CHAPTER II: THE CASES

Grouped under this title the reader will find that which is relevant to the accusative, the genitive and (over against these two cases) the apposition, in order better to bring out, by way of contrast, the use of these three constructions. We shall employ the usual terms *accusative*, *genitive*, and *nominative* by analogy with Latin, although case endings have almost entirely disappeared from Hebrew (cf. § 93 *b* ff.), all these originally morphological categories being now largely syntactic ones.

§ 125. The direct accusative

a   The accusative is, properly speaking, the verbal case: it is subordinated to the verb, either directly (accusative of *object*), or indirectly (accusative of determination relative to the verb, *ad-verbial* accusative, § 126). It is true that the accusative is sometimes found subordinated to a noun (§ 127), but this is a secondary usage based on the analogy of the accusative indirectly subordinated to the verb.

The **direct accusative** indicates the *object* of the verb. The object may be *effected*, i.e. brought about by the verbal action, e.g. חֲלֹמוֹת יַחֲלֹמוּן Jl 3.1 *somnia somniabunt (they will have dreams)*; or simply *affected*, (directly) reached by the verbal action, e.g. וַיְסַפֵּר אֹתוֹ Gn 37.9 *and he told (the dream)*. Therefore a distinction will be made between the two kinds of direct object, i.e. between the **affected object** and the **effected object**([1]) (§ *p*).

(1) Cf. Brock., GvG, II, pp. 291ff.

b   I) **Accusative of the affected object**. With some verbs the verbal action *passes* directly to the object (*transitive* verbs), with others it passes to the object through a preposition([1]) (*intransitive* verbs or, more precisely, *transitive through preposition*). But some verbs can be both transitive and intransitive. Thus נָגַע *to touch* is generally intransitive (transitive through preposition): it usually takes בְּ of contact), sometimes אֶל (*to skim, graze, reach*), only rarely is it transi-

tive (noun object: Is 52.11; suffix object: Gn 26.29; Ru 2.9). So עָזַר usually with לְ, but rarely with אֵת as in Josh 1.14 עֲזַרְתֶּם אוֹתָם; הוֹשִׁיעַ *to save, give victory*: 1Ch 18.6 לְדָוִיד, but vs. 13 אֶת־דָּוִיד; 2Ch 16.12 לֹא־קִנֵּא; דָּרַשׁ אֶת־יהוה כִּי בָּרֹפְאִים Pi. with אֵת, בְּ or לְ with subtle differences in meaning (see lexica). Cp. Ps 77.18 קוֹל נָתְנוּ שְׁחָקִים and 68.34 יִתֵּן זָכְרָה לִּי אֱלֹהַי עַל and 13.14 גַּם זֹאת זָכְרָה־לִּי אֱלֹהַי; Ne 13.22 בְּקֹלוֹ; הֵעֵז אִישׁ Pr 7.13 הֵעֵזָה פָנֶיהָ *she was impudent enough to* ... and 21.29 זֹאת רָשָׁע בְּפָנָיו. Various circumstances may influence transitivity and intransitivity([2]).

The transitive use of a verb may occur when the object is a **pronoun**: thus for the verb נָגַע (quoted above): Gn 26.29 נְגַעֲנוּךָ; Ru 2.9 לְבִלְתִּי נְגָעֵךְ. *To get the better of* is usually יָכֹל לְ, but once יְכָלְתִּיו Ps 13.5. The verb דָּבַק *to cling to* is generally intransitive (especially בְּ of contact; also עִם, אֶל, לְ), but there is the form תִּדְבָּקַנִי Gn 19.19 (§ 63 a). The verb נָשַׁק *to kiss* generally takes לְ; however it is sometimes used transitively with the pronoun: Gn 33.4; 1Sm 10.1; Ct 1.2; 8.1. In 1Kg 21.10,13 הֵעִיד with suff. has the meaning of *to testify against* (בְּ); Job 29.11 *to testify in favour of* (לְ).

To indicate the construction of every verb is the dictionary's function. Note that e.g. צִוָּה *to give orders to* is usually transitive, e.g. Gn 26.11 וַיְצַו אֶת־כָּל־הָעָם (sometimes with עַל, אֶל, לְ); עָנָה *to reply to* is always transitive, e.g. Gn 23.10 וַיַּעַן אֶת־אַבְרָהָם (likewise הֵשִׁיב דָּבָר *reply to*, e.g. 2Sm 3.11 לְהָשִׁיב אֶת־אַבְנֵר דָּבָר).

In Job 19.7 (cf. Hab 1.2) אֶצְעַק חָמָס *I cry out about injustice*, חָמָס originally was probably an exclamation: *I cry out: "Injustice!"* (cf. 2Kg 11.14 קֶשֶׁר *"Conspiracy!"*), then חמס was felt to be like the direct object of אצעק.

(1) It is important to remember that in this context, the direct object marker אֵת (but not אֵת of association and company) does not count as a preposition.
(2) The distinction between transitivity and intransitivity is manifested in the fact that intransitive verbs lack the internal passive (§ 55 b): see Is 33.1 אַתָּה לֹא שָׁדוּד וּבוֹגֵד וְלֹא־בָגְדוּ בּ׳ ... תֻּשַּׁד ... יִבְגְּדוּ־בָךְ *you yourself have not been destroyed ... you treacherous one, they have not dealt with you treacherously ... you will be destroyed ... they will deal with you treacherously.*

One must avoid the error of assuming that every pronoun suffix directly attached to a verb is accusative and that therefore the syntagm can be rewritten analytically with אֵת: thus נְגַעֲנוּךָ = נָגַעְנוּ אֹתְךָ. Either   ba

as a kind of shorthand or on the analogy of genuine transitive verbs, many Hebrew verbs take a suffix pronoun where such a pronoun has "dative" force and therefore is normally capable of being rewritten by means of a preposition other than אֵת[1]. Some examples are cited in the immediately preceding paragraph. To them one can add[2]: בּוֹא in Is 28.15; Ez 32.11; Ps 36.12; 44.18; 119.41; Pr 10.24; 28.22; Job 15.21; 20.22 (poetic texts); נָתַן in Josh 15.19 נְתַתַּנִי *you gave to me* (= Jdg 1.15); Is 27.4; Jer 9.1[3].

(1) Brockelmann (GvG, II, p. 322) denies the existence of the suffix in the dative meaning in Hebrew. König (§ 21), on the other hand, accepts it quite readily, e.g. Ez 29.3 עֲשִׂיתִנִי *I made (it) for myself.* N. Kinberg, in "Notes on the shift from accusative constructions to prepositional phrases in Hebrew and Arabic," *BSOAS* 44 (1981) 8-14, refuses to admit dativaI force of conjunctive verbal suffixes, but instead attempts to explain all, including rare cases of אֵת plus nouns, as genuine acc. as in Arabic. But the antiquity of dativaI suffixes is in no doubt. Akkadian, which is now joined by Eblaite, had a separate series of dativaI pronouns, both independent and suffixal. It is totally unacceptable to regard נתן – suff. as acc. when the verb is predominantly governed by לְ. On textcritical implications of the recognition of the dativaI force of the suffixes under discussion here, see Sperber, *Hist. Gram.*, p. 94 (§ 91).

(2) For more examples and a general discussion, see M. Bogaert, "Les suffixes verbaux non-accusatifs dans le sémitique nord-occidental et particulièrement en hébreu," *Bib* 45 (1964) 220-47, and T. Muraoka, "On verb complementation in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 29 (1979) 425-35. In the light of what has been said above and also in the light of an example such as Is 42.16 אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים עֲשִׂיתִם *these are the things which I have done to them* (so Pesh. and Vulg., and note the immediately following וְלֹא עֲזַבְתִּים *and I have not forsaken them*), even Zech 7.5 הֲצוֹם צַמְתֻּנִי אָנִי, which would mean "did you fast *for* me?," is no longer so troublesome. See also Is 65.5 (on which Ibn Ezra cites Jer 10. 20 יְצָאֻנִי *they are gone out of me*); Jer 31.2; Job 31.18.

(3) This construction may have been influenced by the fact that נתן, with the meaning of *to allow*, takes the acc. of the pers. and the inf. cst. (in the acc.), e.g. Nu 21.23 נָתַן אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבֹר.

bb   The use of conjunctive verbal suffixes of dativaI force seems to have spread by false analogy to nominal complements: Ez 21.25 לָבוֹא חֶרֶב אֶת־רַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן *for a sword to reach Rabbah of the Ammonites*. Also 1Sm 9.18 וַיִּגַּשׁ ... אֶת־שְׁמוּאֵל; 30.21 ... אֶת־הָעָם, and Nu 4.19; Jdg 19.18[1].

(1) Examples mentioned by S. Izre'el in *Shnaton* 3 (1978) 209.

bc   In some verbs, different prepositions can lead to subtle differences

in meaning. For instance, Nu 5.14 וְקִנֵּא אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ *and he becomes jealous of his wife*; Gn 30.1 וַתְּקַנֵּא רָחֵל בַּאֲחֹתָהּ *and Rachel became envious of her sister*; Zech 1.14 קִנֵּאתִי לִירוּשָׁלַם וּלְצִיּוֹן *I am zealous for Jerusalem and Zion*. The fact that an indirect pronominal object can be directly attached to the verb can result in some ambiguity: does Jdg 16.21 וַיֹּאחֲזוּהוּ mean *and they captured him* (= אוֹתוֹ) or *and they held him down* (= בּוֹ)?

bd   Habitual usage can lead to occasional omission of a direct object, creating the impression that some verbs are, at least formally, intransitive. Thus 1Sm 20.16 וַיִּכְרֹת יְהוֹנָתָן עִם־בֵּית דָּוִד in lieu of וַיִּכְרֹת בְּרִית. So also שָׁמַר for שָׁמַר אַף *to bear a grudge*; נָשָׂא for נָשָׂא קוֹל *to lift up voice*[1].

(1) For more possible examples, see Brock., *Syntax*, § 127 b.

c   **Reflexive forms** can be transitive, e.g. נִבָּא (Nifal) *to prophesy* is usually transitive when the object is vague: thus, with שֶׁקֶר (e.g. Jer 23.25 etc.; once לַשֶּׁקֶר 27.15 for a specific thing), with דְּבָרִים Jer 20.1 etc.; likewise הִתְנַבֵּא* *to prophesy*: with vague object שֶׁקֶר Jer 14.14; טוֹב, רָע 1Kg 22.8,18; but with a precise object נִבָּא is found: לְמִלְחָמָה Jer 28.8; לְשָׁלוֹם 28.9; other examples: הִתְפָּרֵק* Ex 32.3; הִתְנַצֵּל* 33.6; נָסַב Josh 9.12; נִמְלָא Jdg 19.22 (cf. § d); הִתְחַתֵּן Gn 34.9; הִתְנַבֵּל Nu 6.19; הִתְנַחֵל Is 14.2[1].

(1) About the accusative with passive forms, cf. § 128.

d   Some semantic categories of verbs require the accusative:

1) Verbs of abundance (*verba copiae*) and scarcity (*inopiae*), e.g. מָלֵא *to be full*[1], נִמְלָא *to fill oneself up, to be filled*: Is 1.15 יְדֵיכֶם דָּמִים מָלֵאוּ *your hands are full of blood*; Ex 1.7 וַתִּמָּלֵא הָאָרֶץ אוֹתָם *and the land was filled with them*; 1Kg 7.14 וַיִּמָּלֵא אֶת־הַחָכְמָה *and he was filled with wisdom*; שָׂבַע (שָׂבֵעַ) *to be sated, satisfied*: Ex 16.12 תִּשְׂבְּעוּ־לָחֶם *you shall be sated with bread*; שָׁרַץ *to teem with*: Ex 7.28; שָׁכַר *to become intoxicated*: Is 29.9; 49.26; רָוָה *to drink one's fill*: Pr 7.18; *verba inopiae*: חָסֵר *to lack, to be short of*: Gn 18.28 etc.; שָׁכֹל *to be deprived of children*: Gn 27.45.

The accusative with some verbs implying motion can probably[2] be explained as having arisen on the analogy of the accusative of the *verba copiae*: פָּרַץ *to run over with, overflow with*: Pr 3.10; נָטַף *to be*

dripping with: Jdg 5.4; נָזַל לְ *to be running with, streaming with*: Jer 9.17; יָרַד *to be running with, streaming with*: Jer 9.17; הָלַךְ *to be running with, streaming with*: Jl 4.18; זָב *to flow*: Lv 15.33 (with a cognate object, זוֹב).(3)

2) Verbs of wearing (*verba induendi*) and putting off (*exuendi*): לָבַשׁ (ב) *to wear (clothes), to put on (clothes)*: 1Kg 22.30 לְבַשׁ בְּגָדֶיךָ *put on your clothes*; Is 61.10; עָדָה *to adorn oneself with*: Is 61.10; Job 40.10; עָטָה *to be covered with, to wrap oneself up*: 1Sm 28.14; Is 59.17; עָטַף *to cover oneself with*: Ps 65.14; פָּשַׁט *to strip off*: Ct 5.3.

(1) According to some grammarians, we have here the adverbial accusative. For Arabic grammarians, the accusative of verbs like *mali'a* "to be full" is a *tamyiz* (accusative of *specification*).

(2) According to some grammarians, this is an indirect accusative.

(3) The standing expression אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבַשׁ *a land flowing with milk and honey* presents another kind of problem: § 129 *i*.

e   **The particle אֵת of the accusative.** The direct object of the verb, whether pronominal or nominal, is often preceded by the particle אֵת (§ 103 *k*). The particle אֵת is mainly an indicator of the accusative of object; but it is also found, albeit very seldom, with other accusatives: acc. of motion (§ *n*), of time (§ 126 *i*), of limitation (§ 126 *g*). The אֵת was probably first used with the pronoun, as in the other Semitic languages, then its use was extended to the determinate noun(1).

With **pronouns** אֵת is used of necessity 1) when the object precedes the verb: Nu 22.33 אֹתְכָה הָרַגְתִּי וְאוֹתָהּ הֶחֱיֵיתִי *I would have killed you, and her, I would have let her live*; 2) when there is a double pronominal object(2): 2Sm 15.25 וְהִרְאַנִי אֹתוֹ *and he will show me*; 3) with the inf. abs. (cf. § 123 *t*); 4) with the infinitive construct in הֶ: Dt 10.12 לְאַהֲבָה אֹתוֹ *to love him*; 5) usually also with the inf. cst. to avoid ambiguity: Gn 4.15 לְבִלְתִּי הַכּוֹת אֹתוֹ כָּל־מֹצְאוֹ (§ 124 *g*); 6) usually when the pronominal object is followed by a nominal object: 1Sm 5.11 יָמִית אֹתִי וְאֶת־עַמִּי; 23.12 הֲיַסְגִּרוּ בַעֲלֵי קְעִילָה אֹתִי וְאֶת־אֲנָשַׁי following 23.11 הֲיַסְגִּרֻנִי בַעֲלֵי קְעִילָה; Ex 12.14 (3)וְחַגֹּתֶם אֹתוֹ ... תְּחָגֻּהוּ (a dozen exceptions, e.g. 1Sm 5.10 לַהֲמִיתֵנִי וְאֶת־עַמִּי; Dt 11.6 [contr. Nu 16.32]; Dt 15.16; cf. Driver, *Notes* ad 1Sm 5.10).

(1) If אֵת is used with a determinate noun and not with an indeterminate noun, it is probably because it was originally used with the pronoun, which is regarded as being

determinate. On the relatively late date of introduction of the accusative marker אֵת, see § 137 *f*, n. On the alleged emphasising function of the particle אֵת, see Muraoka, *Emphatic*, pp. 146-58.

(2) In Akkadian, Arabic, and Ethiopic the verb can take two suffixes.

(3) This alternation appears to be a stylistic feature characteristic of the Priestly source; Paran, op. cit. [§ 3 *a*], p. 69.

With **determinate nouns** אֵת is very common, but seldom necessary(1).   f It must be used after a pronominal object: Dt 11.6 וַתִּבְלָעֵם וְאֶת־בָּתֵּיהֶם וְאֶת־אָהֳלֵיהֶם *and she swallowed them up, as well as their houses and their tents* (cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* ad loc.); Nu 16.32. Placed before the verb, a determinate noun(2) does not specifically require אֵת: thus, without אֵת: Gn 8.17; 30.40; 1Sm 2.9; 2Kg 22.8; with אֵת: Gn 3.10; 9.13; Ex 18.23; 2Kg 23.19. The fluctuation in respect of the use or non-use of אֵת is observable also when the object follows the verb: cp. Gn 20.7 הָשֵׁב אֵשֶׁת הָאִישׁ *Return the man's wife* and 20.15 וַיָּשֶׁב לוֹ אֵת שָׂרָה אִשְׁתּוֹ; 13.14 שָׂא־נָא עֵינֶיךָ and 13.10 (3)וַיִּשָּׂא לוֹט אֶת־עֵינָיו. On the other hand, indeterminate nouns do not take אֵת (cf. § *h*): e.g. Jdg 3.15 וַיָּקֶם לָהֶם מוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת־אֵהוּד *and he raised up for them a deliverer, Ehud*.

(1) On some possible factors conditioning the use or non-use of אֵת, see Muraoka, *Emphatic*, p. 152 with the bibliography mentioned there, to which is to be added, Polzin, pp. 28-31, and E.Z. Melamed, "אֵת in Biblical poetry" [Heb.] in his *Studies in the Bible, its Translations and Interpreters* (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 200-216.

(2) The following are determinate: 1) a proper noun; 2) a noun with the article; 3) a noun with a suffix; 4) a noun constructed on a determinate noun, e.g. Gn 1.25 אֶת־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ *the animals of the earth* (cf. § 137 *a*).

(3) See a discussion in Muraoka, *Emphatic*, pp. 150f.

A **demonstrative pronoun** is regarded as determinate: אֶת־זֶה Gn 44.29;   g Lv 11.4,9,21; אֶת־זֹאת 2Sm 13.17; אֶת־אֵלֶּה Gn 46.18,25. The interrogative pronoun for a person or people, מִי, is assumed to be determinate, hence אֶת־מִי Is 6.8 (but never אֶת־מָה*). The relative אֲשֶׁר can be determinate in respect of the meaning, hence אֶת־אֲשֶׁר in the meaning of *he who* 1Sm 16.3, *that which* Gn 9.24, *the fact that (how)* Josh 2.10.

A **grammatically indeterminate noun**, but which has a certain logical   h determination, can take אֵת. Thus the noun כֹּל *totality, whole*, implying a certain determination (§ 139 *e*), is treated like a determinate noun: Gn 1.21*b*: אֵת כָּל־עוֹף כָּנָף *every winged creature*; 1.30; 8.21. There is also a certain determination in cases such as: Ex 40.2 אֶת־מִשְׁכַּן אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד

the Dwelling of the tent of the congregation (אֹהֶל מֹועֵד is equivalent to a proper noun; it never takes the article, § 137 *h*); Lv 7.8 *a man's burnt offering*; 2Sm 4.11 *a just man* (made determinate by the context); Pr 23.6 *the food of the envious man*; 2Sm 23.21 הוּא־הִכָּה אֶת־אִישׁ מִצְרִי, וְהוּא־הִכָּה אֶת־ אִישׁ מַרְאֶה, with which cp. the parallel 1Ch 11.23 אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים and Jer 16.13 הָאִישׁ הַמִּצְרִי אִישׁ מִדָּה ...

With אֶחָד made determinate by a preposition and its noun (or pronoun): 1Sm 9.3 אֶת־אַחַד מֵהַנְּעָרִים *one of the servants*; Nu 16.15 אַת־ אַחַד מֵהֶם. With numbers: Ex 28.9 *two stones of shoham* (but Samar. הַשֹּׁהַם); Gn 21.30 *seven ewes*; Nu 26.10 *250 men*; 1Kg 6.16 *twenty cubits* (with some determination).

Sometimes אֵת is used with an **indeterminate noun** for the sake of clarity, to indicate the object clearly: Lv 26.5; Nu 21.9; Ex 21.28 (contr. 29); Is 10.2; 41.7; 50.4; 64.4.

i   Noteworthy is the great freedom in the use of אֵת; comp. 1Sm 10.1 אֵת פַּךְ הַשֶּׁמֶן; Ru 3.16 קַח פַּךְ הַשֶּׁמֶן הַזֶּה 2Kg 9.1 and וַיִּקַּח שְׁמוּאֵל אֶת־פַּךְ הַשֶּׁמֶן כָּל־אֲשֶׁר (after the verb) and 3.5,11 כָּל אֲשֶׁר (before the verb); Jer 51.6 מַלְּטוּ אִישׁ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ(1); with which cp. ib. 51.45 מַלְּטוּ אִישׁ נַפְשׁוֹ; Jer 45.4 הִנֵּה אֲשֶׁר־בָּנִיתִי אֲנִי הֹרֵס וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר־נָטַעְתִּי אֲנִי (before the verb in both): נֹתֵשׁ(2).

(1) More examples in Muraoka, *Emphatic*, p. 151, and also § *f* above. See G.A. Khan, *BSOAS* 47 (1984) 471f., 488f.

(2) More examples of the omission of אֵת where the obj. precedes: Gn 31.38; 46.32; 47.22; 50.8; Ex 8.22; Nu 24.8 (Brock., *Syntax*, § 96).

ia   A similar fluctuation also occurs when the object designates a part of the body of the subject in an idiomatic collocation: e.g. Gn 22.4,13 וַיִּשָּׂא יַעֲקֹב עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא 33.1 // וַיִּשָּׂא אַבְרָהָם אֶת־עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא or Gn 27.38 וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ 8.9 or וַיִּשָּׂא אֶת־קֹלוֹ וַיֵּבְךְּ 29.11 // וַיִּשָּׂא עֵשָׂו קֹלוֹ וַיֵּבְךְּ וַיִּשְׁלַח אַבְרָהָם אֶת־יָדוֹ וַיִּקַּח 22.10 // וַיִּקָּחֶהָ.

j   **Observation. Other uses of אֵת.** There are a certain number of cases where אֵת precedes a noun which cannot be regarded, even virtually, as the object(1). These cases are difficult to explain(2); in some there may be an accusative of limitation or of specification; in others the אֵת seems solely designed to bring the noun into prominence, on the analogy of the אֵת which brings the object into prominence. Putting aside text-critically doubtful examples and those which can be explained at

least as accusatives of object, there remain a certain number of cases which may be grouped thus:(3)

1) Before a noun in apposition to a noun with a preposition: Ex 1.14 בְּכָל־עֲבֹדָה בַּשָּׂדֶה אֵת כָּל־עֲבֹדָתָם *by all labours in the fields, all their labours ...*; Ez 14.22 *concerning the evil that I have brought upon Jerusalem, all that I have brought upon her.*

2) In an enumeration: Nu 3.26 before the last two longer terms of an enumeration in the nominative; Josh 17.11 at the beginning of the group of the four יֹשְׁבֵי in an enumeration in the nominative; Ne 9.34 before the first term of an enumeration in the nominative.

3) Before an ordinary subject: Jdg 20.44 (46) *All those were valiant men*; Ez 17.21; 35.10.

4) Before a noun in *casus pendens* (§ 156 c): 1Kg 15.13 וְגַם אֶת־מַעֲכָה אִמּוֹ וַיְסִרֶהָ מִגְּבִירָה *and even his mother Ma'ka, he took away from her the dignity of queen-mother* (here perhaps attraction of the following accusative); Ez 20.16 וְאֶת־חֻקּוֹתַי לֹא הָלְכוּ בָהֶם *and my decrees, they did not follow them.*

5) אֵת with a strong meaning equivalent to a pronoun: Ez 43.7 אֶת־ מְקֹום כִּסְאִי *here is the place of my throne*; Hg 2.5 אֶת־הַדָּבָר *this is the word*(4); Zech 7.7 הֲלֹא אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים *Are not these the words ...?*

6) There is perhaps an accusative of limitation (§ 126 *g*) in 2Sm 11.25 אַל־יֵרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה if יֵרַע is regarded as impersonal (§ 152 *d*) *may it not appear bad to you as far as this matter is concerned;* Ne 9.32 אַל יִמְעַט לְפָנֶיךָ אֵת כָּל־הַתְּלָאָה *may it not appear to you trivial as far as all this toil is concerned;* and by analogy Josh 22.17 הַמְעַט־לָנוּ אֶת־עֲוֹן פְּעֹור *Is Peor's crime too trivial for us?*(5)

7) In the vicinity of a genuine accusative: Ne 9.19 אֶת־עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן אֵת כָּל הָרָעָה; Dn 9.13 לֹא עֲזַבְתָּם בַּמִּדְבָּר, following לֹא־סָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם; לְהָבִיא עָלֵינוּ רָעָה גְדֹלָה following vs. 12 הַזֹּאת בָּאָה עָלֵינוּ.

(1) G.A. Khan's theory can account for only a very small number of the examples concerned: *BSOAS* 47 (1984) 496f. The hypothetical emphasising force of אֵת was claimed by many scholars for most of these abnormal cases; for a critique of the theory, see Muraoka, *Emphatic*, pp. 146-58.

(2) For a discussion of many such cases, see Muraoka, *Emphatic*, pp. 152-58.

(3) Most of these uses are also found with ל (cf. § *l*).

(4) Comp. Acts 10.36 τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλεν.

(5) Cf. Brock., *GvG*, II, pp. 125, 349.

ל **as indicator of the accusative of the direct object.** In the later   *k*

language in particular, לְ is quite often used as indicator of the accusative of the determinate direct object noun[1]: Ps 69.6 יָדַעְתָּ לְאִוַּלְתִּי *you know my folly*; Job 5.2 כִּי לֶאֱוִיל יַהֲרָג־כָּעַס *for vexation kills the foolish one* (object placed before verb; here grammatical determination is lacking); with עָזַב 1Ch 16.37; הִבְדִּיל 25.1; הִמְלִיךְ 29.22; שָׁלַח Ezr 8.16; דָּרַשׁ 1Ch 22.19; 2Ch 17.3,4; 20.3; 31.21; 34.3; זָכַר Ex 32.13; Dt 9.27; Jer 31.34; (לְ due to parallelism); 2Ch 6.42; אָהַב Lv 19.18,34. With a participle: Is 11.9 כַּמַּיִם לַיָּם מְכַסִּים *as water covers the sea* (contr. Hb 2.14); 14.2; Am 6.3.

(1) And in the Chronicles, only in the case of persons (Kropat, *Syntax*, p. 35). The use of לְ as indicator of the determinate object is, to a great extent, probably due to Aramaic influence; but some Hebrew uses of לְ tended towards the same result, e.g. the double construction of several verbs with either the accusative or לְ: thus רפא to *heal* (usu. with the acc., sometimes with לְ, e.g. Nu 12.13; and even Piel once with לְ: 2Kg 2.21), קָרָא *to call* (even within a single verse as in 1Kg 1.9 וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־כָּל־אֶחָיו בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וּלְכָל־אַנְשֵׁי יְהוּדָה *and he invited all his brothers ... and all the men of Juda*); בֵּרֵךְ 1Ch 29.20 (also with אֶת); נָשָׂא Gn 50.17; שָׁאַל *to ask*; הוֹשִׁיעַ *to rescue, to save*; Hifil verbs with לְ like הֵנִיחַ לְ *to give rest to*; הֵצִיק לְ *to make it narrow for*.

l   **Observation. Other uses of לְ analogous to those of אֵת** (cf. § *j*).

1) לְ before a noun in apposition in any case: 1Ch 13.1 עִם־שָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים וְהַמֵּאוֹת לְכָל־נָגִיד *with the chiliarchs and the centurions, all the chiefs*; Lv 5.3; Jer 1.18*b* (after עַל); genitive: Gn 23.10 בְּאָזְנֵי בְנֵי חֵת; 1Ch 7.5; in the nominative: Ez 44.9 לְכָל־; Ezr 1.5; 1Ch 26.26; 2Ch 5.12; accusative: Ezr 8.24; Ne 8.9; even after אֵת: 2Ch 23.1; 33.8.

2) In an enumeration, before the last noun (sometimes even when there are only two): nominative: 1Ch 29.6; accusative: 1Ch 28.1 (after אֵת); 28.18 (last term of the enumeration beginning in vs. 11); 2Ch 24.12; 26.14; genitive: Ezr 7.28.

3) Before a subject: 1Ch 28.21 לְכָל־נָדִיב; 2Ch 7.21.

m   **בְּ of transitivity.** When the object is an instrument, the construction with בְּ is sometimes found instead of the accusative[1]: Ex 7.20 וַיָּרֶם בַּמַּטֶּה *and he lifted up the rod* (contr. 14.16; Is 10.15 with the acc.) lit. *he made an elevation with the rod*; Josh 8.18 בַּכִּידוֹן נְטֵה *extend the javelin*[2]; 1Ch 15.16 (?) לְהָרִים בַּקּוֹל *to raise one's voice* (only instance in prose); הֵנִיעַ בְרֹאשׁ *to shake one's head* Job 16.4 (acc. Ps 22.8); הֵנִיד בְּרֹאשׁ *id.* Jer 18.16; פָּעַר בְּפֶה *to open one's mouth* Job 16.10;

הִפְטִיר בְּשָׂפָה *to open one's lips*(?) Ps 22.8 פֶּרְשָׂה בְיָדֶיהָ *she stretched out her arms* Lam 1.17; בְּקוֹל נָתַן Jer 12.8; Ps 46.7; 68.34 (elsewhere acc.).

(1) Comp. in Arabic, with *bi* of transitivity, e.g. *ramā bissahmi* "he threw the arrow, he made a throwing with the arrow."
(2) Comp. Fr. "cligner (from *clinare*) *de* l'oeil" alongside *cligner les yeux*.

n   Probably related to the accusative of the direct object (§ *b*) is the **accusative of motion towards** a place, of **direction towards** a goal. As explained in § 93 *c*, forms such as גַּתָּה *to Gath* and שְׁאוֹלָה *to Sheol* with the so-called He locale do not belong here[1]. With the accusative placed before the verb, for emphasis: Josh 6.19 אוֹצַר יהוה יָבוֹא *it is into Y.'s treasury that it shall come*; 1Sm 5.8; 1Kg 2.26; 12.1; Is 52.4; Jer 2.10; 20.6; 32.5. The verb בּוֹא with the acc. means not only *to go to, to come to* (Jdg 11.16; 2Kg 6.4; 1Sm 4.12; 2Kg 8.7; Ru 1.2) but also *to enter* Gn 12.11; 41.57; 1Kg 14.12 (cf. *ingredi urbem* "to enter a city"). On the analogy of this construction the accusative is also used for the place out of which one comes (cf. *egredi urbem* "to leave a city"): Gn 44.4 יָצְאוּ אֶת־הָעִיר; Ex 9.29,33; Dt 14.22; cf. Jer 10.20*b* (suffix).

(1) Meek (*JAOS* 60 [1940]) suggests "terminative," a goal of movement, as a new term. E.A. Speiser, "The terminative-adverbial in Canaanite-Ugaritic and Akkadian," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 109, points out Meek's exaggeration that it is exclusively terminative, and says that it can shade off into "locative."

o   Related to the direct accusative are perhaps[1] some accusatives which may be called **accusatives of result**: Is 5.6 וְעָלָה שָׁמִיר וָשָׁיִת *(the vine) shall go up with briers and thorns*; 34.13; Pr 24.31 (comp. *ire in semen*, Fr. *monter en graine*); with נוּב Pr 10.31 *the mouth of the just blossoms out with wisdom*; פָּרַח Ex 9.9 *an eruption budding with boils*; perh. פָּצַח רִנָּה *to break forth into cries of joy* (Is 14.7; 44.23; 49.13; 54.1; 55.12); Is 59.5 תִּבָּקֵעַ *the crushed (egg) breaks forth into a viper*.
   For the accusative חֲלִילָה, cf. § 93 *h*.

(1) But perhaps *predicative* accusative, cf. § *w*, n.; 126 *d*.

p   II) **Accusative of the effected object.** Whereas the *affected* object (§ *a*) is understood as existing prior to the action, the *effected* object is produced by the action itself. Thus Gn 1.29 זֹרֵעַ זֶרַע (cf. 1.11, 12) *producing seed*, זֶרַע is an effected object, whereas it is an affected object in זָרַע זֶרַע *sow, (throw) the seed* of Dt 11.10; 22.9 etc. The

effected object is concrete, and external in relation to the action: it is thus distinguished from the *internal* object (§ *q*). The effected object, thus defined, is rather rare; it is hardly ever found except with a verb of the same root (often denominative)([1]). Examples: Gn 1.11 תַּדְשֵׁא הָאָרֶץ דֶּשֶׁא *let the earth produce grass*; 9.14 עָנָן; 11.3 לְבֵנִים; 37.7 אֲלֻמִּים; Mi 2.4 נְהִי; Ps 144.6 בָּרָק; with a determinative: Gn 30.37 וַיְפַצֵּל פְּצָלוֹת לְבָנוֹת *and he made white stripes.*

(1) Paronomasia is very common with the internal object (§ *q*), but it is relatively rare with the affected object. In all cases there is a *etymologica figura* (*schema etymologicum*).

q III) **Accusative of the internal object.** The internal object is an abstract noun of action, identical with, or analogous to the action expressed by the verb. By extension, some accusatives which are equivalent to this action or which determine it, are said to be related to the internal object. The abstract noun of action is mainly the infinitive absolute, the use of which as acc. of the internal object has been discussed in § 123 *d* ff.([1]) But any other form may be found, e.g. Nu 11. 4 הִתְאַוּוּ תַּאֲוָה *cupierunt cupidinem* = *they were seized with covetousness* Ps 106.14; Pr 21.26); פְּקֻדָּה Nu 16.29; אַהֲבָה 1Sm 20.17; קְבוּרָה Jer 22.19; פַּחַד Ps 14.5; חָטְאָה La 1.8([2]). — With a noun synonymous with the verb: יָדַע בִּינָה *to have intelligence* (lit. *to know* or *to learn intelligence*: Is 29.24; Pr 4.1; Job 38.4; 1Ch 12.32; 2Ch 2.11,12).

The accusative of the internal object is found not only with transitive verbs (e.g. Gn 43.3), but also with intransitive verbs: Ez 18.21 חָיֹה יִחְיֶה *vitam* (*vivere*) *vivet* = *he will live life*, with reflexive and passive verbs: Nu 16.29 פְּקֻדַּת כָּל־הָאָדָם יִפָּקֵד עֲלֵיהֶם *they are punished with the punishment of all men*; Jer 22.19 קְבוּרַת חֲמוֹר יִקָּבֵר *he shall have the burial of a donkey* (cf. § 123 *r*); 1Sm 20.6; Gn 17.13; Nu 11.4; Ex 21.12; prob. הָלַךְ רָכִיל Lv 19.16 etc. *to defame* (רכיל, noun of action: *circulation*, hence *defamation*; cf. König, *Syntax*, § 329 *k*).

(1) What scanty evidence is available in Ugaritic suggests that the inf. abs. thus used is nominative: see Gordon, *UT*, § 9.27, and above in § 123 *d*, n. In such a case the form would be in apposition to the grammatical subject, and thus may have to be reinterpreted as a nomen agentis (actor noun), and cases such as מֹות יוּמַת with a pure inf. abs. (?) and הִתְאַוּוּ תַּאֲוָה with a verbal noun may represent two distinct syntactic structures.

(2) Hence a way (common in Arabic) of expressing the comparative notion (*as*) between

two actions, e.g. 1Sm 20.17 כִּי־אַהֲבַת נַפְשׁוֹ אֲהֵבוֹ *for he loved him with the love of* [i.e. *which he had for*] *himself* = *he loved him as himself*; Nu 16.29 *if they are punished as all men are* (but *ibid.* and 2Sm 3.33 כְּמוֹת, with כ of comparison; on the other hand מְמוֹתֵי without כ in Ez 28.8); Jer 22.19 *he shall be buried as a donkey* (*is buried*) (cf. § *r* for more examples).

The accusative of the internal object may be **qualified**. Thus it can r have an adjective([1]): Nu 11.33 וַיַּךְ יהוה בָּעָם מַכָּה רַבָּה מְאֹד *And Y. struck among the people a very great blow*([2]); Gn 27.34. It can have a genitive: 2Sm 4.5 וְהוּא שֹׁכֵב אֵת מִשְׁכַּב הַצָּהֳרָיִם *now he was sleeping the midday sleep* = (*he was taking a siesta*); 1Sm 20.17 כִּי־אַהֲבַת נַפְשׁוֹ אֲהֵבוֹ *he loved him as*([3]) *himself* (*with the love of himself*); Lv 25.42 לֹא יִמָּכְרוּ מִמְכֶּרֶת עָבֶד *they shall not be sold as one sells a slave*; Is 24.22; — with different subjects: Is 62.5 מְשׂוֹשׂ חָתָן עַל־כַּלָּה יָשִׂישׂ עָלַיִךְ אֱלֹהָיִךְ *as the bridegroom rejoices in his bride so shall your God rejoice in you.*

(1) Comp. e.g. Mt 2.10 ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα.
(2) I.e. *made a great slaughter among the people* (2Ch 13.17; Josh 10.20; 1Sm 6.10 etc.).
(3) Cf. § *q*, n.

Probably([1]) related to the internal object is the use of the word s קוֹל *voice* with verbs which express an emission of voice. This concrete substantive, which has no corresponding verb, indeed seems to be used on the analogy of a noun of action. Thus with קָרָא *to speak loudly, to shout, to call* (without a corresponding noun of action) we have קָרָא קוֹל גָּדוֹל Ez 8.18; 9.1; 11.13; Ezr 10.12 (contr. בְּקוֹל Gn 39.14 etc.); with זָעַק *to cry out* 2Sm 19.5 וַיִּזְעַק קוֹל גָּדוֹל; with בָּכָה *to weep* 2Sm 15.23 בּוֹכִים קוֹל גָּדוֹל. Other examples: Dt 5.19; 27.14; 1Kg 8.55; prob. also Ex 24.3 וַיַּעַן כָּל־הָעָם קוֹל אֶחָד *and all the people answered with one voice.* There probably is an acc. in Is 10.30 צַהֲלִי קוֹלֵךְ *hinni voce(m) tua(m)* [= lit. "Neigh your voice!"] (but not in קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא Ps 3.5; cf. § 151 *c*).
(1) Cf. Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 306.

Also probably related to the internal object is the accusative of t the number of **times** (equivalent to the number of *actions*)([1]): Gn 33.3 וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים *and he bowed down seven times* (= *of seven prostrations*); Ex 23.14 שָׁלֹשׁ רְגָלִים תָּחֹג לִי *three times you shall celebrate the feast in my honour*; Nu 20.11.
(1) Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 301.

IV) **The double accusative** of the affected object([1]). u

1) If, in a clause consisting of a **subject**, an **object**, and a transitive verb with simple (non-causative; § *b—d*) meaning, this verb is changed into a causative, the subject (usually a person) becomes a second object. Thus a sentence such as רָאִינוּ אֶת־כְּבֹדוֹ *we have seen his glory* becomes הֶרְאָנוּ אֶת־כְּבֹדוֹ Dt 5.21 *he has made it that we could see his glory* = *he has made us see* (= *has shown*) *his glory*. Thus we have הִשְׁמִיעַ *to make hear* 2Kg 7.6; הוֹדִיעַ *to make know* 1Sm 14.12; לִמֵּד* *to teach* Dt 4.5; הֶאֱכִיל *to cause sbd to eat* = *to give sbd sth to eat, to feed sbd with sth* Dt 8.3; הִשְׁקָה *to cause sbd to drink* (שָׁתָה) *sth, give sbd sth to drink* Jdg 4.19. With כִּלְכֵּל *to support (feed) sbd with sth* Gn 47.12; 1Kg 18.4,13† the second acc. is prob. an acc. of object (perh. on the analogy of הֶאֱכִיל)(2). This is the construction taken by verbs of abundance and scarcity, verbs of wearing and putting off, and other verbs on the analogy of these (§ *d*), when the meaning is causative, e.g. Gn 26.15 וַיְמַלְאוּם עָפָר *and they filled them with earth*; 41.42 וַיַּלְבֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ בִּגְדֵי־שֵׁשׁ *and he dressed him in garments of byssus*; Ex 25.11 וְצִפִּיתָ אֹתוֹ זָהָב *and you shall overlay it (the Ark) with gold*; Gn 37.23 וַיַּפְשִׁיטוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף אֶת־כֻּתָּנְתּוֹ *and they stripped Joseph of his tunic* 2Ch 20.11 מִיְּרֻשָּׁתְךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹרַשְׁתָּנוּ *out of your possession which you have given us to inherit*; Jdg 9.45 וַיִּזְרָעֶהָ מֶלַח *he sowed it with salt*; Gn 27.37 דָּגָן וְתִירֹשׁ סְמַכְתִּיו *with corn and wine have I sustained him*; Is 43.23 וּזְבָחֶיךָ לֹא כִבַּדְתָּנִי *you have not honoured us with your sacrifices*; 1Sm 24.18 גְּמַלְתַּנִי הַטּוֹבָה *you have dealt well with me*; Gn 32. 24 וַיַּעֲבִרֵהוּ *and he got them across the river*; Dt 32.13 וַיַּעֲבִרֵם אֶת הַנָּחַל *and he made him suck honey*; Jer 23.27 לְהַשְׁכִּיחַ אֶת־עַמִּי שְׁמִי *to make my people forget my name*; Dt 31.7 תַּנְחִילֶנָּה אוֹתָם *you shall put them in possession of it*; Is 28.9 אֶת־מִי יָבִין שְׁמוּעָה *whom will he make the message understood?*; הָשִׁיב דָּבָר *to report,* mostly with double objects, but in Ex 19.8 and 2Ch 10.6 with אֶל or לְ pers.

(1) Of course we can also have several accusatives of various kinds, e.g. Jon 1.16 וַיִּירְאוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים יִרְאָה גְדוֹלָה אֶת־יְהוָה *and they feared Yahweh* (affected object) *with a great fear* (internal object); Jer 50.34 רִיב יָרִיב אֶת־רִיבָם *he will indeed take up their cause* (רִיב inf. cst. used as inf. abs., § 123 *q*; ריבם affected or perh. effected object); Josh 6.11 וַיַּסֵּב אֲרוֹן־יְהוָה אֶת־הָעִיר הַקֵּף פַּעַם אֶחָת *and he caused the ark of the Lord to go round* (first affected object) *the city* (second affected object) *in a circuit* (inf. abs., § 123 *r*) *once* (internal object, § 125 *t*). Cf. M.Z. Kaddari in *Leš* 34 (1970) 245-56.

(2) Perh. comp. כִּלְכֵּל with the construction of סָעַד Jdg 19.5.

2) There is also a double object in the following case: if a nominal clause (consisting of a **subject** and of a **predicate**) is changed to a verbal clause, with a verb such as *to make* etc., the subject becomes object, and the predicate becomes second object, which significantly does not take אֶת. Thus a nominal clause such as הָאָדָם עָפָר *man (is) dust* becomes e.g. Gn 2.7 וַיִּיצֶר אֶת־הָאָדָם עפר *and he formed man (of) dust.* Just as the predicate of a nominal clause is used in a very loose manner (§ 154 *e*), a verbal clause with a double object is likewise used in a very broad manner. Thus it is used for: 1) the thing and the **matter of** which it is made: Ct 3.10 עַמּוּדָיו עָשָׂה כֶסֶף *he made its pillars (of) silver*; Dt 27.6 אֲבָנִים שְׁלֵמוֹת תִּבְנֶה אֶת־מִזְבַּח יהוה *it is (of) whole stones that you shall build the altar of Y.* (the second object in first position for emphasis); 2) the word שֵׁם *name* and a proper noun: Gn 30.6 קָרְאָה שְׁמוֹ דָּן *she called his name Dan*; 3) the counted thing and the number: Ex 25.37 וְעָשִׂיתָ אֶת־נֵרֹתֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה *and you shall make its lamps (to the number) of seven*; 2Sm 14.26*b*; —prob. likewise with מִסְפָּר *number*: Job 1.5(1); Ex 16.16; 1Sm 6.4 (מספר) in first position; in vs. 18 as predicate of a nominal clause, and likewise Jer 2.28, § 154 *e*, 4).

(1) Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* ad Job 1.5.

3) In the following case, the clause which is the basis of the construction with the two accusatives can hardly be a nominal clause, as in the preceding case; it is rather a verbal clause with the verb הָיָה in the sense of *to become*. Thus a clause like הַכֶּסֶף הָיָה פֶסֶל *the silver has become a statue*, consisting of a **subject**, the verbal predicate הָיָה, and a predicative(1) (complement of the predicate, cf. § 126 *a*), becomes, with a verb with causative meaning *cause to become* etc., *make*: עָשָׂה הַכֶּסֶף פֶסֶל *he has made the silver a statue*, where the subject becomes the first object, and the predicative the second object. Thus a second accusative of the **produced thing**, which incidentally does not take אֶת, is often found with verbs(2) like עָשָׂה *to make*, שׂוּם and שִׁית *to place* etc., נָתַן *to put, to give*: Jdg 17.4 וַיַּעֲשֵׂהוּ פֶסֶל *and they transformed it (the silver) (into) a statue*; also with עָשָׂה: Gn 27.9; Nu 11.8; 17.3; Ho 8.4; Ps 104.4. With שׂוּם: 1Sm 8.1 וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־בָּנָיו שֹׁפְטִים *and he made his sons judges*; Gn 28.18 וַיָּשֶׂם אֹתָהּ מַצֵּבָה *he set it (the stone) for a pillar*, and likewise 31.45 וַיְרִימֶהָ מַצֵּבָה *he erected it for a pillar*; again with שׂוּם: Gn 27.37; 1Sm 18.13; 22.7; 11.11 וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־הָעָם שְׁלֹשָׁה רָאשִׁים *and*

he organised the people into three companies (comp. 13.17, § 126 c). With שִׁית: 1Kg 11.34 נָשִׂיא אֲשִׁתֶ֫נּוּ *ducem ponam eum* (Vulg."I will make him ru-
ler"); Is 5.6; 26.1 etc. With נָתַן: Is 3.4 וְנָתַתִּי נְעָרִים שָׂרֵיהֶם *dabo pueros
principes eorum* (Vulg. "I will make boys their princes"); Gn 17.5 etc.
With other verbs: 1Kg 18.32 וַיִּבְנֶה אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים מִזְבֵּחַ *aedificavit lapides
(in) altare*, i.e. *he arranged the stones (in the shape of) an altar*
(contr. Dt 27.6; § v); Ex 12.39 וַיֹּאפוּ הַבָּצֵק עֻגֹת *they baked the dough (to
make) cakes*; 1Kg 11.30 וַיִּקְרָעֶ֫הָ שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר קְרָעִים *and he tore it (the cloak)
(into) twelve pieces*; Ps 114.8 הַהֹפְכִי הַצּוּר אֲגַם־מָ֫יִם *he who turns the rock
into a pool of water*; Am 5.8; Hb 3.9 נְהָרוֹת תְּבַקַּע־אָ֑רֶץ *you did cleave the
earth (with) rivers* (= *rivers come out of it*); Job 28.2.

For the construction of a doubly transitive verb used passively cf.
§ 128 c.

(1) According to analogy with Arabic, the predicative is in the accusative; cf. Dri-
ver, *Tenses*, § 161,3, note.

(2) With the same verbs, לְ is also (and more often) found instead of the second accu-
sative: in Am 5.8 הָפַךְ לְ, then הֶחֱשִׁיךְ with the acc.; Is 54.12 שׂוּם with the acc., then
with לְ.

Also with כְּ as in Gn 13.16 וְשַׂמְתִּי אֶת־זַרְעֲךָ כַּעֲפַר הָאָ֑רֶץ; 34.31 הַכְזוֹנָה יַעֲשֶׂה אֶת־;
אֲחוֹתֵ֫נוּ Ho 2.5; וְשַׂמְתִּ֫יהָ כַמִּדְבָּר Ct 8.1 מִי יִתֶּנְךָ כְּאָח לִי.

Cf. M.Z. Kaddari, *Studies in BH Syntax* [Heb] (Ramat-Gan, 1976), pp. 18f.

x　　Unlike Gn 22.13 וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָאַ֫יִל וַיַּעֲלֵ֫הוּ לְעֹלָה *and he took the ram, and
offered it up as a burnt offering*, the object is often omitted from the
second verb: e.g. 1Sm 31.13 וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־עַצְמֹתֵיהֶם וַיִּקְבְּרוּ *and they took
their bones and buried (them)*; 1Kg 18.33 וַיְנַתַּח אֶת־הַפָּר וַיָּ֫שֶׂם עַל־הָעֵצִים
and he cut up the bull and put (it) on the trees[1].

Such an ellipsis can lead to the development of an apparently new
meaning of verbs: Nu 14.19 נָשָׂ֫אתָה לָעָם הַזֶּה "you have forgiven this people
(עֹנֶם understood)"; Jer 6.10 הִנֵּה עֲרֵלָה אָזְנָם וְלֹא יוּכְלוּ לְהַקְשִׁיב *behold,
their ears are closed; they cannot listen*, cf. Pr 2.2 לְהַקְשִׁיב לַחָכְמָה אָזְנֶ֑ךָ
to lend your ears to wisdom[2]; 1Kg 13.7 בֹּ֫אָה אִתִּי הַבַּ֫יְתָה וּסְעָ֑דָה *Come
with me inside the house and refresh yourself*, cf. Jdg 19.5 סְעָד לִבְּךָ פַת־
לֶ֫חֶם *Refresh your heart with a morsel of bread*. Likewise הֵשִׁיב דָּבָר
to report back, answer, but occasionally just הֵשִׁיב, e.g. Job 13.22.

(1) See Brock., *Syntax*, § 137.
(2) See Rashi ad Dn 9.19.

§ 126. The indirect accusative

The indirect accusative (cf. § 125 a) is indirectly subordinated to　a
the verb (*ad-verbial* accusative). It indicates a determination of the
verbal predicate. In some categories of the indirect accusative, that
of time and place in particular (§ h, i), the syntactic relationship is
sometimes made more explicit by the use of an appropriate preposition
or by the use of a noun with a paragogic vowel. By extension, it can be
found in a nominal clause. Finally the indirect accusative can be the
attribute of a noun (§ 127). The main kinds of indirect accusative are
the following:

1) **Predicative accusative of state**. If to a verbal clause is
added a complementary affirmation expressing a state[1] or a quality of
the subject (or of the object), this complementary affirmation, ex-
pressing something new, cannot simply be juxtaposed to the subject (or
to the object): it is **subordinated to the verbal predicate**[2], in the
same way as an adverb, and is therefore put in the accusative[3]. The
accusative can be recognised, in the absence of the old case-endings,
by the indetermination. The accusative of state can be an adjective, a
participle or a substantive. It can refer either to the subject or to
the object[4].

Adjective: (Predicative referring to the **subject**): Gn 25.25 וַיֵּצֵא
הָרִאשׁוֹן אַדְמוֹנִי *prior egressus est rufus*, "the first one came out (and he
was) red-haired" (אַדְמוֹנִי, being indeterminate, cannot be apposition of
הָרִאשׁוֹן; red-haired expresses something new, and brings about an affir-
mation); Gn 37.35; Nu 16.30; 2Sm 19.21; Ru 1.21 אֲנִי מְלֵאָה הָלַ֫כְתִּי *plena
egressa sum* "I went away full" (the predicative preceding the verb for
emphasis); Is 20.3 הָלַךְ עַבְדִּי יְשַׁעְיָ֫הוּ עָרוֹם וְיָחֵף *my servant Isaiah has
walked naked and barefoot* (in vs. 4 these two adjectives are in the
sing. with plural substantives, like adverbs; likewise also עָרוֹם Job
24.7,10; הֻּמָּם Is 47.5; שׁוֹלָל Job 12.17).

(Predicative referring to the **object**): Nu 6.19 וְלָקַח אֶת־הַזְּרֹעַ בְּשֵׁלָה *and
he shall take the arm (when it is) cooked*; Josh 9.12 חָם *hot* in first
position for emphasis); Gn 37.2 וַיָּבֵא יוֹסֵף אֶת־דִּבָּתָם רָעָה *attulit Ioseph
rumorem de eis (ut) malum* (= *spoke ill of them)*; Nu 14.37; 2Ch 7.10.

(1) Hence: *accusative of state* or *ḥāl* in the terminology of Arabic grammarians.
(2) Hence: *predicative accusative*.

(3) Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 350. Cf. Eng. *this book is no longer sold bound, I bought it new*; Fr. *Ce livre n'existe plus broché* or *La séance continue très houleuse*.
(4) Comp. *Beth essentiae*, as indicator of the predicative, § 133 *c*.

b   **Participle**: (Predicative referring to the **subject**): Nu 16.27 יָצְאוּ נִצָּבִים *exierant stantes* (= "they had gone out and were standing"); 10.25; 1Kg 14.15; Ezr 9.3; 10.9; 1Kg 1.45 שָׂמֵחִים (verbal adj.); — in a nominal clause: Gn 29.2; 2Ch 9.21 אֳנִיּוֹת לַמֶּלֶךְ הֹלְכוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ *the king had ships sailing to Tarshish...* rather than *the king's ships sailed to T.*; 30.22.

      (Predicative referring to the **object**): Nu 11.10 וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הָעָם בֹּכֶה *Moses heard the people crying (who cried)*(1); Gn 21.9; Ex 5.20; 1Sm 10.5; 1Kg 22.17.

(1) With the *verba sentiendi* (= 'verbs of perception'): *to hear, to see, to know*, etc. there can be a second object. — With *to see*, besides the construction of 1Sm 22.9 רָאִיתִי אֶת־בֶּן־יִשַׁי בָּא *I saw the son of Jesse come* (here בָּא with past meaning), there is 2Kg 9.17 וַיַּרְא אֶת־שִׁפְעַת יֵהוּא בְּבֹאוֹ *he saw the troop of Jehu while he was coming*. But stylistic usage adds וְהִנֵּה, which shows the object sighted: Gn 24.63 וַיַּרְא וְהִנֵּה גְמַלִּים בָּאִים *and he saw (and behold) camels coming*; 33.1; 37.25 (cf. § 177 *i*).

c   **Substantive**: (Predicative referring to the **subject**): 1Sm 13.17 וַיֵּצֵא הַמַּשְׁחִית מִמַּחֲנֵה פְלִשְׁתִּים שְׁלֹשָׁה רָאשִׁים *the destroying army came out of the camp of the Philistines (in = in the state of) three companies* (cp. 11.11, § 125 *w*); Jdg 9.34; 2Kg 5.2; Gn 17.12 בֶּן־שְׁמֹנַת יָמִים יִמּוֹל לָכֶם כָּל־זָכָר *when they are eight days old, all your males shall be circumcised* the predicative in first position for emphasis); 9.20; 38.11; Lv 6.9; Jer 31.8; 2Kg 7.3 אַרְבָּעָה אֲנָשִׁים הָיוּ מְצֹרָעִים פֶּתַח הַשָּׁעַר *four men were there (like) lepers at the entrance of the gate*; 2Ch 26.21.

      (Predicative referring to the **object**): 2Kg 8.13 הִרְאַנִי יהוה אֹתְךָ מֶלֶךְ עַל־אֲרָם *Y. has shown you to me king of Syria*; Ex 2.11 וַיַּרְא אִישׁ מִצְרִי מַכֶּה אִישׁ־עִבְרִי *he saw an Egyptian* (indeterminate object) *striking a Hebrew*; Gn 6.17 הִנְנִי מֵבִיא אֶת־הַמַּבּוּל מַיִם *I am about to bring the flood in the form of waters* ....

d   Perhaps related to this discussion are cases like Mi 2.3 לֹא תֵלְכוּ רוֹמָה *you shall not walk with head high (in a high manner, haughtily)*; Lv 26.13 קוֹמְמִיּוּת (*ditto*); Is 60.14 שָׁחוֹחַ (*in bowing = in a bent manner*); Dt 2.9; Josh 9.2 פֶּה אֶחָד *ore uno = unanimously* (1Kg 22.13); Zeph 3.9 שְׁכֶם אֶחָד *lit. with one shoulder* (on קוֹל אֶחָד Ex 24.3, cf. § 125 *s*). Some

substantives thus used as accusatives of **manner** end up taking on an adverbial value (§ 102 *d*): בֶּטַח *safely* Gn 34.25; מֵישָׁרִים *rightly* Ct 1.4.

      Likewise the substantive is predicative in some odd cases, like Is 21.8   *e* (?) וַיִּקְרָא אַרְיֵה *he cried (in = like) a lion*; Ps 22.14; Zech 2.8 *it is (in = like an) open city that Jerusalem shall be inhabited*; Job 24.5.

      The predicative is a phrase when two members are closely associa-   *f* ted(1): Gn 32.31 רָאִיתִי אֱלֹהִים פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים *I have seen God face to face*; Nu 12.8 פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה אֲדַבֶּר־בּוֹ *it is mouth to mouth that I speak to him* (the predicative phrase in first position for emphasis). Likewise probably in cases like Gn 19.1 וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַפַּיִם אָרְצָה *and he worshipped with his face on the ground*.

(1) Cf. Brock., *GvG*, II, pp. 355f.

      2) **Accusative of limitation**(1). The part to which an affirmation   *g* is limited is in the accusative: 1Kg 15.23 חָלָה אֶת־רַגְלָיו *he was ill (as to) his feet* (אֵת very rare with the accusative of limitation, § 125 *e*)(2); Gn 41.40 רַק הַכִּסֵּא אֶגְדַּל מִמֶּךָּ *it is only by (in respect of) the throne that I shall be greater than you*; Gn 17.11 וּנְמַלְתֶּם אֵת בְּשַׂר עָרְלַתְכֶם *and you shall circumcise yourselves (in respect of) the flesh of your foreskin*; Ex 6.3; פָּנָה עֹרֶף *to turn in respect of one's back* (= to turn one's back) Josh 7.12; Jer 2.27; 32.33 (perh. also הָפַךְ עֹרֶף Josh 7.8); Jer 18.17 עֹרֶף וְלֹא־פָנִים אֶרְאֵם *it is only a back-view and not a front-view that I shall have of them*. The accusative of limitation is probably also found in the following cases(3) (with a transitive verb): Gn 37.21 לֹא נַכֶּנּוּ נָפֶשׁ *we must not strike him to death (in respect of the soul)*; Ps 3.8 הִכִּיתָ אֶת־כָּל־אֹיְבַי לֶחִי *you have struck all my enemies on the cheek*; 2Sm 3.27; Dt 22.26; Gn 3.15 יְשׁוּפְךָ רֹאשׁ *it shall aim at your head*; Dt 33.11; Jer 2.16.

(1) In Arabic terminology: *tamyiz* "specification."
(2) With בְּ in // 2Ch 16.12.
(3) According to Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 313 there is a second object here.

      3) **Accusative of local determination**. The place *where* one is   *h* (without motion) is usually preceded by the preposition בְּ *in*, or לְ *at*. But sometimes the noun is not preceded by any preposition: it must then be regarded as being in the accusative of determination. This accusative, which is not common outside certain nouns, may have originated as an extension of the accusative of motion (§ 125 *n*). In some cases the

labial ב may have been dropped by haplography before another ב especially בַּיִת), or even before another labial (especially פֶּתַח)(¹). Examples: 1Kg 8.32 תִּשְׁמַע הַשָּׁמַיִם *you shall hear in heaven* (likewise vss. 34, 36,39,43,45,49; in the parall. 2Ch 6 we find (except vs. 27) מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם (vss. 23,25,30,33,35,39); 2Sm 17.26 וַיִּחַן ... אֶרֶץ הַגִּלְעָד *and he encamped in the land of Gilead*. The local accusative is found with the common names of the cardinal points מִזְרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *in the orient* Josh 1.15; מְבוֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *in the (region of) the setting of the sun* 1.4; 23.4 (comp. Pr 8.3 מְבוֹא פְתָחִים after two nouns with ל); קִדְמַת *east of* Gn 4.16. Likewise for *at the place of the head, at the bed-head* we have מְרַאֲשֹׁתָיו 1Sm 19.16 etc.; *at the place of the feet* מַרְגְּלֹתָיו Ru 3.8 etc. The accusative is usual with פֶּתַח *entrance* followed by a genitive, e.g. Gn 18.1 יֹשֵׁב פֶּתַח־הָאֹהֶל *sitting at the entrance of the tent* (with ל Nu 11.10); Gn 19.11 נִצָּבִים פֶּתַח־הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר־ (with ל Pr 9.14; ב Jer 43.9); Jdg 18.16 הַשַּׁעַר (with ב Jer 26.10; Ez 11.1). To sum up, *at the entrance of* is usually פֶּתַח with the genitive (4 x only with ב, 2 x with ל); on the other hand, for *at the entrance* (without genitive) the acc. is never found (2 x ב, 1 x ל)(²). Likewise the accusative is common with בֵּית *house*(³) followed by a genitive: Gn 24.23 הֲיֵשׁ בֵּית אָבִיךְ מָקוֹם *is there any room in your father's house?* (= Fr. *chez ton père?*); 38.11 (but Nu 30.4 בְּבֵית אָבִיהָ for the sake of clarity); 2Sm 9.4; 2Kg 11.3 (15) בֵּית יהוה *in the temple of Yahweh*; Is 3.6; Mi 6.10; Job 1.4 (but ב vss. 13,18); Esth 4.13. With the proper nouns בֵּית־לֶחֶם 1Sm 17.15; 2Sm 2.32; בֵּית־אֵל 2Kg 10.29 (followed by בְּדָן *in Dan*); Ho 12.5. Contrast the proper nouns with initial ב: בִּבְאֵר שֶׁבַע (6 x), בְּבָבֶל (8 x). Even when בית is followed by a genitive, ב is quite common, e.g. Gn 39.20 (*prison*; likewise vs. 22; 40.5; 42.19; Ex 12.29; Jdg 16.21); after the verb הָיָה, e.g. Jdg 17.4,12. בית, not followed by a genitive, is not used in the accusative. (For בֵּיתוֹ [?] 2Ch 33.20 cp. LXX and 2Kg 21.18).

(1) So in Ugr.: Gordon, *UT*, § 10.4 (p. 95).

(2) Cf. Driver, *Notes* ad 1Sm 2.29 (n. 2).

(3) In Aramaic this word is often used in the local accusative, e.g. Targum and Peshitta of Gn 24.23; 38.11; 1Sm 17.15.

i   4) **Accusative of temporal determination.** A temporal determination answering the questions *when?, how long?*(¹) is often in the accusative: Ps 55.18 עֶרֶב וָבֹקֶר וְצָהֳרַיִם אָשִׂיחָה *in the evening, in the morning and at noon I will cause my complaint to be heard* (but with the article, we

find בָּעֶרֶב [4x וְלְעֵת עֶרֶב], בַּבֹּקֶר, בַּצָּהֳרַיִם); יוֹמָם *by day* (§ 102 b); הַיּוֹם *this day* = *today* (but בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה *on this day*, more emphatic); לַיְלָה *by night* (§ 93 g); הַלַּיְלָה *this night*, e.g. 2Sm 19.8 (but Gn 26.24 בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא *during that night*); עַתָּה *now* (*hoc tempore*, § 93 g; but בָּעֵת הַהִיא *at that same time, at that time*); הַשָּׁנָה *this year* Jer 28.16 (but בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא Gn 26.12 *in that year*(²); however we have 1Kg 17.1 הַשָּׁנִים הָאֵלֶּה (in) *these years*); Gn 27.45 יוֹם אֶחָד (in) *one day*; 3.14 כֹּל־יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ *all the days of your life*; Ex 20.9 שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים *for six days*; vs. 11 *in six days*; with אֵת (rare with the acc. of time, § 125 e): Ex 13.7 אֵת שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים *during the seven days* (אֵת again in Lv 25.22; Dt 9.25).

(1) קֶדֶם Ps 119.152 is used with the meaning of מִקֶּדֶם *from of old*.

(2) Likewise we find הַפַּעַם *this time*, but בַּפַּעַם הַהִיא, בַּפַּעַם הַזֹּאת. From these analogies, one probably ought to read 2Sm 21.9 with the Qre בִּתְחִלַּת קָצִיר (cf. Ru 1.22). Note that one also uses ב in בְּכָל־יוֹם *every day*, בְּכָל־עֵת *at all times*.

j   5) **Accusative of measure.** Gn 31.23 וַיִּרְדֹּף אַחֲרָיו דֶּרֶךְ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים *and he pursued him in the space (way) of seven days*; 7.20 חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה אַמָּה מִלְמַעְלָה גָּבְרוּ הַמָּיִם *by fifteen cubits higher had the waters risen* (the acc. in first position); 43.34 *Benjamin's portion was by five times (parts)* חָמֵשׁ יָדוֹת *larger than that of all of them*; prob. 1Sm 28.20 וַיִּפֹּל מְלֹא־קוֹמָתוֹ *he fell full length upon the ground* (*with the fullness of his stature*).

k   6) For the **accusative of cause**, which is common in Arabic, hardly anything but Is 7.25 is quoted: יִרְאַת שָׁמִיר *by fear of the thorns* (but the text is obscure and יִרְאַת could be subject; cf. A. Dillmann ad loc.).

l   7) The existence of an **accusative of instrument** is doubtful; the few instances that could be mentioned can be explained otherwise. Thus Josh 7.25 אֶבֶן may be an accusative of internal object (Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 306); likewise prob. Pr 10.4 כַּף (GK, § 117 t).

§ 127. Attributive accusative

On the analogy of the indirect accusative determining a predicate (§ 126 a), the accusative is used for the attribute (§ 121 a, n.) of a   *a* noun(¹) (or of a pronoun). The various kinds of accusative listed above in § 126 can be found as attributive accusative.

1) **Attributive accusative of state** (cf. § 126 a, b). **Participle.** (Absence of the article after a determinate noun indicates that the

participle is not in apposition, § 138 a). There are quite a few examples with קוֹל: Gn 3.8 וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִתְהַלֵּךְ בַּגָּן *and they heard the noise of Y. God walking about (as he was walking about) in the garden*; Dt 5.23; Is 6.8; 1Kg 1.41 מַדּוּעַ קוֹל־הַקִּרְיָה הוֹמָה *quare sonitus urbis (ut) strepentis?* (= "what is the meaning of this tumult of the city that is heard?"); 14.6 כִּשְׁמֹעַ אֲחִיָּהוּ אֶת־קוֹל רַגְלֶיהָ בָּאָה בַפֶּתַח *when Ahijah heard the sound of her feet, as she came in at the door* (here the participle is an attribute of the pronominal suffix, which is assumed to be in the genitive, § 94 a); Ct 5.2. More examples: Hg 1.4 בְּבָתֵּיכֶם סְפוּנִים *in your houses (which are at present) panelled*; 1Kg 11.8; 2Kg 19.2; Jon 1.6; 1Ch 12.1; 21.16.

(1) The accusative of *ad-verbial* becomes *ad-nominal*.

b 2) **Attributive accusative of limitation** (cf. § 126 g): 2Sm 15.32 קָרוּעַ כֻּתָּנְתּוֹ *torn as to his tunic (whose tunic is torn.*; § 121 o); Job 15.10 כַּבִּיר מֵאָבִיךָ יָמִים *older than your father (greater [as to the] days)*[1]; 11.9; 2Sm 21.20 עֶשְׂרִים וְאַרְבַּע מִסְפָּר 24 *(in) number*; with the noun of the numbered thing: type אַחַד עָשָׂר יוֹם *11 days (11 as regards day)* Dt 1.2 (cf. § 142 e); 1Sm 26.18 מַה־בְּיָדִי רָעָה *what guilt is on my hands?* (cf. § 144 d); 2Sm 15.2 אֵי־מִזֶּה עִיר אַתָּה *from which city are you?*; 1Sm 24.19 אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָה אִתִּי טוֹבָה *that which you have done to me as regards good*; 2Kg 8.12. — Ez 47.4 מַיִם בִּרְכַּיִם can be explained as acc. of measure: *water (at the height of) the knees*; likewise probably מֵי לַחַץ 1Kg 22.27 [= 2Ch 18.26]; Is 30.20: *water (in the measure of) narrowness*, i.e. *of strict necessity, of indispensability* (= *strictly necessary water*).

(1) With the adjective we usually find the genitive; cf. § 129 i.

c **Attributive accusative of determination** (cf. § 126 h-j): 1Sm 9.9 לַנָּבִיא הַיּוֹם יִקָּרֵא לְפָנִים הָרֹאֶה *he who is now called a prophet was formerly called a seer*; 1Ch 28.18 הַכְּרוּבִים זָהָב *the Cherubim in gold*; perh. in כָּעֵת חַיָּה *at the same time next year* Gn 18.10 etc.[1].

(1) By considering חַיָּה as a noun of unit from חַיִּים *unit of life* = *year* (cf. P. Joüon in *MUSJ* 5 [1911] 411).

d **Observation.** Quite often the vocalisation of Hebrew and comparison with Arabic do not allow us to determine whether we have an accusative, a genitive or an apposition, e.g. Jdg 3.15 אִטֵּר יַד־יְמִינוֹ *weak (?) in the*

right arm (acc. or gen.); Gn 18.6 שְׁלֹשׁ סְאִים קֶמַח *three measures of flour* (acc. or apposition)[1]; in expressions of the type שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים Gn 41.1 etc. *two full (in days) years*, there is an apposition rather than an accusative (cf. § 131 e). In Lv 5.15 בְּכֶסֶף־שְׁקָלִים *silver of several shekels*, there may be a genitive, or an apposition, or even an accusative.

(1) This example is given by Brockelmann as an apposition (*GvG*, II, p. 214), as an accusative (p. 267), by Driver (*Tenses*, § 194) as an accusative.

§ 128. Accusative with a passive verb

a The indirect accusative can obviously be used with a passive verb. Likewise there is no difficulty in the case of the accusative of internal object, e.g. Ex 21.12 מוֹת יוּמַת *he shall be put to death*; Is 45.17 נוֹשַׁע ... תְּשׁוּעַת עוֹלָמִים *it has been saved with an everlasting salvation*; and similarly for the accusative of the effected object.

b The **accusative of the affected object** is found with the impersonal passive: Gn 27.42 וַיֻּגַּד לְרִבְקָה אֶת־דִּבְרֵי עֵשָׂו *it was announced (= sbd announced) to Rebekah the words of Esau*. This strange construction can probably be explained thus: in a form of impersonal passive such as וַיֻּגַּד, the transitive value of the corresponding active form הִגִּיד *to announce* persists in some way; thus וַיֻּגַּד *and it was announced* is felt to be like *someone announced*[1]. That is how the variously explained[2] hybrid construction *legitur Virgilium* in the sense of *one reads Virgil*, developed in Mediaeval Latin alongside the classical construction *legitur Virgilius*. Similarly in Italian a reflexive form such as *si vede* ends up with the meaning of *one sees*, e.g. *la casa si vede*: "the house sees itself = is seen", but *si vede la casa*: "one sees the house"; *lo si vede*: "one sees it"; *si compra, si vende mobili*: "one buys, one sells furniture"[3]. More examples: 2Sm 21.11 and 1Kg 18.13 (again with הֻגַּד *someone announced*); Nu 32.5 יֻתַּן אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת *let one give this land*; 1Kg 2.21 (יֻתַּן again); Gn 4.18 וַיִּוָּלֵד לַחֲנוֹךְ אֶת־עִירָד *and it was born (sbd bore) to Enoch Irad (= to Enoch was born Irad)* (again with נוֹלַד 21.5; 46.20; Nu 26.60); Jer 35.14 הוּקַם אֶת־דִּבְרֵי יְהוֹנָדָב *one has carried out Jonadab's orders*; Ex 21.28 לֹא יֵאָכֵל אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ *one shall not eat its flesh*; 13.7 מַצּוֹת יֵאָכֵל *one shall eat unleavened bread (without*

אֵת because of the indetermination); Lv 6.13 (Nu 7.10) בְּיוֹם הִמָּשַׁח אֹתוֹ *on the day when one shall anoint him* (with pronoun); Nu 11.22 הַצֹּאן וּבָקָר *Would it, if one were to slaughter for them sheep and oxen, be enough for them? Would it, if one were to gather for them all the fish of the sea, be enough for them?* (In a the construction is the same as in b, but אֵת is omitted before the indeterminate noun). In Josh 7.15 הַנִּלְכָּד is in the nominative and יִשָּׂרֵף is impersonal passive: *he shall be burnt*; then the sentence proceeds while assuming an impersonal passive meaning for this same form: [*one shall burn him*] *him and all that he has*. See further: Gn 17.5; 21.8; 40.20; Ex 25.28; 27.7; Nu 26.55 (contr. 53); Is 21.2; Jer 50.20; Ps 87.3 (with participle).

The impersonal character of this construction is evident in the use of the 3m.sg. form of the verb irrespective of the gender and number of the logical object. But see Jer 36.22 וְאֶת־הָאָח לְפָנָיו מְבֹעָרֶת *and there was a fire in the brazier burning before him*; 2Sm 21.22 אֶת־אַרְבַּעַת אֵלֶּה יֻלְּדוּ; 2Kg 18.30 וְלֹא תִנָּתֵן אֶת־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת.

(1) Another explanation in Brock., GvG, II, pp. 126ff. Kropat (*Syntax*, p. 3) rejects the existence of this construction; according to him אֵת indicates the subject (cf. § 125 j). There may be some doubts about this construction in some cases, with אֵת and especially without אֵת, but it is difficult not to recognise the אֵת of the accusative in many cases, e.g. Gn 27.42. Besides, we also have אֵת with the pronoun: Lv 6.13. A fuller list of similar cases with אֵת may be found in Levi, *Inkongruenz*, p. 214, n. 1. For examples without אֵת, see ib., pp. 215-19. Cf. also F.I. Andersen, "Passive and ergative in Hebrew," Fschr. Albright [§ 35 b, n.], pp. 1-15.

(2) Cf. Ch. Thurot, "Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen-âge," in *Noüces et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, vol. 22, part 2 (Paris, 1869), pp. 302ff., 303.

(3) In Neo-Syriac a construction similar to the Hebrew one has developed: *'etkatev laḥtāvā hānā* "one has written this book" (Brock., GvG, II, p. 128).

ba   The impersonal passive can also occur with an indirect object: e.g. Ez 16.34 פֶּן יְבֻלַּע לַמֶּלֶךְ *you were not solicited*; 2Sm 17.16 אַחֲרַיִךְ לֹא זוּנָּה *lest the king be swallowed up*; Dt 21.3 עֶגְלַת בָּקָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־עֻבַּד בָּהּ *a heifer with which no work has been done*; Is 53.5, La 5.5(1).

(1) See J. Blau in Y. Avishur and J. Blau, *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East* [Fschr. S.E. Lowenstamm] [Heb] (Jerusalem, 1978), pp. 85-94.

c   **The second object of a doubly transitive verb remains in the accusative** when the verb is used passively (cf. § 125 u-w). Thus, in

---

the case of § 125 u, the type הֶרְאָנוּ אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ Dt 5.21 *he has caused us to see* (= has shown) *his glory* would become in the passive: הָרְאֵינוּ אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ *we have been made to see his glory* = *his glory has been shown to us*, e.g. Ex 26.30 כְּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ אֲשֶׁר הָרְאֵיתָ *according to its model which was shown to you* (אֲשֶׁר virtually in the acc. = הר' אֹתוֹ 'א); 25.40 (*ditto*); Gn 31.15 הֲלוֹא נָכְרִיּוֹת נֶחְשַׁבְנוּ לוֹ; Dt 2.20 אֶרֶץ־רְפָאִים תֵּחָשֵׁב אַף־הִוא. Strangely enough, in Lv 13.49 the first (logical) object is in the acc.: וְהָרְאָה אֶת־הַכֹּהֵן (*the wound*) *shall be shown to the priest* (one would expect וְהָרְאָה אֹתוֹ הַכֹּהֵן). More examples: Job 7.3 ; perh. Is 1.20? With the verbs of abundance and lack, the verbs of wearing and putting off: Ex 1.7 וַתִּמָּלֵא הָאָרֶץ אֹתָם *the land was filled with them*(1); Is 6.4; 38.10; Ps 80.11 כָּסּוּ הָרִים צִלָּהּ *the mountains were covered with its shadow*; Jon 3.5 שַׂקִּים יִתְכַּסּוּ as against 2Kg 19.1 וַיִּתְכַּס בַּשָּׂק. (See also the examples with the partic., § 121 o). In the case of § 125 v: 1Kg 6.7(?) אֶבֶן שְׁלֵמָה נִבְנָה (*the house*) *was built of whole stones* (comp. Dt 27.6). In the case of § 125 w: Mi 3.12 צִיּוֹן שָׂדֶה תֵחָרֵשׁ *Sion (in) agrum arabitur* = *"Zion shall be ploughed (as) a field"* (= Jer 26.18); Is 6.11; 24.12; Zech 14.4 (comp. Hb 3.9, quoted in § 125 w).

(1) With the same verb נִמְלָא, both objects are, oddly enough, in the accusative in Nu 14.21 (= Ps 72.19); but perh. אֵת here indicates the subject.

§ 129. Genitive and construct state

a   While the accusative is the *verbal* (§125 a) and *ad-verbial* case, the genitive is the *ad-nominal* case. Indeed a noun which is the *attribute* (§ 121 a, n.) of another noun is usually put in the genitive(1). The genitival relationship(2) is expressed by the close phonetic union of the two nouns, the first of which is said to be *constructed* on the second (§ 92 a). The *construct state* is the formal expression of the genitival relationship(3). The two nouns put in a genitival relationship form a compact unit, and theorically **nothing must separate them**(4).

The sequence of the two constituents is typical of Hebrew syntax in that the qualified precedes the qualifier as is the case in אִישׁ חָכָם "a wise man," הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה "this man," and הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי אָבִיו... "the man whose father I saw ..."

Consequently a complex idea such as *the sons of David and the daughters of David*, which in our languages is elliptically expressed as *the sons and daughters of David*, cannot be expressed by בְּנֵי וּבְנוֹת דָּוִד*, for the construct state בני would be separated from its resting point: it would be constructed, as it were, *in cantilever* and would not lean on a resting point([5]). Therefore the translation is בני דוד ובנותיו, This is the usual construction: Gn 41.8 *the magicians of Egypt and its wise men*; Jdg 8.14; 1Kg 8.28; 2Kg 2.12. Or one may say, quite simply בני דוד *men*; מַשְׁקֵה מֶלֶךְ מצרים והבנות, which is a less common construction: Gn 40.1 וְהָאֹפֶה *the cup-bearer and the baker of the king of Egypt*([6]). Finally in some cases (§ 130) one must resort to the circumlocution with לְ: הַבָּנִים והבנות אֲשֶׁר לְדוד *the sons and the daughters of (who belong to) David*, e.g. Gn 40.5.

(1) An attribute substantive can also be in the accusative (rather infrequently, § 127), and in apposition (§ 131). Finally a preposition with its noun is sometimes an attribute.

(2) In Arabic grammar the genitival relationship is called *annexation* ('*iḍāfat*): the first noun is said to be *annexed*, the second is *the one to which annexation is made*. In Hebrew grammar the first noun is called נִסְמָךְ "supported," and the second סוֹמֵךְ "supporting," whereas the syntactic relationship between the two nouns is known as סְמִיכוּת. Some scholars still use the Latin terminology: *regens* "the governing" (= נסמך) and *rectum* "the governed" (= סומך). In spite of the term 'genitive,' the form of the noun in the genitive remains unchanged as a result of the loss of the case endings in Hebrew.

(3) But the light vocalisation of the construct state goes beyond the case of the genitival relationship; it is sometimes found in other cases of close linking (§ *r*, *s*). One may wonder whether the relationship was felt to be properly genitival in cases where the noun was constructed on something other than another noun, e.g., on a preposition.

(4) The article of the second noun does not, of course, create a separation, nor does the paragogic *-â* (§ 93 *d*), e.g. בֵּיתָה יוֹסֵף Gn 43.17. But a possessive suffix would form a separation. However, we find the irregular expression Lv 26.42 אֶת־בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקוֹב *my covenant with Jacob* (two other examples *ibid.*; Jer 33.20 אֶת־בְּרִיתִי הַיּוֹם *my covenant with the day*†). The second noun, e.g. יעקוב, is virtually in the genitive, for the meaning is בְּרִית יעקוב אֲשֶׁר לִי (cf. Dt 4.31). It is hard to see why the author did not write יעקוב (or עִם יעקוב). Lambert (§ 230, n. 5) admits the possibility of a split construct chain in Ez 6.11 תּוֹעֲבוֹת רָעוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל *the evil abominations of the house of Israel*. See further § 129 *u* below. Note also Jer 9.2 וַיַּדְרְכוּ אֶת־לְשׁוֹנָם קַשְׁתָּם שֶׁקֶר, which ought to be compared with ib. 8.8 עֵט שֶׁקֶר סֹפְרִים. More examples of the type בְּרִיתִי יעקב are listed in König, *Syntax*, § 277a-b. On the other hand, there is no

---

need, *contra* Andersen (*Verbless*, pp. 37,67), to see a broken construct chain in Gn 49.3 (רְאוּבֵן בְּכֹרִי אַתָּה כֹּחִי וְרֵאשִׁית אוֹנִי) and to translate *Reuben, you are the firstborn of my strength*.

(5) There are probably a few exceptions: Is 11.2; Ez 31.16; Pr 16.11; Dn 1.4. In all these examples the two constructed nouns, being analogous, have been taken as constituting a unit. See M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, 1980), pp. 308-11. In some of these cases the phrase as a whole refers to a single entity: Ez 31.16 *the choice and best of Lebanon*; Ma 3.3 *refiner and purifier of silver*.

(6) Likewise the suffix can be omitted after a second verb (§ 146 *i*).

But a *nomen regens*([1]) can refer to **several juxtaposed genitives**; in **b** other words, it is not necessary to repeat the *nomen regens* before each genitive([2]). Its repetition or non-repetition depends on the meaning, the style and also the usage of each period([3]): Gn 24.3 בַּיהוה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וֵאלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ (in a solemn adjuration), but 14.19 אֵל עֶלְיוֹן קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ; 2Kg 3.13 לְךָ אֶל־נְבִיאֵי אָבִיךָ וְאֶל־נְבִיאֵי אִמֶּךָ (they are the same prophets); 2Kg 10.13; 1Sm 23.7 עִיר דְּלָתַיִם וּבְרִיחַ *a city with gates and bars*; Nu 31.52 מֵאֵת שָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים וּמֵאֵת שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאוֹת, but vs. 54 שָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים וְהַמֵּאוֹת. With בֵּימֵי עֻזִּיָּהוּ יוֹתָם אָחָז יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ Is 1.1 יְמֵי; in Nehemiah יְמֵי is repeated when different times are mentioned, and it is not repeated in the opposite case (cf. Ne 12.26,47; 12.22,46); עַצְמוֹת is repeated five times in Jer 8.1([4]).

(1) I.e., "governing noun" (= נִסְמָךְ), so called, since logically speaking the first noun is the nucleus of the phrase. The second noun is termed *nomen rectum* "governed noun."

(2) On an exchange of views on a different kind of ellipsis in the annexation structure, see M. Rotenberg in *Lĕš* 32 (1968) 347-58, M. Azar, ibid. 41 (1977) 180-90, and Rotenberg, ibid. 305-8.

(3) In the later period the repetition is readily omitted, e.g. 1Ch 18.10 כְּלֵי זָהָב וְכֶסֶף וּנְחֹשֶׁת (contr. the parall. 2Sm 8.10 כלי כסף וכלי זהב וכלי נחשת); 2Ch 24.14 (contr. 2Kg 12.14); cf. Kropat, *Syntax*, p. 55.

(4) Cp. Dn 8.20 מַלְכֵי מָדַי וּפָרָס (one empire) with 2Kg 23.22 מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה. Cf. § 132 *g*, n. 2, and M.Z. Kaddari in *Lĕš* 30 (1966) 121-30.

A genitive may govern a third noun and so forth: Gn 47.9 יְמֵי שְׁנֵי **c** חַיֵּי אֲבֹתַי *the days of the years of the life of my fathers*; 41.10 (4 nouns); Is 21.17 (6 nouns). Sometimes a לְ can break the **chain of genitives** (§ 130 *c*).

Kinds of genitives. Most relationships which there may be between **d**

two nouns are expressed by the genitival construction. Note in parti-
cular the following genitives:

A) **Subjective genitive:** 1) genitive of the subject **possessing** a
thing, a quality etc.: היכל יהוה *the temple of* Y.; אשתו *his wife*; חָכְמַת
שְׁלֹמֹה *the wisdom of Solomon*; 1Kg 10.9 אַהֲבַת יהוה *the love which* Y. *has*;
Lv 10.3 קְרֹבַי *they who come near me* (= קרֹבים אלי Ez 43.19, or קי׳ לי
42.13); Ne 5.14 לֶחֶם הַפֶּחָה *the food owed to the governor*; 2Sm 16.8 רָעָתֶךָ
the punishment which you deserve; Jdg 11.19 מְקוֹמִי *the place where I
must go*.

2) Genitive of the subject, who is **author of sth.**: דְּבַר יהוה *the
word of* Y.; Gn 24.33 דְּבָרַי *the words which I have to say (that I must
say)*; 2Ch 24.6 מַשְׂאַת מֹשֶׁה *the tax prescribed by Moses*.

e   B) **Objective genitive** in which the first noun indicates an action
performed to, for, or against a person indicated by the second noun:
Pr 20.2 אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ *the fear (one has) of the king*; Am 8.10 אֵבֶל יָחִיד *the
mourning for an only son*; Ob 10 חֲמַס אָחִיךָ *injustice against your broth-
er*; Gn 24.8 שְׁבֻעָתִי *the oath sworn in my favour*; Ps 56.13 נְדָרֶיךָ *vows to
you*; Jer 50.28 נִקְמַת הֵיכָלוֹ *vengeance for his temple* (but ibid. נקמת יהוה
subjective genitive); Dt 4.31 בְּרִית אֲבֹתֶיךָ *the pact with your fathers
(for את or עם)*: Is 32.2 סֵתֶר זָרֶם *shelter against the rain (for מן)*.

f   C) The other **objective genitives** are mainly:

1) the genitive of the **quality** expressed by an abstract noun
(which often makes up for the lack of adjectives): Ex 29.29 בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ
the garments of holiness (= the holy g.); Lv 10.17 מְקוֹם הַקֹּדֶשׁ *the holy
place (= the sanctuary)*[1]; Lv 19.36 מֹאזְנֵי צֶדֶק *scales of justice (just
s.)*[2]; 1Kg 20.31 מַלְכֵי חֶסֶד *merciful kings*; Gn 17.8 אֲחֻזַּת עוֹלָם *possession
in perpetuity*; Jdg 11.1 גִּבּוֹר חַיִל *valiant warrior*.

2) genitive of **whole**: Gn 8.9 כַּף־רַגְלָהּ *the sole of her foot*.

3) genitive of **genus**: Dt 23.15 עֶרְוַת דָּבָר *impropriety of a thing (=
something improper)*; 22.14 עֲלִילֹת דְּבָרִים *certain guilty actions*; Gn 16.12
פֶּרֶא אָדָם *a wild ass of a man*; Ez 36.38 צֹאן אָדָם *human cattle*.

4) genitive of **species**: Gn 23.4 אֲחֻזַּת־קֶבֶר *possession of a tomb*.

5) genitive of **material**[3]: Ex 20.24 מִזְבַּח אֲדָמָה *altar of earth*;
Josh 7.21 לְשׁוֹן זָהָב *tongue of gold*.

6) genitive of **measure**[4]: Lv 14.12 לֹג הַשֶּׁמֶן *the log of oil*.

7) genitive of **proper noun**[5]: Gn 15.18 נְהַר פְּרָת *the river (of)
Euphrates*; 13.12 אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן *the land of Canaan*; Jer 18.13 בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

the virgin (of) Israel; Is 37.22 בַּת יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם *the daughter (of) Jerusa-
lem*[6]. Compare the use of the indefinite pronoun פְּלֹנִי: 1Sm 21.3 (2Kg
6.8) מְקוֹם פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי *such and such a place* (§ 147 f).

8) **partitive** genitive: 2Ch 21.17 קְטֹן בָּנָיו *the youngest of his
sons* (§ 141 e); Gn 22.2 אַחַד הֶהָרִים *one of the mountains*; Jdg 5.29 חַכְמוֹת
שָׂרוֹתֶיהָ *the wise amongst her ladies*.

(1) But always מָקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ *a holy place*, Ex 29.31 etc. Otherwise קָדוֹשׁ is not used with
a noun of thing.
(2) The adjective צַדִּיק is not used for things.
(3) The word for material can also be in the accusative (§ 127 c: 1Ch 28.18) and in
apposition (§ 131 d: Ex 39.17).
(4) The word for a measured thing can also be in the accusative and in apposition
(§ 127 d).
(5) The proper noun can also be in apposition (§ 131 h).
(6) Comp. the type בְּתוּלַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן (§ 129 r), which presupposes בת in the construct
state.

The genitive is also used to express various **other determinations**:   i
Is 10.6 עַם עֶבְרָתִי *the people (object) of my anger*; Jer 7.29; 1Kg 20.42
אִישׁ חֶרְמִי *the man (object) of my anathema (whom I have doomed to an.)*;
Ps 107.30 מְחוֹז חֶפְצָם *the haven (object) of their desire*; Pr 5.19 אַיֶּלֶת
אֲהָבִים *hind (object) of love (= cerva carissima, Vulg.)*; 1Sm 20.14 חֶסֶד
יהוה *kindness inspired by Y. or worthy of Y.*; Ps 51.19 זִבְחֵי אלהים *sac-
rifices (pleasant) to God*; 29.2 (96.8†) כְּבוֹד שְׁמוֹ *glory due to (or wor-
thy of) his name*; 1Kg 2.43 שְׁבֻעַת יהוה *oath by Y.*; 2Sm 5.11 חָרָשֵׁי עֵץ
workers in wood; 1Kg 19.6 עֻגַת רְצָפִים *biscuit (baked) on burning stones*;
Josh 5.9 חֶרְפַּת מצרים *the disgrace (dating from) of Egypt*.

The notion of **dative** is quite often expressed by the genitive (most   j
examples are with the possessive pronoun, which are assumed to be in the
genitive, § 94 a): Ex 3.21 וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־חֵן הָעָם־הַזֶּה בְּעֵינֵי מצרים *I will give
to this people (to be an object of) favour in the eyes of the Egyp-
tians*[1] (with pronoun Gn 39.21 חִנּוֹ); Ex 2.9 אֶתֵּן אֶת־שְׂכָרֵךְ LXX
δώσω σοι τὸν μισθόν; Jdg 4.9 לֹא תִהְיֶה תִּפְאַרְתְּךָ *the glory shall not
be yours*; Dt 28.59 וְהִפְלָא אֶת־מַכֹּתְךָ *he will make you great wounds (he
will make your wounds great)*; Ec 2.4 הִגְדַּלְתִּי מַעֲשָׂי *I made myself great
works*; 1Kg 14.15 *they have made themselves Asherim*; Ps 20.3 *may he send
you help*. See also Lv 26.4; Ez 27.10; Job 5.23; 18.10.

(1) Cf. P. Joüon in *Bb* 2 (1921) 228. Note that in those sentences Hebrew perceives
the noun as being determinate, whereas for us it is logically indeterminate.

i   **Adjectives** with the genitive mainly express **limitation**([1]): Gn 39.6 יְפֵה תֹאַר *beautiful of form*; 41.4 הַפָּרוֹת רָעוֹת הַמַּרְאֶה *the cows bad of appearance* (if רְעוֹת were not construct, it would have the article, and not 'מ); Ex 34.6 אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם *slow to anger* (μακρόθυμος, *longanimis*) = *patient*; Ps 119.1 תְּמִימֵי דֶרֶךְ *wholesome in behaviour*; Is 6.5 טְמֵא־שְׂפָתַיִם *impure of lips* (= *with impure lips*).

It sometimes expresses **cause**: Lv 22.4 (Hg 2.13) טְמֵא־נֶפֶשׁ *impure by (the fact of) a corpse*; Nu 19.16 חֲלַל חֶרֶב *killed by the sword* (חָלָל, originally *pierced*, has become a subst.: *victim of the sword*). Note also Ct 2.5 חוֹלַת אַהֲבָה *love-sick*.

For the **participle** with the genitive cf. § 121 *m-p*, e.g. limitation (§ 121 *o*) קְרוּעֵי בְגָדִים 2Sm 13.31; cause § 121 *p*.

(1) The accusative is used very seldom, § 127 *b* (Job 15.10). Cf. W. Diem in *ZDMG* 136 (1986) 248-53; however, it must be pointed out that syntactically the Arabic "improper annexation" differs significantly from its Hebrew counterpart in that in Hebrew the second noun does not have to be determinate and the adjective cannot take the article.

ia   The syntax displayed by many examples of the structure under discussion in § *i* is interesting in that, in spite of the formal agreement between the first noun and the following adjective or participle, the subject-predicate relationship is in reality between the latter and the second noun. Thus in Ex 32.9 עַם קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף *a stiff-necked people*, the adjective קְשֵׁה is an attribute of עֹרֶף, as can be seen in expressions such as *Do not stiffen your neck any longer*: in the light of a usage such as 1Sm 25.3 הָאִישׁ קָשֶׁה *the man was rough*, the adjective in עַם קָשֶׁה would have a different connotation. Likewise 1Sm 1.15 אִשָּׁה קְשַׁת־רוּחַ([1]).

This construction is not confined to passive participles: e.g., the standing expression אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבַשׁ *a land flowing with milk and honey* in which the logical subject of the participle is clearly חָלָב וּדְבַשׁ.

(1) See Qimḥi ad loc., and a discussion in T. Muraoka, "The status constructus of adjectives in BH," *VT* 27 (1977) 375-80. A similar, but not totally identical phenomenon is known in Akkadian. Cf. also W. von Soden, "Status rectus-Formen vor dem Genitiv im Akkadischen und die sogenannte uneigentliche Annexion im Arabischen," *JNES* 19 (1960) 163-71.

j   **Genitival phrases** with אִישׁ, בַּעַל, and בֶּן־. These nouns, constructed on another (usually concrete) noun, express the possessor of a quality([1]).

With אִישׁ (and similarly מְתֵי *men of*; אֵשֶׁת *woman of*): 2Sm 16.7 אִישׁ הַדָּמִים *man of (shed) blood = bloodthirsty man*; Ex 4.10 אִישׁ דְּבָרִים *man of words = eloquent man*; 1Kg 2.26 אִישׁ מָוֶת *man worthy of death* (2Sm 19.29) (comp. בֶּן־מָוֶת with the same meaning); 1Sm 25.25 אִישׁ הַבְּלִיַּעַל *good-for-nothing* (also with בֶּן־); Gn 6.4 אַנְשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם *the famous men*.

With בַּעַל *owner of, master, lord*: Gn 37.19 בַּעַל הַחֲלֹמוֹת *the man with the dreams*; 14.13 בַּעֲלֵי בְרִית *allies*; 1Sm 28.7 בַּעֲלַת־אוֹב *(woman) who has a spirit = necromancer*.

With בֶּן־: 1Sm 20.31 בֶּן־מָוֶת *who deserves death* (comp. אִישׁ מות); 25.17 בֶּן־בְּלִיַּעַל *good-for-nothing* (cp. אִישׁ בליעל); 1Kg 1.52 בֶּן־חַיִל *virtuous*; to indicate age: Gn 21.5 בֶּן־מְאַת שָׁנָה *100 years old*; Ex 12.5 בֶּן־שָׁנָה *a one-year-old* (lamb), but בֶּן־שְׁנָתוֹ Lv 12.6 (lamb) *of the year*([2]).

בֶּן־ is also used to indicate that an individual belongs to a class of beings: Ez 2.1 בֶּן־אָדָם *an individual of the human species, a human, a man (homo)* as belonging to the species; Ps 29.1 בְּנֵי אֵלִים *individuals belonging to the* אֵלִים *divine beings* (cp. Gn 6.2 בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים and בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם. But the בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים are *disciples of the prophets*, not *prophets properly speaking*([3]).

(1) These expressions often make up for the lack of adjectives (cf. § *f*). For details see lexica.

(2) Properly speaking *son of the year in which he is*, and, therefore less than one year old (Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* ad loc.).

(3) Jon 4.10 בֶּן־לַיְלָה 'overnight" is apparently of a different origin: see G.A. Rendsburg, *Abr-Nahrain* 27 (1989) 110f.

k   Some **genitival phrases** with superlative meaning are found with an abstract first noun([1]): Gn 23.6 מִבְחַר קְבָרֵינוּ *the choice of our tombs = the choicest of our t.*; Is 37.24 קוֹמַת אֲרָזָיו *the height of its cedars = its very tall cedars* (= 2Kg 19.23).

(1) It is therefore the reverse of the case of § *f*.

Extension of the genitival construction and of the construct state. *l*
The construct state is found not only before a noun (substantive or adjective), but sometimes also before an adverb or a preposition([1]). It can also be found before a clause (treated as a nominal block § *p*). Finally the cst. state is sometimes used outside a genitival relationship, as a light linking form (§ *r*).

With an **adverb** (very rarely): Ex 27.13 פְּאַת קֵדְמָה *the east side*; 1Kg 2.31 דְּמֵי חִנָּם *blood (shed) without reason* (חִנָּם old subst., § 102 *b*, n.); Jer 23.23 אֱלֹהֵי מִקָּרֹב ... אֱלֹהֵי רָחֹק *a god near at hand ... a god far off*; Pr 26.2 קִלְלַת חִנָּם *gratuitous curse*; Jer 31.35 אוֹר יוֹמָם *the light of day* (יוֹמָם, § 102 *b*).

(1) There is no need to invoke here the postulated nominal origin of prepositions (§ 103 *a*). This is simply a case of the relationship of qualification, which is normally expressed by nouns, extended to prepositions, and such an extension occurs with adverbs or clauses as well.

m　　With a **preposition**: The following can be found constructed on a preposition followed by its noun: 1) a participle (quite a few examples, even in prose); 2) a substantive (rather few examples; seldom in simple prose); 3) the number *one* in the combination אַחַד מִן (comp. the light form of אחד in אַחַד עָשָׂר, § 100 *b*).

1) **Participle**: The frequent occurrence of a participle in the cst. state before a preposition is probably to be explained by the frequent occurrence of a participle constructed on a noun([1])(§ 121 *k* ff.). Examples: Is 9.1b יֹשְׁבֵי בְּאֶרֶץ צַלְמָוֶת *those who dwell in the land of the shadow of death* (contr. 1a הַהֹלְכִים בַּחֹשֶׁךְ); Ps 2.12 *all those who trust in him.* Also with בְּ: Is 5.11; Ps 84.7. With לְ: Is 30.18 חוֹכֵי לֹו *those who hope in him*; 64.3; 56.10 אֹהֲבֵי לָנוּם *loving to sleep* (with an infinitive); Ez 38.11; Job 24.5. With אֶל: Is 14.19 (quoted in § 121 *n*); Ez 21.17. With עַל: Jdg 5.10. With מִן: Is 28.9. With אֵת indicator of the acc.: Jer 33.22 מְשָׁרְתֵי אֹתִי *who serve me* (cf. § 121 *k*, n.). See also examples like Jer 49.16 (§ 93 *n*).

(1) Thus on the analogy of יֹשְׁבֵי צִיּוֹן it has been possible to say יֹשְׁבֵי בְצִיּוֹן. The scepticism expressed by Hummel can be safely dismissed: *JBL* 76 (1957) n. 92. The phenomena treated here in § *m*, *n*, and *o* have recently been discussed in terms of a "broken construct"; see D.N. Freedman, *Bib* 53 (1972) 534-36, and Waltke—O'Connor, *BH Syntax*, pp. 234, 371-90. However, they lend themselves to one or another more "traditional" interpretation; e.g. in Hb 3.13 יֵשַׁע לְיֵשַׁע אֶת מְשִׁיחֶךָ can be a variant inf. cst. (§ 49 *d*).

n　　2) **Substantive**: Is 9.2 שִׂמְחַת בַּקָּצִיר *joy at harvest time.* Also With בְּ: 2Sm 1.21; Is 5.11; Lam 1.1. With לְ: Ps 58.5; Lam 2.18; 1Ch 6.55; 23.28. With מִן: Jer 23.23; Ez 13.2; Ho 7.5. With אֵת: Is 8.6.

o　　3) With אַחַד: Gn 3.22 כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ *like one of us*; 1Sm 9.3 אַחַד מֵהַנְּעָרִים (perh. on the analogy of אַחַד הנערים); Jdg 17.1 etc.

Observation. It is perh. on the analogy of this use that אַחַד is sometimes found in cases where it cannot be regarded as *nomen regens*: 1) in liaison: Is 27.12 לְאַחַד אֶחָד (conjunctive accent and repetition); 2) without liaison: Gn 48.22 שְׁכֶם אַחַד (disjunctive accent); 2Sm 17.22; Zech 11.7.

Noun constructed on a clause. A clause, whether verbal or nominal, *p* forms a block which may, in some cases, be regarded as a substantive (§ 157); it will therefore be possible to consider it as a genitive in relation to a preceding noun, which will act as its *nomen regens*. In fact the following are found used as *nomen regens* in this position: 1) mainly nouns which have become prepositions; 2) some nouns used in an almost prepositional fashion; 3) (rather rarely) pure substantives keeping their full nominal value.

A genitival clause may be A) an ordinary (non-relative) clause; B) a relative clause.

A) **Ordinary clause** (non-relative):

1) With a *preposition*, e.g. אַחֲרֵי, עֵקֶב, בַּעֲבוּר, יַעַן, טֶרֶם (see lexica)([1]): e.g. אַחֲרֵי נִמְכַּר Lv 25.48 *after he has sold himself* (but usually אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר, § *q*).

Likewise with some particles otherwise used as adverbs: מֵאָז *since* (6 x), e.g. Josh 14.10 מֵאָז דִּבֶּר *since he spoke* (contr. Ex 4.10 with inf.); 2Sm 12.22 בְּעוֹד; Gn 43.3 בִּלְתִּי.

2) With a **noun** used in an **almost prepositional** way. Mainly בְּיוֹם *on the day when* (where יוֹם has a weakened meaning) = *when*: Ex 6.28 בְּיוֹם דִּבֶּר *on the day when he spoke*; כָּל־יְמֵי *all the days when* (weakened to *all the time when, as long as*); 1Sm 25.15 כָּל־יְמֵי הִתְהַלַּכְנוּ אִתָּם *all the time we were living among them*; Lv 14.16; cf. Job 29.2; Ps 56.4 יוֹם אִירָא אֲנִי אֵלֶיךָ אֶבְטָח *when I fear, I shall trust you*; Jer 6.15 בְּעֵת פְּקַדְתִּים *at the time that I punish them.*

3) With **pure substantives** (rare): Ho 1.2 תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר־יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ *Principium loquendi Domino in Osee* (Vulg.); literally: *beginning of (that which) Y. spoke ...* ; Is 29.1 קִרְיַת חָנָה דָוִד *city where D. encamped*; Jer 50.46 מִקּוֹל נִתְפְּשָׂה בָבֶל *at the news (of) that B. had been captured.* Possibly also Gn 1.1 : בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ *At the beginning of God's creation of the heaven and the earth...* ([2]).

(1) Cf. Brock., *GvG*, II, p. 549.

(2) Cf. H.M. Orlinsky in *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (Philadelphia,

1970), pp. 49-52.

q **B) Relative clause:**

a) **asyndetic relative clause** (rare; cf. § 158 *d*):

1) With a **preposition**: Jer 2.8 אַחֲרֵי לֹא־יוֹעִלוּ הָלָכוּ *they followed (those) which are good for nothing.*

2) With a **noun** used in an almost pronominal way: Ex 4.13 בְּיַד־תִּשְׁלָח *by the hand of one whom you will send.*

3) With a **noun**: Job 18.21 זֶה מְקוֹם לֹא־יָדַע אֵל *it is the place of him who does not recognise God*; 29.16; Gn 39.4 כָּל־יֶשׁ־לוֹ *all that he had*; similarly Ex 9.4; Ps 81.6; 2Ch 30.19.

b) **Syndetic relative clause** (with אֲשֶׁר; cf. § 158 *e*):

1) With **preposition** (very common), e.g. אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר (cf. § 104 *b*).

2) With a **noun** used in an **almost prepositional** way: Lv 13.46 כָּל־יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר *as long as* (Nu 9.18; rare); 2Sm 13.22 etc. עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר *(by the thing which)* = *because*(1). מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר *place where* (with weakening of meaning to *there where*)(2): Gn 39.20 בֵּית הַסֹּהַר מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֲסִירֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲסוּרִים *the prison, there where the king's prisoners were imprisoned*; 40.3; Ez 6.13; Esth 4.3; 8.17 (contr. הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר Ex 3.5 etc.). Likewise, with the preposition בְּ: בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר with weakened meaning *there where (everywhere)* 2Sm 15.21; Ne 4.14; and even without a weakening of the meaning: 1Kg 21.19 *in the (same) place where*; Lv 4.24,33; 6.18; 7.2; 14.13; Nu 9.17; Jer 22.12; Ez 21.35; (contr. e.g. Gn 35.13 בַּמָּ' אֲשֶׁר). With זֶה as relative (§ 145 *c*): Ps 104.8 אֶל־מְקוֹם זֶה יָסַדְתָּ לָהֶם.

(1) This same word דבר is once found constructed on a relative clause which is introduced by the indeterminate pronoun מה, acting as a relative: Nu 23.3 דְּבַר מַה־יַּרְאֵנִי *res τοῦ quidquid ostendet mihi* = "the thing, whatever it is, which he will show me."
(2) With אֶל: Ec 1.7 שֶׁ מְקוֹם אֶל. But Gn 19.27 אֲשֶׁר דַּמַּ׳ אֶל; and likewise with עַד Gn 13.3; מִן 13.14.

r **Construct state** as a pure **linking form**. In some cases the form of the construct state is found, although the noun cannot be regarded as *nomen regens*.

The only common case is the following: a noun **having in apposition** a genitival group (and thus with the cst. state) is itself in the cst. state: Is 37.22 בְּתוּלַת בַּת צִיּוֹן *the virgin daughter of Zion* (cf. § *f*); Jer 14.17 בְּתוּלַת בַּת־עַמִּי *the virgin daughter of my people*; 1Sm 28.7 אֵשֶׁת בַּעֲלַת־אוֹב *a woman who has a spirit (necromancer)*; Dt 21.11 אֵשֶׁת יְפַת־

תֹּאַר *a woman beautiful of form* (here with adjective, § *i*); with repetition of the same word: Gn 14.10 בֶּאֱרֹת בֶּאֱרֹת חֵמָר *pits, pits of bitumen* (§ 135 *e*; abs. בָּאֵרֹת); Nu 3.47. See also § 147 *d*, n.

s When **two nouns** are **joined by** ו and form a compact group, the first one sometimes has the light form of the cst. state(1): Ez 26.10 פָּרָשׁ וְגַלְגַּל וָרֶכֶב (conjunctive 1st accent, disj. 2nd); Is 33.6; Zech 13.1 (disj. accent).

For אַחַד, cf. § *o*.

(1) According to Brock., *GvG*, I, p. 108, this phenomenon is due to the accent of unity.

t **Stylistic use** of the genitive. The stylistic use of the genitive in a relative clause is to be noted; it is especially common with the possessive pronoun, which is assumed to be in the genitive (§ 94 *a*): 1Kg 12.8 (13) עֲצַת הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר יְעָצֻהוּ *the advice which the elders had given him*; 2Kg 17.22 חַטֹּאותָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה; 17.8,19; 21.16,17; Ex 32.32 סִפְרְךָ אֲשֶׁר כָּתַבְתָּ *the book which you have written*; Jdg 11.39; 1Kg 3.21; 2Kg 13.14; Ez 22.4(1).

(1) Comp. John 17.24 τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι "The glory which you have given me".

u Notwithstanding the general principle that nothing can break up a construct chain (§ *a*), some cognate languages, especially Ugaritic, suggest that BH may also have allowed the use of the enclitic Mem with the first noun in a construct chain, though its precise function remains obscure; for Ugaritic, see Gordon, *UT*, § 11.8. Out of a list of such possible cases mentioned by Hummel, the following appear reasonably assured: Gn 14.6 בְּהַרְרָם שֵׂעִיר *in the mountains of Seir*; Nu 21.14 וְאֶת־הַנְּחָלִים אַרְנוֹן *and the wadis of Arnon*; Ps 18.16 אֲפִיקֵי מַיִם *the channels of the sea* (= אֲפִיקִים יָם, cf. // 2Sm 22.16 אֲפִיקֵי יָם); Ps 110.3 מֵרֶחֶם מִשְׁחָר *from the womb of dawn* (= מרחמם שחר)(?): see H.D. Hummel, "Enclitic Mem in Early Northwest Semitic, esp. Hebrew," *JBL* 76 (1957) 85-107.

§ 130. Genitive replaced by לְ

a The usual way to express a genitival relationship (Eng. *of*) is to construct the first noun on the second (§ 129). But this construction

is often avoided by reason of necessity or even of simple expediency; ל *to* is used instead (in some cases אֲשֶׁר לְ § e)[1]. The transition in meaning from *to* to *of* can be seen in cases like 1Sm 14.16 הַצֹּפִים לְשָׁאוּל בְּגִבְעַת' *the sentinels whom Saul had in Gibeah* (almost: *the sentinels of Saul*). The practical equivalence of the genitive and ל is illustrated by passages like Jer 29.11 מַחְשְׁבוֹת שָׁלוֹם וְלֹא לְרָעָה *plans of happiness and not of misfortune* and Dt 28.50 לֹא־יִשָּׂא פָנִים לְזָקֵן *it will have no respect for the old man* compared with Lv 19.15 לֹא־תִשָּׂא פְנֵי דָל[2]; 1Ch 27.33 יוֹעֵץ לַמֶּלֶךְ ... רֵעַ הַמֶּלֶךְ. The genitival relationship is expressed by ל in the following cases:

(1) Comp. with *la maison à Jean* meaning *la maison de Jean* in Fr. popular speech. About the substitution of the dative for the genitive in spoken Latin, see F. Brunot, *Hist. de la langue française*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1905), p. 91: *fuit abbes monasterio nostro* C.I.L., XII.944, 6th century); *a deo honorem* (Le Blant, N.R., 323. Cf. in the Oaths of Strasbourg: *pro deo amur*). Cf. E. Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane* (Paris, 1910), § 228. See also BDB, s.v. ל, *b, c*.

(2) In Ez 20.6 צְבִי הִיא לְכָל־הָאֲרָצוֹת is equivalent to צְבִי כָל־הָאֲרָצוֹת הִיא: the place given to הִיא has brought about the resolution of the genitive into ל.

b   The genitive is usually avoided and replaced by ל when the second noun is determinate but the first one is logically **indeterminate**[1]. Thus *a son of Jesse* must normally be expressed as בֵּן לְיִשַׁי 1Sm 16.18; also before a proper noun (always determinate, § 137 *b*): Gn 14.18; 36.12; Nu 22.4; 36.7. *A prophet of Yahweh* is always נָבִיא לַיהוה (1Kg 18.22; 22.7; 2Kg 3.11; 2Ch 18.6; 28.9†. The form *נְבִיא is not attested).

A *Psalm of David* (indeterminate) is rendered by מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד (ל *auctoris* = ל of author [2]) Ps 3.1 etc. Likewise with a determinate genitival group: 2Sm 19.21 בָּאתִי רִאשׁוֹן לְכָל־בֵּית יוֹסֵף *I have come (the) first of all the house of Joseph* (רִאשׁוֹן indeterminate predicative, § 126 *a*); Gn 41.12. Likewise before a noun with suffix (always determinate): Ex 20.5 (to retain the indetermination of רְבִעִים, on the analogy of the preceding nouns; likewise vs. 6).

(1) Because the determination of the *nomen rectum* normally brings about the determination of the *nomen regens* (§ 139 *a*); thus בֶּן־יִשַׁי normally means *the son of Jesse*.
(2) H. Cazelles, "La question du < Lamed auctoris >," *RB* 56 (1949) 93-101, denies the existence of such a Lamed in early Hebrew, though it may have been later so interpreted. He compares cases like לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר and לְדָוִד alone, and is inclined to see here a "lamed de titulature, qui indique la destination, l'appartenance ou le classement."

Rainey argued for the Lamed of "recipient" in Samaria ostraca as against that of "donors" (Yadin). A.F. Rainey, *PEQ* 99 (1967) 32-41, ib. 102 (1970) 45-51.

ל is also used in order not to alter some expressions with a geniti- *c* val construction: 1Kg 14.19 סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel*. (The words דברי הימים form a compact group[1]; moreover ל makes it possible to avoid a sequence of four genitives); Josh 19.51; 2Kg 5.9; 11.4. After place names: Gn 23.9 לְמְעָרַת הַמַּכְפֵּלָה; Jdg 19.14 אֵצֶל הַגִּבְעָה אֲשֶׁר לְבִנְיָמִין אֲשֶׁר לוֹ[2].

This construction is particularly preferred where the first noun forms a close semantic unit with the immediately following one(s); the relationship may be represented as

(a + b) + c,

where *c* in turn can consist of more than one noun. This also applies to many cases mediated by אֲשֶׁר לְ- (discussed in § *e* below). Where three or more nouns follow one after another in genitival relationship, the first normally serves as the nucleus of the entire chain:

a + (b + c + ...).

Thus in Gn 3.2 פְּרִי עֵץ הַגָּן, the הגן is to be construed with עֵץ rather than with פְּרִי: (עֵץ הגן) + פְּרִי.

(1) A similar explanation applies to many cases of the use of ד" in BA: see T. Muraoka in *JSS* 11 (1966) § 2.1 - 2.2.
(2) See Y. Peretz, *The Relative Clause* [in Heb.] (Tel Aviv, 1967), p. 126.

Such is the case, in particular, with **dates**: Ezr 1.1 בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת לְכוֹרֶשׁ *d* *in the year 1 of Cyrus*; Hg 1.1 בִּשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְדָרְיָוֶשׁ; 1Kg 15.28 בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלֹשׁ לְאָסָא (cf. § 142 o); Hg 1.1 בְּיוֹם אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ. Compare the use of adjectival ordinals: 2Ch 29.3 בַּשָּׁנָה הָרִאשׁוֹנָה לְמָלְכוֹ *in the first year of his reign*; 1Kg 3.18 בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְלִדְתִּי *the 3rd day of* (= *after*) *my giving birth.*

אֲשֶׁר לְ *who (is) to* may be used instead of ל in some cases in order to *e* give more precision or more emphasis: 1Kg 1.33 הַפִּרְדָּה אֲשֶׁר־לִי *my mule (my own m.)*; or in order not to alter an expression with a genitival construction (cf. § *c*): Ct 1.1 שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה *the Song of songs, of Solomon*; 1Sm 21.8; 2Sm 2.8. After a noun with the article ל אֲשֶׁר is quite often used for no clearly apparent reason[1]: Gn 29.9 הַצֹּאן אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיהָ *the flock of her father*; 31.19; 47.4; 1Sm 20.40 הַנַּעַר אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ *his servant*; also with a pronoun: 25.7; 2Sm 14.31; 1Kg 4.2; Ru 2.21. Cp. Ex 29.29 בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ לְאַהֲרֹן and 39.41 בִּגְדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן. This con-

struction is a BH precursor of the MH -שֶׁלְ, and is already attested in ninth century Phoenician[2].

(1) This construction thus expresses separately determination and the relation of possession, as if the writer thought first of one, then of the other. The simple ל is not usual in this case.

(2) Segert, *Gram. of Phoen. and Pun.*, § 77.321. Indeed, the above-quoted example from Ct 1.1 is instructive in that this is the sole instance of אשר in the book, -שֶׁ being its equivalent elsewhere, and since it occurs in the title of the work, it is likely to be of secondary origin. Thus we are dealing here with a calque of שְׁלִשְׁלֹמֹה.

f   **Observation.** אֲשֶׁר לְ may be compared with אשר בְ, which is sometimes equivalent to a local genitive: 1Kg 18.38 הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר בַּתְּעָלָה *the water of the canal*; 2Kg 5.3 הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר בְּשֹׁמְרוֹן; 6.12 הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל; 1Kg 13.32 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית־אֵל *the altar of Bethel* (vs. 4 without אשר); 2Kg 10.29. The genitive is not used to say *cedar of the Lebanon*, which is rendered by הָאֶרֶז אֲשֶׁר בַּלְּבָנוֹן(2Kg 14.9 = 2Ch 25.18, where same construction is used for *thistle of the Lebanon, wild beast of the Lebanon*); 1Kg 5.13†; or, with בְ alone, ארז בלבנון Ez 31.3; Ps 92.13¯. For the *islands of the sea*, alongside אִיֵּי הַיָּם Is 11.11; 24.15; Esth 10.1†, the expression הָאִיִּים אֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם is found only once (Ez 26.18†).

fa   The construction discussed in § f, namely a prepositional phrase qualifying a noun, can occur with other prepositions as well: Gn 3.3 מִפְּרִי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ־הַגָּן *from the fruits of the tree in the midst of the garden*; 2Sm 17.11 כַּחוֹל אֲשֶׁר־עַל־הַיָּם *like the sand on the sea*; Gn 24.54 הוּא וְהָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־עִמּוֹ *he and the men (who were) with him*; 2Kg 5.4 הַנַּעֲרָה אֲשֶׁר מֵאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל *the girl from the land of Israel*.

The use of the relative pronoun in these cases is normal, and has the *effect* of averting an erroneous analysis whereby these prepositional phrases are misconstrued as adverbial phrases: for instance, in 2Kg 5.3 אַחֲלֵי אֲדֹנִי לִפְנֵי הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר בְּשֹׁמְרוֹן could, without the relative, be taken to mean *I wish that my lord were before the prophet and in Samaria*[1].

(1) The story is told of a shop assistant who, on being approached by a customer asking to try on a particular suit in the shop-window, felt obliged to point out that a fitting room was available on the premises for that purpose! Cf. § 132 *a*, and see also M. Azar, "The prepositional phrase as attribute in BH" [Heb], *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1977), 1.43-54.

g   ל equivalent to a genitive and attribute of a preceding noun (§ a)

must also be compared with ל **referring to the verb** to indicate *to whom* the action refers. In that case the ל with its noun (or pronoun) is not equivalent to a genitive, since it refers to the noun and not to the verb; in practice, however, this construction expresses in an indirect way the genitival relationship of possession[1]. Examples: Gn 17.12 יִמּוֹל לָכֶם כָּל־זָכָר "shall be circumcised *to you* every male" = *all your males shall be circumcised* (vs. 10; 34.15,22; Ex 12.48); Dt 23.3 (vss. 4,9) גַּם דּוֹר עֲשִׂירִי לֹא יָבֹא לוֹ *etiam generatio decima non ingredietur ei* = "even his tenth generation shall not enter"; Jer 13.13 הַמְּלָכִים הַיֹּשְׁבִים לְדָוִד עַל־כִּסְאוֹ *reges sedentes Davidi super thronum ejus*[2] = "the kings [of the house of] David who sit on his throne" (22.4); Gn 50.23; Dt 22.14; 1Sm 2.33; 9.3,20; 11.2; 25.34; 1Kg 2.4; 14.10,13; 2Kg 10.30; Is 26.14; 33.14; Jer 48.35; Am 9.1; Ps 128.6; 132.12; Lam 1.10.

(1) One may compare the common Italian construction of the type: *gli è morta la madre*, in which the focus is on *to him*, whereas in the construction: *è morta la sua madre*, interest bears on *the mother*.

(2) C.H. Cornill (*Das Buch Jeremia* [Leipzig, 1905]) translates literally: *die Könige, welche dem D. auf seinem Throne sitzen*; likewise F. Giesebrecht in *Das Buch Jeremia* (Göttingen, ²1907).

§ 131. Apposition

Apposition is the simple juxtaposition of a noun to a preceding   a
noun. Whereas the noun in the genitive or in the attributive accusative is subordinated to the preceding noun, the noun in apposition is coordinate to the first noun; it is therefore in the same case as the first noun. There subsists a relationship of identity between the two components, which can be transformed into a nominal clause. The one component usually also agrees with the other in determination or indetermination. Apposition is used in Hebrew in a much broader way than in our languages. This is mainly due to the fact that Hebrew can use in a very loose manner a nominal clause with a substantive as predicate (§ 154 e).

Thus, just as one can say הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֵץ *the altar (is) wood* (cf. Ez 41.22)[1], one can also say המזבח העץ* *the altar (of) wood* (cf. § d). As a rule, two nouns which can be subject and predicate of a nominal clause can become first noun and noun in apposition[2].

Hebrew having lost its case-endings, it may happen that a noun which seems to be in apposition, and is even felt to be so, may originally have been an attributive accusative (§ 127)(3). The comparison with classical Arabic can throw some light in certain cases; but sometimes Arabic allows several constructions: apposition, genitive, accusative. In fact, a good many examples remain doubtful (cf. § 127 d).

(1) And consequently also עָשָׂה אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עֵץ he made the altar (of) wood, § 125 v.
(2) But a noun in apposition cannot always be used as a predicate.
(3) Thus it is that in vulgar Arabic, where cases no longer exist, the singular /kitāb/ book in /'arba'ta'š kitāb/ fourteen books can be felt to be in apposition, although it is originally an accusative of specification: /kitāban/.

b   Main cases of apposition:

1) The noun of **species** in apposition to the **genus**(1): Dt 22.23 נַעֲרָה בְתוּלָה a virgin young woman; 2Kg 9.4 (with the article) הַנַּעַר הַנָּבִיא the prophet young man. The words אִישׁ man and אִשָּׁה woman often have a substantive or a substantivised noun: Ex 2.14 אִישׁ שַׂר וְשֹׁפֵט (man) prince and judge; Lv 21.9 אִישׁ כֹּהֵן priest; Jer 38.7 אִישׁ סָרִיס eunuch; 2Sm 14.5 אִשָּׁה אַלְמָנָה widow (1Kg 7.14; 11.26; 17.9,10); 2Sm 15.16 נָשִׁים פִּלַגְשִׁים concubines; 1Kg 3.16 שְׁתַּיִם נָשִׁים זֹנוֹת two prostitutes; Gn 13.8 אֲנָשִׁים אַחִים brothers; Dt 13.14 אֲנָשִׁים בְּנֵי־בְלִיַּעַל worthless men, cf. Jdg 19.12 בְּנֵי־בְלִיָּעַל.

(1) An analogous usage is known in Greek as well, as far back as Homer, e.g. Iliad xvi 263 ἄνθρωπος ὁδίτης a wayfarer.

c   2) The noun (concrete or abstract) expressing a **quality** of a thing (rare): 1Sm 2.13 הַמַּזְלֵג שְׁלֹשׁ הַשִּׁנַּיִם the fork (with) three teeth (note the determination); Ex 30.23 בְּשָׂמִים רֹאשׁ first quality perfumes, cf. Ct 4.14 אֲמָרִים אֱמֶת(1); Pr 22.21 words (of) truth (but strange after the usual construction אִמְרֵי אֱמֶת; cf. § 129 f)(2); Jer 10.10 אֱלֹהִים אֱמֶת; Ps 68.17 הָרִים גַּבְנֻנִּים mountains (which are) cones (? strange after הַר ג' in vs. 16); 120.2 לָשׁוֹן רְמִיָּה tongue (of) falsehood (strange after שְׂפַת שֶׁקֶר); Zech 1.13 דְּבָרִים נִחֻמִים words (of) comfort (strange after the construction with adjective דְּבָרִים טוֹבִים). Cf. a nominal clause of the type Ps 19.10 מִשְׁפְּטֵי יהוה אֱמֶת.

(1) More examples of this kind may be found in Sperber, Hist. Gram., p. 604.
(2) Cf. BDB, s.v. אֱמֶת, 5. In poetry we also meet with a bold expression with אֱמֶת alone: e.g. Ps 119.142 צִדְקָתְךָ צֶדֶק לְעוֹלָם וְתוֹרָתְךָ אֱמֶת. See also Pr 3.17 דְּרָכֶיהָ. and cp. Ex 3.5 הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו דַּרְכֵי־נֹעַם וְכָל־נְתִיבוֹתֶיהָ שָׁלוֹם

הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו קֹדֶשׁ הוּא with Josh 5.15 אַדְמַת קֹדֶשׁ הוּא Cf. R. Sappan The Typical Features of the Syntax of Biblical Poetry in its Classical Period [Heb] (Jerusalem, 1981), pp. 57f.

d   3) The noun of **material** (rare): 2Kg 16.14 הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת the altar of bronze (to be read so, instead of הַמִּזְבֵּחַ; cf. Ez 41.22, § a); Ex 39.17 הָעֲבֹתֹת הַזָּהָב the cords of gold (but the Samaritan Pentateuch has the cst. עבתת, which gives the usual construction with the genitive, § 129 b); Ex 26.26 בְּרִיחִם עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים bars of acacia wood, cf. 36.31 בְּרִיחֵי ע' שׁ'; 1Ch 15.19 מְצִלְתַּיִם נְחֹשֶׁת brass cymbals(1).

(1) There are a fair number of exceptions to the basic rule of the genitive, i.e. the noun in the construct does not take the definite article: 2Kg 25.11 הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּבֶל the king of Babylon; Ez 46.19 הַלְּשָׁכוֹת הַקֹּדֶשׁ; 1Ch 9.26 הַלְּשָׁכוֹת בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים. הָאֹצְרוֹת בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים Cf. also Is 242 כִּגְבֻרָתֶךָ. For more examples and a discussion of them, see König, Syntax, § 303, and below, § 140 c.

e   4) The noun of the **thing measured** (doubtful): Gn 18.6 (cf. § 127 d); Gn 41.1 שְׁנָתַיִם יָמִים two full (in days) years (for the acc. the sing. יוֹם would be more likely, § 127 d). 1Kg 16.24 כִּכְּרַיִם כֶּסֶף two talents of silver; 2Ch 4.13 שְׁנַיִם טוּרִים רִמּוֹנִים two rows of pomegranates.

f   5) The noun of **number** (or equivalent): In the type בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה sons three (in number) = three sons (§ 142 d); Nu 9.20 יָמִים מִסְפָּר days (in small) number (comp. Dt 33.6 מִסְפָּר as predicate of a nominal clause; but usually with the gen., e.g. מְתֵי מִסְפָּר Gn 34.30 etc.); Ne 2.12 מְעַט אֲנָשִׁים a few people.

g   6) The noun of the **thing numbered**: In the type שְׁלֹשָׁה בָנִים three sons (§ 142 d, e); contr. with acc. sing. אֶחָד עָשָׂר יוֹם, § 127 b.

h   7) The **proper noun** in apposition to the **thing named** (rare; normally the genitive is used, § 129 f): 1Ch 5.9 הַנָּהָר פְּרָת the river Euphrates (but פ' may be an explanation); Gn 14.6; Nu 34.2; Ezr 9.1; 1Kg 16.24; Esth 8.15; Ezr 8.21 הַנָּהָר אַהֲוָא (but 8.31 מִנְּהַר א').

i   8) The **proper noun of person** in apposition to a noun of **kinship**, of group etc.: אָחִיו הֶבֶל his brother Abel(1).

Observation. A preposition, as well as the **particle** אֵת of the accusative, is generally repeated: Gn 32.19 לְעַבְדְּךָ לְיַעֲקֹב to your servant Jacob; 2Sm 7.8 עַל־עַמִּי עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל(2); Gn 4.2 אֶת־אָחִיו אֶת־הֶבֶל; 23.7 לְעַם־הָאָרֶץ לִבְנֵי־חֵת (cf. § 132 g). Likewise the nomen regens is re-

peated: Gn 19.4 אַנְשֵׁי הָעִיר אַנְשֵׁי סְדֹם *the men of the city of S.*; 32.12 מִיַּד אָחִי מִיַּד עֵשָׂו *from the hand of my brother Esau.*

(1) In this *explanatory apposition* ('*atf ul-bayān* of the Arabs) the second word is more precise, more determinate than the first.

(2) But 1Ch 17.7 (parall.) does not repeat the preposition; contr. also 2Sm 7.10,23 with 1Ch 17.9,21 (cf. Kropat, *Syntax*, p. 43); both structures within a single verse in 1Ch 11.2 אֵת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל ... עַל עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל. With מְלֹךְ the particle is never repeated, except once (2Sm 20.21 בַּמֶּלֶךְ בְּדָוִד. For more examples of the repeated particle, see I. Peretz in *Proceedings of the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1969), p. 131.

j 9) The noun of **kinship** etc. in apposition to a **proper noun**: Gn 4.8 אֶל־הֶבֶל אָחִיו *to Abel his brother.* This construction is less common than the previous one(1).

(1) This is the substitution (the *badal* of the Arabs) of the whole for the whole. The second member is less precise than the first; the preposition is not repeated.

k 10) The noun of **office**, occupation, title, in apposition to a **proper noun**: Ex 31.10 לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן *to Aaron the priest*; 1Sm 22.5 גָּד הַנָּבִיא; 1Kg 2.17 לִשְׁלֹמֹה הַמֶּלֶךְ. The word מֶלֶךְ *king*, followed by a name of country or people, naturally comes after the proper noun of person: Gn 14.1 אַמְרָפֶל מֶלֶךְ שִׁנְעָר; Ezr 1.1 כֹּרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ־פָּרַס, but vs. 7 הַמֶּלֶךְ כּוֹרֶשׁ. The phrase הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה 1Kg 2.19, with הַמֶּלֶךְ coming first, is also attested (contr. vs. 17); Is 39.3; 2Ch 22.11; Esth 1.12 הַמַּלְכָּה וַשְׁתִּי (contr. vs. 11 וְשַׁתִּי הַמּ'); 1Kg 1.43 אֲדֹנֵינוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ־דָּוִד; in this case הַמֶּלֶךְ is the main word of the group(1).

(1) See the collection of texts in König, *Syntax*, § 133 x.
שְׁלֹמֹה הַמֶּלֶךְ represents the dominant Aramaic syntax. The vocable מֶלֶךְ is exceptional in that the type הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד is almost the rule in Sm and Kg, but in Ch the reverse order shows a marked increase (25 vs. 20), a tendency observable in a number of Middle and Late Aramaic dialects; cf. Y. Peretz in *Proceedings of the Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1969), p. 131.

l 11) The word כֹּל in apposition to the thing: 2Sm 2.9 יִשְׂרָאֵל כֻּלֹּה *Israel its whole = the whole of Israel*; Ez 29.2 מִצְרַיִם כֻּלָּהּ; often in Ezekiel, e.g. 11.15; 14.5; 20.40 etc.

m **Loose apposition.** Apposition is sometimes used in a loose way for stylistic reasons. Thus with a numeral: 2Kg 14.7 הוּא הִכָּה אֶת־אֱדוֹם בְּגֵי־מֶלַח עֲשֶׂרֶת אֲלָפִים *it is he who struck Edom in the valley of Salt: 10,000 (men)*; vs. 13 *he broke down the walls of Jerusalem ... : 400 cubits*; 2Sm 10.6 *they hired Aram Beth-rehob and Aram Zobah: 20,000 foot sol-*

diers, the king of Maacah: 1,000 men ... etc. There is also loose apposition in the sentence Dt 3.5 עָרִים בְּצֻרֹת חוֹמָה גְבֹהָה דְּלָתַיִם וּבְרִיחַ *forti-fied cities: high walls, gates and bars* (comp. 1Kg 4.13; 2Ch 8.5).

APPENDIX: Apposition or genitive after a proper noun. A proper noun **n** cannot, as a rule, be followed by a genitive. However a place name which retains its primary appellative value is put in the cst. state; thus מִצְפֶּה *ob-servation post*: 1Sm 10.5; גִּבְעַת אֱלֹהִים 1Sm 11.4 etc., גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל *hill*: גִּבְעָה 2Sm *capital*: רַבָּה 1Sm 22.3; מִצְפֵּה מוֹאָב 12.26. Even if the value of appellative is no longer apparent, the genitive is used when there are several places which bear the same name: thus with אֲרָם *Aram*: אֲרָם נַהֲרַיִם Gn 24.10; אֲרָם צוֹבָה 2Sm 10.6; אוּר כַּשְׂדִּים *Ur of the Chaldees* Gn 11.28. In some cases the vocalisation seems to indicate the absolute state: אָבֵל מַיִם 2Ch 16.4; אָבֵל מִצְרַיִם Gn 50.11; אָבֵל בֵּית־מַעֲכָה 1Kg 15.20; יָבֵישׁ גִּלְעָד(1). The cst. (and the patah, § 96 D *d*) is strange in Am 6.2 חֲמַת רַבָּה† *Hamat - Capital*(2). The case of Is 60.14 is noteworthy: צִיּוֹן קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל *Zion of the Holy of Israel.*

(1) The usual spelling with י is perhaps intended to make sure that the *ẹ* is pronounced.
(2) Cf. P. Joüon in *MUSJ* 5 (1911) 420.

In the **divine name** יהוה צְבָאוֹת, the first noun, being a proper noun, **o** cannot be constructed on the second. Therefore there is apposition(1): *Yahweh (the) hosts* or if, as is likely, צְבָאוֹת was felt to be a proper noun(2), *Yahweh-ṣvā'ot.* That is why we find the Qre אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת *Adonãy ṣ.*; that is why we also find the expression אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת (Ps 59.6; 80. 15,20; 84.9) where אֱ takes the place of יהוה(3).

But the origin of יהוה צְבָאוֹת is still obscure. It is generally assumed that this is an ellipsis for יהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת *Y. God of hosts*, which is found in e.g. 2Sm 5.10(4).

(1) Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen* ad 1Sm 1.11.
(2) Cf. LXX Σαβαώθ e.g. Is 5.9 (comp. James 5.4 εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαώθ).
(3) The parallelism with יהוה צבאות renders it unlikely that the Mem of אלהים is enclitic, as suggested by H.D. Hummel, *JBL* 76 (1957) 97. Cf. also A. Murtonen, *A Philological Treatise on the OT Divine Names* (Helsinki, 1951), pp. 67ff., 74ff.
(4) A recently discovered 8th century B.C. inscription from Kuntillet 'Ajrud in Sinai with יהוה שמרן and יהוה תמן "Yhwh of Samaria" and "Yhwh of Teman" suggests that יהוה could have been used as a common noun: see a discussion by J.A. Emerton, "New light on Israelite religion: the implications of the inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 2-20.