replaced by LBH *sbyb sbyb*;[56] and *ḥṣr*, »enclosure« is replaced by LBH *ʿzrḥ*.[57]

Although two of his examples are questionable,[58] the remaining seven do establish that the vocabulary of the Priestly Code does *not* reflect an awareness of the technical vocabulary of the post-exilic period in the areas of sacrificial regulations, religious donations, cloth used for sacred purposes, and temple *loci*.[59] It is possible to conclude on the basis of Hurvitz's diachronic semantic analysis, that the *terminus ad quem* for the technical language of the Priestly document is the end of the exilic period.[60]

Hurvitz presses the data too far when he asserts that the Priestly Code is pre-exilic chronologically because the evidence indicates that exilic Ezekiel occupies an intermediate position between the Code and LBH.[61] The non-Palestinian linguistic milieu of Ezekiel's activity may explain the presence of the late terms in his writings and militates against drawing chronological conclusions affecting Palestinian compositions.[62].

A second linguistic study which may be interpreted to corroborate Hurvitz's major conclusion is that of Robert Polzin *Late Biblical Hebrew:*

Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose.[63] Polzin first isolates 19 linguistic features which are characteristic of the post-exilic language of the Chronicler (1026½ verses), 16 of which are not attributable to Aramaic influence on pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew and which therefore must be attributed to inner-Hebrew developments.[64] He next examines three corpora of texts which are admittedly not of late post-exilic composition in order to determine the number and frequency with which these characteristic features of LBH are attested. Comparing his analysis of the Chronicler with those of the corpora, Polzin plots his results on a continuum indicating a diachronically developing linguistic typology, and describing the linguistic profile of the individual corpora.[65] The corpora examined are a sampling of JE from Exodus and Numbers (216 verses), the Court History, CH (308 verses), and a sampling of Dtr (269 verses).[66]

The foregoing analyses provide a control against which the results of an analysis of the priestly groundwork, Pᵍ (678½ verses), and of secondary additions to the priestly composition, Pˢ (578½ verses), can be compared.[67] Their position on the continuum of developing linguistic features is then used to establish their time of composition.

---

[56] »The Evidence,« 39–41.
[57] »The Evidence,« 41–43.

[58] Hurvitz does not establish that LBH *yḥś* (= *yḥs*) is a semantic equivalent to the pre-exilic terms, but only that it is a post-exilic term used in similar though not exactly equivalent expressions (pp. 27–29). His discussion of LBH *ḥph* is incomplete. In the Qal, it is attested in both pre-exilic and LBH sources with the sense »to cover« (the head/face) in shame, e.g. II Sam 15 30; Jer 14 4; Est 6 12, 7 8, and in Nifal with the sense »to be covered/plated« with silver in Ps 68 14. This latter sense in LBH is expressed only in Piel. *ṣph*, as Hurvitz's examples demonstrate, is attested in both pre-exilic and post-exilic texts, and therefore cannot be considered replaced by *ḥph* in the Piel. The absolute contrast is, therefore, not possible. (Cf. pp. 32–33.)

[59] »The Evidence,« 47. I am not sure how to classify *sbyb*.

[60] Cf. R. Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose (= Harvard Semitic Monographs 12) Missoula, 1976, 168–9 for an appreciation of the significance and implications of Hurvitz's work. The following section of this study broaches the issues raised by Polzin. I thank Dr. Polzin for allowing me to work with his dissertation prior to its publication.

[61] »The Evidence,« 51, 54. Ezekiel employs both the P and LBH terms in the cases of *šš-bwṣ*, *sbyb-sbyb sbyb*, and *ḥṣr-ʿzrḥ*. (The last pair are not used synonymously [cf. p.42 note 33 bis].) Elsewhere he uses the P term, *lqḥ dm* and the LBH ones *hdyḥ*, *m...wlmʿlh*. (Cf. p.46.) Additional buttressing evidence in support of this position will appear in A. Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem (= Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 20) to be published in 1982. I thank Prof. Hurvitz for allowing me to read the page proofs of this important study.

[62] With regard to this aspect of the problem, Hurvitz's study is incomplete in that it does not follow through with an analysis of *why* the changes came about. Aramaic influence is reasonably posited for the development of *sbyb sbyb* (= Aram. *šwr šwr* and *ḥzwr ḥzwr* cf. p.40) as well as many other similar LBH examples: *yōm wāyōm* (Est 3 4), *ʿᵃbōdāh waʿᵃbōdāh* (1 Chr 28 14). Cf. Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 47–51.

[63] Cf. above note 60. Polzin's conclusions on the basis of his analysis are different from the ones which we draw below.

[64] Late Biblical Hebrew, ch. 2. Cf. pp. 27–28 for the list of non-parallel passages used in his analysis.

[65] Late Biblical Hebrew, 91. This is done in ch. 3.

[66] Late Biblical Hebrew, 91.

[67] Polzin determines Pᵍ on the basis of »those passages commonly agreed to be P by S.R. Driver, O. Eissfeldt, M. Noth, and Harford-Battersby and Carpenter« (p. 101). The following is his list of verses:

Pᵍ

Gen 1 1 to 2 4a; 5 1-28, 30-32; 6 9-22; 7 6, 11, 13-16a, 18-21, 24; 8 1-2a, 3b-5, 13a, 14-19; 9 1-17, 28-29; 10 1a, 2-7, 20, 22, 23, 31-32; 11 10-26, 27, 31-32; 12 4b, 5; 13 6abα, 11b, 12abα; 16 1a, 3, 15-16; 17; 19 29; 21 2b-5; 23; 25 7-10, 12-17, 19-20, 26b; 26 34-35; 27 46; 28 1-9; 35 9-13a, 15 22b-29; 36 1-2a, 6-8; 37 1-2a; 41 46a; 46 6-7; 47 27b-28; 48 3-6; 49 1a, 29-33aαb; 50 12-13.
Total verses for Genesis = 268.
Ex 1 1-5, 7, 13, 14b; 2 23b-25; 6 2-12; 7 1-13, 19, 20aα, 21b, 22; 9 8-12; 12 1, 3-20, 28, 40, 41; 16 1-3, 6-7, 9-13a, 14; 19 1; 24 15b-18a; 25 1-40; 26 1-37; 27 1-21; 28 1-43.
Total verses for Exodus = 221.
Lev 9 1-4a, 5-10a, 11-17a, 18-22, 23b, 24b.
Total verses for Leviticus = 21½.
Num 1 1-47; 2 1-34; 3 5-10, 14-25, 27-30, 32a, 33-39; 8 5-22; 10 11-12; 13 1-2bα, 25-26, 32a; 14 1aα, 2, 5-7, 10, 26-27a, 28-29, 35-38; 20 2, 3b-4, 6-8, 10, 11b-12, 22b-23; 22 1b; 27 12-14.
Total verses for Numbers = 164½.
Dtn 34 1aα, 7-9.
Total verses for Deuteronomy = 3½.
Sum of Totals: Genesis, 268 + Exodus, 221 + Leviticus, 21½ + Numbers, 164½ + Deuteronomy, 3½ = 678½ verses for Pᵍ (pp. 88–90).