

Historical linguistics and linguistic dating of the Hebrew Bible 2015-2018:

The Rezetko and Young assessment of the *status quaestionis*

Nicolai Winther-Nielsen

Fjellhaug International University College Denmark, Leifsgade 33.6, 2300 København S
and Eep Talstra Center for Bible and Computer, VU University Amsterdam

nwn@dbi.edu

HIPHIL Novum has always been very open about our policy to welcome short reports and papers read at conferences at the length of 2500 words at an average, but without peer review, while we at the same time focus on peer reviewed papers in the usual 7500 words range.

At the same time, we also want to publish much longer papers, even if they are extremely technical and they would not usually get accepted in standard printed journals. We have done so in the past, one good example being David Kummerow's "Anaphora and Deixis in Tiberian Hebrew: Semantically Mapping the Case for a Distance-Neutral Demonstrative" in *HIPHIL Novum* vol 1 (2014), issue 2, 1-53 [currently available at <http://www.see-j.net/hiphil/ojs-2.3.3-3/index.php/hiphil/article/view/59/57>], a substantially long peer reviewed contribution that proves this point.

The very long contribution in this volume proves the point too. It is clearly an opportunity for HIPHIL Novum to receive and accept a contribution by two leading scholars participating in the debate on the historical linguistics and linguistic dating of Biblical Hebrew and the related ongoing discussion of the role of textual criticism. Robert Rezetko and Ian Young are internationally known for their contribution to this field and we proudly publish their lengthy contribution.

We have for a long time in vain sought peer reviewers who would have the time and qualifications to evaluate this as a paper. In the end the two authors have asked us to bring it out as a report on current research within the last four years. Because of its contemporary interest as part of an ongoing discussion, they have not wanted to postpone publication for a final peer review process that could take months, but rather to publish it as is, and let the work and its value speak for itself as a report. One reviewer has pointed out that publishing both as a paper and as a report would work, and he adds that "the authors...show that our field of research needs substantial revitalization." He concludes that the report is "an informative and entertaining text, so I definitely recommend to publish it." Another reviewer has pointed out, however, that "there are places where their argument is weak, or poorly expressed, and there is a dimension to their presentation that I think is missing, but should be included."

As mentioned, the authors have preferred not to wait additional months for addressing this issue, mainly because they regard their contribution as a review-article or report, and therefore at their wish we publish it now. We are furthermore also publishing a short introduction by Martin Ehrensverd as a recommendation of their work.

HIPHIL Novum would welcome further submissions that would keep the scholarly world informed on other approaches and keep the linguistic discussion alive, including critical responses to Rezetko and Young's report.