Diachrony
in Biblical Hebrew

Edited by
Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit

Contents

Morphological Features

Syntactic Features

Lexical Features

Sociological and Dialectal Considerations

Text-Critical Considerations

Part 4:
Comparative Semitic Perspectives
on Diachrony

Part 5:
Afterword

Diachronic Syntactic Studies in Hebrew Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions

ELITZUR A. BAR-ASHER SIEGAL

1. Introduction

A prototypical reciprocal construction is a grammatical means to denote a mutual event(s). [1] A clause that contains this sort of construction is said to substitute at least two propositions; thus we would say that (1a) is semantically equivalent to (1b):

(1) a. Emily and Tony admire each other
    b. Emily admires Tony and Tony admires Emily

In Biblical Hebrew, we encounter the following types of reciprocal constructions:

(2) a.   וַיִּתְרָאוּ פָנִים, הוּא וַאֲמַצְיָהוּ

They faced each other, he and Amaziah. (2 Kgs 14:11)

    b.   וַיֹּאמֶר נִוָּעֵד אֶל בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים

He said, "Let us meet in the house of God." (Neh 6:10)

Author's note: Examples that are not from Hebrew or Biblical Aramaic are accompanied by interlinear glosses according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules, <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>. Citations from Mishnaic Hebrew are quoted from highly reliable manuscripts and are taken from the text provided by the database of the Academy of the Hebrew Language: *Maagarim.* Where words are abbreviated in the manuscripts, they are provided in full within brackets. Besides the standard abbreviations of this volume, editions of Akkadian texts are cited with the abbreviations used in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (CAD). In general, when the examples in this essay appear in the CAD, I follow its translation unless I either disagree with the editors' proposals or think that an alternative translation would be better for the purpose of the argument. Furthermore, I indicate the time period of each example, if it is known to us.

   1. Haspelmath (2007) has proposed terminology that distinguishes between the semantic plane and linguistic expressions, referring to the former as speaking about "mutual relations" and the latter about "reciprocal constructions." Although I agree with the importance of this distinction (and, as we shall see in the discussion below [4.3], "reciprocal constructions" may also be used to describe situations without "mutual relations"), I follow the terminology common in the standard literature and speak about reciprocity on both planes.

c.   וַתַּעֲרֹךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל וּפְלִשְׁתִּים, מַעֲרָכָה לִקְרַאת מַעֲרָכָה

Israel and the Philistines were drawing up their lines facing each
other [lit., line of battle against line of battle]. (1 Sam 17:21)

d.   וְלֹא קָרַב זֶה אֶל זֶה

Neither went near the other. (Exod 14:20)

e.   וְקָרַב אֹתָם אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד

Bring them near each other. (Ezek 37:17)

f.   וְאִישׁ אָחִיו לֹא יִדְחָקוּן

They do not jostle each other. (Joel 2:8)

g.   יַחְזִקוּ אִישׁ בְּרֹאשׁ רֵעֵהוּ

Then each man grabbed his opponent by the head. (2 Sam 2:16)

While in (a)–(b) the reciprocity is encoded in the verbal form, once with the
T-stem and once with the N-stem, in all the other sentences it is encoded in the
nominal and pronominal elements of the sentence. In (c)–(e) the reciprocity is
marked by a repetition of the same element twice but in different ways. While
in (c) the nouns that participate in the reciprocal relations are the elements
that are repeated, in (d)–(e) various pronominal expressions are the items to
be repeated. Similarly, in (f)–(g) the reciprocity is encoded with pronominal
expressions but with two different components. Another point to notice is that
although (d), (f), and (g) share the fact that the subject of the sentence partici-
pates in the reciprocal relation, they are different in terms of verbal agreement:
in (d) the verb is singular and in (f)–(g) it is plural.

The first question that comes to mind is why there are so many means to
express one semantic function. This question could be approached from dif-
ferent perspectives. Using (1) a synchronic approach, we might investigate
whether there is some sort of functional distribution to explain this variety.
Using (2) a diachronic distribution, we might undertake to explain this variety
as the outcome of various historical developments, either internal to the history
of Hebrew or due to the influence of other languages. Given that the overarch-
ing theme of the current volume is diachronicity, the discussion of this essay
is mostly of the second type.

Because this discussion involves historical syntax, I begin with a brief de-
scription of the basic theoretical dilemmas encountered when one undertakes
this sort of research (§2). With this background, this paper has two parts. In
the first part (§3), I concentrate on the various pronominal constructions in
Biblical Hebrew and propose a historical typological study, using comparative
data from other Semitic languages. Focusing on languages where it is possible
to follow various developmental processes, I suggest how similar explanations

may be applied validly to explicate analogous phenomena in Hebrew, where certain types of evidence are lacking. In the second part (§4), I deal with an internal change in the history of Hebrew and account for the historical development of pronominal reciprocal constructions from Biblical to Mishnaic Hebrew.

2. A Note about Historical Syntax

In the late nineteenth century, the neogrammarians sought to establish a strict positivist scientific methodology for studying the history of languages by focusing on the form and not on the content of the linguistic expression. In their view, historical linguistics should explain changes at the level of the form and not at the level of the content. Thus, the method allowed a more "scientific" investigation, by relying merely on positive empirical data. Consequently, the neogrammarian analyses remained at the level of phonology and morphology. They did not attempt to explain syntactic developments, because in order to assume continuity between two constructions, for example, one must often rely on merely similar functions, which are not empirically given phenomena in the same way that a sound shift is given. In this regard, Ferdinand de Saussure was their student in denying the scientific value of historical syntax.[2]

In the last century and especially within the last few decades, many have attempted to develop strict methodologies for historical linguistics.[3] It is not my aim in this article to examine their level of success in formulating a clear scientific methodology. Instead, I focus on various ways in which the diachronic aspects of a syntactic issue may be analyzed.

It seems easier to follow the neogrammarian positivist approach and to remain at the level of form when dealing with changes in which the linear order of the elements remains the same—for example, when attempting to explain a shift from one stage to another as a result of reanalysis of the correspondence between the morphological units and their semantic content.

In another type of historical syntactic study, constructions from different periods of one language are compared according to their functions. In such cases, it is hard to determine the causal chain that is necessary to explain the changes from one linguistic stage to the other, and each case seems to be rather idiosyncratic. This is a type of comparative diachronic study established by the Prague school of linguistics.[4] At times, the functionalist perspective is also taken as an explanatory force behind historical changes.[5]

---

2. De Saussure 2006: 58.

3. For an overview on current methodologies in historical syntax, see Faarlund 1990; Harris and Campbell 1995.

4. This type of analysis was demonstrated already in Mathesius 1930.

5. See, inter alia, Harris 1978; Givón 1984; Traugott and Heine 1986; and Comrie 1988.

The first type of syntactic change, which involves reanalysis of formally identical structures, is presented in the first part of our discussion (§3). I explain how the various types of pronominal reciprocal constructions should be understood as a result of reanalysis that is attested cross-linguistically. Identifying these processes of reanalysis in other Semitic languages will shed light on the equivalent Hebrew constructions. The second part of this essay examines syntactic change of the second type (§4)—change involving functionally equivalent constructions. I compare the Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew syntactic reciprocal constructions, based only on the similarity of their function and not their forms.

3. The Various Biblical Constructions in Light of Typological and Historical Studies

3.1. Typological Studies of Reciprocal Constructions

Reciprocal constructions have received much attention over the last decade, especially in Nedjalkov's five-volume seminal typological study of 2007.[6] Despite an abundance of information, few studies have focused on the diachronic aspects of such constructions.[7] Hesitation to deal with reciprocity from a historical point of view is explicable in light of the fact that we rarely have a good synchronic description of reciprocal constructions for a given period of a language, making the consequent historical discussion practically impossible. Turning to the Semitic languages, at present there are very few studies that consider reciprocal constructions.[8] It is unfortunate that Nejalkov's enterprise did not dedicate even one section to a Semitic language, ancient or modern. In earlier studies, I have begun to fill this gap by discussing aspects of these con-

---

6. In addition, note the following two volumes: Frajzyngier and Curl 1999; and König and Gast 2008; and the following articles: König and Kokutani 2006; and Evans et al. 2007.

7. In his study on the polysemy of reflexives and reciprocal marks, Heine (1999) suggests a grammaticalization chain in which the origin of various reciprocal markers are nouns that first became emphatic, reciprocal markers; see also Heine and Miyashita 2008; and Maslova 2008. These studies emphasize the close relationship between reciprocals and reflexives. In the present essay, however, this affinity does not exist, at least not in terms of the pronominal markers. Another historical study is Plank 2008, which deals with the grammaticalization of some pronominal constructions in the Germanic languages. Since the components of these constructions are different from the components found in the Semitic languages, his proposal is irrelevant for these languages. Recently, Haas (2010) focused on the development of pronominal constructions in English. He focused mostly on quantifiable constructions, however, while my focus is on pronominal constructions (using König and Kokutani's 2006 terminology).

8. For a study of Standard Arabic, see Kremers 1997; on Biblical Hebrew, see Jay 2009; and on Modern Hebrew, see Siloni 2001; 2008; and Halevy 2010; 2011a; and 2011b (the three papers share the same data and analysis). In the context of Amharic, Goldenberg (1991: 537–41) offers a survey of pronominal constructions, and Amberber (2002) discusses the various verbal constructions.

structions in Akkadian (Bar-Asher Siegal 2011) and Modern Hebrew (E. Bar-Asher 2009). This essay concentrates on the earlier periods of Hebrew.

When speaking of the typology of reciprocal constructions, first and foremost we must distinguish between the verbal and pronominal encoding of reciprocity. In the former, reciprocity is part of the meaning of the verb, while in the latter, reciprocity is encoded by means of a pronominal expression. Reciprocal verbs can be morphologically encoded through various means of affixation and inflection.[9] In Biblical Hebrew, as in other Semitic languages, reciprocity is marked by verbal templates either in the N-stem[10] or in the T-stem,[11] as sentences (3a–b) demonstrate. Example (4) illustrates pronominal reciprocals; and in (5), reciprocal verbs and pronominal reciprocals occur together:

(3) a. וַיִּוָּעֲדוּ כֹּל הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ יַחְדָּו[12] אֶל־מֵי מֵרוֹם לְהִלָּחֵם עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל[13]

All these kings joined forces and camped together at the waters of Merom to fight against Israel. (Josh 11:5)

---

9. For a detailed survey of morphological forms, see Nedjalkov 2007b: 170–81.

10. The N-Stem is also used for this function in Akkadian; however, as von Soden (*GAG* §90e–g) noted, it is relatively rare.

11. As much as generalizations of this sort can teach us something about the nature of the phenomenon, one can also identify the use of this affix across the Semitic languages in the verbal category of middle voice (and occasionally middle-passive). For example, Arnold (2005) demonstrates this in his treatment of the T-infix in Semitic languages in general and more specifically in Classical Hebrew (for a survey of the uses in the Semitic languages, see especially Arnold 2005: 60–72). Following Kemmer's (1993) typological study of the middle voice, the fact that T-forms are used to express reciprocal events in languages from all branches of the Semitic language family should not be a surprise. It is worth noting that, according to Lipiński (1997: 396), the basic meaning of these stems in Semitic languages is to express an effective involvement, which is similar to the semantic definition proposed in E. Bar-Asher (2009: 261–77) for the verbal encoding of reciprocals in Modern Hebrew.

12. On the use of the adverb יַחְדָּו in this context, see below, n. 26.

13. The second reciprocal sentence, לְהִלָּחֵם עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל, is part of what is called a discontinuous construction. In these constructions, reciprocity occurs between the subject set and the oblique set introduced by the associative preposition עִם in Hebrew (on "sets," see n. 16 below). According to Siloni's (2001) typology, this sort of construction is possible only in languages that, according to her theory, express reciprocity by the lexicon (which is parallel to what in the present paper is called "the verbal encoding of reciprocity"). In fact, Haspelmath (2007: 2093) proposed the following universal rule: "Only verb-marked reciprocals allow discontinuous construction." On this matter, see also Maslova 2007: 337. The fact that in some languages discontinuous constructions are allowed with clitics seems to be problematic for this universal claim. I have offered a solution to this problem (in E. Bar-Asher 2009: 272–75).

Behrens (2007) discusses the choice between the "regular" and the "discontinuous" constructions by considering information structure parameters. An examination of this subject in Hebrew would require a more thorough study of the context of each of these constructions in order to reveal the contrast between them, which is beyond the scope of the current paper.

b.   לְכָה נִתְרָאֶה פָנִים

"Come, let us look one another in the face." (2 Kgs 14:8)

(4) a.   לֹא רָאוּ אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו

They did not see one another. (Exod 10:23)

b.   הֶחָרֵב נֶחֶרְבוּ הַמְּלָכִים וַיַּכּוּ אִישׁ אֶת רֵעֵהוּ

The kings must have fought and slaughtered each other.
(2 Kgs 3:23)

(5)   וְסִכְסַכְתִּי מִצְרַיִם בְּמִצְרַיִם וְנִלְחֲמוּ אִישׁ בְּאָחִיו וְאִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ עִיר בְּעִיר
                                           מַמְלָכָה בְּמַמְלָכָה

And I will stir up Egyptians against Egyptians, and they will
fight, one against the other, and neighbor against neighbor, city
against city, kingdom against kingdom. (Isa 19:2)

While both the verbal and the pronominal strategies express reciprocity, they
are different in the way that the reciprocity is encoded.[14] Pronominal recip-
rocals such as 'one . . . the other' may appear with the "regular" form of the
verb (which does not encode reciprocity). Thus the verbs in (4) are the same as
verbs that refer to regular, nonreciprocal situations. Through the pronominal
expressions ('one against the other' in the English translations), the sentence
has an object—that is, each one saw the other. In contrast, verbal reciprocals
might be regarded as derivatives resulting from a process of detransitivization[15]
characterized by two sets[16] of participants that are in a reciprocal relationship
and occupy the same syntactic position. Thus, in (4a), for example, while a
regular "seeing" event is described with a subject and an object, in (3b) there is
only a subject, and the object position remains "empty" ("Alex kissed Ruth and
Ruth kissed Alex" versus "Alex and Ruth kissed"). The current study concen-
trates on the pronominal constructions, because the verbal encoding seems to
have behaved similarly throughout the history of the Hebrew language. Thus,

14. The distinction between verbal and pronominal encoding roughly parallels the dis-
tinction drawn by Evans et al. (2007) between the "transitive" and "intransitive" strategies,
in which the syntactic realization of the argument structure provides the distinguishing fea-
ture of these constructions.

15. In a manner similar to Nedjalkov (2007a) and Haspelmath (2007), I am using this
terminology merely as a schematic description without taking a position regarding an actual
synchronic or diachronic derivation. In fact, I have demonstrated (E. Bar-Asher 2009) that
we should not speak about an actual detransitivization, because these are two separate items
in the lexicon (in the sense of linguistic "mental storage"). Instead, it is advisable to speak of
a structural relationship marked by the lexicon.

16. I am speaking of "sets" because reciprocity can be a relation between groups and not
just individuals, as example (3) illustrates.

returning to the question posed in the introduction regarding the existence of various constructions in Biblical Hebrew, thus far I have only noted that (2a–b) are different in type from the other sentences (2c–g) and that, for a language to have both types is a common phenomenon cross-linguistically. Various studies (Siloni 2001; E. Bar-Asher 2009; inter alia) even demonstrate some semantic differences between the verbal and the pronominal strategies; however, it is (almost) impossible to examine whether these distinctions hold in a dead language such as Biblical Hebrew.

3.2. Types of Pronominal Construction

I begin the discussion on the various biblical pronominal reciprocal constructions with a more general typological discussion concerning three types of these constructions, illustrating the various relevant phenomena with examples from the Semitic languages. As we shall see, this discussion explains the difference between (2d) and (2f–g) regarding verbal agreement in reciprocal constructions when the entities participating in the reciprocal relation are the subject of the sentence. Delineating the various developments in the Semitic languages will lead to the suggestion that the various constructions in Biblical Hebrew reflect different stages in a similar path of development. I begin with a brief introduction to the types of pronominal constructions found cross-linguistically.

Generally speaking, there are two types of reciprocal pronouns: (1) the two-unit pronouns, preserving the iconicity of the reciprocal relations between the two sets participating in a reciprocal relationship ('one to another', 'one with the other'); and (2) the one-unit pronoun co-referring with the plural subject ('to each other', 'with each other', 'each other's') that occupies the non-subject position required by the verb.

Among the Semitic languages, Akkadian (for example) has both types of pronouns. The two-unit pronouns consist of a repetition of *aḫum* 'brother', and the one-unit type is made up of *aḫāmiš/aḫāiš* in its various forms. The former was predominant in the earlier dialects (as illustrated in [6a]); the latter developed only in the middle Babylonian and middle Assyrian periods (7a). [17] Similarly, in Classical Arabic, only the two-unit pronouns, consisting of the repetition of *baʿḍ* 'some' (6b) (with a possessive pronominal suffix attached to the first, agreeing with the set[s] that participate[s] in the reciprocal relation) [18] were available, and in the modern standard language this is still the case (6c). In addition, there are two other pronominal expressions: (1) either a one-unit pronoun that contains only the first element (7b); or (2) a construction that

---

17. Bar-Asher Siegal 2011. For a discussion of diachrony in Akkadian, see the essay by Kouwenberg in this volume.

18. Some agreement on the pronominal expression with the set participating in the reciprocal relation is found in other languages as well (see Evans et al. 2007: 556).

seems at first to comprise two-unit pronouns but in fact consists of only one declined pronoun with a second frozen form without case (7c). In Syriac, as well, one encounters both a two-unit pronoun consisting of a repetition of *ḥad* 'one' (6d) and a one-unit pronoun, *ḥdādē* (7d):

(6) a. Old Akkadian
    urkatam   aḫ-um   ana aḫ-im   lā
    afterwards brother-NOM to   brother-GEN NEG
      inappuš
      3.SG.DUR.make.a.claim
    Afterwards one will not make a claim against the other.
    (TCL 19 63:45)

   b. Classical Arabic
    danā   baʿḍ-u-hum   min
    3.M.SG.PST.approach some-NOM-POSS.3.M.PL from
      baʿḍ-in
      some-GEN.INDF
    They approached each other. (AS 161; Kremers 1997: 31, example 24)

   c. Standard Arabic
    qāla   baʿḍ-u-hum   li
    3.M.SG.PST.say some-NOM-POSS.3.M.PL to
      baʿḍ-in
    some-GEN.INDF
    They said to each other. (Cantarino 1975: 137)

   d. Syriac
    mallel   reʿw-ātā   ḥad ʿam ḥad
    3.M.PL.PST.speak shepherd-PL one   with one
    The shepherds spoke with each other. (Luke 2:15)

(7) a. Late Babylonian
    aḫāmeš   ippalū
    RECP   3MPL.DUR.pay
    They will compensate each other. (Dar 321:29)

   b. Standard Arabic
    muraddidīna   ʿalā-masāmiʿ-i baʿḍ-i-him
    AP. M.PL.ACC.repeat on-ear.PL.GEN some-GEN-POSS.3.M.PL
      ikāyāt-i   l-ʾayyām-ī   wa-l-layāl-ī
      story-PL.GEN DEF-day-PL.GEN and-DEF-night-PL.GEN
    Retelling (lit., repeating to the ears of) to one another stories of the days and nights. (Cantarino 1975: 137)

    c. Standard Arabic

       tuʿazzizāni   *baʿḍ-a-humā*   *l-baʿḍ*
       strengthen.IMPF.DU   some-ACC-POSS.3.DU DEF-some
       They strengthen each other. (Kremers 1997: 55, example [44a])

    d. Syriac

       mšaḥlp-īn   *rehāy-hon*   *men da-ḥdādē*
       different-M.PL smell-POSS.3.M.PL from of-RECP
       Their smells are different from each other. (*Life of Simon Stylites*
       382: 8)

The shift from two-unit pronouns to a one-unit pronoun is very well known cross-linguistically (compare 'one another' in English with *einander* in German). Nedjalkov observes that "the degree of fusion manifests the degree of grammaticalization of a reciprocal pronoun" (Nedjalkov 2007b: 156).[19] Comparing (6d) with (7d), it is evident that this is the case in Syriac, which uses the repetition of the word *ḥad* 'one' variously: *ḥad l-ḥad* 'one another', *ḥad ʿal-ḥad* 'one toward the other', and *ḥad d-ḥad* 'of each other'. But it also can fuse the elements into one unit: *ḥdādē* 'each other', *laḥdādē* 'to each other', and *daḥdādē* 'of each other'. Babylonian Aramaic, in contrast, has only the last option, *hdāde*; and similarly, in Mandaic there is only *hdadia*.[20] Decedents of this pronoun are found also in the Near Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects, such as *ġđađe* in the Barwar dialect (Khan 2008: 1287).

    However, based on the examples above, there clearly are alternative paths of development. In Standard Arabic, on the one hand, in the construction of (7b), there is not fusion but deletion of one of the elements ([7c] seems to be a middle stage in this process). Akkadian, on the other hand, is interesting in that, while one can trace a shift from two-unit pronouns to a one-unit pronoun, nevertheless the one-unit pronoun *aḫāmiš/aḫāiš* does not derive from the repetition of the two-unit pronouns that include *aḫum* (Gelb 1957: 104b; Bar-Asher Siegal 2011:30–33).[21] Thus it is possible that these are two types of pronouns that emerged independently.

---

    19. Nedjalkov (2007b) considers this to be a process of grammaticalization. It is unclear to me that a one-unit pronoun is more grammaticalized than two-unit pronouns. Instead, the two constructions seem to reflect two different possible grammatical relations within a pronominal reciprocal construction. Concerning this process, see also Plank 2008.

    20. Nöldeke (1875: 349–50 n. 2, §242) proposed that the form of repetition in one word and the way this form was used may suggest influence by Indo-European pronouns (this proposal was repeated by Macuch 1965: 415 n. 57; and Sokoloff 2002: 362). In light of the discussion here, I believe that these pronouns could have developed in the Aramaic languages independently, and one could conceive of there being an Akkadian substrate as well, as will be demonstrated in examples (6)–(7); as well as in n. 21.

    21. This is the case in the main dialects. In Old Babylonian texts from Susa, however, one finds the one-unit pronouns *aḫmaḫam/im* and *aḫmāmam/im* (see CAD A/1 193), which reflect a fusion of two-unit pronouns.

Nedjalkov (2007b) does not propose how exactly the shift from two-unit pronouns to the one-unit reciprocal pronoun occurs; in §3.3, I undertake to explain how it occurs. At this point, the process found in the history of Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic, which is also common cross-linguistically, allows us to infer that the two-unit pronominal construction is typologically older than the one-unit pronominal construction. Thus, since it is possible to trace the latter's derivation from the former in many languages, whereas an explanation in the other direction is not as readily available, it makes sense to hypothesize this direction of development. Consequently, the next stage of research is to search for the linguistic factors underlying this development.

In a prototypical pronominal construction, the two pronominal units occupy the regular syntactic positions of the nonreciprocal relation, and the fact that they hold these positions is evidence of encoded reciprocity. Thus, with transitive verbs, the pronouns occupy the regular positions of the subject and the object, as is also the case, for example, in the earlier stages of Akkadian:

(8) *aḫ-um   ana   aḫ-im   ul   eraggam*
    brother-NOM against brother-GEN NEG 3.SG.DUR.claim
    They will not raise a claim against each other. (BE 6/1 15:11, OB)

With an explicit antecedent in the adjacent contexts, the members of the set that are in a reciprocal relation are topicalized and appear in the nominative absolute:

(9) *atta u   nakrī-ka   aḫ-um   ina pāni*
    you and enemy-2.M.SG.POSS brother-NOM from
       aḫ-im   udappar
       brother-GEN 3.SG.DUR.withdraw
    You and your enemy will withdraw from each other.
    (YOS 10 47:81, OB)

The fact that in (9) 'you and your enemy' are the topic and not the subject is indicated by the form of the verb, which is 3rd-person singular, not 2nd-person plural, because the verb agrees with the reciprocal pronoun *aḫum*. In light of this, it is reasonable to conclude, for example, that the origin of the pronoun attached to the first *baʕḍ-* in the Arabic construction relates to the fact that *baʕḍ* is a partitive (unlike *aḫum* in Akkadian, which functions as a pronoun), and, therefore, a resumptive pronoun that refers to the topicalized element is needed in this sort of construction.

Returning to examples (4a–b) in Biblical Hebrew—the reciprocal pronouns are not like either of these two types. While at first the various combinations seem to be two-unit pronouns, the verbal agreement is (almost) always plural. Therefore, apparently, the first pronoun does not hold the subject position.

This sort of hybrid construction is not unknown in other language families. In languages that have this type of construction and are declined for case, both the topic and the first element of the reciprocal pronouns are nominative, as, for example, is the case in Icelandic:[22]

(10) *Þeir   elska   hvor   annan*
      they.NOM love.3.PL.IND   one.NOM   other.ACC
      They love each other. (Everaert 1999: 69, example [15])

Consequently, this type of construction raises two questions:

1. Syntactically, what are the grammatical relations between the various elements of the sentence?
2. Semantically, how is reciprocity expressed compositionally?

Because the focus of this volume is diachronic, I will leave a precise synchronic analysis for a different venue and will comment briefly here only when it is necessary for the purposes of this essay.[23] I turn now to proposing a diachronic development that accounts for the three types of construction, suggesting the following order:

two-unit pronouns > hybrid construction > one-unit pronoun

Noted that, in principle, it is also possible to have a direct shift from two-unit pronouns to a one-unit pronoun without the intermediate stage.

3.3. The Diachronic Development of the Pronominal Constructions

As argued above, from a typological point of view, there is good reason to take the two-unit construction, similar to the example found in Akkadian, as the original stage. Thus, I propose the following development:

---

22. In some languages only the second element declines for case, as, for example, in Russian.

23. In the context of Biblical Hebrew, Jay (2009) proposes that איש functions as a quantifier. This analysis relies on the hypothesis regarding English that a sentence such as "The cats tickle each other" derives from "The cats each tickle the other(s)" (this observation has a long history in the literature; see Dougherty 1970; Belletti 1982; Heim et al. 1991). This theory encounters various problems, however, even in English. For example, the truth conditions are not the same in the two sentences: if there are many "cats," the first sentence is true even if not all cats in fact were tickled, but the second sentence is not. More importantly, in many languages, including Biblical Hebrew, the pronominal elements, unlike in English, are not quantifiers. Although Jay (2009; based on Stein 2008) demonstrates that איש most often does not appear in its "lexical" meaning, he does not demonstrate that it is a quantifier anywhere in the biblical corpus. In fact, Stein has failed to notice the significant function of איש when it appears with its correlative רעהו; see below, §4.4, on this issue.

Stage I:

{N(oun)P(hrase)$_1$, NP$_2$ ...NP$_n$}.NOM VERB.SG reciprocal-pronoun$_1$ NOM.SG reciprocal-pronoun$_2$ ACC.SG

Topic   Subject   Object

(6) Old Akkadian
  aḫ-um   *ana aḫ-im*   *lā* *inappuš*
  brother-NOM to brother-GEN NEG 3.SG.DUR.make.a.claim
  One will not make a claim against the other. (TCL 19 63:45)

Stage II:

{NP$_1$, NP$_2$ . . . NPn$_3$}.NOM VERB.PL reciprocal-pronoun$_1$ NOM.SG reciprocal-pronoun$_2$ ACC.SG

Topic   Subject   Object

The main change is that the verb is plural in form. While one might initially assume that the plural agreement reflects a reanalysis of the nominative topic as the subject, it seems that the plural appeared for another reason. Plural agreement can also occur when there is no explicit topic, and the reciprocal pronouns are anaphoric expressions referring to an earlier sentence in the context. Thus, this seems to be a good example of what is known in the literature (Corbett 2006: 155–60) as semantic agreement instead of syntactic agreement ("the committee have met" versus "the committee has met") due to the fact that part of the meaning of a reciprocal relation is that more than one member occupies the subject position. Occasionally, this development appeared already in the Old Babylonian dialect of Akkadian:

(11) *aḫ-um*   *aḫ-am*   *lā* *ibaqqarū*
  brother-NOM brother-ACC NEG 3MPL.DUR.raise.a.claim
  None should raise claims against the other. (YOS 8 99:19f, OB)

This is also what we encounter in Standard Arabic in sentences with two-unit pronouns, as the following example demonstrates:

(12) a. *naḥnu nuwaddiʿu*   *baʿḍ-u-na*
    we 1.C.PL.IMP.say.farewell some-NOM.1.C.PL
     baʿḍ-an
     some-ACC.INDF
    We bade farewell to each other. (Cantarino 1975: 137)

  b. *linusāʿida*   *baʿḍ-u-na*   *baʿḍ-an*
    1.C.PL.SBJV.assist some-NOM-1.C.PL.POSS some-ACC.INDF
    Let us assist each other. (ar-ar.facebook.com/tohelpeachother)

Compare this with examples from the Qurʾān during the classical period, where the agreement is with the pronoun:

(13) a. *rabb-ana*   *stamtaʿa*   *baʿḍ-u-na*
        lord-POSS.1.PL   3.M.SG.PST.make.profit   some-NOM-1.PL.POSS
          bi-baʿḍ-in
          in-some-GEN.INDF
        Our Lord! We made profit from each other. (6:128)

      b. *yakfuru*   *baʿḍ-u-kum*   *bi-baʿḍ-in*
        3.M.SG.IMP.deny   some-NOM-2.M.PL.POSS   in-some-GEN.INDF
        You will disown each other. (29:25)

Similarly, in Biblical Hebrew, another strategy for expressing reciprocity appears: reciprocity is expressed, not pronominally (see above [2c]), but by repeating the same noun phrase in two positions in the sentence. For the purpose of this discussion, it is important to note that, even in sort of case, where there is clearly no other antecedent, the verb is plural:

(14)   כִּי גִבּוֹר בְּגִבּוֹר כָּשָׁלוּ
        One warrior will stumble over another. (Jer 46:12)

Stage III:

{NP$_1$, NP$_2$ . . . NP$_n$}.NOM   VERB[PL]   indefinite-pronoun$_1$-indefinite-pronoun$_2$ ACC.SG.[24]

Subject   Object

The last stage is a typical example of the topic reanalyzed as the subject and, consequently, the two separate pronouns are conceived as one unit—namely, the one-unit reciprocal pronoun.

Before we turn to the constructions found in the history of Hebrew, it is important to note the following:

1. This process may explain phonological fusion, in which two-unit pronouns become a one-unit pronoun, such as, for example, in German *einander* or in the Syriac merger of *ḥad ḥad* into *ḥdādē*. Similarly, it may account for the development in Standard Arabic (example [7b]) in which only one element of the pronoun remains (both cases can be considered tokens of haplology, with differing degrees of phonological deletion: *ḥadḥad > ḥdādē*; *baʿḍuna ~~baʿḍan~~* > *baʿḍuna*).
2. These stages reflect different syntactic relations. Thus, one language may have both types of construction simultaneously.

---

24. In languages in which the verb is always in final position (as is the case in Akkadian), there is no relocation of the verb.

Returning to the biblical formulas—as I have noted (see [2e] above and [15] below), there are a few examples of stage I, such as the following:

(15)   וְדִבֶּר חַד אֶת אַחַד

      One said to the other. (Ezek 33:30)

But in almost all other instances with pronominal constructions, the verb is plural. Thus, returning to the question at the beginning of this essay: the difference between the constructions in terms of verbal agreement reflects (1) two different grammatical relations in reciprocal constructions, and (2) two historical stages. This suggests that the sentences in Biblical Hebrew with a singular form of the verb are relics of an older formula. After following languages where it is possible to track such a development, I propose a similar development in the history of Hebrew, of which only a few vestiges remain.

It is now possible to turn to the question of whether the standard biblical construction, which consists of איש and אחיו/רעהו, represents stage II or stage III. Clearly, from the formal perspective, this is not completely stage III, because it is possible to insert elements between the components of the formula, as in (16):

(16)   לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אִישׁ שְׂפַת רֵעֵהוּ

      They will not understand one another's speech. (Gen 11:7)

However, it is possible that, semantically, Biblical Hebrew was already at stage III because there is a known phenomenon in the process of grammaticalization in which the functional process precedes its formal representations.[25] The support for this sort of analysis would be the few examples in which an explicit subject appears in a verb-initial sentence, and the NP cannot be analyzed as a topic, such as, for example, in (17):

(17)   וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָעָם שָׂרֵי גִלְעָד אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ

      The people, the leaders of Gilead, said to one another. . . .
      (Judg 10:18)

However, there are very few examples of this sort and they are all, to some extent, indecisive.[26]

---

25. This is the assumption of most studies on grammaticalization: functional processes motivate formal developments. In other words, once the functional process occurs the formal development can follow; hence, the assumption that there is also an order in time. See Bybee et al. 1994: 9–12, 19–21, among others. See also Hopper and Traugott (2003: 53–55) regarding the development of the French future.

26. In example (17), the verb is in initial position because it is a *waw*-consecutive construction and, according to various analyses, the verb moves to this position only late in the derivation. Another example is the following: כִּי אָז מֵהַבֹּקֶר נַעֲלָה הָעָם אִישׁ מֵאַחֲרֵי אָחִיו (2 Sam 2:27). However, it is very possible from the context (see v. 26) that the reciprocal expression

Returning to the question of the variety of reciprocal constructions in Biblical Hebrew, introduced at the beginning of this paper—so far, I have briefly discussed the typological distinction between verbal and pronominal constructions (2a–b vs. 2d–g) and provided a diachronic explanation for the difference between (2d) and (2f–g) in terms of verbal agreement. Now I turn to the various options for the components of pronominal constructions in Biblical Hebrew.

3.4. Variations of Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions in Biblical Hebrew

3.4.1. The Standard Constructions

The sentences in (2f–g) and (4a–b) above demonstrate the two regular formulas of two-unit constructions to express reciprocity pronominally in Biblical Hebrew. In both, the first element is אִישׁ 'man', and the second is either אחיו 'his brother' or רעהו 'his friend'. This presents us with an interesting situation in that, in one language, there are simultaneously two alternative constructions. Other languages also have more than one set, but often they are either typologically different (as in English "one . . . another" versus "each other") or belong to different registers (as is the case in Modern Hebrew, אחד את השני [standard], זה את זה [higher level]). [27] Surveying the biblical data, we have a

belongs to another sentence, in which case there is an ellipsis and one should add שבו to translate: 'Surely then the people would have turned away from following each other in the morning'. Another sentence to consider is: אָז נִדְבְּרוּ יִרְאֵי יְהוָה אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ 'Then those who feared God spoke to one another' (Mal 3:16). The complement of this verb with the preposition אֶל is unexpected. In fact, it seems to be an example of a more general phenomenon in which the expression אִישׁ אל רעהו/אחיו appears with verbs that do not usually take the preposition אֶל, such as in Gen 43:33; Jer 36:16; Ezek 24:23; Isa 13:8. One may consider that in these contexts this expression has an associative meaning. This function is expressed in various way cross-linguistically, most commonly with adverbs such as "together." In other languages, it is expressed with a prefix, such as the Latin prefix *com-*. Interestingly, very often this is the same expression used in these languages for a reciprocal action (see Zaliznjak and Shmelev 2007; see also Evans et al. [2007], who argue that 'act jointly' is part of the meaning of the "prototypical reciprocal clauses"). This conceptual connection is also realized in the discontinuous construction (discussed above in n. 13), where the relationships between the participants of the reciprocal relations are expressed by the associative meaning. In light of this, the following line in Jeremiah should be reconsidered: וְנִפַּצְתִּים אִישׁ אֶל אָחִיו וְהָאָבוֹת וְהַבָּנִים יַחְדָּו. Instead of translating the verse 'I will smash them one against the other, parents and children together' (Jer 13:14), one could tie together the final two expressions with the meaning 'together.' In this context, note that the adverb יחדו 'together' also appears several times in reciprocal contexts: Deut 25:11; 2 Sam 2:16; Isa 45:21; Amos 3:3; Ps 71:10, and others. In the future, I will consider these various phenomena further. See also Halevy 2011b: 406.

27. Nedjalkov (2007b: 157) mentions a few other languages with more than one set of pronominal expressions. He also comments that this phenomenon is often the result of borrowing from other languages. See also Haas (2010: especially chap. 5) regarding competing strategies in English. In our context, it is interesting to note that, on the one hand, אישׁ־רעהו

hard time finding a clear distribution for the two constructions either textually or historically. Books such as Judges, which uses איש/רעהו exclusively, or such as Ezekiel, which uses איש אחיו/אישה אחותה exclusively, are rare.[28] Isaiah and Jeremiah seem to be aware of this alternation and combine both expressions in their poetry to create parallel expressions:

(18) אִישׁ אֶת רֵעֵהוּ יַעְזֹרוּ וּלְאָחִיו יֹאמַר חֲזָק[29]

They help each other and say one to another, "Be strong!"
(Isa 41:6)

(19) כֹּה תֹאמְרוּ אִישׁ עַל רֵעֵהוּ וְאִישׁ אֶל אָחִיו

Thus will each of you say to his neighbor and to his brother. . . .
(Jer 23:35)

Before surveying the less common constructions in Biblical Hebrew mentioned in the introduction (2c–e), I would like to add another comment regarding possible signs of internal grammaticalization within Hebrew of the components of these constructions.

As noted, sentences (2c) and (14) demonstrate that in Biblical Hebrew the repetition of any noun could express reciprocity.[30] Thus, one could speculate the following stages in the grammaticalization of the pronouns:

1. Originally, there was no single word dedicated to expressing reciprocity. At this stage, it is reasonable to assume that the words איש and אחיו/רעהו were used only in contexts where the meaning of 'brother/friend' was relevant.
2. Later, through a process of grammaticalization, the semantics of the words איש and אחיו/רעהו went through a process described in the literature of grammaticalization as semantic bleaching—that is, the loss of lexical content and the retention (or acquisition) of grammatical content. Thus in our contexts, these lexemes became pronouns in the context of reciprocal constructions.

___

is a calque of an Aramaic formula and, on the other hand, the אח component in the alternative formula is a cognate of the same lexeme used for similar functions in Akkadian.

28. There are some short books, such as Joel, with only one occurrence of this sort of construction; they are irrelevant to our discussion.

29. Note the difference in agreement. While the first is plural, as is standard in Biblical Hebrew, the second verb is singular.

30. Regarding the cross-linguistic phenomenon of repeating a noun phrase to express reciprocity, see Nedjalkov 2007: 154; Bar-Asher Siegal 2011; for evidence of this phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew, see Jay 2009: 7 n.14. It is impossible to characterize the text in which such a formula occurs in diachronic or stylistic terms. It is also hard to determine whether the occurrences of this sort of formula are merely relics of an older stage or are evidence that at some level the repetition was still a productive means of expressing reciprocity. See Bar-Asher Siegal 2011 for the Akkadian evidence with regard to this question.

In fact, however, it seems to be more accurate to say that at first only the first component, איש, was the regular indefinite pronoun.[31] Thus, the extension was the addition of a second correlative component: either אחיו or רעהו. Both are nouns with a genitive pronominal suffix that refers to the first component, איש. One can even imagine that this process of semantic bleaching began when רעהו/אחיו were being used in contexts similar to the following:

(20)   עִבְרוּ וָשׁוּבוּ מִשַּׁעַר לָשַׁעַר בַּמַּחֲנֶה וְהִרְגוּ אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו וְאִישׁ אֶת רֵעֵהוּ
        וְאִישׁ אֶת קְרֹבוֹ

> Go back and forth through the camp from one end to the other,
> each killing his brother and friend and neighbor. (Exod 32:27)

This is a context in which the original meaning of 'brother' is probably still relevant in the listing, even though the list as a whole ('brother', 'friend', and 'neighbor') reflects 'everyone'. In other contexts, one can imagine that all three of these words were perceived as a general expression for such a relation.[32] Thus, in the early stage, only איש was used as an indefinite pronoun with various other participants ('brother', 'friend', etc.), and then רעהו or אחיו became a pronoun as well.

In an early stage, איש and רעהו/אחיו were probably used only for people, but once these words were grammaticalized, we find the expected development of their being used in the context of animals as well:[33]

(21)   וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו קְחָה לִי עֶגְלָה מְשֻׁלֶּשֶׁת וְעֵז מְשֻׁלֶּשֶׁת וְאַיִל מְשֻׁלָּשׁ וְתֹר וְגוֹזָל.
        וַיִּקַּח לוֹ אֶת כָּל אֵלֶּה וַיְבַתֵּר אֹתָם בַּתָּוֶךְ וַיִּתֵּן אִישׁ בִּתְרוֹ לִקְרַאת רֵעֵהוּ
        וְאֶת הַצִּפֹּר לֹא בָתָר

> So he said to him: "Bring me a heifer, a goat and a ram, each
> three years old, along with a dove and a young pigeon." And
> he brought all these, cut them in the middle and arranged the
> halves opposite each other; the birds, however, he did not cut in
> half. (Gen 15:9–10)

Later, the same terms were even used with inanimate objects:

(22)   חֲמֵשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת תִּהְיֶיןָ חֹבְרֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל אֲחֹתָהּ

> The five curtains should join each other (Exod 26:3)

---

31. See Stein 2008, among others.

32. As we shall see below (§4.4), the use of these pronouns in Biblical Hebrew is more general, and thus we may assume that this development occurred independently of the reciprocal use of these pronouns.

33. For a similar description, see Jay 2009: 7.

Another development that might be expected would be lack of gender agreement. Biblical Hebrew does not exhibit lack of gender agreement in these constructions, but signs of this development are found in other languages.

3.4.2. Other Constructions

As noted in the introduction, there are also some other less-common pronominal constructions in Biblical Hebrew. The first is a repetition of the words אחד/אחת 'one' (see above, [2e]):

(23)   וַיְחַבֵּר אֶת הַיְרִיעֹת אַחַת אֶל אַחַת בַּקְּרָסִים

He joined the curtains to one another with the clasps.
(Exod 36:13)

It is interesting to note that the repetition of the lemma 'one' in the two-unit pronouns is common in all dialects of Late Aramaic. In fact one may consider that the following example in Ezekiel is the Aramaic expression (note the Aramaic form חַד) with its Hebrew gloss (אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו):[34]

(24)   וְדִבֶּר חַד אֶת אַחַד אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו לֵאמֹר

One said to the other, saying to each other. . . . (Ezek 33:30)

Note that the use of 'one' in this sort of construction is common cross-linguistically, and, while it is common in Late Aramaic, it is occasionally found in other Semitic languages as well.[35] However, since it is only occasionally found in Hebrew, it is reasonable to infer that this was a linguistic variation that was probably introduced due to influence from other languages.

Even less common is the repetition of the demonstrative (2d), as examples (25)–(26) demonstrate, though this construction is very important to this historical discussion:

(25)   שְׂרָפִים עֹמְדִים מִמַּעַל לוֹ . . . וְקָרָא זֶה אֶל־זֶה וְאָמַר

Seraphim stood above Him . . . and they called one to the other and said. . . . (Isa 6:2–3)

(26)   וַיַּחֲנוּ אֵלֶּה נֹכַח אֵלֶּה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים

For seven days they camped opposite each other. (1 Kgs 20:29)

Notice that, from a typological point of view, both (24) and (25) illustrate the first stage in the development of the pronominal constructions, because the

---

34. Moshkovitz 1985: 264. Interestingly, the Septuagint translates only the Hebrew sentence.

35. Nöldeke (2001: 354) also provides references for a similarly rare formula in Arabic. In Bar-Asher Siegal 2011, I mention one Akkadian example from the Neo-Assyrian period in which the two-unit pronouns consist of the repetition of *ištēn* 'one'. I speculate that this occurred due to the influence of Aramaic.

verb is still singular.[36] Interestingly, it appears with the nonstandard formulas (that is, constructions that do not consist of איש *and* אחיו/רעהו). Furthermore, unlike the other constructions, as the contrast between (25) and (26) illustrates, the pronouns agree in number with their antecedents (זה 'this' versus אלה 'these'). I continue the discussion about number agreement in §3.5.

From a typological perspective, (25) illustrates the older type, which is rare in the biblical corpus. However, from the perspective of the history of Hebrew, examples (25)–(26) provide the earliest attestations of the elements that became the regular construction in later Mishnaic Hebrew, when the most common construction was the repetition of demonstratives (Segal 1927: 208, §433). Thus, it is not unlikely that the few examples of this construction in Biblical Hebrew reflect early signs of this mishnaic construction back in the biblical period.

Because the relationship between the biblical and mishnaic constructions is the topic of the next section of this essay, I turn now to introducing reciprocal pronouns in the rabbinic corpus.

3.5 Mishnaic Hebrew Pronominal Reciprocal Construction(s)

The following examples demonstrate the above-mentioned standard construction of Mishnaic Hebrew:

(27) a.　　השוכר את האומנים והיטעו זה את זה ואין לו זה על זה אלא
　　　　　תרעומת

　　　If one engages craftsmen and they deceive one another, they
　　　have only resentment against each other. (*m. B. Meṣiʿa* 6:1)

b.　　אין דנין לא זה את זה ולא זה עם זה ולא זה על זה ולא זה בפני
　　　זה. ואין מעידין לא זה את זה ולא זה עם זה ולא זה על זה ולא זה בפני
　　　זה

　　　They do not judge each other, with each other, concerning each
　　　other, or in the presence of each other; and they do not testify
　　　against each other, with each other, or in the presence of each
　　　other. (*t. Sanh.* 5.4)

c.　　שתי חבורות שהיו אוכלות בבית אחד. בזמן שמקצתן רואים
　　　אלו את אלו הרי אלו מצטרפין לזימון

　　　If two separate parties have dined in the same house, if some of
　　　each party are able to see some of the other company, they may
　　　join to say the grace of the meal together. (*m. Ber.* 7:5)

---

36. See also Greenberg 1997: 686. It is interesting to compare the ancient translations of this sentence. While the Septuagint relies strictly on the Hebrew text and is singular, the Aramaic targum uses the plural for both verbs, which is also the standard in the rest of the Hebrew Bible.

In (27c), there is agreement in number between the sets participating in the reciprocal relation. It should be noted that in both (27a) and (27c) the antecedent of the pronouns is plural ('craftsmen' and 'two parties'); however, only sentence (27c) has the plural form of the demonstrative. The reason for this is that in (27a) the reciprocal relationship is between individuals (one craftsman deceives the other), and in (27c) the reciprocal relationship is between sets (one party sees the other). Thus, it is clear that this agreement is not syntactical but semantic.[37]

However, in a few other places, we encounter the singular demonstrative זה where the plural form אלו is expected, indicating that the *grammaticalization* of the demonstratives as the components of the pronominal reciprocal construction affected the grammar:

(28)   הקמחין והסלתות מעלין זה את זה

The flours and fine meals may neutralize each other. (*t. Ter.* 6.6)

The shift from the biblical formula to the mishnaic is nicely illustrated in the following example, taken from a legal midrash that cites a reciprocal expression in the Bible but then uses the rabbinic formula in its own phrasing of the law:

(29)   ״וכשלו איש באחיו.״ אינו או[מר], ״איש באחיו.״ אלא איש בעונות
            אחיו. מלמ[ד] שכל יש[ראל] ערבין זה לזה

"They shall stumble over one another"—the verse does not say "over one another" [lit., a man over his brother] but "one over the sins of the other." This teaches us that all the Israelites are a pledge for each other [lit., this to this]. (*Sipra Beḥuqotay* 7.5)

In a few instances, we do find the biblical formula in Mishnaic Hebrew. The following example appears in tractate *ʾAbot*, which is known for its archaic style and, thus, shows affinity with the language of the Bible:[38]

(30)   ר׳ חנניה סגן הכהנים או[מר]. הוי מתפלל (ל)[ב]שלמה שלמלכות.
            שאילולי מוראה איש את רעהו חיים בלענו.

R. Ḥanina, the chief priest, said: "Pray for the welfare of the ruling power, since, but for the fear thereof, men would engulf each other alive." (*m. ʾAbot* 3:2)

---

37. Glinert (1989: 69) already noted this distribution in the context of Modern Hebrew, where this construction appears in situations with a higher register of language and preserves this syntactic-semantic distinction. Regarding the uniqueness of these agreement rules cross-linguistically, see Heine and Miyashita 2008: 169–70.

38. For the relationship between the language of tractate *ʾAbot* and Biblical Hebrew, see Sharvit 2006: 32–59. For a discussion of the issue of reciprocal expressions, see specifically p. 48 there.

In this same context, it is interesting to note that at Qumran one regularly finds the biblical components איש–אחיו/רעהו, while the components זה–זה, which are common in Mishnaic Hebrew, are used only occasionally (compare, for example, 1QS 2:20–21 with 1QS 5:23).[39] This is the expected distribution, when there is such a difference between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew.

So far, the differences between the biblical and the mishnaic formulas are mostly formal. While in the former the construction consists of the pronominal expressions איש–אחיו/רעהו, the latter consists of a repetition of the demonstrative זה. Syntactically, both constructions seem to be similar with to the fact that, despite the single number of the components of the construction, the verb is plural.

4. The Biblical and Mishnaic Pronominal Constructions and Their Diachronic Relation

4.1. Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew

Before proceeding to the specific issue of the relationship between the reciprocal constructions in each period, we should note one fact with regard to the relationship between the languages of the two corpora. While it is clear that the texts of the biblical era and the mishnaic era are from different periods, it is not always accurate to speak of them as successive linguistic periods. In other words, encountering a certain grammatical function expressed by X in Biblical Hebrew and by Y in Mishnaic Hebrew, we are not always correct methodologically in inferring that X changed/developed into Y and then positing an explanation for the change. There are strong arguments in support of the notion that Mishnaic Hebrew evolved from an early dialect that probably coexisted with the biblical dialect. It is reasonable to suppose that the appearances of the pronominal reciprocal construction that consisted of the repetition of the demonstratives reflected this situation.[40]

For the purposes of the functional comparison to be discussed below (§§4.3–4), it is sufficient to note that, for some speakers, this sort of development occurred. Thus, the goal of this part of the paper is to describe the nature of this shift.

4.2. The Origin of the Mishnaic Construction

From a typological perspective, the mishnaic and the biblical formulas are the same, because both have two-unit pronouns, and the verbs are plural. However, it is not a simple matter to determine how to characterize the change between the periods. Presumably, since pronominal reciprocity is a syntactical phenomenon, this is a syntactical change. But it is difficult to claim this definitively because, from a typological perspective, nothing changed on the

---

39. See also Mor 2009: 238–39.
40. See, inter alia, Bar-Asher 2006: 573; and Rendsburg's article in this volume.

syntactic level. It was not a morphological shift either, because no morphological changes occurred. Thus, one could potentially argue that, although this is a grammatical issue, it involved nothing more than a lexical change from איש–אחיו/רעהו to זה-זה. As we saw in §3.4.2, the mishnaic formula had already appeared in a few examples in the biblical corpus; thus it is possible that this is another example of a dialectal variation that became the standard in the later period (§4.1). One could also propose that Aramaic contributed to this shift and consider it to be some sort of a calque of an Aramaic formula, because similar vocabulary is found in the equivalent Biblical Aramaic construction, where pronominal reciprocity is also expressed by repeating the demonstrative pronoun:

(31) a.   וְאַרְכֻבָּתֵהּ דָּא לְדָא נָקְשָׁן

> and his knees were striking one another. (Dan 5:6)

b.   וְלָא לֶהֱוֺן דָּבְקִין דְּנָה עִם דְּנָה

> and they will not adhere to one another. (Dan 2:43)

If there was Aramaic influence on Mishnaic Hebrew in this matter, we should ask: where and when did it happen?

The examples in (31) are from Biblical Aramaic, specifically from the book of Daniel, the provenance of which is debatable. Interestingly, repeating the demonstratives is not the standard way to express reciprocity pronominally in Galilean Aramaic, where it is customarily expressed (as in the late eastern dialects) by repeating the word חד 'one': [41]

(32)   ואינון פליגין חדא על חדא

> They are at variance with each other. (*y. Ḥal.* 3.2)

The construction with a repetition of the demonstratives also appears at Qumran (Muraoka 2011: 51) and in the Samaritan dialect (Stadel 2011: 39–40). However, it is still unclear whether these are only attestations of a higher level of language, imitating the biblical style, or whether the formulation was a genuine phenomenon in these dialects. Similarly, in the late Palestinian translation, *Tg. Yerushalmi* (*Pseudo-Jonathan*), occasional sentences that are not a translation of a biblical verse also use the following formula:

---

41. There are rare examples of demonstratives used for the reciprocal function: גבר אית ליה בר וחורגא ואינתו אית לה בר וחורגה ואסבון דין לדין 'a husband has a son and a stepdaughter and the wife has a son and a stepdaughter and they married each other' (*y. Yebam.* 10.6; and in a similar context in *y. B. Meṣiʿa* 2.5); גלי גרמיה וחכים דין לדין. והוו מגפפין דין לדין ומנשקין דין לדין 'he uncovered himself, and they recognized each other, and they embraced each other and kissed each other' (*Lam. Rab.* 1:46). Since such sentences are rare, they may be examples of the use of an archaic formula, or they may reflect a variation that was retained in certain dialects.

(33) וקריבו דין לדין

And they approached each other. (*Tg. Ps.-J.* on Num 21:14)

Although it is possible that this is a reflection of another variation in Palestinian Aramaic, in this case it might instead be an archaism. As long as we do not have a full survey of the pronominal reciprocal constructions in the history of Aramaic, it is difficult to determine where and whether the mishnaic form is exhibiting a borrowing from Aramaic. It could have occurred in the older period of Official or Middle Aramaic, or it could be reflecting a local Palestinian dialect that appears only in the late translations.

With regard to the question introduced at the beginning of this essay, the various components of the pronominal constructions may be explained as the result of a calque that literally translated the components of the pronominal construction of another language. Although structures similar to (2d) and (2e) appear in Aramaic, it is significant that they are not found in the same Aramaic dialects, suggesting that there may have been various times or locations that exercised influence.

4.3. The Pronouns in Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions

The beginning point for the current discussion was a common assumption in the typological literature that a reciprocal construction is a defined phenomenon that can and should be treated independently—in other words, that there are forms, the function of which is to represent reciprocal situations. As such, these forms can be compared cross-linguistically, and they can also be subjected to historical analysis.

I begin with a fact observed in the literature on reciprocal constructions, which is that the so-called reciprocal pronouns are also used in asymmetric relations in which reciprocity is impossible:

(34) כִּי אָז מֵהַבֹּקֶר נַעֲלָה הָעָם אִישׁ מֵאַחֲרֵי אָחִיו

then the people would have gone away in the morning, each from following the other. (2 Sam 2:27)[42]

If X follows Y, Y cannot follow X. The pronouns in these asymmetrical contexts convey the fact that X follows Y, Y follows Z, and so on. This is definitely not a reciprocal relation; and clearly, while the objects in the middle fulfill the role of both leaders and followers, this is not true of the first and the last. In light of this, it is better to describe the function of these pronouns in the following way:

These are pronominal expressions used in relationships between two sets or more without specifying which of the sets occupies which position.

42. Concerning the interpretation of this verse, see above n. 28.

Thus, these pronouns may serve to mark both reciprocal relationships and asymmetrical relationships.[43]

Furthermore, in Biblical Hebrew, the use of the pairs איש and אחיו/רעהו should be considered more broadly. I submit that this usage is actually what stands behind the situations in the legal corpora that list casuistic laws:[44]

(35) a.   וְכִי יָזִד אִישׁ עַל רֵעֵהוּ לְהָרְגוֹ בְעָרְמָה

> If a man acts presumptuously toward his neighbor to kill him treacherously. . . . (Exod 21:14)

b.   כִּי יִתֵּן אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ חֲמוֹר אוֹ שׁוֹר אוֹ שֶׂה וְכָל בְּהֵמָה לִשְׁמֹר

> If a man gives his fellow a donkey, an ox, a sheep, or any other animal to keep for him. . . . (Exod 22:9)

c.   כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָקוּם אִישׁ עַל רֵעֵהוּ וּרְצָחוֹ נֶפֶשׁ כֵּן הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה

> This case is like that of someone who rises against his fellow and murders him. (Deut 22:26)

These examples are not reciprocal; even if the verb allows for a reciprocal reading elsewhere, this is not the case in these legal contexts (35a–c).

These examples fit the proposed definition above, though the "sets" usually contain only one member each. In fact, the sentences in (35) are regular examples of lexicalized nonspecific indefinite pronouns. Thus, although above, the semantic bleaching of relevant nouns was thought to occur only in the context of reciprocal constructions, it now becomes clear that this "bleaching" is relevant to more situations because these nouns appear as "pronouns" in more contexts.

There are, however, some differences between these examples (35) and the examples above (16–22) with the reciprocal use of these expressions (and to some extent this is also true in the case of the asymmetric examples). First, there is no specification in any of examples (35a–c) about which of the sets occupies which position; in reciprocity, however, the lack of determination with regard to the referent of each component of the pronouns (איש and אחיו/רעהו) is only within a defined domain (the extension of the sets in the topic/subject

---

43. Dalrymple et al. 1998 survey the various logical relations that can be expressed by the so-called reciprocal pronouns in English. They examine the various semantic components that determine the specific logical relations between the various sets that hold the relation expressed by the predicate.

44. The following sentence from outside of the legal corpus perhaps is also relevant for our analysis: וְדִבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה פָּנִים אֶל פָּנִים כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ 'The LORD used to speak to Moses face to face, just as a man speaks to his friend' (Exod 33:11). The fact that the verb is in singular suggest that only God is speaking, and what the second clause describes is only the fact that God and Moses are facing each other, as is the case in a regular conversation.

of the sentence). Thus, in (35) the pronouns are not limited to a specific group, because they do not refer to any constituent in the specific context. Second, in reciprocity each set that is a member of the topic/subject set is supposed to participate more than once in the relation/action of the verb, each time as a different argument, whereas in nonreciprocal contexts each participant participates only once. As discussed above (§3.2), the reason for the plural form of the verb is either that the subject is always plural or that the plurality of the events results in semantic agreement; consequently, it is not surprising that in (35) the verb is singular.

Let us compare this distribution with similar contexts in Mishnaic Hebrew and examine how all the functions expressed by the biblical pronouns איש and אחיו/רעהו are expressed in Mishnaic Hebrew.

The repetition of demonstratives is the regular expression for relations between sets of two or more without specifying which of the sets occupies which position. Thus, this formula appears also in nonreciprocal/asymmetrical contexts, as example (36) illustrates:

(36)   ואפה בשלשה תנורין זה אחר זה.

   He baked in three ovens, one after the other. (*t. Pesaḥ.* 2.1)

However, these are not the pronouns used in casuistic laws. In Mishnaic Hebrew, instead of the pair איש-רעהו, the regular expression in such contexts consists of the following pair of indefinite pronouns: אדם-חבירו:

(37) a.   התקינו שיה(ו)א אדם שואל את שלום חבירו בשם

   It was directed that every man should greet his friend in the name of the Lord. (*m. Ber.* 9:5)

   b.   אדם מועד לעולם. בין שוגג בין מזיד. בין ער בין ישן. ס[י]מא את עין חבירו ושיבר את הכלים. משלם נזק שלם

   A man is always accounted as noxious, regardless of whether he causes damage intentionally or unintentionally, when awake or asleep. If one blinded the eyes of his fellow, or broke his vessels, he must pay full damage. (*m. B. Qam.* 2:6)

In fact, it is even more accurate to say that in (37b) the first element of the blinding relationship (סימא את עין חבירו) is implied by the agent of the verb. Indeed, in Mishnaic Hebrew it is very common for the first element of these sentences to be implied by a participial form:

(38) a.   המסכך את גפנו על גבי תבואתו של חבירו הרי זה קידש וחייב באחריותו

   If one allows his vine to overtop the grain crop of his fellow. . . . (*m. Kil.* 7:4)

b.   הגוזל את חבירו. או שלווה המינו

If one has robbed aught from his fellow or borrowed from him.
. . . (*m. B. Qam.* 10:6)

Interestingly, unlike Biblical Hebrew, where the process of grammaticalization also allows for the application of these indefinite pronouns to inanimate objects (as demonstrated above in [22]), Mishnaic Hebrew usually does not, as the following example illustrates:

(39)   מטבילים מגב לגב ומחבורה לחבורה ביום טוב.

One may immerse from one purpose to another, and from one company to another. (*m. Beṣah* 2:3)

For animate expressions, these indefinite pronouns are used, but for inanimate expressions, a full repetition of the relevant noun phrase is required.[45] This contrast is evident in the following example, where the word חטאת 'a sin-offering' is repeated, while in the case of תינוק 'a child', the second element is the pronoun חבירו:

(40)   לא היו עושין (א)לא חטאת על גב חטאת [ו]לא תינוק על גב[י] חבירו.

It was prohibited to prepare a sin-offering by virtue of [the pu-rification made for] another sin-offering, or [to make use of] a child by virtue of [the purification made for] his fellow.
(*m. Parah* 3:4)

There seem to be occasional exceptions, however, in which such pronouns appear for inanimate objects as well, such as the following:

(41)   אין משחיזין את הסכין אבל משיאה על גבי חברתה

One may not whet a knife, but one may sharpen one against the other. (*m. Beṣah* 3:7)

Thus, if Mishnaic Hebrew had employed indefinite pronouns for the recipro-cal constructions, the two-unit pronouns would have included the nouns אדם and חבירו (Segal 1927: 208–9, §434). Instead, we have an example of a hybrid construction in the Mishnah. In example (42), the first element is the biblical איש, and the second is the mishnaic חבירו:

(42)   והחזנים מזרקים לפניהם והן מחטפים ומכים איש את חבירו

The superintendents threw them before them, and they snatched at them, and struck one another. (*m. Sukkah* 4:4)

---

45. See n. 30 for a discussion on the use of repetition in similar contexts in Biblical Hebrew and cross-linguistically.

With regard to the origin of this construction, note that, while אדם as a lexicalized indefinite pronoun was found already in Biblical Hebrew (see, for example, Lev 13:3 [Segal 1936: 64–65, §101]) and was very common in Second Temple literature such as Ben Sira, the use of חבר instead of the biblical lexeme רע should be regarded in light of what is found in Aramaic. There were signs of this construction already in Biblical Aramaic, and this is the lexeme that was used for this function in all Late Aramaic dialects.[46]

4.4. What Accounts for the Different Distributions of Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew?

Surveying the data in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew introduces the paramount question at hand: What is the reason for this difference between Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew? This question can be asked from two directions: Why in the former are the same expressions used in both reciprocal contexts and nonreciprocal casuistic laws? Conversely, why in Mishnaic Hebrew is reciprocity expressed with demonstratives, while indefinite pronouns are used in nonreciprocal legal contexts?

I propose that the answer lies in the fact that, while the biblical construction used nouns that bleached in certain contexts and were used as indefinite pronouns in certain contexts, the mishnaic construction contains demonstratives that are part of the grammar and are anaphoric expressions—that is, expressions that by their nature refer to other nominal expressions.[47] As anaphoric expressions, they are linked to an antecedent. Therefore, the context clarifies their reference. This requirement is met only when there are antecedents, which is the case in most reciprocal contexts. This requirement is not met in generic contexts such as casuistic laws. This is not the case with indefinite pronouns, which are not necessarily anaphoric, because they stand by themselves and do not refer to other nominal expressions in the context. Therefore, these indefinite pronouns can be used in contexts such as casuistic laws where such referents are not specified. Continuing in this line of thought, one may assume that, on the one hand, the fronting of the nominal expression in a reciprocal relationship (as, for example, in sentences like "to be patient with each other is a good thing") could have been expressed easily only in Biblical Hebrew. Although I could not locate such an example in the biblical corpus, ironically, I found an example that uses the biblical construction in the mishnaic corpus:

---

46. In Dan 7:20, it is used in the meaning of 'other'.

47. To avoid confusion, I do not use the term *anaphora* in the sense in which it was used in government and binding contexts. That framework distinguishes between anaphora and pronominals—the former must have strictly local antecedents (i.e., the anaphor and its antecedent are in the same sentence), while the antecedents of the latter need not be local. In this essay, as is common in typological literature, the term *pronoun* is used more broadly in that it does not need an antecedent, and the term *anaphora* is used in its more classic sense as a pronoun that has an antecedent, but its antecedent is not necessarily local.

(43)   קשה שנאת איש את רעהו לפני המקום
        Mutual hatred is unfavorable in the eyes of God. (*t. Menaḥ.* 13.22).

On the other hand, it was probably impossible to express this sentence using
the mishnaic formulation without an explicit topic, such as "for people to hate
each other is unfavorable in the eyes of God." Admittedly, it is hard to prove
this, but the requirement of binding explains the absence of these pronouns in
the mishnaic casuistic laws, making this conclusion reasonable.

    In sum, having given consideration to the pronominal reciprocal construc-
tions from a typological point of view and in isolation from the other uses of
these pronouns, we see that the relationship between the standard constructions
in Biblical Hebrew and the constructions in Mishnaic Hebrew is identical,
even though they have different lexical elements. Once these constructions are
examined from a structural perspective, exploring the function of each element
as it also appears in various other syntactical constructions, we can see that
they are clearly different. The Biblical Hebrew construction employs indefinite
pronouns, while the Mishnaic Hebrew construction is built by repeating the
demonstrative pronouns.

    Returning to the methodological concerns considered at the beginning of
the discussion regarding a functional comparison of two linguistic periods
(§2), we see clearly that describing the phenomena of reciprocal constructions
is not trivial. Assuming a diachronic relationship between Biblical Hebrew
and Mishnaic Hebrew, one could posit that the Aramaic construction found
in Daniel was reflected in the Hebrew construction. But, instead of describing
the differences between Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew by focusing
on the reciprocal construction, one will find it more productive to observe
the pronouns used in each period. While Biblical Hebrew uses indefinite pro-
nouns with and without explicit antecedents, Mishnaic Hebrew uses indefinite
pronouns only nonreferentially—that is, without explicit antecedents. Thus,
indefinite pronouns can appear in casuistic laws but not in reciprocal con-
structions. When the antecedent is a set and the verb describes a relation that
connects them, then demonstratives appear in Mishnaic Hebrew, because they
are anaphoric. As a result, pronominal reciprocal constructions have a differ-
ent shape in each period. The older construction, which appears in Biblical
Hebrew, has indefinite pronouns, and the later construction, which appears in
Mishnaic Hebrew, has demonstrative pronouns.

    Accordingly, the similarity between the constructions of both periods (such
as the plural form of the verbs and the way that the constructions provide recip-
rocal readings) is part of other, more-general principles that are used in order
to produce the reciprocal meaning cross-linguistically.

    This observation might be related to another phenomenon. In Biblical He-
brew, איש can be specific and have a referent, as is in the following verse:

(44) וַיֵּלֶךְ אִישׁ מִבֵּית לֵוִי וַיִּקַּח אֶת בַּת לֵוִי

> A man from the house of Levi went and married a daughter of Levi. (Exod 2:1)

In contrast, אדם in Mishnaic Hebrew is used only nonspecifically. When אִישׁ has a specific referent, it may also be used in Mishnaic Hebrew, and in the Mishnah it is almost always followed by פלוני 'so-and-so':

(45) היה עובר בשוק ושמע קול הסופרים מקרים. איש פלוני מגרש את
      פלונית ממקום פלוני

> If a person passing through a street hears the voice of public notaries [dictating to their clerks or pupils], saying, "So-and-so divorces so-and-so living at a certain place. . . ." (*m. Giṭ.* 3:1) [48]

Table 1. Comparison of the Distribution of Indefinite Pronouns in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew

Biblical Hebrew

	איש־אחיו/רעהו
specific/non-specific (for inanimate as well)	

Mishnaic Hebrew

איש	אדם-חבירו	זה-זה
specific	nonspecific	
(occasionally also nonspecific)	(mostly for animate)	anaphoric

Thus, borrowing from Aramaic changed not only the forms of the pronouns but also the function of each of the pronouns and the differences between them. Regarding reciprocal constructions: formally, the elements are different but, from a typological point of view, there is a great deal of similarity.

5. Conclusion

In this essay, I deal with various aspects of pronominal reciprocal constructions in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. I focus on the phenomena related to various aspects of historical syntax, and in §2 I briefly mention various methodological considerations. Throughout this paper, I illustrate different types of syntactic developments that occurred in the history of the pronominal reciprocal constructions in Hebrew, among them the following:

---

48. The fact that indefinite pronouns are used referentially in some languages whereas in other languages they are not is well known in the typological literature (see Haspelmath 1997; among others).

1. *Changes from one type of construction to another.* These changes are the result of reanalyses of the grammatical relations between the components of the constructions. Thus, for example, the topic of the sentence is reanalyzed as its subject, and this development reveals itself through verbal agreement, whether the verb agrees with the nouns participating in the reciprocal relationship or with their pronouns (§3.3).

2. *Changes in the range of application of a certain construction.* Thus, many of the pronominal constructions consist of nominal expressions that became grammaticalized pronouns used in various constructions. This process involved a semantic bleaching in which nouns lost their lexical meaning and only retained their grammatical content. As expected, this was a gradual process; thus, for example, there are sentences from Mishnaic Hebrew in which certain nouns are used only for animate expressions (§4.3), while similar expressions in Biblical Hebrew were (already) being used for a wider range, and were used for inanimate expressions as well (§3.4.1).

3. *Changes in the components of the various constructions.* In addition, it is possible that some changes in the components of the various constructions reflect the influence of Aramaic and may be considered examples of calques with regard to the function of the demonstratives (§§3.4.2, 4.2).

Returning to the methodological discussion about historical syntax in §2—the first two types of development are easier to follow, because there is similarity in form in the various periods. In contrast to this, in positing a third type of development, we find that the influence of one language on another relies on a functional similarity, which is more delicate. Section 4.4 was devoted to examining one case of such a development: the shift from the biblical components of the pronominal reciprocal construction to the mishnaic construction. Dealing with the question of how to characterize this shift reveals, I believe, the risk of considering syntactic issues in isolation. As became clear, what at first seemed to be a lexical shift from איש–אחיו/רעהו to זה-זה, was in fact a rather significant change from a structural perspective. The terms איש–אחיו/ רעהו are indefinite pronouns and therefore can be used in legal texts without references. The component זה is a demonstrative and therefore needs to have a referent in its context.

In light of these types of changes, it is now possible to conclude with the question that opened this paper about the coexistence of the various reciprocal constructions in Biblical Hebrew, and to summarize the explanations that were given throughout this essay regarding their origin and their relationship with similar constructions in Mishnaic Hebrew (see table 2).

Table 2. Summary of the Origin and Nature of Reciprocal Constructions in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew

	Example	*Type*	*Comments*
I.	וַיִּתְרָאוּ פָנִים הוּא וַאֲמַצְיָהוּ (2 Kgs 14:11; §3.1)	Verbal construction	T-stem, common among the Semitic languages
II.	וַיֹּאמֶר נִוָּעֵד אֶל בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים (Neh 6:10; §3.1)	Verbal construction	N-stem found in other Semitic languages (such as Akkadian)
III.	וַתַּעֲרֹךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל וּפְלִשְׁתִּים מַעֲרָכָה לִקְרַאת מַעֲרָכָה (1 Sam 17:11; §3.3, §4.3)	Nominal construc-tion—repetition of the nouns	Assumed to be relics of a typologi-cally older encoding of reciprocity
IV. a. b.	וְלֹא קָרַב זֶה אֶל זֶה (Exod 14:20) השוכר את האומנים והיטעו <u>זה את זה</u> (*m. B. Meṣiʿa* 6:1; §3.3, §3.4.2–3.5, §4.2)	Pronominal construction Two-unit pronouns—singular agreement (in Biblical Hebrew [a]) reflects an older stage in the grammati-calization process of pronominal reciprocal constructions. Similar to the standard biblical construction, mishnaic construction (b) has plural verbal agreement	The construction with demon-stratives is standard in Mishnaic Hebrew. A few examples appear in Biblical Hebrew. Found also in Biblical Aramaic and in *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan* Function: Pronominal expression used in relating two sets or more without specifying which set oc-cupies which position. This construction contains de-monstratives, which, as anaphoric expressions, require explicit antecedents (therefore not used in formulation of casuistic law, for example).
V.	וְקָרַב אֹתָם אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד (Ezek 37:17, §3.4.2)	Pronominal construction	The use of 'one' in a pronominal construction is found in the standard Late Aramaic formula and occasion-ally in other Semitic languages.
VI.	וְאִישׁ אָחִיו לֹא יִדְחָקוּן (Joel 2:8, §3.3–3.4.1)	Pronominal Construction Two-Unit pronouns – the plural agree-ment reflects at least the second stage in the grammatical-ization process of pronominal reciprocal constructions	One of the two standard construc-tions in Biblical Hebrew. Function: Pronominal expression used in relations between two sets or more without specifying which set occupies which position. Consisting of "bleached nouns", these are indefinite pronouns and do not require explicit antecedents. Therefore, they are used in casuistic laws as well.
VII.	וַיַּחֲזִקוּ אִישׁ בְּרֹאשׁ רֵעֵהוּ (2 Sam 2:16, §3.3–3.4.1)	Similar to VI	Similar to VI In Mishnaic Hebrew it appears as a marked construction, usually with some connection to the Biblical corpus.

References

Amberber, M.
  2002   *Verb Classes and Transitivity in Amharic.* LINCOM Studies in Afroasiatic
          Linguistics. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Arnold, M. A.
  2005   *Categorization of the hitpaʿel of Classical Hebrew*. Ph.D. dissertation, Har-
          vard University.
Bar-Asher, E. A.
  2009   *A Theory of Argument Realization and Its Applications to Features of the
          Semitic Languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
Bar-Asher, M.
  2006   Mishnaic Hebrew: An Introductory Survey. Pp. 567–95 in *The Literature
          of the Sages, Second Part*, ed. M. E. Stone and S. Safrai. Amsterdam: Van
          Gorcum / Philadelphia: Fortress.
Bar-Asher Siegal, E. A.
  2011   Notes on Reciprocal Constructions in Akkadian in Light of Typological and
          Historical Considerations. *Semitica et Classica* 4: 23–42.
Behrens, L.
  2007   Backgrounding and Suppression of Reciprocal Participants: A Cross-
          Linguistic Study. *Studies in Language* 31: 327–408.
Belletti, F. A.
  1982   On the Anaphoric Status of the Reciprocal Constructions in Italian. *The Lin-
          guistic Review* 2: 101–38.
Bybee, J. L.; Perkins, R. D.; and Pagliuca, W.
  1994   *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of
          the World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Cantarino, V.
  1975   *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose,* vol. 3. Bloomington: Indiana University
          Press.
Comrie, B.
  1988   Topics, Grammaticalized Topics, and Subjects. *Berkeley Linguistics Society*
          14: 265–77.
Corbett, G. G.
  2006   *Agreement.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dalrymple, M.; Kanazawa, M.; Kim, Y.; Mchombo, S.; and Peter, S.
  1998   Reciprocal Expressions and the Concept of Reciprocity. *Linguistics and Phi-
          losophy* 21: 159–220.
Dougherty, R. C.
  1970   A Grammar of Coordinate Conjoined Structures, Part I. *Language* 46: 850–98.
Evans, N.; Gaby, A.; and Nordlinger, R.
  2007   Valency Mismatches and the Coding of Reciprocity in Australian Languages.
          Linguistic Typology 11: 541–97.

Everaert, M.
  1999   Types of Anaphoric Expressions: Reflexives and Reciprocal. Pp. 63–83 in
         Reciprocals: Forms and Functions, ed. Z. Frajzyngier and T. S. Curl. Am-
         sterdam: Benjamins.
Faarlund, J. T.
  1990   *Syntactic Change: Toward a Theory of Historical Syntax.* Berlin: de Gruyter.
Frajzyngier, Z., and Curl, T. S., eds.
  1999   *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Gelb, I. J.
  1957   Notes on von Soden's Grammar of Akkadian. *BO* 12: 93–111.
Givón, T.
  1984   *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction*, vol. 1. Amsterdam:
         Benjamins.
Glinert, L.
  1989   *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Goldenberg, G.
  1991   'Onself', 'one's own' and 'one another' in Amharic. Pp. 531–49 in *Semitic
         Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*, ed. A. S. Kaye. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Greenberg, M.
  1997   *Ezekiel 21–37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB
         22a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Haas, F.
  2010   *Reciprocity in English: Historical Development and Synchronic Structure.*
         Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics 15. New York: Routledge /
         London: Taylor & Francis.
Halevy, R.
  2010   Reciprocal Constructions in Hebrew. Pp. 265–86 in *Judaic Studies in Memory
         of Moriah Liebson*, ed. A. Maman and R. Bliboim. Jerusalem: Hebrew Uni-
         versity. [Hebrew]
  2011a The Grammaticalization of Bipartite Reciprocal Markers in Hebrew. *HS* 52:
         7–18.
  2011b Reciprocal Constructions between Syntax and Lexicon. *Leš* 73: 401–22.
Harris, A. C., and Campbell, L.
  1995   *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Cambridge Studies in Lin-
         guistics 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Harris, M.
  1978   *The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach*. London: Longman.
  1997   *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon.
  2007   Further Remarks on Reciprocal Constructions. Pp. 2087–2115 in *Reciprocal
         Constructions*, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Heim, I.; Lasnik, H.; and May, R.
  1988   Reciprocity and Plurality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 63–102.
Heine, B.
  1999   Polysemy Involving Reflexive and Reciprocal Markers in African Languages.
         Pp. 1–29 in *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions*, ed. Z. Frajzyngier and T. S.
         Curl. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Heine, B.; and Miyashita, H.
  2008   The Intersection between Reflexives and Reciprocals: A Grammaticalization
          Perspective. Pp. 169–223 in *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Ty-
          pological Explorations*, ed. E. König and V. Gast. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Hopper, P. J., and Traugott, E. C.
  2003   *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jay, J.
  2009   Reciprocal Constructions in Biblical Hebrew. *GIALens: Electronic Notes Se-
          ries* 3/1. http://www.gial.edu/.
Kemmer, S.
  1993   *The Middle Voice: A Typological and Diachronic Study.* Amsterdam:
          Benjamins.
Khan, G.
  2008   *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Barwar*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.
Kikusawa, R.
  2003   The Development of Some Indonesian Pronominal Systems. Pp. 237–68 in
          Historical Linguistics 2001: *Selected Papers from the 15th International Con-
          ference on Historical Linguistics, Melbourne, 13–17 August 2001*, ed. B. J.
          Blake, K. Burridge, and J. Taylor. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
König, E., and Gast, V., eds.
  2008   *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations.* Berlin:
          de Gruyter.
König, E., and Kokutani, S.
  2006   Towards a Typology of Reciprocal Constructions: Focus on German and Japa-
          nese. *Linguistics* 44: 271–302.
Kremers, J.
  1997   *How Arabs Speak to Each Other about Themselves: A Study of* nafs *and* baʿḍ
          in Modern Standard Arabic. M.A. thesis, University of Nijmegen.
Lipiński, E.
  1997   *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. OLA 80. Leuven:
          Peeters.
Macuch, R.
  1965   *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Maslova, E.
  2007   Reciprocal and Polyadic: Remarkable Reciprocals in Bantu. Pp. 335- 52 in
          Reciprocal Constructions, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
  2008   Reflexive Encoding of Reciprocity: Cross-Linguistic and Language-Internal
          Variation. Pp. 225–57 in *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typo-
          logical Explorations*, ed. E. König and V. Gast. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Mathesius, V.
  1930   On Linguistic Characterology with Illustrations from Modern English.
          Pp. 56–63 in *Actes du Premier Congrès International de Linguistes à La
          Haye*, du 10-15 avril 1928. Leiden: Sijthoff.

Mor, U.

  2009 *The Grammar of the Epigraphic Hebrew Documents from Judaea between the First and the Second Revolts*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

Moshkovitz, Y. T.

  1985 *Sēfer Yĕḥezkēl: Daʿat Mikrâ*. Jerusalem: Rabbi Kook Institution.

Muraoka, T.

  2011. *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic.* Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 38. Leuven: Peeters.

Nedjalkov, V. P.

  2007a Overview of the Research: Definitions of Terms, Framework, and Related Issues. Pp. 3–114 in *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

  2007b Encoding of the Reciprocal Meaning. Pp. 147–208 in *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, V. P., ed.

  2007 *Reciprocal Constructions.* 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Nöldeke, T.

  1875 *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle: Waisenhaus.

  2001 *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Appendix trans. P. T. Daniels. Reprinted Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Plank, F.

  2008 Thoughts on the Origin, Progress, and Pronominal Status of Reciprocal Forms in Germanic, Occasioned by Those of Bavarian. Pp. 347–73 in *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations*, ed. E. König and V. Gast. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rendsburg, G. A.

  1990 *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.

Saussure, F. de

  2006 *Writings in General Linguistics*, trans. C. Sanders and M. Pires. London: Oxford University Press.

Segal, M. H.

  1927 *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon.

  1936 *Diqduq lešon ha-mišna*. Tel-Aviv: Devir.

Sharvit, S.

  2006 *Language and Style of Tractate Avoth through the Ages.* Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press.

Siloni, T.

  2001 Reciprocal Verbs. *Proceedings of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics 17*. http://linguistics.huji.ac.il/IATL/17/TOC.html.

  2008 The Syntax of Reciprocal Verbs: An Overview. Pp. 451–99 in *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations*, ed. E. König and V. Gast. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Soden, W. von

  1952 *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Sokoloff, M.
  2002   *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Pe-
          riods*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press / Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Uni-
          versity Press.
Stadel, C.
  2011   The Morphosyntax of Samaritan Aramaic. Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Univer-
          sity. [Hebrew]
Stein, D. E. S.
  2008   The Noun אִישׁ (ʾîš) in Biblical Hebrew: A Term of Affiliation. *JHS* 8/1. http://
          www.jhsonline.org/.
Traugott, E. C., and Heine, B.
  1986   Introduction. Pp. 1–14 in *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* ed. E. C. Trau-
          gott and B. Heine. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Zaliznjak, A. A., and Shmelev, A. D.
  2007   Sociativity, Conjoining, Reciprocity and the Latin Prefix *com-*. Pp. 209–29 in
          Reciprocal Constructions, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. 5 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins.