

# A Note on the Conjugation of ה"ח Verbs in the Derived Patterns\*

Aaron Rubin (Cambridge)

## Introduction:

It has long been noticed that the 1cs perfect forms of *lamed-he* verbs in the piel often contain a *šere* under the second radical (Gesenius §75z), but there have been no convincing explanations as to why this form appears. We will show that these 1cs forms are the regular result of a previously unnoted sound rule. This *šere* also occurs in hiphil and hithpael forms, which will be examined and analyzed below.

The paradigmatic forms of the piel perfect for *lamed-he* verbs contain a *hiriq* under the second radical in the first and second person forms, which can be traced back to an earlier \*/iy/. For example, using the Hebrew root צוה, we derive:

PCan. piel perfect 3ms (pattern: \*qittila) \*šiwwiya > Heb. šiwwā (\*/iya/ > /a:/)

PCan. piel perfect 2ms (pattern: \*qittilta) \*šiwwiya > Heb. šiwwīta (\*/iy/ > /i:/)

Likewise, we can derive:

PCan. piel perfect 1cs (pattern \*qittilti) \*šiwwiyti > Heb. šiwwīti (\*/iy/ > /i:/)

Why, then, do we often find a *šere* under the second root radical (e.g. šiwwētī in Lev 8:31, Deu 3:21, Isa 13:3)?

## Possible Solutions:

There are four possible sources for the *šere*.

1. We can argue that the *šere* is the correct form, derived < \*/ay/. Bauer-Leander (§57n) and Bergsträsser (§30o) believe this to be the case. For example, Bauer-Leander derive Heb. *pittētī* < \*pattaiku. Their reconstruction is problematic on many levels, as is any attempt to show that the *šere* is the historically “correct” vowel.

Huehnergard (1992) has convincingly showed that we must reconstruct PNWS piel \*qattil-, PCan. \*qittil-. Therefore Bauer-Leander’s reconstruction from a \*qattala form is highly unlikely. Some still may attempt to derive a form like šiwwīti < \*šiwwayti, just as we see *dibbartī* (< \*dibbirti by Philippi’s Law, cf. Lambdin 1985, Huehnergard 1992). This is an option if we posit the following chronology:

\* I would like to sincerely thank Professor Jo Ann Hackett, and especially Professor John Huehnergard for their many corrections and suggestions. Thanks also to Ronald Kim for his helpful corrections. Any errors and opinions are mine alone.

1) Philippi's Law

2) \*/iy/ > /i/

This chronology is unlikely, however. First, Philippi's Law is a late sound change. Second, this chronology would produce a *šere* in all first and second person piel forms. But these forms, except 1cs, always exhibit a *hiriq*. Bauer-Leander claim that this is on analogy with the *hiriq* of the qal (e.g. *bānîṭî*). We might expect then that we would see an alternation of *hiriq* and *šere* in these forms, as in the 1cs, but this never happens. Therefore, this is a highly unlikely scenario, and the following chronology is certainly correct:

1) \*/iy/ > /i/

2) Philippi's Law

2. A second option is to attribute the *šere* to contamination from the pual (as well as the niphāl and hophāl), where the *šere* is derived regularly. For example:

PCan. pual perfect 1cs (pattern \**quttal-*) \**šuwwayti* > Heb. *šuwwēṭî* (\**/ay/* > */e/*)

This analogical change seems rather unlikely, as the piel is far more common than the pual. And again, why only the 1cs?

3. A third option is to suggest that the *šere* may have been created by analogy with the *lamed-aleph* verbs, which have *šere* throughout the entire piel perfect paradigm. *Lamed-he* and *lamed-aleph* verbs are occasionally confused in BH, and fall together in later Hebrew, so this may seem a plausible suggestion. However, with such an analogy, we would expect to see the reflexes throughout the *lamed-he* piel paradigm, and yet *šere* appears only on the 1cs form.

4. A fourth option is to formulate a new sound rule of dissimilation:

*i* > *e* / iCC \_\_\_ Ci, in stressed position

This seems to be a logical explanation, and is supported by the fact that in the piel, the non-paradigmatic *šere* appears *only* in the first person singular.

It would be prudent at this point to look for other forms that would have been susceptible to this sound rule, however, upon examination it seems that none exist. We might mention the form *qāṭṭā* (Jdg 7:2, Gen 29:19, 1Ki 21:3), but note that while very close, the second geminate *tav* and the word-final stress make it ineligible.

It is unclear whether this dissimilation rule is early (Biblical) or late (Masoretic). It may be the case that during the period of attestation, the rule is a sound change in progress. Joüon (1996, §79h) claims that the *šere* is the usual vowel in the piel 1cs perfect, but this is not exactly the case. It does seem that the *šere* is more likely to appear on less common verbs, whereas the common forms *šiwvîṭî* and *qiwvîṭî* tend to have *hiriq*.

Note that a waw-consecutive perfect form would not be susceptible to this sound law as it is given above, since these forms have stress on the ultima. The stress constraint on this rule is necessary however, since forms with object suffixes always contain *hiriq*. However, we find that they behave exactly as the simple perfect forms, without exception. Therefore, we must assume a chronology,

1.  $i > e / iCC \_\_ Ci$ , in stressed position
2. Shifting of stress in waw-consecutive forms

There is other good evidence that this order is correct. If word-final stress were original in a form like  $\text{וְלִקְחָתִי}$ , we would expect reduction in the pro-pretonic vowel (cf.  $\text{לִקְחָתִי}$ ).<sup>1</sup> Now let us examine all of the relevant data.

**Piel Data:**

There are 128 *lamed-he* 1cs piel perfects in the Bible, 24 of which are waw-consecutive forms.<sup>2</sup> Just 21 different roots are found, though  $\text{צוּה}$  is by far the most common, occurring 62 times. The following 23 forms appear with *šere*:

- Lev 8:31 –  $\text{צִוִּיתִי}$
- Lev 10:18 –  $\text{צִוִּיתִי}$
- Deu 3:21 –  $\text{צִוִּיתִי}$
- Isa 5:4 –  $\text{קִוִּיתִי}$
- Isa 13:3 –  $\text{צִוִּיתִי}$
- Isa 45:12 –  $\text{צִוִּיתִי}$
- Isa 49:4 –  $\text{כִּלִּיתִי}$
- Jer 49:10 –  $\text{גִּלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 14:9 –  $\text{פָּחִיתִי}$
- Eze 31:15 –  $\text{כִּסְּפִיתִי}$
- Joel 4:21 –  $\text{נִקִּיתִי}$
- Psa 35:13 –  $\text{עֲנִיתִי}$

**Waw-Consecutive:**

- 1 Sam 8:17(b) –  $\text{וְקִוִּיתִי}$
- Jer 31:14 –  $\text{וְרִוִּיתִי}$
- Jer 33:6 –  $\text{וְגִלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 6:12 –  $\text{וְכִלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 7:8 –  $\text{וְכִלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 13:15 –  $\text{וְכִלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 16:37 –  $\text{וְגִלִּיתִי}$
- Eze 26:4 –  $\text{וְסִחִיתִי}$
- Eze 32:7 –  $\text{וְכִסְּפִיתִי}$

<sup>1</sup> See Blau (1971) for a discussion of this stress shift.

<sup>2</sup> I have not included Psa 50:21  $\text{דָּמִית}$  which is parsed by most as the 1cs piel perfect of  $\text{דָּמָה}$ , and translated by most as 1cs from  $\text{דָּמַם}$  ‘to be silent’.

Joe 4:21 – וַגִּיחִי

Nah 3:5 – וַגִּיחִי

Note that there seems to be a much higher percentage of waw-consecutive forms with *šere* (11/24 waw-consecutive perfects versus 12/104 simple perfects). Actually, to be more accurate, we should not include the forms with object suffixes (6/24 and 35/104), since they are not eligible for the sound rule. Once we subtract these forms, the proportions become 11/18 waw-consecutive perfects versus 12/69 simple perfects. The percentage of waw-consecutive forms is still much higher, in fact more so, but may simply be coincidental. The form *šiwwîti*, which occurs so frequently in the perfect (56 times; 29 times without an object suffix, yet only 5 times *šiwwêti*), is found only once as a waw-consecutive, and hence skews the percentage bit. If we subtract out all of the *šiwwîti* forms, (29 times) we see that the ratio becomes 12/40. The tendency for *ħiriq* to appear on the more common verbs is mysterious. Perhaps they were “corrected” at some point by an editor?

The book of Ezekiel is most interesting, as in this book this sound rule seems to be completely *regular*. The book of Isaiah is nearly regular. This may simply be coincidence, especially since the root צוה does not occur in Ezekiel in the first person perfect, but note that two of the five occurrences of וַגִּיחִי are in Isaiah. The forms with *ħiriq* in these books are:

Isa 8:17(a) – וַחֲכִיתִי – unexplained.

Isa 14:24 – דִּמְיִיתִי – unexplained.

Isa 26:9 – אֲנִיחֶדָּךְ – used with object suffix, therefore stress shift negates the sound rule.

Isa 38:13 – שָׁנִיתִי – the context, Qumran, and Targum suggest that there is really a different verb here. See BHS critical apparatus.

Isa 51:16 – פִּסְיִתֶדָּךְ – used with object suffix.

Eze 5:10, 6:5, 12:15, 30:26 – וַזְרִיתִי – the *reš* cannot be doubled, and so the compensatory lengthening of the preceding *ħiriq* to *šere* (\**/zirriyti/* > */zēriti/*) negates the sound rule.<sup>3</sup>

Eze 22:31 – פִּלִּיתִים – used with object suffix.

Eze 29:12, 30:23 – וַזְרִיתִים – used with object suffix, plus root is זרה.

Hence, all 1cs piel perfect forms in Ezekiel, and all but two forms in Isaiah, can be explained by regular sound rules. I highlight these two books above to note the regularity of the forms here, and also to illustrate how we can explain some forms with *ħiriq*.

### Hiphil Data:

The hiphil seems to complicate things slightly, because we find a slightly different pattern. Unlike in the piel, the 1cs forms (without an object suffix) nearly always

<sup>3</sup> Hence the rule of compensatory lengthening must be ordered before the new sound rule. This is expected, as the doubling of *reš* seems to have been given up rather early.

take *šere*. In addition, *šere* occasionally appears in other persons, whereas in the *piel* it never does.

There are 78 *hiphil* lcs forms of 17 different *lamed-he* roots, 44 of which are waw-consecutive forms. Almost without exception, the lcs forms exhibit a *šere* when bare, and a *hiriq* when they take an object suffix. In fact, the *only* unexplainable form is *הִפְרִיחֵי* in Pro 5:13. Other unexpected forms are explainable.

The form *וְהוֹרִיחֵי* in Exo 4:15 and 1Sa 12:23 seems odd, as it should not be eligible for our sound rule. We could simply posit analogy with the rest of the *lamed-he* verbs. However, we also find the forms *וְהוֹרִיחֵיךְ* in Exo 4:12 and *וְהוֹרִיחֵךְ* in Pro 4:11, where we expect a *hiriq* because of the suffixes. I therefore suggest that this verb is conjugated on analogy with the *hiphil* of the very common *יָצָא*.<sup>4</sup> The form *וְהִלְאִיחֵךְ* in Mic 6:3 should also be ineligible for our sound rule, again because of the object suffix. I suggest that this form may be analogous to *lamed-aleph* verbs, due to the *aleph* in the root. The form *וְהִרְאִיחֵי* in Nah 3:5 may also be created by such an analogy, since the initial *pataḥ* should make it ineligible for the sound rule, but see below for a more likely explanation.

One may also question whether *pe-guttural* forms such as *וְהִעֲלִיחֵי* Jdg 6:8, *וְהִעֲלִיחֵיךְ* Eze 26:3 should be affected by the sound rule. The simple perfect form can be explained in one of two ways. We can assume a chronology,

1.  $i > e / iCC\_Ci$ , in stressed position
2.  $\#CiGC- > \#CeG\check{C}-$  (\**hiʕleti > heʕlétî*)

We might turn to Greek transcriptions to shed some light on this chronology, but one must be wary. Forms like Psa 35:15 *ευνηθη*<sup>5</sup> (= *עֲנִיחֵי*) and Psa 30:4 *εελθ* (= *הִעֲלִיחֵי*) suggest that both of the above changes have already taken place. However, it is often the case that the vowels in Greek transcriptions are different from their Tiberian counterparts. For example, the form Psa 89:46 *εετηθ* (= *הִעֲטִיחֵי*) may point to a pronunciation *הִעֲטִיחֵי*. However, Greek *η* sometimes can represent Tiberian *hiriq*. Compare the form Psa 30:2 *δελλιθαγη* (= *וְדִלִּיחֵנִי*), where *η*, *ε*, *ι* all represent *hiriq*! I hesitate to mention Greek forms here, and do not do so elsewhere, as they create additional problems far beyond the scope of this paper.

Another solution, which avoids the need for rule-ordering, is simply to say that in the form *וְהִעֲלִיחֵי* the initial *הֵ* is the surface (phonetic) representation of underlying (phonemic) *הֵ* (see Addendum below). As for the waw-consecutive forms, the *pataḥ*, the origins of which are unclear, should block our sound rule. Either the *pataḥ* should be considered late, or the form is merely analogous to the simple perfect in conjugation. With these *pe-guttural* waw-consecutive forms we can most likely include the form *וְהִרְאִיחֵי* in Nah 3:5, mentioned above. Here the *res* is behaving as a guttural, as it does in other situations (cf. Ecc 2:24 *וְהִרְאֵה*).

<sup>4</sup> There are very few *pe-yodh lamed-he* verbs, and all except *יָרָה* are rare. *יָרָה* is the only one attested in the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> persons in the perfect.

<sup>5</sup> Greek forms are taken from Brønno (1943).

Every other hiphil 1cs perfect form adheres to our sound rule. Note that the data do not include the *ktiv* הַחֲעִיחַ in Jer 42:20 (for the *qere*, see discussion of 2mp below), or the root גבה, with etymological *he*, in Eze 17:24.

In general, the forms for the other persons regularly exhibit *hiriq*, with a handful of exceptions. All 7 attested 1cp forms exhibit *hiriq*, and no 2fp forms are attested. The other second person forms are as follows:

2fs: 3 forms are attested; Isa 57:6 הֶעֱלִיתְּ, Jer 46:11 הִרְבִּיתִי (*ktiv* form. *qere* = הִרְבִּיתִי), and Nah 3:16 הִרְבִּיתִי. The Jeremiah form could possibly be explained as regular, as the dialect of Jeremiah preserves the feminine ending –ti, but the Nahum form is still unexplained, and we do not find *šere* in the 2fs piel perfect. Strangely, this root is attested 4 times in the 2ms, but never contains *šere*. It is impossible to conclude what the regular pattern for this form is since there is so little evidence. But it is safe to say, based on the other conjugations, that we expect *hiriq*.

2mp: 18 forms are attested, 9 of which are waw-consecutives, from 8 different roots. We do not expect to find *šere* here, since 2mp forms have ultimate stress, as well as the wrong final vowel to trigger the sound rule. However, we do find two forms with *šere*: Jer 42:20 הַחֲעִיחַ is a *qere* form, but clearly the correct one based on context. Eze 11:6 הִרְבִּיתֶם is also unexplainable, but note that this is the root we found with *šere* in the 2fs forms.

2ms: 55 forms are attested, 20 of which are waw-consecutives, from 16 different roots. Just 5 forms contain an unexpected *šere*, only 1 of which is explainable:

Exo 29:21 וְהִזִּיתְּ - unexplained.

Exo 32:7 הֶעֱלִיתְּ - unexplained.

Exo 40:4 וְהֶעֱלִיתְּ - possibly influenced by וְהִבְאִתְּ which appears twice in this verse?

Hos 5:3 הִזִּיתְּ - unexplained.

Psa 119:102 הִרְבִּיתִי - We have already seen that this root forms its hiphil by analogy with *pe-yod lamed-aleph* verbs (namely יִצָּא).

Note that of the four unexplainable forms, two are formed from the root עלה and two are formed from a root beginning *zayin-nun* or *nun-zayin*. I am unable to attach any significance to these two facts. Also note that the root רבה occurs four times in the 2ms, each with expected *hiriq*.

From an examination of all the data, it is clear that the pattern for the hiphil is much more regular than the handbooks might suggest. First person singular has just one unexplained appearance of *hiriq*. The other persons have very few unexplained appearances of *šere* which we must attribute to analogy or error.

### Hithpael Data:

There are very few examples of first and second person *lamed-he* hithpael perfects in the Bible. However, the ones we do find follow a regular pattern: *šere* appears in the sole 1cs form, *hiriq* appears elsewhere. The attested forms are:

1cs: Jer 17:16 הַתְּאַוִּיחִי  
 2ms: 1 Ki 2:26 הַתְּעַנִּיחַ ; Pro 24:10 הַתְּרַפִּיחַ  
 2fs: Jer 50:24 הַתְּגַרִּיחַ ; 1 Ki 14:2 הַתְּשַׁנִּיחַ  
 2mp: Num 34:10 הַתְּאַוִּיחֶם

We can also include here the lone hišthapel of the root חרה. There are slightly more examples of this root than there are of the hithpael roots. The pattern is the same:

1cs: 2 Sa 16:4 הִשְׁתַּחֲוִּיתִי ; 1Sa 15:30 הִשְׁתַּחֲוִּיתִי ; 2Ki 5:18 הִשְׁתַּחֲוִּיתִי

There are four 2ms and five 2mp forms, all with paradigmatic *hiriq*.

Note that the hithpael forms cannot be explained by the new sound rule. We can posit a Proto-Hebrew form \*hitqattil, but certainly not \*\*hitqittil.<sup>6</sup> Thus, for the root רפה, we expect:

PCan. 1cs perfect \*hitrappiyti > Heb. \*\*hitrappîtî  
 PCan. 2ms perfect \*hitrappiyta > Heb. hitrappîtā

But based on the small amount of evidence available, it seems that the hithpael has a regular pattern of *šere* in the 1cs vs. *hiriq* in the other first and second person forms. This pattern is most likely analogical to the same pattern for *lamed-he* verbs in the piel and hiphil.

### Conclusions:

All of the above evidence suggests that the posited sound rule is correct, and directly affects both the piel and hiphil conjugations. The sound rule does not apply to the hithpael, the forms of which are analogical to those which are affected. It should be mentioned that there is no effect on the qal, pual, or hophal.

### Addendum:

In addition to the Tiberian Hebrew material analyzed above, we have also briefly examined the relevant forms attested with Babylonian vocalization (Kahle 1913). Unfortunately, only the following three *lamed-he* piel 1cs perfects are attested<sup>7</sup>: Jer 20:12 גְּלִיחִי, Eze 12:15 וְזִרְחִי, Psa 25:5 קְנִיחִי. These are exactly the forms we find in Tiberian Hebrew. Hiphil forms are slightly better attested. We find: Gen 17:20 וְהַפְּרִיחִי and וְהַרְבִּיחִי, Exo 8:18 וְהַפְּלִיחִי, 1 Sam 10:18 הַעֲלִיחִי (Tib. הַעֲלִיחִי), 2 Sam 24:17 הַעֲוִיחִי (Tib. הַעֲוִיחִי), Jer 21:6 וְהַכִּיחִי. We also find the following two 2ms forms: Exo 33:1 הַעֲלִיחַ (Tib. הַעֲלִיחַ !), 1 Chr 4:10 וְהַרְבִּיחַ. Note also that we find the expected forms for other persons: 2 Chr 6:37 הַעֲוִינוּ (Tib. הַעֲוִינוּ), 1 Sam 10:24 הַרְאִיחֶם (Tib. הַרְאִיחֶם).

<sup>6</sup> Compare Aramaic *ḥtqatal*, Arabic *taqattala*.

<sup>7</sup> Due to font restraints, Babylonian vowel points are represented here with Tiberian signs. I reproduce the forms exactly as Kahle has printed them. Vowels are often omitted by Babylonian scribes, as the reader will notice here.

These forms show that the sound rule is in effect for Babylonian Hebrew as well as Tiberian. Only one Babylonian form has *šere* where Tiberian has *ḥiriq*, though considering the small number of Babylonian data, it is reasonable to assume that we would find more differences if we had more evidence. Note also the different treatment of initial -וּת sequences. This is further proof that the phonetic changes affecting this sequence occurred later than the proposed sound rule.

### Sources

- BAUER, HANS; LEANDER, PONTUS: *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1922 (reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1962).
- BERGSTRÄSSER, GOTTHELF: *Hebräische Grammatik mit Benutzung der von E. Kautzsch bearbeiteten 28. Auflage von Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräischer Grammatik* (2 vol.). Leipzig 1918-29 (reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1985).
- BLAU, JOSHUA: "Marginalia Semitica I: The General Background of the stress shift in the perfect with waw consecutive". IOS 1, 1971, 15-24.
- BÖTTCHER, FRIEDRICH: *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (2 vol.), ed. by Ferdinand Mühlau. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1866-68.
- BRØNNO, EINAR: *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vocalismus auf Grundlage der mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origines*. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1943.
- GESENIUS, WILHELM: *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch*, 28<sup>th</sup> ed., trans. by A.E. Cowley, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- HUEHNERGARD, JOHN: "Historical Phonology and the Hebrew Piel". In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Bodine, Walter. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- JANSSENS, GERARD, *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen's Secunda*. OG 9, Leuven: Peeters, 1982.
- JOÜON, PAUL, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, translated and revised by T. Muraoka. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966.
- KAHLE, PAUL: *Masoreten des Ostens*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913.
- LAMBDIN, THOMAS O.: "Philippi's Law Reconsidered". In *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, eds. Kort, Ann; Morschauer, Scott. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985.



**Abstract:**

The interchange between *šere* and *hīriq* under the second radical of *lamed-he* verbs in the piel perfect lcs has long been noticed (Gesenius §75z), but has never been convincingly explained. Similarly, the interchange of *šere* and *hīriq* in various persons of the hiphil (Ges. §75ee) and hithpael (Ges. §75z). The appearance of *šere* in the piel and hiphil lcs forms can be attributed to a previously unnoted regular sound rule. Furthermore, upon examination of all the relevant forms in the Bible, it becomes clear that the alternation of *šere* and *hīriq* follows a rather regular pattern, particularly in the hiphil. A great many of the forms which seem to violate this sound rule can be explained on other grounds. The conjugation of the hithpael forms, which are not susceptible to the sound rule, has been taken from that of the piel and hiphil.

**Address of the author:**

Aaron Rubin, NELC – Harvard Semitic Museum, 6 Divinity Ave., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA, e-mail: arubin@fas.harvard.edu

Copyright © 2005 by Brill Academic Publishers. All rights reserved. This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Organizations in the USA who are also registered with the Copyright Clearance Center may therefore copy material (beyond the limits permitted by sections 107 and 108 of US copyright law) subject to payment to C.C.C. of the per copy fee of \$12.00. This consent does not extend to multiple copying for promotional or commercial purposes. ISI Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA, is authorized to supply single copies of separate articles for private use only. Organisations authorized by the Copyright Licensing Agency may also copy material subject to the usual conditions. For all other use, permission should be sought from Brill Academic Publishers. This journal is registered at the Library of Congress, 100 Congress Street, Washington, DC 20540, USA. Databases in the USA may therefore be searched using the ISSN. This journal is registered at the British Library, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 0LP, UK. Organizations in the USA who are also registered with the Copyright Clearance Center may therefore copy material (beyond the limits permitted by sections 107 and 108 of US copyright law) subject to payment to C.C.C. of the per copy fee of \$12.00. This consent does not extend to multiple copying for promotional or commercial purposes. [www.brill.nl](http://www.brill.nl)