where LBH does use the introductory infinitive construct with b^e and k^e this usage is different from earlier constructions.

A9　The third feminine plural pronominal suffixes: the Chronicler shows a merging of the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix.

A11　*Wayhi* greatly recedes in Chronicles and in the younger language.

A12　The cardinal numerals: in appositional relationship, the Chronicler prefers to place the substantive before the numeral and most always puts it in the plural. This is contrary to the older general practice of putting the number first.

B1　Material and its weight or measure: appositional order: the Chronicler often has: material weighed or measured + its weight or measure (+ number).[70]

A2.　The 0 figure reported for Dtr on p. 94 of the study is misleading. Polzin himself lists 13 occurences of the construction in the Deuteronomistic history of which Dtr is the author/editor and concedes that of the 13, at least four are »unable to be shown as late passages,« i.e. Dtn 22 24; I Sam 17 34; 20 13; II Sam 11 25.[71] In fact, none of the 13 are demonstrably late chronologically, though a few may be secondary insertions, e.g. Dtn 14 13-17; Josh 17 11; 22 17; Ju 20 44, 46. Minimally, according to Polzin's own evaluation, four examples are either earlier than or coeval with Dtr.

---

[70] The references in Polzin's study are for A2 – pp. 32–37; A3 – pp. 38–40; A4 – pp. 40–42; A6 – pp. 43–44; A7 – pp. 45–46; A9 – pp. 52–54; A11 – pp. 56–58; A12 – pp. 58–60; B1 – pp. 61–64. The remaining features described and discussed in ch. 2 of the study are the following:

A1.　Redically reduced use of 'et with pronominal suffix (pp. 28–32).

A5.　The Chronicler exhibits a preference for plural forms of words or phrases which the earlier language uses in the singular (pp. 42–43).

A8.　Repetition of a singular word = Latin quivis (pp. 47–51). Cf. note 57 above.

A10.　The first person singular imperfect with -āh (the lengthened imperfect or cohortative) is found but once on the Chronicler's language (pp. 54–55).

A13.　The Chronicler shows an increased use of the infinitive construct with l^e (pp. 60–61).

The following features were influenced by Aramaic:

B2.　l^e is used very often as mark of the accusative (pp. 64–66).

B3.　*Min*: »from:« the *nun* is often not assimilated before a noun without an article (p. 66).

B4.　The Chronicler uses the l^e emphatic before the last element of a list (pp. 66–68).

B5.　*Rabbim* used attributively is placed twice in Chronicles before the substantive (p. 68).

B6.　Chronicles uses ‘*ad* l^e, »up to,« before a substantive indicating a spatial or temporal limit (p. 69).

[71] Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 35.

The construction is also attested twice in pre-exilic Jeremiah (Jer 36 22; 45 4) and six times in exilic Ezekiel (e. g. Ez 10 22; 17 21; 29 4).[72] These data indicate that the structure is employed in pre-exilic Hebrew, albeit late pre-exilic Hebrew, and cannot be considered an innovative characteristic of LBH.

A3.　Polzin's description of this feature includes three distinct constructions: a) noun + suffix + 0 + noun; b) noun + suffix + l^e + noun; and c) noun + suffix + *šel* + noun.[73] (Actually, type c is noun + suffix + *sě* + l^e + noun.) Type a is attested seven times: Jer 52 20 (a post-exilic addition = II King 25 17); Ez 10 3; 42 14; Ps 49 14; Prov 13 4; Job 29 3; Ezr 2 62 (= Neh 7 64). Type b is attested five times: I Chr 7 4, 5, 9; 24 19; II Chr 31 18.[74] Type c is attested once, in Song of Songs 3 7. Type a is a pre-exilic construction which continued to be employed into the exilic period while type c will be dated according to the date assigned to Song of Songs. Only type b is attested in the Priestly source (– all 3 types are absent from the other corpora –) and is used in drawing a chronological conclusion. All five examples of type b occur in lists.

The 13 examples of this feature listed under P[g] all come from Num 1 where the same construction recurs in a list (Num 1 23-43; $p^e q\bar{u}d\bar{e}hem$ $l^e matt\bar{e}h$ x) while the 3 examples from P[s] (Num 4 36, 40, 44) involve the same vocable as in Num 1, $p^e q\bar{u}d\bar{e}hem$ $l^e mišp^e h\bar{o}t\bar{a}m$.

Since the structure is attested in P[g] and P[s] with only one word, $p^e q\bar{u}d\bar{\iota}m$, in the same »list« genre there is in fact only one attestation of

---

[72] Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 34.

The myriad of questions involved in dating the sections of these prophetic books are beyond the scope of this study. The prose of Jeremiah has its closest affinities with Deut. and with Dtr – even when it may not be of Jeremianic composition. Ezekiel, by and large, is an exilic composition deriving primarily from the early years after the destruction of the Temple. Although Ezekiel's language is that of the 6th Century (cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I [BKAT], Neukirchen: Neukirchen Vluyn, 1969, 31*–35*), it is neither preexilic nor LBH typologically (cf. Hurvitz, »The Evidence of Language,« 25, 43, 51, and idem »The Term *lškt šrym* (Ez 40 44) and its Position in the Cultic Terminology of the Temple,« (in Hebrew) EI 14 (1978) 103–104.

[73] Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 39.

[74] I am not convinced that I Chr 8 28; 9 34; 26 31 are used the same way. Ezra 9 1b is grammatically difficult. While Polzin's translation (p. 35) of the half-verse as involving a *b* type construction may be correct (»according to the abominations of the Canaanites«) it must be challenged since it does not clarify the sentence. The noun, $k^e t\bar{o}^e b\bar{o}t\bar{e}hem$, appears to refer to the abominable acts of the Priests and Levites, and to those of the nation as a whole; the list of nations is a paranthetical appositive »to ‘*my h*·*rṣt*« while the sentence continues in v. 2.

With the exception of Ezr 9 1b, the five examples of type *b* as well as the three texts from Chronicles mentioned at the beginning of this note are from lists.