REVIEW ARTICLE
and responses

The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew. Vol. 1 א

DAVID J. A. CLINES (ed.)

This is the first of a projected eight volumes of what is announced in the Preface to be "the first dictionary of the Classical Hebrew language ever to be published" (p. 7). *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* [hereafter *DCH]* is new in several respects.[1] These are the main new

---

[1]We will use the following abbreviations refer to other standard reference works:

AHW	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch.* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965- 81).
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907, 1953).
Ben Yehuda	Eliezer Ben Jehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew.* Centennial Edition (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1960).
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.*
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, ed. L. Oppenheim, *et al.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956–).
ES	Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1981).
HAL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Hebräische und aramäische Lexicon zum Alten Testament* (3d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1967-90).
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: Brill, 1958).
Mand	Solomon Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiæ Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ* (Jerusalem: Schocken, 1967).

features. (i) It includes as the corpus of "Classical Hebrew" the text of the Hebrew Bible, inscriptions from biblical times, Hebrew ben Sirach, and Qumran texts in Hebrew. (ii) It lists the use of each item with other items in terms of syntactic constructions and idiomatic and rhetorical co-occurrences. Thus it lists the subject, objects, etc., of verbs. It lists the verbs that a noun is the subject or object of. It lists nouns in construct or apposition with the noun under study as well as its attributive adjectives. (iii) Lists of synonyms are given at the end of each entry. (iv) At the end of the volume is an index of English glosses, an amenity in the old Tregelles English edition of Gesenius' Lexicon (1846), but dropped from BDB.

The Introduction includes *The Recent History of Hebrew Lexicography*. KB (*HAL*) is the only major project discussed. The impressive work of Zorell is not mentioned. Yet it is always worth consulting. Zorell reflects progress made since BDB; for example, he is aware of the recovery of the G passive for many verbs. Thus he correctly reports יוּאַר (yûʾār: Num 22:6) as Gpas (Zorell 82b); *DCH* continues to classify it incorrectly as Ho. (p. 398). Nor does the review of history mention the magisterial work of Ben Yehudah, an indispensable treasury for the serious student of Hebrew lexicography.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

In March 1972 a colloquium on Semitic Lexicography was held in Florence.[2] James Barr presented a paper on "Hebrew Lexicography."[3] Barr laid down the guide lines for Hebrew lexicography in keeping with modern linguistics. In 1987 Barr once more addressed the topic, now in

RSP	*Ras Shamra Parallels* (AnOr 49-51; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972-81).
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* 6 vols., ed. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-90).
TWOT	*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* 2 vols., ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody, 1980).
Wagner	Max Wagner, *Die lexicalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch.* BZAW 96 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966).
Zorell	Franciscus Zorell, *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1984).

[2]Pelio Fronzaroli, ed., *Studies on Semitic Lexicography.* Quaderni di Semitistica 2 (Florence: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali, Università di Firenze, 1973).

[3]Fronzaroli, *Studies*, 103-26. Hereafter, Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973.

the light of his experience as editor of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon.[4] The makers of *DCH* claim that "unlike previous dictionaries, *DCH* has a theoretical base in modern linguistics" (p. 14). That claim can be studied by placing *DCH* alongside Barr's recommendations.

1. THE HISTORICAL COMPONENT OF HEBREW VOCABULARY

Barr discusses the desirability of tracking the history of Hebrew word meanings.[5] This requires tagging their occurrence, not only in early or late books, but (especially with the Pentateuch) identifying the sources (J, E, D, P) as indicators of the relative age of use. "The task of the lexicographer cannot therefore be entirely separated from involvement in certain questions that are historical rather than directly linguistic".[6]

DCH explicitly eschews this task. It "studies the classical Hebrew language as if it were a synchronic system. . . . we regard the classical language as constituting *a single phase in the history of the Hebrew language*" (p. 16 [italics ours]). *DCH* professes to be not interested in the development of word meanings in any period. By treating the corpus "as if it were a synchronic system" (p. 16) *DCH* either assumes that there were no changes over time worth reporting in the lexicon, or that any such changes cannot be detected, or that the users can work that out for themselves.

The assumption that we have here "a single phase in the history of the Hebrew language" (p. 16) amenable to treatment "as if it were a synchronic system" (p. 16) is so patently false that the results of this homogenization are inevitably flawed. The language, including the lexical component, of the chosen texts is far from uniform. Apart from historical changes over such a long period of time, there are dialectal variations, even within the Hebrew Bible[7]. On the basis of dialect geography, texts in the language conventionally called "Moabite" are less divergent from "classical Hebrew" than some portions of the Bible (e.g., Qoheleth, Song of Songs). Ben Sirach was still writing bravely in "biblical" Hebrew, but the Dead Sea Scrolls are another matter, particularly in the area of lexicon. To suppose that the use of a word at Qumran at the turn of the era can be

[4]James Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography: Informal Thoughts," pp. 137-151 in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew,* ed. Walter R. Bodine (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992); hereafter, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1992. See also W. C. van Wyk, "The present state of OT lexicography," pp. 82-96 in *Lexicography and Translation*, ed. J. P. Louw (Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa, 1985).

[5]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1992, 148.

[6]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 106.

[7]Ian Young, *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew.* Forschungen zum Alten Testament 5 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993).

placed alongside its use in the time of David, a thousand years earlier, is like saying that the meaning of an English word in the twentieth century gives us the meaning it had for Chaucer, or even King Alfred.

This is not the way dictionaries are being made nowadays for any corpus of classical texts that we know of. *CAD* is careful to report where, and if possible when, each reported attestation of use of a dictionary item occurs. I. I. Sreznevsky's monumental *Materials for the Dictionary of the Old Russian Language* (St. Petersburg, 1893-1903) was flawed by lack of historical perspective and insensitivity to regional differences in usage. It is now superseded by dictionaries that control both these parameters. There are separate reference works for Old Ukrainian, Old Russian[8] and Old Slavic[9]. These works are careful to list separately the attestations in each subcorpus, with dates when possible.

The inclusion of material from LXX in the old Liddell and Scott Greek lexicon was an amenity much appreciated by Bible students. Its reduction in the current edition avoids the false impression that biblical Greek is "classical." It is no longer possible to lump all ancient Greek together for synchronic description. A separate dictionary is needed for Koine, and even for its major corpora—the papyri, LXX[10] (even a part of it, as in Muraoka's exemplary work[11]), early Christian Greek (Bauer), Philo, Josephus, Patristic Greek (Lampe), Byzantine Greek, and so on. All this material could be assembled in one gigantic dictionary, of course. But to homogenize it!

To study any such corpus of historical texts synchronically can be nothing better than a makeshift, for want of knowledge of dates for much of the material. To invoke modern linguistics as warranting such a policy is a subterfuge. It is ironic for this to be happening in Hebrew lexicography at the very time when historical linguistics is enjoying a comeback with the realization that even in one generation the heterogeneous usage

[8]C. D. Barkhudarov (ed.), *Dictionary of the Russian Language XI-XVII Century* (Moscow: Sciences, 1975–).

[9]Josef Kurz, *Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského* (Praha: Academia, 1966–).

[10]Johan Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992).

[11]Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Twelve Prophets.* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993). See also the important methodological discussions in *idem*, "Towards a Septuagint Lexicon," *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986); *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography.* SBLSCS 28 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990).

reflects the time-driven evolution of the language.[12] The old hangs on, particularly when a prestigious traditional literature retains its influence. The new emerges only partially. The data resist the inductive method. How much more, then, when the time period could be a thousand years!

While it is true that "the holding together of this wide span of linguistic change is appropriate"[13] , to ignore the changes that undoubtedly took place in classical Hebrew over the thousand years of use recognized by *DCH* is irresponsible.

For this kind of information, e.g., the occurrence of a lexical item in the sources of the Pentateuch (J, E, D, P, etc.), however provisional or disputable, the student will find that the tagging in BDB is still useful. More recently Andersen and Forbes have supplied these assignments exhaustively in their *Vocabulary of the Old Testament* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989).

Sometimes the distinctiveness of late classical Hebrew vocabulary is evident in an entry. Of ten instances of אורה (*'ōrâ;* the specimen in Isa 26:19 is dubious[14]), seven, all meaning **spiritual illumination**, are in Qumran texts. Incidentally, another instance—רוח נבונה ואורה (11QPsᵃDavComp 27₄)—is not reported; it provides the important «SYN» נבונה.[15]

2. THE CORPUS

Barr defined the scope of what he called "classical Hebrew"[16] as the Hebrew Bible, inscriptions of biblical times, Hebrew Sirach, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. *DCH* follows Barr's prescription. Barr went on to say that "the lexicography of old Hebrew needs to develop adequate contacts with Middle Hebrew; some indication must be given of the direction in which the word or words in question were already developing in the centuries about the turn of the era".[17]

---

[12]Roman Jakobson, doyen of modern linguists, pointed out that "the achievements of the synchronic concept force us to reconsider the principles of diachrony as well. ... Pure synchronism now proves to be an illusion: every synchronic system has its past and its future as inseparable structural elements of the system" (*Language in Literature*, Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy, eds. [Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987] 48).

[13]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 109.

[14]Day, John, "טל אורות" in Isaiah 26:19," *ZAW* 90 (1978) 265-69.

[15]Professor Andersen's MS. often vocalized the Hebrew; because *AusBR* does not use vocalized Hebrew, a transliteration is added where needed (ed.).

[16]"Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 110; "Hebrew Lexicography"—1992, 138.

[17]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 111.

For the Hebrew Bible *DCH* takes *BHS*, virtually the Leningrad Codex (**L**) of 1009 CE, as its standard. But *BHS* has not always been followed. The entry for אמה (*'ummâ;* p. 312) misses the additional places where this word occurs in *BHS*, following **L** (Pss 44:15; 57:10; 108:4; 149:7). The *ketib / qere* apparatus of *BHS* cannot be considered authoritative.

A mirage is created by putting together the fully pointed Hebrew Bible as found in *BHS* with texts a thousand years older or more that survive only in consonantal orthography. It is not the classical language of biblical times that is being studied, but a massive overlay of mediaeval tradition, which is plastered over the non-biblical texts as well. How, for instance, do we know how to point אנץ? How do we know, from its one attestation in the corpus, that it means **sighing**, and does not have, say, one of the meanings that this word has in later Hebrew according to Ben Yehuda?

3. SEMITIC ROOTS AND COGNATES

On p. 24 *DCH* refers to the discovery of Ugaritic as one reason for updating Hebrew lexicography. At the same time *DCH* asserts that evidence from possible cognates in other Semitic languages is, theoretically, "strictly irrelevant to the Hebrew language" (p. 17) and complains that, practically, "the significance of the cognates has been systematically misunderstood by many users of the traditional dictionaries."

How then should a dictionary handle information from outside the chosen corpus? Besides culturally related texts from before and during the classical period, there is also "the testimony of ancient versions" and "Jewish lexicographical and exegetical tradition" (p. 18). "It is a cardinal error in principle to seek to isolate the biblical language from later Hebrew".[18] How then does *DCH* know the meanings of so many words whose meagre attestation in the chosen texts of classical Hebrew gives so little evidence of "use in the language" that only the vaguest notion of possible meaning can be gained by a linguistic method that disqualifies the use of comparative philology?

Nobody knows the pitfalls of comparative philology better than James Barr, and nobody has exposed the rubbish of the subject more remorselessly than he has done. This background makes his judicious remarks all the more telling. "We do not have the sort of knowledge of many terms in Biblical Hebrew that can stand on its own as a purely intra-hebraic matter, to be taken in total indifference to other Semitic languages. We have to accept that, for us in our situation, our perception of Hebrew words and their meanings is linked with comparative-philological and historical-

---

[18]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973. 103.

philological perceptions"[19] Van Wyk says, "Old Testament lexicography is inconceivable without its comparative Semitic context" (Louw 89).

"This fact [comparative philology] has to be taken into account by the linguist of today".[20] The use of comparative philology to identify "new" meanings for Hebrew words has, in this century "become a major industry".[21] "The full indexing of all this material has become a major task for the lexicographer".[22]

Notwithstanding the mention of Ugaritic, *DCH* disavows the use of comparative data. There are no explicit references to other languages; yet the *results* of comparative-philological research are everywhere accepted.

How does *DCH* know that אשיה (*ʾašyâ; hapax* in Jer 50:15) is a **tower**? KB says "pillar," citing cognates. Ben Yehuda says "base." *TWOT* "buttress." The comparative evidence is summarized by Wagner (p. 30).

How else could *DCH* possibly know that אלי (*ʾĕlî*), attested only once (Joel 1:8) means **mourn**, and not, say **curse**? From the cognate in Aramaic (disqualified by *DCH*)? Because it fits the context? A flimsy argument that can only support an argument based on something firmer. We are left with an oblique hint from LXX θρηνησον (BDB). And that is only half the story. BDB did not report that LXX reads θρηνησον προς με, with προς με matching אלי. This leaves θρηνησον unexplained, and אלי along with it.

How can it be inferred from one attestation that אובל (*ʾûbāl*) might mean **tower** (p. 148) rather than the usual **river**? The knowledge that אבה (*ʾēbeh;* Job 9:26) means **reed** is not the result of fresh study of use, unprejudiced by tradition. It is traditional; but the recognition of cognates confirms it. (BDB *abu* has to be corrected to *apu* [KB; *CAD* 1 A II: 199; *AHW* 62], and the Mesopotamian connection makes "papyrus" less certain.)

On what basis does one propose **twilight** as the sense of אמש (*ʾemeš*) at Job 30:3? If Arabic be permitted to supply a clue (God forfend!), *ʾams* means "yesterday" or "last night." If the proposal is not to be dismissed as merely ad hoc, it needs to be shown that the sinister associations of the following words betray the literary motif of night as danger and twilight as an especially ominous time. In reaching this conclusion, comparative philology joins forces with comparative literature and exegesis.

The fact that "the significance of the cognates has been systematically misunderstood by many users of the traditional dictionaries" (pp. 17-18) is not a reason for withholding information about cognates. Even if much of

---

[19]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1992, 142.
[20]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 107.
[21]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 116.
[22]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 116.

this work has been done badly and many of the proposed meanings are not convincing enough to make their way into a standard dictionary, the remedy for bad work is not no work but good work. If users are to judge for themselves, the least they can expect from a dictionary is a reporting of the options, with pointers to the technical literature where the proposals are discussed. Here *HAL* is indispensable. Disciplined by sound method, the sober study of cognates is a legitimate part of lexicography, and students of classical Hebrew will be grateful for dictionaries that supply that kind of information. BDB is regrettably out of date in this matter; but the remedy is to replace it with something more reliable. The remedy for systematic misunderstanding of cognates is valid understanding arising from rigorous methodology. In this regard *DCH* is outclassed by *HAL*.

4. DERIVATIONS

DCH has cross-references based on common roots. It insists, nevertheless, that there are "no historical implications" (p. 21); it is "not concerned with the etymology of words" (p. 22). It is not so easy to escape from history. *DCH* has liberated itself from the mystique of the Semitic root only partially. While other words are ordered simply by their conventional spelling, and all derivatives of the same root are treated as lexical items in their own right, the treatment of the verb is still controlled by the supposed common root of the several stem formations, even when modern descriptive method would require the recognition of the lexicalization of the *binyānîm*.

   DCH lists verbs by traditional three-consonant roots, even when there is no evidence for the existence of such entities.

   The sole use of התאחדי in Ezek 21:21 can hardly yield the knowledge that it means **be united** (*DCH* 179). The proposal is the outcome of etymologizing (supposedly banned in modern lexicography), recognizing the root אחד as the same as the root of the numeral "one." That may be legitimate. But such a move subverts the stated policy of *DCH*. It uses old-fashioned "derivation." There is only a difference in degree, not in principle, between using the evidence of a postulated cognate within Hebrew and resorting to a cognate now attested only in some other Semitic language.

   We know from the three occurrences of אבוס (*ʾēbûs*) and the two occurrences of אבוס (*ʾābûs*) that they have something to do with domesticated animals (and perhaps with each other, if roots can be used etymologically). But how can we narrow the possibilities to **trough** or **stall (fatten** or **keep in stall**)?

   Derivation rather than use as an ordering principle is implied by the cross-references. Behind the link between אדמה (*ʾădāmâ*) and אדם (p. 132) is the old notion that "earth" is "red." The supply of אנה (*ʾōneh;* p. 333) as

the (unattested) lemma for three words meaning **distress** depends on the supposition that the root is אנה, as the cross-reference shows. This identification does not do justice to the feature that the stem vowel is always *plene*, making it hard to justify the segregation of these instances from און (*ʾāwen*) **misfortune** (p. 154). Etymology is still evident in the inclusion of אביב **ear** (of cereal) and (month of) **Abib** in one entry. Modern dictionaries that are more descriptive tend to recognize the lexicalization of such forms, and list them separately or at least distinctly in subentries.

5. BORROWINGS

Not only does classical Hebrew contain many words with cognates in other Semitic languages; it has borrowed words from other languages. They might not always preserve their original meaning, but as Barr says, "we can separate off the case of loanwords, words adopted into Hebrew from another language, whether Semitic or not Semitic. Where these are recognized *they should be clearly marked as such* [italics added]; attention should be drawn to the sense in the original language . . . and to the probable period of adoption".[23]

If we knew only its one occurrence in Dan 11:45, how could we work out that אפדן (*ʾappeden*) means **palace**? From extensive attestation in other languages (Wagner 28) the identity of the word as a loan is established, and there is no reason why we should not be told that, since that is how we know that means "pavilion" or the like.

What is the basis for the declaration of **palanquin** as the only candidate for the meaning of the *hapax* אפריון (*ʾappiryôn;* p. 361)? The users need a lot more data before they can make their own judgment. At the very least it would be helpful to be told where a problem like this is discussed in detail (in this case, Pope's generous discussion in Anchor Bible: *Song of Songs* pp. 441-42).

6. TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE OF WORD MEANINGS

In Hebrew lexicography, extensive use is made of clues provided by other ancient languages, by ancient translations into Greek or Aramaic, by the knowledge of meanings preserved in the Jewish community and now available in the writings of the rabbis. As Barr says: "The meaning of a word in the immediate postbiblical period can help us to estimate how far the traditions of its biblical meaning may on the one hand be genuine and go back to actual senses in usage, and how far on the other hand they

---

[23]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 113.

derive from popular etymology, religious interpretation, and general guesswork".[24]

There is no need to claim that the rabbis had a scientific knowledge of the historical dialectology of classical Hebrew in order to make use of the knowledge of the usage of Hebrew vocabulary that came down in the Jewish community. Robert Gordis pointed out more than once that biblical lexicography had failed to exploit the rabbinic writings as a rich source of evidence of the use of biblical vocabulary. Due caution is always needed, of course. The possibility of anachronism can never be ruled out. The (mis)understanding of an old word by giving it its current meaning goes on all the time. It can be seen in the way Qumran texts use biblical words. This is why a dictionary of one thousand years of a language should work out, not only what a word meant, but also when it meant it. The cultural gap between the Bible and the rabbis is no greater than, for instance, the pre-exilic texts and Qumran.

An illustration from the Masoretic text of 1 Sam 21:9: אִין יֶשׁ־פֹּה (*'iyn yēš pōh*). אִין is a *hapax* in the Bible. Manuscripts show that the scribes could not protect this word from being gobbled up by the ubiquitous אַיִן (*'aiyn*), as it is in *DCH* (pp. 217, 220). Assuming that it should be אַיִן (*'aiyn*), the text is cast aside as "unintelligible"[25] The context suggests that David is asking a question, and various emendations have been proposed to turn the Hebrew text into some textbook form of interrogation. Gordis has pointed to the evidence that אִין (*'în*) is a real word, an interrogative particle.[26] The fact that a claim such as this falls short of proof does not mean that it should be disdained. Very few such discussions supply the certainty that we would like to have in these matters.

7. LEMMATIZATION

DCH has no settled policy when it comes to lemmatization.[27] When are two or more items that are different in form but similar in meaning to be joined as "the same" under one lemma? Should אָסִיר (*'assîr*) and אָסִיר (*'āsîr*); אַבִּיר (*'abbîr*) and אָבִיר (*'ābîr*) be one entry each pair (as in ES) or

---

[24]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 111-12.

[25]P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel* (AB 8; New York: Doubleday, 1980) 348.

[26]Robert Gordis, "Studies in the Relationship of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew," L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, 1946, pp. 173-200; reprinted in *The Word and the Book: Studies in Biblical Language and Literature* (New York: KTAV, 1976) 158-184 (see p. 161). The entry in Ben Yehuda (I, p. 193) is also worth studying.

[27]Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes "Problems in Taxonomy and Lemmatization," *Proceedings of the First International Colloquium: Bible and the Computer—The Text,* (Paris-Geneva: Champion-Slatkine, 1986) 37-50.

two (as in BDB, Mand)? אמנם (*'omnām*) and אמנם (*'umnām*) have two entries (p. 319), but putative אמר (*'ēmer*) and אמר (*'ōmer*) are combined (p. 325). BDB (p. 57) gives אמרה (*'emrâ*) its own lemma. Even though אישים (*'îšîm*) is attested, *DCH* lists אנשים as pl. of איש. The empirical approach of modern linguistics would suggest separate lemmas. Likewise אשה, נשים. It is only by the supposition of a common etymology (implied by the cross-reference to אגד) that four words אגדה (*'ăguddâ*) are under one lemma.

Lemmatization is a problem even for proper nouns. When a person has two names, how similar do they have to be to be put in one entry (ארן/ארונה)? How different to be put into two (אברהם/אברם)?

And, contrariwise, when is a word that has, by use, distinguishable meanings to be split into distinct entries? The older practice was to list submeanings in one entry if the bearers of those meanings were believed to derive from the same ancestor (the etymological fallacy) or if one was a figurative extension of the other. The problem of lexicalization of the *binyānîm* was mentioned above, under *Derivation*. BDB and *HAL* have one lemma for the ni. and pi. of אלם. *DCH* gives pi. its own entry (p. 294).

It would be more in line with the contemporary practices of dictionary makers to recognize each numeral as a distinct lexical item and to give each its own lemma, not listing "forty" with "four," for instance (a hang-over of the discredited derivational approach). The technical use of אחדים (*'ăhădîm*) meaning **few** deserves its own entry, by modern practice, as in Alcalay's Dictionary of Hebrew[28].

The two approaches are illustrated by the words אשמורה (*'ašmûrâ*) and אשמרת (*'ašmōret*). Traditional works (BDB, KB, Zorell) put them in one entry. Works with a more descriptive approach (ES, BY) split them. *DCH* links them.

The difficulty with splitting a homonym into more than one entry is that, the greater the delicacy, the more likely that there will be equivocal cases. The word אלוף (*'allûp*) occurs sixty-nine times in the Hebrew Bible. *DCH* has an entry for each of the three glosses **chief, cow, tame**. KB has two. Across the reference works the attested instances are variously assigned to the two or three categories.

The dictum "meaning is use" has led, in modern dictionary making, to the recognition that the individual word is not always the most appropriate item for a lexical entry. Compounds of more than one word often acquire the status of vocabulary item, and should be listed accordingly. *DCH* does this only in the case of some proper nouns (eight names of God compounded with אל (*'ēl*) and some geographical names). The word אלגביש (*'elgābîš*) is attested only in composition with אבני (p. 271). אין (*'aiyn*) is

---

[28]Reuben Alcalay, *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary* (Hartford, Conn.: Prayer Book, 1965).

interrogative only in מֵאַיִן, a distinct lexical item (cf. Alcalay).[29] Compound prepositions are recognized for the syntagmatic analysis, but not as lexical entries. For compound verbs, see below under "Synonyms."

8. USE DETERMINES MEANING

The main claim of *DCH* to be using modern linguistics is the dictum "the meaning of a word is its use in the language" (p. 14). The dictum "meaning is use" works only when there is ample attestation. If enforced, this ukase would greatly limit the capacity of the lexicographer to supply glosses for rare words. It would ban the use of sources of knowledge long exploited to augment the all-too-often insufficient evidence of use in the chosen corpus itself—etymology, comparative philology, translation equivalents in ancient versions, and traditional understandings of classical vocabulary disclosed in post-classical sources. The method stultifies work on an ancient language, such as classical Hebrew, because the accidents of attestation leave so many words as *hapax legomena.* With such a small corpus, the number of rare words is quite large. Of the 851 א entries, 427, just over half, occur three times or fewer and contribute less than one per cent of the total word count. Many of these are proper nouns, so the situation is not as bad as it might seem. Even so, there are many *hapax legomena* about which the only thing to be said, on the basis of use in the restricted corpus (since *DCH* scorns the use of etymology, cognates, ancient versions, and Jewish lexicographical and exegetical tradition), is that we cannot tell what they mean. *HAL* often does this. How can it be inferred, for instance, from the one dubious attestation of אֵשׁוּן (*ʾĕšûn*) in Prov. 20:20 that it is a real word, let alone that it means "beginning"?

The dictum works with a living language because one can get beyond the limitations of meagre attestation by eliciting from natural speakers more specimens of the use of a puzzling word. For classical Hebrew the next best thing is to chase up the word in later Hebrew texts, or to find out how it was translated in the earliest versions. These sources, and not just use in classical Hebrew, are where knowledge of the meaning of many rare Hebrew words came from in the past, and *DCH* has accepted that tradition.

How can one tell from the one place (two occurrences) where אֲמֻצִּים (*ʾămuṣṣîm*) is used in the Bible (Zech 6:3, 7) that it means precisely **dappled** (p. 320), and not, say "piebald" (NJB) or "bay," as in Middle Hebrew. From this meagre attestation, all one can say is that it refers to something in a horse's appearance, possibly a colour, since the other horses in the passage are distinguished by more well attested colour terms.

[29]The one possible instance of interrogative אַיִן (*ʾayin*) without *mem* (1 Sam 21:9) is the product of a gratuitous emendation, discussed in note 13.

Access to a natural speaker would settle the question at once. Similar uncertainty must attach to numerous other *hapax legomena.*

Studying the two occurrences of the word אֵד (*ʾēd*) would not get us past the inference from intra-Hebrew use that it is some form of water or moisture.[30] More precise denotation is established by pointers from outside Hebrew. The replacement of traditional "mist" by "stream" is entirely due to comparison with ID in Mesopotamian sources. Although *DCH* has pronounced Akkadian "strictly irrelevant to the Hebrew language" (p. 17), it has accepted this result, albeit without telling the user where this knowledge comes from.

This recovery of the meaning of אֵד (*ʾēd*) carries with it the recognition that אֶרֶץ (*ʾ-ereṣ*), in Gen 2:6 refers to the underworld. There is abundant evidence for this within Hebrew as well as from Ugaritic and other ancient sources.[31] Use alone could have told us. This meaning is not reported in *DCH*.

How do we know so exactly the species of plants that are mentioned only once in the sources—**melon, caperberry, walnut**? How does one guess, let alone know, from one occurrence in 2 Kgs 4:39, that אֹרֹת (*ʾōrōt*) refers to a vegetable, "perh. **mallow**"? It could be anything. Some lexicons join it to Isa 26:13 (KB 90; Zorell 25). Ben Yehudah has the whole story.

Or the trees:

	אֵלָה *ʾēlâ*	אַלָּה *ʾallâ*	אֵלוֹן *ʾēlôn*	אַלּוֹן *ʾallôn*
DCH	terebinth	terebinth	terebinth	oak
Holladay	mighty tree	stately tree	great tree	any stately tree
KB	species of big tree, unsure which	undefined species of big tree	hardly a species of tree	vigorous tree, likely Quercus aegilops L.

Mand and ES have the third only in composite toponyms. Zorell has the third and fourth in one lemma. *HAL* helpfully refers the user to handbooks of natural history.

A similar study could be made of words with the root איל—**ram, chief, terebinth, pilaster**. Reference works have two, three, or four lemmas for these glosses.

How does *DCH* know that אֹרֶן (*ʾōren*), attested once, means **laurel**? That מְאֻזָּל (*mĕʾûzāl*) means **woven** (Ezek 27:19)? *DCH* perpetuates the old

---

[30]Francis I. Andersen, "On Reading Genesis 1-3," *Interchange* 33 (1983) 11-36, discusses the methodological significance of this word. A briefer form is, "On Reading Genesis 1-3," in *Backgrounds for the Bible*, eds. M. O'Connor and D. N. Freedman (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988) 137-50.

[31]W. L. Holladay, "*ʾereṣ,* 'underworld': two more suggestions," *VT* 19 (1969) 123-24.

guess that אֲנָךְ (*ʾănāk*) means **lead** (p. 342). Users need to be told that already in antiquity scholars did not know what the word meant. The homiletical "plumb line" is fanciful. Although the word occurs four times, they are all in the same context, and it is not even sure whether Amos' characteristic play on words might not involve a pun on a homonym.

There are 179 vocabulary items in the א volume of *DCH* attested twenty or more times. Even that amount is often hardly enough to point to meaning from observed use. Sometimes the outcome is a simple consistent meaning, but often this is the deceptive result of frequent use in an identical context. The more abundant the attestation with a range of collocations, the more problematic some of the lexicographical calls become. אֵפֹד (*ʾēpōd*) occurs 52 times, mostly referring to a priest's vestment. But is the object used for divination also a garment? Unless that can be proved or even plausibly supposed from clues provided in texts where the ephod is used for divination, the divination ephod really deserves its own lexical entry with as yet undetermined meaning.

9. FIGURATIVE USE

DCH says that it is not going to mark any usages as "figurative" or metaphorical" ("upon the commonly accepted principles of modern linguistic theory" [p. 15]). With so much poetry in the Hebrew Bible, the outcome of this policy can only be pedantic. Why then is the use of אֶזְרָח (*ʾezraḥ;* **native**) in Ps 37:35 to refer to a tree not given its own lemma? Distinguishing a meaning of **light** "as representing goodness, hope, etc." (p. 161) is tantamount to identifying a metaphor. *DCH* still has אַף (*ʾap*), **nose, anger,** in one entry, whereas meaning from use requires two.

10. GLOSSES

The glosses of Hebrew names do not always represent them correctly. In particular, the important set of names ending in **–yāhû** comes through with the late **–yāh** variant. אֱלִיפְלֵהוּ (*ʾĕlîpĕlēhû*) is glossed **Elipheleh**, itself unattested (**Eliphelehu** [NJPST]).

11. GRADING THE GLOSSES

Barr suggested that "new suggestions should be graded".[32] His gradient: "assured," "good," "deserving to be mentioned," "another opinion exists." By the same reasoning, long- standing meanings should be assessed by similar criteria. Users of a dictionary have a right to know *how* its authors know what a word means. Users want to know where that knowledge comes from and how reliable it is. *DCH* says, "We have not, in fact, seen

---

[32]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 117.

it as our task to justify the meanings we propose from the Hebrew words; that is too complex a task to be accomplished within the confines of a dictionary" (p. 18). The complexity of a task is no excuse for not attempting it. *DCH* presents all glosses categorically. The analysis and interpretation needed in order to grade the claims of any proposed or traditional meaning are admittedly arduous, but what Barr calls "semantic responsibility"[33] requires more than "mere listing of the forms that occur" (p. 118). *DCH* invokes the authority of postmodernism: "a dictionary for the age should be short on authority and prescription and long on readership-involvement, open-endedness and uncertainty" (p. 26). This is like a doctor giving a do-it-yourself pharmacopoeia to a sick person. This claim to be nonprescriptive is, however, belied by the generally peremptory tone of the entries. And underneath it all *DCH* is still very much bound by tradition, very little released by an independent application of modern linguistic principles from the mere recycling of tralatitious opinions. This is the last cargo one would expect to find on a ship sailing under the flag of postmodernism.

12. GRAMMATICAL CLASSIFICATION
(TAXONOMY AND PARTS OF SPEECH)

If the dictum "the meaning of a word is its use in the language" is true, then it should drive the whole treatment. Modern linguistics, especially when the emphasis is on description, requires that the distinctiveness of each language be respected by allowing the grammatical categories used to arise from within the language, not be imported from the grammar of another language. For anyone acquainted with the debates that rage in modern linguistics over fundamental taxonomy (units, classes, structures, relationships), the policy of *DCH* in retaining the traditional parts of speech because they are "generally uncontroversial" (p. 18) is astonishingly innocent. The hangover from this pre-scientific classification of the Hebrew parts of speech spoils numerous entries. The same is true of other grammatical terms. The terms "object" and "subject" are used as if their significance needed no discussion. (This may be the reason why use of the pronoun אֲנִי, I as subj. is recognized, but not as obj. in apposition [Gen 27:34, 38]; «COLL» is too "miscellaneous" [p. 89].) If sufficiently different semantic meanings of a homonym warrant a separate entry for each meaning, functionally different grammatical meanings of a word that is syntactically a homonym equally deserve separate entries. אִם (*'im*) is called conj., but the eight meanings given are, for the most part, different translation equivalents in English. The undefined category "particle" is used for many of these subsets. Quite apart from the dubious status of

[33]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 118/

some of these subsets as grammatically distinct from the others, an "interrogative particle" is not a conjunction, and should be recognized as a distinct lexical item.

In this connection *DCH* compares quite unfavorably with ES. ES is more comprehensive than *DCH* in its listing of grammatical structures, sometimes more accurate, and, with the concordance display of one citation per line, it is much easier to find the information in ES.

DCH is not only light-hearted in its handling of parts of speech; it is also half-hearted. If ארמית is an adverb because of use, why is not אשדודית likewise an adverb, as BDB classifies it (78b)? Here, as in other connections, the classifications inherited from tradition by *DCH* are supplied by translation equivalents. "The adverbial functions of various European languages afford no guide to Hebrew adverbial use, for in Hebrew other *syntactic approaches* are taken to those functions."[34]

Syntactic tests are needed to determine when אור (*'ôr*) is a verb or a noun. In עד־האור (Judg 19:26), the definite article makes it a noun. In אור הבקר (Gen 44:3) the syntax makes it a verb. In עד אור הבקר does the preposition make אור a noun, or does the subject הבקר make it an infinitive? Zorell (p. 23) recognizes this and five other occurrences as inf. In *DCH* they are all nouns (p. 164).

13. ADJECTIVES

The indifference of *DCH* to issues in taxonomy that rage in modern linguistics is shown in its treatment of adjectives. There are four reasons for calling a word an "adjective." To be blunt, contemporary linguistics, when it addresses rigorously questions of taxonomy ("parts of speech") has not come up with a fool-proof definition of "adjective" for any natural language, let alone as a universal. Reference works and linguistic dictionaries are content with working definitions. *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (Oxford University Press, 1992) is typical. It characterizes and identifies adjectives by their use as modifiers of nouns (Vol. 3, p. 165). This usually occurs in attributive phrases. In Hebrew the normal sequence is Noun Adjective, and the two usually agree in number, gender and definiteness. That is the first and strictly the only valid definition of "adjective." It is often noted, however, that words used as attributive adjectives can also be used as "predicates"—strictly speaking "subject complements" in equative, existential and (in Hebrew) verbless (so-called, but miscalled "nominal") clauses. The two functions are related by having similar deep structure, as shown by the transformation: "fat cat" to "the cat is fat." Now it may be acceptable, once "fat" has been identified as an

---

[34]Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 656.

adjective by its attestation with attributive use, to call it a predicative adjective in "the cat is fat." But the ground has changed.[35] It is assumed that "fat" is always an adjective, no matter how it is used. This subverts the rule that use determines, not only meaning, but also functional class ("part of speech"). This taxonomic confusion gets worse when a proclaimed adjective is used neither attributively nor predicatively, but is just like a noun. The sleight of hand is betrayed in the language "an adjective used as a noun." Even more tortuous, אחור (ʾāḥôr) is called a noun, but mainly used as an adverb, or "as adj, used as noun" (p. 184b). If use determines functional class, then, in that instantiation the word *is* a noun. This kind of obfuscation is the result of *DCH*'s prejudice against cataloging figurative use, in this case the well known Hebrew practice of using names of body parts, not literally for anatomical reference, but metaphorically for spacial reference.

A third and even less defensible reason for calling a Hebrew word an adjective is the fact that works of reference have been calling it an adjective for a long time. It is precisely this kind of unquestioned tradition that modern linguistics is supposed to clear away. The fourth and worst reason for calling a Hebrew word an adjective is that it is translated into English by a word that is called an adjective in English folk grammar. *DCH* perpetuates this confusion.

In *DCH* words are called "adjective" that are not *used* as adjectives. Take as an example the word אכזב (ʾakzāb). In *DCH* "adj. **deceptive**, alw. as noun" (p. 239). Why not simply call it a noun, and be done with it?

---

[35]The best recent work on the adjective has considerably clarified the semantic significance of these distinctive syntactic functions. "In a categorically based grammar with compositional semantics . . . semantic type is a function of syntactic combinatory properties. Consequently the fact that adjectives are words that can serve either attributively as ad-common nouns or as predicates will predict that adjectives will play two different semantic roles as well" (Muffy E. A. Siegel, *Capturing the Adjective* [New York & London: Garland, 1980] 1-2). We cannot pursue this problem in detail here. But it should be pointed out that the predicative role of some adjectives takes them into the domain of the verb, particularly in a language like Hebrew that does not have to use a copula for such predication. (Cf. M. Bierwisch and E. Lang, eds. *Dimensional Adjectives: Grammatical Structure and Conceptual Interpretation.* [Springer Series in Language and Communication 26; Berlin: Springer, 1987] esp. p. 19.). The origins of this affinity lie deep in ancestral Hebrew, and the entail remains in the "adjectival" behaviour of participles and stative verbs. These problems in semantics and syntax have an immediate bearing on the making of a linguistically driven dictionary, but *DCH* is untouched by modern linguistics in this matter.

Likewise אבל (*'ābēl;* p. 108) אפיל (*'āpîl;* p. 357), אפיק (*'āpîq;* p. 358) and many more.

The status of some words as "adjectives" is even more murky in the case of words of shape *qātēl*, variously classified as perfect (stative) verb, participle, noun, or adjective, using various combinations of morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria.[36] אבל (*'ābēl;* p. 108), אפל (*'āpēl;* p. 358), אשם (*'āšēm*) are called adj., but never "used as" an adjective. אמן (*'āmēn*) is called adv. (p. 317), yet it is not used to modify a verb.

The dubious status of the adjective as a part of speech in Hebrew, or rather the dubious qualifications of certain words traditionally called adjectives, leads to an inconsistency in lemmatization. Masculine and feminine forms of adjectives are "the same," but masculine and feminine forms of the same noun are different lexical entries. Thus אמה (*'ummâ;* Ps 117:1) is listed as f. on p. 312. There is no syntagmatic reason for this classification. The other forms are m. on p. 309.

There is a big historical factor in this too, swept under the carpet by *DCH*. It has been shown that the Hebrew participle moves away from its primitive noun character more and more to its verb character during the biblical period. It is instructive to study closely the differing treatments that ארב (*'ōrēb*) receives in the reference works. The more traditional practice (BDB, Mand. and KB) is to put them all under the verb as participles. ES (p. 28), however, lists fifteen of them as nouns, with 1 Sam 22:8, 13; Lam 3:10; Ezra 8:31 as ptcp. The entry in *DCH* (p. 366) is confusing; some instances are listed both under the verb and also under the noun **ambush**, with a tally of eighteen (excluding Josh 8:4; Lam 3:10).

14. SYNONYMS

One of the useful amenities of *DCH* is the provision of "synonyms". This is the nearest that *DCH* comes to meeting the modern expectation that a dictionary that is serious about semantics will recognize that semantic fields are more significant than individual lexemes. On p. 25 *DCH* recognizes the need to examine "the place they [words] hold within the total system of the language." Barr discusses the practical difficulties of such a task in both his articles. The lists in *DCH* are welcome, but somewhat short, being limited to items that appear at least twice in the entry (p. 21). They suffer also from the results of mechanical compilation from mere collocation rather than semantic analysis. Thus it would be better to describe the association of הלך with אסף as a compound (**go gather**) than to call הלך «SYN» of אסף. For more ample coverage, the קרובים in ES are more satisfactory. Example: *DCH* has five items as «SYN» of און (*'āwen*),

---

[36]E. Rubinstein, "Adjectival verbs in Biblical Hebrew," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979) 55-76.

ES has thirteen קְרוּבִים. *DCH* has no «SYN» for אִישׁ (זּ̈י), ES provides six קְרוּבִים. The lack is even more serious in the case of verbs. For אמר *DCH* has none, ES thirteen; for איב *DCH* none, ES six; for אהב *DCH* one «SYN», one «ANT», ES seven; for אסף *DCH* five, ES nine.

15. THE CLAIM OF FULL REPORTING

Barr has put his finger firmly on our predicament. "In the present state of our knowledge of Hebrew, it is impossible to be entirely authoritative without becoming dogmatic and ignoring real elements of doubt; and it is impossible to become totally objective unless one confines the task to a mere listing of the phenomena of the text . . .".[37] By supplying all glosses as if all were equally certain, *DCH* falls into the first trap. By listing "syntagmatic relationships" (p. 19) without analysis and interpretation, *DCH* falls into the second trap. This defalcation is presented as a virtue: "we have consistently regarded our task as providing and organizing the data that others will use as they think best, rather than imposing our own views as to what is significant" (p. 26). What contribution, for instance, does the listing of several columns of verbs that the pronouns אֲנִי (*ʾănî*) and אַתָּה (*ʾattâ*) are subjects of make to our understanding of those pronouns? At several places in the papers cited Barr points out the inadequacy of "mere listing," when what is needed is analysis and interpretation, with a backup of references to the literature where the problems are discussed in more detail.

The claim that *DCH* displays "the full evidence for the way Classical Hebrew words were used in our extant texts" (p. 15) is overstated. The emphasis on "syntagmatic analysis" (p. 19) is intended to serve the grammatical dimension of Hebrew lexicography. It is not as complete as one is led to believe. The syntagmatic collocations are read through too narrow a window. And not all possible syntagmatic relationships (p. 19) are explored. Some important grammatical categories in verbal adjuncts are overlooked, e.g., object complements. The co-occurrences of nouns in construct and apposition are recorded, but not in coordination, one of the most significant relationships for semantic analysis and classification. This shortfall is most conspicuous in the case of verbal nouns, exacerbated by inattention to the problems of "part of speech" as they arise with participles and infinitives. Hebrew verbal nouns may be used as nouns at their front end (governed by a preposition, or, with participles, determined by the definite article); they may be used as verbs at their back end (e.g., with a direct object, even using אֵת). Both diagnostics might be present at once, or neither. By the criterion of use determining part of speech, a word like אהבה (*ʾahăbâ*), **love** is a noun when it is used as a noun, a verb when it

[37]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1973, 118-19.

is used as a verb. But what when it is used as both, or as neither? The dividing line, or rather the overlapping condominium territory between various pairs of traditionally but unscientifically assigned parts of speech has not yet been charted for Hebrew. This is often the reason for discrepancies between the tallies in *DCH* and those in other reference works. The dual roles of some instantiations of some verbal nouns call for special measures. It would be appropriate to include in the lists places where an infinitive is noun enough to be *nomen rectum.* In *DCH* **food** is the only gloss for the noun אֹכֶל (*ʾōkel*). But אׇכְלוֹ (*ʾoklô*) in Exod 12:4, 16:16, 18, 21 is not listed under «CSTR» because *DCH* has decreed that לְפִי is a preposition, a violation of its own policy of not distinguishing metaphorical use. Why should אׇכְלוֹ (*ʾoklô*) not be recognized as an infinitive in these texts?

DCH says that אהבה (*ʾahăbâ*), **love** is a noun in all forty of its occurrences. Mand. has 18 nouns, ES 20, Zorell 23, BDB 30. In Gen 29:20 and 1 Sam 20:17 אהבה (*ʾahăbâ*) uses את to govern a direct object, verb behaviour *par excellence.* Because of the limited scope of its syntagmatic analysis, *DCH* misses this important point and so fails to report the verb function, let alone permit it to produce the part-of-speech classification. (The remedy would be to include "object with את" in the grammar of nouns; but this would be putting the cart before the horse, the definition driving use rather than use driving definition.)

Strangely *DCH* does not include *nota accusativi* in the repertoire of prepositions. So the occurrences of את־האהבה (Cant 2:7; 3:5; 8:4; 8:7), the best evidence of its noun role, are not reported.

16. EMENDATIONS

Barr says that a dictionary "should not register text corrections simply because they have been proposed"[38] *DCH's* policy is to aggregate the emendations adopted in BDB and *HAL* and mentioned in *BHS* while expressing no opinion as to their worth. I happened to notice that some emendations worth reporting are missing. Thus BDB (p. 54) suggested emending האמון (Jer 52:15) to המון (*hāmôn*) as in the parallel 2 Kgs 25:11. *BHS* suggests emending נחת: (Jer 22:23) to נאנחת (*neʾĕnaḥtĕ;* not cited on p. 335).

17. TALLIES

One of the unfortunate consequences of *DCH's* policy on verb lemmatization is that the tallies are given for the root when it would have been more helpful to have them for each *binyān*. The policy of *ketib / qere* is not clear. From some of the tallies it seems as if *qere* is given preference; e.g.

---

[38]Barr, "Hebrew Lexicography"—1992, 150.

וַתֵּרָאֶנָה (1 Sam 14:27 [p. 159]). The inclusion of tallies for all lexical items, both at the entry itself and also in a table (pp. 68-88) is a welcome amenity. But the counts are not always correct, and sometimes it is not clear whether dubious or even conjectural forms have been included in the total.

Word	Page	Tally	Correct
אדמה II	83	1	4 (p. 132)
אביב	103	9	8
אדמי	132	12	11 (*qere* of 2 Kgs 16:6 inc.)
אדר	136	4	3 (emd. incl.?)
אופיר (ʾôpîr)	156	12	11 (ES, Mand)
אח alas	178	3	4 cited, 2 dubious
אחור (ʾāḥôr)	184	51	41
אימה	213	16	17 (Isa 33:18 omitted)
אכל (ʾōkel)	247	43	44 (ES; Ps 145:15 omitted)
אכן (ʾākēn)	248	19	18 (ES)
אליעיני	291	7	10 (nine different persons)
אניה	341	20	31

אדרת (ʾadderet) is listed and counted twice, bringing the tally of אדיר (ʾaddîr) to 28 (p. 122).

18. ERRORS

I could not find the source for the quotations from Geniza Psalms. On p. 365 the text (אראל [ʾărîʾēl], אריאל [ʾărîʾēl]) and emended (אראלי [ʾarʾēlê]) forms are mixed up. אדרת is listed twice, on p. 122 as f. of אדיר (ʾaddîr), on p. 137 in its own right. Why is אזנה **stink** not listed? Presumably it will come at זנה. Yet אדוש, a byform of דוש, is listed. There is no other evidence for such a root in Hebrew. The evidence comes from Arabic.

The book is beautifully printed, and the rarity of typographical errors is a miracle. On p. 71 א:מנום; on p. 72 אזו for אזור; on p. 73 cloak; on p. 85 אלני; on p. 229 איה for איש.

19. CONCLUSION

It should be emphasized that the features in which *DCH* breaks new ground make it a valuable complement to other works of reference. The main value is the enlargement of the corpus to include, not only the text of the Hebrew Bible and of Hebrew Sirach, but also the text of ancient inscriptions and of the Dead Sea Scrolls deemed to be Hebrew. This information has never before been consolidated into a single dictionary. Furthermore the exhaustive listing of the occurrences of the vocabulary make *DCH* a useful adjunct to existing concordances of these corpora, taken separately.

As a guide to shoppers, we present the following comparisons.

Corpus:	The only dictionary to include the inscriptions and Qumran texts
Syntagmatic analysis:	Extensive, but not as complete as claimed; presentation opaque; not as user-friendly as ES
Synonyms:	Meagre; the קְרוֹבִים of ES are more extensive, augmented by the inventories of word pairs in *RSP*
Comparative data:	None; BDB, Zorell, *HAL* still needed
Bibliography of literature:	None; *HAL* and *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* are needed

20. SUGGESTIONS FOR LATER VOLUMES

The usefulness of the cross-references would be improved if they were more precise and if more information were given about the alternative forms. Under «CSTR» it would be helpful if *regens* and *rectum* were distinguished more clearly. Include אֵת (*nota accusativi*) in the repertoire of prepositions. Include coordination, at least of nouns, as an important syntagma. Most seriously, if *DCH* is to demonstrate the superiority of "linguistics rather than philology" (p. 25) for making a dictionary and bring *DCH* into step with contemporary linguistics the taxonomy used for syntagmatic analysis needs to be overhauled. *DCH* correctly says that "the focus in modern linguistics has rightly been on sentences as wholes" (p. 25; cf. "the sentence or unit of discourse" [p. 26]). Yet at no point in this first volume is a whole sentence presented as the unit. In no instance does the syntagmatic analysis of any word show the global scope of its relationships with all the other things in its sentence.[39] It is all still piecemeal. Not to mention the horrendous difficulties of finding whole sentences in the first place.[40] To be still using nineteenth-century grammatical concepts at the end of the twentieth century is bad enough. To take them into the twenty-first century . . . .

Francis I. Andersen
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena

---

[39]For one way of doing this in modern linguistics see C. Pollard and I. A. Sag, *Information-Based Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 1. Fundamentals* (Stanford: CSLI, 1987); *Vol. 2. Topics in Binding and Control* (Stanford: CSLI, 1990).

[40]Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, "On Marking Clause Boundaries," *Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium: Bible and the Computer— Methods and Tools*, (Paris-Geneva: Champion-Slatkine, 1992) 181-202.