

A New Look at Pentateuchal *HW'* *

One of the strangest and most peculiar forms in Biblical Hebrew is the 3rd pers. com. sing. ind. pron. *HW'* in the Pentateuch. As is well known, when used for "he" the word is pointed *hû'*, but when used for "she" the word is pointed *hî'* as a *qre perpetuum*⁽¹⁾. This usage has never been satisfactorily explained; indeed the question is seldom even addressed⁽²⁾. The problem, of course, as everyone has noted, is that every Semitic language distinguishes a 3rd pers. masc. sing. pron. and a 3rd pers. fem. sing. pron.⁽³⁾, so that an epicene form in Hebrew, at least as we have it in the *ktiv* in the Pentateuch, is in need of explanation.

Before attempting my own solution to the problem, it is worth looking at the usual explanation offered by those grammarians who have tackled the situation. The general theory is that before the introduction of medial vowel letters, ancient Hebrew orthography would have called for *H'* irrespective of gender, a fact which is

* Because this paper deals with a *qre/ktiv* problem, it has been necessary to adopt the following conventions in transliterating the Hebrew. All capitals refers to the consonantal text, e.g., *HW'*. Lower case forms refer to the vocalization based on the Masoretic pointing, e.g., *hû'* or *hî'*. The same system is used when citing Moabite and Phoenician inscriptions too; all capitals refers to the actual written form and lower case forms refer to the presumed pronunciation.

(1) The usual 3rd pers. fem. sing. pron. *HY'* occurs sporadically in the Pentateuch, in Gen 14,2; 20,5; 38,25; Lev 11,39; 13,10; 13,21; 16,31; 20,17; 21,9; Num 5,13; 5,14; for a total of eleven times. I merely make note of this now and will return to this point later.

(2) Thus, for example, in what is an otherwise excellent reference grammar, one finds no explanation offered for the *qre perpetuum* *HW'* vocalized *hî'* in J. BLAU, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Wiesbaden 1976). The same holds for the comparative work of S. MOSCATI [ed.], *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden 1969), and the dictionary of L. KOEHLER and W. BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden 1958).

(3) For the one exception from Old Babylonian, see below.

borne out by contemporary Moabite and Phoenician inscriptions (cf. lines 6 and 27 of the Mesha Stele and lines 9 and 13 of Byblos Inscription #10)⁽⁴⁾. When the medial vowel letters were instituted, this form *H'* was artificially and incorrectly expanded to *HW'* throughout the Pentateuch irrespective of gender. The Masoretes recognized the error involved and reintroduced the gender distinction with the *û*-vowel for the masculine and the *î*-vowel for the feminine. This is the standard explanation for the crux at hand, and it is expressed by Bernhard Stade⁽⁵⁾, William Wright⁽⁶⁾, Gesenius-Kautzsch⁽⁷⁾, Jacob Barth⁽⁸⁾, Brown-Driver-Briggs⁽⁹⁾, Bauer-Leander⁽¹⁰⁾, and many others.

Thus virtually every major work of that great period of Hebrew grammatical study, 1870-1930, states that epicene *HW'* cannot be a correct form and that it arose due to some orthographic maneuvering during the long history of the transmission of the text. But if our advances in comparative Semitic and ancient Near Eastern studies since 1930 have taught us anything about Biblical Hebrew, it is

⁽⁴⁾ See A. H. VAN ZYL, *The Moabites* (Leiden 1962) 168-169; and R. TOMBACK, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Missoula, MT 1978) 78-79. Both of these authors, as well as all concerned with Phoenician and Moabite inscriptions, assume that *H'* was pronounced with the *û*-vowel (*hû'*) when referring to masculine nouns and with the *î*-vowel (*hî'*) when referring to feminine nouns. Naturally there is no proof that this was the case, but since gender distinction is the norm for the pronoun in Semitic, it would be foolish to conclude otherwise. Ugaritic, a language geographically, temporally, and typologically close to Phoenician, certainly had the gender distinction (*hw* for the masculine and *hy* for the feminine) in the Late Bronze Age, so it would not be too bold to conclude the same for Phoenician. See further, n. 56 below.

⁽⁵⁾ B. STADE, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig 1879) 128. Stade calls the practice "gedankenlos".

⁽⁶⁾ W. WRIGHT, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Cambridge 1890) 104.

⁽⁷⁾ E. KAUTZSCH [ed.], *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. by A. E. COWLEY (Oxford 1910) 107.

⁽⁸⁾ J. BARTH, *Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig 1913; reprint: Hildesheim 1967) 14.

⁽⁹⁾ F. BROWN, S. R. DRIVER, C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1906) 214-215.

⁽¹⁰⁾ H. BAUER and P. LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle 1922; reprint: Hildesheim 1965) 248. Bauer-Leander call the practice "verständnislos!".

that we should not expunge the anomalous form from our text but rather consider it authentic and try to arrive at an explanation for it by treating the text on its own terms⁽¹¹⁾. If this is true of the anomalous form which occurs once or twice in the Hebrew Bible, *qal wāḥômer* a form which occurs 120 times in the Hebrew Bible. In other words, it is difficult to believe that the *qre perpetuum* *HW'* vocalized *hî'* occurring 120 times in the Pentateuch is in each case the result of the scribal transmission process. One would also have to ask why only in the Pentateuch did this arise, not in the Prophets and the Writings⁽¹²⁾.

I would therefore proceed on the assumption that epicene *HW'* is a genuine Hebrew form. It is true that comparative Semitic is of little help to us because no other Semitic language exhibits the use of a 3rd pers. com. sing. ind. pron.⁽¹³⁾. But other languages used in the area did employ a common form for the 3rd pers. sing. pron., albeit non-Semitic languages such as Hurrian and Hittite. The evidence which I will present suggests that the strongest concentration of Hurrians and Hittites within Canaan was in the hill country of Judea and Samaria, whether one looks at the Patriarchs in Genesis or at the Conquest in Joshua and Judges. Thus I would propose that epicene *HW'* is the result of the Hurrian and Hittite substratum in the very area where Hebrew first appears as a distinct dialect of the Canaanite language. In other words, far from being an incorrect and artificial form, epicene *HW'* was actually used during the earliest stage of the history of the Hebrew language, a conclusion which, as we will discuss below, has far-reaching effects for Pentateuchal criticism.

(11) Cf. G. BONFANTE, "On Reconstruction and Linguistic Method", *Word* 1 (1945) 133-134, who states: "'anomalous' forms are, therefore, 'survivals', fossils, remainders of past linguistic systems".

(12) Actually the same *qre* does occur in 1 Kgs 17,15; Isa 30,33; Job 31,11, but they do not affect the present problem in any substantial manner. I am also aware that a few more instances may be found in the St. Petersburg MS of the Latter Prophets with Babylonian pointing published by H. L. STRACK, *Prophetarum posteriorum Codex babylonicus Petropolitanus* (Petropoli 1876). How these examples affect our understanding of epicene *HW'* I will leave to those more qualified than I in non-Tiberian Masoretic traditions.

(13) Again, for the one exception from Old Babylonian, see below.

What is the evidence for the Hittites and the Hurrians in the Israelite hill country? First let us consider the Hittites, especially where they are mentioned in the Bible. They are most prominent in Genesis 23 where Abraham contracts to buy land from the Hittite community at large (23,3 *et passim*) and from Ephron the Hittite in particular (23,10 *et passim*) in the city of Hebron, one of the largest cities in the hill country. Extra-biblical evidence demonstrates that the negotiations and sale were conducted within the domain of Hittite law⁽¹⁴⁾ so we have corroborating material to show that the citizens of Hebron in Abraham's time were indeed true Hittites. Obviously, I accept here the argument of Manfred Lehmann⁽¹⁵⁾ and reject that of H. Petschow⁽¹⁶⁾ and G. M. Tucker⁽¹⁷⁾ that the contract reflects neo-Babylonian law.

Esau married either one or two Hittite women (Gen 26,34; 36,2) — I make no attempt here to dovetail the conflicting traditions on Esau's wives — and although her/their place of origin is not stated, we can assume that because the Patriarchs are centered in the hill country, she/they came from the same area. According to Num 13,29, the Hittites lived especially in the mountainous terrain, in contradistinction to other ethnic groups who populated the coastal plain and the Negev. David's soldier Uriah is called a Hittite who definitely resided in Jerusalem (2 Sam 11,2-3; 11,8). David had another Hittite soldier, Ahimelech (1 Sam 26,6), and although we are not told where he hailed from, because David came from Bethlehem and spent his premonarchical days in the Judean wilderness area, it would not be too bold to presume that Ahimelech likewise came from the Judean hill country if not Bethlehem itself.

Judg 1,25-26 records a very interesting tradition about Bethel in

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. R. LEHMANN, "Abraham's Purchase of Machpelah and Hittite Law", *BASOR* 129 (1953) 15-18.

⁽¹⁵⁾ As do W. F. ALBRIGHT in an adjoiner to Lehmann's article in *BASOR* 129 (1953) 18, n. 14; C. H. GORDON, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura", *JNES* 17 (1958) 29; J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia 1972) 79, n. 24; and K. A. KITCHEN, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL. 1966) 154-156.

⁽¹⁶⁾ H. PETSCHOW, "Die neubabylonische Zwiegesprächsurkunde und Genesis 23", *JCS* 19 (1965) 103-120.

⁽¹⁷⁾ G. M. TUCKER, "The Legal Background of Genesis 23", *JBL* 85 (1966) 77-84.

the mountainous region just north of Jerusalem. A local citizen who assisted the Israelites in their conquest of the city was spared (à la Rahab at Jericho in Joshua 2 and 6) and left the town for the land of the Hittites to found a new city called Luz⁽¹⁸⁾ (also the name of Bethel formerly). Regardless of what is meant by the geographic designation "land of the Hittites" here — the problem arises because the Empire was destroyed in 1190 presumably before the present event in question occurred — it is generally held that the local Bethelite was a Hittite⁽¹⁹⁾. Indeed not far from Bethel at Khirbet Raddana near Ramallah a unique krater dated to the late 1200's has been found which is notably Hittite in style⁽²⁰⁾.

Finally, any discussion of the Hittites in Judea would not be complete without mention of the oft-quoted statement by Ezekiel addressing the Jerusalemites, "your mother was a Hittite" (Ezek 16,3; 16,45). There can be little question that the Hittites in Canaan were concentrated to a great extent in the Judean hills⁽²¹⁾, surely in Hebron and Jerusalem and in all probability in other locales as well⁽²²⁾. Who were these Hittites? In the Patriarchal period, which

(18) Yoël Arbeitman calls to my attention that Greek Λυδία is most likely a Hellenization of the indigenous Anatolian name *ludi, and that V. Sheveroshkin, in his privately circulated materials for his planned *Comparative-Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite-Luwian Languages*, has pointed out that Anatolian *d followed by a palatal glide or a front vowel may shift to c in Lydian resulting in free variants within the same dialect. Whatever the precise phonetic realization of this c in Lydian itself and even more importantly in the parent language of Lydian of c. 1100, it is a highly reasonable assumption that this c would be represented by the Hebrew grapheme *zayin*. Could Hebrew *lûz* reflect the Lydians' pronunciation of the name of their country (*ludi/luzi)? This would be additional evidence for the Anatolian presence in the Israelite hill country. The d/z dialect mixture within Hebrew itself, e.g., the roots *ndr* and *nzr*, may have made a *lûz*/**lûd* variation acceptable to the *Sprachgefühl* of the Hebrew speaker.

(19) So R. G. BOLING, *Judges* (AB; Garden City, NY 1975) 59.

(20) J. A. CALLAWAY and R. E. COOLEY, "A Salvage Excavation at Raddana in Bireh", *BASOR* 201 (1971) 15-19. Cf. A. KEMPINSKI, "Hittites in the Bible", *BAR* 5:4 (1979) 38-39, 43.

(21) I use the term "Judean hills" quite loosely because technically Jerusalem is half in Benjaminite territory and Bethel is in Ephraimite territory, though at its southern extreme on Benjamin's border.

(22) KEMPINSKI, "Hittites", 30, 34, 40-41, 43, cites evidence for Hittites in other areas of Canaan as well, e.g., Aphek, Hazor, Kfar Yehoshua, Azor, but

following Cyrus Gordon I date to the Amarna Age⁽²³⁾, they are to be identified with the southern extent of the great Hittite Empire or with Hittite (mercantile) colonies established beyond the political sway of the empire. The Hittites of the Davidic period would either be the descendants of the earlier Hittite population who remained in Judea even after the diminution of power in the 1200's and eventual destruction in 1190 of the Hittite Empire, or they would be descendants of more recently arrived Hittites who penetrated southward after 1190⁽²⁴⁾.

Roland de Vaux, most recently in his monumental work *The Early History of Israel*⁽²⁵⁾, objected to identifying the Hittites of the Bible with the Hittites of the great Anatolian-Syrian empire. Apart from noting that no extra-Biblical sources show Hittites living in Jerusalem and Hebron and environs and from rejecting Lehmann's understanding of Genesis 23, de Vaux also saw all the Hittites mentioned in the Bible as having Semitic names. While it is true one would be hardpressed to treat Ahimelech as anything but Semitic indeed Hebrew or Canaanite, Yoël Arbeitman has shown that a large portion of the Hittite onomasticon in the Bible could be analyzed as Hittite or at least Hurro-Hittite. This holds for Uriah and Ephron mentioned above as well as for Mamre and (Qiryat) Arba⁽²⁶⁾. Also there is a growing recognition that a sizable number of Hebrew words other than proper names may be of Hittite or Hurro-Hittite

the concentration as I hope to have demonstrated was in the hill country. See also the references cited by Kempinski in notes 6, 7, 16 on pp. 44-45.

⁽²³⁾ See C. H. GORDON, "The Patriarchal Narratives", *JNES* 13 (1954) 56-59; and C. H. Gordon, *The Ancient Near East* (New York 1965) 116.

⁽²⁴⁾ So KEMPINSKI, "Hittites", 43.

⁽²⁵⁾ R. DE VAUX, *The Early History of Israel* (Philadelphia 1978) 134-136.

⁽²⁶⁾ Y. ARBEITMAN, "Luwio-Semitic *Mischname* Theophores in the Bible, on Crete, and at Troy", *Scripta Mediterranea* 3 (1982) Sec. Ia for Uriah; and Y. ARBEITMAN, "The Hittite Is Thy Mother: An Anatolian Approach to Genesis 23 (ex indo-europea lux)", in Y. ARBEITMAN and A. R. BOMHARD [eds.], *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* (Amsterdam 1981), for Mamre and (Qiryat) Arba; and Y. ARBEITMAN, "The Hittite is Thy Mother", Part II, *Scripta Mediterranea* (forthcoming) for Ephron. Not all of these etymologies may stand the test of time, but at the present state of our knowledge they should be given serious consideration.

origin. Harry Hoffner has shown this for *'ôb* and *terāpîm*⁽²⁷⁾ and Chaim Rabin has presented us with a much longer list⁽²⁸⁾.

All of the evidence points to the conclusion that indeed there was a Hittite presence in Canaan. How else could we explain the fact that the Bible includes them in each of the 18 lists of people to be driven out of the land, that Heth is included among the sons of Canaan in the ethnographic record in Gen 10,15, and that the entire land of Canaan is called "the land of the Hittites" in Josh 1,4? Furthermore, if we accept George Mendenhall's widely held theory on the correlation between the Biblical covenant and the Hittite suzerainty treaties⁽²⁹⁾, the Hittite presence in the Israelite hill country would go a long way to explaining the historical and geographical setting necessary for such a correlation.

Even if one is not convinced of the Hittite presence in the hill country, the Hurrian evidence is more compelling. The Bible informs us that a certain Jerusalemite (probably a nobleman or mayor of sort as we shall presently see) during the Davidic period bore the title *'ărawnāh* or *'ăwarnāh* (2 Sam 24,16-24), reflecting both variants of the Hurrian word for "lord", *iwri* and *irwi* with the Hurrian postpositive article *-ne*. (A third variant *'ornān* occurs in 1 Chr 21,15-28; 2 Chr 3,1). That the word is a common noun and not a personal name is indicated by the form in 2 Sam 24,16 where the Hebrew definite article *hā-* is attached⁽³⁰⁾. Since this individual

⁽²⁷⁾ H. A. HOFFNER, "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *'ôb*", *JBL* 86 (1967) 385-401; and H. A. HOFFNER, "Hittite *tarpiš* and Hebrew *terāpîm*", *JNES* 27 (1968) 61-68.

⁽²⁸⁾ C. RABIN, "Hittite Words in Hebrew", *Orientalia* 32 (1963) 113-139. I do not find most of Rabin's arguments convincing, especially where good Semitic etymologies may also be proposed, but as with Arbeitman's analysis of various proper names, a number of Rabin's examples will doubtless stand the test of time. HOFFNER, *JNES* 27 (1968) 67, n. 44, agrees with this evaluation: "Of the twenty-two examples cited by Rabin, only about seven are very plausible. Yet even these reveal an appreciable cultural influence albeit indirect". I would drop his last two words since I see the contact as very direct.

⁽²⁹⁾ G. E. MENDENHALL, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh 1955); and G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant", *IDB* 1, 714-723. Of course, not all scholars follow Mendenhall; cf. D. J. MCCARTHY, *OT Covenant* (Oxford 1972) for a survey of different opinions.

⁽³⁰⁾ For other examples of redetermination, see H. L. GINSBERG, "Ugaritico-Phoenicia", *JANESCU* 5 (1973) 136, n. 23. I have proposed an alterna-

bore the Hurrian title "the lord", probably meaning "the mayor" or "the nobleman" if not "the prince" or "the king" (meaning the royal head at the time of David's conquest of Jerusalem), we can assume that a Hurrian enclave existed in Jerusalem in the early 10th Century. It would be quite strange for a man to bear a Hurrian title for "the lord" if there were no Hurrian community for him to be lord over.

The Hurrian ruling class in Jerusalem dates back at least to the Amarna Age (= the Patriarchal period), for the king of the city in EA 285-290 is called ARAD-*hipa*, "the servant of Hep/ba". One of David's heroes from nearby Shaalbim, located 17 miles northwest of Jerusalem at the very foot of the Judean hills, is named Eli-hep/ba (Masoretic *'elyahbā'*) in 2 Sam 23,32; 1 Chr 11,33⁽³¹⁾. The inclusion of Hep/ba, the chief Hurrian goddess, in these names points to a strong Hurrian influence in the hill country during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages.

We may even venture to suggest that the Jebusites as a group were Hurrian, if not as a whole at least in large part. This conclusion may be arrived at by noting that *'ārawnāh/'āwarnāh*, the Hurrian overlord of Jerusalem is specifically called "the Jebusite" in 2 Sam 24,16; 24,18 (cf. *'ornān* "the Jebusite" in 1 Chr 21,15; 21,18; 21,28; 2 Chr 3,1), and that the Jebusites are always associated with Jerusalem (Josh 15,63; Judg 1,21) which we know had a king with a Hurrian theophoric name in the Amarna Age.

The Hurrian character of Jerusalem and the Jebusites is further illustrated by recognizing the proper etymology of the toponym Moriah. Although from its first occurrence in the Bible in Gen 22,2 little can be said of its location, from its second occurrence in 2 Chr 3,1 it may be noted that Moriah is in Jerusalem. Shmuel Yei-vin has given us a fine Hurrian etymology of the word, analyzing it

tive analysis of *dnnym* in the Karatepe inscription ("The Danites", *ArOr* 49 [1981] 151-152), but Ginsberg's other examples are indisputable. The work just cited is actually my contribution to a joint article, Y. ARBEITMAN and G. RENDSBURG, "Adana Revisited", *ArOr* 49 (1981), in which Arbeitman agrees with Ginsberg regarding *dnnym* (p. 148) and cites still other redetermined forms (p. 148, n. 11).

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. B. MAISLER (MAZAR), *Untersuchungen zur alten Geschichte und Ethnographie Syriens und Palästinas* (Giessen 1930) 38; and ARBEITMAN, *Scripta Mediterranea* 3 (1982), Sec. Id.

as the relative particle or demonstrative pronoun *me* or *ma* plus our word *iwri*, "lord"⁽³²⁾.

Another name in the Bible which is certainly Hurrian is that of Shamgar ben Anath in Judg 3,31. Regardless of what "ben Anath" refers to⁽³³⁾, his own name is identifiable with Hurrian *šī-mi-ga-ri* known from Nuzi as first recognized by B. Maisler (Mazar)⁽³⁴⁾. To locate Shamgar is difficult but as one who fought against the Philistines, centered on the coastal plain due west of the Judean hills, it is tempting to place this hero in Judea as well. The reference to Shamgar in Judg 5,6 might suggest this, with the 'ōrāhôt 'āqalqallôt referring to mountain paths of the highlands as opposed to the main trade routes of the lowlands which were not under Israelite control⁽³⁵⁾.

Still other names in the Bible are patient of Hurrian analysis, as H. L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler determined nearly a half-century ago⁽³⁶⁾. Most important for our present purpose is to note that it is specifically in the Judahite genealogy in 1 Chronicles 2 where one finds these Hurrian names: Ahlai and Sheshan in 2,31, Peleth and Zaza in 2,33, and Shobal and Caleb in 2,50, the latter in fact being called *ben hûr*. Whether these people were Hurrians who became

⁽³²⁾ S. YEIVIN, "Marginal Glosses", *Tarbiz* 40 (1971) 396-397 [in Hebrew]. Yeivin's analysis of Moriah militates against the general view that 2 Chr 3,1 represents nothing more than a late tradition trying to associate the site of the Temple with the site of the binding of Isaac in Genesis 22. This view is expressed, for example, by N. M. SARNA, *Understanding Genesis* (New York 1966) 159. But if Moriah is an actual Hurrian name then its location would most likely be Jerusalem or environs.

⁽³³⁾ Of all the theories proposed the least probable is that it reflects his place of origin, namely, Beth-Anath in the territory of Naphtali; so W. F. ALBRIGHT, "A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology", *JPOS* 1 (1921) 55-62; and BRIGHT, *A History of Israel*, 172. I am inclined to treat Anath here as the famous Canaanite goddess of war reflecting Shamgar's military prowess (so A. VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", *VT* 14 [1964] 294-309, where however a Semitic etymology of Shamgar is offered) and/or his birth from a divine mother (so C. H. GORDON, *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations* [New York 1966] 61-62, 246.

⁽³⁴⁾ B. MAISLER (MAZAR), "Shamgar ben 'Anat", *PEFQS* 66 (1934) 192-194.

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf. BOLING, *Judges*, 109.

⁽³⁶⁾ H. L. GINSBERG and B. MAISLER (MAZAR), "Semitised Hurrians in Syria and Palestine", *JPOS* 14 (1934) 243-267. See also W. FELLER, "Hurritische Namen im Alten Testament", *ZA* 45 (1939) 216-229.

members of the tribe of Judah or whether they were native Semites who merely bore Hurrian names cannot be determined. In either case, however, we have additional evidence for the Hurrian substratum in the Israelite hinterland.

To the south of Judah, in Edom, were even more Hurrians. Why scholars⁽³⁷⁾ continue to deny the identification of the "Horites" of Gen 14,6; 36,20; Deut 2,12; 2,22, with the historical Hurrians is frankly beyond me. Ginsberg and Maisler would seem to have ensured the equation with their recognition of Hurrian names in the Seir genealogy in Gen 36,20-30, e.g., Shobal, Dishon, Shepho, Aran, Aian, Timna, Anah, Alvan, Zaavan.

According to the LXX, the Hurrians were even more widespread, having lived in Shechem (Gen 34,2 where MT has *hahiwwi*) in the heart of the Samarian hills and in Gibeon (Josh 9,7 where MT again has *hahiwwi*) a bit north of Jerusalem. We need not accept the theory of E. A. Speiser⁽³⁸⁾ that *throughout* the Bible the Hivites refer to Hurrians in Canaan, but we may note that the LXX and presumably its *Vorlage* do speak of Hurrians in the very place where they would be most likely to be found given the above evidence: in the Israelite hill country. Mendenhall has also gone too far in identifying the Hivites with the Cilicians and the Levites with the Luwians (!)⁽³⁹⁾, but at least he is on the right track in recognizing an Anatolian substratum in early Israel.

Thus there is mounting evidence supporting a Hurrian presence in Judea and perhaps Samaria during early Israelite times. Far too little is known about the Hurrians but the geographic distribution of the known onomasticon — from Nuzi to Ugarit to Jerusalem to Crete — suggests that their influence was widespread. Their influence over Canaan must certainly have been great, for one of the commonest terms in Egyptian for referring to the land is *hzw*, or "Hurru-land".

Now that we have established the Hittite and Hurrian presence in Canaan, particularly in the Judean highlands, let us look at the way these languages treat the 3rd pers. sing. pron. Hittite does not

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf., e.g., DE VAUX, *The Early History of Israel*, 138.

⁽³⁸⁾ E. A. SPEISER, *Genesis* (AB; Garden City, NY 1964) 264; and E. A. SPEISER, "Hivite", *IDB* 2, 615.

⁽³⁹⁾ G. E. MENDENHALL, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore 1973) 154-163.

distinguish genders for this pronoun: *apā-* is the 3rd pers. com. sing. ind. pron.; the enclitics which are more widely used are *-aš* for the nominative common, *-an* for the accusative common, and *-at* for the nominative/accusative neuter, all of them epicene⁽⁴⁰⁾.

When we look at Hurrian we also see no gender distinction for the 3rd pers. sing. pron. The independent form is still unattested, but the enclitic which is commonly used is *-nna* or *-n* irrespective of gender⁽⁴¹⁾. I underscore the point: both Hurrian and Hittite use epicene forms for the 3rd pers. sing. pron.

To return to our historical survey: in the Israelite hill country of c. 1500 – c. 1000, the Hittite and Hurrian elements there both used epicene forms. It is in this very area at this very time that Israel has its origins. The cities associated with the first Hebrews, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whom I date to the 15th and 14th Centuries, are Shechem (12,6), Bethel (12,8), Hebron (13,18), Sodom (14,17), (Jeru)salem (14,18), Gerar (20,2), Beersheba (21,31), Bethlehem (35,19)⁽⁴²⁾. Obviously these cities are to be found in the very highlands where Hittites and Hurrians abounded, or, in the case of Gerar and Sodom for example, in fringe areas nearby.

Moreover, the social customs of the Patriarchs have their closest parallel to the Hurrian customs attested at Nuzi⁽⁴³⁾, either because of the Hurrian influence in Canaan itself or because the Patriarchs ulti-

⁽⁴⁰⁾ J. FRIEDRICH, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I* (Heidelberg 1960) 62-63.

⁽⁴¹⁾ J. FRIEDRICH, "Churritisch", *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abteilung 1, Band 2, Abschnitt 1-2, Lieferung 2; Leiden 1969)* 15.

⁽⁴²⁾ I cite only the first verse where each city is referred to; the book of Genesis is to be understood for each obviously.

⁽⁴³⁾ See C. H. GORDON, "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets", *BA* 3 (1940) 1-12, reprinted in D. N. FREEDMAN and E. F. CAMPBELL [eds.], *Biblical Archaeologist Reader* 2 (Garden City, NY 1964) 21-33. The attack by some scholars (most notably T. L. THOMPSON, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives* [Berlin 1974] 196-297; and J. VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition* [New Haven 1975]) on the relevance of the Nuzi tablets for understanding the patriarchal narratives has not, in my estimation, met with much approval through it still requires a full scale rebuttal. See provisionally E. M. YAMAUCHI, "Archaeology and the Scriptures", *The Seminary Review* 25 (1979) 169-173. Robert BIGGS is a first class Assyriologist but his statement that "It is now generally agreed that the Nuzi finds are of no direct relevance for the Old Testament" reflects an ignorance of Biblical scholarship ("The Ebla Tablets: An Interim Perspective", *BA* 43 [1980] 82).

mately hail from the Ur/Haran area in northern Mesopotamia near the Hurrians' greatest geographic concentration⁽⁴⁴⁾. Nahum Sarna is correct in stating that "Nuzi and Haran were both part of an integrated ethnic and cultural area"⁽⁴⁵⁾. The Bible refers to the Haran area as (Aram) Naharaim in Gen 24,10 and Egyptian documents apply the same term (Naharin [*nhrn* and variants] in hieroglyphic, Nahrima in the Amarna letters) to the Mitanni kingdom of the Hurrians⁽⁴⁶⁾.

The Israelites left Canaan for a few generations (note that according to Exod 6,16-20 [Levi-Kohath-Amram-Moses] the lives of the generation which entered Egypt could easily have overlapped to some extent with the lives of the generation which left Egypt), but when they returned to Canaan they headed again for the highlands. The first cities conquered under Joshua and therefore the earliest Israelite settlements were Jericho (ch. 6), Ai (ch. 8), and Gibeon (ch. 10)⁽⁴⁷⁾. Next, although the Israelites did not fully conquer their cities, they defeated the allied kings of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon (10,23). These cities are also centered in the Judean hills or foothills. Indeed the summary statement of Joshua's battles reveals that the first stage of the Israelite conquest was in the area where the Hittites and Hurrians were most prominent: "Joshua conquered the entire country [this can only refer to the whole of the southern lands]: the mountains, the Negev, the foothills, and the mountain slopes" (10,40). All of the evidence points to one conclusion: the area of Hittite and Hurrian penetration in Canaan and the area of the earliest Israelites coincided. *Here then is the answer to epicene HW': it is the result of the Hittite and Hurrian substratum in the Israelite hill country.*

The question must now be asked, can a non-Semitic substratum have such an effect on a Semitic language? The answer is an un-

⁽⁴⁴⁾ For Locating Abraham's Ur near Haran, see GORDON, *JNES* 17 (1958) 28-31; and C. H. GORDON, "Abraham of Ur", in D. W. THOMAS and W. D. McHARDY [eds.], *Hebrew and Semitic Studies* (Oxford 1963) 77-84. The report of an "Ur in Haran" in the Ebla Tablets has reopened the question; see C. H. GORDON, "Where is Abraham's Ur?" *BAR* 3:2 (1977) 20-21, 52.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Understanding Genesis*, 91.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See further R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, *Aram Naharaim* (Rome 1948) *passim*, but especially 132-142 for the primary sources.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Naturally all these citations are from the book of Joshua.

doubted yes, and a number of examples involving Hurrian in fact may be cited. Of all the Semitic languages, only Aramaic has a postpositive article, most probably the result of the Hurrian substratum in northern Mesopotamia⁽⁴⁸⁾. Similarly, spirantization of *bgdkpt* in Hebrew and Aramaic has been ascribed to the influence of Hurrian phonetics⁽⁴⁹⁾. It has also been suggested that the widespread gender confusion in the Nuzi dialect of Akkadian is the result of Hurrian interference⁽⁵⁰⁾. These are but a few of the effects that Hurrian had on the Semitic languages, they are quite basic, and I am suggesting that the use of epicene *HW'* in the Pentateuch is another.

If the Hurrian substratum helps us explain epicene *HW'* in Hebrew, it may also help us explain the Old Babylonian epicene forms for the 3rd pers. sing. obl. pron., *šuāti* for the genitive/accusative and *šuāšim* for the dative⁽⁵¹⁾. They are the only other examples

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Pointed out to me by C. H. GORDON (oral communication). The Hurrian article is postpositive *-ne* as in *'āwarnāh/'ārawnāh*. The influence of non-Semitic substrata (Hurrian, Iranian, etc.) on Aramaic has also been recognized by G. KROTKOFF, *A Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Kurdistan* (New Haven, forthcoming), § 5. I thank Professor Krotkoff for sharing these pages with me before the appearance of his monograph.

Postpositive articles appear in South Semitic as well, where they developed independently. The article is an innovation throughout Semitic (thus it does not appear in older attested languages such as Akkadian, Eblaite, Ugaritic, Minoan, and archaic Hebrew poetry) so there is no need to correlate the Aramaic article with the South Semitic data. Thus I feel we are on safe grounds in accepting Gordon's proposal of explaining the Aramaic phenomenon as a result of the Hurrian substratum. For the South Semitic material, see A. F. L. BEESTON, *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian* (London 1962) 30-31; M. HÖFNER, *Altsüdarabische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1943) 113-114; and A. DILLMANN, *Grammatik der äthiopischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1899) 426. The ESA article *-n* has not survived in the modern South Arabian dialects, but the Ethiopic use of the 3rd pers. masc. sing. pron. suf. for the article may still be found in some modern dialects; see W. LESLAU, *Gafat Documents* (New Haven 1945) 43, and the works cited there.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ E. A. SPEISER, "Hurrians and Hittites", in E. A. SPEISER [ed.], *At the Dawn of Civilization (The World History of the Jewish People I; Givatayim/Ramat-Gan 1964)* 160.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ C. H. GORDON, "The Pronoun in the Nuzi Tablets", *AJSL* 51 (1934) 21; and C. H. GORDON, "The Dialect of the Nuzi Tablets", *Orientalia* 7 (1938) 231.

⁽⁵¹⁾ W. VON SODEN, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (Rome 1969) 41.

within Semitic of a 3rd pers. com. sing. pron. Old Babylonian dates from the 20th to the 16th Centuries, and although Hurrian influence in Mesopotamia is greatest during the height of power of the Mitanni kingdom in the 15th and 14th Centuries, it may explain this Babylonian peculiarity⁽⁵²⁾. In any case, this is a subject better left for Assyriologists who specialize in Old Babylonian. I merely raise the issue here and leave it for those more competent than I to settle. It is clear that Akkadian in general, not just the Nuzi variety, was subject to influences from non-Semitic substrata, for the placing of the verb at the end of the sentence, contrary to the Semitic norm, is doubtless due to Sumerian influence⁽⁵³⁾.

It is worth pointing out that because the Hebrew dialect within the Canaanite branch was used specifically in mountainous terrain, it is not surprising to find a grammatical oddity such as epicene *HW'* preserved. Linguists have noted that geographical isolation can be a

(52) Hurrian influence will not, however, explain the occasional Middle Egyptian practice of using the Old Egyptian 3rd pers. masc. sing. ind. pron. *swt* as an epicene form. The form itself is undoubtedly an archaism, since in Middle Egyptian *ntf* and *nts* occur for "he" and "she" respectively. But why *swt* should have been extended to feminine as well as masculine usage by the Middle Egyptian archaizing scribes is unexplained. Interestingly, both Egyptian and Akkadian distinguish gender for the 3rd pers. sing. pron. in their oldest stages (Old Egyptian and Old Akkadian), but adopt an epicene usage in their next oldest stages (occasionally with *swt* in Middle Egyptian, always with *šuāti/šuāšim* in Old Babylonian). Of course, this statement presumes a linear development from Old Egyptian to Middle Egyptian and from Old Akkadian to Old Babylonian, situations which are not absolutely proven, especially for the latter. Cf. the brief comments by C. H. GORDON, "Echoes of Ebla", in A. I. KATSH and L. NEMOY [eds.], *Essays on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of the Dropsie University (1909-1979)* (Philadelphia 1979) 137-138.

(53) VON SODEN, 183. From Akkadian the practice of verb final spread to Aramaic. In his *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Chicago 1974) 132-133, S. KAUFMAN assumes otherwise but informs me that on the basis of first reports about the Aramaic-Assyrian bilingual inscription from Tell Faḥariyya he has changed his opinion, and now posits Akkadian influence for the Aramaic verb final (oral communication). The only other Semitic language where placing the verb at the end is the norm is Ethiopic, but this is due to Cushitic influence; see W. Leslau, "The Influence of Cushitic on the Semitic Languages of Ethiopia: A Problem of Substratum", *Word* 1 (1945) 73. I thank Professor Leslau for pointing this reference out to me.

very conservative influence on a language⁽⁵⁴⁾, thus, e.g., Icelandic is the most conservative of the Germanic languages. And although the Israelites were not isolated to the extent of being on an island hundreds of miles from other peoples, the less populated and relatively isolated hill country allowed Judean Hebrew to preserve phenomena not otherwise found in Canaanite. One example resulting from this isolation of Judean Hebrew is the retention of the diphthongs *ay* and *aw* at least in accented syllables when all other Canaanite dialects reflect monophthongization to *ê* and *ô* throughout⁽⁵⁵⁾.

When the Israelites began to spread out from the hill country and come in greater contact with other Canaanite dialects, they adopted the widespread use of *HY'* (*hî'*) for the 3rd pers. fem. sing. and limited *HW'* (*hû'*) to the masculine. It is impossible to pinpoint the date of this transition, but the Davidic and Solomonic period may be posited as a *terminus ad quem*. In the international empire controlled by the Israelites, the gender distinction was obviously predominant⁽⁵⁶⁾ and the epicene *HW'* fell by the wayside.

There is, moreover, one verse in the Pentateuch which bears this out. Genesis 14 is a document of unquestionably early date⁽⁵⁷⁾,

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Cf., e.g., W. CHOMSKY, *Hebrew: The Eternal Language* (Philadelphia 1957) 30.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Z. S. HARRIS, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven 1939) 29-32. The retention of the diphthong is actually only the norm because occasional words do show monophthongization even in accented syllables, e.g., *šôr*, *yôm*, *hêq*, and such isolated instances as *hêl* in 2 Kgs 18,17; Isa 36,2; *lêl* in Isa 21,11; *gê'* in Zech 14,4.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Theoretically one could assume that Phoenician also used an epicene *H'* in earlier times and then later adopted the gender distinction for the 3rd pers. sing. pron., clearly evidenced by the fem. *HY* (= *hî*) in Punic and the masc. *ou* (= *hû*) in Greek transcription. For these forms, see J. FRIEDRICH and W. RÖLLIG, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (Rome 1970) 46. But there would be no reason to think this since the gender distinction is the norm in Semitic and only Hebrew is anomalous in this regard. This is especially true given the Ugaritic evidence; see above, n. 4. Similarly, in theory one could assume an epicene *H'* in Moabite, but our 9th Cent. Mesha Stele if analogous to contemporary 9th Cent. Hebrew would demand the gender distinction.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ See SPEISER, *Genesis*, 106, where a mid-second millennium date is offered; and SARNA, *Understanding Genesis*, 111-112. I am not convinced by studies such as M. C. ASTOUR, "Political and Cosmic Symbolism in Gen-

and thus many of its onomastic entries had to be updated by later glosses (see verses 2, 3, 7, 8, 17)⁽⁵⁸⁾. In one instance, verse 2, the gloss has *HY'*. That is to say, the later editor used *HY'* because he was writing at a time when this form was already entering Hebrew. That it had not totally displaced feminine *HW'* may be gathered from the fact that the older form is still used in the glosses in verses 7 and 8. Thus we may tentatively date the glosses in Genesis 14 to the transitional period in which *HY'* was gradually replacing *HW'* for the 3rd pers. fem. sing. pron. For the ten other attestations of *HY'* in the Pentateuch⁽⁵⁹⁾, however, no similar conclusion may be arrived at.

Obviously I reject any possibility of orthographic confusion between *waw* and *yod* resulting in *HW'* being read for *HY'* 120 times. It is true that the two letters begin to look very much alike in late antiquity (cf. the Dead Sea Scrolls or even worse the Aramaic magic bowls), but we must then ask why only in the Pentateuch does *HW'* occur for the feminine and not in the other books. Similarly, we must ask why only in *HW'* and *HY'* does this so-called interchange occur. All of the other apparent *waw/yod* confusions may be explained morphologically, e.g., *peni'el* in Gen 32,30 is based on the genitive **pani* and *penu'el* in the next verse is based on the nominative **panu*, so we should seek a morphological answer and not an orthographic one to the *HW'/HY'* problem as well.

The explanation of epicene *HW'* offered herein has a profound impact on the dating of the Pentateuch. If my argument holds, then those books which use epicene *HW'*, namely, the Pentateuch, must be dated early. The Pentateuch as a whole would by necessity be dated earlier than the composition of Joshua, Judges, etc. These books were written after the introduction of the *HW'/HY'* distinction; the Pentateuch antedates the distinction. I believe that this

esis 14 and in its Babylonian Sources", in A. ALTMANN [ed.], *Biblical Motifs* (Cambridge, Mass. 1966) 65-112, which date this chapter much later. See also M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs* (Stuttgart 1948) 170 [English translation: *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1972) 154].

⁽⁵⁸⁾ See SARNA, *Understanding Genesis*, 112; and Y. AHARONI, "Tamar and the Roads to Elath", *IEJ* 13 (1963) 32.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ See above, n. 1.

linguistic datum therefore vindicates the theory of Umberto Cassuto and M. H. Segal who held, contrary to most higher critics, that the Pentateuch is early⁽⁶⁰⁾. Elsewhere I have collected additional linguistic evidence which points to this conclusion, such as the relatively large number of dual personal pronouns in the Pentateuch and the lack of Persianisms in the Pentateuch⁽⁶¹⁾.

If this conclusion is a blow to the dating of the Pentateuch by most higher critics, then it is also a blow to the entire JEDP schema. Those who subscribe to the Documentary Hypothesis would have us believe, regardless of my analysis of epicene *HW'*, that when writing Deuteronomy D used *HW'* for "she", but when writing his other works Joshua-Kings, he used *HY'*. This is an impossibility and obviously holds for so-called P in the Pentateuch vs. the so-called P additions to Joshua through Kings, and for any so-called JE material to be found outside the Pentateuch against the so-called JE narrative within the Pentateuch.

This paper has covered as much history and geography and textual criticism as it has linguistics, so perhaps it is best to close with a summation:

- 1) It is extremely doubtful that epicene *HW'* in the Pentateuch is an artificial form or scribal convenience resulting from the transmission of the text. Accordingly, it should be treated as a genuine Hebrew form.
- 2) The Hittites and Hurrians in Canaan were most prominent in the hill country of Judea and Samaria. Neither of their languages distinguishes gender for the 3rd pers. sing. pron.
- 3) The area of the earliest Israelites, both during the Patriarchal period and the time of the Conquest, coincides with the area of the Hittite and Hurrian penetration into Canaan. Epicene *HW'* should

⁽⁶⁰⁾ U. CASSUTO, *The Documentary Hypothesis* (Jerusalem 1961); and M. H. SEGAL, *The Pentateuch* (Jerusalem 1967). I do not mean to lump these two savants together indiscriminately, for I realize their theories did not agree in every detail. But in their approach and their opposition to the Documentary Hypothesis, it is convenient to refer to them in the same breath.

⁽⁶¹⁾ G. RENDSBURG, "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'", *JANESCU* 12 (1980) 65-80. The reader will also find a less detailed treatment of epicene *HW'* in this article. The present work is meant as an expansion of the idea germinated therein.

therefore be considered the result of Hittite and Hurrian influence⁽⁶²⁾.

4) It was the earliest Hebrew which employed epicene *HW'*. When the Israelites spread out during the centuries after the initial Conquest, especially during the time of David and Solomon, normal Canaanite usage was adopted; *HW'* (*hû'*) was restricted to the masc. and *HY'* (*hî'*) was adopted for the fem.⁽⁶³⁾.

5) This explanation of epicene *HW'* leads to the conclusion that the Pentateuch is early and that the JEDP theory cannot be correct.

In closing, a final word; near the end of my research for this article, I came across the same general conclusion by W. H. Green, who wrote more than a century ago. It is worth quoting him in full: "The explanation of this is that *HW'* *hû* was at that early period of common gender and used indifferently for both masculine and feminine. As this primitive usage subsequently became obsolete, the word, when used for feminine was read *HY'* *hî* according to the uniform practice of the later books, and the punctuators have suggested

⁽⁶²⁾ Sumerian is another Near Eastern language which does not distinguish gender for the 3rd pers. sing. pron. Obviously, by dating the Patriarchs to the Late Bronze Age and by divorcing Abraham's Ur from Ur of Sumer, I preclude any direct contact between the early Israelites and the Sumerians. Nevertheless, Hebrew and Canaanite dialects have a number of Sumerianisms imbedded in their languages, e.g., many *nomen agentis* forms, which probably go back to the 3rd Millennium. The Ebla archives are a telling witness to the great Sumerian influence in the West in pre-Israelite times. They give us a clear picture of this for Syria and it is not too dangerous to assume a similar situation in Canaan. Still, I would divorce Sumerian from our treatment of Hebrew *HW'* because other West Semitic languages and certainly Akkadian would more than likely be expected to have been affected in the same manner. In other words, if Eblaite and Akkadian were not so influenced, and they had direct contact with Sumerian, why should Biblical Hebrew have been affected. The Sumerian evidence could explain the Old Babylonian epicene forms, but then we are stuck with the question of why just Old Babylonian and not Old Akkadian and other dialects.

⁽⁶³⁾ I am well aware that until now I have skirted the issue of the quiescent *aleph* in both *HW'* and *HY'*. Comparative Semitic evidence and Dead Sea Scrolls orthography suggest that at one time they were pronounced *hû'ā* and *hî'ā*. But since the problem of the *aleph* is independent of the problem addressed in this paper, I have relegated comment on it to this one footnote.

this by giving it the corresponding vowel”⁽⁶⁴⁾. Green’s conclusion is remarkably similar to mine, though naturally his was accomplished merely through intuition and/or a belief in the antiquity if not Mosaicity of the Pentateuch. I hope I have supplied the historical and linguistic background necessary for reaffirming Green’s view⁽⁶⁵⁾.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Canisius College
Buffalo, NY 14208
U.S.A.

GARY A. RENDSBURG

SOMMAIRE

Le Pentateuque emploie régulièrement le pron. pers. de la 3^{ème} pers. du sing. *HW'* de façon indifférenciée. Cet épïcène est vocalisé *hû'* quand il est utilisé pour «il» et *hî'* quand il est utilisé pour «elle» (qeré perpétuel). La plupart des exégètes traitent *HW'* vocalisé *hî'* comme une forme artificielle ou une erreur scribale. On suppose ici que l’épïcène *HW'* est une forme hébraïque authentique. Puisqu’aucune autre langue sémitique ne possède pareille forme, son origine peut être cherchée dans le substrat non sémitique des régions montagneuses d’Israël. Il y a un bon nombre d’indices qui suggèrent une forte présence hittite ou hourrite précisément dans cette partie de Canaan. Aucune de ces deux langues ne distingue le genre pour la 3^{ème} pers. du sing. du pron. pers., fait qui pourrait expliquer l’épïcène hébraïque *HW'*.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ W. H. GREEN, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language* (New York 1872) 96. It is interesting that Green infers no conclusion vis-à-vis the date of the Pentateuch, perhaps because J. Wellhausen’s major publications were still a few years away, e.g., his *Geschichte Israels I* (Berlin 1878) = *Prolegomenon zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin 1883).

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Actually other 19th Century grammarians also treated *HW'* vocalized *hî'* as a genuine form, and it is somewhat comical now to look at the great pains they went to to explain the word; cf. I. NORDHEIMER, *A Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language I* (New York 1842) 87-88; G. BICKELL, *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar* (Leipzig 1877) 62-63, n. 1; GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 107, informs us that “The old explanation regarded this phenomenon as an archaism”, with apparently works such as Nordheimer, Bickell, and Green in mind.; J. I. MUNRO, *A Research Into the Origin of the Third Personal Pronoun HW' Epicene in Pentateuch* (London 1912), also regards the form in question as genuine, but his philological method is so outlandish that the work is virtually useless. I refrain from any detailed criticism and cite the monograph if only for bibliographic completeness.

BIBLICA

VOL. 63 - FASC. 3 - 1982