We thus have here a clear and typical

instance of reasoning in a circle: first these passages are attributed to J because they contain *yāladh;* thereafter the deduction is made that *yāladh* is an expression peculiar to J.

Furthermore, the verb *yāladh* in the *Qal* occurs a number of times in the Bible in the signification of *hōlīdh,* even in poetry (for example: *You were unmindful of the Rock that* BEGOT YOU [*yelādhᵉkhā*], Deut. xxxii 18); and even outside the Pentateuch, for instance, Hos. v 7: *They have dealt faithlessly with the Lord; for they have begotten* [*yālādhū*] *alien children;* so, too, Psalms (ii 7), Proverbs (xvii 21; xxiii 22, 24), and Job (xxxviii 29). There can be no doubt, therefore, that the usage is not restricted to any particular linguistic section.

The *Hiph'īl 'hōlīdh',* even more so, cannot be regarded as characteristic of any special linguistic group; it is the normal expression for 'begetting' in the Bible and throughout the entire range of Hebrew usage, as all Hebrew-speaking persons are well aware. It will thus be seen that the documentary theory does not solve the problem of the difference between the sections that use *yāladh* and those that employ *hōlīdh.* Is it possible to find another solution that is acceptable? Indeed it is possible.

It will suffice to note the fact that the verb *yāladh* occurs in the signification of *hōlīdh* only in the *past tense* [perfect] and the *present* [participle]. We say, 'so-and-so *yāladh* [mas. sing. perfect] so-and-so', and we say *yōlēdh* [participle mas. sing.; 'is begetting']; but we do not say in the *future tense* [imperfect] 'so-and-so *yēlēdh* [to signify: 'he will beget'] (or *wayyēledh* [imperfect with *Wāw* conversive, to connote: 'and he begot']) so-and-so'. In the imperfect, the *Qal* is employed only with reference to the mother, for example, 'so-and-so *tēlēdh* ['will give birth to'] (or *wattēledh* ['and gave birth to']) so-and-so'. In connection with the father one can only say, *yōlīdh* [*Hiph'īl* imperfect; 'he will beget'] or *wayyōledh* [*Hiph'īl* imperfect with *Wāw* conversive; 'and he begot'] (although we find in Prov. xxvii 1: *what a day may bring forth* ['*yēledh*' *Qal* imperfect], the verb is not used there in the connotation of 'begetting' but actually in the sense of 'giving birth'). Similarly, we do not say, using the infinitive, '*aḥărē lidhtō* [to signify 'after his begetting'] but only '*aḥărē lidhtāh* ['after her giving birth']; with regard to the father we can only say, '*aḥărē hōlīdhō* ['after