam 20:30 וַיִּחַר־אֶף שָׂאוּל בַּיהוֹזָבָב

Sipre Num. 86, 15 למלך בשר ודם שכעם על בנו

b. Ber. 32a משל למלך שכעם על בנו

Particularly significant is the following diachronic contrast:²⁷

Exod 16:20 וַיִּקְצַף עֲהֵם מֹשֶׁה

Mek. Besh. IV יקצוף עליהם משה כעס עליהם ואמד להם

Already, in the exilic period as demonstrated by the Book of Ezekiel, we see this shift taking place.²⁸

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 310

Ezek 16:42 וַיִּשְׁקֹטְתָת וְזָא אֶכְעַס עוֹד

The book of Ezekiel represents the earliest attestation of the replacement of the earlier semantic parallels with the Qal of כָּעַס.

In Isaiah 40–66 there are nine occasions when the conceptual idea of expressing anger is evoked. On seven occasions the verb קִצַּף is used,²⁹ while in the other two, we find the verb ³⁰חָכָה.

Isa 57:16 כִּי זֶה לְעוֹלָם אָרִיב וְזֶה לְנֹצֵחַ אֶאֱקַצֹּף

Ezek 16:42 וַיִּשְׁקֹטְתִי וְזָא אֶכְעַס עוֹד

Never does the later equivalent כָּעַס occur in Isaiah 40–66. Isaiah 40–66, therefore, demonstrates Hebrew language representative of an earlier linguistic stratum.

IV. אָסַף / קָבַח < קָנַס

In Early Biblical Hebrew, the idea of gathering or collecting was expressed by two verbs אָסַף <size;11q>אָסַף ³¹אָסַף / קָבַח. In later Biblical Hebrew this idea is expressed by the verb קָנַס in the Qal and Piel stems.³² Support for the lateness of קָנַס in Biblical Hebrew is reinforced by the observation that קָנַס does not occur in early biblical texts.³³ Note the contrast of usage in these biblical texts:³⁴

Gen 29:22 וַיֹּאסֹף לָנוּן אֶת־כָּל־אֲנִי הַמָּקוֹם

1 Chron 22:2 וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד לְכָנוֹס אֶת־הַגְּרָמִים

Note particularly how these early Biblical Hebrew verbs are replaced כָּנַס in parallel expressions in later texts as well as by its cognate in the Aramaic Targum:³⁵

2 Sam 12:29 וַיֹּאסֶף דָּוִד אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם

2 Sam 2:30 וַיִּקְבַּח אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם

Esth 4:16 כָּנוּס אֶת־כָּל־הַיְהוּדִים

Lev 25:3 וְאַסְפֹּת אֶת־תְּבוּאָתְךָ

m. B. Bat. 3:1 כנס את בואתו

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 311

Exod 3:16³⁶ וְאַסְפֹּת אֶת־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Tg. Onq. איזיל ותכנוש ית סבי ישראל

1 Kgs 18:19³⁷ קָבַח לִי אֶת־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל

Tg. Neb. כנוש לותי ית כל ישראל

It can be easily observed from the illustrations cited above, that early Biblical Hebrew קָבַח/אָסַף and late Biblical Hebrew and post-biblical כָּנַס are parallel semantically. Note the use of the terms in Isaiah as well as in Ezekiel where we observe the use of כָּנַס already employed in the exilic period:³⁸

Isa 56:8 מְקַח נְדִי יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹד אָקַח עָלָיו לְנִקְבְּצָיו

Ezek 22:21 וְכִנְסֹתֵי אֶתְכֶם

Ezek 39:28 וְכִנְסֹתֵי עַל־אֲדָמָתְךָ

Ezekiel again displays lexicographical affinities with late Biblical Hebrew by the use of the later Hebrew lexeme כָּנַס. This verb, used in place of the earlier, corresponding verbs in pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew, continued to be preferred by the writers of post-biblical Hebrew. The verb increased in usage in Mishnaic Hebrew as the term occurs in place of קָבַח/אָסַף according to Abba Bendavid.³⁹

Isaiah 40–66 employs the early Biblical Hebrew expression on 22 occasions, eight times the verb אָסַף, 40 with קָבַח occurring fourteen times.⁴¹ The later synonym כָּנַס used in Ezekiel is completely absent from Isaiah 40–66 .

V. Conclusion

The few examples I have presented are in no way unique but are consistent with other features which likewise point in this same direction (see

WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 312

Appendix). But it should be emphasized that where diachronic comparison can be made, based on the present state of diachronic research, Ezekiel, from the exilic period as well as post-exilic Hebrew literature always indicates later linguistic features than those we find in Isaiah 40–66. Thus, if critical scholars continue

to insist that Isaiah should be dated in the exilic or post-exilic period, they must do so in the face of contrary evidence from diachronic analysis.

V. Appendix

42

EBH in Isaiah 40–66 mversus LBH in Ezekiel

חַר	עֲזָרָה
חַי	חַיָּה
וְזָבַב	וְזָבַב וְכִסְף
דָּרַךְ	מִהֶלֶךְ
כְּבוֹד	קָרָא

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, North Carolina

1

Christopher R. Seitz, “The One Isaiah || The Three Isaiahs,” in *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Christopher R. Seitz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 14.

2

S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian Books, 1967) 236–42; Ernest Sellin and Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965) 375.

3

Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965) 337-50; E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954) 202-211.

4

Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik* (Weimar: Druck der Hof, 1909). For the history of the study of this discipline, see Mark F. Rooker, “The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew,” *JNSL* 14 (1988) 199-214.

5

For the most detailed treatment of the methodology for diachronic research, see Avi Hurvitz, “Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts,” *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973) 74-79; idem, “The Chronological Significance of ‘Aramaisms’ in Biblical Hebrew,” *IEJ* 18 (1968) 234-40; and Mark F. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 55-59.

6

See Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew*, 55–59.

7

For these illustrations, see Avi Hurvitz, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition—A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and its Implications for the Dating of Psalms*, (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972) 81; and Ronald L. Bergrey, “The Book of Esther—Its Place in the Linguistic Milieu of Post-Exilic Biblical Hebrew Prose. A Study in Late Biblical Hebrew,” (Ph.D. diss., Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1983) 32.

8

See Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz su den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 125; *DJD*, VII, 1982) 327.

9

For the full discussion, see David N. Freedman, "The Spelling of the Name 'David' in the Hebrew Bible," *HAR* 7 (1983) 89-102; and Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986) 4-9.

10

These are passages which Anderson and Forbes suggest were subject to editorial activity. *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible*, 5.

11

See also, 2 Sam 6:16 = 1 Chron 15:29; 1 Kgs 12:19 = 2 Chron 10:19.

12

For these and other examples, see Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQjsa^a)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974) 99. See also 2 Sam 5:13 = 4QSam^a 5:13; 2 Sam 8:17 = 4QSam^a 8:7; and 2 Sam 12:15 = 4QSam^a 12:15. For these readings see Emmanuel Tov, "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Problems," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, ed. Emmanuel Tov (Jerusalem: Academans, 1980) 55; and Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978) 45, 83, 138, 143. For additional plene spellings of דָּוִד in 4QSam^a, see Ulrich, *ibid.*, 45, 56, 82, 86, 88, 196, 197.

13

Thus Freedman, "Spelling of the Name 'David'," 92, n. 7, 95, 96, 99, 102; and Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew*, 68-71.

14

Freeman, "Spelling of the Name 'David'," 99.

15

William James Adams, Jr. and L. La Mar Adams, "Language Drift and the Dating of Biblical Passages," *Hebrew Studies* 18 (1977) 162. For this tendency in Mishnaic Hebrew and in the Samaritan tradition, see Z. Ben-Hayyim, "The Samaritan Tradition and its Relation to the Tradition of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature," *Leshonenu* 22 (1958) 236-237 [in Hebrew].

16

GKC §72m, 197; cf. Abba Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, 2 vols. (Tel Aviv: DVIR, 1967) 2:481, 485 [in Hebrew].

17

See Hurvitz, *A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew*, 142; and Bergey, *Esther*, 41.

18

For a reading, see Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958) 39. Another possible illustration of the Piel use may occur in CD 15.5-6. See Rabin, *ibid.*, 73 n. 62.

19

Observe how this late Midrash uses the Piel of דִּקַּח in this phrase identically to Ezek 13:6, and thus in contrast to the Hiphil stem of the earlier 1 Kgs 2:4. The late phrase is also found in the Mishnah in m. Ḥag 2.4; m. Yebam. 4.13; 8.4; m. Neg. 9.3; 11. 17. For the voluminous number of passages in the Mishnah and the Midrashim which use the Piel of דִּקַּח, see Eliezer Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraicitatis*, VII (London: Thomas Yoseloff, 1959) 5910-15.

20

This shift may also be observed in T. Onq. Num 30:15.

21

See Abba Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew*, 2: §§115, 481; and Bergey, "Esther," 41.

22

See George Albert Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 143; Arnold Bogumil Ehrlich, *Mikra ki-Peschuto* (New York: Ktav Pub. House, 1968), 307 [In Hebrew]; Paul Joüon, "Notes Philologiques sur le Texte Hébreu d'Ezéchiél," *Biblica* 10 (1929) 304; and Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 236.

23

Max Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramäismen im alttestamentischen Hebräisch*, BZAW (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966) 138; and F. Selle, *De Aramaismis libri Ezechielis* (Leipzig, 1880) 28-29. This increased tendency to use the Piel stem of DQ as well as to consonantalize the middle radical root of hollow verbs is probably due to Aramaic influence. Thus Bauer-Leander, *HG* §56 1', 394–95; Wagner, *Aramaismen*, 138; Walter Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, 1983) 293; and the Targumic examples cited above. For illustrations of the Piel of DQ in Nabataean, see George Albert Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903) 217, 235.

24

Other examples of the early Biblical Hebrew usage include Gen 41:10; Lev 10:16; Num 11:33; 16:22; Deut 6:15. See also, Eccl 5:16; 7:9 .

25

The verb occurs in the Qal in Ps 112:10. The date of this Psalm is open to question. This one possible exception, however, does not lessen the force of the basic premise that כעס in the Qal is a feature of late Biblical Hebrew. See Hurvitz, *A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew*, 174 n. 303; and idem, *Linguistic Study*, 115. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* 1:361.

26

For example, see Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim* (New York: Shalom, 1967) 1, 656. The verb in the Qal is absent from the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. These documents, however, do attest the occurrence of the common early Biblical Hebrew idiom כעס .ףא חוה does occur in the story of Ahikar, line 189. See A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 218. Furthermore, the Hiphil stem is extant at Qumran in 4Q504, 26.7. For transcription, see *DJD* VII, 166. Among the numerous other examples from Rabbinic literature include m. 'Abot 5.11; *Deut Rab.* 97b; *b. Ber.* 7a; and *b. Sanh.* 103a.

27

Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, 1:332, cited by Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study*, 116.

28

Linguistic Study, 116.

29

Isa 47:6; 54:9; 57:17; 64:4; 57:16, 17; 64:8 .

30

Isa 41:11; 45:24. The noun ףא is missing in these texts, however.

31

Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*, 1:338.

32

BDB, 488; and *KB*, 444. The verb occurs one time in the Hithpael conjugation, in Isa 28:20. This reference is, however, not relevant to this discussion as the verb not only differs morphologically, belonging to a different stem, but is semantically obscure as well. See Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study*, 124 n. 201. Acknowledged to be late by *BDB*, 488; *KB*, 443; and Driver, *Introduction*, 475.

33

The occurrence of the term רָתַתְּ אֶסָּף in the phrase רָתַתְּ אֶסָּף in the pre-exilic Gezar Inscription is apparently harmonious with what occurred in early Biblical Hebrew. See *KAI I*, 182.1, 34.

34

See also, Ezek 22:21; 39:28; Ps 33:7; 147:2; Esth 4:16.

35

See Hurvitz, *A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew*, 175 n. 308; "Linguistic Criteria For Dating Problematic Biblical Texts," *Hebrew Abstracts* 14 (1973) 77; and Bergey, *Esther*, 130.

36

The Aramaic Targum also translates [sa with vnk in Gen 29:22; 30:23; 42:17; 49:33; Exod 4:29; Num 11:16, 24, 32; 21:16, 23; Deut 28:38; and passim.

37

The Aramaic Targum also translates קָבַח with כִּנְשַׁח in Gen 41:35, 48; Deut 13:17; 30:3, 4, etc.

38

The earlier terms רָתַתְּ אֶסָּף and קָבַח occur often in Ezekiel as well. See Ezek 11:17; 16:37; 20:34, 41; 22:19, 20; 24:4; 28:25; 29:5; 34:13; 36:24; 27:21; 39:17, 27 .

39

Thus Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* 1:46, 109. For the scores of occurrences of this root in Mishnaic Hebrew, see especially Kasovsky, *Mishnah Concordance* III, 974. רָתַתְּ אֶסָּף , on the other hand, occurs only rarely in Mishnaic Hebrew, about eleven times for all stems. The root קָבַח does not occur in Mishnaic Hebrew and only one time in the Tosefta, t. Sanh. 14.5. Greenfield has called the substitution of כִּבֵּשׁ for earlier קָבַח / רָתַתְּ אֶסָּף a "mishnaism." See Jonas Greenfield "The Lexical Status of Mishnaic Hebrew," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956), xvii. It is probable that the verb owes its existence in Hebrew vocabulary, as well as in Akkadian vocabulary, to the influence of Aramaic. See Emil Friedrich Kautzsch, *Aramäismen im Alten Testament untersucht* (Halle, 1902) 107; Driver, *Introduction*, 475; and W. von Soden, "Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen and neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten. Ein Vorbericht," *Orientalia* N.S. 35 (1966) 12-13. The latter reference was cited by Hurvitz, *A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew*, 175 n. 308. See also, Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 247. כִּנְשַׁח (Biblical Hebrew כִּנְסַח) was widespread in Imperial Aramaic, Aramaic Targums, Palmyrene, and BA.

40

Isa 58:8; 57:1; 57:1; 49:5; 60:20; 43:9; 52:12; 62:9 .

41

Isa 43:9; 49:18; 60:4; 60:7; 45:20; 48:14; 66:18; 56:8; 62:9; 56:8; 43:5; 54:7; 40:11; 44:11 .

42

See Hurvitz, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*; idem, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972); idem, "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code. A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology," *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974) 24-56; idem, "'Diachronic Chiasm' in Biblical Hebrew," in *The Bible and the History of Israel. Studies in Honor of Jacob Levor* (Tel-Aviv: Bialik Institute, 1972) 248-55 (in Heb); Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972); Bergey, "Book of

Esther”; Rooker, *The Language of Ezekiel* .

current : : uid:3173 (drupal)