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I. INTRODUCTION

It is an almost unavoidable problem of the specialization in modern scholarship that with all the insights achieved, just as many broad—and sometimes deeper—insights and connections are lost. For the study of the ancient Hebrew language, the advantages of specialization are clear and numerous. Advances in many areas of general linguistics, from historical-comparative to typological to a variety of theoretical frameworks, have been and continue to be applied with success to the description of ancient Hebrew phenomena. And yet, exegetical competence is often the unfortunate casualty of achieving competence in historical-comparative Semitics or a linguistic theory. Grammatical descriptions typically present data as if they exist in a syntactic and semantic vacuum, disconnected from the communicative, discourse pragmatic context of the texts out of which the data come.

The typical disconnect between grammar and text may work for many examples, perhaps even a majority of the data, but never for all. For example, in a clause like יִרְאַ֣תִיהוָהִתּוֹס ֣יףִיָמ (Prov 10:27), the 3rd f. sg. features of the verb unambiguously identify the f. sg. יִרְאַ as the syntactic subject. But, of course, there are many examples in which both the subject and verbal complement match the features of the verb, and only the context allows reasonable interpretation. Consider רְשָׁעַתְּסַלּ (Prov 13:6), in which both רְשָׁעַ and חַטָּאת match the 3rd f. sg. features of the verb תְּסַלּ, allowing either to be the syntactic subject. The discourse context, though—in this case, the poetic parallelism—strongly points to רְשָׁעַ as the subject since the clear subject of the preced-

*I am indebted to John A. Cook for feedback on my linguistic arguments concerning הָּזֶה as well as lengthy discussion of the poetic features of Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9. I also appreciate the feedback of an anonymous reviewer as well as that of the participants of the Hebrew Bible session at the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies annual meeting in St. Catherines, Ontario, at which a previous version of this paper was delivered on May 25, 2014. All claims and errors remain my responsibility.
ing clause is צדקה, which is often an antithetical word-pair with שער (Fox 2009: 563). My point, of course, is that while grammaticalcy obviously influences literary interpretation, the influence is not unidirectional. Rather, the relationship between grammar and interpretation is symbiotic. It is a fundamental principle of good philology that both grammatical and literary features are kept in view and used to check and improve the results of each other.

With this basic principle of philology in mind, in this study I will re-visit the grammar of the demonstrative זה. The masculine singular זה, with its feminine counterpart, זאת, and the common plural, אלה, are primarily used in ancient Hebrew as demonstratives, but also as relative markers and copular elements. After describing the grammar of זה, I will conclude by illustrating the conjunction of linguistic analysis and textual interpretation with a discussion of זה in Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9.

II. DEMONSTRATIVE SYNTAX IN ANCIENT HEBREW:
AN OVERVIEW

The most recent thorough study of demonstratives from a typological perspective is Diessel 1999. In his introduction, he helpfully previews the nature and distribution of demonstratives. First, he defines demonstratives as “deictic expressions serving specific syntactic functions” (2) and notes a common discourse-pragmatic function: “they are primarily used to focus the hearer’s attention on objects or locations in the speech situation (often in combination with a pointing gesture), but they may also function to organize the information flow in the ongoing discourse” (2). Second, Diessel observes that all languages have two sets of demonstratives used for proximal deixis and distal deixis (2). And finally, he organizes the typology of demonstratives into four categories: pronominal, in which a demonstrative serves as the argument (e.g., subject) of a verb or adposition (e.g., the object of a preposition); adnominal, in which a demonstrative accompanies a co-occurring noun; adverbial, in which a demonstrative modifies a verb (e.g., a locative deictic); and identificational, in which a demonstrative serves as the expletive subject of a non-verbal or copular clause, often with a presentative nuance (4–5).

Ancient Hebrew זה fits Diessel’s typological profile in straightforward terms. It is often clearly deictic, pointing to entities or events in the preceding discourse, and it is also used in pronominal and adnominal functions. The basic deictic nature (1) as well as the first two of Diessel’s four functions—pronominal (2) and adnominal (3)—are illustrated in the examples below.

1 For a clear application of Diessel’s typological study to Semitic demonstratives, see Hasselbach 2007.
(1) Deictic

יָֽמָרֵ֑י הָאָ֖רֶץ אִ֝םֹּ֑ית לַאֲשׁ ִ֑ית מַה־וָָ֧הִאֱלֹה ִ֛יםִלָא שָָּׁ֖הִוַֹּ֨אמֶרִיְהֵ֖י אֲמֹר רָֽאֶֽהָ֜ם לְמַ֥ם־וֵ֖אֱלֹהִ֣ים אֲנֹתּ ָ֙ו֮יֵ֥נוּב ִ֔נָו יִ֙וּב ֣ינ יכֶֶ֔םִוּב ִ֛יןִ" בָּֽאֶֽהְ֥רֶ֖ם לְהָֽאָֽרֶץ בֶּןִ֖הוּyclopedia סֶ֚הָֽשִׁי הַזֹּֽאת וַיֹּ֣אמֶרִאֱלֹה ָ֗יםִ כָּֽל־נֵֶ֥פֶשִׁחַיָָ֖הִאֲשֶׁ֣רִא תְּכִֶ֑םִלְדֹרָֹ֖תִעוֹלָָֽם׃

And Yhwh God said to the woman, “What is this (that) you have done?” (Gen 3:13).

(2) Pronominal

יָֽמָרֵ֑י אָ֝וֹת־הַבְּר יתִ֙אֲשֶׁ֣ר־אֲנ ֣יִנֹת ָ֗ןִבּ ינ יִ֙וּב ֣ינ יכֶֶ֔םִוּב ִ֛יןִ כָּל־נֵֶ֥פֶשִׁיָָ֖הִאֲשֶׁ֣רִא תְּכִֶ֑םִלְדֹרָֹ֖תִעוֹלָָֽם׃

And God said, “This is the sign of the covenant that I am setting between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for everlasting generations” (Gen 9:12).

(3) Adnominal

וַיּ  בֶןִ֖הָאָ֣רֶץִהַזִּ֑ואָרִיַּ֖רְעֲךִֶ֔אֶתּ ָ֖ןִאֶת־ שָׁםִ֙מ זְבּ ֶ֔חִַלַיהוָָ֖הוְיַָֽיו׃

And Yhwh appeared to Abram and said, “To your seed I will give this land.” And he built there an altar to Yhwh, who appeared to him” (Gen 12:7).

In (1), the הַזֹּאת points back to the woman’s transgression. In (2), the הַזֹּאת functions as a pronominal subject of the null copula clause. And in (3) the הַזֹּאת modifies the preceding noun attributively.

Whether Hebrew הַזֹּאת behaves as a demonstrative adverbial, that is, Diessel’s third functional category, is unclear due to lack of sufficient data. Diessel restricts the term demonstrative adverbial to “locational deictics such as here and there in English … which are primarily used to indicate the location of the event or situation that is expressed by a cooccurring verb; that is, locational deictics function as some sort of verb modifiers” (1999: 74). In all but a handful of cases, the presence of הַזֹּאת within an adverbial modifier is complicated by the fact that the הַזֹּאת is not itself the adverbial, but rather the complement of a preposition (i.e., הַזֹּאת is a pronominal demonstrative), such as מ זֶּה “from this [place]” > “from here” or following a temporal or spatial noun that is used adverbially (i.e., הַזֹּאת is an adnominal demonstrative), such as מַקְפִּף “this day” > “today.” Only in the six cases of הַזֹּאת “hey this!” > “look here”2 does הַזֹּאת itself approach an adverbial sense, like English here.

Finally, with regard to the fourth functional category, it is doubtful that הַזֹּאת functions as a “demonstrative identifier,” at least as it is described by Diessel (1999: 78–88). There is no distinct class

2 1 Kgs 19:5; 2 Kgs 6:33; Isa 21:9; Ezek 16:49; 43:12; Job 5:27. In two additional cases in Song 2:8, 9, it is more likely that the הַזֹּאת is the subject of the following participial clause even though it is prosodically connected to the preceding הַזֹּאת by the מַקְפִּף. It is unclear what Waltke and O’Connor mean by calling this use of הַזֹּאת “tautologous” (1990: 313), since even in these cases הַזֹּאת carries a force that can be distinguished from that of the deictic presentative הַזֹּאת, i.e., “hey, this (thing)” or “look here.”
of demonstrative identifiers in Hebrew and זֶה when used as the subject of a copula (overt or null) always retains its deictic demonstrative characteristics (Diessel’s comment on English is apropos; 1999:79).

Beyond the four core demonstrative functions (two of which are not attested for זֶה), Hebrew exhibits two additional, derivative uses of זֶה—as a non-verbal copula (4) and as a relative marker (5).

(4) Copular

וַיֹּ אֵ֥רֵךְ וּלְ֖יָשׁוּבָֽם יָשְּׂאָ֖ה וַיְּאָמְר֖וּ כִּֽי־נָתָ֑ן בַּֽיָּמֵֽהּ כִּי־נָתָֽן

And Isaac said to Jacob, “Draw near and let me feel you, my son. You are my son Esau, or not? (i.e., Are you my son Esau or not?) (Gen 27:21).

(5) Relative

וִֽשְׁלָֽם מְרֶֽמֶשׁ בַּֽקְרָאָ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֑רְבּוּ לָֽם:

They went up the mountains, they went down the valleys, to a place that you established for them (Ps 104:8).

Both functions in (4) and (5) are attested cross-linguistically as the result of the grammaticalization of the demonstrative (for copulas, see Diessel 1999:143–48; for relatives, see Diessel 1999:120–23). The copular use of זֶה is similar to the grammaticalization of the independent pronoun הָו into a pronominal copula, though the precise path is slightly different and the copular זֶה is rare (see Holmstedt and Jones 2014). The relative use of זֶה (and וּ and וּ) reflects a grammaticalization of the Semitic demonstrative, perhaps as early as proto-West Semitic (PWS); moreover, the זֶה relative represents a type of relative element—the relative marker—that is unlike other early Semitic relative elements: the זֶה (PWS ן) relative marker is inflected (contrary to, e.g., אֲשֶׁר) though not for the relativized noun’s position within the relative but in the matrix clause, resulting in an inflectional redundancy (see Deutscher 2001, 2002; Holmstedt 2013).

The grammatical description of זֶה that I have just sketched accounts for all the data involving זֶה, זֹאת, and אֲלֶה. That is, it transparently accounts for all the data except one small set—the זֶה—NP type.

---

3 See Gen 25:22, 32; 27:21, 24; 1 Sam 9:18; 17:55; 2 Sam 2:20; 1 Kgs 18:7, 17; 2 Kgs 3:8; Ps 24:8; 25:12; Job 28:12, 20; 38:19; Esth 7:5.

4 Only m. sg. זֶה is used as a relative marker, not the f.sg. זֹאת or common plural אֲלֶה; however, the relative use is also found with the rare f. sg. variants וּ and זֶה as well as an indeclinable form found only in poetry, ו. See Exod 13:8, 15:3, 16; 2 Sam 14:2; Isa 42:24; 43:21; Hab 1:11; Ps 9:16; 10:2; 17:9; 31:5; 32:8; 62:12; 68:29; 74:2; 78:54; 104:8, 26; 132:12; 142:4; 143:8; Job 15:17; 19:19; Prov 23:22.
III. The Syntax of זֶה–NP

Grammarians have long noted a small number of cases in which the demonstrative precedes its associated NP, often a quantified NP or number phrase. In Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, the syntax of these examples is explained as apposition, in which the NP is appositive to זֶה, or a null copula clause in which the זֶה is the subject and the NP is the copular complement (1910: §126aa, 136d). Joüon and Muraoka depart from this by suggesting that in very rare cases זֶה is used before the noun but still attributively (2006: §143i), as in (6).

(6) Exod 32:1

וַיַַּ֣֣רְאִהָעֶָ֔םִכּ ָֽי־בֹשׁ ֵ֥שִׁמֹשֶָׁ֖הִלָרֶ֣דֶתִמ ן־הָהִָ֑רִוַיּ קָה ֹ֨לִהָעָָ֜םִעַָֽオンライン

And the people saw that Moses was delaying to come down from the mountain. And the people gathered to Aaron and they said to him, “Get up. Make for us gods that walk before us, because this Moses, the man who brought us up out of the land of Egypt—we do not know what has happened to him.”

Waltke and O’Connor analyze examples like (6) similarly (§17.4.1), but also describe the cases of זֶה preceding a number phrase as the use of זֶה to “emphasize the time,” as in (7):

(7) Josh 14:10

וְעַתָָּ֗הִה נּ הִ֩הֶחֱיָֹ֨הִיְהוָ֣הִ׀ִאוֹת יִ֮כַּאֲשֶׁ֣רִדּ בּ רִ֒

Now then, Yhwh has kept me alive, just as he promised, these forty-five years (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: §17.4.2, #6).

Few previous studies have focused on the syntax of זֶה, especially the non-conforming examples. Those that have attempted explanations, such as Pennachietti 1980, Joosten 1991, and Pat-El 2007, have contributed important pieces to the grammatical puzzle, though none provides an overall adequate and thus convincing analysis.

Pennachiatti argues that the temporal adverbial use of זֶה in the זֶה-Number phrases (e.g., והזֶה לשֶׁלֶשֶׁפּּוּות ים Judg 16:15) developed out of a cleft-construction. That is, for discourse structure reasons, the cleft construction זֶה לשֶׁלֶשֶׁפּּוּות ים “this is three times (that) you have deceived me,” serves both to focus the clefted constituent (the זֶה-NP) and “to establish a relationship of identification between the first and second section.” From this original cleft

Pennachiatti 1980: 237: “è quello di stabilire un rapporto di identificazione tra il primo troncone e il secondo.” I am grateful to Krzysztof Baranowski and Mark Graham for discussing Pennachietti’s argument with me.
structure, Pennachiatti argues that the הָוָא-Number examples were reanalyzed as adverbial phrases rather than full predications, e.g., “già tre volte ti sei burlato di me!” for Judg 16:15 (226).

Joosten specifically addresses the very rare cases of “a proper noun with an adjectival demonstrative” that precedes the noun (1991: 413). He cites הָוָא מָנוֹשֶׁ in Exod 32:1 and 23 as the only sure examples, but also discusses the possible cases in Ezek 5:5 (תַּאֲדוֹן לִשְׂכַּחֻוֹ), Isa 25:9 (תִּתְאֵר הָוָא יְרוּשָׁלְיָם), Ps 48:15 (תַּאֲדוֹן לִשְׂכַּחֻוֹ), and Gen 15:2 (תַּאֲדוֹן לִשְׂכַּחֻוֹ). He argues that the הָוָא מָנוֹשֶׁ pattern “implies that the speakers take their distance” from the named person or entity, thus assigning a plausible pragmatic function to the demonstrative-noun sequence, but providing little insight into the syntactic structure. Since he does not find the “distancing” function in Isa 25:9 and Ps 48:15, he suggests that they are better understood as null copula clauses, i.e., “this is Yhwh” and “this is God?”

The most recent attempt is in Pat-El 2007, and it is with her study that I will end my survey. Pat-El concentrates on the cases of הָוָא preceding a number phrase or quantified NP. Though her argument is not always perspicuous, she appears to make the following claims:

1. הָוָא in these constructions is adverbial (151);
2. The הָוָא מָנוֹשֶׁ construction is just as often at the end of a clause and so cannot be, or be derived from, a cleft construction, contra Pennachiatti 1980 (153–54);
3. There are no comparable syntactic patterns in other Semitic languages (154);
4. The הָוָא מָנוֹשֶׁ pattern developed from an “adverbial circumstantial sentence,” such as in Gen 31:41 [see appendix, below], “lost the possessive marker l, perhaps first in colloquial parlance, and became more and more dependent on the main sentence until it was understood to be a circumstantial adverbial phrase, rather than a clause with full nexus” (156).

Though the recent proposals, such as Pat-El’s have been creative, I suggest that when it comes to the syntax of הָוָא, we should admit that Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley articulated a more accurate description over a century ago. First, nowhere do they make the ill-advised claim that הָוָא is adverbial, either in origin or use. Hebrew הָוָא transparently patterns according to the pronominal and adnominal functions of demonstrative in all but a very few cases (see above, section II). Even when הָוָא is used within adverbial phrases, its own function remains clearly demonstrative. Thus, it is confusing at best and simply inaccurate at worst to compare הָוָא with demonstrative adverbials like English here and there (contra Jouon and Muraoka 2006: 143a).

---

6 In Holmstedt and Jones 2014, we read the הוּא in Gen 15:2 as a pronominal copula (83).
Second, Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley were correct that two syntactic patterns explain all the examples in which זֶ֣ה precedes an NP or number phrase: either the NP following זֶ֣ה is in apposition to it or the NP is the complement of a null copula clause, of which זֶ֣ה is the subject. Consider again Exod 32:1 from (6), repeated in (8).

(8) Exod 32:1

וַיַַּרְאִהָעֶָ֔םִכּ ָֽי־בֹשׁ ֵ֥שִׁמֹשֶָׁ֖הִלָרֶ֣דֶתִמ ן־הָהִָ֑רִוַיּ קָה ֹ֨לִהָעָָ֜םִעַָֽיוִּכּ י־ִ

And the people saw that Moses was delaying to come down from the mountain. And the people gathered to Aaron and they said to him, “Get up. Make for us gods that walk before us, because this one, Moses, the man who brought us up out of the land of Egypt—we do not know what has happened to him.”

In cases like Exod 32.1, the זֶ֣ה cannot modify מֹשֶׁה, since that implies the existence of at least two men named Moses, “this one (that led us)” versus “that one (that did not lead us)” (see also 1 Sam 21:12; Isa 23:13; Song 7:8). Rather, the deictic pronominal זֶ֣ה is the people’s way of dismissively referring to Moses, who has not met their expectations (similarly, Joosten 1991; see also Brockelmann 1956: 20). The proper noun מֹשֶׁה follows the זֶ֣ה to clarify it appositively, as does a second appositive, the more complex הָא ָ֗ישׁ with its relative clause. Thus, “because this one, Moses, that man who took us out of the land of Egypt—we don’t know what has happened to him.”

In the second pattern, where זֶ֣ה is followed by a temporal phrase, the זֶ֣ה points backward or forward to an event that can be quantified, mostly in years. Consider the example in (9).

(9) Deut 8:2

וְזָכַרְתִָּ֣אֶת־כָּל־הַדֶָּ֗ךְִאֲשֶֹׁ֨רִי לֹ֣כְךָ֥ה דַּ֖עָת אֲשֶׁ֣ר לְבֵ֑ךְ הֲת שְׁמֵ֥רִי

And you shall remember the whole road that Yhwh your God led you on. This was forty years in the wilderness in order to humble you, to test you, to know what was in your heart …

Rather than interpret זֶ֣ה אָרַקְבִּים שָׁנָ֖ה in (9) as some sort of questionably formed adverbial phrase (Pat-El 2007), it is much simpler and avoids imaginative grammatical creations to follow the Masoretes in understanding a small prosodic break before the זֶ֣ה and so take זֶ֣ה as the subject of a new clause: “And you shall remember the whole road that Yhwh your God led you on. This was forty years in the wilderness in order to humble you, to test you, to know what was in your heart.” Examples like Gen 27:36, given in
(10), should be read similarly but with an unmarked relative following the הָּ clause (so also Pennachietti 1980: 238):

(10) Gen 27:36

And he said, “Is it because one called his name Cheater (that) he cheated me? This is twice (that) my birthright he has taken!

The proposed syntax of (10) is precisely what Pennachietti argues for the examples he identifies as originally cleft constructions. He is, in fact, correct, though I see no support for his subsequent proposal that these cleft sentences were transformed into non-cleft adverbial phrases.

Although Waltke and O’Connor may not accurately describe the syntax of the הָּ אָרְבָּע יָםִּישוּנָה pattern, the notion that the pattern “emphasize[s] the time” (1990: 311) points in the correct direction. Most of the examples exhibit a clear exclamative function within their discourse contexts. For example, in (10), Esau expresses his distress and anger at being cheated by Jacob two times. Similarly, in (11), the messenger’s use of the separate clause הָּשֶׁבֶּעַּיָּם, at the end of his plaintive question is intended to reinforce his perspective that it has been entirely too long since Yhwh has acted on behalf of his people (see, e.g., Petersen 1984: 146–51).

(11) Zech 1:12

And the messenger of Yhwh answered and said, “O Yhwh of Hosts, until when will you not have compassion on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah that you have been angry (with them)? This has been seventy years!”

The exclamative force of (10) and (11) are due to the implicatures arising from the nature of the discourse. Yet the syntax in the two examples is simply a null copula clause with the הָּ as the subject and the number phrase as the copular complement.  

These two patterns, that הָּ is followed by an appositive NP or that הָּ is the subject of a null copula clause that is completed by a number phrase, build on known, widely attested features of Hebrew grammar. On these points alone, the principle of parsimony suggests that the more complex descriptions, no matter how creative, are dispreferred. If the well-established patterns also ade-

---

7 Cf. the unnecessary development posited in Blau 1976 (103): “... also [i.e, functioning as temporal adverbs] phrases introduced by הָּ, as in Gen 34, 10 ‘now (already) twice’; 45, 6 ‘now (already) two years’, presumably originally independent clauses opening with deictic הָּ (‘it is twice’, ‘it is two years’)."
quately explain the data within their literary context, then the novel proposals should be firmly rejected.

IV. THE SYNTAX OF הֵס ינַי EXPLAINED

How the syntactic analysis of הֵס ינַי relates to textual interpretation brings us back to the general principle of philology I asserted in the introduction, which I shall formulate a slightly different way here—grammatical analysis must make good sense of a text. To illustrate how this principle ought to work, as well as how it has been ignored, resulting in interpretive unlikelihoods, I will conclude this study by examining the syntax of הֵס ינַי in Ps 68:9 and Judg 5:5, provided in (12) and (13):

(12) Ps 68:9
מ פְנֵ֥יִאְלֹה ָ֗יםִזֵֶ֥הִס ינִַ֑יָּם פְנ ֵ֪יִאֱלַֹ֫ה ֵ֥יִי שְׂרָא ָֽל׃
The earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain at the presence of God, the God of Sinai, at the presence of God, the God of Israel (NRSV; alternatively, “before God, the One of Sinai,” e.g., Tate 1990: 160, 163).8

(13) Judg 5:5
מ פְנ ֹ֕יְהוָָ֖הִאֱלֹה ֵ֥יִי שְׂרָא ָֽל׃
The mountains quaked before the LORD, the One of Sinai, before the LORD, the God of Israel (NRSV; alternatively, “Yhwh of Sinai,” e.g., Pat-El 2007: 44).9

Both examples are from notoriously difficult poems, sometimes considered to be among the earliest texts in the Bible (see, e.g., Sáenz-Badillos 1993: 56–57 as well as the references listed below in note 11).10 It has become standard to analyze הֵס ינַי in both

---

8 NJPS: “the earth trembled, the sky rained because of God, yon Sinai, because of God, the God of Israel”; NIV: “the earth shook, the heavens poured down rain, before God, the One of Sinai, before God, the God of Israel”; KJV: “The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel.”

9 NJPS: “The mountains quaked Before the LORD, Him of Sinai, Before the LORD, God of Israel”; NIV: “The mountains quaked before the LORD, the One of Sinai, before the LORD, the God of Israel”; KJV: “The mountains melted from before the LORD, even that Sinai from before the LORD God of Israel.”

10 See Frolov 2011 for arguments placing the Hebrew of Judges 5 between c. 700 and c. 450 B.C.E. Though there is certainly not the space in this study to address Frolov’s arguments, I find it compelling that the language of Judges 5 mirrors the early monarchical period, but I disagree with the implication that a monarchical setting suggests that there is no distinction between “archaic” and “standard” biblical Hebrew. Also, Frolov uses the same problematic argument typified by Young and
examples as remnants of the proto-West Semitic  g-series “determinative-relative” and to take the ב as a marker of the genitive, resulting in “God of Sinai” (Ps 68:9) and “Yhwh of Sinai” or “Yhw, the one of Sinai” (Judg 5:5). The sample translations in (12) and (13) and notes 8 and 9 reflect this analysis.

There are two good reasons that the genitive analysis is very unlikely for Ps 68:9 andJudg 5:5—1) it is an ad hoc grammatical analysis and 2) it makes little sense in their poetic contexts. I will spell out each of these issues below, but first a comment on the “genitive” analysis of ב in comparative Semitic perspective is in order.

**EXCURSUS: ב ב AND COMPARATIVE SEMITIC ARGUMENTATION**


Additionally, Cross adduces in support of the “genitive” analysis Albright’s reading of גַּד בֵּית “the Serpent Lady,” as an epithet of Asherah, El’s consort, the phrase גivered, “the Merciful One,” as an epithet of El similar to Ugaritic דא פֹּדוֹ, “the Compassionate One” (1962: 238). Cross adds additional proto-Canaanite evidence to reconstruct the phrase *אֱלֹה הִזֶּה יָני אֱלֹה יָני אֱלֹה יָני אשֶרַה (Gen 21.33), which supposedly reflects the loss of the demonstrative (239–40).

Based on this comparative evidence, the Hebrew זֶה עוֹלָם, or more fully, the sequences אֱלֹה יָני or יָני, are understood as “genitival” in that the יָני marks a genitive relationship between יָני (as the “possessed,” broadly understood) and יָני (as the “possessor”). While the comparative evidence for יָני is salient, the flaw lies in how the “genitive” origin of this Semitic construction has been understood and applied to the Hebrew phrase.

In an insightful argument concerning the origin of subordination, Deutscher (2009) points to this very structure in Old Akkadian, such as, $u$t in TU. RA $u$tir$u-l $u$tuz “he should take those of $u$t (who) were delayed in illness” (209, with slight modification), in which the $u$t demonstrative is the East Semitic reflex of the West Semitic גivered demonstrative-cum-relative. In this example, the demonstrative $u$t is the head of an unmarked relative clause; moreover, it is bound to the unmarked relative that modifies it (a common Semitic structure; see, e.g., Holmstedt 2008). Deutscher then argues that relative clauses formed using the ג iterable demonstratives, such as $u$-um $u$ idin $u$ “the judgment that he rendered,” reflect the integration of an appositional structure, in which a noun (e.g., $u$-um) is modified by demonstratively-headed relative clause (e.g., $u$ idin $u$), that is, “the judgment, that one of (that) he rendered.” From this apposition structure, the “demonstrative pronoun was degraded from an independent head of a relative clause to a mere marker of the onset of a relative” (209).

Deutscher’s cogent analysis can be directly applied to most of the Semitic parallels adduced in the study of יָני . In each of these demonstrative-noun constructions, the analytical options are either that the demonstrative retains its demonstrative force (and is bound to and so modified by an unmarked relative clause, e.g., $u$-$u$ $u$-$u$-$u$ “that one of $u$-$u$” or “that one (who is) of $u$-$u$”) or has become a relative word modifying a null head, “(the one) who is of $u$-$u$.” In either case, the demonstrative pronoun itself is not a genitive marker (contra, e.g., Allegro 1955; Pat-El 2010); rather, the “genitive”

12 See also the references above in note 11.
nature of the relationship is a product of the bound/cliticization construction in Semitic.

As most grammatical references recognize, and as I have briefly described in this study, there are four well-established uses of the deictic demonstrative זֶה in ancient Hebrew: 1) pronominal, 2) adnominal, 3) relative, and 4) copular. A “genitive” use is not among these. Moreover, Diessel 1999 provides no comparable typological evidence for a demonstrative used as a genitive marker as suggested for ancient Hebrew. This strongly suggests that we should consider whether one of the four established functions for זֶה can adequately explain the data.

Perhaps more damning for the “genitive” analysis of זֶה in Ps 68:9 and Judg 5:5 than the misunderstood comparative Semitic data is the poetic structure of the two verses, which seems to have been ignored by those who have proposed the “genitive” analysis. It is worthwhile starting our poetic discussion by noting that the Masoretic tradition divides the verse in Ps 68:9, given again in (14), by the עֹלֵי יִוְיוֹר ד on אֱלֹה ים, leaving זֶה ס ינַי in the second half. Similarly, in Judg 5:5, given again in (15), the אַתְנָח after גַּהְיו once again places זֶה ס ינַי in the second half of the verse (so also Frolov 2011: 166).

(14) Ps 68:9
אֶ רֶץִרָשָה | אַף־שָׁמַ֣י םִנָטְפוִּ֮מ פְנ ֵ֪יִאֱלַֹ֫ה ֵ֥י שְׂרָא ָֽל׃

13 The only potential demonstrative-genitive connection Diessel describes is one of the proposed origins for a genitive linker in Chadic, that it developed from a demonstrative used as an adnominal determiner or as the demonstrative used pronominal with a possessor NP in apposition. Importantly for the discussion of Hebrew, though, is that in the Chadic data, the NP following the demonstrative is the possessor NP, i.e., John’s in the horse of John’s (1999: 131–32). This structure has no parallel in the Hebrew data, in which the alleged “genitive” noun is not a possessor. Indeed, the variable semantics of the cliticization process of the bound (or “construct”) structure, which may but do not necessarily signal possession, mislead many Hebraists and Semitics to use the Latinate “genitive” label inaccurately.

14 Joüon and Muraoka also invoke the Masoretic טְעָמ ים, but their point is opaque (2006: 500, §143i, n. 10). An anonymous reviewer questioned whether the אַתְנָח in Ps 68:9, which is placed on ס ינַי, does not imply that the Masoretes, at least, understood ס ינַי to be associated with the preceding אֱלֹה ים. The simple answer to this is, absolutely not. In a poetic verse with an עֹלֵי יִוְיוֹר ד, this טְעָמ marks the primary division of the verse, which results in a downgrade of the אַתְנָח, which then marks the primary division of whatever half-verse in which it appears (see Yeivin 1981: 266–67). Thus, in Ps 68:9, the אַתְנָח separates ס ינַי from the remainder of the half-verse, מ פְנ יִאֱלֹה ים. That is, the אַתְנָח neatly separates the subject from the complement of the gapped verb, רָעַשׁ.
The earth shook—even the heavens dripped—before God;
this one, Sinai, (shook) before God the God of Israel.  
(15) Judg 5:5

The mountains streamed before Yhwh;
this one, Sinai, (streamed) before Yhwh, God of Israel.

15 Knohl (2012) proposes that ס ינַי in Ps 68:9, 18 is not a geographic reference but an epithet for יהוה, thus “The earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain, before Elohim—that is, Sinai.” With this supposed epithet, Knohl sees an early equation of יהוה with the Mesopotamian moon god Sin. But the textual argument for this in Psalm 68 is very weak. First, Knohl builds the equation on his analysis of 68:18, in which he finds the reference to Mount Sinai too close to the description of Mount Bashan as the eternal residence of יהוה in vv. 16–17. Even Knohl acknowledges, however, that by a small (and common) emendation the reference to ס ינַי in v. 18 can be understood to “depict God as coming from his abode at Mount Sinai in order to assist his people in the war (see Judg 5 and Hab 3), and moreover, as deciding to reside on Mount Bashan and to make this mountain into His eternal bode” (2012: 16). Second, Knohl’s analysis is definitely not “based on the usual meaning of the word זה in Biblical Hebrew” (2012: 17), since his translation “that is, Sinai” does not transparently reflect any accepted understanding of זה, but suggests that he takes it (uniquely) as an appositive marker (and Isa 23:13, which he provides in n. 44 as a similar use of זה, is not a helpful comparison; see below, example (41) in the Appendix). In sum, there is no good literary or grammatical reason to take ס ינַי as an epithet of יהוה in Psalm 68.

16 The Qal נזל “flows” is often repointed, based on the putative evidence of ἐσαλεύθησαν in the LXX, as a Nifal from נזל, so נזל “quaked”; see NRSV; DCH, s.v. נזל; HALOT, s.v. נזל; Keil 1874: 249; Boling 1975: 108; Butler 2009: 115–16. However, the Greek evidence is not as clear as the lexica and commentators suggest or imply and the sense of “stream” for mountains is neither illogical nor out of place in the literary context of both Judges 5 and Psalm 68. First, the LXX rendering ἐσαλεύθησαν for נזל in Judg 5:5 does not clearly suggest that a verb from the root נזל II “to quake” (HALOT) was in its Vorlage. The root נזל II “to quake” (DCH נזל III) appears only in Isa 63:9 and 64:2. In both cases the LXX has the noun תּרָם “trembling” (not a verb). Moreover, at the end of the same clause in Is 63:9 is תּאֵקָדָת (ךְָנֶאֵמ “to melt”), which reflects נזל “to flow” (Muraoka 2010: 275), not נזל II. Thus, the Greek evidence does not clearly support repointing the MT Hebrew נזל to נזל.

Second, the image of mountains melting and subsequently “flowing” (see, e.g., Ps 147:18 for the sequence “melting-flowing”) is neither illogical nor necessarily foreign to the biblical conception of theophanic effects. The language of the mountains “dripping” and “flowing” occur in images of agricultural bounty connected to restoration (see, e.g., Joel 4:18, Amos 9:13) and is arguably extended to Yhwh’s appearance in judgment in Mic 1.4 (וְנָמַּס הָרֵּרִים וְתָמַּחְתָּם יָםִּים וְהָעַמִּים תְּבַקְּעֻ בְּמוֹרָּד.).

1874: 249; Boling 1975: 108; Butler 2009: 115–16. However, the Greek evidence is not as clear as the lexica and commentators suggest or imply and the sense of “stream” for mountains is neither illogical nor out of place in the literary context of both Judges 5 and Psalm 68. First, the LXX rendering ἐσαλεύθησαν for נזל in Judg 5:5 does not clearly suggest that a verb from the root נזל II “to quake” (HALOT) was in its Vorlage. The root נזל II “to quake” (DCH נזל III) appears only in Isa 63:9 and 64:2. In both cases the LXX has the noun תּרָם “trembling” (not a verb). Moreover, at the end of the same clause in Is 63:9 is תּאֵקָדָת (ךְָנֶאֵמ “to melt”), which reflects נזל “to flow” (Muraoka 2010: 275), not נזל II. Thus, the Greek evidence does not clearly support repointing the MT Hebrew נזל to נזל.

Second, the image of mountains melting and subsequently “flowing” (see, e.g., Ps 147:18 for the sequence “melting-flowing”) is neither illogical nor necessarily foreign to the biblical conception of theophanic effects. The language of the mountains “dripping” and “flowing” occur in images of agricultural bounty connected to restoration (see, e.g., Joel 4:18, Amos 9:13) and is arguably extended to Yhwh’s appearance in judgment in Mic 1.4 (וְנָמַּס הָרֵּרִים וְתָמַּחְתָּם יָםִּים וְהָעַמִּים תְּבַקְּעֻ בְּמוֹרָּד.).
It seems transparent that the poetic structure (i.e., the parallelism of the respective couplets) indicates that זֶה סִיָּגִי is best understood as parallel to אֶרֶץ in (14) and to הָר ים in (15). But given the difficulties these verses have posed for interpreters, I will briefly situate each verse within its literary context and describe the poetic features that I have represented in my translations.

Psalm 68 covers numerous themes, often dealing with Yhwh’s kingship, though scholars have had difficulty determining a clear structure. However the psalm is structured overall, vv. 8–11 are widely recognized as a unit in which most interpreters see a theophany that builds both on the imagery of the storm-god and God’s advocacy for his people. The poetic structure of v. 9 consists of a well-balanced bicolon, with three prosodic word-pairs in each half, illustrated in (16) by the division of pairs using ||:

(16) Ps 68:9

אֶרֶץ רָעָשָׁה | אַף-שִָּׁנַי מַי נֶנֶּפֶּ | מְפִנְיָאִלֹה ים זֶה סִיָּגִי | מְפִנְיָאִלֹה יָּֽי שְׂרָא ל

Additionally, the verb רָעָשָׁה in the first half-verse is gapped into the second half. While the second half is complicated by the verb-gapping and the appositive אֱלֹה יָּֽי שְׂרָא ל (both to clarify who this אֱלֹה יָּֽי שְׂרָא ל is and to balance the lines), the first half includes its own complication—a parenthetical clause, beginning with אַף, that sits between the verb רָעָשָׁה and its adjunct מְפִנְיָאִלֹה ים.

In sum, in Ps 68:9, when Yhwh marched before his people, the earth רָעָשׁ, the heavens נֶנֶפֶּ, and Mount Sinai רָעָשׁ (by gapping from the preceding main clause), all of which reflects a progression of nature’s responses to Yhwh’s theophany during the Exodus.

Like Psalm 68, the complications surrounding the interpretation of Judges 5 are numerous, and run the gamut from genre to

17 Moore (followed by Seeligman 1964: 80, n. 1) suggests that זֶה סִיָּגִי in Judg 5:5 is a gloss (1895: 142). Fishbane argues similarly that זֶה סִיָּגִי in Ps 68:9 is a scribal gloss to connect the earthquake imagery with the Sinai theophany: “It is therefore readily conceivable that a later glossator-scribe read the particular imagery of Ps. 68:9 within its particular historicogeographical context as an allusion to the Sinaitic revelation—and so interrupted the a–b parallelism (‘before Elohim . . . before Elohim, God of Israel’) with the specifying comment: הז סִיָּגִי ‘this [earthquake caused by Elohim] refers to [the theophany of] Sinai’” (1985: 55). Knohl allows that הז סִיָּגִי in Judg 5:5 might be a gloss, but dismisses Fishbane’s argument for Ps 69:9 (2012: 16, n. 43). I see no reason to take הז סִיָּגִי as a gloss in either text; it fits the literary development and poses no grammatical problems, as I argue below.


19 Although not all scholars connect the mention of סִיָּגִי in Ps 68:9 to the Exodus traditions (see, e.g., Knohl 2012), many do take such a connection to make sense not only of the word סִיָּגִי in the verse but also of the perceived literary progression (or concentricity) of the Psalm as a whole (see, e.g., Tate 1990: 177; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 165).
structure, language to dating. This passage is the Song of Deborah about the Israelite victory over the army of Hazor. But more than a poetic recital of the victory that was narrated in Judges 4, the song in Judges 5 celebrates both those who זֶה גָּרָם (to paraphrase 5:23) and Yhwh himself as Israel’s champion (Webb 2012: 205–6). After the narrative introduction (v. 1) and then brief preliminary elements of the song in vv. 2–3, the song quickly moves to the powerful image of Yhwh marching forth to battle, beginning from the southern areas associated with the beginning of his relationship with Israel, שׂ ע יר/אֱדוֹם (v. 4). This battle march affects creation, including ס ינַי (v. 5), by which the song draws Israel’s constitutional tradition into the glorious victory. Just as the psalmist invokes Mount Sinai to connect the theophanic imagery to the Exodus memory (see above, n. 15), so Deborah draws on the Exodus event by invoking Sinai in order to describe the similar victory provided by Yhwh against Sisera:

This powerful poetry draws on the historical memory of the exodus, when Yahweh as the divine warrior manifested his presence by making wind and water change their normal behavior for the sake of his people, and Sinai, where his presence was manifested on the mountain in cloud and fire and earthquake … Here in Judges 5 it gives powerful poetic expression to the belief that the storm which broke over Sisera and his army and threw them into panic and retreat was no merely natural event, or amazing stroke of luck; it was unleashed by Yahweh, as he had divided the Sea at the exodus and shaken Mount Sinai by descending on it (Webb 2012: 208).

The poetic structure of Judg 5:5 consists of a bicolon with three words or word pairs in each half, illustrated in (17) using || to divide the units:

(17) Judg 5:5

וַיִּרְאֶה הָרְיִים || נָצַל מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה

וַיִּרְאֶה הָרְיִים || נָצַל מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִי שְׁרָא ל

Though the six units of the bicolon are not quite as neatly isolated as they are in Ps 68:9, the separation of subject phrases (וַיִּרְאֶה and מִפְּנֵי) from the other syntactic elements of the clause is clear. Moreover, just as in Ps 68:9, the gapping of the verb in the first half into the second half is compensated for by the appositive אֱלֹהִי שְׁרָא ל in the second half so that the basic balance between the two lines is preserved. There is also a similar thematic progression in Judg 5:5 compared to Ps 68:9—the earth רעש (5:4a), the heavens and the clouds נְטַף water (5:4b), and the mountains נַנָּל (5:5a) as does Mount Sinai (5:5b gapped from v. 5a).

In summary, in both Ps 68:9 and Judg 5:5, זֶהָיָּה סִינָי “this (mountain), Sinai” is experiencing the effects of Yhwh’s power, not defining who Yhwh is (as a זֶה relative clause would do, and presumably as the supposed זֶה genitive phrase would do). Thus, the weight of Hebrew grammar as well as the literary features of the verses in question indicate that it unnecessary to propose a novel grammatical function for the demonstrative זֶה. Rather, in both cases the זֶה operates as a deictic demonstrative followed by an appositive proper noun, סִינָי, which clarifies the deictic reference. As such, these examples are no different than the זֶהָיָּה מְשָה (Exod 32:1) or זֶה אַרְבָּע יָמִשָׁנָה (Deut 8:2) types explained above.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, זֶה grammar in ancient Hebrew straightforwardly accords to cross-linguistically attested patterns of demonstratives. זֶה and its feminine and common plural counterparts function primarily as deictic pronouns or deictic nominal modifiers. A small set of examples indicate that some stage of Hebrew witnessed the grammaticalization of זֶה as a relative marker and a copular pronoun.

But beyond this, there is no compelling evidence for the use of זֶה as a “genitive” marker. Indeed, as I have shown with the two examples most often adduced as זֶה genitives, the genitive analysis fails the tests of both grammar and literary sensitivity. Instead, both Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9 should be understood as the Masoretes understood them, with זֶה סִינָי beginning the second half-verse and the זֶה in each as a pronominal demonstrative.

More than simply clarifying the grammar of זֶה-NP or זֶה-Number phrases in the Hebrew Bible, this study also serves as a bifold warning. First, comparative Semitic evidence must be used cautiously, since there are many nuances of syntax yet to be fully understood. To wit, the demonstrative does not ever serve as a “genitive” marker in זֶה constructions (nor in the Semitic parallels). Second, ancient language grammarians, whether operating within an historical-comparative framework or theoretical linguistic framework, must not—indeed, cannot!—ignore the literary context of data examples. To put it more bluntly, linguists and grammarians risk significant error if they ignore (or simply cannot read) texts.
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APPENDIX: READING THE ℹ NP DATA

The following examples have been previously mis-analyzed within at least one of the studies or reference works I have cited in this work. Below I provide the texts with translations that clearly indicate the analysis I consider legitimate, according to the arguments I present in this study. In a few cases, I add salient notes after the translation.

(18) Gen 2:23

And the man said, “This is the time! Bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh! This one will be called ‘Woman’, because from man this one was taken.”

(19) Gen 27:36

Is it that one called his name Grasper (that) he grasped me? This is twice (that) my birthright he has taken!

(20) Gen 31:38

This is twenty years (that) I have been with you. Your ewes and goats have not been childless. And I have not eaten the rams of your flock.

(21) Gen 31:41

This has been for me twenty years (that) I have served you in your house—fourteen years in exchange for your two daughters and six years in exchange for your sheep and you have changed my wage ten times.

(22) Gen 43:10

Because if we would not have tarried, indeed, now we would have returned twice.
(23) Gen 45:6
Because this has been two years (that) the famine has been in the midst of the land and five more years that no plowing or harvest will be.

(24) Num 14:22
Indeed, all the men who saw my glory and my signs that I did in Egypt and in the wilderness tested me. This was ten times! And they didn’t hear my voice.

(25) Num 22:28
What have I done to you, because you have hit me? This is three times (now)!

(26) Num 22:32
And the messenger of Yhwh said to him, “Why did you strike your ass? This is three times (that) behold, I have come out as an adversary, because your way is slippery(?)

(27) Num 22:33
And the ass saw me. And it turned before me. This is three times! If it had not turned from me, indeed, I would therefore have killed you but it I would have let live.

(28) Num 24:10
And Balak’s anger burned against Balaam and he clapped his palms and Balak said to Balaam, “To curse my enemies I called you and look—you have blessed them! This is three times (now)!
(29) Deut 2:7

Because Yhwh your god blessed you in every deed of your hand. He knew your going through his great wilderness. This is forty years (that) Yhwh your god has been with you. You have not lacked a thing.

(30) Deut 8:2

And you shall remember the whole road that Yhwh your God led you on. This was forty years in the wilderness in order to humble you, to test you, to know what was in your heart, whether you would keep his commandments or not.

(31) Deut 8:4

Your shirt has not worn out from upon and your foot has not swelled, (even though) this has been forty years.

(32) Josh 9:12

This is our bread; we took it from our houses warm on the day that we went out to come to you and now, look—(it) is dry and spotted.

(33) Josh 14:10

And now, look, Yhwh has let me live, just as he spoke. This has been forty five years since Yhwh spoke this work to Moses (at the time) that Israel walked through the wilderness …

(34) Josh 22:3

You have not abandoned your brothers. This has been many days until today and you have kept the watch of the commandment of Yhwh your God.
(35) Judg 16:15

And she said to him, “How can you say ‘I love you’ and your heart is not with me. This is three times (that) you have deceived me and you have not told me how your strength is great.”

(36) 1 Sam 29:3

Is not this David, the servant of Saul, king of Israel who has been with me? This has been days or this has (even) been years and I have not found anything in him from the day he fell until this day.

(37) 2 Sam 14:2

And Joab sent to Tekoa and he took from there a wise woman. And he said to her, “Mourn and put on mourning clothes. Do not anoint yourself with oil. And so you shall be like a woman (who) has for many days been mourning over a dead person” (on relative זה used with a f. sg. head, see הר תִּזְרִית in Ps 74:2).

(38) 1 Kgs 14:14

And Yhwh shall raise for himself a king over Israel who will cut off the house of Jeroboam this time—today! And what? Even now!

(39) 2 Kgs 6:33

And while he was speaking with them, look—the king* was coming down to him and he said, “Look—this, the trouble, is from Yhwh. Why should I wait for Yhwh longer?”

(40) 2 Kgs 14:14

And Yhwh shall raise for himself a king over Israel who will cut off the house of Jeroboam this time—today! And what? Even now!
Then Yhwh shall raise for himself a king of Israel who will cut off the house of Jeroboam this (day), today! And what now?

(41) Isa 23:13

Behold, the land of the Chaldeans. This is the people (that) does not exist (any longer). Assyria—He appointed her for wild beasts. They raised its towers (Ketiv), destroyed its citadels, and made it into a ruin (this is as admittedly difficult verse, much more than Knohl’s citation as an analogue for Ps 68:9 would suggest [2012: 17, n. 44]; for discussion, see Wildberger 1997: 405, 410–11).

(42) Jer 25:3

From the thirteenth year of Josiah, son of Amon, king of Judah, until this day, this has been twenty-three years (that) that word of Yhwh came to me. And I spoke to you, waking early and speaking, and you did not listen.

(43) Zech 1:12

And the messenger of Yhwh answered and said, “O Yhwh of Hosts, until when will you not have compassion on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah that you have been angry (with them)? This has been seventy years!”

(44) Zech 7:3

Say to the priests who are at the Temple of Yhwh of Hosts and to the prophets, “Shall I weep on the fifth month, separating myself like I have done? This has been how many years?”

(45) Zech 7:5

Say to all the people of the land and to the priests: When you fasted and lamented in fifth month and in the seventh month (this has been seventy years!), did you really fast for me?—me?!
This (one), a poor man, cried and Yhwh heard; and from all his distresses he saved him (Waltke and O'Connor emend "poverty"; 1990: 338).

This is their way—folly is theirs; and (this is) their end—they take pleasure in their own mouth. Selah.

This, the sea, is great and broad; creeping things are there, and there is no number; small creatures are (there) with the great ones (alt. “this is the sea; it is great”; also, “this is the sea [that] is great”).

This has been ten times (that) you have reproached me! Are you not ashamed (that) you have wronged me?

This, your stature, resembles a palm tree, and your breasts (resemble) clusters.
(53) Ezra 3:12

וְרַבּ ֹּ֡יםִמ הַכֹּהֲנ ֣יםִוְהַלְו יּ םִ֩וְרָאשׁ ִֹ֨

יִהָ֖אָבָ֜וֹתִהַזְּק נ ָ֗יםִאֲשֶֹׁ֨רִרָאָ֜וִּאֶת־

בֹּכ ָ֖יםִבְּק֣וֹלִגָּדִ֑וְרַבּ ִ֛יםִ

זֶ הִהַבַּ֙י תִ֙בְּע ֣ינ יהֶֶ֔ם

הַבַּ י תִהָָֽר אשׁוֹןִ֙בְּיָסְדֶ֔וִֹ

בּ תְרוּעֵ֥הִבְשׂ מְחָָ֖הִלְהָר ֵ֥יםִקָֽוֹל׃

And many among the priests and the Levites and the heads of the families, elderly people who had seen the first temple, when it was founded, this one, the temple in their sight, were weeping with a great voice; but many with a shout and with joy (responded) by being loud.