

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIBLICAL HEBREW
PREPOSITIONS

SBL Press

ANCIENT NEAR EAST MONOGRAPHS

Jeffrey Stackert
Juan Manuel Tebes

Editorial Board:
Pablo R. Andiñach
Jeffrey L. Cooley
Roxana Flammini
Lauren Monroe
Emanuel Pfoh
Andrea Seri
Bruce Wells

Number 28

SBL Press



THE DEVELOPMENT OF BIBLICAL HEBREW
PREPOSITIONS

By
H. H. Hardy II

SBL Press



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2022 by H. H. Hardy II

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022935202

SBL Press

In loving memory of
Kathryn Marie Hardy
24 June 1982–16 February 2017

SBL Press

SBL Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	xv
Abbreviations	xvii
Transliteration	xxi
Introduction	1
1. Grammaticalization Framework	3
1.1. Towards a Definition	3
1.2. Grammaticalization of Future Markers in English	7
1.3. Issues in Grammaticalization Theory	9
1.4. Lehmann’s Six Parameters	17
1.5. Theoretical Framework for the Present Study	20
1.6. Studies of Grammaticalization in Semitic	26
1.7. Methodology.....	28
2. Biblical Hebrew Prepositions.....	31
2.1. Overview of Semitic Prepositions	31
2.2. Classification of Hebrew Prepositions.....	32
3. The Development of Simple Prepositions	37
3.1. אָהַר <i>ʔahar</i>	37
3.2. אָחַרִי <i>ʔah^are</i>	52
3.3. אֶצֶל <i>ʔeʕel</i>	66
3.4. בֵּין <i>ben</i>	73
3.5. בַּעַד <i>baʕad</i>	86
3.6. חֲלִפֵּי <i>heleṗ</i>	91
3.7. יָעַן <i>yaʕan</i>	93
3.8. נֶגֶד <i>neḡed</i>	94
3.9. נֹכַח <i>noḵaḥ</i>	98
3.10. סָבִיב <i>sabib</i>	102
3.11. עָקֵב <i>ʕeqeb</i>	106
3.12. תַּחַת <i>tahaṭ</i>	108

3.13. Other Prepositions.....	118
3.14. Overview of Simple Prepositions	120
4. Multi-Word Prepositions.....	123
4.1. Multi-Word Prepositions and Grammaticalization.....	123
4.2. Grammaticalization of Biblical Hebrew Multi-Word Prepositions....	125
4.3. The Development of Multi-Word Prepositions	125
4.4. בְּגֵלָל <i>biḡlāl</i>	127
4.5. בְּיוֹם <i>bəyom</i>	129
4.6. בְּעִבּוּר <i>baʿṣ̄bur</i>	133
4.7. בְּקֶרֶב <i>bəqereḅ</i>	136
4.8. בְּתוֹךְ <i>bətoḵ</i>	140
4.9. כְּפִי <i>kəpī</i>	148
4.10. לְבֵד <i>ləḅad</i>	152
4.11. לְיָד <i>ləyad</i>	155
4.12. לְמַעַן <i>ləmaʿan</i>	158
4.13. לְנֹכַח <i>lənoḵaḥ</i>	163
4.14. לְפִי <i>ləpī</i>	166
4.15. לְפָנַי <i>ləp̄nē</i>	169
4.16. לְקִרְאָת <i>liqraʾt</i>	175
4.17. מִיּוֹם <i>miyyom</i>	180
4.18. מִפְּנֵי <i>mipp̄nē</i>	183
4.19. עַל יְרֵךְ <i>ʿal yerek</i>	186
4.20. עַל פִּי <i>ʿal pī</i>	190
4.21. Other Examples.....	194
4.22. Overview of Multi-Word Prepositions	197
5. Conclusion	201
5.1. Overview of the Study	201
5.2. Diachronic Change and Grammaticalization in Biblical Hebrew.....	202
5.3. Further Implications.....	208
5.4. Suggestions for Future Studies	222
Bibliography.....	223
Ancient Source Index.....	239
Modern Author Index.....	286

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Overlap Model.....	16
Figure 1.2. Parameters of Grammaticalization	17
Figure 1.3. Expansion	25
Figure 1.4. Retraction.....	26
Figure 3.1. Functional Developments of <i>ʔaħar</i>	50
Figure 3.2. Overlap Model for <i>ʔaħar</i>	51
Figure 3.3. Semantic Map of <i>ʔaħar</i>	51
Figure 3.4. Functional Developments of <i>ʔaħ^are</i>	64
Figure 3.5. Overlap Model for <i>ʔaħ^are</i>	64
Figure 3.6. Semantic map of <i>ʔaħ^are</i>	65
Figure 3.7. Functional Developments of <i>ʔeşel</i>	72
Figure 3.8. Overlap Model for <i>ʔeşel</i>	73
Figure 3.9. Semantic Map of <i>ʔeşel</i>	73
Figure 3.10. Functional Developments of <i>ben</i>	84
Figure 3.11. Overlap Model for <i>ben</i>	84
Figure 3.12. Semantic Map of <i>ben</i>	85
Figure 3.13. Semantic Map of <i>başad</i>	91
Figure 3.14. Semantic Map of <i>ħeleḫ̄p̄</i>	93
Figure 3.15. Semantic Map of <i>neḡed</i>	97
Figure 3.16. Functional Developments of <i>noḳaħ</i>	101
Figure 3.17. Overlap Model for <i>noḳaħ</i>	101
Figure 3.18. Semantic Map of <i>noḳaħ</i>	101

Figure 3.19. Functional Developments of <i>səḥib</i>	106
Figure 3.20. Overlap Model for <i>səḥib</i>	106
Figure 3.21. Semantic Map of <i>səḥib</i>	106
Figure 3.22. Semantic Map of <i>ʕeqəḅ</i>	108
Figure 3.23. Functional Developments of <i>taḥaṭ</i>	117
Figure 3.24. Overlap Model for <i>taḥaṭ</i>	117
Figure 3.25. Semantic Map of <i>taḥaṭ</i>	118
Figure 3.26. Semantic Map of <i>bet</i>	119
Figure 4.1. Overlap Model for <i>biḡəlal</i>	128
Figure 4.2. Semantic Map of <i>biḡəlal</i>	128
Figure 4.3. Overlap Model for <i>bəyom</i>	133
Figure 4.4. Semantic Map of <i>bəyom</i>	133
Figure 4.5. Overlap Model for <i>bəqereḅ</i>	139
Figure 4.6. Semantic Map of <i>bəqereḅ</i>	140
Figure 4.7. Functional Developments of <i>bətok</i>	147
Figure 4.8. Overlap Model for <i>bətok</i>	147
Figure 4.9. Semantic Map for <i>bətok</i>	148
Figure 4.10. Overlap Model for <i>kəḗi</i>	151
Figure 4.11. Semantic Map of <i>kəḗi</i>	151
Figure 4.12. Overlap Model for <i>ləḅad</i>	155
Figure 4.13. Semantic Map of <i>ləḅad</i>	155
Figure 4.14. Overlap Model for <i>ləyaḍ</i>	158
Figure 4.15. Semantic Map of <i>ləyaḍ</i>	158
Figure 4.16. Functional Developments of <i>ləmaʕan</i>	162
Figure 4.17. Overlap Model for <i>ləmaʕan</i>	162
Figure 4.18. Semantic Map of <i>ləmaʕan</i>	162
Figure 4.19. Functional Developments of <i>lənoḳaḥ</i>	165
Figure 4.20. Overlap Model for <i>lənoḳaḥ</i>	165
Figure 4.21. Semantic Map of <i>lənoḳaḥ</i>	165

Figure 4.22. Functional Developments of <i>lāḫi</i>	168
Figure 4.23. Overlap Model for <i>lāḫi</i>	168
Figure 4.24. Semantic Map of <i>lāḫi</i>	169
Figure 4.25. Functional Developments of <i>liḫne</i>	174
Figure 4.26. Overlap Model for <i>liḫne</i>	174
Figure 4.27. Semantic Map of <i>liḫne</i>	175
Figure 4.28. Overlap Model for <i>liqraḫt</i>	179
Figure 4.29. Semantic Map of <i>liqraḫt</i>	180
Figure 4.30. Overlap Model for <i>miyyom</i>	183
Figure 4.31. Semantic Map of <i>miyyom</i>	183
Figure 4.32. Functional Developments of <i>mippəne</i>	186
Figure 4.33. Overlap Model for <i>mippəne</i>	186
Figure 4.34. Semantic Map of <i>mippəne</i>	186
Figure 4.35. Overlap Model for <i>ḫal yerek</i>	189
Figure 4.36. Semantic Map of <i>ḫal yerek</i>	189
Figure 4.37. Functional Developments of <i>ḫal pi</i>	192
Figure 4.38. Overlap Model for <i>ḫal pi</i>	192
Figure 4.39. Semantic Map of <i>ḫal pi</i>	193
Figure 4.40. Semantic Map of <i>bəḫēḫes</i>	195
Figure 4.41. Semantic Map of <i>bəḫet</i>	196
Figure 4.42. Semantic Map of <i>miḫḫad</i>	197
Figure 5.1. Semantic Map of <i>ḫaḫar</i>	203
Figure 5.2. Semantic Map of <i>ḫaḫ^are</i>	203
Figure 5.3. Functions of <i>ḫaḫar</i> in Standard Biblical Hebrew	205
Figure 5.4. Functions of <i>ḫaḫar</i> in Late Biblical Hebrew	205
Figure 5.5. Functions of <i>ḫaḫ^are</i> in Standard Biblical Hebrew	206
Figure 5.6. Functions of <i>ḫaḫ^are</i> in Late Biblical Hebrew	206
Figure 5.7. Overlap Model of <i>ḫaḫar</i> , <i>ḫaḫ^are</i> , and <i>ḫaḫor</i>	208
Figure 5.8. Evolution of Locative Expressions from Nominal Sources	210

SBL Press

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Classification of Hebrew Prepositions.....	34
Table 3.1. Usage Comparison of <i>ʔaḥar</i> and <i>ʔaḥ^are</i>	66
Table 3.2. Semantic Distribution of <i>ben</i> Usage Patterns	85
Table 3.3. Comparison of Feminine- and Masculine-type plurals of <i>səḅib</i>	102
Table 3.4. Nominal and Verbal Suffixed Forms of <i>taḥat</i>	109
Table 3.5. Grammatical Outcomes from Nouns	121
Table 4.1. Complex Prepositions	126
Table 4.2. Grammatical Outcomes from Preposition Phrases	198
Table 5.1. Ratio of Lexical Sources to Grammatical Outcomes.....	211
Table 5.2. Tokens of Grammatical Outcomes without Lexical Sources.....	213
Table 5.3. Body Part Sources.....	216
Table 5.4. Location Sources.....	217
Table 5.5. Object Sources	219
Table 5.6. Relation Sources	219
Table 5.7. Abstract Sources	220
Table 5.8. Verbal Sources	220
Table 5.9. Locative Function Sources.....	221
Table 5.10. Directional Function Sources.....	222
Table 5.11. Temporal Function Sources	222

SBL Press

PREFACE

The present volume comprises more than a decade of research on grammaticalization and the development of Biblical Hebrew prepositions. Various components of this study were presented at three annual meetings of the Society for Biblical Literature in 2011, 2014, and 2017. These presentations and the subsequent feedback from a number of scholars aided considerably in my thinking and the development of the project.

I am profoundly indebted to Dennis G. Pardee, Rebecca Hasselbach, and Salikoko Mufwene for their guidance. Many thanks to the magnanimous contributions over the years from Pete Bekins, Drayton Benner, Samuel Boyd, Aaron Butts, Andrew Dix, Brian Gault, Young Bok Kim, Matthew McAfee, Jody Otte, Benjamin Thomas, Jacqueline Vayntrub, and many others. Thank you, James Spinti, for your princely encouragement. Particular acknowledgment is due Daniel Rodriguez who interacted substantively with this investigation in personal communication and his own thesis (Rodriguez 2016).

Special thanks are in order to Jeffrey Stackert, who encouraged publishing this work in the Ancient Near Eastern Monograph series, and Nicole L. Tilford for curating the project with SBL Press. Two anonymous reviewers provided beneficial comments and meticulous observations on the manuscript. Calvin Jaffarian offered instrumental technical experience in creating the graphics. Ms. Billie Goodenough assisted attentively with the final editing and type-setting.

The final submission was facilitated by a year-long sabbatical in 2019 granted by the trustees of Southeastern Seminary (Wake Forest, North Carolina) and facilitated by the faculty and administration. I would also like to thank an unnamed patron who provided a research grant in the summer of 2020.

Finally, this volume is dedicated to my late wife, Katy. Her steadfast support—even in the most difficult days—is the reason the original study was completed. It is with great sadness that she was not able to see this finished product. May her memory be a blessing for she is not forgotten.

SBL Press

ABBREVIATIONS

The Leipzig glossing rules and conventions developed in consultation with the Max Planck Institute (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>), as much as possible, are used for the interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme linguistic abbreviations.

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABS	absolute state
ACCRD	accordantive
ADJ	adjective
ADJP	adjective phrase
ADV	adverb(ial)
ADVZ	adverbializer
AUX	auxiliary
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BEN	benefactive
BTWN	between function
C	common gender
<i>CTA</i>	Herdner, Andrée, ed. <i>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939</i> . Paris:Geuthner, 1963
CAUS	causative
CJ	conjunction
CJ ADV	conjunctive adverb
COM	comitative
COMP	complementizer
CSTR	construct state
DEM	demonstrative
DIR	directional
DOM	direct object marker

EA	El-Amarna tablets. According to the edition of Jörgen A. Knudtzon. <i>Die el-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908–1915. Repr., Aalen: Zeller, 1964. Continued in Anson F. Rainey, <i>El-Amarna Tablets</i> , 359–79. 2nd rev. ed. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1978.
Eval	evaluative
EXIST	existence marker
F	feminine gender
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
GN	geographical name
IMP	imperative
INF	infinitive
INSTR	instrumental
KAI	Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–1969.
KTU	Dietrich, Manfred, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín, eds. <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013. 3rd enl. ed. of <i>KTU: The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places</i> . Edited by Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995.
LM	landmark
LOC	locative
LOG REL	logical relation
M	masculine gender
N	noun
NEG	negation, negative
NP	noun phrase
PART	partitive
PC	prefix conjugation
PL	plural
PN	proper noun
POSTP	postposition
PP	preposition phrase
PREP	preposition
PRS	present
PRO	pronoun
PTCP	participle
PTCL	particle
PURP	purpose
Q	question particle/marker
RCPR	reciprocative
REL	relative

S	sentence
SC	suffix conjugation
SG	singular
SPRT	separative
TEMP	temporal
TR	trajector
VB	verb
VP	verb phrase
WCPC	<i>waw</i> -consecutive prefix conjugation
WCSC	<i>waw</i> -consecutive suffix conjugation

SBL Press

SBL Press

TRANSLITERATION

The Biblical Hebrew consonant system is represented in Latin transliteration following the paradigm:

א	ך	ח	ה	פ	ף	p
ב	b	ט	t	פ	ף	p̄
ב	b̄	י	y	צ	ץ	s
ג	g	כ	ך	ק		q
ג	ḡ	כ	ך	ר		r
ד	d	ל	ל	ש		š
ד	d̄	מ	ם	ש		ś
ה	h	נ	ן	ת		t
ו	w	ס	s	ת		t̄
ז	z	ע	ע			

For a more phonemically-oriented description of Tiberian Hebrew, this representation may be compared with that of Khan (2020, 240–42).

The Tiberian seven vowel system for Biblical Hebrew is transliterated as *a*, *o*, *ε*, *e*, *i*, *o*, and *u*. For a discussion of the allophonic realizations of *pataḥ* as the open front [a] and the open back [ɑ] qualities, see Khan (2020, 248–51). The zero-vowel (∅) realization of *schwa* is not transliterated. Even though vocalic schwa ([a]) and the *ḥatef* vowels ([a], [o], [ε]) were likely read as full vowels (Khan 2020, 305–20), the graphic distinction is maintained with vocal schwa signified as ə and the compound-schwa vowels supra-linearly as ^a, ^o, and ^ε. The presence of *matres lectionis* is not represented in transliteration system. Vocalic length is not represented.

The individual Semitic languages are transliterated according to their standard phonetic systems. The Central Semitic languages are represented consistent with Fox (2003, xvii–xix); Akkadian follows Huehnergard and Woods (2004); Geʿez corresponds to Leslau (1987); and Old South Arabian conforms to Beeston (1984) and Stein (2003).

SBL Press

INTRODUCTION

At every linguistic level—phonological and morphological, syntactic and pragmatic—speakers interact and adapt to one another’s speech in discrete, recurrent steps to create meaning. These collaborative steps produce ongoing language variation and the perception of change. Structural innovation and procedural spread are offset with contraction and abandonment. On one level, concrete utterances generate variation in new contexts. But also, discourse occasions incipient structures, or procedures, that construct emergent grammar. Like partners dancing, verbal interaction couples memetic speech with expanding eclecticism. This improvised negotiation results in the emergence of shared grammar as epiphenomenal. Notably, such a conception contrasts with the common notion of grammar as “an abstract mentally represented rule system ... [of] already available abstract structures and schemata” (Hopper 1987).

Two linguistic approaches are often employed to describe the choreography of language. A mostly synchronic assessment explains the relationship between the convergences and divergences of grammar from the standpoint of an individual and/or circumscribed community, whereas a diachronic examination explores the origin, development, and spread of adaptations unbounded by the temporal constraint of a speaker. While not ignoring the synchronic realities of language, the present work adopts a diachronic framework to investigate the development and emergence of Biblical Hebrew prepositions. It should be noted that determining actual historical change is not the end goal of the present study but rather potential (or shall we say cogent) semantic development. The resulting grammatical exploration accounts for language variation and change within a robust linguistic framework and an inductive, data-driven investigation in the textual corpus of the Hebrew Bible. Findings from cognitive linguistics and diachronic typology help to shed light on the evolution of prepositions. Moreover, it is shown that a “grammaticalization theory” can provide not just a descriptive rubric for individual changes but can help to account for the system-wide development of innovative grammatical functions.

In view of the extensive research conducted on Biblical Hebrew prepositions, one may query what, if anything, another study can offer. Previous work, while valuable, has largely been conducted using traditional philological approaches

often without substantial integration of current linguistic frameworks. Where up-to-date methods have been employed, the scope of study—rarely more than a lone preposition—affords only limited evaluation. This study presents a more comprehensive appraisal. It integrates an utterance-based or discourse-oriented approach with a clause-by-clause analysis of the Biblical Hebrew preposition usage. Forty-one source constructions (types) are examined comprising a total of nearly seven thousand tokens. Several novel semantic functions are plausibly identified. A semantic development pathway is proposed for each preposition from its source to all evidenced outcomes. In sum, the study yields a novel accounting of prepositions not merely as polysemous semantic glosses but through developmentally related functional use.

Chapter 1 presents an introduction to the theoretical framework of grammaticalization. A review of common approaches and a working definition is provided. Chapter 2 describes the grammatical characteristics of Biblical Hebrew prepositions including the morphological categories of simple and multi-word prepositions. Chapter 3 provides an examination of a subset of the simple prepositions. The source constructions, the functional usages, and the potential development(s) are assessed. Chapter 4 includes a similar accounting of the changes attested with Biblical Hebrew multi-word prepositions. Finally, Chapter 5 aggregates and compares the data on a corpus-wide scale.

One overarching goal of the study is to provide an interchange of ideas, or maybe even a prototype for constructive discourse, between research in linguistics and traditional grammatical approaches. The volume includes both a linguistic discussion—for those interested in the theoretical background—and a philological discussion—for those interested in the more data-driven approach. The intended audience includes grammatically minded readers in biblical studies who are interested in understanding and implementing current linguistic models for language variation and diachronic development. The result is a type of diachronic lexicon of preposition meaning that is useful not merely for linguistic investigation but Hebrew exegetes. That said, an effort to provide broader accessibility for the historical linguist and diachronic typologist is attempted with the hope that the wealth of Semitic data available may be more widely integrated into cross-linguistic investigations. This endeavor is largely accomplished through following common linguistic glossing practices and adhering to established functional terminology.