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ABSTRACT

The benefits of teaching ancient, no-longer spoken languages, using communicative methods have recently been recognised and implemented modestly in teaching Biblical Hebrew. The typological closeness of Biblical and Modern Hebrew can result in negative crosslinguistic influence from Modern Hebrew, which could interfere with understanding of the Biblical text. This study attempted to determine what type of linguistic input Biblical Hebrew students with prior knowledge of Modern Hebrew need in order to firstly, acquire Biblical Hebrew and secondly, to prevent negative crosslinguistic influence. A linguistic contrastive analysis was performed on parallel Biblical and Modern Hebrew texts of the book of Ruth to determine the key morphological and syntactic phenomena that set Biblical Hebrew apart from Modern Hebrew and the results are presented in this study.

The information gleaned from the contrastive analysis was applied to Biblical Hebrew pedagogy in two ways: firstly, as a guide to know which Biblical Hebrew phenomena to emphasise when teaching students with a prior knowledge of Modern Hebrew; and secondly, as a tool to present contrastive information in the classroom to raise students’ awareness of the potential negative crosslinguistic influence from Modern Hebrew.

A survey was performed to determine which communicative methods to apply to Biblical Hebrew pedagogy and whether negative crosslinguistic influence from Modern Hebrew would affect the choice of methods used. The approach chosen advocates for the inclusion of some form-focus in a combination of implicit and explicit instruction, within the communicative setting. Biblical Hebrew/Modern Hebrew contrastive information can be introduced in written form without compromising the monolingual environment.

The study also offers examples of classroom activities and exercises that demonstrate how to conduct a BH lesson in an immersive setting, using one of the phenomena highlighted in the contrastive analysis, the wayyiqtol verbal forms. In addition, suggestions are made of how to introduce contrastive information into an immersive BH classroom setting. These lessons are presented as part of a potential pre-reading preparatory course for the book of Ruth.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

RELEVANCE AND PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Communicative competence has been identified as the most important factor for language acquisition and has caused a paradigm shift in how languages are taught. [Larsen-Freeman, 2013:135] Out of a need for communicative proficiency, communicative language teaching (CLT) began to develop in the 1980s, which focused on language as a function of communication rather than a mere mastery of grammatical structures. [Richards & Rodgers, 2014:105] Various methodologies began to develop within the communicative approach and over time the benefits of these methods for ancient language acquisition have been recognised. These communicative methods have been applied modestly in the teaching Latin and Greek, and more recently in Biblical Hebrew (BH). [See for example, Gruber-Miller, 2006 and Overland, 2004 & 2011] There are several issues unique to teaching ancient ‘dead’ languages using communicative methods as compared with living languages, for example, limited corpuses and lack of native speakers. Another issue, which is unique to teaching BH, is that unlike Latin and Greek, Hebrew has already been ‘revived’ in the form of Modern Hebrew (MH1). For BH learners that have MH as their second language (L2) the typological closeness of MH to BH can be both an advantage and disadvantage due to crosslinguistic influences (CLI). MH has a unique relationship with its ancient sources since it is still very rooted in and dependent on them. From the perspective of the writing system and many grammatical features there is no clear separation between Classical Hebrew (Biblical, Mishnaic, and to a lesser extent Medieval Hebrew) and MH. Although MH is still developing, there remains a convergence with BH. Therefore, when speaking MH a great deal of BH is used but the opposite is also true; when trying to speak BH, one can naturally incorporate a lot of MH because the separation is not

---

1 There is debate as to whether ‘Modern Hebrew’ is an appropriate term; however, since the debate is not relevant to this study I have adopted the more common term ‘Modern Hebrew’ for simplicity’s sake. For more information see, e.g. Matras & Schiff, 2005.
strict. With the changes in lexical meanings and grammatical structures that have evolved over time it can be difficult to grasp the original meaning in BH when one has a preconceived understanding from MH. This is where the need for philology becomes apparent. A communicative method of language pedagogy does not have time or enough tools for an in-depth philological study, that is, analysing the meaning in context. Since BH and MH share similar linguistic features a contrastive analysis (CA), if presented correctly, could help to define the boundaries between them. Such a CA could be a very helpful tool for BH pedagogy by highlighting relevant similarities and differences, which can assist teachers to raise learner awareness of the crosslinguistic influences in order to facilitate BH learning. This study aims to make these goals more concrete.

The central question in SLA research about second language instruction is what type of linguistic input and what kind of learning environment is optimal for L2 acquisition. [Loewen, 2017] This study will attempt to determine what type of linguistic input comprises essential information BH students who know MH need to know, firstly to acquire BH and secondly, to prevent negative CLI from MH. It will explore how to adapt the communicative learning environment, with respects to teaching methods, to BH pedagogy. The current chapter will take a brief look at CA and CLI in the light of the historical evolution of second-language acquisition (SLA) theories and approaches to L2 teaching and the relevance of CA within contemporary theories of SLA. It will also examine the closeness of BH and MH and the necessity to define the similarities and differences of their linguistic systems. Next, the current state of BH pedagogy with respects to CLT methods is addressed. The chapter ends with a description of the corpus and methodology. Chapter 2 will present the results of the CA between BH and MH; and finally, chapter 3 will review which methods and techniques within the CLT approach are relevant to this study and why. It offers examples of classroom activities and exercises that demonstrate how to conduct a BH lesson in an immersive setting and makes suggestions of how to raise learners’ awareness of CLI from MH by applying the results of the CA.
CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS AND ITS ROLE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW PEDAGOGY

Contrastive analysis and in the light of changing theories of language

CA is a branch of applied linguistics that aims to analyse and describe the similarities and differences between a pair of languages. CA has found its place in comparative language studies, especially in combination with other linguistic techniques, such as typology; or as part of research on translation in computer-based parallel-text analysis of large corpora, which uses translated L2 texts and comparable L1 texts to compare linguistic features and their frequencies in language pairs. [Köning, 2012:1; Mcenery & Xiao, 2007:1] The original CA hypothesis aimed to predict all language difficulties that L2 learners may experience due to ‘interference’ from their L1 but it was abandoned as a theory due to lack of empirical evidence. L1 interference was later established as only one of the sources for learner errors in L2. [Ortega, 2009:53; Köning, 2012:1] In addition, contemporary SLA findings have since proved that errors are not always inhibitive but are a necessary part of the learning process. [VanPattern and Williams, 2015:22]

The term ‘interference’ is increasingly being replaced by the term ‘crosslinguistic influence’ so as not to be confused with ‘interference’ as defined by behaviourists and structuralists, a notion that implies that L1 hinders L2 learning. [Ortega, 2009:30] Evidence suggests that L1 is not the only influence on additional language learning (L2, L3 etc.) but that all previously learned languages can be a source of transfer. [Ellis, 1994: 300; Ortega, 2009:53] Typological closeness of the previously learned languages was found to be the deciding factor for predicting the source of CLI, due to formal similarities between languages (so-called ‘false friends’). [Ortega, 2009:48-49; Benson, 2002:69] CLI can be both positive and negative, in other words, it can either accelerate or inhibit L2 development, not only inhibit as was previously thought. [VanPattern and Williams, 2015:20] Transfer can occur at all levels, including lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax and pragmatics. [Benson, 2002:69]
This is particularly evident with respects to the unique BH-MH language pair in which MH continues to convergence with BH. The proximity of BH and MH can be both an advantage and a disadvantage to learners of BH (L3), who have already acquired or are learning MH (L2), because of CLI from MH due to typological closeness. Positive transfer from MH is substantial, enabling MH speakers to read a BH text such as a simple narrative and understand a significant amount. At the same time, apparent proximities of the languages can create confusion for learners, in other words, what seems to be similar may in fact be different. For example, the BH narrative past form wayyiqtol may be confused with the MH yiqtol expressing future tense due to their similar morphology; or a lexeme may have undergone a semantic shift having the same form but a different meaning. CA as an analytical tool for describing language pairs can be of great value when trying to define the boundaries between BH and MH by mapping out their similarities and differences.

The CA hypothesis as rooted in structural-behavioural SLA overlooked the communicative aspects of language learning by oversimplifying the learning process, viewing both L1 and L2 acquisition as learning a set of language habits. [VanPattern and Williams, 2015:17-22; Du, 2016:16]. Classroom instruction was centred on L1/L2 contrasts particularly to explain the meaning of the L2, translation was used extensively (e.g. the Grammar-Translation Method) and students were not encouraged to speak. In reaction to the behaviourist approach some took a minimalist view, such as Newmark and Reibel (1968: 159), who postulated that L1 has little influence on L2 development and that learners only fell back on their L1 where they had gaps in their L2 knowledge. [Quoted in Du, 2016:17] The minimalist view seemed to imply that L2 learners should acquire the L2 the same way as children acquired their L1 following their own 'internal syllabus', rather than relying on their L1; and therefore, teaching curricula should maximise L2 input and avoiding the use of the L1 in L2 classrooms altogether. [Du, 2016:18;

---

2 If you can speak BH in addition to MH one would be hesitant to say that you speak an additional language, it may be more appropriate to call MH and BH L2a and L2b, respectively, but for simplicity’s sake we will refer to BH as the L3.

As a result, instruction became exclusively in the L2 and L1 contrasts were abandoned.

However, L1 and L2 development processes are different in many respects, e.g. while L2 development builds on skills that were learned in the L1, L1 development relies fully on the child's internal "universal grammar" or built-in language ability, a situation that is impossible to recreate. Therefore, the role of L1 on L2 continued to be discussed extensively in the literature and it is now generally accepted that transfer does occur. According to Ellis (1994) the importance of learners' prior linguistic knowledge in L2 acquisition cannot be ignored and any theory that does so is incomplete.

In reaction to the CA hypothesis the Interlanguage theory was formed by Selinker (1972) and is an important term when explaining learner cognitive processes. Ellis pointed out that it 'was the first major attempt to provide an explanation of L2 acquisition'. Selinker argued that the L2 utterances produced by the learner were different to those which a native speaker would produce and he hypothesised the existence of a separate linguistic system, now known as the interlanguage. This was the first time that the learner's imperfect L2 system was understood as a dynamic, autonomous system and it caused a revolution in L2 research and teaching. Selinker also believed that the development of interlanguage was different from the first-language development because of "the likelihood of fossilization in the second language", which is the state in which a learner's interlanguage fails to develop despite exposure to the target language (for a review see McLaughlin, 1987:110-112).

Krashen (1982) made a distinction between two pathways to language competence, subconsciously by 'natural' acquisition during communication or by a conscious learning process to gain metalinguistic knowledge. Unlike the CA hypothesis, which emphasised conscious learning of L1/L2 differences, Krashen took a minimalist view to the role of L1 in L2
acquisition, which sees errors as gaps in L2 knowledge and not from L1 ‘interference’. He believed that all that was needed to overcome crosslinguistic ‘interference’ is copious amounts of comprehensible input to fill in these gaps, which would results in subconscious acquisition of the L2. [Du 2016:18; Krashen and Terrell, 1983: 41]

Contemporary contrastive analysis and its implications for L2 pedagogy

In recent literature on SLA pedagogy there has been a renewed interest in L1/L2 contrastive instruction to learners with the same L1. The primary focus is to determine whether increasing learners’ crosslinguistic awareness, by drawing their attention to L1/L2 differences using contrastive information, would facilitate L2 learning. [Du, 2016:20] Unlike the earlier teaching methods that used L1 contrasts rooted in behaviourist-structuralist rationale, contemporary versions of CA embed contrastive information within CLT methods. For example, Kupferberg & Olshtain (1996) investigated linguistic features known to be problematic for L1 Hebrew speakers learning L2 English. Their study revealed that “learners who participated in communicative tasks within which L1/L2 contrastive information was provided outperformed learners in a control group on grammatical judgement, recognition and production tasks.”

Ammar, et al. (2010) performed a study on scholars who were taught English (L2) in an immersive setting, with a pedagogical approach that “focused on communication rather than on formal grammar instruction, bringing little attention to language form or accuracy via either instruction or corrective feedback.” They investigated whether explicit grammar instruction would improve L2 development and found that scholars who were unaware of their L1 and L2 grammatical rules, were also unaware of differences between the languages and therefore the implicit grammatical rules from their L1 unconsciously affected their L2 performance. They also found a positive correlation between students’ awareness of L1–L2 differences and their ability to correctly judge and form grammar in the L2. [Ammar, et al., 2010]5

5 See also Doughty, 1991; James, 1996 and Kupferberg, 1999
These studies support the claim that learners make cognitive comparisons between the L2 form they have noticed and their L1 form; and it also supports the approach that providing contrastive information may be beneficial to L2 learning and teaching. [Du, 2016:21; Kupferberg 1999: 212]

The role of metalinguistic knowledge in communicative language teaching

The role of grammar instruction within CLT remains a controversial topic and the lack of consensus suggests a need for further research. The communicative approach to language teaching caused a shift from explicit focus on the language itself towards learners using language to express their own meaning through interactive group or pair work. [Larsen-Freeman, 2013:135] Krashen (1981, 1982) claimed explicit grammar instruction has no effect on L2 ‘acquisition’, which operates without the learner’s awareness. Long (1991) argued that grammar instruction should not be abandoned entirely. He proposed the ‘focus on form’ approach in which attention is drawn to grammatical forms with in natural communication. In other words, making learners aware of a grammatical form that they are already able to use communicatively. Currently, most researchers would agree on some degree of ‘focus on form’ but discussions on how this should be implemented meet with a great deal of disagreement. [Larsen-Freeman, 2015:271; Spada & Lightbown, 1990] Ortega (2009) notes that grammar instruction cannot override the natural development process but it has been shown to improve accuracy and rate of learning for both morphology and syntax. [Ortega, 2009:143] In addition, L1/L2 contrasts can help students ‘notice’ structures that otherwise would have escaped their attention, and thereby prevent fossilisation of incorrect interlanguage patterns. [Larsen-Freeman, 2015:266; Ammar, et al. 2010:142, Schmidt, 2010]

---

6 For a selective review on grammar learning and teaching see Larsen-Freeman, 2015.

7 Long (1991) differentiates between ‘Focus on Form’ and ‘Focus on Forms’; the latter refers to traditional methods that focus exclusively on teaching grammatical forms as separate units.
CROSslinguistic Influence of Modern Hebrew on Biblical Hebrew Acquisition

Before discussing which BH grammatical forms should be taught to MH (L2) speakers, or the broader issue of how these forms should be introduced, it is necessary to establish whether a definition of the boundaries between BH and MH is needed. In other words, is CLI from MH significant in BH acquisition? We have already established that typological closeness is the deciding factor on which previously learned language will influence the acquisition of an additional language. The BH-MH language pair is unique, it is unlike any other ancient-modern language pair due to its discontinuity in history and the active inclusion of BH in MH corpus, and their closeness is such that one can easily incorporate forms from one language into the other. CLI from MH becomes particularly evident when students try to speak BH, only to find their interlanguage is peppered with MH. So why speak BH anyway?

Communicative approach to Biblical Hebrew pedagogy

Reconsideration of teaching methodologies to promote teaching ancient languages as spoken languages is important not only for the benefits provided by SLA research but also for the survival of classical language programs in educational institutions and for the retention of student interest in ancient languages. In addition, there are inherent challenges to overcome when analysing ‘dead’ languages such as BH, including the limited corpus and the lack of native speakers. Native speaker intuition is crucial within formal linguistic approaches and with no one to provide intuitive judgements our source of knowledge on the internalised grammar is limited to the text. CLT methods and other SLA techniques when applied to ancient language acquisition aim to bridge this gap by reviving a ‘dead’ language into a spoken one again. Hornkohl (2014) argues that no matter how effectual our immersive and communicative curricula are we cannot escape “the crucial truth that there exists no native population among whom we

---

8 See, for example, Carlon (2013) for an opinion on modernising Latin instruction and Koutropoulos (2011) on Greek.
can send them to become fluent in the target language.” In other words, ancient languages cannot be taught as communicative languages in the full sense that SLA research speaks of communicative goals, however, the advantages of the methodology still outweigh the challenges. It is important for students to relate to BH as an authentic, ‘living’ linguistic system for instruction to be effective; and therefore, a spoken component is important to help achieve this goal. [Hornkohl, 2014, 2015] Consequently, there is a growing interest in teaching BH using communicative methods. The current study aims at institutions in which both BH and MH are an important part of the curriculum and particularly to those which have a preference for SLA type methods. Therefore, alongside the growing openness to incorporate SLA methodology to BH pedagogy there is a growing need for studies that validate the use of SLA methodology in teaching BH and examine surrounding issues like cross-linguistic influence from MH.

Modern Hebrew as a communicative language component

Holmstedt, when discussing the comparative value of MH asks: “Can and should we use it to help us understand ancient Hebrew?” [Holmstedt, 2006:14] There are a number of issues that one should consider, like the changes in lexicon and grammatical structures, but also the existence of two different registers, the literary and colloquial MH. He concludes that, “If literary registers of the modern language are the most appropriate with which to compare BH then colloquial Israeli Hebrew and the processes by which it emerged are mostly irrelevant for comparative studies.” [Holmstedt, 2006:14] This study focuses on mainly on literary, or prescriptive MH.

Due to the lexical and grammatical similarities between the two languages, BH instruction can be supported with MH as a spoken language component to compensate for the communicative deficiency. It can be a very effective tool to overcome the time pressure and need to become fluent as soon as possible. Students can benefit greatly from learning MH; however, there are significant differences that must be learned, especially those related to syntax and the
grammatical semantics of non-lexical issues (such as the verbal system) so as not to impose modern features back onto the early stages of the language. Having MH in the background can make it more difficult to assimilate the BH syntax. Some have overcome this by starting with BH instruction first and once it is internalised MH learning can commence. [Buth & Alley, 2018] However, how does one decide how much BH the students need to assimilate first, and what about students who already know MH? Nevertheless, MH acquisition is not enough to produce BH reading fluency and is not a replacement for communicative BH instruction. [Hornkohl, 2014]

Teaching Biblical Hebrew as a communicative language

Despite the limitations and challenges of teaching a ‘dead’ language such as BH as a living linguistic system it still has advantages, for example, psycho-linguistics shows that speech also has a lot to do with reading fluency. A phonological loop develops in the brain when hearing a sound and speaking it out, teaching the learner to think in BH allowing for a more rapid understanding, which greatly improves reading skills. [Buth & Alley, 2018] Research on teaching BH as a communicative language is in its infancy and therefore very few empirical studies are available; however, these techniques have been implemented successfully in classroom situations. [Alley, 2018; Nahum, 2018, Overland, 2011]

A vast number of introductory BH textbooks and grammars are available and they continue to proliferate, mostly in English. However, the majority do not vary much from one another nor do they incorporate CLT approach or methods. Despite the benefit of CLT emphasised in the standards for Classical Language Learning in 1997, BH lags behind modern L2 instruction and continues to be limited to grammar instruction and audiolingualism. [Overland, 2011:584]

A few textbooks claim to have MH in mind for the BH student but do not specifically point out any differences leaving it up to the learner to ‘note the differences’. [Halabé, 2001:1] Brettler produced a textbook that is not inductive in its methods but is unique in its audience in that it is aimed at students who have a foundation of MH, and therefore, do not need an introduction to
the basics. Instead, his intension was to offer a supplement that provides the necessary information for reading the Hebrew Bible. [Brettler, 2002, ix]. His textbook highlights some of the syntactic differences that set BH apart from MH using traditional methods of BH grammar instruction, offering mainly parsing and translation exercises.

In 2005, Bergman presented a textbook claiming to apply ‘many of the tools of modern language acquisition to make learning this classical language an active and inspiring process’. However, in Holmstedt's opinion, the textbook failed at its goals since it uses too much English instead of Hebrew and copious grammatical descriptions, which leaves it rather similar to other introductory textbooks. [Holmstedt, 2008]

In 2006, Randall Buth introduced a ground-breaking conversational approach in his work ‘Living Biblical Hebrew’. [Buth, 2006b] Another project that emerged in 2006 was the ‘Cohelet Project’, which aimed at constructing a curriculum using the communicative approach. This innovative project showed accelerated language acquisition, extended retention and increased reading effectiveness. [Overland, 2011:585]

In 2013 Cook and Holmstedt introduced a BH text that takes a more communicative approach. They admit to realising the limitations of SLA methods in ancient language acquisition (e.g. the limited corpus) and claim to have created a balance by combining more traditional grammar exercises with exercises that induce the students to produce and interact with the language in several ways. [Cook and Holmstedt, 2013:i]

Explicit grammar teaching, such as the Grammar-Translation Method, continues to be used in BH instruction where the purpose of L2 learning is to understand literary texts rather than to speak the language. [Richards and Rodgers 2001:6–7] Part of understanding a language fully is being able to produce it by speaking. Failure to incorporate the advantages of communicative competence in ancient language acquisition could possibly be due to misunderstanding the

9 The Cohelet Project, https://sites.google.com/a/ashland.edu/cohelet/what-is-clt
goal of oral fluency, which is not ultimately for conversation but rather for mastery of the
language itself with the ultimate goal of fluency in reading. Lloyd correctly points out that “this
primacy of the auditory in encoding meaning may be overlooked when teaching and learning
ancient languages because its ancient usage at least has only been recorded in written form
and because of uncertainties over pronunciation.” [Lloyd 2017:32] Another reason is the lack of
teachers trained in communicative techniques. [Overland, 2011:585] Perhaps the most
poignant reason is the relatively small pool of publications proving the validity of these
techniques when applied to ancient language acquisition, especially with respects to BH, due to
the novelty of this field.

A comparison of Biblical and Modern Hebrew

Hebrew, like all languages, has undergone many changes resulting in a language today that is
very different to that of the Bible. These changes have affected all components of the linguistic
system, to such an extent that the overall grammatical and lexical structure is new [Kutscher
1982:243-245] Despite the initial efforts of the revivers of Hebrew to preserve the Semitic nature
MH is heavily influenced by Indo-European languages; consequently, some question whether
MH can still be considered a Semitic language.10 [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:277] Whether MH can
be classified as a new language is often been disputed. [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:272] The novelty
of the language was pointed out in the 1950s by H.B. Rosen and H. Blank and was met with
much resistance. Gradually this view was accepted into scholarly consensus. [Reshef,
2000:note 7] Nevertheless, there are still many similarities between the linguistic systems of BH
and MH. Holmstedt notes that rejection or ignorance of the comparative value of MH data to
help us understand BH “does not take seriously the continued existence and development of
literary Hebrew within numerous pre-twentieth century Jewish communities nor that Hebrew was
used as a “Jewish lingua franca” both within the Diaspora and Palestine well before Ben-

Otto Harrassowitz.
Yehuda". [Holmstedt, 2006:14] BH continues to plays a central role in Israeli education and culture and MH, as prescribed by the Academy of the Hebrew language and promoted by the education system, is permanently rooted in and nourished by Classical Hebrew. It should be noted that due to a process of secularisation and other influences MH has a noticeable diglossic gap between its colloquial or normative prescriptive forms. As mentioned before, this study will not deal with the issues of diglossia but will deal only with prescriptively correct Hebrew.

Lexicon and Semantics

The Strong’s Concordance identifies 8,674 words in the Hebrew Bible. This is a rather limited vocabulary upon which to revive a language. As a result, Eliezer Ben-Yehuda used these biblical words together with Mishnaic Hebrew words and where there was no Hebrew equivalent, loaned words from Arabic in order to preserve the Semitic character of Hebrew. [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:270] The loaning of words is not a phenomenon new to MH but words were loaned in the same way in the biblical period. [Schwarzwald, 2010:214] Since BH vocabulary is very limited the creation of new words has been a pressing issue since its revival, and it is the area the most open to innovation. As is the case in every language, vocabulary is an area which is constantly changing as new words are needed to describe the changing culture. [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:286] At times the precise sense of less used Biblical words were enriched with new meaning, especially those of hapax legomena. [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:271, Reshef, 2000:2] Other words have changed their meaning completely, e.g. אבות in BH (literally father's house) meant family; today it is used to refer to an old age home. It follows, therefore, that MH speakers would need to take care not to assume they know the precise sense of biblical words since they may have undergone a semantic shift. However, out of the 1000 most frequently used words in MH, 800 of them come from BH, which makes knowledge of MH a useful tool for BH students as long as they are made aware of these changes.
Orthography and Phonology

BH in its Tiberian Masoretic transmission contains diacritical pointing, or niqqud that indicates vocalisation. During the revival process of Hebrew a decision was made to leave the written language unpointed, much like the consonantant orthography of the ancient text in the original manuscripts, with the exception of matres lectionis in cases that could be ambiguous. [Sáenz-Badillos, 1993:283] Many changes have occurred to the phonology of MH and it is difficult to reconstruct the pronunciation of Biblical times. Therefore, when teaching BH in an immersive setting a MH pronunciation is used and not any reconstructed pronunciation. Issues of vocalisation in general are complexed issues and will not be dealt with in this study.

Morphology

According to many scholars, the basic morphological system of MH, which is based on BH remains intact. The basic system of roots and vocalic patterns - binyanim for verbs and mishkalim for nouns - is rather stable, although some new prefixes and suffixes are used in MH, especially for nouns. [Schwarzwald, 2010:214] For BH students that know MH, there are some significant morphological differences they should be made aware of; therefore, several of these differences will be discussed in Chapter 2.

Syntax

The main difference that distinguishes BH from MH is syntax but MH has preserved some of the syntactic forms of BH. The following is a brief summary of some of those similarities with examples take from the book of Ruth
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a) The adjective comes after the noun and the demonstrative pronoun follows, e.g. Ruth 3:17
BH: יהוה יפר את הָעִם, מַשְׁלָהָה, נַתַּ֤תָה_MASTERシェウיה; MH: מתואלשנויה מַשְׁלָה, שִׁיָּדֶשֶׁרֶים, שִׁיָּדֶשֶׁרֶים; b) The numeral comes before the noun, e.g. Ruth 1:4
BH: הקָאנָה, מַשְׁלָה, מַשְׁלָה, מַשְׁלָה, מַשְׁלָה, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר; MH: יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר, יַשְׂעַר; c) There is generally agreement between the predicate and the subject in gender and number, e.g. Ruth

11 The MH translation is from HaEdut, Danielson, 2006 (see Methodology).
1:22  BH: תַּחַת הַגּוֹדֶשׁ לְבָדָּה, מִן בֵּית לָהֶם  
MH: לָהֶם הֵַגְדוֹשׁ מִן בֵּית לָהֶם

d) The definite direct object requires the addition of את, e.g. Ruth 1:6  BH: וְהֵרָכַב אֶת עָבְרַיָּא  
MH: וְהֶרַכֵּב עָבָרַיָּא

e) the construct state occurs very frequently in BH, e.g. in Ruth 1:2 BH: שֵׁם נָאִיר, שֵׁם אָציָתָה  
MH: עם נָאִיר, שֵׁם אָציָתָה.

In a class of student with a background in MH it is not necessary to provide explicit instruction about phenomena that have been preserved such as the examples above, rather, the focus should be on the differences in BH syntax.

Do Modern Hebrew speakers understand Biblical texts?

It is a common view that BH is easily understood by MH speakers. [Kutscher 1982:298]

Although the majority of the lexicon in the Bible seems familiar to Israelis, they are mostly unaware of the structural differences and tend to understand BH from a contemporary perspective. [Reshef, 2000:1,2,6] Some of the changes in semantics are so subtle that “the native speaker runs the risk of misinterpreting the text or failing to notice some meaningful linguistic features.” [Muraoka 1995:2] Zuckermann insists that MH is a new language and suggests that BH should be taught like a foreign language in Israel: “employing the most advanced alternative applied linguistics methods of second language teaching.” [Zuckermann, 2010:4] He endorses MH ‘translations’ of the Hebrew Bible arguing that there is a need for such translations and that their mere existence gives MH the standing of a language in its own right. “The bottom line,” he says, “is that Israelis misunderstand the Hebrew Bible.” [Zuckermann, 2010:6] Although not everyone may agree with Zuckermann’s extreme view it does draw attention to a need to clarify the differences between MH and BH. In addition, since MH has many differences to BH, it supports the approach of teaching BH as spoken language in addition to, or rather than MH. Either way, the fact remains that many BH students already know MH (L2), which is also useful for access to BH commentaries and extra biblical texts that are in MH; therefore, there remains a need to clarify their boundaries, especially for non-native speakers.
Modern Hebrew translations of the Hebrew Bible

Two different projects undertook to translate the Bible into MH, Tanakh RAM [Ahuvia, 2010] and HaEdut [Danielson, 2006]. These translations are worth mentioning since their very existence serves to highlight the challenges of understanding BH. This endeavour stirred up much controversy; one being that although the thought behind it was to make the Bible more accessible and stir interest, especially among the youth, there is a danger that the connection to the sources will be lost. [Roach, 2006] Others considered it downright heretical. [Rotem, 2008] Nevertheless, these projects are useful as a research tool to examine their linguistic variations. In summary, although some scholars demonstrated that BH and MH basic morphological structure is very close, others emphasise their differences. The literature supports the need to clarify the differences between the two linguistic systems and it follows that such clarity would be helpful when teaching BH to students who know MH. As far as I am aware, there have been no contrastive linguistic analyses that compare the BH text to a MH translation.

CORPUS: THE BOOK OF RUTH

Two corpora were chosen for this study, the Masoretic text (Westminster Leningrad Codex - WLC)\(^{12}\) of the book of Ruth and a modern translation equivalent called העדות [HaEdut, Danielson, 2006].\(^{13}\) Ruth is mainly narrative and direct speech quoted within the story and has often been used as a target text for beginner students of BH. [Holmstedt, 2010:2] Using a MH translation of the biblical text for language comparison controls for certain variables, e.g. culture and context. Two texts of different languages are never fully equivalent under any circumstances, since all language is culturally relative. However, BH is part of the MH corpus and has continually been part of Jewish culture and education and therefore the cultural and contextual aspects will be similar. Moreover, it is more methodologically strict to use a well-

---

\(^{12}\) “Modern Bible software such as BibleWorks, Accordance and Logos all have electronic editions of the Leningrad Codex based on the text created by the Westminster Theological Seminary, and referred to as the Michigan-Claremont-Westminster Electronic Hebrew Bible." [https://biblemanuscriptssociety.com/Bible-resources/Bible-manuscripts/Leningrad-Codex](https://biblemanuscriptssociety.com/Bible-resources/Bible-manuscripts/Leningrad-Codex)

\(^{13}\) Note: the Tanakh RAM project is incomplete and therefore does not yet contain a translation of Ruth, for this reason only the alternative translation, HaEdut, is used in this study.
defined corpus (in this case a MH translation of Ruth) than to rely on one’s own intuition. Dating the language of Ruth has been problematic since the language contains elements of both of Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew. [Holmstedt, 2009a:2] Certain forms and expressions that appear in Ruth are characteristic of post-biblical Hebrew, for example, instead of the biblical expression: אישהַ֣֔ (Ruth 1:4) is used; some words end with a paragogic nun, e.g., 2:8 BH: instead of and there is interchanging of masculine and feminine pronominal suffixes, such as, instead of (Ruth 1:9, 1:11), and conversely, מ֗ instead of (Ruth 1:13). [Bar-Asher, 2008:1] Holmstedt suggests that the author deliberately included these features to colour the language of the characters. [Holmstedt, 2010:§4] Perhaps Ruth is a good example of the diversity there is in BH since the BH corpus itself is diachronic having been written over an extensive period of time.

METHODOLOGY
Contrastive analysis of Biblical and Modern Hebrew by parallel text alignment

A verse by verse parallel text alignment of the Masoretic (WLC) and a MH translation equivalent (העדות) of the book of Ruth was performed. (The alignment can be found in Appendix A.) A database of key similarities and differences in morphology and syntax was formulated by identifying and mapping them out in the context of the parallel texts of Ruth. (A database containing selected phenomena can be found in Appendix B.) Phenomena that are identical in BH and MH are not discussed. A list of key phenomena that set BH apart from MH was compiled from the overlap of the database in this study with information from the literature and from curricula of beginner BH courses.14 From this list of key phenomena, a CA describing the similarities and differences between the two systems was performed and the results are presented in Chapter 2. All examples presented in the charts contain one typical BH phenomenon within the relevant clause, which is contrasted with the equivalent MH clause. To see each clause in the context of the full text see the BH-MH text alignment in Appendix A.

14 See the bibliography for a list of the textbooks used.
CHAPTER 2: CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

The following chapter presents the key morphological and syntactic differences between BH and MH in the book of Ruth that were highlighted in the CA. Hebrew words in the cited phrase that are in [brackets] represent the Qere.

MORPHOLOGICAL PHENOMENA THAT CHARACTERISE BIBLICAL HEBREW

Lengthened and shortened verbal forms

The lengthen form of the verb is a salient features of BH and no longer exists in MH. The lengthened imperative is produced by the addition of the paragogic suffix ו, such as from וָוָו (Ruth 4:1), and וּוּוּו from וּו (Ruth 4:4). When the paragogic suffix is added to the imperfect form (or more correctly the jussive) the cohortative is formed, such as וָו (Ruth 2:2) or וּו (Ruth 4:4). [Gesenius, 1983§108]

1. Lengthened form of the verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BH</th>
<th>MH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּה</td>
<td>בָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּל</td>
<td>בָּל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is generally understood that the lengthened form is either a stylistic variant, a more emphatic form or a more polite form of the imperative. [Fassberg, 1999:7] Fassberg suggests that the paragogic suffix on imperatives is used when the action of the verb is directed either towards or for the benefit of the speaker, whereas the קְטֹל form indicates an separate action that is away from the speaker. He concludes, therefore, that the lengthened imperative is a marked form and that קְטֹל is an unmarked imperative. [Fassberg, 1999:13]
The shortened form of the imperfect, also known as the jussive, is found mostly in the 2nd and 3rd person singular, e.g. יַעַשׂ from יִהְיֶה in Ruth 1:8; or יְהִי from יִהְיֶה in Ruth 2:19. [Gesenius, 1983 §48] In MH these lengthened and shortened forms mainly occur in MH poetry but have fallen out of use in the spoken and written language. The syntactical functions of these forms and how MH deals with them will be discussed later.

2. Shortened form of the verb

Negative Imperatives

In BH the use of the negative particle לא in combination with an imperfect is usually used in legal literature to express instruction or urgency. [Waltke and O'Connor, 1990, §31.5d] This combination is used in the Book of Ruth where Boaz instructs Ruth not to leave his field לא תשב(chose) (Ruth 2:8) and instructs his workers to grant Ruth’s request to glean among the sheaves (Ruth 2:7) and not to rebuke her לא תגרה (Ruth 2:16).¹⁵ BH makes a distinction between the modal yiqtol and the negative jussive, as in the case in Ruth 2:8 BH: אל תשב which would be Boaz’s wish for Ruth to stay in his field, whereas לא תשב would be a more emphatic expression of the same desire, much like his instructions to his workers in Ruth 2:16. MH no longer uses the imperfect of prohibition in combination with לא and therefore loses this distinction. Instead MH uses the negative particle אל with yiqtol, e.g. אל תלהי מקומך (Ruth 2:8) and אל תגר ב (Ruth 2:16). In MH if לא is used in combination with yiqtol, it always refers to the future. In BH the אל and imperfect (jussive)

---

¹⁵ The law required farmers to leave the corners of their fields unharvested for gleaners, they were not to pick up that which was dropped (gleanings), and not to harvest any over-looked produce that had been forgotten when they harvested the majority of a field. (Leviticus 19:9, Leviticus 23:22, Deuteronomy 24:19) Boaz’s instructions went beyond the law to favour Ruth, it is as if he is establishing a new law.
combination produces the negative jussive, such as in Ruth 1:20 BH: אֲלֵיהֶ֑ן אֲלָלְקַ֔ה הָלֹּ֔כָה לִשְׁמֹ֖רְתָּךְ אָלִֽים, which is translated the same way in MH: אֲלָלְקַ֔ה הָלֹּ֔כָה לִשְׁמֹ֖רְתָּךְ אָלִֽים, i.e. (אל + yiqtol).

3. Negative imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine plural imperatives</th>
<th>Feminine plural imperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שומַר כֵּלָה לִבְּתָךְ אָמָה</td>
<td>1:8 שומַר כֵּלָה לִבְּתָךְ אָמָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שומַר, בְּתוֹךְ</td>
<td>1:11 שומַר, בְּתוֹךְ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שומַר, בְּתוֹךְ</td>
<td>1:12 שומַר, בְּתוֹךְ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feminine plural imperatives

In MH gender distinction is neutralised in the feminine plural future and imperative forms. [Schwarzwald, 2011:529] For example, in BH the feminine plural form of the imperative often has the suffix -נה, e.g. בְּנָה and לֵכְנָה (Ruth 1:8, 1:11, 1:12), where as MH uses הבו and לכו.

4. Feminine plural imperatives

Infinitive construct

The infinitive construct corresponds to the traditional infinitive and has both verbal and nominal functions. [Lambdin, 1973 §115] It can occur in various constructions with other nouns, prepositions and suffixes. The infinitive construct is redundant and is most likely used to emphasise the chaos that reigned at that time. [Holmstedt, 2010:52] The MH translation omits the redundancy and translates only בערבי השופטים, which carries the same meaning but without the nuance.

5. Infinitive construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive construct</th>
<th>Infinitive construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>רְאֵי בִּיטָרְךָ שְׁפֹטֵךְ וְשַׂמְתוּךְ לִשְׁמֹרְתָּךְ אָלִים</td>
<td>1:1 רְאֵי בִּיטָרְךָ שְׁפֹטֵךְ וְשַׂמְתוּךְ לִשְׁמֹרְתָּךְ אָלִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אל תָּרֵשְׁךְ מֵמַי לִפְנֵי מַמְנִי אֱלֹהִים</td>
<td>1:16 אל תָּרֵשְׁךְ מֵמַי לִפְנֵי מַמְנִי אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The infinitive construct can receive pronominal suffixes that act as the subject of the verb or the object of the verb. When it attaches its subject, e.g. Ruth 1:19 BH: נָאַבְּדַ, it is modified into a clause in MH: השיגהו עַד. When the infinitive construct attaches an object, e.g. Ruth 1:16 BH: לְעָזְבֵ and Ruth 2:9ךְּּּּּ, the infinitive in construct with -ל can be used in MH, e.g. Ruth 1:16אותך לעזוב and Ruth 2:9בך עְלִפְגָו, with the object attached separately, in this case to either the object marker ת or a preposition, respectively. In MH the infinitive is always in construction with -ל and is rarely attached to other prepositions. When attached to -ל it has a similar form and meaning to the BH infinitive. [Brettler, 2002:175]

When in construction with the preposition ת, e.g. Ruth 1:19 הבאות the infinitive construct becomes a temporal clause expressing a commencing action. The phrase ועד הבאות serves as a temporal adjunct to the verb לְכַנָה. MH changes these constructions into full subordinate clauses, e.g. Ruth 1:19ünde השיגהו וכתיב הגרות.

Negation of an infinitive construct is usually with לֶבַלָה as can be seen in Ruth 2:9ךְּלָּלֶבַלָה. In MH the negation is achieve by using the negative particle לא with the infinitive, Ruth 2:9 MH: לא לפגוע בך.

**Infinitive absolute**

The infinitive absolute has fallen out of use in spoken MH and is rarely used in literary Hebrew. The function of the infinitive absolute is to intensify the finite verb, to serve as a command or as a finite verb. [Waltke & O’Connor, 1990:§35.2.1a] It is usually used paronomastically with a finite verb that shares the same stem creating a play on words, which is emphatic. [Waltke &
O’Connor, 1990:§35.2.1c] For example, in Ruth 2:16 BH: *
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The relative particle

The extensive use of אֲשֶׁר (1:8) and its components is characteristic of BH, e.g. Ruth 2:19. The proclitic -שׁ is frequently replaces the relative particle אֲשֶׁר, e.g. Ruth 2:19. The proclitic is used ubiquitously in MH and is usually synonymous with אֲשֶׁר but is not always interchangeable. Although -שׁ is attested in BH it is very rare. [Gesenius, 1983, §36]

7. Relative particle
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SYNTACTIC PHENOMENA THAT CHARACTERISE BIBLICAL HEBREW

Tense and aspect

The BH verb has a complexed function, where one verb form can perform various functions, and conversely, different verb forms can serve similar functions. The wayyiqtol forms are the most frequently used verbal form and their function is to express consecutive past events primarily in narrative, thereby linking one event in the narrative to the next. [Waltke & O’Connor 1990:544–547] In most cases, wayyiqtol is identical in meaning to BH qatal, that is, expressing a
completed action or past event. [Brettler, 2002:172] A narrative sequence can be interrupted by the conjunction ו followed by a non-sequential tense, such as qatal or the participle, in order to express new information, such as background or to introduce a new character or event.

[Nahum, 2018a:קד] For example, Ruth 1:1-6 has a cascade of wayyiqtol that thread together the background information of the story, starting with the יְהִי form, which introduces the narrative, until the sequence is broken by the non-sequential qatal verb שָמְעָה in verse 6, which marks the end of the background information and brings Naomi to the forefront of the narrative. The wayyiqtol form is characteristic of BH and is no longer used in MH. As a result, the temporal use of the verb forms is different in MH expressing tense, whereas the aspectual distinctions are more prominent in BH. MH uses only qatal throughout the entire sequence and there is no waw-sequence in MH that connects the verbs: Ruth 1:1 הלך-לֶךְ יֵ֨וֹ-וַיְהִי-וַיְהִי-וַיְהִי. Since there is only qatal and no long waw-sequence the semantics of the interruption of the verbal sequence by שָמְעָה in verse 6 is lost in MH.

8. Wayyiqtol-qatal sequence

The weqatal form can also appear in a sequence of verbs, especially following a clause with a yiqtol verb as in Ruth 3:13. The weqatal form is also unique to BH; and therefore, in MH it is replace by yiqtol, e.g. in Ruth 3:13 אֶנָּאָל הַכָּלָלָה הַכָּלָלָה מַעְבִּדְוָה מִלְּקָם פֶּרֶשָּׁה. אֶנָּאָל is replace by the yiqtol, אנאאל.

9. Weqatal-yiqtol sequence

| Wayqatal-yiqtol sequence | 3:13 אֶנָּאָל הַכָּלָלָה הַכָּלָלָה מַעְבִּדְוָה |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| נִשָּׁבְתָה | |
Although weqatal is an indicative form, it is sometimes used to indicate a command. Imperatives are generally used to address actions that must be performed immediately and the indicative forms are used to indicate future actions. [Shulman, 2001:272] For example, in Ruth 3:3 the instructions that Noami gives Ruth are in a sequence of weqatal. In MH, these are all translated to imperatives.

10. Weqatal as imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BH</th>
<th>MH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֵֽלְכָה אֲלַקֳטָה</td>
<td>לאסוף...ללכת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modality: cohortative and jussive

The cohortative form is the volitive mood (directly expressing a wish, request or command, or indirectly expressing intent) and is formed by adding the suffix ה to the first person singular or plural, e.g. Ruth 2:2 BH: אֲלַקֳטָה, אֵֽלְכָה. [Waltke & O’Connor, 1990§34.5] The modal yiqtol should be distinguished from the indicative form, since it can be identical in morphology but functionally different. [Cook, 2002:116] These two modal yiqtol forms are substituted by modal verbs in MH, i.e. imperatives followed by an infinitive, Ruth 2:2 MH: תָּרֵשֵי...ללכת.

Ruth 2:2 MH: תָּרֵשֵי...ללכת...לאסוף.

11. Cohortative mood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BH</th>
<th>MH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>תָּרֵשֵי...ללכת...לאסוֹף</td>
<td>לאסוף...ללכת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The jussive mood, like the cohortative, is used to express a wish or a desire of the speaker but is limited almost exclusively to the 2nd or 3rd person. [Gesenius 1909 §48] The jussive mood is rare in MH, however, some expressions remain frozen in the language, e.g. Ruth 2:4 MH: "וְּרֹדֶה...וְיָרַד..."
"האותך יברך יהוה": 2:4 [Gesenius, 1983, §142] In MH, the word order that governs the sentence is predominantly subject-predicate, therefore, in the translation "אלימלך", the subject, comes first and is followed by the predicate, "מת" [Schwarzwald, 2010:210]

13. Word order: predicate-subject

First conjunct agreement

In Ruth 1:6 BH: "תֶ֔יהָ לֹּו וְכַּ֖הִיא קָםָה תּוֹ וַ" the predicate appears before the subject and agrees with the first conjunct "הִיא", of the compound subject "תֶ֔יהָ לֹּו וְכַ֖הִיא" (instead of "תֶ֔יהָ לֹּו וְכַ֖הִיא קָמָה תּוֹ וַ*). In MH, when the subject precedes the predicate, syntactic agreement occurs: Ruth 1:6 MH: "הִיא תֶ֔יהָ לֹּו וְכַ֖הִיא קָמָה תּוֹ וַ".

14. First conjunct agreement

 BH's use of pronominal suffixes as objects to the verb versus MH's use of the direct object marker, will be discussed below. 

Although Holmstedt (2009b) argues that first-conjunct agreement in BH is a perceived, rather than a real, syntactic phenomenon.
Synthesis versus periphrasis

BH, like other Semitic languages, is an economical language preferring to use less words. As such, it uses many construct states, pronominal suffixes and verbal suffixes.

Possessive pronominal suffix on the noun

The pronominal suffixes are used abundantly in BH but are not as commonly used in MH, except certain lexical terms in literature, formal forms of speech and family names. [Kutscher, 1982 §417] Such as in Ruth 1:22, BH uses the pronominal suffix: נַעֲרוֹתָיו, whereas MH uses the relative particle של analytically: שלו הקוצרות.

The construct state

The construct state continues to be used in MH; but more frequently the particle של is used analytically. [Schwarzwald, 2011:529] Therefore, in MH the construct is expressed as של המר. Another phenomena seen here that is typical of literary and formal style in MH is the anaphoric pronoun attached to של creating של המר, which together with של between the two nouns produces the double genitive: של המר.

Pronominal suffix as object of the verb

Pronominal suffixes appended as the object of the verb are very common in BH, e.g. לְעָזְבֵי בָּרֶכֶךָ in Ruth 1:16, 1:21 and 2:4, respectively. The inflected form of the object marking pronoun של (של + pronominal suffix) is also found in BH but it is conditional and limited. In MH, the inflected accusative is used analytically and the synthetic use appears only in literary
contexts. In the spoken language these forms are falling out of use. [Schwarzwald, 2011:529]

As such, יבר אוח is translated as שלטת in לועות אוח and יבר אוח as שלטת in לועות אוח.

17. Pronominal suffixes as objects of verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>1:16</th>
<th>1:16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
<td>יבר אוח</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination and subordination

BH is generally paratactic, i.e. coordination is frequently used and subordination is less common. Conversely, in MH subordination occurs more frequently using -ש in all kinds of subordinations. [Kutscher, 1982§364] For example, Ruth 3:7 is coordinated by waw (ו) in the wayyiqtol sequence ראבכל...ויתשת...ויהב...ותיכה...ותשקב. Since MH uses less coordination it also uses waw less in general, as seen in 3:7. BH does occasionally use subordination, e.g. Ruth 3:14 יבר אוח אתייה but in MH the subordinate clauses almost always begin with -ש, as in יבר אוח.

There are relatively few conjunctions in BH, especially subordinate particles at the beginning of clauses. Sometimes waw acts as a subordinate particle to introducing a purpose clause (volitive + ו + volitive), e.g. Ruth 4:4 BH: התמידה ול ירא, once again MH uses -ש, MH: כר שיאדו.
Interrogatives

The interrogative particle -ֲ is consistently translated into MH as אם, which is also a BH interrogative, e.g. in Ruth 1:19 becomes “‘אמים תרתי?’”. Interestingly, all four occurrences of interrogatives using -ה are rhetorical questions and are translated that way in MH. The interrogative negatives לא or לא, e.g. Ruth 3:2 are also all rhetorical questions; however, in MH they are not translated as rhetorical questions, instead they are presented as statements. Another interrogative that is no longer used is安宁 and along with安宁 and 이, see Ruth 2:19.

19. Interrogatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARENא</td>
<td>“What are you doing?”</td>
<td>1:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תלע</td>
<td>“Brought, invested with power, shall he not?”</td>
<td>3:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כלף</td>
<td>“Are they not finished and completed?”</td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepositions

The BH prepositions את and עם that express association are used differently in MH; את is used with a pronominal suffix and עם is mostly used with a noun. [Muraoka, 1995:18] For example, in Ruth 1:11 BH: עלפי, which has a pronominal suffix is substituted by ואת; and in Ruth 2:20 BH: ואת, which is associated with a noun (חרים) is substituted by עם in MH. The associative את should not be confused with את marking the direct object.

20. Prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>את</td>
<td>“With whom?”</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עם</td>
<td>“With whom?”</td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 See Holmstedt, 2010:78, 81 & 96 about these interrogatives being rhetorical questions.

20 See Holmstedt, 2010:118, 123, 148 & 149 about these negative interrogative being rhetorical questions.
CHAPTER 3: APPLICATIONS TO BIBLICAL HEBREW PEDAGOGY

TEACHING BIBLICAL HEBREW AS A LIVING LANGUAGE

The goal of this chapter is to discuss ways in which to apply CLT methods that have risen from contemporary SLA research to BH pedagogy; and to discuss how to apply the CA results of this study in a CLT environment with students that know MH(L2). It will start with a review of the CLT approach, methods and techniques to frame the approach taken in this study and discuss in which way the students' prior knowledge of MH may affect the type of exercises used. Firstly, to determine what kind of learning environment to cultivate for BH instruction and secondly, which teaching methods would be most suitable. After that, an outline of typical classroom activities and exercises is presented that demonstrate how to conduct a BH lesson in an immersive setting; using as an example one of the phenomena highlighted by the CA, the wayyiqtol verbal forms. It will also make suggestions of how to introduce BH-MH contrastive information from the results of the CA without compromising the monolingual environment. This will be done in the context of a potential pre-reading preparatory course for the book of Ruth; and therefore, the content of the course will be designed accordingly, i.e. all phenomena taught are taken from the book of Ruth.

There are two important perspectives to keep in mind when designing curricula to teach BH using communicative techniques. The first is that SLA research results do not automatically apply to the classroom environment and, therefore, may have to be adapted to the specific situation and needs. This is particularly true when applying SLA research for living languages to no-longer spoken languages such as BH. Researchers and teachers have very different goals and more dialogue between them is required in order to bridge this gap in the constantly changing relationship between SLA theory and pedagogy. Larsen-Freeman notes that: “So
certainly there is a controversy. It might be helpful to recall, however, that SLA theorists are concerned with specifying what is minimally necessary for acquisition to proceed. Second language educators are concerned with maximising effectiveness.” [Larsen-Freeman, 2013:140]. In addition, more empirical studies are needed to determine how these SLA finding apply specifically to BH.

The second perspective is that methodology like CLT is a pedagogical tool that should serve the content of the coursework and not determine it. In other words, methodology like writing compositions, making speeches or speaking to one another in BH is not the ultimate goal of the course; these are tools that should be designed to help learners understand the biblical text. Determining the content of the course should always be the primary goal, which is determined by the specific goals and end-needs of the students and potential issues and solutions they may encounter. [Traphagen, 2009]

As such, when designing curricula for students who are generally biblical and language scholars and Bible translators, the methods and content should aim towards the ultimate goal of reading fluency. In order to tailor-make the content of the course, to take into consideration any potential CLI from MH, a CA was performed to establish which grammatical forms comprise essential contrastive information that learners need to know in order to clarify the boundaries between BH and MH (see Chapter 2 and Appendix B).

The learning environment

The CLT approach: methods and techniques applied to BH pedagogy

The CLT approach to teaching second languages focuses on communicative competence and fluency in all four language skills and brought communicative activities into the learning environment. As far as the methodology is concerned, Richards and Rodgers (2001) pointed out that ‘there is no single text or authority on it [CLT], nor any single model that is universally accepted as authoritative’. [Richards & Rodgers, 2001:155] The CLT approach has many
methods and no single method can guarantee results or suits everyone’s needs, all methods and techniques have their advantages and disadvantages and finding a suitable model for BH instruction can often be a matter or trial and error; which emphasises the need to keep course content and student goals as priority. CLT preserved the monolingual principle (full immersion) from the Natural Approach (see Krashen & Terrell, 1983), that is instruction exclusively in the target language. [Richards & Rodgers, 1986:72; Du 2016:33] The immersion method that has been used successfully in L2 teaching for spoken languages for years but using this method for ‘dead’ languages, such as BH, is a very novel idea.

The importance of the auditory in language learning

The importance of the auditory in language was brought to light by the structural linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. [Saussure, 1992:9-12] His concept of the ‘sign/signifier/signified’ forms the core of the field of semiotics. He describes a linguistic ‘sign’ as a link between a concept (‘signified’) and a sound pattern (‘signifier’), that is, language (langue) is a means for thought to be expressed as a sound (parole). This concept highlights the importance of the auditory in language, since meaning is primarily encoded through sound (speech) and is key for the internalisation of a language. In other words, you need to be able to hear in order to learn a spoken language. The interdependency of audition, language and learning is demonstrated in studies, which have shown that “the ability to extract linguistic rules develops in early infancy and is tightly linked to functional aspects of basic auditory mechanisms.” [Mueller el al., 2012] Auditory memory not only helps us to internalise sound (verbal language), it also helps us to process, remember and recall information. [Bellis, 2003:298] This underscores the importance of preserving an environment where only BH is spoken in a class that teaches BH as a living language, particularly with respects to skills such as listening and speaking. Since there are no native speakers it is inevitably the only environment the students have to hear the language and make important sound-meaning-form connections.
Hypotheses concerning conditions for acquisition

Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis states that acquisition takes place when learners understand input that is slightly more advanced that their current level of competence (which he described as interlanguage +1). [Krashen, 1982, 1985; VanPattern and Williams, 2015:17-32; Du, 2016:18] Swain argued that when our abilities are limited to reading a text, we are only partially processing the L2, since different mental processes are utilised when producing utterances than those used during comprehensible input. Therefore, Swain put forward her comprehensible output hypothesis which states that language is acquired during the process of grappling to find the correct form of utterance to transmit meaning. [Swain, 1985:371; 1993] Long's interaction hypothesis states that acquisition is enhanced through interacting in the L2, specifically when a breakdown in communication occurs and the students have to negotiate for meaning, by modifying their speech to be more comprehensible. [Long, 1996] The implications for BH learning are that instead of the traditional methods of teaching BH through reading only, the inclusion of audible input and output can greatly increase acquisition and consequently improve reading fluency.

The full immersion method

The full immersion method provides an environment where the comprehensible input, output and interaction hypotheses can all be put into practise. Students receive large amounts of input from the teacher and through interacting with one another in BH. Creative ways are used to introduce new concepts or words in the context of an event or situation, such as stories, skits or TPR, using visual aids, hand gestures, drawing, images and props. Group activities increase opportunities to practise producing the language (output) and to interact in BH in conversational pairs or trios where they can speak with one another at the same level of competence. [Du, 2016:19] Another way to encourage student participation is through games that are useful for
revision and to create an enjoyable environment, which according to Krashen’s (1982:32) affective filter hypothesis is also important for acquisition (see lesson plan for an example).

Although immersion students develop high levels of communicative ability they tend to have underdeveloped grammatical accuracy if the instruction is too implicit, which can lead to fossilisation of incorrect use of the target linguistic features. Therefore, instructional strategies need to include some kind of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. [Loewen & Sato, 2017:6, 90-95, 490] This becomes even more significant when teaching BH students who do not have much opportunity to practise speaking.

**Employing all four of the languages skills**

In contrast to traditional methods, which concentrate on reading skills, the goal of CLT is to develop procedures for teaching all four of the languages skills equally, that follow the natural order that a child acquires them: listening, speaking, reading and then writing. [Brown, 1994; Koutropoulos, 2011; Carlon, 2013:112] As such, students should be encouraged to produce the forms that they have learnt as soon as possible through speech. Speech also provides a method of assessing the students’ acquisition and it is an opportunity for corrective feedback. A cyclical strategy of input-output can be effectively used throughout the stages of development of the interlanguage, leading to greater fluency (see Fig.1). Thus, a new concept will be gradually assimilated through all four skills cycle using various drills and activities; and then, the same concept is reintroduced into grammatical contexts that gradually become increasingly difficult. [Nahum, 2018b, Cook & Holmstedt, 2013]

For example, wayyiqtol verbal forms will first be introduced in singular and once the singular is assimilated then the plural can be introduced.
Communicative methods to raise metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness

Due to the shift away from explicit grammar instruction various methods have been developed to help students ‘notice’ grammar within the context of communicative language. These methods offer a middle ground where grammar is not completely ignored but rather it is made visible without compromising the L2 only environment. The key idea behind using techniques that encourage students to find the rules by themselves is that it teaches them to process and think in BH and in this way the grammar is more deeply internalised. The following is a review of various form-focused methods that can be applied to BH pedagogy and will be demonstrated in the lesson plan following.

**Inductive versus deductive instruction**

Explicit instruction is when the focus of the lesson is to point out a particular grammatical feature, such as morphosyntactic rules and patterns, including L1/L2 contrasts. One issue with traditional explicit grammar explanations is that they are often out of context and not connected to the language as a whole. Therefore, one way to overcome this is to precede explicit instruction with implicit instruction allowing learners to figure out the rules for themselves as they assimilate the language. The explicit instruction will then confirm what the students have already acquired in the inductive phase. For example, when introducing the wayyiqtol form a method like TPR can be used to demonstrate that it is past narrative. After the forms has been assimilated by hearing and producing them, the paradigm can be written down on the board at the end of the lesson so that the students can make a connection between the written form and the meaning. (See lesson plan for more details.)

BH/MH contrastive information can also be introduced in this way, i.e. after the inductive phase. BH/MH written information can be juxtaposed when appropriate to help the learner establish a link between a BH form and its corresponding MH form which makes the learners conscious of
the target form and aids memorisation. [James, 1996:146-147] However, explanations should be conducted in BH and the goal of the students will always be to produce BH not MH.

**Input-based instruction**

Rather than deducing or inducing grammar rules, input-based instruction requires learners to attend to grammatical forms during the input phase while they are processing the meaning of a form, which is achieved through making the input salient. [Loewen & Sato et al. 2017:212] VanPattern (1990) emphasised the need for comprehension activities that help learners to make crucial connections between form and meaning. This can be achieved by some form of input enhancement, such as boldface, highlighting, using different colours, making oral language more prominent, or by ‘input flooding’, which makes many uses of the same grammatical form. Spada & Lightbown claim that more explicit enhancement improves L2 development. [Spada & Lightbown, 2008:195 in Larsen-Freeman, 2015:269] For example, when writing a wayyiqtol paradigm on the board the different suffixes can be highlighted in a different colour to make them more salient or the root word can be emphasised, e.g. אֶמַרְנָה, אֶמְרָנָה, אֶמְרָנָה. For contrastive information, e.g. negative imperatives, the use of a different negative particle can be highlighted:

| 2:16 | לא תנויריו בלה. |
| 2:16 | לא תנויריו בלה. |

**Output-based instruction**

Output-based instruction encourages learners to practise producing the language and then attends to grammatical forms during the output. [Loewen & Sato, 2017:211] Once such method is the Present-Practise-Produce method (PPP), which involves a grammar explanation first that is contextualised, e.g. through a situation build, a dialogue, a picture etc., followed by a controlled use of the grammar structure, ending with opportunities for the students to use the particular structure in more open type exercises. [Loewen, 2014:83] For example, the grammatical rules...
of relative clause formation can be introduced by acting out a story from the text, with grammatical explanations in BH. The students can then engage in sentence forming activities where they have to combine two sentences using a relative clause. Afterwards activities should include activities where students make more free use of relative clauses.

**Task-based instruction**

Task-based instruction is an effective way of fulfilling all the essential requirements for acquisition, i.e. input, output, interaction and corrective feedback on output, which focuses learners’ attention to form while performing the task. It can be effective for complexed structures that are difficult to draw attention to through other methods. [Loewen & Sato, 2017:88,122] To qualify as a communicative task the activity must 1) be a meaningful task; 2) contain some kind of gap, where the students need to interact with other students to obtain the information they need to fulfill the task; 3) require learners to rely largely on their own resources in order to complete the task; and 4) focus on the task at hand, i.e. language is used to communicate and language learning is secondary. [Ellis and Shintani (2014) in Loewen & Sato, 2017:108] Tasks are focused mainly on output-based instruction, i.e. language production, but they can combine input-based instruction, i.e. listening or reading, especially for beginners. [Loewen & Sato, 2017:121; Ellis, 2003:86] For example, to practise using the interrogative -מ the students could play a game where they have to discover which character in the book of Ruth the other students are without asking their name. The one who discovers all the characters first wins. They have to go around the class asking each student questions from a list of questions starting with -מ given by the teacher to find their partner, e.g. קַשָּׁבָה מָשְרֵךְ מַלְאָךְ?

**Total Physical Response (TPR)**

TPR was developed by Asher (2009) based on two observations, first that young children have to comprehend a lot of input before they learn how to speak, and second that that input involved
a lot of physical interaction. This method only requires students to respond physically to verbal commands and the association made between movement and language facilitates acquisition. Learning is inductive rather than deductive and is based on the premise that understanding comes before production. [Molina et al., 2015] In this way, learning starts through listening comprehension and the physical response becomes a tactile and visual conveyance of the meaning of the word. The physical enactment not only helps for comprehension of the word but also aids memorisation. Sequential TPR is another variation, in which 4-5 commands are grouped together in a sequence. In this way, a cluster of verbs that are related to one another can be learned. As an approach it is limited since you cannot teach everything through TPR, it can be monotonous and it is mostly suitable for beginners. However, as a technique it can be effectively used to introduce new concepts. An example of how wayyiqtol forms can be introduced using sequential TPR can be found in the lesson plan.

Other principles and techniques used

Reading

Since reading is the ultimate goal, dealing with texts is important. There should be a pre-reading preparation, where new concepts are introduced such as vocabulary, during which the students should become familiar with the item they are about to encounter in the text. [Grabe & Stoller, 2011:133] In order to achieve this, new concepts should be introduced in several different ways and contexts using varying techniques. The texts from Ruth can be adapted to the students’ competence by removing difficult segments and rewriting grammatical structures using those that the students have already acquired. The same text can then be reintroduced with increasingly difficult grammar, until the students are reading the original, unmodified text. [Cook & Holmstedt, 2013] Texts can be read together as a group (choral reading), silently, or in pairs, which are helpful to build reading fluency. [Grabe & Stoller, 2011:152] Finally the text can also be acted out as a skit, or drama, after the students are familiar with it, which is another visual aid to help convey meaning and improve memorisation. There are several post-reading
techniques that can be employed, such as asking directive questions that help the students understand the text, or comprehension questions that assess their understanding and exercises that are based on the text, e.g. identifying the forms they have just learned. These methods are employed in the lesson plan.

**Oral structure drills**

Although oral drills were largely inspired by the Audiolingual Method, the use of this method still persists within other approaches. The shortcoming of the Audiolingual Method was that it paid little attention to meaning or context. [Nassaji and Fotos, 2011:3] Just because a new approach appears, it does not automatically nullify all previously used methods, as long as the old method is adapted to new SLA findings. Oral drills can be a first step to helping students speak. Simple word drills can be followed by meaningful sentence drills, which can then be inserted into a meaningful context. Since BH is a pattern-based language, assimilation of grammatical forms can be effectively achieved through analogy. [Nahum, 2018b] Which means, that when a student repetitively hears a verbal paradigm and produces it orally, the pattern is effectively assimilated and they can intuitively recognise a verb type by hearing the pattern and apply the appropriate paradigm to the new verb. This can be achieved through repetitive oral chain drills or even singing the paradigm. They should be able to use them passively, i.e. by recognising the pattern and relating it to a new verb; or actively being able to produce the entire paradigm, both verbally and the written forms. After which the students will start to use the verbs in context (see lesson plan).

**A PRE-READING PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR THE BOOK OF RUTH**

Presented is the outline for a pre-reading preparatory program to the book of Ruth that is to be taught in a BH immersive setting and is tailored for students who know MH. The purpose of such a program is to introduce students to all the BH phenomena highlighted in the CA that they will encounter in the text of Ruth.
Goals for curricula design and syllabus outline

When teaching BH to MH speaking students in an immersive setting curricula design should have the following goals in mind:

1. to create an environment where only BH spoken in the classroom,
2. to raise BH metalinguistic awareness by placing emphasis on the phenomena characteristic of BH that were highlighted in the CA,
3. to raise crosslinguistic awareness from MH through written BH/MH contrasts (without speaking MH),
4. to design classroom activities and exercises that give opportunities for the correct usage of these phenomena in both speech and writing,
5. to design methods to assess assimilation and correct usage.

The syllabus outline can be formulated from the results of the CA. The program can be divided into units that group related topics, such as: Unit 1: Introduction to consecutive verbal form: the wayyiqtol-qatal sequence, the weqatal-yiqtol sequence; Unit 2: Volitive moods and interrogatives: imperative, cohortative, jussive, interrogative; Unit 3: Synthetic versus analytic syntax: construct state, pronominal suffixes on nouns, pronominal suffixes as objects to the verb; Unit 4: coordination and subordination. Such a holistic program is beyond the scope of this study, and therefore only the wayyiqtol verbal forms are used as an example.

Unit 1: Introduction to consecutive verbal forms

1.1 The wayyiqtol-qatal sequence

Since MH no longer uses wayyiqtol forms they can easily be confused with the yiqtol form by MH speakers. The wayyiqtol form is a distinctive marker of biblical narrative and is, therefore, a crucial form to understand, especially with respects to its intricate relationship with qatal. The BH verbal system is arguably the most difficult to master due to its intricacy. Fully comprehending

21 For charts see Appendix B, which include phenomena that are not used in these lessons. These charts can be used as teaching aids for curricula design or lesson planning, or as study guides for students for orientation and revision.
these forms can be very challenging for the student and consequently, teaching them also has its challenges since their morphology and syntax are not simple. Due to the complexity of these forms, the student needs to accumulate a lot of information before they can actively produce these forms. That is, background knowledge about verbs in general is necessary before a systematic teaching of the morphology and syntax of the wayyiqtol forms can be introduced. However, these forms occur so frequently in the text, that a good grasp of them early on is beneficially. The following lessons assume a level of competence that would have been obtained in previous lessons and therefore, focuses only on the wayyiqtol forms as an example.

Initially a few wayyiqtol verbs can be memorised as lexical units without the students having to know anything about there morphology or syntax. For example, the paradigm: 

\[\text{라면 הָאֵמָהוּ, וַיֹּאמְר} \]

can be used for the purpose of introducing dialogues. By the time the student is ready to be systematically introduced to the wayyiqtol forms and their usage, they will already be familiar with the \[ריַאמַר הָאֵמָהוּ, וַיֹּאמְר] paradigm. The \[ויְהִי] paradigm should also be taught early on because it is an important narrative verb, which the students will often come across.

Lesson 1: Introduction to wayyiqtol - qal

Objectives: The wayyiqtol-qal strong verbs will be introduced as a narrative past tense, with the goal of teaching the students to recognise these forms by their characteristic morphology, such as their triconsonantal root, and position in a clause.\(^{22}\) TPR can be used to introduce the wayyiqtol forms, starting with the strong verbs in the simplest stem, which is binyan qal. Since the wayyiqtol most frequently occur in the third person, only the third person will be taught until the students have assimilated all the wayyiqtol forms.

Group activity: Sequential TPR

Skills: Listening. Topic: Introduce the consecutive, narrative past tense nature of the wayyiqtol verbs.

\(^{22}\) Nahum, 2018b, Chapter 9: יִקְטֹל, note 1
Background knowledge: The students are familiar with the paradigm. This is also an opportunity to revise known imperatives.

Content: The teacher uses a string of simple commands which a student has to act out, e.g. “Say your name!”; “Hold the bread!”; “Eat the bread!”; “Lie down on the ground!” and so on.

After the student has followed the teacher’s string of commands, the teacher will retell what the student has done in narrative form using wayyiqtol, e.g.

This exercise should be repeated a number of times using different qal verbs giving each student a turn to act it out. At first only masculine and feminine singular should be used until these forms are assimilated. Exercises should be based on known vocabulary so that the input is comprehensible. A few new words that are relevant to the lesson can be introduced by acting them out or using visual props. After the inductive phase the paradigm can be used to orientate the students by writing it on the board and pointing out the characteristic morphology: a waw prefixed to a yiqtol form with a patah under the waw and a dagesh in the next consonant. If the students have enough background knowledge the teacher can also point out issues of stress and vocalisation changes that occur when the waw is prefixed to the yiqtol form. This could be a brief introduction and a more thorough explanation can follow once they have been introduced to the guttural and weak verbs.

Group activity: Sequential TPR and producing the verbs

Skills: Listening and speaking. Topic: The formation and active use of the wayyiqtol verbs.

Content: As in the previous activity, the teacher instructs a student to complete a sequence of tasks but this time, instead of the teacher, another student must describe what the first student

---

23 Modern punctuation can be used in the texts until a later stage when the students are ready to learn more about cantillation marks.

24 Stress and vocalisation are complexed issue and are out of the scope of this study.
did by repeating the sequence of verbs in wayyiqtol. This can be repeated for all the verbs that are to be introduced in that lesson, giving each student an opportunity to speak.

**Group activity: Choral reading**

**Skills:** Reading.  
**Topic:** To recognize and read the wayyiqtol verbs in context.

The class can read a scripture together that contains the wayyiqtol forms they have just learnt. Ask the students to identify the wayyiqtol forms. Ruth 3:15, for example, will help them recognize the command and correlating wayyiqtol, that they have been hearing in the TPR exercises.

![Ruth 3:15](image)

**Group activity: Reading a narrative and dramatising it.**

**Skill:** listening, speaking, reading.  
**Topic:** Understanding the wayyiqtol narrative forms in context.

**Instructions:** A fictional narrative can be prepared based on, for example, the story in Ruth 2 where Boaz meet Ruth and he goes home and tells his mother about her and relates to her what happened using wayyiqtol verbs. The teacher should read the story to the class, refreshing their memory about new words they have learned and asking directive questions to make sure the students are following the story. Comprehension questions should follow. A few students can then act out the story with the rest of the class just listening, i.e. without looking at the text. The teacher could then read the entire story to the class while they read along in the text.

**Conversational pairs exercise: identifying the wayyiqtol verbs**

**Skills:** Reading and speaking

Students can be divided into pairs to read the text to one another identifying the wayyiqtol verbs.

**Group activity: paradigm assimilation**

**Skills:** Reading and speaking

**Topic:** Paradigm assimilation through speech and pattern recognition
Content: Finally, the wayyiqtol verbs that have been introduced in the lesson can be written as a paradigm on the board, using one strong verb as an example. The whole class can read through the paradigm on the board as a choral reading to learn the pattern of the verbs.

Homework

Skill: Reading and writing  
Objectives: Recognition and comprehension of wayyiqtol forms

EXERCISE 1: Objectives: Identifying whether a verb is masculine, feminine, singular or plural.

Fill in the blank with one of the following: אָמַרְנָה 

| דַּוִּי (כְּבָלָה) בֵּית לְּהֹם וְּחָכְמָה (עֲלֵיהֶן) לָא נָרִי | 1:19
| וָאֻנִּי (כְּבָלָה) בֵּית לְּהֹם וְּחָכְמָה (עֲלֵיהֶן) לָא נָרִי | 2:20
| וּבְמַהְרֵהּ מַחְּסִית לְּהֹם וְּחָכְמָה (עֲלֵיהֶן) לָא נָרִי | 4:16

EXERCISE 2: Objectives: Assess comprehension of words.

Select one of three wayyiqtol verbs to complete the sentence.

| דַּוִּי (כְּבָלָה) בֵּית לְּהֹם וְּחָכְמָה (עֲלֵיהֶן) לָא נָרִי | 1:6

EXERCISE 3: Objectives: Recognise the common root. This exercise will also serve to help student make the initial connection between the qatal form as used in MH and wayyiqtol.

Match the wayyiqtol verb with its qatal equivalent and write down the three consonants root they share as in the example: אָמַרְנָה, אָמַרְנָה, אָמַרְנָה

| אָמַרְנָה | קָטַל | שָׁמַר |

Lesson 2: Introducing weak and guttural wayyiqtol verbs

Objectives: In this lesson the guttural and weak qal verbs will be introduced. Similar lessons can be prepared to introduce more strong and weak verbs and other binyanim, like piel and hiphil.

Only one new verb stem (binyan) should be introduced per lesson. The students will be
expected to produce these forms in both speech and writing. Other verb stems that are not included in this example, like piel and hiphil, can be introduced in the same way.

**Group activity: Sequential TPR and producing the verbs**

**Skills:** Listening and speaking

**Topic:** Introduce weak and guttural wayyiqtol verbs (לֶהַיְי, לֶהַיְנָי, לֶהַנְיָי) in singular and plural.

**Background knowledge:** Some wayyiqtol strong verbs.

**Revision and content:** The best way to study the weak verbs is in comparison with the strong verbs; therefore, a revision of strong verbs should be done before introducing the guttural and weak verbs. The new verbs can be introduced in the same way as before, i.e. using sequential TPR. However, this time commands can be given to 2-3 students in order to introduce the plural forms as well. Repetition is important not only to give the students several examples but it also provides each student an opportunity to speak.

**Group activity: Listening comprehension, narrative, weak verbs**

**Skills:** Listening and speaking

**Topic:** Introduce wayyiqtol לֶהַי. Recognize wayyiqtol verbs in context. Relate to past perfect, i.e. qatal.

**Background knowledge:** Some wayyiqtol strong, guttural and weak verbs.

**Content:** After a period of pre-reading preparation where new vocabulary is introduced, the students listen to a reading of a narrative (pre-recorded or read by the teacher) that contains a sequence of wayyiqtol forms, e.g. Ruth 1:1-5 that introduces the background narrative. The teacher should ask directive questions about the main events and characters during and afterwards to help them follow the narrative. The students can listen to the story a several times, if necessary. Afterwards, comprehension questions should be asked to make sure the students understand the text. For beginners, these can be simple yes/no questions, such as, “Did Naomi’s husband die?”, or questions that need a one word answer, such as, “Who died?”, or multiple choice, such as, “Did Naomi die or did her husband die?”.
Conversational pairs: Reading

**Skills:** Reading and speaking.

The students divide into pairs and read the story to one another. They should identify and circle the wayyiqtol forms in the text, and then convert all the verbs they found into qatal, speaking them out to each another. Afterwards, the teacher will read through the text and repeat the same exercise together as a class.

Group activity: Drama

**Skills:** Listening and speaking

A few students can act out the story and the other students watch and listen without looking at the text. If there is time, the drama can be acted out by different students.

Group activity: Revision: Games

The teacher should write one paradigm of each type of verb on the board in columns, i.e. a strong, a guttural and a weak verb. To revise the list of new wayyiqtol verbs, a card with a qatal verb can be held up in front of the class and the students have to say the verb in wayyiqtol and recognize which group the verb belongs to, i.e. whether it is a strong, guttural or weak verb. When a student has answered correctly that student should write the verb on the board in the appropriate column.

After the inductive phase, the paradigms of all the new verbs should be clearly written on the board, grouped into strong, weak and guttural verbs. (This may already be on the board after the game.) The teacher can revise the morphology pointing out exceptions and characteristic vocalisation patterns of each group. Vocalisation can be pointed out using a different colour pens for clarity as a means of input enhancement. The whole class can read through the entire wayyiqtol paradigm, in chorus fashion. Since the verbs have a specific recognisable pattern, reading the paradigm out loud will help them to hear and memorize the verbal pattern and be able to apply the pattern to new wayyiqtol verbs.
Homework

EXERCISE 1: Objectives: Relate the qatal and wayyiqtol forms and produce the paradigm in writing.

Fill out verbal paradigm tables, including strong, guttural and weak verbs. Read the verb paradigm out loud.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דָּכָּה</td>
<td>רָכָּה</td>
<td>זָכָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶכֶּרָה</td>
<td>דֶכֶּרָה</td>
<td>כֶכֶּרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֹכֶּרָה</td>
<td>כֶכֶּרָה</td>
<td>תֶכֶּרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַכָּרָה</td>
<td>קַכָּרָה</td>
<td>בַכָּרָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXERCISE 3: Objective: Become familiar with the נֶרֶה paradigm.

Write in the blank either נוֹרֶה, נוֹרֶה, נוֹרֶה.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נֶרַע</td>
<td>שֶרַע</td>
<td>חֶרַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶרַע</td>
<td>בֶרַע</td>
<td>גֶרַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶרַע</td>
<td>דֶרַע</td>
<td>הֶרַע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶרַע</td>
<td>זֶרַע</td>
<td>טֶרַע</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXERCISE 3: Objective: Assess understanding of meaning in context and produce the verbs in writing.

Cloze: Select from the list of wayyiqtol verbs and write them in the blank spaces:

1:2 נָרַע שֶרַע לָעַע נָרַע נָרַע 1:11
1:19 נָרַע שֶרַע לָעַע נָרַע

Lesson 3: Functions of qatal in a wayyiqtol narrative sequence

Objectives: The students will be introduced to more advanced concepts, such as word order and the function of the qatal form in a narrative. They will be expected to produce these
phenomena in a small writing composition. Once all the binyanim have been introduced the teacher can introduce the relationship between wayyiqtol and qatal in a narrative.

**Group activity: Revision - qatal to wayyiqtol**

**Objectives:** The students will do guided practise and autonomous practise exercises to revise what they have learned and practise producing the forms.

**Revision exercise 1:** The teacher says a sentence in qatal and the students must repeat the sentence in wayyiqtol. This can be done as a group, where the whole class repeats the sentence together in wayyiqtol, in chorus. This is a guided activity to help students practise using the forms, the next step is for them to practise using them autonomously in more open type exercises, such as exercise 2.

**Revision exercise 2:** The students are given a verb in qatal and they must first convert it to wayyiqtol and then they must create a sentence using that wayyiqtol verb and speak it to the class.

**Group activity: wayyiqtol and word order**

**Skills:** Reading  
**Topic:** Introduce predicate-subject word order and word order reversal.

Word order can be demonstrated by writing a few sentences the students have already heard on the board and explaining the clause initial rule of wayyiqtol and the predicate-subject rule, e.g.

Ruth 1:3 (see ‘predicate-subject’ column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>subject-predicate</th>
<th>predicate-subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נָעְמִי אִישׁ אֱלִימֶלֶךְ נֵי שְׁוֹאְרָה הִיא</td>
<td>אָלַיִלְתָּה אָרֶשׁ בָּנֶיהָ נֵי</td>
<td>קָמוּ תוֹיהָ לַוֹ יֵשׁ בַּהֲלַת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נִשְׁאָרָה הִיא</td>
<td>נָעְמִי אִישׁ אֱלִימֶלֶךְ נֵי שְׁוֹאְרָה הִיא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נְשׁוּאָרָה נֵי בָּנֶיהָ</td>
<td>אָלַיִלְתָּה אָרֶשׁ בָּנֶיהָ</td>
<td>קָמוּ תוֹיהָ לַוֹ יֵשׁ בַּהֲלַת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afterwards, the same BH sentences can be rewritten as subject initial in BH (see ‘subject-predicate’ column), illustrating that if the subject comes first the use of qatal, instead of
wayyiqtol, is necessary. It also shows that as opposed to wayyiqtol, qatal does not appear at the beginning of the sentence (exceptions can be discussed later). This can also be an opportunity to discuss the different functions of qatal in second position, such as to contrast two topics, to mark negation, in a relative clause, in a כִּי clause or any subordinate clause. Once these concepts have been assimilated through oral, reading and written exercises, these structures can be contrasted with a MH equivalent. (See below at the end of the lesson.)

Conversational pairs: wayyiqtol/qatal.

Skills: Reading and speaking  Topic: Identify when to use wayyiqtol and qatal forms.
The students work in pairs on this exercise to solve sentences using wayyiqtol or qatal forms.

Group activity: Introduce functions of the wayyiqtol-qatal sequence.

Skills: Reading  Topic: Introduce the functions of the wayyiqtol-qatal sequence.
Context clarifies meaning and therefore, various functions of the wayyiqtol-qatal sequence is best illustrated in context. For example, this is well illustrated in the beginning of the story of Ruth 1:1-6 (which the students are now already familiar with); where a sequence of wayyiqtol verbs describe the background events until verse 6 where the sequence is interrupted by a qatal, marking the beginning of Naomi's journey.

Verse 6 should be read aloud and can be used to point out the change in aspect from wayyiqtol to qatal. Then the whole story should be read in context from Ruth 1:1-6 by the teacher, or an audio recording, and the students can listen. Comprehension questions should follow. This sequence can illustrate one of the functions of qatal when it interrupts a narrative sequence, i.e. it can refer to an event that happened prior to, or parallel to the series of wayyiqtol verbs. A timeline can be drawn to explain the sequence of the events, e.g. in Ruth 1:6 שָׁמְעָה interrupts
the wayyiqtol sequence, indicating that it occurred prior to her getting ready to leave. In the
same way, the second qatal happened before she heard it.

It could also be an opportunity to show that not all clauses follow this verbal pattern, but some
clauses are introduced with a noun, preposition, pronoun, adverb and/or a conjunction. This
can be contrasted at a later stage with the BH-MH contrastive information.

Written exercise: wayyiqtol-qatal

Skills: Reading, writing, knowledge of the particle and imperative forms.

Objectives: Practise recognising the relationship between wayyiqtol and qatal

Write the following verbs in the blank spaces in either wayyiqtol, qatal, imperative or participle.

1. (אֹחֶזֶת, אֶחֳזִי, וַתּאֹחֶז, תּאֹחֵז, אָחַז, ).

2. (בָּהּ, בָּהּוּ, בָּהֶה, בָּהָה, בָּהַה, בָּהַו, בָּהַו).  

3. (״הֲלוֹא: אֶל־רוּת עַז בֹּאמֶר יֹו וַ״. )

Group activity: Reversal of word order for emphasis

Skills: Reading   Topic: The use of qatal to interrupt the narrative sequence.

A student can read the following verse aloud.

This passage can be used to illustrate that the subject can be placed before the verb for
emphasis, or contrast. Once again a sequence of wayyiqtol verbs is interrupted by qatal, to
indicate that the actions happened simultaneously; but the subject-predicate word order also
serves to contrast Ruth’s actions (who clung to her mother-in-law) to those of Orpah (who left
her). [Holmstedt, 2010:86] The verse can be made into a skit to illustrate the point.

Group activity: Revision and paradigm assimilation

Skills: Speech  Topic: Revision and paradigm assimilation

The students are each given a note with a pronoun written on it. The teacher says a word in
qatal and the students has to give the form in wayyitqol that agrees with the pronoun they are
holding, e.g. If the teacher says, "קָם" and if the pronoun is הֵמָּה the student answers:

Once each student has had a turn, they can hand their note with the pronoun to the student next
to them; the teacher then gives a new qatal verb and each student gives their answer in
agreement with their new pronoun.

Homework

EXERCISE 1: Objective: Assess understanding of word order.
Rearrange the following list of words into a sentence.

מלשון/הוֹרְא/תִּשְׁעֵת/וּלְשֵׁנָה/וּלְשֵׁנָה/מְאֹת/ 1:6

EXERCISE 2: Objective: Assess understanding the wayyiqtol paradigm and test comprehension.
Fill in the blanks with the corresponding wayyiqtol verbs from the qatal verbs listed below:

דְֹלָתָה. כאו, שביה, לָבֶּה, נשאה, טובים. איך
don't know how to spell column header.

LEAD: התשעֵת בַּכְּלָלֶה בֶּלָּשֶׁב כְּלָלֶה בֶּלָּשֶׁב כְּלָלֶה בֶּלָּשֶׁב כְּלָל 3:7

EXERCISE 3: Objective: Assess writing skills and understanding of the use of the wayyiqtol and qatal
verbs in context.
Cloze: fill in the blanks with a verb of your choice and write it in either qatal or wayyiqtol.
Exercise 4: Objective: Assess writing skills and understanding of the use of the wayyiqtol and qatal verbs in context.

Write a short story using the wayyiqtol verbs you have learned starting with the following words:

הַיּוֹם וַיְהִי ... 

The students can read their composition to the class in the next lesson, which gives them a chance to speak and provides another opportunity to assess the students’ listening comprehension.

Lesson 4: Modern Hebrew to Biblical Hebrew crosslinguistic awareness activities

Once the students are familiar with the wayyiqtol paradigm in various binyanim and have practised producing them both in oral and written forms, some BH/MH contrastive information can be introduced.

Skills: Listening and speaking

Topic: To contrast BH phenomena such as the use of wayyiqtol in BH instead of qatal, differences in word order, and different functions of waw.

Background knowledge: Knowledge of these forms and concepts in BH. Knowledge of differences in relevant BH and MH vocabulary.

A text like the introduction to the book of Ruth (1:1-1:6), which was used to introduce the wayyiqtol past tense narrative sequence and the function of qatal to interrupt the narrative, can be juxtaposed along side the MH equivalent in order to show the differences in syntax. For example, that as MH uses qatal through out the sequence for narrative instead wayyiqtol, with a corresponding change in word order from predicate-subject to subject-predicate. The contrasting functions of waw in BH and MH can be demonstrated by showing that the BH waw has many functions: it serves to coordinate the sequence of verbs (the students could be asked to highlight all the waw forms prefixed to wayyiqtol) and does not always simply mean ‘and’ as in MH. It can serve to contrast two situations or events e.g. Ruth 1:14, or it can acts as a
subordinate particle to introduce a purpose clause, e.g. Ruth 4:4 BH: שִׁרְדֵּה לְיִגְאַל.

Identifying equivalent BH and MH verbal forms

The first stage could involve simply recognising the form and making a connection between the BH and MH form. The student can be asked to identify and highlight all the wayyiqtol verbs in the BH text and the equivalent qatal verb in the MH text. They can either work alone so as not to mix MH and BH speech.

Group activity: Written reverse translation

**Topic:** The students are required to rewrite sentences from MH into BH using wayyiqtol and the correct word order. The sentences are read to the entire class so that any corrective feedback from the teacher will be of benefit to everyone.

Write the following passages in BH using wayyiqtol.

1. את הולך, נעמי שלבעלה, אלימלך.
2. באינה שני עם לבד נשארה היא.
3. קמווכלתיה היא.

Conversational pairs - oral reverse translation

Each student gets a note with a sentence in MH written on it that they need to convert into BH.

The students can work in pairs and read their MH sentence to their partner in BH, without writing it down. This is to encourage them to process the BH language in their minds. For example:

1:1 ואהדר היה בימי השופטים ובאהר ברת ע儲.

Once they have both converted the MH sentences to BH they should swap and, if necessary, try and improve on the sentence their partner spoke. The note is then passed on to the next pair of
students and they repeat the exercise. Once all the pairs have worked on all the sentences, they can read a sentence to the class and the class can have a group discussion, in BH, as to which is the most correct BH form of the sentence.

**Group activity : Drama - The time traveller.**

The following exercise is only for advanced students who have learned all the phenomena characteristic of BH. A story including dialogue is written that can be acted out. A foreigner comes to visit Bethlehem, however, he is from a country that only speaks MH and no one in Bethlehem knows MH except Ruth, who can act as an interpreter. There are set lines written in BH and the dialogue for the foreigner is left empty. The words of the foreigner are written in MH on pieces of paper which the student, who's turn it is to be Ruth, must draw from a hat. Every time they come to the place in the story where the foreigner speaks, Ruth has to translate it into BH by translating the traveller’s story, e.g. into narrative past tense using wayyiqtol. The teacher can write a list of the BH phenomena needed that correspond to the notes that the students have to ‘interpret’.

**Homework:**

**Objective:** Assess the ability to distinguish between BH and MH grammar and lexicon and whether these forms have been correctly acquired. This exercise assumes knowledge of relevant contrastive vocabulary and morphology.

**Restore the BH grammar in the following passage using the wayyiqtol forms:**

וֹהֵה יִּלְּךָ וְלֶךְ אָמְרוּ

וַיְהִי אֵר שָּׂתִּי וַמָּת יָּוְּהֵי וַיְהִי יִּוְּהֵי אֵר

וְשֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה, הוּא, בְּמֹאָב לַגְּוֹר הָלַך בֶּשֶׁבֶּהוֹדָא בִּימֵי הַבִּלְעָד בָּאָרֶץ שְׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי יְהוּדָה בָּאָרֶץ הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בְּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים בָּיָמֵי הַשְּׁפֹּטִים הַשְּׁפֹּטִים יַבְּנָוָה שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה וְלֶךְ אָמְרֶנָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי שֵׁנִי אַשְׁתִּוָה אֶלָּם אָלִילִם בָּאָרֶץ נַעֲמֵי
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Summary of findings and pedagogical implications

This thesis addressed two main questions about teaching BH in a communicative setting. Firstly, what type of learning environment and methods are suitable for BH acquisition and does the students prior knowledge of MH affect the choice of methods used. Secondly, what type of linguistic input do learners need who have prior knowledge of MH, i.e. which specific structures should be taught. A review on SLA teaching approaches and methods revealed that there is a shortage of empirical studies that apply communicative methods to BH pedagogy. In addition, studies that compare BH and MH do not specifically discuss possible interference from MH while teaching BH, nor suggest teaching methods to address this issue. Since CLT has no one specific method that can guarantee acquisition and there is no consensus regarding how exactly to teach grammar, it seems appropriate that the most suitable teaching methods for BH students, who's goal is to be fluent in reading Biblical text and who as scholars also need metalinguistic knowledge, are those that include form-focused instruction in a combination of implicit and explicit instruction.

The results from the CA highlighted many BH features that differ from MH. The key morphological features that set BH apart from MH, in order of frequency, are: the relative particle القدس; the infinitive construct (except when attached to -ל, then it has a similar form and meaning to the MH infinitive); the negative jussive; feminine plural imperatives; negation of the infinitive construct; the negative imperative and the lengthened imperative.

The key syntactic features characteristic of BH were: the wayyiqtol verbal form and its corresponding coordination by the waw prefix; varied functions of waw (coordination and occasionally subordination or contrast); the predicate-subject word order; the jussive; the weqatal verbal form expressing imperfect; the weqatal verbal form expressing imperatives;
pronominal suffix on verbs, the frequency of the genitive construct state; the cohortative; varied uses the prepositions אֶל and מְזָא; the negative interrogative; the interrogative הוא, the interrogative אתה, and first conjunct agreement.

These results showed the paratactic preference of BH in narrative using wayyiqtol verbal forms to coordinate actions or events, as compared with MH’s preference for subordination using the proclitic -ש. BH also prefers synthesis, and consequently, there is a high frequency of construct states and pronominal suffixes on nouns and as objects of the verb, as contrasted with MH’s preference for analytic syntax, usually using the particle של and the use of the inflected from of the object marker אתה.

Due to the importance of the audible in learning a spoken language this study emphasises the importance of preserving a monolingual environment in the BH classroom, since it is the only environment where the students receive audible comprehensible BH input and output in the context of meaningful communication, which is essential for acquisition.

The CA is valuable tool for two reasons. Firstly, it provides teachers with a description of key phenomena that are characteristic of BH that should be emphasised in a class of MH speakers. The teacher should give students more opportunities to produce and practise these forms, especially orally. Secondly, once the students have learned these forms using all four language skills, BH/MH contrasts can be introduced, where appropriate. BH/MH contrasts can be introduced in written form in a communicative environment without compromising the monolingual principle, with grammar explanations remaining in BH. Corresponding exercises should be given to once again practise producing these forms now that the students have awareness of possible crosslinguistic influence from MH forms. Written contrastive information may also be useful if included in a text box, or as a note at the end of a chapter in a textbook, with an example of some structures and a note explaining differences, e.g. “Note: In BH the relative particle אשר is used instead of -שים“.
Limitations of the study and suggestions for future study

The current study focuses on defining the boundaries of two languages that overlap significantly, in order to prevent negative CLI from MH during BH instruction. Since previous studies show that areas of similarity are the most vulnerable to CLI, there are many potential areas of CLI from MH since the BH and MH linguistic systems are very similar. A CA, however, cannot predict which specific structures the students will have difficulty with, it can only provide a list of potentially problematic features. Therefore, an empirical study is needed, which analyses actual BH language samples from students, to determine which phenomena are most vulnerable to CLI and actually cause interference in realtime. Some of the questions that should be asked are: Which structures are most vulnerable to CLI? Are they structures that are similar in form and function to those in MH, e.g. ב- andław, or are they those that are similar in morphology and different in function, like wayyiqtol versus qatal in MH, or both? Are there variations among learners, and if so, why? These results can be compared with students who do not know MH as a control. The study should also include a verification stage, to determine whether activities and exercises that include BH/MH contrastive information have improved BH acquisition as compared with students who were not exposed to the contrasts.

The data in this study could serve as a foundation for future studies that could involve describing other features, such as significant lexical and phonological differences. This CA was primarily confined within the boundaries of a sentence, future studies could also include examining the texts at pragmatic and discourse levels. In addition, this study was limited to the book of Ruth, which is mostly narrative; therefore, future studies could analyse other books of the Bible to find more phenomena. Since BH and MH are frequently learned together, a CA that defines the boundaries between the two languages can make a useful contribution to BH studies. Promotion of a communicative approach to BH pedagogy and more empirical studies that prove its efficacy will take a step in the direction of making BH learning more effective and enjoyable.
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# APPENDIX A: Book of Ruth - Parallel text alignment

Words in [brackets] represent the Qere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Hebrew</th>
<th>The Westminster Leningrad Codex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| כל שָׁכַךְ, שָׁבָּהְיוּ | אֱלֹהִים בְּשָׁכְךָ נִמְנָּה | א. 1:3
| הָלְכוּ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:4
| כְּלֶכֶךָ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:5
| הָלְכוּ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:6
| כְּלֶכֶךָ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:7
| הָלְכוּ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:8
| כְּלֶכֶךָ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:9
| הָלְכוּ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:10
| כְּלֶכֶךָ | אֱלֹהִים יָשֹׁבְוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל | א. 1:11
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15 נמס לקצץ וציינו אדיגעתי לファー. וגוזי.

16 וגוזי ה意图ים לא מפילים: כל ה. לא כנ万股 בה.

17 בגוזי השועצה וצ'אברמקות ותתיות את. א-פי-פרז.

18 גוזי תקצנות את לשון הדיבור משקbec אשתו: גוזי השועצה ואת אדיגעתי מתפרקת.

19 הטעיפה ל-המה את DRIVER: לי הלאת חמשת דויו ופשית גוזי.

20 הטעיפה ל-המה את DRIVER: לי הלאת חמשת דויו ופשית גוזי.

21 גוזי השועצה ואת(driver) ואת אדיגעתי מתפרקת.

22 גוזי השועצה ואת(driver) ואת אדיגעתי מתפרקת.

23 גוזי השועצה ואת(driver) ואת אדיגעתי מתפרקת.
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רות בצתה חילול בכל עטה, הח팎 רגילה.
שראל שיבב רגילה.
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 الرابع מארה והאמר: "אני רוח, שחרר את
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10.
והי אמר לה: "מזרחי, או, "ה人は". המבושל שירה,
האחוךшедш שירה וחורראש. לא חפשוنشر
ברוח רביעי, או, ואיש.

11.
כל תושביה הנער והער שיאה שלה התובה.
כל חוכל מחוון, אף שראה את האיש.

12.
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14.
רות שיבב לזרע על הזרע הקומת לפנים שמשהו
ירא את זה, או, במצות פארס: "משש אירש אל עד
שראות 베אר אלי ערגרה".

15.
דע אמר לה: "אני את אגני שלגית החרב
ב. רוח החורים במערה. בירז מרדני שירד לגדים
שוריים, העמיס והאמות על מבג חלול אלא.
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כָּלַךְ כָּל הַצַּהְרָה בָּשָּׁרְתָה בְּכָל הַזָּהֲרוֹת אֲפַרְסָה וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.

"בָּשָּׁרְתָה בָּשָּׁרְתָה בְּכָל הַזָּהֲרוֹת אֲפַרְסָה וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.

בִּנס הַשָּׁרוֹן אֲפַרְסָה בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.

לֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן יִנַּשֵּׂא בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.

לֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן יִנַּשֵּׂא בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.

לֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן יִנַּשֵּׂא בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן וְלֹא יֵלֶדֶךְ שְׁמָנוּ וּלְהַרְחִיב בַּת הַשָּׁרוֹן.
# APPENDIX B: SUMMARY CHARTS

The following database contains key phenomena that are discussed in this thesis. Hebrew words in [brackets] represent the Qere.

## MORPHOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional occurrences</th>
<th>Modern Hebrew</th>
<th>Biblical Hebrew</th>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td>&quot;לאтверждаSyntactic_function&quot;</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>lengthened imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8, 1:9, 1:12, 1:20</td>
<td>שומרים</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>feminine plural imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15, 2:16</td>
<td>&quot;אני לאSyntactic_function&quot; 2:8</td>
<td>2:8</td>
<td>negative commands (prohibitions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16, 2:6, 3:3, 3:11, 3:14, 3:17</td>
<td>&quot;אניSyntactic_function&quot; 1:20</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>negative jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7, 2:9, 3:10</td>
<td>Lalai betul</td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>negation of infinitive construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>&quot;אשיוריSyntactic_function&quot; 2:11</td>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>infinitive absolute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SYNTAX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional occurrences</th>
<th>Modern Hebrew</th>
<th>Biblical Hebrew</th>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as above</td>
<td>אלFormatException &quot;Aleph Syntactic_function&quot; 1:3</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>predicate-subject word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>תמצית Syntactic_function&quot; 1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>first conjunct agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9, 2.14, 2.16, 3.3, 3.4, 3.9</td>
<td>התר胨ת - מדריך, מריה א. נ. פ. בהדר</td>
<td>ו.endTime והועתקה והועתקה שלולית, כֶּלֶד.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2, 2.7, 2.13, 4.4</td>
<td>הדרשלי - לכל הילדה</td>
<td>כֶּלֶד.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8, 1.9, 1.16, 1.20 2.4, 2.8, 2.12, 2.19, 3.3, 3.4, 3.11, 3.13, 3.14, 3.17, 4.11, 4.12, 4.14</td>
<td>الزوجות - יושב בטוח</td>
<td>יושב והעתק בטוח</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 words in 66 verses</td>
<td>שֶׁמֶרֶת של הָיוּ</td>
<td>שֶׁמֶרֶת של הָיוּ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21, 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.13, 2.15, 2.19, 2.20, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.13, 4.15, 4.16</td>
<td>הלוגו - אגר</td>
<td>הלוגו - אגר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-8, 1.10-11, 1.14-16, 1.18-20, 1.22, 2.2-8, 2.10-11, 2.13-15, 2.17-23, 3.1, 3.5-10, 3.14-18, 4.1-6, 4.8-9, 4.11, 4.13-14, 4.16-17</td>
<td>ה扺 המשך בצга התרמא</td>
<td>בהלוגו ניידת והתרמא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Weqatal as imperative:** הדרשלי
- **Cohortative:** הדרשלי
- **Jussive:** יושב
- **Construct state:** שֶׁמֶרֶת
- **Nominal suffixes as objects of verbs:** לוגו
- **1 as coordinating particle:** יושב
- **Subordinate particle:** אָנָה
- **Subordinate clause:** החומת להפוך לשון
- **Interrogative yes:** האם זה נגרם?
- **Interrogative negative:**是什么 בוחן שלג
- **Preposition:** בַּשָּׁמַי
- **Preposition (in):** בֵּית

**M.A. Thesis: Contrastive Analysis Between Biblical & Modern Hebrew**

The table above lists various sections and notes from the biblical text, along with their corresponding page numbers and notes in Hebrew and English. The table includes notes on the use of weqatal, cohortative, jussive, construct state, and other grammatical structures, as well as notes on subordinate particles, subordinate clauses, interrogative yes/no, and prepositions.