

"Hazon Gabriel: A Grammatical Sketch," in Matthias Henze, ed.,
Hazon Gabriel: New Readings of the Gabriel Revelation
(Early Judaism and its Literature 29)
(Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 61-91.

FIVE

HAZON GABRIEL: A GRAMMATICAL SKETCH

Gary A. Rendsburg

0. INTRODUCTION

The following grammatical sketch of the *Hazon Gabriel* (*HazGab*) inscription is based on the readings provided by Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky and Elisha Qimron, whose analysis covered primarily lines 11–32 and 64–80.¹ While an occasional string of letters in the remaining lines of the epigraph may yield a word here or there, in the main we refrain from invoking such evidence, given the extremely fragmentary nature of these sections (lines 1–10, 33–63, 81–87) and the overall difficulty of reading the ink on the stone.² The only exception is a string of four-

It is my distinct pleasure to thank Steven Fassberg (Hebrew University) and Matthew Morgenstern (University of Haifa) for their generously reading the pre-final version of this article, for their many constructive comments and criticisms, and for providing several key bibliographic sources (most importantly the 2009 dissertations by Uri Mor and Gregor Geiger, both cited herein—as the reader will see, my ability to consult the former in particular was a special boon to my research). Note the abbreviations *DSSSEL* = *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (2006 edition); *Maʿagarim* = *Maʿagarim: Mifʿal ha-Millon ha-Histori la-Laṣon ha-ʿIvrit* = *The Hebrew Language Historical Dictionary Project* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1998–), online at <http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il/>.

1. Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky and Elisha Qimron, “Heʿarot ʿal ha-Ketovet ha-Mekuneh ʿHazon Gavriʿel,” *Cathedra* 133 (2009): 133-44, along with the abridged English version in the present volume.

2. Notwithstanding our great confidence in the expert reading skills of Ada Yardeni (for which see Ada Yardeni and Binyamin Elizur, “Teqst Nevuʿi ʿal ʿEven min ha-Meʿa ha-Rišona lifne Sefirat ha-Noṣerim: Hodaʿa Rišona,” *Cathedra* 123 [2008]: 155–66), as indicated, I utilize herein the study of Yuditsky and Qimron, as the most up-to-date statement on the matter. The readings presented by Yardeni and Elizur served, by and large, as the basis for four earlier treatments: Israel Knohl, “ʿIyyunim be-ʿHazon Gavriʿel,” *Tarbiz* 76 (2007): 303–28; Israel Knohl, “By Three Days, Live: Messiahs, Resurrection, and Ascent to Heaven in *Hazon Gabriel*,” *JR* 88 (2008): 147–58; Moshe Bar-Asher, “ʿal ha-Laṣon be-ʿHazon Gavriʿel,” *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 7 (2009): 193–226; and Gary A. Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 107–16. (To be sure, Knohl also introduced his own readings into his article, most famously with חַיִּים, “live,” in line 80, whereas Yardeni

teen words in lines 57–59, for which there is general agreement on the reading; and thus this passage will be included in our investigation. In general, we do not include partially reconstructed words, except where absolutely certain, e.g., אִשְׂרָאֵל [Isra]el, in line 30, נְבִיאִין [pro]phets in line 79, and so on.³ In addition, we shall not comment on the very enigmatic לוֹ בִּסְדָּ (line 22), except in one place as an aside (see §2.2.7).⁴

It is only natural to compare the language of *Hazon Gabriel* with the linguistic profiles of other varieties of ancient Hebrew, namely, (a) Biblical Hebrew (BH), in particular, in its Tiberian Masoretic garb—at times to be divided between Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH) and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH); (b) Qumran Hebrew (QH), representing the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS); (c) the Hebrew of the Judean Desert documents (HJDD), that is, Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Murabbaʿat, and other sites; and (d) Mishnaic Hebrew (MH), including the language of not only the Mishnah but of other Tannaitic works as well. We will make such comparisons along the way (with occasional nods to Samaritan Hebrew [SH] and to the Hebrew of Ben Sira as well); and then at the article’s end we will provide a summary assessment of the language of *Hazon Gabriel*.

1. PHONOLOGY AND ORTHOGRAPHY

1.1. PLENE AND DEFECTIVA SPELLING⁵

As one can see from the following lists, the scribe of *HazGab* favors *plene* over *defectiva* orthography, very much in keeping with the spelling tendencies in the DSS.

The fuller spelling system occurs in the following vocables:⁶

כּוֹל	(13)
צִוְבָאִים	(14)
שְׁלוֹשׁ	(15)
הַנְּבִיאִין	(15)

and Elizur read only a partial ן at the beginning of the word and nothing thereafter.) While I follow Yuditsky and Qimron’s readings herein, I also devote a brief Appendix (see below) to some of Yardeni and Elizur’s readings, if only for the sake of completeness.

3. In such cases, a superscript ʿ is placed after the line number.

4. For an excellent attempt to extract meaning from these words, see Yuditsky and Qimron, “Heʿarot ʿal ha-Ketovet,” 138.

5. For an earlier treatment, see Bar-Asher, “ʿal ha-Laṣon be-Ḥazon Gavriʿel,” 196–99, though his data are based on the readings of Yardeni and Elizur.

6. I do not include here examples of the masculine plural ending, whether ים- or ין-, even though these include *yod*, since these are always written this way in *HazGab*. Some such forms are recorded here, though their inclusion in the list is due to the presence of another *mater lectionis*, either *waw* or *yod* earlier in the word. Nor do I include words that are always written *plene* in ancient Hebrew sources, such as בְּרִיָּת (18) and בְּרִיךְ (23).

החסידין[ו]	(16)
עומד	(22)
מקומו	(24)
קיטוט	(24)
שׁוֹד	(27)
ולכול	(28)
שלושה	(30, 65, 70, 75, 79)
בטוחין	(66)
אוהבין	(68)
נביאים	(70)
רועין	(70)
בכוחך	(73)
עושה	(74)
רועין	(75)
קדושין	(76)
אותך	(78)
רועים	(79)
שלושת	(80)

Forms with *defectiva* spellings—that is, where one would expect a *waw* or *yod* based on the usual orthography in BH and/or the preponderance of *plene* spellings in *HazGab* as revealed by the above list—occur as follows:

שאלני	(11)
ואגדה	(12)
דוד	(16, 72)
לפנך	(17)
צבאת	(28 ^r , 68, 69) [line 28: הַצָּבָא]
האהבין	(28)

Notes:

- The active participle typically uses *waw* to represent the first /ō/ vowel, as in **צוֹבְאִים** (14), **עומד** (22), **אוהבין** (68), **עושה** (74), and in a noun derived from this grammatical form, that is, **רועין** (75), **רועים** (79).⁷ In two instances, however, the form occurs without *waw*, viz., **שאלני** (11) and **האהבין** (28). Both of these are the result of what James Barr termed “affix effect,” which is to say, the addition of morphological elements to a lexeme typically yields a *defectiva* orthography.⁸ In the first case, the suffix pronoun **ני-** serves as the catalyst, while in the second instance, the prefixed definite article **-ה** causes the resultant spelling.

7. In the Bible spelled always as **רועים** (cstr. **רועי**).

8. James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), esp. 25–32.

- I have not included the many instances of the feminine plural ending *ות* in the *plene* list above, since this is the standard usage, e.g., גדלות (12), המרכבות (26), and the many instances of צבאות (11, 18, 20, 26, 29, 58). The only feminine plural ending written *defectiva* is צבאת (28^r, 68, 69), most likely due to the scribe's desire to introduce variation into his orthography.⁹
- As expected, given both BH and QH orthography, the long /ī/ vowel of Hiph^cil forms is indicated throughout with *mater lectionis yod*—with one exception. Thus, one finds (and these are not included in the first list above) [השׁ]בְּנֵי (17), ואגיד (21), מרעיש (24), תצילם (78), יצילו (78), versus only ואגדה (12) without *yod*. Again, I would explain this spelling (along with the presence of final *he*) as simply for the sake of variation; see further §2.5.9, first bullet.
- As expected, *matres lectionis* are used mainly for long vowels. In one sure instance, however, *yod* is used to represent a short /i/ vowel, viz., קיטוט, “trembling” (24).¹⁰ For a parallel from the DSS, note 1QH^a 16:18 בִּיתֹאֹם, “suddenly.”¹¹
- The name “David” is spelled *defectiva*: דוּד (16, 72). This spelling dominates in the Bible and in Ben Sira (5x), whereas the *plene* form דוּיֵד dominates in LBH (264x in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah)¹² and in QH (19x [e.g., 1QM 11:2] vs. 1x without *yod* [CD 7:16 citing Amos 9:11¹³])¹⁴; see also Ben Sira 47:2, 49:4.
- An unusual spelling occurs with לִפְנֶיךָ, “before you” (17),¹⁵ a spelling attested once elsewhere in an ancient Hebrew source, viz., Mur.

9. For this underappreciated scribal technique, see Barr, *Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*, 187, 194–95, though this approach goes back to Alfred Rahlfs, “Zur Setzung der Lesemütter im Alten Testament,” *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Klasse (1916): 315–47, esp. 343–47 (cited by Barr on p. 186 n. 4).

10. On this word and its possible meanings and interpretations, see Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 108–10; Bar-Asher, “‘al ha-Lašon be-‘Hazon Gavri‘el,” 211–17; and Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 141.

11. See Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 110 and n. 11. To my mind, the attempt by Elisha Qimron (*Megillot Midbar Yehuda*, vol. 1, *ha-Hibburim ha-‘Ivriyim* [Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010], 82–83) to read this form as פּוֹתֹאִים, “simpletons,” fails, given the context in 1QH^a 16:18.

12. For further details, see David Noel Freedman, “The Spelling of the Name ‘David’ in the Hebrew Bible,” *HAR* 11 (1983): 89–104; reprinted in David Noel Freedman, *Divine Commitment and Human Obligation: Selected Writings of David Noel Freedman*, vol. 2, *Poetry and Orthography* (ed. John R. Huddleston; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 108–22.

13. Even though Amos 9:11 MT uses דוּיֵד.

14. In addition, 1QIsa^a always utilizes the longer spelling דוּיֵד, whereas Isaiah MT always has the shorter form דוּד. See Edward Y. Kutscher, *ha-Lašon ve-ha-Reqa‘ ha-Lešoni šel Megillat Yeša‘yahu ha-Šelema mi-Megillot Yam ha-Melaḥ* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959), 5, 75; and Edward Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Magnes/Leiden: Brill, 1982), 94.

15. See already Bar-Asher, “‘al ha-Lašon be-‘Hazon Gavri‘el,” 197.

30:24.¹⁶ Note, by contrast, לְפָנֶיךָ 107x in the Bible, לפניך 15x and לפניכה 42 in the DSS, etc. Once more, one notes an attempt by our author to vary his text and orthography; cf. מִן לִפְנֵיךָ, “from before you” (17) and מִלְּפָנֶיךָ, “from before you” (79).¹⁷

- On the spelling לכה, “to you” (21), see §2.1.2, first bullet.¹⁸

1.2. THE SPELLING OF “JERUSALEM”

HazGab evinces several different spellings of the city name “Jerusalem”:

- ירושלם (12, 14, 27),¹⁹ without the second *yod*, as per BH (save for five examples, chiefly LBH)—see also Ben Sira 36:18; 47:11; ca. 10x in the DSS (e.g., 1QpHab 9:4, 12:7); three coins from Year 1 of the First Revolt; and four Bar-Kokhba coins.²⁰
- ירושלים [י] (66), with the second *yod*, as per the dominant QH spelling (ca. 25x in the DSS [e.g., 1QM 1:3, 3:11]).²¹ See also 5x in BH (chiefly LBH); and seven coins from Years 2–4 of the First Revolt.²²
- ירושלם [י] (32), with the second *yod* hanging, no doubt added secondarily.

While one hesitates to summon the explanation of variable spelling as a stylistic aspect continually, such may be the best approach for the variant spellings of “Jerusalem” in *HazGab*. In analogous fashion, note that among the five passages in the Bible in which the “long” spelling occurs, two of the verses (2 Chr 25:1,

16. See Uri Mor, “Diquduq ha-‘Ivrit šel Te‘udot Midbar Yehuda ben ha-Mered ha-Gadol le-Mered Bar Kokhba” (Ph.D. diss., Ben-Gurion University, 2009), 41, 103, 199.

17. Variation in orthography is discussed above, with reference to the approach by Rahlfs and Barr (see n. 9 above). Variation in text (or wording) is mentioned here for the first time, though see further below, on several occasions.

18. See already Bar-Asher, “‘al ha-Lašon be-‘Ĥazon Gavri‘el,” 199.

19. See also line 39, according to the reading of Yardeni and Elizur, even though that line is not included in the present treatment. For earlier discussions of the spelling of “Jerusalem” in *HazGab*, see Bar-Asher, “‘al ha-Lašon be-‘Ĥazon Gavri‘el,” 198; and Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 142.

20. Data from *Ma‘agarim*, except for the DSS data taken from *DSSEL*. This is also the sole spelling in the major Tannaitic works: Mishnah (14x), Tosefta (41x), Mekhilta (7x), Sifra (6x), Sifre BeMidbar (5x), Sifre Devarim (7x), with an occasional spelling with the second *yod* in a few other Tannaitic sources (see *Ma‘agarim* for details). Of course, since our manuscripts are all early medieval and onward, the MH evidence may be less central to our discussion here. For discussion, see Shim‘on Sharvit, *Lešonah ve-Signonah šel Masseket ‘Avot le-Doroteha* (Beersheva: Ben-Gurion University Press, 2006), 178–79; and Gabriel Birnbaum, *Lešon ha-Mišna bi-Genizat Qahir: Hege ve-Šurot* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2008), 331–32 (with evidence for both the shorter and the longer spellings among the Geniza manuscripts).

21. See the brief comment in David Noel Freedman, “The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography,” *Textus 2* (1962): 97–98; reprinted in Freedman, *Divine Commitment and Human Obligation*, 2:23.

22. Again, data from *Ma‘agarim*, except for the DSS data taken from *DSSEL*.

32:9) witness the “short” spelling as well, while in a third instance (1 Chr 3:5) the previous verse bearing on the same subject includes the “short” spelling.²³

1.3. PRONUNCIATION OF VARIOUS CONSONANTS

Unusual or unexpected spellings reveal changes in the consonantal phonology represented in *HazGab*.

- The spelling גַּאִים, “nations” (13) discloses the shift of intervocalic /y/ > /ʔ/. One assumes a pronunciation *gōʔim*, as opposed to MT גּוֹיִם *gōyīm*; see further §2.3.1, first bullet.
- The spelling אֱלִי, “God” (cstr.) (68) is most odd and apparently reflects something like אֱלֹיֶ *ʔēlōyē* (thus Yuditsky and Qimron), as opposed to MT אֱלֹהֵי *ʔēlohē*, with shift of intervocalic /h/ > /y/.
- The form גַּטוּוּהָ, “outstretched” (74)²⁴ implies a pronunciation *nētūwā*, as opposed to MT נִטְוֵיָהָ *nētūyā*, with shift of intervocalic /y/ > /w/. Alternatively, one could imagine the pronunciation *nētūhā*, with the *waw* marking the /ū/ vowel and the *he* marking the consonant /h/, with a following /ā/ vowel unmarked in the orthography. If this were the case, then the consonantal shift would be intervocalic /y/ > /h/.
- These three unusual spellings demonstrate the weakening of intervocalic /y/ in particular, which presumably could be realized as either /ʔ/ (based on example 1) or /w/ (based on example 3, the first explanation), and perhaps /h/ as well (based on example 3, the second explanation). Though regardless of how one explains גַּטוּוּהָ, “outstretched” (74), the shift of intervocalic /y/ to /h/ is independently suggested by what is presumably hypercorrection reflected in the second example, with intervocalic /h/ > /y/.
- On the other hand, none of the weakening of the laryngeals (e.g., /h/ > /ʔ/) and pharyngeals (e.g., /ħ/ > /h/) inherent in QH and SH is evident in *HazGab*.²⁵ The spelling of תִּירָה, “fear” (23) = MT תִּירָא is insufficient evidence to suggest any general weakening of this group of consonants.
- On the fluctuation between final *mem* and final *nun*, see §2.6.

1.4. NON-ASSIMILATION OF NUN BEFORE FOLLOWING CONSONANT

On this feature, see §2.2.4.

23. Does the author of Jer 26:18 utilize the “long” spelling, since the passage quotes Mic 3:12 with the “short” spelling?

24. See also the *ketiv* נִטְוֵיָהָ in Isa 3:16, with *qere* נִטְוֵיָהָ *nētūyōt*.

25. For QH, see Kutscher, *ha-Lašon ve-ha-Reqaʿ ha-Lešoni šel Megillat Yešaʿyahu*, 398–400; idem, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 96; and Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 25–26. For SH, see Zeʿev Ben-Ḥayyim, *Ivrit ve-ʿAramit Nusah Šomron*, vol. 5 (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1977), 20–37; Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 109; and Zeʿev Ben-Ḥayyim, *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 38–43.

2. MORPHOLOGY

2.1. PRONOUNS

2.1.1. INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS²⁶

	Singular	Plural
1c	אני (17, 24, 77)	אנחנו (66)
2m	אתה (11, 22, 77)	---
2f	---	---
3m	הוא (22)	---
3f	היא (24)	---

Notes:

- The attested forms are exactly those of BH.
- According to Yardeni and Elizur, אני occurs in line 77, and indeed I discussed this word in a previous publication.²⁷ Yuditsky and Qimron, however, now read this word as אתה, so that only אני is listed in the chart above. As such the 1st com. sg. independent personal pronoun matches LBH especially.
- For the form מהו (31), a contraction of מה הוא, see below on the interrogative pronoun, §2.1.5.

2.1.2. SUFFIX PRONOUNS

	Singular	Plural
1c (with nouns)	י- (16, 18, 18, 70)	---
1c (with verbs)	ני- (11, 17, 21)	---
2m	ך- (17, 23, 66, 73, 78, 79) כה- (21)	---
2f	---	---
3m	ו- (67)	ם- (76) הן- (76)
3f	---	---

26. For a recent comprehensive treatment of the subject, presenting the evidence from BH, QH, and MH (notwithstanding the title's spotlight on QH), see Moshe Morgenstern, "Ma'areket ha-Kinnuyim ha-Perudim be-Qumran: Le-Še'elat Toldot ha-ʿIvrit bi-Yme ha-Bayit ha-Šeni," in *Ša'are Lašon: Mehqarim ba-Lašon ha-ʿIvrit, ba-ʿAramit, u-ve-Balšanut ha-Yehudim Mugašim le-Moše Bar-ʿAšer*, vol. 1 (ed. Aharon Maman, Steven Fassberg, and Yohanan Breuer; Jerusalem: Bialik, 2007), 44–63.

27. Rendsburg, "Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription," 111.

Notes:

- For the 2nd masc. sg. form, *HazGab* clearly prefers the shorter γ - to the longer -כה . This stands in contrast to the distribution of these two orthographic variants in the DSS, with about 900 of the former and about 160 of the latter.²⁸ The single instance of -כה in line 21 may be due to its use on the uniconsonantal preposition -ל , thereby giving the form לכה , “to you” greater “bulk” than would occur with לך .²⁹
- I would explain the two alternative 3rd masc. pl. forms in line 76 as follows. The text reads: $\text{אם יש בהן אם יש בהם}$, “if there is among [lit. ‘in’] them, if there is among [lit. ‘in’] them,” repeating the same expression essentially, with שלושה רועין , “three shepherds” (75) or whatever is to be restored at the end of said line as the antecedent. Apparently the scribe wrote אם יש בהן first, but then realized that he had used an Aramaizing form instead of the proper Hebrew form.³⁰ Accordingly, he wrote the phrase again, this time using the proper Hebrew form. Perhaps, though, with a moment to consider his options at this point, our author selected the more archaic Hebrew form בם , instead of the later Hebrew form בהם .³¹ Note that the form בם is the one that dominates in the DSS (בם 98x vs. בהם 33x; to select a single important text, note בם 9x vs. בהם 0x in 1QS), running against the trend of LBH continuance into QH.³²

2.1.3. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

The masc. sg. form זה (= BH זֶה , the default form throughout the history of the Hebrew language) occurs in line 22, in the combination הצמח הרע הזה , “this evil plant,” serving as a demonstrative adjective. The fem. sg. form זו occurs in line 67, in the combination זו המרכבה , “this is the chariot,” where it serves in the nominative slot. The latter form, of course, is rare in the Bible (occurring as זו 2x and as זה 11x); it never occurs in QH; it appears twice in HJDD, both times with the definite article (Mur. 44:6 הזו , N.H. 49:7 הזוא), though note that הזות also appears 2x);³³ and then זו becomes the standard form in MH.

28. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 58-59.

29. This practice would be in line with a general trend in the MT, as summarized by Barr, *Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*, 118: “it seems as if there may be a certain tendency for the spelling with *he* to appear with *short* words such as particles, monosyllables.”

30. בהן prevails in MH as well, occurring 215x in the Mishnah vs. 41 attestations of בהם (data according to *Maʿagarim*; the same situation obtains in the other Tannaitic texts).

31. On this issue, see Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem* (Paris: Gabalda, 1982), 24-27 (and the literature cited in his nn. 5 and 9).

32. Gary A. Rendsburg, “Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1QS]),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 89; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 217-46.

33. Mor, “Diquduq ha-ʿIvrit,” 116, 120-21.

particle של occurs in line 67 (regardless of what follows), we provide here the number of attestations in our other corpora: 7x in the Bible; 25x in 3Q15 Copper Scroll; one other attestation in QH, viz., 4Q385 (4QpsEzek^a) 6:9 ואחד של אדם, “and one of a man”; 18x in the Bar Kokhba letters and associated documents³⁸; and of course as a standard usage in MH.

2.2.2. PARTICLE OF EXISTENCE

יש, “there is, there are,” occurs twice in line 76, though probably we have a scribal rewriting of the same phrase (see §2.1.2, second bullet). In any case, this particle is fully in use in all stages of ancient Hebrew, from BH through MH, and of course beyond.

2.2.3. PRESENTATIVE PARTICLE

The particle הנה, “behold,” occurs twice: הנה כול הגאים צֹבְאִים עַל יְרוּשָׁלַם, “behold, all the nations are besieging Jerusalem” (13[-14]), and הנה כבוד יהוה אלהים צבאות, “behold, the glory of YHWH, God of Hosts, God of Israel” (25[-26]). This form occurs throughout BH and is attested 17x in QH.³⁹ In MH, on the other hand, the presentative particle is הרי, serving in all contexts where BH/QH הנה would be expected.⁴⁰

2.2.4. PREPOSITIONS

The following prepositions are attested in *HazGab*:

ב-	(12, 18, 73, 76, 76)
ל-	(19, 19, 21, 22, 28, 67, 68, 74, 75, 79, 80)
כ-	(32)
אל	(70, 71)
על	(66, 67)

Nothing about these occurrences requires comment.

For the forms of the preposition (ן)מ, “from,” on the other hand, discussion is required, and thus we list here all the attestations, including the specific phrases:

מן לפני	“from before me”	(16)
מן לפניך	“from before you”	(17)
מלפני הצדק	“from before the righteousness”	(21)

38. For the attestations, see Mor, “Diquduq ha-‘Ivrit,” 58 (see also p. 200).

39. According to the *Ma’agarim* database. *DSSEL* lists many more attestations, though most of these either are fragmentary or are biblical citations embedded in DSS compositions (e.g., Exod 14:10 in 4Q365 [4QRP^c] 5:1).

40. Pérez Fernández, *Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 20, 54, 153, 173, 184, 187, 213-215, 226.

מִן מְקוֹמוֹ, “from its place”	(23–24)
מִלְפָּנֶיךָ, “from before you”	(79)

Of the five attestations of the preposition (מִן), “from,” one is struck by several points. First, four of the five occur in the compound preposition מִלְפָּנֶיךָ, “from before.” One is not sure what to make of this point, except to suggest that the usage is a favorite of the writer (for the record, this preposition occurs 73x in the biblical corpus and 40x in QH, including cases with pronominal suffixes).⁴¹

More strikingly, though, in three of the five instances the *nun* is not assimilated to the next consonant, as one would expect in Hebrew. One sees here the influence of Aramaic, exactly as one sees in LBH, with fifty-one examples in Chronicles and a few additional ones in Daniel and Nehemiah,⁴² and in HJDD, with many such examples (e.g., Mur. 24.2:7 מִן קֶצֶת עֶפֶר, “a portion of land” [lit. “from some dust”]).⁴³

Most remarkable is the example in lines 23–24, בְּרוּךְ כְבוֹד יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן מְקוֹמוֹ, “blessed is the glory of YHWH God from its place,” since it is based on Ezek 3:12 בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה מִמְּקוֹמוֹ, *bārûk kěbôd YHWH mimměqômô*, with the standard form מִמְּקוֹמוֹ, “from its place.”

2.2.5. CONJUNCTIONS

For the sake of completeness, we mention here the standard conjunction -וּ, “and” (passim), and the conditional particle אִם (76, where the word appears twice, though again see §2.1.2, second bullet, on the apparent rewriting of the same phrase).

The conjunction לְמַעַן occurs twice in *HazGab*, both times followed by nouns: לְמַעַן צְבָאֵי [ה] מִלְאֲךָ מִיכָאֵל, “for the sake of the armies of the angel Michael” (27[–28], though the reading is uncertain), and לְמַעַן דוֹד עַבְדֵי יְהוָה, “for the sake of David, servant of YHWH” (72). This form is standard in BH, occurs 10x in Ben Sira, and ca. 70x in QH.⁴⁴ It is not a feature of MH, however.⁴⁵

2.2.6. ADVERBS

The temporal adverb עוֹד, “still” occurs in line 24, though the passage here is adapted from Hag 2:6. *HazGab* 24 reads עוֹד מַעֲטָא קִיטוּטָא הִיא, while Hag 2:6 states עוֹד אֶחָת מְעַטָּא הִיא (with the continuation of each passage the same). Obviously, this adverb is common to all varieties of ancient Hebrew and beyond.

41. According to the counts of Avraham Even-Shoshan, *Qonqordansya Hadaša* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1993), 605–6; and *DSSEL*, respectively.

42. See Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 66.

43. Mor, “Diquduq ha-‘Ivrit,” 90.

44. Seventy-five times according to *DSSEL*, though some of these occur in fragmentary texts where considerable restoration is necessary.

45. See Pérez Fernández, *Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 160.

The second adverb that appears in *HazGab* is the logical marker כה/בו, “thus,” spelled with *waw* in lines 11, 17, 19, 29, 57, 58 and with *he* in line 69, each time used to introduce variations of “thus says YHWH” statements.⁴⁶ This form is standard in BH, especially to introduce divine speech (153x in Jeremiah alone). It does not occur in QH and in effect not in MH either (see only *t. Soṭah* 5:13; *Sifra* ²*Aḥare Mot* 6:1).

2.2.7. NEGATIVE MARKER

The negative marker אל occurs in the expression אל תירא, “do not fear,” in line 23. This morpheme occurs throughout ancient Hebrew to express (one-time) prohibitions,⁴⁷ and thus its presence in *HazGab* is perfectly normal and expected.

If Yuditsky and Qimron are correct in their interpretation of לו in line 22 (Yardeni and Elizur read these letters the same) as a nonstandard spelling of BH לא, QH לוא,⁴⁸ then a second negative marker appears in our inscription.

2.3. NOUNS

2.3.1. COMMON NOUNS

With two exceptions (see the third and fourth bullets below), every noun in *HazGab* is a relatively common lexeme in ancient Hebrew. Here follows the list of common nouns (including construct forms) and their attestations:⁴⁹

א(ו)הבין, “lovers”	28, 68 (written <i>defectiva</i> in line 28 and <i>plene</i> in line 68)
אות, “sign”	17, 80
אמרים, “sayings”	16
ארץ, “land”	25, 73
בית, “house”	12
בן, “son”	18
ברית, “covenant”	18
בשר, “flesh”	67
גאים, “nations”	13
גדולות, “great-things”	12
דם, “blood”	67
חסד, “fealty”	74

46. On these statements, see Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 114–16. Some of what I wrote there needs to be rephrased, in light of the readings by Yuditsky and Qimron, but the main point stands nonetheless.

47. If anything, its use increases in QH, on which see Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 80–81.

48. Yuditsky and Qimron, “He^earot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 138.

49. In both this list and the list of proper nouns below, I have not marked letters of uncertain reading with the dots or circles above.

חסידין, “pious-ones”	16
טבחי, “slaughters” (cstr. only)	57 ⁵⁰
יד, “hand”	18
ימות, “days”	32
ימין, “days”	19, 80
כבוד, “glory”	23, 25
כוח, “strength”	73
כול, “all”	13, 28
מלאך, “angel”	22, 28, 31
מקום, “place”	24, 72
מרכבה, “chariot”	26, 67
נביא, “prophet”	78
נביאים/ן, “prophets”	15, 70, 79 ^r
עבד, “servant”	16, 72
עולם, “eternity”	32, 65
עם, “people”	70
עץ, “tree”	31
ערי, “cities” (cstr. only)	27
צבא(ו), “armies”	11, 18, 20, 26, 28 ^r , 29, 57 ^r , 58, 68, 69 (written <i>defectiva</i> in lines 28, 68, 69; <i>plene</i> in the others)
צדק, “righteousness”	21
צמח, “plant”	21
קדושי(ן), “holy ones”	65 (cstr.), 76 (abs.)
קיטוט, “trembling”	24
רועה, “shepherd”	78
רועים/ן, “shepherds”	70, 75, 79
רע, “evil”	20 (see also §2.3.4. s.v.)
שבין, “elders”	15
שוד, “violence”	27
שמים, “heavens”	25, 73
שני, “years” (cstr. only)	32

Notes:

- גאים, “nations” (13), is never written this way in any ancient Hebrew text. The spelling גואים, with *mater lectionis waw* to mark the /ō/ vowel, appears 22 times in QH,⁵¹ e.g., 1QM 12:14; 16:1; 11QT 56:13; 57:7; 60:21; 62:12; 64:10. In addition, the spelling גואין occurs in N.H. 51:6 (an extremely difficult text to read)—but the specific form גאים as attested in *HazGab* 13

50. On an alternative explanation for this word, see n. 70 below.

51. Data according to *DSSEL*, updating the 14 attestations mentioned by Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 31.

is unknown from elsewhere. Naturally, one would reconstruct the same pronunciation for גאים and גואים, viz., *gō'im* (see §1.3, first bullet), but the unique orthography is noteworthy nonetheless. In theory, the word גאים, “haughty ones,” could be read here (cf. Pss 94:2; 140:6; Prov 15:25; 16:19), but the two passages in Isa 29:7–8 (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם הַצְּבֹאִים עַל־אֲרִיאֵל), *kol haggōyīm haṣṣōbē'im ʿal ʾārīʾēl*, “all the nations that besiege Ariel,” and כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם הַצְּבֹאִים עַל־הַר צִיּוֹן, *kol haggōyīm haṣṣōbē'im ʿal har ṣiyyôn*, “all the nations that besiege Mt. Zion”) make this highly unlikely.

- *HazGab* 19 and 80 attest the expected plural form ימין, “days” (on the final *nun* in place of final *mem*, see §2.6). In *HazGab* 32, the atypical form ימות occurs in the expression יְמוֹת עוֹלָם, “days of eternity,” clearly borrowed from Deut 32:7, יְמוֹת עוֹלָם, *yēmôt ʿōlām*.⁵² One should note that this form is not attested in QH, though it continues to be productive in MH, as witnessed through an assortment of phrases: ימות המשיח, “days of the Messiah” (e.g., *m. Ber.* 1:5); ימות השנה, “days of the year” (e.g., *m. Šeqal.* 7:2; 8:1); ימות החג, “days of the festival” (e.g., *m. Sukkah* 3:13; 4:8); ימות החמה, “days of sun(shine)” (e.g., *m. B. Meṣiʿa* 8:6); ימות הגשמים, “days of rain” (*ibid.*), etc.—even if the phrase ימות עולם, “days of eternity,” does not occur in the Tannaitic corpus.⁵³
- The first rare word in the above list is קיטוט, “trembling” (24), treated in two earlier articles—by the present writer, with said definition, and by Bar-Asher, who would define the word as “just, only, little.”⁵⁴ In either case, one notes that the form of the noun קיטוט is the verbal substantive *qittūl*, relatively rare in BH, but which appears more prominently in MH.⁵⁵
- The second rare word in the above list is שבין, “elders” (15), an Aramaism in *HazGab*. In the Bible, the noun שֶׁבַע, “old man,” occurs in Job 15:10; the verb שֶׁבַעְתִּי, “I am old/gray,” appears in 1 Sam 12:2; and the unusual nominal form שִׁיבוֹ, “his old age,” occurs in 1 Kgs 14:4.⁵⁶ (I do not deal here with

52. The only other occurrence of ימות in the Bible is Ps 90:15. In Isa 63:9; 63:11, we encounter the expected phrase יְמֵי עוֹלָם.

53. The use of the plural construct ימות in Deut 32:7, Phoenician, and MH suggests that this form is an Israelian Hebrew (IH) feature (even if Ps 90:15 cannot be explained thereby). See further Gary A. Rendsburg, “The Galilean Background of Mishnaic Hebrew,” in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. Lee I. Levine; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992), 233.

54. Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 108–10; and Bar-Asher, “al ha-Laṣon be-Ḥazon Gavriʾel,” 211–17. See also Yuditsky and Qimron, “Heʿarot ʿal ha-Ketovet,” 141.

55. See Kutscher, *History of the Hebrew Language*, 128; and Pérez Fernández, *Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*, 57. For the larger context, see Steven E. Fassberg, “The Movement from *Qal* to *Piʿel* in Hebrew and the Disappearance of the *Qal* Internal Passive,” *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001): 243–55.

56. This distribution suggests that the root is an IH feature, since in one passage the speaker is Samuel from the hill country of Ephraim, while in the other the setting is Shiloh. Its presence in Job 15:10 fits into the much larger picture of numerous Aramaisms in that book;

the standard noun שִׁיבָה, “old age,” which occurs 19x in the Bible.) This lexeme appears three times in Ben Sira (8:9; 32:3; 42:8),⁵⁷ again due to Aramaic influence on postbiblical Hebrew. The first occurrence (from ms A) is plural שְׁבִים; the latter two (from ms B) singular שֵׁב. Interestingly, the well-known Aramaic noun סב is spelled with *samek*,⁵⁸ while both *HazGab* and Ben Sira follow the biblical orthography in using *śin*.

- On the plural endings ים- vs. ין-, see §2.6.

2.3.2. PROPER NOUNS

The proper nouns (including the various forms meaning “God”) attested in *HazGab* are the following:

אלה, “God”	26
אלהים, “God”	11, 20, 23, 25, 29
אלהי, “God” (cstr.)	13 ^r , 18, 20, 26, 29, 58, 58, 69
אלי, “God” (cstr.)	68
גבריאל, “Gabriel”	77, 80
דוד, “David”	16, 72
יהודה, “Judah”	27
יהוה, “YHWH”	11, 13, 18 ^r , 20, 23, 25, 29, 57, 58, 68, 69, 72
ירושלם, “Jerusalem”	12, 27, 32 ^r , 57, 66 ^r (line 32 with hanging <i>yod</i> , line 66 with <i>plene</i> spelling)
ישראל, “Israel”	12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 26, 30 ^r , 58, 59, 68, 69, 75
מיכאל, “Michael”	28

Notes:

- The shorter form אלה, “God,” appears in line 26, in the expression אלה המרכבות, “God of the chariots.” While one might be inclined to assume here the Masoretic Hebrew vocalization, viz., אֱלֹהִים, *ʾēlōhîm*, one should note that this word is almost always written *plene* in MT as אֱלֹהִים (55x), with only three instances of the *defectiva* orthography אֱלֹהִים, each of which can be explained. In Deut 32:17, the expression לֹא אֱלֹהִים, “non-god,” creates a single unit, which leads to the non-use of *waw*; in Hab 1:11, the presence of the suffix pronoun explains the spelling לְאֱלֹהָיו, “to his god”; and in Dan

see Edward L. Greenstein, “The Language of Job and Its Poetic Function,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 651–66.

57. Ben Sira 32:3, according to the numeration system of Pancratius C. Beentjes (*The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* [VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 58), as opposed to 35:3, according to the numeration system of *Sefer Ben Sira* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 5733), 31.

58. See, e.g., Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990), 364–65.

11:38, the use of וְלֵאלֹהִים, “and to the god,” allows for variation in light of וְלֵאלֹהִים, “and to the god,” later in the verse. Given the propensity for *plene* spelling in *HazGab* (see §1.1), one wonders if אלה in line 26 should not be vocalized as in Aramaic, *viz.*, אֱלֹהֵ (Dan 2:28; etc.).

- On the construct form אלי ישראל in line 68 in the expression אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “God of Israel,” presumably to be read as אֱלֹהֵי (thus Yuditsky-Qimron), see §1.3, second bullet.

2.3.3. CONSTRUCT PHRASES

The following construct phrases are attested:

בית ישראל, “house of Israel”	(12)
גדלות ירושלם, “great things of Jerusalem”	(12)
כבוד יהוה, “glory of YHWH”	(23, 25)
אלה המרכבות, “God of the chariots”	(26)
שׂוֹד יְרוּשָׁלַם, “violence of Jerusalem”	(27)
ערי יהודה, “cities of Judah”	(27)
צָבָא [א]תְּ [ה]מלאך, “armies of the angel”	(28 ^r)
יְמוֹת עוֹלָם, “days of eternity”	(32)
[] שני, “years of []”	(32) ⁵⁹
קדושי העולם, “holy-ones of eternity”	(65)
עבד יהוה, “servant of YHWH”	(72)

In addition to the above list, one finds the repeated expressions יהוה צבאות, “YHWH of armies” (traditionally “LORD of Hosts”) and אלהי ישראל, “God of Israel” (with variant spellings and phrasings). Interestingly, we also encounter the following expressions, in which the absolute form אלהים, “God,” is used:

אלהים צבאות	(11)
יהוה אלהים צבאות	(20, 25–26, 29)

These phrases are not original to *HazGab*, since they occur in the Bible: the former in Ps 80:8, 15; the latter in Pss 59:6; 80:5, 20; 84:9.⁶⁰

2.3.4. ADJECTIVES

Four adjectives are attested, in the following adjectival clauses:

בְּרִית חֲדָשָׁה, “new covenant”	(18–19)
הצמח הרע הזה, “this evil plant”	(21–22)

59. The construct of the numeral 2 is possible here, though given the presence of יְמוֹת עוֹלָם, “days of eternity,” immediately preceding in line 32, one assumes that “years of []” is the correct understanding (with Yuditsky and Qimron).

60. For more on these usages, see Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 115.

אוהבין רבים, “many lovers” (68)
 הנטוה [], “outstretched []” (74)⁶¹

2.3.5. DEFINITE ARTICLE

The definite article -ה occurs in lines 13, 15, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 22, 25, 25, 26, 28, 64, 67, 72, 73, 73, 74, 80. It is used regularly and exhibits no peculiarities or departures from the grammatical norm of BH. Thus, for example, the definite article is attached to all three elements in the adjectival clause הַצִּמְחָה הָרָעָה הַזֶּה, “this evil plant” (21–22); it appears after each use of אֵת (24–25, 73, even if both of these passages derive from biblical verses); etc.

2.4. NUMERALS

The following numerals are attested:

חת[א]	“one” (fem.)	15 ^r
אחד	“one” (masc.)	30
שתין	“two” (fem.)	15
שנין	“two” (masc.)	30
שלוש	“three” (fem.)	15
שלושה	“three” (masc.)	30, 65, 70, 75, 79, 79
שלו(ו)שת	“three” (masc. cstr.)	19, 80 (the form is written defectiva in line 19, plene in line 80)
ארבע	“four” (fem.)	15
ארבעה	“four” (masc.)	30
חמשה	“five” (masc.)	30
ששה	“six” (masc.)	30
אלפים	“thousands”	74

Notes:

- In line 15, we have a simple counting of 1 through 4, using the feminine forms, even if it is not clear what is being enumerated here. The nouns that follow are all masculine: הַנְּבִיאִין וְהַשִּׁבְיִין [וְ]הַחֲסִידִים, “the prophets, and the elders, [and] the pious ones.”
- In line 30, we have a simple counting of 1 through 6, using the masculine forms. In this instance, there are no nouns following, so again one must assume a basic enumeration.
- The fact that line 15 uses the feminine (that is, unmarked) forms, while line 30 uses the masculine (that is, marked) forms, should be ascribed to

61. Almost without a doubt the word וּבְזֵרוּעַךְ, “and with your arm,” is to be restored in the brackets representing the end of line 73, as per Yuditsky and Qimron.

stylistic variation.⁶² As an aside, one may observe that these two sequences of numerals represent the oldest simple counting in an ancient Hebrew text.⁶³

- Use of numerals beyond simple counting occurs in the following phrases:
 - שלושה קדושי העולם, “three holy-ones of eternity” (65)
 - שלושה רועין, “three shepherds” (70)
 - שלושה רועין, “three shepherds” (75)
 - שלושה רועים, “three shepherds” (79)
 - שלושה [נבי]אין, “three [pro]phets” (79r)
 - לשלשת ימין, “for three days” (19)
 - לשלושת ימין, “for three days” (80)
- One observes the use of the absolute form שלושה when counting individual items (holy ones, shepherds, prophets), but the use of the construct form של(ו)ש when counting items more naturally counted, such as “days.” This pattern accords generally with the BH standard.⁶⁴ Note, for example, 27 occurrences of שלֹשֶׁת יָמִים *šlōšet yāmîm* in the Bible vs. only 4 occurrences of שלֹשָׁה יָמִים *šlōšâ yāmîm*.⁶⁵
- All seven instances above reflect the dominant order in SBH, QH, and MH, that is, with numeral preceding the item counted.⁶⁶

62. We have mentioned variant phraseology as a stylistic device several times above. For a convenient introduction to the subject, see Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 116. Such variations are legion in the Bible; see, e.g., Lev 11:27, טְמֵאִים הֵם לָכֵם, *tēmē'im hēm lākem*, and Lev 11:28, טְמֵאִים הֵמָּה לָכֵם, *tēmē'im hēmmâ lākem*, both meaning “they are impure to you.” I plan to present a study of this stylistic device in the near future.

63. No such sequences occur in BH, QH, etc., though hardly anyone seems to have noticed this point. For a brief comment, see Saul Levin, “A Theory of Grammatical Gender, Suggested by the Anomalous Agreement of the Semitic Numerals,” in *The Seventh LACUS Forum 1980* (ed. James E. Copeland and Philip W. Davis; Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam, 1981), 297. For three later instances from the Tannaitic corpus, see *m. Bek. 9:7*, *t. Ta'an. 2:2*, and *Sifra Zavim 5:2*. All three of these passages use the masculine form, since days are being counted.

64. Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2 vols.; Subsidia Biblica 14; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 526; and Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 278.

65. For the situation in MH, see Moshe Azar, *Taḥbir Lešon ha-Mišna* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1995), 189–90. The author claims that the absolute forms of the numerals 3 to 10 are used when the counted item is unknown, and that the construct forms are used when the counted item is known—though measurements may take the construct forms regardless. At any rate, we note here that the MH standard for the specific phrase under discussion is שלשה ימים, with over 50 such examples, vs. only 3 instances of של(ו)שת ימים (*m. Šabb. 1:9*; *m. Mo'ed Qat. 3:5*; *m. Sanh. 3:5*).

66. For the situation in LBH, see Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 58–60; though note the corrective presented in Gary A. Rendsburg, “Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of ‘P’,” *JANES* 12 (1980): 71.

- The forms for 2, namely, שתיך and שניך, both contain final *nun* instead of expected *mem*. The feminine form שתיך is attested 3x in 3Q15 Copper Scroll (9:2; 10:9; 10:13) and once in the Judean Desert debt document, line 1.⁶⁷ See further §2.6, where these forms are integrated into the larger picture of final *mem/nun* usage.

2.5. VERBS

The following verbs are attested, presented here with root, specific form, gloss, and parsing.⁶⁸

2.5.1. SUFFIX CONJUGATION (SC)

אמר	אמר, “he said” (11, 13, 17, 19, 29, 57, 58, 69)	Qal 3rd masc. sg. SC
בקש	בקש, “he requested” (16) בקשו, “they requested” (28)	Pi ^ʿ el 3rd masc. sg. SC Pi ^ʿ el 3rd masc. pl. SC
יצא	יצאו, “they went out” (75)	Qal 3rd masc. pl. SC
ראה	ראיתי, “I saw” (71)	Qal 1st com. sg. SC
שוב	שוב [הש]יבני, “he answered me” (17 ^ʿ)	Hiph ^ʿ il 3rd masc. sg. SC + 1st com. sg. obj. pron.
שלח	שלחתי, “I sent” (70)	Qal 1st com. sg. SC
שמע	שמע, “he heard” (26)	Qal 3rd masc. sg. SC

2.5.2. PREFIX CONJUGATION (PC)

ידע	תדע, “you will know” (19)	Qal 2nd masc. sg. PC
ירא	אל תירא, “do not fear” (23)	Qal 2nd masc. sg. PC (with neg. אל)
נגד	ואגדה, “and I will tell” (12) ואגיד, “and I will tell” (21)	Hiph ^ʿ il 1st com. sg. PC (long form) (with conj. -ו) Hiph ^ʿ il 1st com. sg. PC (with conj. -ו)
נחם	ינחם, “he will console” (27)	Pi ^ʿ el 3rd masc. sg. PC
נצל	תצילם, “you will save them” (78) יצילו, “they will save” (78)	Hiph ^ʿ il 2nd masc. sg. PC + 3rd masc. pl. obj. pron. Hiph ^ʿ il 3rd masc. pl. PC

67. Magen Broshi and Elisha Qimron, “A Hebrew I.O.U. Note from the Second Year of the Bar Kokhba Revolt,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 286–94, with discussion of שתיך on pp. 288, 293. Otherwise HJDD uses forms with *mem*; see Mor, “Diquq ha-ʿIvrit,” 192.

68. As with the long list of nouns above, here too I omit dots or circles marking letters of uncertain reading.

2.5.3. WAYYIQTOL FORMS (WYQTL)

אמר	ואמרה, “and I said” (31)	Qal 1st com. sg. <i>wyqtl</i> (long form)
ראה	ואראה, “and I saw” (32)	Qal 1st com. sg. <i>wyqtl</i> (long form)

2.5.4. IMPERATIVE (IMPV.)

שאל	שאלני, “ask me” (21)	Qal masc. sg. impv. + 1st com. sg. obj. pron.
-----	----------------------	--

2.5.5. PARTICIPLE (PTC.)⁶⁹

בקש	מבקש, “(I) request” (17)	Pi ^l el masc. sg. ptc.
עמד	עומד, “(you) stand” (22)	Qal masc. sg. ptc.
עשה	עושה, “(he) does” (74)	Qal masc. sg. ptc.
רעש	מרעיש, “(I) will shake” (24)	Hiph [‘] il masc. sg. ptc.
צבא	צובאים, “(they) besiege” (14)	Qal masc. pl. ptc.
שאל	שאלני, “(you) ask me” (11)	Qal masc. sg. ptc. + 1st com. sg. obj. pron.

2.5.6. PASSIVE PARTICIPLE (PASS. PTC.)⁷⁰

בטח	בטוחין, “(we) are certain” (66)	Qal masc. pl. pass. ptc.
ברך	ברוך, “(he) is blessed” (23)	Qal masc. sg. pass. ptc.

2.5.7. INFINITIVE CONSTRUCT (INF. CSTR.)

סמך	בסמכך, “in supporting you” (23)	Qal inf. cstr. + 2nd masc. sg. obj. pron.
-----	---------------------------------	--

2.5.8. *Uncertain forms:*

- **נשבר** (20). The Niphal of שבר, “break,” though it is unclear whether the word to be read as a SC (= BH נִשְׁבַּר) or as a participle (= BH נִשְׁבָּר). Knohl rendered the phrase “the evil has been broken,” suggesting the former.⁷¹

69. See also א(ו)הבין (28, 68), “lovers” (70, 75, 79), morphologically participles, though treated above under §2.3.1 Common Nouns.

70. See also הנטוה, “outstretched” (74), treated above under §2.3.4 Adjectives. Bar-Asher (“al ha-Laṣon be-Ḥazon Gavri’el,” 198) would include טבחי (57) as well, equal to Masoretic טְבַחִי, understanding ירושלם דם טבחי as “the blood of the slaughtered of Jerusalem.” Thus also Knohl, “By Three Days, Live,” 151. But this usage is unknown in ancient Hebrew sources. Singular טְבוּחַ, “slaughtered,” occurs in Deut 28:31 with reference to an ox/bull and in *b. Ketub.* 3b, 4a for meat that has been prepared, but not until the *ʿAvinu Malkenu* prayer (most likely from the Geonic period) does one read על ייחודך עשה למען טבוּחִים, with the plural passive participle referring to Jews who have been killed. In light of this evidence, it is better to understand טבחי in line 57 as the plural construct of טְבַח, “slaughter,” used of humans in Isa 34:2; 65:12; etc. (though admittedly the specific form טְבַחִי* is not attested in BH or in postbiblical sources).

71. Israel Knohl, “Gabriel’s Revelation’ in English Translation,” sidebar to Israel Knohl,

Yuditsky and Qimron would agree vis-à-vis the form, though they prefer to see the time reference as עתיד קרוב, that is, the imminent future.⁷²

- קש [] (78). The root is clearly בקש, though one cannot be certain if the form is prefix conjugation or participle (suffix conjugation is less likely).

2.5.9. Suffixed ה- on 1st com. sg. PC and wayyiqtol Forms

- Two variant forms of “and I will tell you” occur in the inscription: ואגדה (12) and ואגיד (21). Unfortunately, the words preceding בית ישראל ואגדה בגדלות ירושלם, “... house of Israel, and I will tell the great things of Jerusalem,” cannot be read. Accordingly, one cannot determine if the verb here bears cohortative force or not.⁷³ I suspect not: to my mind a new statement begins here, in which case the cohortative preceded by conjunctive -ו would be unusual. Instead, we should see here the PC long form serving as the indicative, with no cohortative force. If this be the case, then the two forms in lines 12 and 21 are simply variants of one another, with no real distinction. Which is to say, once more we are dealing with the stylistic device of variation with repetition: in the first case the scribe used the long form ending in ה-, without internal *mater lectionis yod*; while in the second instance he used the standard form, with internal *mater lectionis yod*.⁷⁴
- Note further that the two 1st com. sg. *wayyiqtol* forms, ואמרה, “and I said” (31) and ואראה, “and I saw” (32) include the additional ה- ending. This usage is especially characteristic of LBH and QH.⁷⁵
- The trend visible in three of the aforementioned forms, to affix ה- to 1st com. sg. (and 1st com. pl.) PC verbs (both *wēyiqtol* and *wayyiqtol*), which lack this ending in SBH, is a distinguishing feature of LBH (see the previous bullet), SH,⁷⁶ and QH (even if we cannot always distinguish the two in QH, given the lack of vocalization).⁷⁷

“The Messiah Son of Joseph: ‘Gabriel’s Revelation’ and the Birth of a New Messianic Model,” *BAR* 34 (2008): 62.

72. Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 138.

73. Though for an attempt to suggest such, see Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 137.

74. Note that Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 138, read both of these with final -ā.

75. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 141; and Elisha Qimron, “The Type וְאָבְרָה in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Jan Joosten and Jean-Sébastien Rey; STDJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 149–54.

76. Ben-Ḥayyim, *‘Ivrit ve-‘Aramit Nusah Šomron*, vol. 5, §2.9.10.

77. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 44. For further details and analysis, consult Qimron’s series of articles on the PC forms in their various manifestations in both BH and QH: “Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect: The Form of the Imperfect with *waw* in Biblical

2.6. FINAL MEM/NUN

With nouns, adjectives, numerals, and participles now presented, we may address the issue of the variant endings ם- and ן-.⁷⁸

The following seven forms bear the ם- suffix:⁷⁹

גאים	(13)
צובאים	(14)
אמרים	(16)
רבים	(68)
נביאים	(70)
אלפים	(74)
רועים	(79)

More dominant, however, is the ן- suffix, carried by eight different plural forms for a total of twelve attestations:

נביאין	(15, 79) ⁸⁰
שבין	(15)
חסידין	(16)
ימין	(19, 80)
א(ו)הבין	(28, 68)
בטוחין	(66)
רועין	(70, 75)
קדושין	(76)

In addition, the two forms of the numeral 2 bear the *nun* ending: שתין (15) and שנין (30). On the other hand, the common noun שמים, “heavens” (25, 73) retains the expected *mem*.

To my mind, no discernible pattern can be established for these data.⁸¹ Clearly, *HazGab* does not cohere with BH, Ben Sira, and QH, in which forms with *mem*

Hebrew,” *JQR* 77 (1986-87): 149–61; “A New Approach to the Use of Forms of the Imperfect without Personal Endings,” in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995* (ed. T. Muraoka and John F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 174–81; and “Haṣaʿa Ḥadaša le-Feruš Šurot he-ʿAtid ba-ʿIvrit ha-Qeduma,” *Leshonenu* 61 (5758): 31–43.

78. See the earlier treatment by Bar-Asher, “al ha-Lašon be-Ḥazon Gavriʿel,” 199–200, though his data are based on the readings of Yardeni and Elizur.

79. I do not include here אלהים, “God,” which always appears, not surprisingly, with final *mem*.

80. Again, in line 79, the reading is אִין [נבִיאִין]. Even if another lexeme were to be read here (which is highly unlikely), the form ends with *nun* nonetheless.

81. See already Yuditsky and Qimron, “Heʿarot ʿal ha-Ketovet,” 143: בכתובת לא נמצאו “כללים אחידים לשימוש במ”ם או בנו”ן (“In the inscription there is no uniform principle governing the use of *mem* or *nun*.”).

dominate, with a smattering of forms with *nun*. The two corpora in which the two endings occur with more or less equal frequency are MH and HJDD, but in these two cases at least some order is present. For MH, Shelomo Naeh established basic rules—dealing not only with the masculine plural ending but with personal pronouns and suffix pronouns as well—which interface with both phonology (depending on the nature of the preceding vowel) and morphology (depending on whether the form is a noun, adjective, or participle).⁸² These rules are not operative in *HazGab*, however. Thus, for example, the masculine plural active participle occurs with both endings, viz., צובאים (14), א(ו)הבין (28, 68), and two common nouns, רועים/ן and גביאים/ן, appear with both endings (on which see further below). In the case of HJDD, Uri Mor determined that individual documents typically witness either *mem* or *nun*, indicating that individual scribes favored one ending over the other⁸³—though naturally this issue is not relevant to our inscription, a single text written by a single scribe.

The only possible tendency that governs this issue in *HazGab* is dependency on the biblical text. This would explain the use of גאים (13) and צובאים (14) (cf. Isa 29:7 for both); אמרים (16) (assuming reliance on Prov 22:21);⁸⁴ and אלפים (74) (cf. Exod 20:6 // Deut 5:10). On נביאים (70) and רועים (79), see the next paragraph. This leaves only the adjective רבים (68) without a proper explanation. Though one must consider the possibility that the potential explanation offered here results merely from coincidence.

Finally, on the assumption that the last word in line 69 can be restored as [שלושה] (as per Yuditsky and Qimron), one observes the stylistic device of repetition with variation between the following two passages:

- שלושה רועין . . . נביאים [שלושה], “[three] prophets . . . three shepherds” (69–70)
- שלושה רועים שלושה [גבי]אין, “three shepherds, three [pro]phets” (79r)

Note both (a) the order of “prophets > shepherds” in the first passage vs. “shepherds > prophets” in the second; and (b) how the first plural noun in each case ends in -ים, while the second one ends in -ין. This device yields attestations of both רועים / רועין / גביאים / גביאין.

82. Shelomo Naeh, “Šte Sugyot Nedošot bi-Lšon Ḥazal,” in *Qoveš Mehqarim le-Talmud u-vi-Ṭumim Govlim Muqdaš le-Zikro šel Prof. ʿEliʿezer Šimšon Rosenthal* (ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and David Rosenthal; Jerusalem: Magnes, 5753) = *Mehqare Talmud* 2 (5753): 369–92.

83. Mor, “Diqduq ha-ʿIvrit,” 82–85.

84. Yuditsky and Qimron, “Heʿarot ʿal ha-Ketovet,” 137.

3. SYNTAX

3.1. OBJECT OF THE VERB

As can be seen above (in the various subsections in §2.5), the object of the verb is suffixed to the verb on four occasions:

יבני [הש], “he answered me” (17)	Hiph ^c il 3rd masc. sg. SC + 1st. com. sg. obj. pron.
תצילם, “you will save them” (78)	Hiph ^c il 2nd masc. sg. PC + 3rd masc. pl. obj. pron.
שאלני, “ask me” (21)	Qal masc. sg. impv. + 1st com. sg. obj. pron.
שאלני, “(you) ask me” (11)	Qal masc. sg. ptc. + 1st. com. sg. obj. pron.

Coincidentally, each of the four principle parts of the verbs (SC, PC, imperative, and participle) is represented here.⁸⁵

By contrast, there is only one instance of the object of the verb expressed via the independent morpheme, that is, אֹתְךָ in the phrase יִצִּילוּ אֹתְךָ, “they will save you” (78).

This distribution accords with LBH, QH, HJDD, and MH, in which the former system prevails.⁸⁶ Once more we may invoke the stylistic device of variation to explain the lone counterexample in *HazGab*, as we observe how יִצִּילוּ אֹתְךָ, “they will save you,” follows immediately upon תצילם, “you will save them,” in line 78, with the same verb utilized in these two instances.⁸⁷

3.2. WORD ORDER

3.2.1. WORD ORDER WITH NOUN SUBJECTS AND FINITE VERBS

In this section I treat verb clauses in which a noun serves as subject. I do not include the formulaic “thus says YHWH” clauses, in which the verb אָמַר always precedes the subject, due mainly to the presence of בּוֹ/כֵה, “thus,” at the head of the clause.

85. One also notes the infinitive construct with object pronoun in the form בַּסִּמְכָךְ, “in supporting you” (23), though in this instance there is no alternative usage.

86. See Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 28–31; Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 75–77; Mor, “Dīquḏq ha-‘Ivrit,” 213; and Chaim E. Cohen, “ha-Šimmuš be-Kinnuy ha-Musa’ ha-Davuq le’umat ha-Šimmuš ‘et + kinnuy (‘ot-) bi-Lšon ha-Mišna,” *Leshonenu* 47 (5743): 208–18.

87. For an instance of such in the Mishnah, see *m. Bek.* 9:7–8, with גְּמוּנָן (9:7) followed by מוֹנֵה אֹתָן (9:8), as noted by Cohen, “ha-Šimmuš be-Kinnuy ha-Musa’ ha-Davuq,” 211.

Subject–verb (SV) order occurs in the following:

- עבדי דוד בקש מן לפני, “my servant David requested from before me” (16)
- שלושה רועין יצאו לישראל, “three shepherds went out to Israel” (75)
- נביא ורעה יצילו אותך, “a prophet and a shepherd will save you” (78)

By contrast, *HazGab* includes only one example of verb–subject (VS) order, perhaps owing to the passive voice:

- נשבר הרע מלפני הצדק, “the evil is broken before the righteousness” (20–21)

The predominance of SV over VS in *HazGab* accords with the increased use of the former (compared to SBH) in LBH, QH, and MH.⁸⁸

3.2.2. WORD ORDER WITH PRONOUNS AND PARTICIPLES

HazGab includes four cases of pronoun + participle, with no instances of the reverse order. The relevant examples are:

- אתה שאלני, “you ask me” (11)
- אתה עומד, “you stand” (22)
- ואני מרעיש, “and I cause-to-quake” (24)
(even if this passage is based on Hag 2:6)
- אנחנו בטוחין, “we are certain” (66)

I provide here information regarding the question of pronoun + participle vs. participle + pronoun throughout the varieties of ancient Hebrew. While I know of no study that presents the raw data for BH, according to Joüon-Muraoka, “The pronoun can precede or follow the verb, apparently without any difference in meaning; in most cases it precedes.”⁸⁹ An exception would appear to be Qohelet, where the norm is participle + pronoun.⁹⁰ In QH, the more frequent order is

88. Steven E. Fassberg, “Shifts in Word Order in the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period” (paper delivered at the Twelfth International Orion Symposium, “Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources,” December 2008). I am grateful to Professor Fassberg for kindly sharing his unpublished paper with me.

89. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 540. For a similar comment, see Samuel R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions* (3rd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1892; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 169.

90. W. C. Delsman, “Zur Sprache des Buches Koheleth,” in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg* (ed. W. C. Delsman; AOAT 211; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), 362; and Antoon Schoors, *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study on the Language of Qoheleth* (OLA 41; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 184.

pronoun + participle.⁹¹ To cite one famous text, 4QMMT, one finds six instances of אַנְחָנוּ, “we,” preceding the participle (4Q394 4:5, 4Q396 1:3, 3:4–5, 4:2, 4Q397 1:7, 4:9) vs. only one case of אַנְחָנוּ following the participle (4Q394 3:12). Most instances of the order participle + pronoun involve a performative act, most frequently with the passive participles בְּרוּךְ, “blessed,” and אָרוּר, “cursed,” e.g., 1QS 11:15: בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה, “blessed are you”; 1QS 2:7: אָרוּר אַתָּה, “cursed are you.”⁹² In the second-century C.E. Judean Desert documents,⁹³ one finds the pronoun preceding the participle 3x (Mur. 174:5, N.H. 49:7, Yadin 49:3), and the pronoun following the participle 5x (Mur. 43:3, N.H. 6:1 [via restoration], Yadin 45:6, 46:3, Bet ‘Emer 4–5)—though four of these involve the verb יָדָה (H-stem), “thank,” e.g., Yadin 45:6 מְלוֹדָא אֲנִי לְךָ הַיּוֹם, “I thank you today,” again a performative act. Nor do I know of a study that scrutinizes MH regarding this question, though apparently the more common usage is participle + pronoun.⁹⁴ In light of these data, *HazGab* fits with BH, QH, and HJDD, against the idiosyncratic Qohelet and MH.

4. LEXICON

4.1. INDIVIDUAL NOUNS AND VERBS

As the above lists of nouns and verbs indicate (see §§2.3.1; 2.5) most of the vocabulary in *HazGab* is basic Hebrew. Only a few items provide fodder for the LBH–QH–MH continuum of Second Temple period (and beyond) Hebrew, three of which (the nouns) have been discussed above already.

- The verbal noun קִיטוּט, “trembling” (24), occurs in the *qittūl* pattern, as treated elsewhere by the present author.⁹⁵
- The noun שְׁבִין, “elders” (15), occurs under Aramaic influence.
- The vocable אֱלֹה, “God” (26), may reflect the Aramaic, as opposed to the Hebrew, pronunciation.
- The verbal root בִּקֶּשׁ, “request,” occurs 4x in *HazGab* (including the form in line 78, however it is to be restored). While this root appears in BH

91. Gregor Geiger, “ha-Benoni be-‘Ivrit šel Megillot Midbar Yehuda” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 2009), 189–92.

92. *Ibid.*, 200–203.

93. Mor, “Dīqduq ha-‘Ivrit,” 208. See also his earlier study, U. Mor, “Seder ha-Millim bi-Štarot u-ve-‘Iggarot mi-Midbar Yehuda,” *Meghillot* 7 (5769): 237–61.

94. Moses H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 164; and Segal, *Dīqduq Lešon ha-Mišna*, 182. Unfortunately, Azar (*Taḥbir Lešon ha-Mišna*, 29–61) is not as helpful as one would hope on this issue, since the material tends to be organized on a structural basis, without attention to the different parts of speech (noun vs. pronoun as subject; finite verb vs. participle as predicate).

95. Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 108–10.

texts of all periods, the verb becomes more common in LBH (e.g., 5x in Zechariah, 3x in Malachi, 10x in Ezra-Nehemiah, 9x in Esther, 7x in Qohelet),⁹⁶ a trend that continues into postbiblical times, as it occurs 15x in Ben Sira, 49x in QH,⁹⁷ and 200x in Tannaitic texts. The frequency of the verb בקש, “request,” in *HazGab* dovetails well with this picture.

4.2. PHRASEOLOGY

While not strictly belonging to a grammatical sketch, I take the opportunity to present here comments on two phrases in *HazGab* that reflect developments central to the Hebrew of Second Temple period sources.

In lines 23–24, ברוך כבוד יהוה אלהים מן מקומו, “blessed is the glory of YHWH God from his place,” expands on Ezek 3:12, בָּרוּךְ כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה מִמְּקוֹמוֹ *bārûk kēbôd YHWH mimmēqômô*, “blessed is the glory of YHWH from his place.” The inclusion of אלהים in the *HazGab* version reflects the growing trend in Second Temple sources toward less frequent use of the divine name יהוה, “YHWH,” with a concomitant increase in the use of אלהים, “God.” For example, in the Bible, יהוה occurs 6,828x,⁹⁸ while אלהים (including construct אֱלֹהֵי, with suffixes, etc.) occurs ca. 2,500x.⁹⁹ In Samuel–Kings, the data are 1,007 and 346, respectively; that is, these books use YHWH about 75 percent of the time. In Ezra-Nehemiah, by con-

96. These numbers are more glaring when one realizes that the root בקש, “request,” occurs but 8x in the entire Torah. I do not include here instances of the noun בקשה, “request,” which is a separate LBH feature; see Avi Hurvitz, “Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran,” *RevQ* 5 (1965): 226–27; idem, *Ben Lašon le-Lašon* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972), 59–60; and Ronald L. Bergley, “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, 1983), 133–34, 168 (*non vide*).

97. Qimron (*Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89) lists the combination -ש בקש as an element “mainly attested in the DSS and in the Late Biblical Books,” based on a single attestation in each corpus: Dan 1:8, 4Q398 (4QMMT^c) frgs. 14–17 ii 4). As I indicate here, however, the increased use of the verb בקש, “request,” by itself is an LBH trait.

98. This is the number presented by BibleWorks 7.0; Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1992), 330; and David J. A. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–), 4:122. Incongruously, Even-Shoshan (*Qonqordansya Hadaša*, 447) has the number 6,645 (6,639 plus the six additional attestations in the individual entries following).

99. BibleWorks 7.0 yields 2,602 occurrences. Clines (*Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 1: 277) and Even-Shoshan (*Qonqordansya Hadaša*, 74) have 2,603. From either of these numbers one needs to subtract about 101 instances (according to my count, using the phrases presented in Even-Shoshan, *Qonqordansya Hadaša*, 69) where the reference is to foreign gods, e.g., אלהים אחרים, אלהי הגוים, אלהי נבר, אחרים, etc. Quite oddly, Andersen and Forbes (*Vocabulary of the Old Testament*, 276) list only 1,073 occurrences, which apparently counts only אלהים and האלהים together (without the construct form אלהי), since BibleWorks 7.0 yields a count of 1,046 occurrences for these two forms—excluding instances of אלהים preceded by the uniconsonantal prepositions -ב, -כ, and -ל, which would add an additional 113 attestations.

trast, the data are 54 and 120, respectively, so that this material uses YHWH only about 31 percent of the time.¹⁰⁰ In the DSS, יהוה occurs 333x, while אלהים occurs 414x—though these occurrences are outweighed by the more frequent use of אל 694x.¹⁰¹ Clearly, the author of *HazGab* could not simply delete יהוה in his paraphrase of Ezek 3:12, and thus the term remains in line 23. His inclusion of אלהים immediately thereafter, however, reflects the greater use of this divine term during the period of composition.

Yuditsky and Qimron have called attention to the idiom שבר, “break,” + לפני, “before,” as seen in lines 20–21 נשבר הרע מלפני הצדק “the evil is broken before the righteousness.” They cited two Qumran parallels: 4Q372 2:12 כי נשבר “for he was shattered before him”; and 4Q373 1:6 כי שברו יהוה אלהינו לפנין “for YHWH our God shattered him before.” A check of the latter (including the photograph), however, reveals that לפני is not visible before the break. Better to read כי שברו יהוה אלהינו לפיך “for YHWH our God shattered him with the mouth of,” with presumably the word חרב, “sword,” following. Another potential parallel is forthcoming from 4Q393 2:7 נשברה מלפניך “broken before you,” though unfortunately little can be read with certainty before these words. Regardless, and more importantly, one will concur with Yuditsky and Qimron that the collocation derives from Aramaic, as per their noting *Tg. Onq. Deut 20:3 ולא תיתברון מן קדמיהון* to render ואל־תִּעַרְצוּ מִפְּנֵיהֶם “and do not be in dread before them.”¹⁰²

5. SUMMARY

5.1. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND BH

- Spelling of דוד
- Retention of laryngeals and pharyngeals
- Personal pronouns
- Suffix pronouns, especially use of בם
- Use of הנה
- Use of למען
- Use of כה
- Order of numeral + noun
- Use of של(ו)שת ימין “three days”
- Order of pronoun + participle

100. I do not contrast Chronicles here, since much of the material parallels Samuel-Kings, including slavish copying of יהוה.

101. On this last divine name, see Rendsburg, “Qumran Hebrew,” 238–39.

102. Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 138.

5.2. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND LBH:¹⁰³

- Retention of laryngeals and pharyngeals
- Personal pronouns
- Suffix pronouns, though not use of בם
- Relative pronoun ך-
- Use of הנה
- Non-assimilation of nun in the combination מן + following consonant
- Use of למען
- Use of כה
- 1st com. sg. verbs ending in -ה
- Object of the verb expressed through suffix pronoun attached to verb
- SV word order

5.3. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND SH

- 1st com. sg. verbs ending in ה-

5.4. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND BEN SIRA

- Spelling of דוד
- Retention of laryngeals and pharyngeals
- Use of למען
- Use of שב

5.5. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND QH

- Preponderance of *plene* spelling
- Pronunciation of גויים *gōyīm* > גואים *gō'im* (spelled גואים typically in DSS)
- Use of של (3Q15 Copper Scroll only; not general QH)
- Use of הנה
- Order of numeral + noun
- שתין (3Q15 Copper Scroll only; not general QH)
- 1st com. sg. verbs ending in ה-
- Object of the verb expressed through suffix pronoun attached to verb
- SV word order
- Order of pronoun + participle

103. Some of these features are not distinctive of LBH per se, but rather of BH as a whole; I include them here nonetheless. For an exceedingly long list of LBH traits identified by scholars in the last several decades (some of which are discussed herein), see the summary chart in Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (2 vols.; London: Equinox, 2008), 2:160–214—even if I disagree with the overall approach taken by the authors of this work. Incidentally, on p. 168, no. 32, the first word should be corrected from “decrease” to “increase.”

5.6. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND HJDD

- The form לפנך
- Pronunciation of גוים *gôyim* > גאים *gô'im* (spelled גואין 1x)
- Feminine singular demonstrative pronoun זו
- Use of מהו
- Use of של
- Non-assimilation of *nun* in the combination מן + following consonant
- Use of שתין
- Final *mem/nun* fluctuation (albeit with no apparent pattern in HG)
- Object of the verb expressed through suffix pronoun attached to verb
- Order of pronoun + participle

5.7. FEATURES SHARED BY *HAZGAB* AND MH

- Feminine singular demonstrative pronoun זו
- Relative pronoun -ש
- Use of מהו
- Use of של
- *qittûl* formation, as in קיטוט
- Order of numeral + noun
- Final *mem/nun* fluctuation (albeit with no apparent pattern in HG)
- Object of the verb expressed through suffix pronoun attached to verb
- SV word order

Any ancient Hebrew text will share features with other Hebrew texts of the general period, especially large corpora such as those underlying QH and MH. The above digest demonstrates this point clearly, with many links between *Hazon Gabriel* and the two largest text groups of late antiquity: the Dead Sea Scrolls, on the one hand, and the Tannaitic literature, on the other. At the same time, however, *Hazon Gabriel* uses several forms that are lacking in one or the other of these corpora. For example, *HazGab* uses זו and מהו, which are lacking in QH but present in MH, while it uses למען and הנה, which are present in QH but lacking in MH—not to mention בה, which is wanting in both QH and MH.

In conclusion, I refrain from attempting to categorize the language of *HazGab* as closer to one variety of ancient Hebrew over another, though it is hoped that this grammatical sketch will serve researchers, especially as (*hoffentlich!*) more such texts come to light in the future.

6. APPENDIX

As indicated at the outset of this article, I follow the reading of *HazGab* provided by Yuditsky and Qimron. If the readings proffered by Yardeni and Elizur were followed, we would gain the following forms, not treated above.

בן, “thus”	(11, 29, 58)
ארבעין, “forty”	(15)
בי, “that”	(17, 19, 57)
מושב, “his seat”	(24)
שְׁעָרִי, “gates (of)”	(27)
מלאכה, “work”	(28)
אחרים, “others”	(28)
מלאכה, “work”	(31)
שלהן, “their”	(67)
כהן, “priest”	(76)
בני, “sons (of)”	(76)

All of these lexemes, once more, are part of the basic Hebrew vocabulary, spanning all of ancient Hebrew.

- The use of both בן, “thus” (11, 29, 58), and בי, “that” (17, 19, 57), to introduce “thus says YHWH” statements would be, as Yuditsky and Qimron have stressed,¹⁰⁴ unusual—though it is hoped that the present author has provided a suitable explanation for their use,¹⁰⁵ should the reading(s) of Yardeni and Elizur be sustained.
- If the reading שלהן, “their,” in line 67 is accepted, we would gain another attestation of the 3rd masc. pl. suffix pronoun הן-, seen also in the form בהן, “in them” (line 76), treated above, §2.1.2.

104. Yuditsky and Qimron, “He‘arot ‘al ha-Ketovet,” 137–39, s.v., lines 11, 17, 19, 29 (especially line 11).

105. Rendsburg, “Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the Hazon Gabriel Inscription,” 114–16.