

< >

## Preface to the Spanish Edition of *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* by Joüon & Muraoka

Joüon(1923)-Muraoka(1991, 2006)-Pérez Fernández(2007)

T. Muraoka\*

Asociación Bíblica Española and Editorial Verbo Divino have done my wife and myself an uncommonly great honour by inviting us to this gathering of distinguished Spanish biblical scholars, our first visit to your country. We are both truly grateful for this generosity.

Since the main purpose for my presence here this evening is to launch a recently published Spanish version of the Hebrew grammar, P. Joüon-T. Muraoka, *Grammática del hebreo bíblico*, as translated by M. Pérez Fernández, I would like to attempt to see where this grammar can be placed in the history of Hebrew linguistics and also to compare its French original<sup>1)</sup> with its first English version<sup>2)</sup> and its recently revised version<sup>3)</sup>, which is now available in your mother tongue.

---

\*

\* : 2007 “ - ” 가 .

- 1) P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome, 1923): abbreviated as Joüon (F). This went through many reprints with slight corrections. My English translation was made from what is styled “Deuxième édition anastatique corrigée” of 1947. The French edition is still available.
- 2) P. Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew translated and revised by T. Muraoka*, Subsídium biblicum 14/I-II, 2 vols. (Roma, 1991): abbreviated as JM 91. A slightly corrected edition was published in 1993, also reprinted in 1996.

As to how Joüon's grammar was evaluated up to 1990, what I wrote in my English version of 1991 may be quoted:

Since its publication in 1923 Paul Joüon's *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* has been generally recognised as one of the finest grammars of Biblical Hebrew. Two of its obvious strengths are the clarity and lucidity of exposition, characteristic of many a work in French, and the splendid section, allocated nearly half the pages of the book, on syntax, a compartment of grammar often sadly relegated to ancillary status in Hebrew grammars. This latter aspect is important also in view of the dominant position syntax has come to occupy in contemporary general linguistics. In spite of this widely acclaimed position, Joüon's grammar, which, apart from those of Gesenius-Kautzsch and König, is the only modern and comprehensive Biblical Hebrew grammar of substantial size, has sometimes been unduly neglected. Even scholars who one would have thought would be better read have failed to do justice to Joüon by putting forward a particular idea on one or another aspect of Hebrew grammar as if they were the first to do so. At the other extreme, there are those whose discussion of some point of Hebrew grammar has tell-tale signs of their acquaintance with the position held by Joüon, but no acknowledgment is made of their indebtedness to this Jesuit scholar. One possible reason for this may be the fact that the grammar is in French.

The last sentence in this quote may not apply to my distinguished audience, many of whom might read French as if it were a dialect of Spanish. However, I know for a fact that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of scholars around the world who have welcomed the appearance of an English version of Joüon's grammar.

---

3) P. Joüon-T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia biblica 27, one volume and hard-covered (Roma, 2006): abbreviated as JM 06.

Back in 1985, when I first approached the Pontifical Biblical Institute Press in Rome with a proposal to have an English version of the grammar published, I did point out that it was in need of revision and updating. The publisher agreed. After all, neither French nor English is native to me. Merely to translate the grammar into English could have been better undertaken by someone else.

There are a number of reasons why I felt Joüon's grammar was ripe for updating and revision.

## 1. Comparative Semitic philology

In the Preface Joüon says that he wanted to take advantage of the fruits of advances made in comparative Semitic philology. Although his grammar is not written from a fully comparative Semitic perspective, he nonetheless knew that some aspects of Biblical Hebrew grammar can be better understood in the light of comparable phenomena in cognate languages.<sup>4)</sup> Working in Beirut for most of his career he was conversant with Arabic and he also published a number of studies on Aramaic, not only Biblical, but also Imperial Aramaic.<sup>5)</sup> We all know that

---

4) See, for instance, his articles: "Études de philologie sémitique," *MUSJ* 5 (1911), 355-404 and "Sémantique des verbes statifs de la forme *qatila* (*qatel*) en arabe, hébreu et araméen," *MUSJ* 15 (1930-31), 1-32. For the sake of those interested in comparative phonology and graphemics of Semitic languages we have added a table of correspondences of consonants in the major, classical Semitic languages: JM, § 5 r.

5) See "Notes grammaticales, lexicographiques et philologiques sur les papyrus araméens d'Égypte," *MUSJ* 18 (1934), 1-90. For a complete bibliography of Joüon's Aramaic studies, see J. A. Fitzmyer and S. A. Kaufman, *An Aramaic Bibliography*, Part I (Baltimore and London, 1992), pp. 258f. Joüon also quotes often from Classical Syriac, e. g., § 79 s.

since 1923 the Semitic philology has made further advances, to which many Spanish scholars have contributed, and are still doing so. For some reason or other, Joüon, who died in 1940, did not undertake any substantial revision of his grammar, though he must have kept himself up-to-date with the advances made since 1923, since he kept publishing thereafter.

Since 1923 a couple of new Semitic languages have become known to us: Ugaritic and Eblaite, both discovered close to where Joüon was working. In § 79 *t* Joüon (F) analyses  $\text{hwx}|\text{t}|\text{yhi}$  as Hitpa'lel of the root *hxv*. In Ugaritic, however, we come across a form such as  $\text{tš}|\text{wy}$  "she prostrates herself." The form ends with two different consonants, *w* and *y*. Therefore it cannot be a form of the conjugation Pa'lel with the final root consonant reduplicated. Therefore it is better to see the root as  $\text{c}|\text{wy}$ , and Ugaritic, unlike Hebrew, has  $\text{š}$  in its causative prefix, not *h*. The form is most likely a reflexive causative, though such a conjugation is not attested in Hebrew by no other verb. In the light of this we have not only rewritten § 79 *t*, but also added a new subparagraph, *g*, in § 59, where rare conjugations are discussed. Thus Biblical Hebrew has now gained a new rare conjugation. The meaning of the verb remains traditional, to prostrate oneself, so already in the Septuagint with its *proskunēn*, but its grammatical analysis is new.

The latest addition to the Semitic language family is Eblaite, a language of the cuneiform tablets discovered in the ancient city of Ebla, a little NE of Ugarit, in the mid seventies of the last century. The texts date from the second half of the third millennium B.C. In one of those texts we find a form spelled *šī-ne-mu* meaning his teeth, which would correspond to  $\text{š}|\text{ny}|\text{m}|\text{v}|\text{i}$  in Hebrew. The archaic, poetic possessive suffix  $\text{m}|\text{v}|\text{i}$  usually means their. But it has been long known<sup>6)</sup> that on very rare occasions it means his as in Ps 11.7  $\text{m}|\text{v}|\text{i}|\text{p}'$ , which can only mean his face,

6) See already Joüon (F), § 103 *m*.

because it is about God's face. In JM 93 § 94 *i* we not only added םח-ל as a rare possessive suffix meaning their, but also a note saying that this can also mean his. Moreover, in JM 06 we added a footnote referring to the above-mentioned Eblaite form, suggesting that this particular usage is possibly not a case of secondary, late poetic licence in the Hebrew Bible. The reference to this Eblaite example we owe to an article published by Gordon in 1997.<sup>7)</sup>

Canaanite glosses inserted into the Akkadian documents, El Amarna tablets of the mid second millennium B.C., enable us to observe the way the Hebrew preterite *qatal* emerged on the basis of the archaic stative.<sup>8)</sup>

## 2. New texts

Fortune smiles on us from time to time with new texts of already known languages.

The most important discovery of this nature are undoubtedly Dead Sea Scrolls. No comprehensive and thorough investigation of the language(s) of these new texts has been undertaken yet. The publication of the texts has taken very long, too long for many people. However, some important steps have already been taken. One would mention a classic study by Kutscher of the Hebrew of the complete Isaiah scroll.<sup>9)</sup> One often refers to Qimron's abridged, though incomplete, grammar of Hebrew of non-biblical Qumran texts.<sup>10)</sup> One of the fundamental insights

---

7) C. H. Gordon, "Amorite and Eblaite," R. Hetzron, ed., *The Semitic Languages* (London, 1997), 100-113, esp. 107.

8) See A. F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect used by Scribes from Canaan*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 1996), pp. 5f., 281-294.

9) E. Y. Kutscher, 1974. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa)* (Leiden, 1974), translated from the Hebrew original (Jerusalem, 1959).

that emerge from these studies is the vitality of the Hebrew language around the time of Jesus. Until the discovery of these texts and their studies the dominant view among Hebraists and biblical scholars was that already in the intertestamental period Hebrew had long since ceased to be spoken, Jesus and His disciples conversed and taught in Aramaic, Hebrew had degenerated into an artificial language of discourse among rabbis.<sup>11)</sup> However, authors of non-biblical Hebrew scrolls show that they were capable of writing Hebrew with confidence and creativity. They were not merely select elite of litterati; they had a contemporary reading public. There are indications that Hebrew remained as a spoken language as late as the time of the Bar Kochba revolt, at least among certain circles of the Jewish population. This realisation had the effect of rekindling our interests in the neglected period of the history of Hebrew, namely the post-exilic, so-called Second Temple period, Late Biblical Hebrew. Joüon (F) cited often<sup>12)</sup> the classic study on the syntax of the book of Chronicles by Kropat published in 1909.<sup>13)</sup> Qimron was fortunately not the only student of Kutscher who would carry on the flag hoisted by his teacher flying. Since his dissertation<sup>14)</sup> Avi Hurvitz of The Hebrew University has been publishing a long series of important studies on Late Biblical Hebrew in its interaction with Aramaic. This keen interest has

---

10) E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [HSS 29], (Atlanta, 1986, which is an abridged but substantially new version of his 1967 Hebrew University dissertation.

11) A typical expression of such a position may be found in H. Bauer-P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle, 1922), pp. 27f.

12) E.g., § 3 a, 47 d.

13) A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen* (Giessen, 1909).

14) Published as a monograph: *ימי תיב ימיב ארמית למל תודותי למלל למל ליב* (Jerusalem, 1972).

infected scholars outside of Israel, too. There have, of course, been controversies and there is no universal consensus, which is, however, welcome and healthy for furthering of research. The degree of interest in the recent years in this phase of Classical Hebrew can be measured by the number of pages allocated to a chapter entitled “Hebrew in the period of the Second Temple” in the famous book by A. Sáenz-Badillos, *Historia de la Lengua Hebrea* (Sabadell, 1988): in the English translation the chapter occupies 49 out of a total of 287 pages. The scrolls have naturally aroused interests not only among Hebraists, but also students interested in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Judaism, Jewish literature and the like. Almost every year there is held somewhere in the world an international conference of Qumran studies. Among tens of papers presented this year at the adjunct congress during the IOSOT congress in Slovenia this summer, however, I noted only two which dealt specifically with the languages. Out of my personal conviction that a thorough linguistic study of the languages concerned is a sine qua non for any scientific philological investigation into ancient texts I organised the first international conference on the Hebrew of the scrolls and Ben Sira held in Leiden in 1995,<sup>15)</sup> followed by three more.<sup>16)</sup> Another is planned to take place next year in Jerusalem. There is still very much work to be done. One of the new features of JM 06 is an index of authors quoted or mentioned in the grammar. The index shows how frequently

---

15) Its proceedings were published as: T. Muraoka and J. Elwolde, eds., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (Leiden, 1997).

16) Cf. T. Muraoka and J. Elwolde, eds., *Sinach, Scrolls, & Sages. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, & the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (Leiden, 1999); id., *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Leiden, 2000). A volume of the proceedings of the conference held in Strasbourg in 2005 is in press.

Qimron is mentioned: 42 times. The relevance of Qumran Hebrew for our analysis of Biblical Hebrew may be illustrated by mentioning that the 2nd sg. masc. possessive suffix is very often spelled plene in Qumran scrolls with a vowel letter Heh. According to Qimron,<sup>17)</sup> the form hk- occurs some 900 times as against about 160 times of \$-. Here we are talking about non-biblical Hebrew texts.<sup>18)</sup> By contrast, in the *textus receptus* as represented in BHS the situation is completely reverse: 40 as against 7076.<sup>19)</sup> On this question P. Kahle with his expertise in the formation of the Massoretic Hebrew text in its early, crucial stage wielded quite an influence until the middle of the last century. On the basis of the orthography in the traditional Bible manuscripts and the transcription with the Greek alphabet of the Hebrew Bible and the transcription in Latin by Jerome he championed the view that the traditional pronunciation of the suffix with a final vowel a was a secondary development under the influence of Classical Arabic, with which Massoretic scholars were familiar. The orthographical practice we observe in the scrolls, however, suggests that in the first century of our era the long form was still very much alive. This new position, which is nowadays a *communis opinio*, also has general implications for Hebrew linguistics. For Kahle this specific issue was only one of several phenomena as represented by the vocalisation of the Tiberian school: Kahle held a rather low view on the authenticity of the Tiberian tradition.

In the early twenties of the 20th century only a handful of ancient Hebrew inscriptions were known. The most im-

---

17) *Op. cit.* (f.n. 10 above), § 310.11.

18) On the situation in the complete Isaiah scroll, see Kutscher, *op. cit.* (f.n. 9), pp. 45-48, 446f.

19) See F. I. Andersen, "Orthography in ancient Hebrew inscriptions," *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 36 (1999), 25. See JM 06, § 94 b.

portant are the Siloam tunnel inscription and the Gezer calendar. Since then, however, quite a quantity of new materials have come to light. To name only a few early ones: Samaria ostraca, Lachish ostraca, Tel Arad inscriptions. By their nature they are often fragmentary, but are of great value for our understanding of Early Hebrew. Most of them were not intended to be preserved for future generations, copied and recopied or edited. They give us a glimpse into the Hebrew language as it was at the time of their writing. Joüon F (§ 123 *u*) notes that the infinitive absolute is idiomatically found in commands given by God. In the light of !tn to be pronounced *naton* occurring in an Arad ostracon (1.2) we have added “given by a military commander.”<sup>20</sup> This usage illustrates nicely the use of the inf. abs. in the Decalogue such as Ex 20.7 *rwkz!*, 20.11 *dbk!*<sup>21</sup>

### 3. Traditions other than Tiberian

In the early decennia of the last century, only scant attention had been paid to traditions of Hebrew other than Tiberian.<sup>22</sup> This is understandable, seeing that almost all the extant, complete manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible represented the Tiberian tradition, most of the earlier studies of the Hebrew grammar, including those done by mediaeval Jewish scholars, were focused on the Tiberian form of Biblical Hebrew. The diversity visible in the transliterations in the Septuagint or Vulgata or Jerome’s writings tended to be ignored. Kahle was instrumental in drawing attention to the significance of diverging traditions as reflected

---

20) JM, § 123 *u*.

21) JM 06, § 123 *v*. The reference “Ex 20.12” ought to be corrected to “Ex 20.11.”

22) Among the more important grammars, with the exception of Einzelstudien, it is only Bergsträsser’s *incomplete Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1918-29) that takes serious note of a non-Tiberian tradition, namely Babylonian.

in Cairo Genizah materials of Palestinian origin. He also drew attention to another divergent tradition, Babylonian. Subsequently, a scholar such as Sh. Morag undertook an important research into the Yemenite tradition, and Ben-Ḥayyim into the Samaritan tradition. Against the background of this widening horizon, materials embedded in the second column of Origen's Hexapla, transliterations of Hebrew in the Septuagint, Vulgata and Josephus began to receive fresh attention of scholars. When the Babylonian tradition has only one vowel sign covering two in Tiberian Hebrew-patach and seghol-one is naturally tempted to ask which tradition is more archaic: is the one a result of simplification and the other one of diversification? When Origen transliterates segholate nouns as monosyllabic forms as in *ars* for the Tiberian #*rā*, how is such a tradition to be assessed. The Origenian form is Proto-Semitic, Proto-Hebrew. Did the two traditions coexist at the time of the church father or did the bisyllabic form develop later? Results and the main aspects of these debates and researches need to be reflected in a comprehensive, up-to-date Biblical Hebrew grammar, which you would be able to ascertain when you leaf through it.

#### 4. Mishnaic Hebrew

Mishnaic Hebrew, also called Rabbinic Hebrew, is a generic designation of Hebrew of the Mishnah and related early Jewish Hebrew documents. Until the 19th century this idiom was generally looked askance as a decadent epigonen of Biblical Hebrew. Even in the first decennia of the last century it was treated by most Hebraists as a Cinderella of Hebrew linguistics. Subsequently, however, it began to attract serious attention of some Hebraists, among whom my esteemed colleague, Prof.

Pérez Fernández, partly because they noticed some significant isoglosses shared between this idiom and Qumran Hebrew on the one hand and some non-Tiberian traditions of Hebrew on the other. They also realised that the previous studies of Mishnaic Hebrew were mostly dependent on manuscripts contaminated by scribes attempting to “improve” the language by modelling it on Biblical Hebrew. By studying “non-contaminated” manuscripts there emerged Mishnaic Hebrew in its pristine form. Scholars also began to notice close affinities between Late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew. Implications of this for Biblical Hebraists are obvious. Even a cursory perusal of A. Bendavid’s classic, *השפה העברית המיושנת* (Tel Aviv, 1967-71) would not fail to convince you.

## 5. Legacy of mediaeval Hebrew studies

We sometimes delude ourselves by assuming that one can safely ignore what was done by Hebraists in the Dark, Middle Ages. In 1977, when I published a small study on the structure typified by a phrase such as *איש קשה צו צוואה* “a stiff-necked man,” I was happy with the thought that I had made an original contribution. Some years ago, reading the book of 1Samuel I was humbled when I noticed that David Qimhi was aware of the syntactic rule that I thought I was the first to discover.<sup>23)</sup> Given the history of the Jewish people in the early Middle Ages my Spanish colleagues are far more appreciative of this legacy. To name only one out of many examples, I think of A. Senz Badillos with his study of Ben Labrat. Of course, Rashi, Qimhi and others do not use the technical terminology so familiar to us: phoneme, immediate constituent, syntagmatics, etc. etc.

---

23) See JM 06, § 129 *ia*.

Commenting on Gen 22.2 *ta tbha rva \$dyxy ta \$nb ta an xq qxcy*, Rashi draws on Genesis Rabbah (55.7) where we find a fictitious dialogue between the patriarch and angels. It is not impossible that Rashi was aware of a syntactic rule according to which the *nota accusativi* need not be repeated before each of the noun phrases in apposition, and he found in the midrash a possible explanation for this departure from the rule.<sup>24)</sup> Among the previous, modern reference grammars of Biblical Hebrew, only E. König<sup>25)</sup> makes frequent references to mediaeval Hebrew grammarians. In JM you will find ample proof of our indebtedness to our mediaeval Jewish predecessors.

## 6. Old issues revisited

Between 1920 and 1990, as I have tried to show above, Hebrew linguistics never stood still. In addition to studies made on the basis of new materials and new perspectives, many an old issue were revisited. One such issue is of course that of the verbal system, its syntax in particular. A certain distinguished scholar singled it out as the greatest challenge for not only Hebraists, but also for Semitists in general. Even today the issue is far from closed or settled despite some considerable gains made over the decennia. Hence the first paragraphs of the Syntax have been substantially expanded. It is, however, to the credit of Joüon that I did not feel it necessary drastically to revise the main outline of his description.

On some other issues, however, I did feel it justified to revise Joüon (F) in a way which may seem to some people

---

24) See JM 06, § 132 g, and see also Rashi's comment at Gn 12.1.

25) In his monumental *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-97).

quite radical. One such issue is the phonological interpretation of shva. Joüon stuck to the traditional distinction between shva quiescens and shva mobile, while JM advocates the view that the symbol in the Tiberian system, phonologically speaking, marks the vowellessness, though it may be articulated in more than one way, depending on the phonetic environments in which it occurs. I may be representing the minority view here, but I have some distinguished Hebraists on my side.<sup>26)</sup>

Another controversial issue over which I have decided to take the exception to Joüon concerns the word-order of the verbal clause. He took the view that the unmarked sequence is Subject-Predicate, exactly as for the nominal clause.<sup>27)</sup>

Even in a period of less than two decennia after 1990 Hebraists have not been idle, which has given me an excuse to produce a revised edition in the form of JM 06, which now lies here as Pérez Fernández(2007).

One who compares Joüon F with JM 91, even not having noticed the two radical changes between them I have just mentioned, will notice that the English version, even quantitatively, has grown quite substantially: from 536 pages to 653 pages. The growth is largely due to very many expanded and / or new footnotes. I am the first to admit that I inadvertently missed some publications, but I did my best to read and assimilate the great majority of studies published since around 1920 in journals, monographs, encyclopaedia articles in a variety of languages with the important exception of Slavonic languages. I would like to stress that I also covered publications written in Modern Hebrew. Some Hebraists and Semitists seem to advocate the motto *Hebraice scripta sunt, ergo non leguntur*. Maybe they have not been as fortunate as I who was privileged to study in Jerusalem. In any case there are quite a few important studies

---

26) For details, see JM § 8.

27) Joüon (F), § 155 *k*. My position is diametrically opposed: JM, § 155 *k*.

not available in any European language. To name only two monographs, Yeivin's weighty study on the Babylonian tradition of Hebrew,<sup>28)</sup> and Morag's on the Yemenite tradition.<sup>29)</sup>

My review of studies published since 1990 including some which had earlier escaped my notice for JM 1991 has been kept up up to mid 2004 or thereabout, as you can confirm by going through a complete list of modern works mentioned in the grammar. When one compares the two English editions, however, one might find it a puzzle that JM 06 with a total of 772 pages is a bit thinner than its predecessor with 779 pages. Moreover, JM 06 has two extra indexes: Authors and Bibliography, and the main body of the grammar has shrunk much further in the new edition with 614 pages as against 653 pages of JM 91. One explanation for this is that the line-spacing has been reduced in the recent edition: the preface to the original French edition in JM 91 with four and a half pages has been reproduced unaltered in JM 06, in which it occupies four pages and barely two lines. Another explanation is the adoption of citation mode current in the social sciences indicating the author's name, the year of publication, and page numbers only, leaving the full bibliographical information to the above-mentioned appendix: Bibliography.

## 7. Globalisation of Hebrew studies

About half a century back, when I first taught myself the Alef-Bet in Tokyo, it did not occur to me that I would eventually

---

28) I. Yeivin, ילבב דיאנב תפאמח תרב[ח לילח תרסח {*The Hebrew Language Tradition as Reflected in the Babylonian Vocalization*} (Jerusalem, 1985).

29) Sh. Morag, למת ידוהי יפב תרב[ח {*The Hebrew Language Tradition of the Yemenite Jews*} (Jerusalem, 1963).

be playing a role in the process of globalisation of Hebrew studies. Until the onset of the Renaissance in Europe, Hebrew studies, with a rare exception like Jerome, remained a strictly Jewish preserve. Even thereafter the discipline formed part of the theological curriculum, becoming part of a larger discipline called Semitic studies only in the last century. Even today there is no Hebrew chair in Germany in spite of a long, distinguished tradition of Hebrew studies there. Last year I was privileged to teach Hebrew and Aramaic at the Chinese University of Hong Kong for two months, and most of my students were from the mainland China with no Christian background. Over the recent years South Korea has been sending out quite a few talented and well-motivated young students to study Hebrew, Ugaritic, Akkadian, Sumerian, even Old Persian at institutions in Europe and North America. A Korean translation of JM 06 is already in the making.

Three years ago, when I taught Hebrew in Indonesia, I read with my students various parts of JM 91. Then I noticed something odd which had escaped me till then. I came across an innocuous phrase, “our languages,” found throughout the grammar where Joüon compares Hebrew with “our languages.” I asked myself: whose languages is he talking about? No doubt he had in his mind French, Italian, English, German, Greek and Latin, perhaps Spanish, too, but definitely not Bahasa Indonesia, Japanese or Chinese, which surely can boast of far more speakers than some of what he innocently called “our languages.” With the ever-increasing interest in Hebrew and related subjects outside of Europe and North America, I said, this cannot go on. In JM 06, therefore, you will only meet phrases such as “some European languages,” “many languages.”

When Professor Pérez Fernández finished translating JM 06, he asked me to contribute a preface for the reader of the

Spanish JM. May I close by reading one passage out of it? Please pardon me for my Japanese-English-Dutch accent:

La traducción española representa también un singular entramado de lenguas entre un estudioso español y un hebraísta japonés cuya herencia cristiana se remonta a la región del Japón donde el navarro Francisco Javier, miembro fundador de la Compañía de Jesús (a la que también pertenecía el autor francés original de esta gramática), llegó en 1549. Los dos hebraístas modernos, el español y el japonés, han cooperado desde sus respectivas jubilaciones; el japonés, jubilado de una Universidad, la de Leiden, fundada en 1575 como recompensa regia, según la leyenda, por el valor de los ciudadanos de Leiden en su lucha por liberarse del “yugo español.”

[This is a Korean translation of a speech delivered in English in Sevilla, Spain in July 2007 on the occasion of the publication of a Spanish translation of JM 06. The speech was subsequently published in Spanish as “De Joüon 1923 a Joüon-Muraoka 2006. La gramática del Hebreo bíblico en la historia de la lingüística hebrea,” *Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos. Sección de Hebreo* 56 (2007), 7-20. The Korean translation of JM represents an improvement on JM 06, which has, at the end, “Errata corrige.” This list, however, has come out incomplete for some technical reason unknown to me. The Korean version has incorporated all the corrections, but also some more corrections which have been made since the publication of JM 2006, and a reprint of it issued in 2009. T. Muraoka]