

# Studies in Semitic Vocalisation and Reading Traditions

EDITED BY AARON D. HORNKOHL AND GEOFFREY KHAN



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

Faculty of Asian and Middle  
Eastern Studies



<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

© 2020 Aaron D. Hornkohl and Geoffrey Khan. Copyright of individual chapters is maintained by the chapters' authors.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the text; to adapt the text and to make commercial use of the text providing attribution is made to the authors (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Attribution should include the following information:

Aaron D. Hornkohl and Geoffrey Khan (eds.), *Studies in Semitic Vocalisation and Reading Traditions*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0207>

In order to access detailed and updated information on the license, please visit, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0207#copyright>

Further details about CC BY licenses are available at, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at <https://archive.org/web>

Updated digital material and resources associated with this volume are available at <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0207#resources>

Every effort has been made to identify and contact copyright holders and any omission or error will be corrected if notification is made to the publisher.

Semitic Languages and Cultures 3.

ISSN (print): 2632-6906

ISSN (digital): 2632-6914

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-78374-935-5

ISBN Hardback: 978-1-78374-936-2

ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-78374-937-9

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0207

Cover image: Detail from a bilingual Latin-Punic inscription at the theatre at Lepcis Magna, IRT 321 (accessed from [https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Inscription\\_Theatre\\_Leptis\\_Magna\\_Libya.JPG](https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Inscription_Theatre_Leptis_Magna_Libya.JPG)). Leaf of a Syriac prayer book with Western vocalisation signs (source: Wikimedia Commons). Leaf of an Abbasid-era Qur'ān (vv. 64.11–12) with red, yellow, and green vocalisation dots (source: Wikimedia Commons). Genizah fragment of the Hebrew Bible (Gen. 11–12, Cambridge University Library T-S A1.56; courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library). Genizah fragment of a Karaite transcription of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic script (Num. 14.22–24, 40–42, Cambridge University Library T-S Ar. 52.242; courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library). Greek transcription of the Hebrew for Ps. 22.2a in Matt. 27.46 as found in Codex Bezae (fol. 99v; courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library).

Cover design: Anna Gatti

# THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HEBREW WAYYIQTOL ('WAW CONSECUTIVE') VERBAL FORM IN LIGHT OF GREEK AND LATIN TRANSCRIPTIONS OF HEBREW

*Benjamin Kantor*

---

## 1.0. INTRODUCTION

Hebrew is counted among the few languages of the world that have a specific 'sequential' past tense verbal form. What is particularly unique about the morphology of this Hebrew verbal form, however, is that it appears to be constructed from the conjunction *waw* (ו־ /v-/ 'and.CONJ') and a verb in the *prefix conjugation* (henceforth referred to as the '*yiqtol*' form), which is elsewhere used for non-past semantics (e.g., future, jussive). What is more, the conjunction *waw* is normally connected to this 'sequential' verbal form by means of gemination, a feature occurring in no other context following the conjunction *waw*. This verbal form has come to be known as either the '*waw* consecutive', or, as a more neutral term mirroring the morphological shape of the verb, the *wayyiqtol* form (Table 1):

Table 1

<i>waw</i>	<i>yiqtol</i>	<i>waw</i> + <i>yiqtol</i>	<i>wayyiqtol</i>
וְ	יִכְתֹּב	וְיִכְתֹּב	וַיִּכְתֹּב
/v-/	/ji-χto:v/	/v-ji-χto:v/	/vaj-ji-χto:v/
[va-]	[ji-χ <sup>h</sup> o:ov]	[vi-ji-χ <sup>h</sup> o:ov]	[vaj-ji-χ <sup>h</sup> o:ov]
and.CONJ	3MS-write.YIQTOL	CONJ-3MS-write.YIQTOL	CONJ-3MS-write.(WAY)YIQTOL
‘and’	‘he will write; let him write!’	‘and let him write!’	‘and he wrote!’

The questions and issues surrounding the *wayyiqtol* form are primarily concerned with the form’s history and morphology. From a historical perspective, the questions regarding the *wayyiqtol* form relate to its grammatical origins and development within Biblical Hebrew. From a morphological perspective, the questions regarding the *wayyiqtol* form relate to the status of the conjunction *waw* as a component of the form, the presence of a full vowel after the conjunction *waw*, and the morphological derivation of the gemination in the following consonant.<sup>1</sup> Though neither of these topics can be addressed without addressing the other, at least in cursory fashion, the focus of this paper will be on the latter.

In particular, this paper will analyse all attestations of the *wayyiqtol* form in ancient Greek and Latin transcriptions of Biblical Hebrew in order to determine *when*, *why*, and *how* the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* form came to be realised distinctly from the realisation of the conjunction *waw* elsewhere, with respect to both its vocalisation with *pataḥ* (instead of *shewa*) and the doubling of the following consonant. After a brief review of

<sup>1</sup> For an introduction to the issues, see Smith (1991, 1–15).

scholarship (§§2.0–4.0), the relevant data from the transcriptions will be presented and analysed (§5.0). Based on the findings, a plausible diachronic reconstruction will be suggested (§6.0). The paper will conclude by outlining the implications that such a reconstruction has for understanding the development of the Biblical Hebrew reading tradition(s) in the Second Temple period more broadly.

## 2.0. REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP: GRAMMATICAL DEVELOPMENT

Though not the focus of this paper—focused, as it is, on the morphological development of the form, rather than its grammatical origins—it behoves us to briefly rehearse the generally accepted view of how this ‘sequential’ past tense form developed from a grammatical perspective before more extensively detailing the various theories regarding the form’s morphology. According to most researchers, Proto-Central Semitic had both a long *\*yaqtulu* verb form, essentially used for indicative non-past semantics, and a short *\*yaqtul* verb form, used for both indicative past (preterite) and volitive meanings (jussive). These forms eventually fell together in Hebrew (in most paradigms) and both came to be vocalised as *yiqtol*.<sup>2</sup> Syntactically, the short/preterite *yiqtol* form (< *\*yaqtul*) gradually came to be replaced by *qaṭal* (< *\*qaṭala*) as the more common regular past-tense verb. It was only following

---

<sup>2</sup> This identity applies only to strong roots. Note that a number of weak roots (e.g., II-*w/y*, III-*w/y*) and the *hiṣ’il* stem still exhibit two distinct forms, one ‘long’ (< *\*yaqtulu*) and one ‘short’ (< *\*yaqtul*).

the conjunction *waw* that short/preterite *yiqṭol* (< \**yaqṭul*) continued to serve regularly as a past tense verbal form.<sup>3</sup> Its relegation to this syntactic slot has often been associated with its most common role as a narrative past tense.

### 3.0. REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP: MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

We must begin by providing a bit more background regarding the particular morphological features of the *wayyiqṭol* form which the various theories attempt to explain. In Tiberian Hebrew, following the conjunction *waw*, the preterite *yiqṭol* form is distinguished from the jussive *yiqṭol* form by means of two features: (1) the conjunction *waw* is vocalised with *pataḥ* instead of *shewa* and (2) the prefix consonant of the verbal form is geminated (Table 2):<sup>4</sup>

Table 2

<i>waw</i> + <i>yiqṭol</i>	<i>wayyiqṭol</i>
וְתִכְתֹּב	וַיִּכְתֹּב
/v-θi-χto:v/	/vat-ti-χto:v/
[va-θi-χt <sup>h</sup> o:v]	[vat <sup>h</sup> -t <sup>h</sup> i-χt <sup>h</sup> o:v]
CONJ-3FS-write.YIQṬOL	CONJ-3FS-write.(WAY)YIQṬOL
‘and let her write!’	‘and she wrote’

<sup>3</sup> For a comprehensive treatment, see Smith (1991).

<sup>4</sup> In the 1cs form, we find a *qameṣ* and singleton consonant instead of *pataḥ* and gemination due to compensatory lengthening, e.g., וְאָכַתְּבָא ‘and I wrote’ (Jer. 32.10).

It should be noted, however, that because vocalic *shewa* was generally realised in the Tiberian tradition as [a], it was more the gemination of the verbal prefix than the preceding full vowel that distinguished these forms in actual pronunciation. Moreover, according to the phonotactics of Tiberian Hebrew, a geminated consonant must be preceded by a full vowel and cannot be preceded by *shewa*. Accordingly, while both the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* with *pataḥ* and the gemination of the following consonant are characteristic morphological features of the *wayyiqtol* form, it is primarily the gemination that should be regarded as the essential marker of this form over against a non-past or jussive *yiqtol*, at least in Tiberian Hebrew.

Theories for explaining the gemination in the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* verbal form are as numerous as they are diverse. With respect to diachrony (i.e., when gemination developed in this form), the range of possible dates suggested for this innovation spans so extensively, that it is not helpful at all, with some scholars suggesting that gemination in the form is as old as Proto-Hebrew and others suggesting that it was introduced by the Masoretes in the Middle Ages. The various explanations, though numerous, are all essentially variations on one of two main theories.<sup>5</sup> One group of scholars regards the gemination in the form as deriving etymologically from a distinct morpheme of its own, most of them suggesting that it results from an assimilated *nun*.

---

<sup>5</sup> Though they discuss the morphological nature of the full vowel and gemination, I have intentionally left off synchronic interpretations of the *wayyiqtol* form, such as Hatav's (2004), due to the fact that they do not approach the problem from a historical perspective.

Another group of scholars sees the gemination in the form *not* as deriving etymologically from a distinct morpheme, but rather as a phonetic phenomenon emerging for various morphosyntactic reasons.<sup>6</sup>

The most well-known proponents of the first view are Young (1953) and Gordon (1957, 275–76), who understand the doubling to be the result of an assimilated *nun*, i.e., *\*wan-yiqtol* > *wayyiqtol*. They arrive at this conclusion by comparing the *waw* in *wayyiqtol* to the Egyptian particle *ʔiw*, both of which they argue have a common Proto-Afro-Asiatic source. According to their theory, Egyptian *ʔiw* is a sentence adverbial which can affect the time reference of a verbal form. In particular, they look to the following Egyptian verbal structure for a morphological cognate to Hebrew *wayyiqtol*: *ʔiw sdm-n-f* (*ʔiwa*.ADV hear-PAST-3MS) ‘when he has heard’. By rearranging the order of the morphemes in this structure, they can derive Hebrew *wayyiqtol* from a perfect morphological cognate to the Egyptian form: *\*(ʔi)wa-n-yi-qtol* (*[ʔi]wa*-PAST-3MS-kill.YIQTOL). The gemination, then, is the result of the Proto-Afro-Asiatic past tense marker /n/ assimilating to the following pronominal element at a very early stage of the language. This argument is taken up by Rendsburg (1981, 668–69; 1993, 204–5), who notes in further support of it that a *waw*-consecutive structure tends to crop up most in Semitic languages spoken in those areas in which Egyptian administration was strongest during the New Kingdom. Brenner (1986, 14, 21, 24, 34) also follows

---

<sup>6</sup> For a comprehensive review, see Smith (1991, 1–15); Andrason (2011, 37–38).



Young and Gordon, but suggests that the form in Hebrew is borrowed from Egyptian rather than inherited from an earlier stage of the language. Maag (1953, 86–88) also suggests that the gemination is the result of an assimilated *nun*, but appeals to the Hebrew demonstrative particle הן ‘look!’ rather than the Egyptian form: *\*wəhanyiqtul* > *\*wanyiqtul* > *wayyiqṭol*.

Hetzron (1969, 9–10) also suggests that the gemination is the result of an assimilated consonant, yet he opts for /j/ rather than /n/. This is based on the claim that the morpheme *wa-* in *wayyiqṭol* does not derive from the conjunction *waw*, but rather from a shortened form of the verb *\*haway* was-3MS.QAṬAL ‘he was’, e.g., *\*(ha)way yāqom* (was-3MS.QAṬAL get.up-3MS.YIQṬOL) > *wayyāqom* (get.up-3MS.WAYYIQṬOL) ‘he got up’. Accordingly, gemination is the result of the assimilation of the third radical /j/ of the 3MS.QAṬAL form of the verb *\*haway* ‘to be’.

The most well-known proponent of the second view is Lambdin (1971, 322–25), who suggests that the gemination in the *wayyiqṭol* form is an example of “junctural doubling,” a phonetic phenomenon that occurs when a short word is closely connected or bound to the following word. Though Lambdin’s theory of ‘junctural doubling’ emerged primarily to explain gemination in the definite article, he also suggested that it would apply to the *wayyiqṭol* form, since the form reflects the close bonding between the conjunction *\*wa-* and the preterite *yiqṭol* verbal form. Later scholars dealing with the *wayyiqṭol* form often accept Lambdin’s morphological explanation (see, e.g., Smith 1991, 6).

A similar theory, which has not, in my opinion, received adequate attention, is that of Loprieno (1980, 10). According to

Loprieno, the conjunction *waw*, which was vocalised as *\*wa-* in all environments at an earlier stage of Hebrew, became a grammaticalised part of the preterite *yiqtol* verbal form, i.e., *\*wa-yiqtol* > *\*wayiqtol*. Preceding the jussive *\*yiqtol* form, however, the conjunction *waw* did not become grammaticalised. Accordingly, when the vowel of the conjunction *waw* reduced to *shewa*, i.e., *\*wa-* > *\*w(ə)-*, it affected jussive *\*wa-yiqtol*, but not preterite *\*wa-yiqtol*, i.e., preterite *yiqtol*: *\*wa-yiqtol* > *\*wayiqtol*; jussive *yiqtol*: *\*wa-yiqtol* > *\*w(ə)-yiqtol*. Thus, when the Tiberian Masoretes inherited the grammaticalised form *\*wayiqtol*, the phonotactics of their tradition of Hebrew could preserve the initial /a/ vowel only by doubling the following consonant. In other words, rather than gemination being the principle characteristic of the *wayyiqtol* form as in Tiberian, at an earlier stage of Hebrew it was only the vowel of the conjunction *waw* that distinguished the forms. Baranowski (2016, 12–13) accepts the proposal of Loprieno, stating that the gemination is a phonetic phenomenon utilised to preserve the “grammaticalized preposition *wa*” and thus mark the (past) meaning of the *wayyiqtol* form. In other words, the gemination *prevents* the reduction of the /a/ vowel to *shewa*. He goes on to note, however, that “it is impossible to establish whether the doubling appeared as a phonetic development already in Proto-Hebrew or in Hebrew spoken in biblical times, or whether the Masoretes created it as an artificial device to keep the *wayyiqtol* pattern distinct.” Joüon and Muraoka (2009, 128) also seem to agree with this claim in their statement that the *pataḥ* “must be considered primitive” and that the gemination is “a device [introduced] to preserve this primitive vowel.”

Revell (1984) makes a similar claim, but suggests that the distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* form arose due to stress patterns. Just as the conjunction *waw* is prone to lengthen before monosyllabic stressed nouns, e.g., טוֹב וְרָע ‘good and evil’ (Gen. 2.9), so too it lengthened before certain weak *wayyiqtol* forms with initial stress, such as וַיָּקָם *vajˈkɑːqɑm* ‘and he got up’ and וַיִּבֶן *vajˈbiːvɛn* ‘and he built’. This distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* was then transferred to other instances of *waw* preceding preterite *yiqtol* forms as a mark of the past meaning. Because other *yiqtol* forms had final stress, it was necessary to geminate the prefix consonant as a way of maintaining the syllable’s length. He compares this phenomenon to the gemination in compounds such as בְּמָה/בִּמָּה ‘in what...?’ and בְּמָה/בִּמָּה ‘how much/long...?’. He suggests that such a distinction arose as a development of the reading tradition toward the end of the biblical period to distinguish the past meaning of *yiqtol*, which was no longer used in the spoken language.

A number of comments are warranted regarding the views outlined above. To begin, one should be cautious in accepting any permutation of the first view, due to lack of supporting evidence elsewhere in Hebrew. These theories all require positing an additional morpheme between the conjunction *waw* and the *yiqtol* verbal form, even though such a morpheme with a similar function is not attested, even vestigially, anywhere in Hebrew.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, Revell (1984, 443–44) and Smith (1991, 3–5) have

---

<sup>7</sup> Note that short/preterite *yiqtol* forms in poetry not following the conjunction *waw* are never preceded by any distinct morpheme, such as *\*-n-*, *\*hVn*, or *\*haway*, in order to mark them as past.

outlined a number of problems with the hypothesis that Hebrew *\*wa-* ought to be connected to Egyptian *\*iw*.

The second view, which regards the gemination as purely a phonetic phenomenon, is naturally more economical and persuasive. Not all permutations of this view, however, are equally convincing. With respect to Lambdin's 'junctural doubling', for example, it is difficult to explain why it would occur at the juncture of the conjunction *waw* and the preterite form, but not the jussive form. Moreover, the gemination after the definite article, which the theory was originally developed to explain, likely has another explanation altogether.<sup>8</sup> If 'junctural doubling' is not even a valid explanation for the phenomenon it was primarily developed to explain, one must wonder how productive it was and if perhaps other apparent instances of 'junctural doubling' also have more satisfactory explanations. The theory of Loprieno (and Baranowski) is less problematic from a theoretical perspective, though it leaves much wanting in terms of diachrony and absolute chronology. Revell's theory is most promising, especially in terms of absolute chronology and motivating factors, though it is not without problems. These theories will be picked up and discussed further in the analysis of the transcription material below.

---

<sup>8</sup> Pat-El (2009) has argued persuasively that the definite article is to be derived from the deictic particle *\*han* and that the following gemination is the result of the assimilation of the final /n/ of *\*han*.

#### 4.0. REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP: *WAYYIQTOL* IN THE TRANSCRIPTIONS

Before proceeding to analyse the evidence of the transcriptions, it is worth noting how previous scholars who have worked on the transcriptions see the data from the Secunda and Jerome fitting into the various stages of development outlined above.

In the Secunda, parallels to Tiberian *wayyiqtol* forms are not represented consistently. A vowel is transcribed after the conjunction *waw* less than half the time and gemination is rarely represented. These points of data are interpreted in one of two ways (or some combination thereof). The first interpretation suggests that not all instances of *wayyiqtol* in the Tiberian tradition were identified and/or vocalised as such in the Secunda. The second interpretation suggests that though the forms are ancestors of *wayyiqtol* and do express past semantics, gemination of the prefix consonant of the *wayyiqtol* form was not (yet) a regular feature of Secunda Hebrew (Brønno 1943, 235–36; Janssens 1982, 84–85; Yuditsky 2017, 232; Kantor 2017, 244, 280, 337, 346–48).

Particularly noteworthy here is Yuditsky's (2017, 232) theory, that ancient Hebrew had no pronunciation distinction between the conjunction *waw* before a non-past/jussive *yiqtol* form and before a preterite *yiqtol* form (i.e., Tiberian *wayyiqtol*). The evidence from the Secunda reflects the initial stages of such a distinction coming into being, i.e., a transitional period during which the preterite form *\*w(a)-yiqtol* was gradually shifting to *wayyiqtol*. During this transitional period, a distinction would be present in some preterite *yiqtol* verbal forms and absent in others.

Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 171), when dealing with the lack of distinction between ‘*waw* consecutive’ and ‘*waw* conjunctive’ in Samaritan Hebrew, also points to the Secunda as evidence of an earlier stage of Hebrew, in which such a distinction did not exist.

While Yuditsky’s theory is generally sound, it lacks two things. First, though he acknowledges that the gemination in *wayyiqṭol* is secondary and still developing at the time of the Secunda, he offers no explanation for how or why the distinction came to be. Second, he does not avail himself of the evidence supplied by Jerome regarding *wayyiqṭol*, though it supports the diachronic trajectory he outlines. In this paper, we will take Yuditsky’s theory as a starting point, but will revise and build upon it, dealing with the issues in a more comprehensive manner.

With respect to the Latin transcriptions of Hebrew in Jerome, no scholar has yet analysed or even enumerated the attestations of the *wayyiqṭol* form in his writings. As far as I can see, this is mainly a result of two factors. First, there appear to be only six attestations of the *wayyiqṭol* form in all of Jerome’s writings. Second, none of these attestations is found in his commentaries, which served as the main source for some of the early publications on the transcriptions of Hebrew in Jerome. Four of the six attestations are found in his letters and the other two are from his *Prologus Galeatus* (‘Helmeted Preface’), that is, the introduction to the books of Kings. To the best of my knowledge, these six *wayyiqṭol* forms are first enumerated and analysed here. Though six attestations constitute a relatively small sample size, their consistency is sufficient to support the diachronic argument which will be made below.

## 5.0. WAYYIQṬOL IN THE TRANSCRIPTIONS

Because the distinctive features of the *wayyiqṭol* form are the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* (with the full vowel *pataḥ* as opposed to *shewa*) and the presence of gemination (in the prefix consonant of the verb), there are three issues that must be understood with respect to the Greek and Latin transcriptions in order to rightly interpret the data regarding *wayyiqṭol*:

- 1) The distribution, status, and representation of ‘*shewa*’
- 2) The distribution of the various representations of the conjunction *waw*
- 3) The distribution and representation of gemination

In the following sections, first these three principles will be addressed, with respect to both the Greek transcriptions of Hebrew in the Secunda (§5.1) and the Latin transcriptions of Hebrew in Jerome (§5.3). Following this, all attestations of the *wayyiqṭol* form will be presented and analysed (§§5.2; 5.4).

### 5.1. ‘*Shewa*’, the Conjunction *Waw*, and Gemination in the Secunda

#### 5.1.1. *Shewa*

For purposes of this paper, we must consider if the data from the Secunda are sufficient to convey whether the conjunction *waw* is vocalised with *shewa* or a full vowel. In the Secunda, the parallel to Tiberian vocalic *shewa* is in most cases left unrepresented (i.e., the transcriptions present a consonant cluster; Table 3):

Table 3

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Translation
Ps. 30.10	בְּדָמִי	βδαμι	‘in my blood’
Ps. 46.5	פְּלִיזֵי	φλαγαι	‘its (ms) streams’
Ps. 89.48	בְּנֵי	βνη	‘sons of (cstr.)’

At the same time, it is also frequently represented by Greek α or ε. Most instances of α also correspond to an etymological \*/a/ vowel (Table 4):

Table 4

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Translation
Ps. 18.48	נִקְמוֹת	νακαμωθ	‘vengeances’
Deut. 1.1	הַדְּבָרִים	αδδεβαρειμ	‘the words’

While not all Secunda scholars agree that it is appropriate to refer to ‘*shewa*’ in the Secunda,<sup>9</sup> most see significance in the presence or lack of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* (see below).

<sup>9</sup> In the twentieth century, virtually every Secunda scholar took it for granted that ‘*shewa*’ was a reality in the transcriptions, some suggesting that it was realised as [ĕ] (Brønno 1943, 327, 329, 333; Janssens 1982, 89–110), others as [æ] (Blau 1984), and still others that its quality was unstable (Margolis 1909). Only recently was it suggested that there is no ‘*shewa*’ in the Secunda at all, but only the preservation of etymological short vowels, even if they were occasionally realised with extremely short durations (Yuditsky 2005). I argued recently that inconsistencies in previous scholarship may be reconciled if we make a distinction between mid-central *shewa* (i.e., phonetic [ə]) and variable *shewa* (i.e., a qualitatively indistinct vowel that assimilates to its environment), on the one hand, and between acoustic reduction (i.e., centralisation of vowels when pronounced with short duration far from the stress) and



### 5.1.2. Conjunction *waw*

If we are to ascribe importance to the transcription of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* (represented by *ou*) in the Secunda, we must establish that the same does not occur elsewhere, or, if it does, that it is governed by consistent rules. It turns out that in the Secunda, the conjunction *waw* is almost always represented by the Greek digraph *ou* (= /w-/ [(ʔ)u(:)-]) with no subsequent vowel (more than 100x) (Table 5; Yuditsky 2017, 230–31; Kantor 2017, 346).<sup>10</sup>

Table 5

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 18.38	וְלֹא־	ουλω	‘and not’
Ps. 18.47	וּבְרִיךְ	ουβαρουχ	‘and blessed’
Ps. 32.11	וְגִילֵי	ουγλου	‘and rejoice!’

lexical reduction (i.e., the quality of a reduced vowel merging with that of a phonemic vowel), on the other. I argued for three general principles regarding *shewa* in the Secunda: (1) a reduced centralised vowel (i.e., vocalic *shewa*) was generally realised as [ə] or [ɛ]; (2) assimilatory tendencies in vocalic *shewa* point towards a variable realisation in certain contexts; and (3) the preservation of historical /a/ in ‘*shewa*-vowel’ slots demonstrates that the Secunda transcriptions provide a ‘snapshot’ during the transition from acoustic reduction to lexical reduction (Kantor 2017, 315–26).

<sup>10</sup> In light of contemporary Greek pronunciation, the digraph *ou* likely indicates that the conjunction *waw* was realised phonetically as [(ʔ)u(:)], even though its phonemic realisation was probably consonantal /w-/. Such a phonemic and phonetic realisation has parallels in modern dialects of Arabic and Aramaic (Kantor 2017, 228–32, 346–50).

Instances in which a vowel ( $\alpha$  or  $\epsilon$ ) is transcribed after the conjunction *waw* (fewer than 10x) are governed by two rules, both of which are based on syllable structure:<sup>11</sup> (1) the conjunction *waw* precedes a word-initial consonant cluster or (2) the conjunction *waw* precedes a monosyllabic stressed noun (Table 6–7; Yuditsky 2017, 230–31; Kantor 2017, 346–50):<sup>12</sup>

Table 6: Rule (1): Conjunction *waw* before word-initial consonant cluster

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 28.9	וְרָעָם	ουαρημ	‘and shepherd them!’
Ps. 35.28	וְלִשׁוֹנִי	ουαλσωνι	‘and my tongue’
Ps. 46.11	וְדָעוּ	ουαδου	‘and know!’
Ps. 49.7	וּבְרָב	ουεβροβ	‘and in the abundance of’

Table 7: Rule (2): Conjunction *waw* before stressed monosyllabic word

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 5.5	MT: תֵּשַׁע (read: וְתֵשַׁע)	ουαθεσα	‘and nine’
Ps. 32.9	וְרִסָּן	ουαρεσν	‘and a bridle’
Ps. 49.12	וְדֹר	ουαδωρ	‘and generation’

The transcriptions categorised under rule (1) are probably best interpreted as reflecting vowel syncope ( $v \rightarrow \emptyset$  /  $C\check{v}C\_C\check{v}(C)$ ) and thus should be vocalised as *waršēm*, *walšōnī*, *wadšū*, and *wēbrob*, respectively. Parallels to such vocalisations are also

<sup>11</sup> Instances of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* when it precedes *yiqtol* verbal forms are not included.

<sup>12</sup> As to why ουδαρημ | וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם ‘and after them’ (Ps. 49.14), which should be emended to \*ουααρημ, is likely not an exception, see (Kantor 2017, 347).

found in Babylonian Hebrew, e.g., וְבַמִּשׁוֹר *wabmīšōr* ‘and with uprightness’ (Mal. 2.6); וּבַיּוֹם *wībyōm* ‘and in the day of (cstr.)’ (Isa. 49.8) (Yeivin 1985, 1152). The transcriptions categorised under rule (2) are best interpreted as reflecting pre-tonic lengthening of the conjunction *waw*, which coheres with their vocalisation with *qameṣ* in both Tiberian and Babylonian Hebrew.

It is worth noting that in both environments, Tiberian and Babylonian vocalise the conjunction *waw* with a full vowel rather than *shewa*. It seems, then, that the conjunction *waw* is written as *וא*- (less frequently *ווע*-) only when the corresponding forms/environments in Tiberian and Babylonian might also have a full vowel. Aside from such cases, the conjunction *waw* is normally written as *ו*-, generally corresponding to cases in which Tiberian and Babylonian have a simple vocal *shewa*. Finally, we should also mention that just because instances with a vowel transcribed after the conjunction *waw* occur within the confines of these two rules, that does not mean that every instance of the conjunction *waw* that fits within these two rules will be transcribed with a vowel, e.g., *וּמְצִידָתִי וְסוּסוֹ* ‘and my fortress’ (Ps. 31.4); *וְעֹז וְיָ* ‘and strength’ (Ps. 29.1).

### 5.1.3. Gemination

As stated above, gemination in the prefix consonant is the most regular and significant morphological indicator of a *wayyiqṭol* form in the Tiberian tradition. If we are to rely on the Secunda for accurate information regarding this feature, we must first establish that gemination is consistently indicated therein. Though scholars differ as to the extent to which gemination is

accurately represented in the Secunda, most agree that the representation of gemination is generally reliable.<sup>13</sup> There are, however, several consonants which cannot be represented as geminates due to the limitations and conventions of Greek orthography: the gutturals /ʔ/, /h/, /ħ/, /ʕ/, the consonant /z/, and the semi-vowels /w/ and /j/. In addition to this, it should be kept in mind that Hebrew /r/ cannot be geminated in most traditions of Biblical Hebrew.

We can demonstrate the relevance and reliability of the Secunda transcriptions for accurately conveying the presence or lack of gemination in the *wayyiqṭol* form by examining all attestations of the definite article. Like the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqṭol* form, the definite article is a monosyllabic morpheme made up of one consonant, the vowel [a], and gemination in the following consonant. Excluding the consonants listed above, which cannot be represented as geminates in the Secunda, the definite article is attested twenty times, in eighteen of which (90

---

<sup>13</sup> For slightly different views, note how Yuditsky (2017, 36–44) generally accepts at face value the Secunda transcriptions' representation of gemination or lack thereof, whereas Kantor (2017, 237–48) argues that cross-linguistic speech perception may be a significant factor in inaccurate representations. Nevertheless, Kantor still acknowledges that the representation of gemination and lack thereof is generally reliable, even if not infallible.

percent) gemination is represented and in just two of which (10 percent) it is not (Tables 8–9):<sup>14</sup>

Table 8: Definite article with gemination

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 18.33	הַמֶּאֱזֶרְנִי	αμμααζερηνι	‘the one who girds me’
Ps. 18.48	הַנוֹתֵן	αννωθην	‘the one who gives’
Ps. 29.3	הַמַּיִם	αμμαιμ	‘the water’
Ps. 29.3	הַכְּבוֹד	αχχαβωδ	‘the glory’
Ps. 31.7	הַשֹּׁמְרִים	ασσωμριμ	‘those who keep’
Ps. 31.25	הַמְּיַחֲלִים	αμμιαλιμ	‘those who wait’
Ps. 32.10	וְהַבּוֹטֵחַ	οααβωτη	‘and the one who trusts’
Ps. 35.26	הַמְּגִדִּילִים	*μααγδiliμ	‘those who exult’
Ps. 49.10	הַשְּׁחַת	ασσααθ	‘the pit’
Deut. 1.1	הַדְּבָרִים	αδδεβαρειμ	‘the words’
1 Kgs 1.1	וְהַמֶּלֶךְ	Οααμμελχ	‘and the king’
2 Kgs 11.7	הַמֶּלֶךְ	αμμελεχ	‘the king’
2 Kgs 23.7	הַקֳּדָשִׁים	ακκοδασίμ	‘the holy things’
Ps. 118.26	הַבָּא	αββα	‘the one who comes’
Song. 1.1	הַשִּׁירִים	ασσιρειμ	‘the songs’
Isa. 9.6	הַמִּשְׁרָה	αμμεσρα*	‘the government’
Jer. 38.6	הַמֶּלֶךְ	εμμελέχ	‘the king’
Mal. 2.13	הַמִּנְחָה	αμμανα	‘the offering’

<sup>14</sup> See also Yuditksy (2017, 233). Yuditksy does not, however, include all the attestations cited here. Moreover, he includes examples that are not from the Hexapla’s second column.

Table 9: Definite article without gemination

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 8.1	הַגִּתִּית	ἀγεθθίθ	‘the Gittith’
Ps. 12.1	הַשְּׁמִינִית	ἀσμενίθ	‘the Sheminith’

This high degree of consistency with respect to the transcription of gemination after the definite article suggests that we can rely on the Secunda for the information it conveys about gemination after the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqtol* forms as well. However, this applies only to the prefixes /t/ (2S, 3FS, 2PL, 3FPL) and /n/ (1PL), since neither /ʔ/ (1S) nor /j/ (3MS, 3MPL) can be represented as geminate in Greek.

## 5.2. *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda

In order to appropriately analyse the data from the Secunda, we must survey not only all the attestations of *wayyiqtol* forms (in comparison with Tiberian Hebrew) therein, but all attestations of any *yiqtol* form following the conjunction *waw*. It is not enough to observe how the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* before preterite *yiqtol* may differ from its vocalisation elsewhere. We must also observe how the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* before preterite *yiqtol* differs both from its vocalisation elsewhere *and*, more specifically, from its vocalisation before other non-preterite *yiqtol* verbs. This, of course, also raises the question regarding whether or not a *waw* + *yiqtol* form was interpreted as a preterite or non-preterite form in the Second Temple period. A number of tools will be utilised to answer such a question, not least the ancient translations.

In the following sections, we will deal with the material in a three-step process. First, we will enumerate all attestations of *waw* + *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* in the Secunda according to the Tiberian tradition. Variations between the vocalisation traditions and ancient translations will be taken into account in order to arrive at a final count in accordance with how these forms are presented in the Secunda. Second, we will analyse each of these groups with respect to the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw*. Third, we will analyse each group with respect to the presence or lack of gemination in the prefix consonant. Finally, conclusions will be drawn regarding the nature of the *wayyiqtol* form as opposed to that of the *waw* + *yiqtol* form in the Secunda.

### 5.2.1. *Waw* + *yiqtol* in the Secunda

In the Secunda, thirteen forms are attested corresponding to Tiberian *waw* + *yiqtol* (Table 10):

Table 10: *Waw* + *yiqtol* in the Secunda according to the Tiberian tradition

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 18.33	וַאֲשִׁיגֶם	ουεσιγημ	‘and I overtake them’
Ps. 18.43	וַאֲשַׁחֲקֶם	ουεσοκημ	‘and I beat them’
Ps. 18.46	וַיִּחַרְגּוּ	ουϊερογου	‘and they come forth trembling’
Ps. 18.47	וַיִּרְם	ουϊαρουμ	‘and [the God ... ] will be exalted’
Ps. 31.4	וַתְּנַהֲלֵנִי	ουθνεελνι	‘and you guide me’
Ps. 31.25	וַיִּאֲמַץ	ουιαεμας	‘and let [your heart] be courageous’
Ps. 32.8	וַאֲוִדְךָ	ουωρεχ	‘and I will teach you’
Ps. 35.26	וַיַּחֲפְרוּ	ουϊφρου	‘and let them be disappointed’
Ps. 35.27	וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ	ουειεσομου	‘and let them rejoice’

Ps. 35.27	וַיֹּאמְרוּ	οὐτωμρου	‘and let them say’
Ps. 49.9	וַיִּקָּר	οὐῖααρ	‘and [the ransom ... ] will be costly’
Ps. 49.10	וַיְחִי	οὐαῖ	‘that he should live’
Isa. 26.2	וַיָּבֹא	οὐῖαβω	‘that [a ... nation] should come’

A survey of the ancient translations indicates that these forms were overwhelmingly interpreted as non-past *yiqṭol* forms in the Second Temple period.<sup>15</sup> There are two exceptional forms, however, which should probably be removed from this list. First, the form *οὐῖααρ* in Ps. 49.9 is universally interpreted as the noun *יָקָר* ‘preciousness; price’ in the ancient translations (Greek: *τιμὴ* ‘price’; Latin: *pretium* ‘price’; Aramaic: *יקר* ‘honour’). Second, the form *οὐαῖ* is more likely to reflect *waw* + *qaṭal*, parallel to *וָחַי*, than *waw* + *yiqṭol*, parallel to *וַיְחִי*. On the other hand, the Secunda parallel to Tiberian *וַיַּעֲזְרֶה* ‘[God] helps it (fs)’ (Ps. 46.6), transcribed as *οὐεζρα*, likely reflects a *waw* + *yiqṭol* form and thus should be included in the list even though it is without the conjunction in Tiberian. This is supported by the Hexaplaric translations, which render the form as future (Table 11):

Table 11: *וַיַּעֲזְרֶה* (Ps. 46.6) in the Hexapla

<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Aquila</i>	<i>Symmachus</i>	<i>LXX</i>	<i>Quinta</i>
<i>οὐεζρα</i>	<i>βοηθήσει αὐτῇ</i>	<i>βοηθήσει αὐτῇ</i>	<i>βοηθήσει αὐτῇ</i>	<i>βοηθήσει αὐτῇ</i>
‘uezra’	‘will help her’	‘will help her’	‘will help her’	‘will help her’

Yuditsky (2017, 184–85) interprets *οὐεζρα* as reflecting *וַיַּעֲזְרֶה* ‘and its (fs) help’, but it is perfectly consistent with the phonology and

<sup>15</sup> Aquila never translates with a past tense, Symmachus renders only Ps. 18.38 and Ps. 18.43 as past, the LXX renders only Ps. 18.46 as past, and the Quinta renders only Ps. 18.46 as past.



orthographic conventions of the Secunda to suggest that *ουεζρα* reflects /w-jeʕzrā(h)/, parallel to וְיַעְזְרָה ‘and will help (3MS) her’ (Kantor 2017, 234–35). In addition, as will be explained below, the form *ουιδεαββερ* וַיִּדְבֵּר ‘and he subdued’ (Ps. 18.48) is probably better interpreted as a *waw* + *yiqtol* form than as a *wayyiqtol* form in the Secunda. This results in thirteen total attestations of *waw* + *yiqtol* (non-preterite) forms in the Secunda.

### 5.2.2. Wayyiqtol in the Secunda

In the Secunda, nineteen forms are attested corresponding to Tiberian *wayyiqtol* (Table 12):

Table 12: wayyiqtol in the Secunda according to the Tiberian tradition

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 5.5	וַיְחִי	ουαεεει	‘and [Adam] lived’
Gen. 33.4	וַיִּשָּׁקֵהוּ	ουεσσακη	‘and he kissed him’
Gen. 34.2	וַיִּשְׁכַּב	ουεσχαβ	‘and he lay’
Lev. 1.1	וַיִּקְרָא	ουικρα	‘and he called’
2 Kgs 4.35	וַיִּגְהַר	ουיעγαρ	‘and he stretched’
Isa. 9.5	וַיִּקְרָא	ουιεκρα	‘and he called’
Hos. 11.1	וְאַהֲבֵהוּ	ουεαβηου	‘and I loved him’
Ps. 8.6	וְתַחַסְרֵהוּ	ουθασρηου	‘and you made him lower’
Ps. 18.33	וַיִּתֵּן	ουιεθθεν	‘and he set’
Ps. 18.36	וְתַתֵּן	ουθεθθεν	‘and you gave’
Ps. 18.40	וְתִאֲזַנִּי	ουθεζορηγι	‘and you equipped me’
Ps. 18.48	וַיִּדְבֵּר	ουιδεαββερ	‘and he subdued’
Ps. 28.7	וַיַּעֲלֶז	ουαιαλεζ	‘and [my heart] trusted’
Ps. 28.7 (bis)	וַיַּעֲלֶז	ουαιαλεζ	‘and [my heart] trusted’
Ps. 30.12	וְתִאֲזַנִּי	ουεθαζερηγι	‘and you clothed me’
Ps. 35.21	וַיִּרְחִיבוּ	ουειεριβου	‘and they opened wide’

Ps. 44.19	וַתָּט	ουαθετ	‘and departed (3fs)’
Ps. 49.15	וַיִּרְדּוּ	ουιαρδου	‘and [the upright] ruled’
Ps. 89.39	וַתִּמָּאס	ουαθθεμας	‘and you rejected’

While the overwhelming majority of the ancient translations interpret these forms as past tense, the following three forms exhibit mixed evidence:  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\epsilon\delta\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\rho$  וַיִּדְבֵּר (Ps. 18.48);  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\alpha\rho\delta\sigma\upsilon$  וַיִּדֹּו (Ps. 49.15);  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha$  וַיִּקְרָא (Isa. 9.5) (Table 13):

Table 13: Ancient translations interpretation of  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\epsilon\delta\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\rho$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\alpha\rho\delta\omicron\upsilon$ , and  $\sigma\upsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha$  (Aq. = Aquila, Sy. = Symmachus, LXX = Septuagint, V. = Quinta, Th. = Theodotion, VL = *Vetus Latina*/Old Latin, Vul. = Vulgate, Tar. = Targum)

	οὐῖδαββεϛ (Ps. 18.48)	οὐιαρδου (Ps. 49.15)	οὐιεκρα (Isa. 9.5)
<b>Aq.</b>	(καὶ) συνοδῶσει CONJ FUT 'and he will lead'	καὶ ἐπικρατήσουσι(ν) CONJ FUT 'and they will rule over'	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν CONJ PAST.ACT 'and he called'
<b>Sy.</b>	καὶ ὑποτάσσω(ν) CONJ PRES.PTCP 'and subjecting'	καὶ ὑποτάξουσι(ν) CONJ FUT 'and they will subject'	καὶ κληθήσεται CONJ FUT.PASS 'and will be called'
<b>LXX</b>	καὶ ὑποτάξας CONJ PAST.PTCP 'and having subjected'	καὶ κατακυριεύσωσι(ν) CONJ SUBJ 'and let them lord over'	καὶ καλεῖται CONJ FUT.MED-PASS 'and is called'
<b>V.</b>	(καὶ) ὑποτάσσω(ν) CONJ PRES.PTCP 'and subjecting'	(καὶ) κατακυριεύσωσιν CONJ SUBJ 'and let them lord over'	-
<b>Th.</b>	-	καταχθήσονται FUT.PASS 'they will be lead down'	(καὶ ἐκάλεσεν) CONJ PAST.ACT 'and he called'
<b>VL</b>	<i>et subdidisti</i> CONJ PAST.ACT 'and you subjected'	<i>et obtinebunt</i> CONJ FUT 'and they will hold fast'	<i>et vocatur</i> CONJ PRES.PASS 'and is called'
<b>Vul.</b>	<i>et congregas</i> CONJ PRES.ACT 'and you gather'	<i>et subicient</i> CONJ FUT 'and they will subject'	<i>et vocabitur</i> CONJ FUT.PASS 'and will be called'
<b>Tar.</b>	ומתבר CONJ PTCP 'and breaking'	ותברו CONJ PAST 'and they broke'	ואתקרי CONJ PAST.PASS 'and was called'

In the case of *οι̇εδαββερ*, only the LXX and the Vulgate render with past tense. The other translations have a present or future. In light of the fact that it also deviates from the Tiberian form in terms of verbal stem, i.e., *piʿel* and instead of *hiʿil*, it is probably better to regard this form as regular *waw* + *yiqtol* rather than *wayyiqtol*—this is tabulated in the final count of the *waw* + *yiqtol* list above.

The form *ουιαρδου* is rendered as past only in the Targum. The remaining translations render it as a future (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Old Latin, Vulgate) or a jussive (LXX [but note that other LXX MSS have a regular future form: *κατακυριεύσουσιν* ‘they will rule/lord over’], Quinta). Another problem with a Tiberian interpretation of *ουιαρδου* is that the initial vowel of the verb is *α* instead of the expected *η* for the *yiqtol* form. A more likely interpretation, therefore, is *waw* + *qatal* indicating future tense, i.e., *ουιαρδου* = *וַיִּרְדּוּ* (Yuditsky 2017, 117). Such an interpretation would assume some degree of root contamination between *וַיִּרְדּוּ* and *וַיִּרְדּוּ*, but similar root confusion is attested elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew. Therefore, this form is excluded from our analysis altogether.

Finally, the form *ουιεκρα* presents several interpretive problems, even apart from looking at the transcriptions or the ancient translations. First, it is found in a prophetic context, which can lead to the semantic meaning (past) being different from the pragmatic meaning (future). Second, it is used in an impersonal sense, which can also lead to translations oscillating between an active verb and a passive verb. These mixed approaches are both attested in the ancient translations. While there is a strong case

for interpreting the form as a *waw* + *yiqtol*, the fact that Aquila, Theodotion, and the Targum all translate the form as past should give pause in doubting the MT here. Accordingly, this form should remain in our tabulation of *wayyiqtol* forms.

We are left with seventeen *wayyiqtol* forms in the Secunda. Having analysed and categorised the data into *waw* + *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* forms, then, we may now proceed to analyse the data statistically with respect to both the presence of a transcribed vowel after the conjunction and gemination of the prefix consonant.

### 5.2.3. Conjunction *waw* + *vowel* in the Secunda

As might be expected in light of our earlier discussion regarding the conjunction *waw* in the Secunda (§5.1.2), the *waw* + *yiqtol* forms almost never have a vowel transcribed after the conjunction *waw* (Tables 14–15):

Table 14: *Waw* + *yiqtol* in the Secunda: Conjunction *waw* + *vowel*

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Translation
Ps. 35.27	וְשִׂמְחוּ	ουειεσομου	‘and let them rejoice’

Table 15: *Waw* + *yiqtol* in the Secunda: Vowelless conjunction *waw*

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Translation
Ps. 18.33	וְאֶשְׁיָגֶם	ουεσιγημ	‘and I overtake them’
Ps. 18.43	וְאֶשְׁחַקֶּם	ουεσοαημ	‘and I beat them’
Ps. 18.46	וְיִחְרְגוּ	ουιερογου	‘and they come forth trembling’
Ps. 18.47	וְיִרְוֶם	ουιαρουμ	‘and [the God ... ] will be exalted’
Ps. 18.48	וְיִדְבֹּר	ουιεδαβερ	‘and he subdued’
Ps. 31.4	וְתִנְהַלֵּנִי	ουθνελνι	‘and you guide me’

Ps. 31.25	וַיֵּאמֶן	συιαεμας	‘and let [your heart] be courageous’
Ps. 32.8	וְאֶנִּי	συωρεα	‘and I will teach you’
Ps. 35.26	וַיִּחְפְּרוּ	συϊφρου	‘and let them be disappointed’
Ps. 35.27	וַיֵּאמְרוּ	συιωμρου	‘and let them say’
Ps. 46.6	וַיֵּצֵרָהּ	συεζρα	‘and he will help her’
Isa. 26.2	וַיָּבֵא	συιαβω	‘that [a ... nation] should come’

The only instance in which the conjunction *waw* in a *waw* + *yiqṭol* form has a vowel, συειεσομου וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ ‘and let them rejoice’ (Ps. 35.27), probably has an explanation specific to its environment. The preceding word ends in a long unstressed /ū/ (ιαποννου συειεσομου וַיִּרְצוּ וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ) and thus the conjunction /w-/ might not have been pronounced at all if it was not consonantal (Kantor 2017, 347–48).<sup>16</sup> In other words, if the conjunction *waw* had been pronounced with the expected vocalic realisation of [(?)u(:)] in the sequence \**yāronnū* (?)*ŭ*-*yesomhū*, it would have been prone to elision or misperception, so that the entire sequence would have sounded more like \**yāronnū yesomhū* (i.e., without a conjunction before the second verb). It may be, then, that the consonantal allophone of the conjunction *waw* was used to prevent such confusion.

The *wayyiqṭol* forms, on the other hand, are transcribed with a vowel in nearly half the attestations (Tables 16–17):

<sup>16</sup> This has parallels in the distribution and realisation of the conjunction *waw* /w-/ as [u-] and [w-] in Syrian Arabic (Kantor 2017, 347–48).

Table 16: *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda: Conjunction *waw* + vowel

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 5.5	וַיְחִי	ουαεεει	‘and [Adam] lived’
Ps. 28.7	וַיַּעֲלֵז	ουαϊαλεζ	‘and [my heart] trusted’
Ps. 28.7 ( <i>bis</i> )	וַיַּעֲלֵז	ουαϊαλεζ	‘and [my heart] trusted’
Ps. 30.12	וַתַּאזְרֵנִי	ουεθαζεργει	‘and you clothed me’
Ps. 35.21	וַיִּרְחִיבוּ	ουεϊεριβου	‘and they opened wide’
Ps. 44.19	וַתָּט	ουαθετ	‘and departed (3fs)’
Ps. 89.39	וַתִּמְאַס	ουαθθεμας	‘and you rejected’

Table 17: *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda: Vowelless conjunction *waw*

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 33.4	וַיִּשָּׁקֵהוּ	ουεσσακη	‘and he kissed him’
Gen. 34.2	וַיִּשְׁכַּב	ουεσχαβ	‘and he lay’
Lev. 1.1	וַיִּקְרָא	ουϊκρα	‘and he called’
2 Kgs 4.35	וַיִּגְהַר	ουϊεγαρ	‘and he stretched’
Isa. 9.5	וַיִּקְרָא	ουιεκρα	‘and he called’
Hos. 11.1	וְאֶהְבֵּהוּ	ουεαβηου	‘and I loved him’
Ps. 8.6	וַתַּחֲסֶרְהוּ	ουθασρηου	‘and you made him lower’
Ps. 18.33	וַיִּתֵּן	ουϊεθθεν	‘and he set’
Ps. 18.36	וַתִּתֵּן	ουθεθθεν	‘and you gave’
Ps. 18.40	וַתַּאזְרֵנִי	ουθεζεοργει	‘and you equipped me’

The data with respect to the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw*, both in *waw* + *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* forms, may be summarised in the following chart (Table 18):

Table 18: Distribution of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* in *waw* + *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* forms in the Secunda

	<i>ou-</i>	<i>ouα-/oue-</i>	<b>Total</b>
<b><i>waw</i> + <i>yiqtol</i></b>	12 (92%)	1 (8%)	13
<b><i>wayyiqtol</i></b>	10 (59%)	7 (41%)	17
<b>Total</b>	22	8	30

The chart clearly indicates that there is a much greater tendency full vowel with the *waw* of a preterite *wayyiqtol* form (transcribed with  $\alpha$  in all but one case) than with that of a non-preterite *waw* + *yiqtol* form. At the same time, however, this tendency affects fewer than half of the forms, with most forms of the conjunction *waw* exhibiting no difference when preceding a preterite *yiqtol* form as opposed to a non-preterite *yiqtol*.

#### 5.2.4. Conjunction *waw* + *gemination* in the Secunda

Because there is no way of indicating a geminated *yod* in the transcriptions, only the 3FS and 2MS forms are given to an analysis with respect to gemination. This amounts to one form of *waw* + *yiqtol* and six forms of *wayyiqtol* (Tables 19–21):

Table 19: *Waw* + *yiqtol* in the Secunda: Singleton prefix consonant

<b><i>Verse</i></b>	<b><i>Tiberian</i></b>	<b><i>Secunda</i></b>	<b><i>Translation</i></b>
Ps. 31.4	וְתַנְהִלֵּנִי	ουθνεελνι	‘and you guide me’

Table 20: *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda: Singleton prefix consonant

<b><i>Verse</i></b>	<b><i>Tiberian</i></b>	<b><i>Secunda</i></b>	<b><i>Translation</i></b>
Ps. 8.6	וְתַחְסֶרְהוּ	ουθασρηου	‘and you made him lower’
Ps. 18.36	וְתָתַן	ουθεθθεν	‘and you gave’
Ps. 18.40	וְתַאֲזָרְנִי	ουθεζορηνι	‘and you equipped me’

Ps. 30.12	וַתִּצְרֶנִי	ουεθαζερηνι	‘and you clothed me’
Ps. 44.19	וַתֵּשֶׁבֶת	ουαθετ	‘and departed (3fs)’

Table 21: *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda: Geminated prefix consonant

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 89.39	וַתִּמְצֵא	ουαθθεμας	‘and you rejected’

It is no surprise, of course, that the *waw* + *yiqtol* form is not transcribed with gemination. Of the 6 *wayyiqtol* forms which could possibly exhibit gemination in the Greek transcriptions, however, only 1 is transcribed with gemination: ουαθθεμας וַתִּמְצֵא ‘and you rejected’ (Ps. 89.39). The data may be summarised in the following chart (Table 22):

Table 22: Distribution of geminated θθ after the conjunction *waw* in 3FS/2MS *waw* + *yiqtol*/*wayyiqtol* forms in the Secunda

	θ	θθ	Total
<b><i>waw</i> + <i>yiqtol</i></b>	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1
<b><i>wayyiqtol</i></b>	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	6
<b>Total</b>	6	1	7

This chart indicates that the gemination of the prefix consonant, though attested and present in the language, was by no means regular in the Hebrew of the Secunda.

To be fair, however, we might also note that only three of the six instances of a 3FS or 2MS form have a vowel transcribed after the conjunction *waw*. Among the attested Biblical Hebrew reading traditions, a geminated consonant must be preceded by a full vowel. Therefore, it may be more appropriate to suggest



that of those instances which could possibly reflect a double letter in the Secunda, only one in three (33 percent) exhibit gemination. The two instances without gemination may have alternative explanations (see §5.6.2).

Finally, it should be noted that although Greek script is incapable of explicitly indicating a geminated *yod*, there are certain conventions which always accompany geminated *yod*. For example, while singleton (consonantal) /j/ may be written with regular *iota* (ι) or *iota* with *diaeresis* (ï) in the Secunda, geminated /jj/ seems to have been written only with ĭ (Yuditsky 2017, 32–33). Thus, it is likely that gemination is also reflected in 3M forms, such as οὐαῖαλεζ̄ וַיַּעֲלֶזְ ‘and [my heart] trusted’ (Ps. 28.7) and οὐεῖερίβου וַיִּרְחִיבוּ ‘and they opened wide’ (Ps. 35.21).

### 5.3. ‘*Shewa*’, the Conjunction *Waw*, and Gemination in Jerome

#### 5.3.1. *Shewa*

While the Secunda normally leaves the parallel to Tiberian *shewa* unrepresented, and less frequently transcribes it with an /a/ or /e/ vowel, Jerome tends to transcribe the parallel to *shewa* with a vocalic grapheme more often than not, most frequently with *a* and slightly less frequently with *e* (Table 23):

Table 23

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Nah. 1.8	מְקוֹמָהּ	<i>macoma</i>	‘her place’
Joel 3.5	וּבְשָׂרֵיהֶם	<i>saridim</i>	‘survivors’
Hos. 1.2	זְנוּנִים	<i>zanunim</i>	‘whoredom’
comm. Isa. 7.14	בְּתוּלָה	<i>bethula</i>	‘virgin’
comm. Ob. 21	פְּלִטִים	<i>pheletim</i>	‘escaped ones’

Most examples of *a* corresponding to Tiberian vocalic *shewa* also happen to correspond to the historical vowel (e.g., *macoma*, *saridim*).<sup>17</sup> This may indicate that *e* was the normal representation of a reduced vowel and that instances of *a* actually reflect the preservation of the historical vowel rather than a reduced ‘*shewa*’ vowel.

There are also examples, especially in the environment of sibilants and sonorants, in which the parallel to vocalic *shewa* is omitted in transcription (Table 24; Kantor 2017, 328):

Table 24

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Isa. 40.20	הַמְּסָכֵן	<i>amsuchan</i>	‘the poor one’
Isa. 62.12	דְּרוּשָׁה	<i>drusa</i>	‘sought out (fs)’
Ps. 20.10	בְּיוֹם-	<i>biom</i>	‘when; in the day of (cstr.)’

It might seem that because the parallel to *shewa* in Jerome is represented with a vocalic grapheme more often than not, the significance of a vocalic grapheme being transcribed after the

<sup>17</sup> There are, however, a few examples in which *a* does not correspond to the historical vowel (e.g., *zanunim* זְנוּנִים [*< \*zunūnīm/\*zinūnīm*]).

conjunction *waw* before potential *wayyiqṭol* forms would be diminished. Based on the behaviour of the conjunction *waw* in Jerome's transcriptions, however, this is not the case (see below).

### 5.3.2. Conjunction *waw*

In Jerome's transcriptions, the conjunction *waw* is normally represented by *u* with no subsequent vowel (Table 25; Kantor 2017, 348):

Table 25

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 14.18	וְהוּא	<i>uhu</i>	'and he'
Gen. 14.20	וּבְרֹךְ	<i>ubaruch</i>	'and blessed (ms)'
Isa. 7.12	וְלֹא	<i>ulo</i>	'and [I] will not'
Ezek. 40.49	וְרֹחַב	<i>urob</i>	'and width'
Ps. 76.4	וּמִלְחָמָה	<i>umalama</i>	'and war'

As with the *Secunda*, instances in which the conjunction *waw* is transcribed with a subsequent vowel occur in two environments: (1) preceding a word-initial consonant cluster or (2) preceding a monosyllabic stressed noun in a natural linguistic pair (Tables 26–27; Kantor 2017, 348):

Table 26: Rule (1): Conjunction *waw* before word-initial consonant cluster

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 104.25	וְרֹחַב	<i>uarab</i>	'and wide of'

Table 27: Rule (2): Conjunction *waw* before stressed monosyllabic word

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Gen. 14.18	לֶחֶם וַיַּיִן	<i>lehem uaiain</i>	'bread and wine'

In sum, a vowel is transcribed after the conjunction *waw* in Jerome's transcriptions according to the same distribution as in the Secunda. If anything, the transcriptions of Jerome exhibit even more consistency and fewer exceptions.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, if we find a vowel transcribed after the conjunction *waw* before a *yiqtol* verbal form, it is unlikely to reflect a phonological reality parallel to vocalic *shewa* in Tiberian or Babylonian.

### 5.3.3. Gemination

In Jerome's transcriptions, much like the Secunda, the representation of gemination is generally reliable. Unfortunately, because all of the *wayyiqtol* forms attested in Jerome are 3MS forms, the Latin script does not explicitly indicate whether the form was read with a geminate or singleton *yod*. Nevertheless, certain principles of syllable structure may indicate gemination in at least one form (see below).

## 5.4. *Wayyiqtol* in Jerome

Due to the nature of the data, the present section on Jerome is significantly less detailed than the previous section on the Secunda with respect to two points. First, because there are no *waw* + *yiqtol* (non-preterite) forms in Jerome, we are unable to compare the behaviour of the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqtol* forms to its behaviour before a regular *yiqtol* form. Second, because

---

<sup>18</sup> The singular exception to these rules is *uares* וָאֶרֶץ 'and earth' (Gen. 14.19). According to rule (2), we might expect this word to be transcribed as *\*\*uaares*. However, it is also possible that the singular *a* grapheme could represent a long vowel with elision of the guttural.

there are no verbal forms beginning with a prefix consonant other than *yod*, the section on gemination contains only a tentative suggestion based on syllable structure rather than a statistical analysis. Nevertheless, the data from Jerome's transcriptions concerning the presence of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqṭol* form are relevant and given to analysis.

#### 5.4.1. Wayyiqṭol in Jerome

In Jerome's transcriptions, six forms are attested which correspond to *wayyiqṭol* in the Tiberian tradition (Table 28; but cf. the forms without the conjunction in §6.2.3):

Table 28: *Wayyiqṭol* in Jerome according to the Tiberian tradition

Verse	Tiberian	Jerome	Translation
Num. 1.1	וַיִּדְבֹּר	<i>uaiedabber</i>	'and [the LORD] spoke'
Lev. 1.1	וַיִּקְרָא	<i>uaiecra</i>	'and he called'
Gen. 4.15	וַיֹּאמֶר	<i>uaiomer</i>	'and [the LORD] said'
Gen. 14.19	וַיְבָרְכֵהוּ	<i>uaibarcheu</i>	'and he blessed him'
Gen. 14.19	וַיֹּאמֶר	<i>uaiomer</i>	'and [the LORD] said'
Gen. 14.20	וַיֵּתֶן	<i>uaiethen</i>	'and he gave'

Because every example here is found in a clear narrative past context, there is no reason to suggest that any of these forms would be *waw* + *yiqṭol* (non-preterite).

#### 5.4.2. Conjunction *waw* + vowel in Jerome

It is significant that all six instances (100 percent) of *wayyiqṭol* are preceded by the conjunction *waw* with the vowel *a* transcribed after it (*ua-*). While we have no *waw* + *yiqṭol* (non-preterite) forms to which we may compare the conjunction *waw* in

these forms, we may reiterate the standard rules for the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* in Jerome's transcriptions: the conjunction *waw* (1) is generally vocalised as *u-*, (2) before an initial consonant cluster is vocalised as *ua-*, and (3) before a monosyllabic stressed noun is vocalised as *ua-*. Aside from the transcriptions *uaiedabber* and *uaibarcheu*, the verbal part of which could be interpreted as beginning with a consonant cluster (see §5.4.3 for the significance of this), there is no reason for any of the other forms to be transcribed with a vowel after the conjunction *waw*.

Accordingly, we may conclude that the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqṭol* forms in Jerome was normally pronounced with a full vowel, which is markedly distinct from its pronunciation elsewhere. The presence of this vowel probably also indicates following gemination, though this is not explicitly indicated (see §§5.4.3; 5.6).

#### 5.4.3. Conjunction *waw* + *gemination* in Jerome

The only evidence regarding the potential gemination of the prefix consonant in Jerome's transcriptions is based on syllable structure. As stated above, there are two instances of *wayyiqṭol* in Jerome's transcriptions in which the verbal prefix is vocalised with *shewa* in the Tiberian tradition (Table 29):

Table 29

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Jerome</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Num. 1.1	וַיְדַבֵּר	<i>uaiedabber</i>	'and [the LORD] spoke'
Gen. 14.19	וַיְבָרְכֵהוּ	<i>uaibarcheu</i>	'and he blessed him'

In the case of *uaiedabber*, Jerome actually transcribes the very same form elsewhere, but without a prefixed *waw* (Table 30):

Table 30

Verse	Tiberian	Jerome	Translation
Isa. 32.6	יִדְבֵּר	<i>idabber</i>	‘[a fool] speaks’

There is a tendency in the ancient transcriptions for the parallel to *yod* with vocalic *shewa* in Tiberian to be represented merely with Greek ι (without *diaeresis* ¨) or Latin *i* without any subsequent vowel. By comparing the representation of the prefix *yod* in *yiqṭol* forms of the *piʿel* with its representation in the *qal*, I have argued elsewhere that this representation indicates an initial cluster realised phonemically as /jC-/ and phonetically as [(ʔ)i(:)C-] (Kantor 2017, 334–38).

Therefore, it may be possible to explain the different representations of the vocalisation of *yod* in *uaiedabber* and *idabber* on the basis of gemination. In the form *idabber*, the initial *id-* was most likely vocalised as something like /jd-/ [(ʔ)i(:)ð-]. In the form *uaiedabber*, however, gemination may have preserved the consonantal realisation of the *yod*, i.e., /wajjed-/ [wajjið-]. The form *uaibarcheu*, on the other hand, might represent the lack of gemination (or degemination) due to the fact that *yod* is not transcribed with a following vowel. It should be noted, however, that such an argument is only speculative, since there is variation in the representation of the parallel to word-initial *yod* with *shewa* elsewhere in Jerome. Nevertheless, the contrast between *uaiedabber* and *idabber* is compelling. Also, the fact that gemination is already evidenced in the *Secunda*, though rare, would suggest that if the full vowel had become universal in Jerome’s tradition, then gemination likely had as well.

### 5.5. Diachrony: Comparing the Secunda and Jerome

A clear diachronic trajectory in the development of the conjunction *waw* in these forms is evident on the basis of a comparison between the transcriptions of *wayyiqtol* in the Secunda and in Jerome. Though both operated in Palestine, nearly two centuries separates Origen from Jerome; the original text of the Secunda itself likely pre-dates Origen by a century or more.<sup>19</sup>

Due to the nature of the evidence in Jerome's transcriptions, it is not possible to compare the two traditions with respect to the presence of gemination or lack thereof in the *wayyiqtol* form. Nevertheless, there are ample data for comparing the presence or lack of a vowel following the conjunction *waw* in these forms.

#### 5.5.1. Conjunction *waw* + vowel in *wayyiqtol* Forms in the Secunda and Jerome

From the transcriptions of the Secunda to those of Jerome, there is a clear increase in the frequency with which the conjunction *waw* is transcribed with a vowel (Table 31):

Table 31: Transcription of a vowel following the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqtol* forms in the Secunda and Jerome

	<i>Secunda</i> (ca. 1st–3rd CE)	<i>Jerome</i> (4th/5th CE)	<i>Total</i>
<i>ov- or u-</i>	10 (59%)	0 (0%)	10
<i>ova-/ove- or ua-</i>	7 (41%)	6 (100%)	13
<i>Total</i>	17	6	23

<sup>19</sup> See Kantor (2017, 38–47).



Not only does the frequency with which the conjunction *waw* vocalised with a following vowel increase from the Secunda to Jerome, it seems to become universally standardised before all *wayyiqtol* forms, with 100 percent of cases transcribed as *ua-*.

While one could argue that such a discrepancy could be the result of a statistical coincidence due to the dearth of the material, a subset of the data would argue against this. It just so happens that two of the six forms in Jerome have exact (or near exact) parallels with forms found also in the Secunda, in which all are attested without a following vowel (Table 32):

Table 32

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Jerome</i>
Lev. 1.1	וַיִּקְרָא	ουῖκρα	<i>uaiecra</i>
Ps. 18.33	וַיִּתֵּן	ουῖεθεν	
Ps. 18.36	וַתִּתֵּן לִי	ουθεθεν λι	
Gen. 14.20	וַיִּתֵּן לִי		<i>uaiethen lo</i>

Though not from the Secunda, additional evidence is found in an early list of the Hebrew names of the books of the Bible transcribed into Greek. In this list, which should probably be dated to the first or second century CE, an alternative name of the Book of Numbers transcribed into Greek (taken alongside that of Jerome) also seems to exhibit the same development.<sup>20</sup>

Table 33

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Name List</i>	<i>Jerome</i>
Num. 1.1	וַיְדַבֵּר	ουιδαβηρ	<i>uaiedabber</i>

<sup>20</sup> For more on this list and its various attestations, see Audet (1950); Torrey (1952); Jepsen (1959); Goodblatt (1982).

All of this evidence would seem to suggest that the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* form changed over time. While some would argue that these differences could also be ascribed to mere differences in contemporaneous but distinct traditions, there are a number of reasons for regarding such a theory as less plausible. First, Origen (and most likely the original text of the *Secunda*) and Jerome both operated in Palestine. While multiple traditions did exist within Palestine in late antiquity, the chronological difference here is far more apparent than any potential geographical or communal one. Second, aside from its behaviour in *wayyiqtol* forms, the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* has the same distribution and is governed by the same rules in the *Secunda* and Jerome. Rule (1) is especially significant, since the behaviour of the conjunction *waw* before an initial cluster (i.e., *shewa*) is not identical between Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian, and Samaritan. The fact that both the *Secunda* and Jerome exhibit similarity here would suggest that the distinct behaviour of the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqtol* forms is not likely to be attributed *solely* to Jerome representing a contemporaneous yet distinct tradition. Therefore, while we cannot entirely discount the possibility that the *Secunda* transcriptions and Jerome merely represent different Hebrew traditions existing contemporaneously, their geographic proximity, yet chronological distance, together with their close affinity in the vocalisation of the conjunction *waw* elsewhere, suggest that clear trajectories of change from Origen to Jerome (with respect to the *wayyiqtol* form) are best explained as a function of diachrony rather than contemporaneous linguistic diversity.

If one were to disregard the data of Jerome, one could suggest that both a full vowel and gemination were original to the *wayyiqtol* form and that the Secunda reflects a tradition in which a distinct *wayyiqtol* pronunciation was fading away due to the fact that the regular use of *wayyiqtol* had faded out of the language in Late Biblical Hebrew. However, because we can discern a clear diachronic trajectory from the Secunda to Jerome, it is far more likely that there was originally no distinction in pronunciation between the conjunction *waw* before a preterite *yiqtol* form and a non-preterite *yiqtol* form in earlier stages of Hebrew. This diachronic reconstruction is further supported by the evidence from Samaritan Hebrew (see below).

### 5.5.2. Primacy of the Vowel or Gemination?

Finally, we must also consider the question as to whether it was primarily the full vowel or gemination that first distinguished the conjunction *waw* in the preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form at the time of the Secunda. After all, of the six forms which could possibly indicate gemination in the Secunda, three are transcribed with a following vowel and only one is transcribed with gemination (Table 34):

Table 34: *Wayyiqtol* in the Secunda: Forms with vowel and/or gemination in 2MS/3FS forms

<i>Verse</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Secunda</i>	<i>Translation</i>
Ps. 30.12	וְתַאֲזִינִי	ουεθαζεργινι	‘and you clothed me’
Ps. 44.19	וְתָט	ουαθετ	‘and departed (3FS)’
Ps. 89.39	וְתַמְאֵס	ουαθθεμας	‘and you rejected’

Because a vowel can be transcribed without gemination in *wayyiqṭol* forms in the Secunda, one might argue that this distribution actually suggests that the presence of a full vowel has primacy over gemination. On the other hand, the presence of a vowel after each of the other two forms cited here (*ουεθαζερηνι*, *ουαθετ*) actually accords with the normal rules governing the presence of a vowel after the conjunction *waw* elsewhere in the Secunda (§5.1.2). In the case of *ουεθαζερηνι*, the conjunction *waw* precedes an initial cluster (assuming /ʔ/ had not elided). In the case of *ουαθετ*, the conjunction *waw* precedes a monosyllabic stressed word. These might be sporadic instantiations of such rules playing out, since they are by no means universal in the Secunda. One might also explain the omission of transcribed gemination in these forms in light of its occurrence on a morpheme boundary. Moreover, although it cannot be explicitly indicated by the script, it should be noted that gemination is also probably present in some of the 3M preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* forms (see §5.2.4).

At the same time, the transcriptions with a vowel and no gemination may indeed point to the primacy of the full vowel in the development of these forms. On this point, however, the claims of Loprieno (1980, 10) and Joüon and Muraoka (2009, 128) that gemination was introduced to preserve the original historical short (but full) vowel *\*/a/* of the conjunction *waw* seem to be contradicted by the form *ουαθθεμας* *וַאֲנִי* (Ps. 89.39). Gemination would not have been necessary to preserve such a vowel according to the phonotactics of the Secunda (see §§5.2.3; 6.1). Further, the idea that the full */a/* vowel was an integral (or

grammaticalised) part of the form seems to be contradicted by the conception of the morphological elements of these forms in late antiquity (see §6.2.3).

Revell's (1984) account, on the other hand, which suggests that the distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* constituted (initially) a lengthened vowel in pre-tonic position, is worth further consideration. The only *wayyiqtol* form with word-initial stress with which we could test this claim, *ουαθετ* וַתֵּן (Ps. 44.19), would seem to support his theory, in that it exhibits a vowel and no following gemination. Presumably, the gemination in *ουαθθεμας* וַתִּתְּנֵם (Ps. 89.39) would be explained by Revell as a way of maintaining the lengthened first syllable even though the conjunction *waw* did not precede a stressed syllable. Finally, for what it's worth, the compounds *בַּמָּה/הַבָּמָה* and *בַּמָּה/הַבָּמָה* both exhibit gemination in the transcriptions, e.g., *bamma* בַּמָּה 'in what...?' (Isa. 2.22); *chamma* הַמָּה 'how much/long...?' (Ps. 35.17). Revell's theory is admittedly appealing, especially because it posits a limited and isolated environment consistent with the phonotactics of the language (the conjunction in pre-tonic position) as the launchpad for the more widespread morphophonological change.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, there are several reasons for questioning Revell's theory and for continuing to regard gemination as the primary innovation in these forms.

First, his theory is largely predicated on regarding V:C and VC: as equivalent. Some have raised questions, however, about

---

<sup>21</sup> According to Janda and Joseph (2003), sound changes first occur in a "highly localized context" and then subsequently spread.

whether there is even such a phenomenon as ‘quantitative metathesis’ in Semitic (Huehnergard 2005, 463). In fact, the opposite often occurs in Biblical Hebrew, with just such a contrast (VC: instead of V:C) serving as a phonetic device developed in the reading tradition to distinguish the meaning of otherwise homophonous forms, known as *dagesh mavhin* ‘distinguishing *dagesh*’ (see §6.2.2). Second, there is no apparent reason why forms such as \*וִיקָם, with a lengthened vowel due to word-initial stress, would later be revocalised with gemination as וִיקָם. If the forms with gemination are to be regarded as mere extensions of the form with the long vowel, but modified according to the phonotactics of the language, it is unlikely that gemination would later be generalised across the entire paradigm. This especially in light of the fact that three of the most common six *wayyiqtol* verbs (וַיִּבְנֶה, וַיַּעַשׂ, וַיִּאָּמֶר) have initial stress in their most frequently attested forms. Moreover, a distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* is not necessary as a distinguishing marker in such cases, since the vowel pattern is already unique to the preterite *yiqtol* form. Third, if the vowel of the conjunction *waw* regularly lengthened before *yiqtol* forms with word-initial stress, it is difficult to explain the contrast between forms like וַיְבָנֶה [viʹji:ven] ‘and let him build!’ (Ezra 1.3) and וַיִּבְנֶה [vaʹji:ven] ‘and he built’ (Gen. 10.11). If the lengthening of the conjunction was originally a purely phonological development, both of these forms would presumably have undergone the same development. Fourth, and finally, positing gemination as the primary distinguishing feature is simply more economical. The complete uniformity of the Jew-

ish reading traditions (Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian) with respect to gemination in *wayyiqtol* is hard to reconcile with Revell's reconstruction, which must posit a stage in which thousands of forms were vocalised with a long vowel and thousands were vocalised with gemination before gemination eventually won out. One would expect at least vestigial attestations of forms such as \*\*וַיִּקְםּ if Revell's theory were correct.

### 5.5.3. Summary

In sum, then, the claim that gemination developed as the primary distinguishing mark of the *wayyiqtol* form remains more plausible. Nevertheless, I remain open to the possibility that Revell's theory or a variation thereof may prove correct. As more data come to light, future research may indeed reveal that the origins of the full vowel [a] are bound up in a more sophisticated explanation than that of merely accompanying the gemination. Nevertheless, based on the evidence from the transcriptions, we may state the following about the realisation of the conjunction *waw* in *wayyiqtol* forms:

- 1) First Temple Period: The diachronic trajectory implied by (2)–(3) (see below) would suggest that the conjunction *waw* was ***pronounced identically*** before a preterite *yiqtol* and non-preterite *yiqtol* form, probably with the original etymological \*/a/ vowel:
  - PRETERITE: \**wa-yiqtol*
  - NON-PRETERITE: \**wa-yiqtol*
- 2) Late Second Temple Period: The conjunction *waw* was ***usually pronounced identically*** before a preterite

*yiqṭol* and non-preterite *yiqṭol* form, namely, with no full vowel or following gemination. Nevertheless, the conjunction *waw* was also **frequently pronounced distinctly** before a preterite *yiqṭol* form, being vocalised with a full vowel and (probably) gemination:

- PRETERITE: \**w-yiqṭol*; \**wa(y)-yiqṭol*
- NON-PRETERITE: \**w-yiqṭol*

3) Early Byzantine Period: The conjunction *waw* was **always pronounced distinctly** before a preterite *yiqṭol* form (as opposed to before a non-preterite *yiqṭol*), being vocalised with a full vowel and (probably) gemination:

- PRETERITE: \**wa(y)-yiqṭol*
- NON-PRETERITE: \**w-yiqṭol*

This reconstruction suggests that up to some point in the Second Temple period, *yiqṭol* in the sequence \**w-yiqṭol* was a polysemous form, indicating either past or non-past (usually jussive) semantics according to context. In the coming sections, the evidence from the transcriptions will be utilised to suggest a plausible path of development for the distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqṭol* form.

## 6.0. RECONSTRUCTION: THE MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF *WAYYIQṬOL*

In this final section, it will be argued that gemination was introduced into the preterite \**w-yiqṭol* form (> *wayyiqṭol*) during the Second Temple period to distinguish preterite *yiqṭol* from non-preterite *yiqṭol* after the conjunction *waw*. After re-evaluating the



theories regarding the morphological development of *wayyiqtol* in light of the evidence from the transcriptions, we will further elaborate on this theory in full.

### **6.1. Review of Scholarship in Light of Evidence from Transcriptions**

In an earlier section of this paper (§3.0), we suggested that theories for explaining the morphological development of the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* form can be categorised into two main groups: those which regard the gemination as deriving from an early Hebrew or Afro-Asiatic morpheme and those which regard the gemination as a phonetic development due to morpho-syntactic factors.

Based on the evidence from the transcriptions, we can immediately dismiss almost every theory which suggests that the *dagesh* in the prefix consonant is the result of an assimilated /n/ or /j/ of an independent morpheme. This is because most of these theories require that the developments in question occurred at an early stage in Semitic (not even in Hebrew!). Moreover, even Brenner, who suggests that the form entered Hebrew via Israelite scribes as a borrowing from Egyptian, must date the development to the Second Temple period at the latest. If any of these theories were correct, it would be highly unusual that both a full vowel and gemination would be absent in the majority of forms in the *Secunda* and yet be present (at least with respect to the full vowel) in all forms in *Jerome*. After all, gemination in the definite article, which likely derives from an assimilated /n/ (from \*han-) and was introduced into the language during roughly the same

period in which Brenner suggests *wayyiqtol* was adopted, is almost always represented in the Secunda.

Theories that regard the gemination as a phonetic development based on morphosyntactic factors are thus far more plausible. With respect to ‘junctural doubling’, however, the evidence of the transcriptions should caution against accepting such a proposal. In Lambdin’s original article, he suggested that the following four phenomena were all examples of junctural doubling: (1) gemination following the definite article; (2) gemination following the conjunction *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* form; (3) gemination following the relative particle *-š*; and (4) gemination in *deḥiq* constructions. While there are no examples in the transcriptions by which we can evaluate (3), examples of (1), (2), and (4) are all attested. In the case of (1), it has been demonstrated above that the definite article was overwhelmingly realised with gemination in the Secunda (see §5.1.3). In the case of (2), on the other hand, gemination in the *wayyiqtol* form occurs in only a minority of cases (see §5.2.4). Finally, in the case of (4), the only example we have exhibits lack of gemination (Table 35):

Table 35: *Deḥiq* in the Secunda

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Translation
Ps. 8.6	וַתַּחַסְרֵהוּ מַעַט	οὐτθασρησὺ μὰτ	‘and you made him lower’

Three of the four phenomena cited by Lambdin as examples of ‘junctural doubling’ all appear to be at different stages of development at the time of the Secunda. In my view, this suggests that there are serious problems with accepting that ‘junctural doubling’ may explain all that it claims to explain.

Loprieno's theory, which suggests that grammaticalised *\*wayiqtol* was received into Tiberian as *wayyiqtol* due to phonotactic constraints, also deserves further comment. While there is much to commend in his theory,<sup>22</sup> the transcriptions do not support his precise reconstruction. According to Loprieno, the conjunction *\*wa-* was grammaticalised with the full vowel in preterite *\*wayiqtol* before the vowel of the conjunction underwent reduction in other environments; the grammaticalisation is what prevented its reduction before the preterite *yiqtol* form. However, the evidence from the Secunda seems to reflect a stage in which the vowel of the conjunction *waw* had reduced when preceding both preterite *yiqtol* and non-preterite *yiqtol*. Moreover, neither is Loprieno's suggestion that gemination was introduced to preserve the full vowel due to phonotactic constraints supported by the evidence from the Secunda. The Secunda exhibits gemination in at least one *wayyiqtol* form (σουαθημας וַיִּקְרָא [Ps. 89.39]) while not being bound by the same phonotactic constraints as Tiberian—note that a full /a/ vowel can exist far from the stress without gemination in the Secunda, e.g., פָּנֶי וַיִּקְרָא 'the face of (cstr.)' (Ps. 18.43); נַחֲמָוּת וַיִּקְרָא 'vengeances' (Ps. 18.48).

---

<sup>22</sup> Though not mentioned by Loprieno, one might compare the Persian loanword בְּנֵי וַיִּקְרָא 'his palace' (Dan. 11.45). Though the /p/ in the original Persian word *apadāna* is singleton and *not* geminate, it seems that the only way the Tiberian tradition could accurately reflect the [p] sound after a vowel was by marking the consonant with a *dagesh*. In this case, then, gemination serves to accurately reproduce an 'inherited' form that would not otherwise conform to Tiberian Hebrew phonotactics.

With respect to Revell's theory, which is based on stress patterns, see the critique in §5.6.2.

It would seem, then, that none of the theories put forward to explain the full vowel and gemination in the *wayyiqtol* form are consistent with the earliest vocalisation evidence we have, namely, the transcriptions. In the following section, we will propose an alternative solution.

## 6.2. An Alternative Proposal: *Dagesh Mavḥin* 'Distinguishing *Dagesh*'<sup>23</sup>

In this final section, we will argue that the gemination (and thus the preceding full vowel) was an innovative phonetic device which began to be added to the preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form during the mid- to late Second Temple period to distinguish it from the non-preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form. This development may be compared to what is referred to in the literature as *dagesh mavḥin* 'distinguishing *dagesh*'. The introduction of gemination was motivated by the need to preserve and distinguish the past verbal semantics of a form that was falling (or had already fallen) out of use in the spoken language. Such a desire for preservation points to the introduction of gemination in the form being a product of the reading tradition rather than of the living language.

This reconstructed scenario is built on three pieces of supporting evidence, which will form the outline of the rest of this

---

<sup>23</sup> The theory that the gemination in the *wayyiqtol* form is a *dagesh mavḥin* was originally suggested almost three decades ago by Khan (1991, 241; 2013, 43).

section: the disappearance of the sequential tenses from the living language (§6.2.1); parallels of gemination distinguishing homophonous forms attested in other traditions of Hebrew (§6.2.2); and the conception of the morphological components of the *wayyiqṭol* verbal form in late antiquity (§6.2.3). Finally, conclusions and implications for understanding the historical development of the Hebrew reading traditions will be summarised (§§6.2.4–6.2.5).

### 6.2.1. Diachronic Considerations Regarding the Sequential Tenses

In the Second Temple period, the Hebrew verbal system had two sequential tenses, *\*w(a)-yiqṭol* (> *wayyiqṭol*) for the past and *\*w(a)-qaṭal* for the future. As suggested by the transcriptions, the *yiqṭol* form following the conjunction *waw* during this period would have been semantically polysemous, with past and jussive meanings, the semantics of each given form being recognised and differentiated only according to context. Nevertheless, the use of the sequential tenses was stable and pervasive; they are attested and used consistently in a wide array of genres in the biblical text and are found in numerous extra-biblical inscriptions. At some point after the exile (i.e., the Second Temple period), however, the Hebrew verbal system began to reconfigure. One of the results of this reconfiguration was that the sequential tenses began to gradually fade out of common use. This is most apparent in the distribution and function of consecutive forms in Late Biblical Hebrew. However, non-biblical compositions from Qumran clearly indicate that the sequential tenses were still

known and used at a relatively late period, even if due only to the literary character of the compositions rather than to the living language.<sup>24</sup> By the first few centuries CE, as evidenced from Rabbinic Hebrew, use of the sequential tenses had disappeared entirely from the language, being absent even from the literary register. In the syntactic slot following the conjunction *waw*, the ‘non-converted’ forms came to fill the role previously filled by the sequential tenses (i.e., *\*w-yiqṭol* for CONJ + future and *\*w-qāṭal* for CONJ + past). Nevertheless, the sequential tenses continued to be recognised and ‘used’ in the recitation of the Bible and liturgical texts.

In the Secunda (ca. first–third c. CE), the process by which the conjunction *waw* in preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* forms came to be realised distinctly is attested, but incomplete. It is most probable, then, that the initial stages of this innovation began at some point during the Second Temple period or Roman period. It seems hardly coincidental that a phonetic innovation distinguishing an otherwise homophonous form came into being during precisely the same period in which the use of that form was diminishing.

Indeed, this fact brings us to a point of tension between the morphophonological developments of the *wayyiqṭol* form and its syntactic status and usage in the language. On one hand, the preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* form was becoming less and less familiar to users of the language. Simultaneously, *\*w-yiqṭol* with a non-past meaning was becoming the more natural way to read a *yiqṭol* form in

---

<sup>24</sup> Personal communication with Aaron Hornkohl. For more on the development of the sequential forms in Qumran Hebrew, see Eskhult (2018).

this syntactic position. On the other hand, it is precisely during this period that the preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form begins to be pronounced distinctly in the attested vocalisation of Biblical Hebrew, and that not by means of any identifiable morpheme attested elsewhere in the language.

Taken together, these two points suggest that the distinct pronunciation of the preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form by means of gemination was not a natural development of the living language, but rather a deliberate innovation of the reading tradition. While Hebrew speakers would not have had difficulty in distinguishing preterite *\*w(a)-yiqtol* from non-preterite *\*w(a)-yiqtol* in the Second Temple period, the form *\*w-yiqtol* was sounding less and less naturally like a preterite as the Second Temple period progressed and the sequential tenses fell out of use. It would seem, then, that the introduction of gemination was innovated in the reading tradition to preserve the distinct meaning of a past tense form that otherwise might have been perceived as non-past/future.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> The claim that phonetic features such as gemination could be introduced—apart from their being associated with any particular morpheme—solely for the purpose of distinguishing homophonous forms may seem difficult to accept. It is worth noting, however, that the advancement of the stress to the ultima in the other sequential tense likely reflects just such a phenomenon, e.g., כָּתַבְתִּי [k<sup>h</sup>:ʔa:av<sup>h</sup>i:] ‘I wrote’ (Exod. 24.12), but cf. וְכָתַבְתִּי [vaχ<sup>h</sup>:θav<sup>h</sup>i:] ‘and I will write’ (Exod. 34.1) (Revell 1984; but cf. Suchard [2019], who sees the advancement of stress in such forms as the result of sound change). The alternative, that some unidentifiable morpheme with inherent past tense semantics was introduced into the *\*w-yiqtol* form to indicate past tense at a late stage of development, seems far less likely.

This reconstruction is also supported by the development of the preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* form in Samaritan Hebrew, with respect to both absolute chronology and parallel development. Unlike the Jewish reading traditions (Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian), the Samaritan vocalisation exhibits no indication of an original full vowel or gemination in preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* forms. Indeed, in the strong verb, there is no difference between a historically preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* form and a historically non-preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* form (Table 36; Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 108–9, 171–73):

Table 36

<i>waw</i>	<i>yiqṭol</i>	<i>*w-yiqṭol</i> ( <i>non-preterite</i> )	<i>*w-yiqṭol</i> ( <i>preterite</i> )
-ו	ישמר	וישמר	וישמר
<i>w-</i>	<i>yīšmār</i>	<i>wyīšmār</i>	<i>wyīšmār</i>

From a diachronic perspective, it is especially instructive that the Samaritan tradition alone has preserved the homophonous realisation of preterite *\*w-yiqṭol* and non-preterite *\*w-yiqṭol*. As a distinct community, the Samaritans likely split off from the rest of Judaism at some point between the fourth and second centuries BCE.<sup>26</sup> The Samaritan Pentateuch has its origins during this time (ca. third c. BCE) and certain other linguistic innovations, shared by Jewish Hebrew, but absent in Samaritan, suggest that

---

<sup>26</sup> For background regarding the establishment of the Samaritan community and the origins of their version of the Pentateuch, see Kartveit (2009); Pummer (2012).



the Samaritans had their own distinct form of Hebrew by the beginning of the common era at the very latest.<sup>27</sup>

Accordingly, it is almost certainly the case that at the time when the Samaritans split off from the rest of Judaism and began to develop a language tradition of their own, there was still no distinction in the pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* before preterite *yiqtol* and non-preterite *yiqtol*. In terms of absolute chronology, this suggests that the introduction of gemination into these forms in the Jewish Hebrew tradition(s) began at some point between the fourth century BCE and the first or second centuries CE. If it had occurred earlier, we would expect some remnant of a distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* before a preterite *yiqtol* form to be attested, at least vestigially, in Samaritan as well.

How, then, did the Samaritans deal with a form in the biblical text (i.e., preterite *\*w-yiqtol*) which signified the temporal opposite of the same form in their spoken language (i.e., future

---

<sup>27</sup> According to Steiner (2005; 2007), the secondary fricative articulations of the *b g d k p t* consonants in Hebrew did not develop all at once. Spirantisation, which was likely due to the influence of Aramaic, first affected the labial stops /b/, /p/ and dental stops /d/, /t/. Only later, after the uvular fricatives /ġ/ and /ħ/ had merged with the pharyngeal fricatives /ʕ/ and /ħ/, were the velar stops /g/ and /k/ also spirantised. Steiner dates the loss of /ħ/ to the first century BCE and the loss of /ġ/ much earlier. Therefore, the fact that Samaritan Hebrew does not have fricative realisations of the velar stops, but does have fricative realisations of the labial and dental stops, probably indicates that it had already split off from Jewish Hebrew by this time. Alternatively, it could have split off much earlier.

*\*w-yiqtol*)? The tension between the natural impulse to interpret preterite *\*w-yiqtol* forms as future coupled with the awareness that preterite *\*w-yiqtol* was indeed part of the biblical register led the Samaritans to introduce artificial (or non-etymological) distinctions in pronunciation to mark the preterite *\*w-yiqtol* form as signifying past (but only in certain weak verbs). While a number of different strategies for the morphophonological restructuring of the form are discussed in the literature (such as reappropriating coexisting patterns), the most prevalent among them is superimposing the vowel pattern of the past tense (i.e., *fāqāḏ*, *fāqāḏu*) over the *yiqtol* form, even unto the disruption of the root (Table 37):<sup>28</sup>

Table 37

<i>Tiberian</i>	<i>Samaritan</i>	<i>Samaritan</i>	<i>Tiberian</i>
וַיֵּשֶׁב >	<i>wyēšob</i>	<i>wyāšāb</i>	< וַיֵּשֶׁב
וַיַּעֲשֵׂו >	<i>wyeššu</i>	<i>wyāššu</i>	< וַיַּעֲשֵׂו
וַתֵּלֶד >	<i>tēlād</i>	<i>wtālād</i>	< וַתֵּלֶד
וַיִּפְּנוּ >	<i>tifnu</i>	<i>wyāfānu</i>	< וַיִּפְּנוּ
וַיִּבְרָא >	<i>yibri</i>	<i>wyibra</i>	< וַיִּבְרָא

It would seem, then, that once the sequential tenses fell out of use in the living language, it was not unusual to introduce non-etymological features to preserve the original past meaning of preterite *\*w-yiqtol*. In light of the evidence examined here, such a phenomenon appears to have developed in parallel in both the

<sup>28</sup> For a full discussion of this phenomenon, see Florentin (1996, 218–21; 2016, 126–27); Ben-Hayyim (2000, 108–9, 170–73).

Jewish Hebrew reading traditions and the Samaritan Hebrew reading tradition, though not by means of the same device. While the Jewish Hebrew reading traditions distinguished the form by means of gemination, Samaritan Hebrew utilised variant vowel patterns.

### 6.2.2. *Dagesh Mavḥin*

A similar function of non-etymological gemination for distinguishing meaning is attested in other forms of Hebrew as well. Such gemination is referred to in the literature as *dagesh mavḥin* ‘distinguishing *dagesh*’. Simply put, *dagesh mavḥin* is an innovative phonetic feature (i.e., gemination) added to an existing form to distinguish it from an otherwise homophonous form.

In Tiberian Hebrew, apparent instances of *dagesh mavḥin* can essentially be divided into two categories: (1) distinguishing between two distinct lexemes that have homophonous realisations (or between the various meanings of one polysemous lexeme) and (2) distinguishing between sacred and profane referents (e.g., divine as opposed to human, the true God as opposed to idols) for one particular lexeme. Examples of the former include the distinction between the negative particle *ʾal* ‘not’ and the preposition *ʾel* ‘to’ with the 3MS suffix, i.e., *ʾel* ‘to him’<sup>29</sup> and the

---

<sup>29</sup> E.g., *ʾel-ʾal* ‘not his own’ (Prov. 26.17).

distinction between the interjection אָנָה/אָנָא 'please' and the interrogative particle אָנָה 'to where?'.<sup>30</sup> Other examples of the former include distinguishing between two potential meanings of the same verb, such as הָנִיחַ 'he placed' and הָנִיחַ 'he gave rest'.<sup>31</sup> Examples of the latter are found in the geminated בּ in אָבִיר 'powerful' (human) as opposed to אָבִיר 'Mighty One' (divine)<sup>32</sup> and the geminated בּ in עֲצָבִים 'idols' (foreign gods) as opposed to עֲצָבִים 'toils'.<sup>33</sup> It can also be used in a verb to signify a human referent as opposed to a divine referent, as found in the geminated ר in הִרְעִמָּה 'vexing her' (human) as opposed to הִרְעִים 'thundered (3ms)' (divine).<sup>34</sup> In addition to such examples, Khan (2018, 337–47) has also recently argued that the *dagesh* in the word בָּתִּים

<sup>30</sup> E.g., אָנָא שְׂאָנָא פָּשַׁע אָחִיךָ 'please forgive your brothers' transgression!' (Gen. 50.17); אָנָה הָלְכוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים 'where did the people go?' (Josh. 2.5).

<sup>31</sup> E.g., וְלָקַח הַכֶּהֱן הַטֵּנָא מִיָּדְךָ וְהָנִיחוֹ לִפְנֵי מִזְבֵּחַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ 'and the priest shall take the basket from your hand and place it before the altar of the LORD your God' (Deut. 26.4); עַתָּה הָנִיחַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לְאָחֵיכֶם 'and now, the LORD your God has given rest to your brothers' (Josh. 22.4).

<sup>32</sup> E.g., וְשָׁם אִישׁ... אָבִיר הָרָעִים אֲשֶׁר לְשָׂאוֹל 'and there was a man there... the chief of Saul's shepherds' (1 Sam. 21.8); אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לַיהוָה נָדָר לְאָבִיר יַעֲקֹב 'which he swore to the LORD, vowed to the Mighty One of Jacob' (Ps. 132.2).

<sup>33</sup> E.g., וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ אֶת־עֲצָבֵיהֶם 'and they served their idols' (Ps. 106.36); לֶחֶם הָעֲצָבִים 'bread of toil' (Ps. 127.2).

<sup>34</sup> E.g., כְּעִסְתָּהּ צָרָתָהּ גַּם־כָּעַס בְּעַבּוֹר הִרְעִמָּהּ 'and her adversary angered her exceedingly in order to vex her' (1 Sam. 1.6); אֱלֹהֵהֶכָבוֹד הִרְעִים 'the God of glory thundered' (Ps. 29.3).

‘houses’ is actually an early (pre-Hebrew) innovation to distinguish the plural noun *\*bātīm*/*\*bātīn* ‘houses’ from the verbal adjective *\*bātīm*/*\*bātīn* ‘spending the night (mp)’.

In Babylonian Hebrew, the use of *dagesh mavḥin* is in fact far more widespread, though its function and the contexts in which it occurs parallel that of Tiberian, e.g., אֱלֹהִים *ʔelōhīm* ‘God (of Israel)’ vs. אֱלֹהִים *ʔellōhīm* ‘(foreign) gods’ (Yeivin 1985, 355–63). It is likely that instances of *dagesh mavḥin* in Babylonian were not merely orthographic, but were actually pronounced and are best interpreted as “innovative additions to existing forms rather than morphological variants” (Khan 2018, 344). A similar phenomenon is also attested in Rabbinic Hebrew (e.g., חָתַךְ ‘cutting’; חֶתֶךָ ‘piece’), Samaritan Hebrew (e.g., אֲדָנִי ‘Lord’; אֲדַנְנִי ‘master’), and the Yemenite tradition of Aramaic (e.g., חַיָּ ‘living’ [referring to God]; חַיָּ ‘living’ [referring to humans]) (Khan 2018, 342–47).

*Dagesh mavḥin* seems primarily to be a feature of the reading tradition.<sup>35</sup> This claim is underscored by the high frequency of *dagesh mavḥin* in Babylonian as opposed to Tiberian. One might thus object to positing *dagesh mavḥin* as the reason for gemination in the *wayyiqṭol* form on the grounds that it may not yet have been a productive feature of the language in the Second Temple period. Such an objection naturally leads to the following question: Is there any evidence for *dagesh mavḥin* in the ancient transcriptions? Unfortunately, the number of forms in the transcriptions in which the presence or absence of gemination would

---

<sup>35</sup> But note the exceptional case of the *dagesh* in בָּחַיָּ, which pre-dates Hebrew (Khan 2018).

be relevant for assessing the potential existence of *dagesh mavhin* are few.<sup>36</sup> They are presented below (Table 38):

Table 38: Possible instances of *dagesh mavhin* in the transcriptions

Verse	Tiberian	Secunda	Jerome	Theodotion
Ps. 118.25	אָנָא	αννα	anna	
Jon. 4.2	אָנָה		anna	
2 Kgs 23.7	בְּתִים			βεθθειμ

If אָנָא/אָנָה is indeed an example of *dagesh mavhin*, the transcriptions *αννα* and *anna* would suggest that the phenomenon was already present in late antiquity. The form בְּתִים, on the other hand, was likely geminated even in pre-Hebrew. Accordingly, its gemination (βεθθειμ) in the Secunda is of little significance.<sup>37</sup>

Another relevant piece of evidence may be found in Jerome's discussion regarding the words בְּמָה/בְּמָה 'in/by what...?'

<sup>36</sup> There are a few forms with non-Tiberian gemination attested in the transcriptions which one might speculatively suggest are relevant for the discussion on *dagesh mavhin*: *οσαλλα* וְעָלֶיהָ 'and upon it (fs)' (Ps. 7.8) (to distinguish from וְעָלָה 'and he will go up?'); *χαφφειρ* כְּפֹר 'frost' (Ps. 147.16) (to distinguish from כְּפִיר 'lion?'); *assurim* אֲסוּרִים 'bands' (Eccl. 7.26) (to distinguish from אֲסוּרִים 'those bound; prisoners?'). However, the lack of supplementary evidence makes such a hypothesis entirely speculative.

<sup>37</sup> Moreover, its specific referent in 2 Kgs 23.7 is to some sort of cultic 'hangings' and not the conventional 'houses'. In light of its contextual meaning, the unexpected initial vowel (ε instead of α) and the unexpected bisyllabic plural ending (-ειμ) may point to a different lexeme entirely (בְּתִים?).

and בָּמָה ‘high place’ in his comments on Isa. 2.22. Although the distinction between בָּמָה/בִּמְה and בָּמָה is not typically regarded as an example of *dagesh mayhin*—nor should it be—the way in which Jerome discusses the issue seems to indicate that such a concept was not unfamiliar to him (**bolded** emphasis mine):

What we have rendered as, *HE IS REGARDED AS EXALTED*, Aquila has interpreted as <<in what is he regarded?>>. The Hebrew word BAMA means either ΥΨΩΜΑ, that is, ‘high place’, about which we read in the Books of Kings and Ezekiel, or indeed <<in what?>> and it is written with the same letters: BETH MEM HE. [The correct reading is determined] according to the nature of the passage. If we want to read <<in what?>>, we say BAMMA, but if we [want to read] <<high place>> or <<exalted one>>, we read BAMA.<sup>38</sup>

It is worth noting that Jerome discusses the words בָּמָה/בִּמְה and בָּמָה not as two separate words, but as one word with two distinct meanings and pronunciations according to the context: ‘the Hebrew word BAMA means either ‘high place’... or ‘in what?’... and it is written with the same letters: BETH MEM HE’. At

---

<sup>38</sup> Ubi nos diximus *EXCELSUS REPUTATUS EST IPSE*, Aquila interpretatus est <<in quo reputatus est iste?>>. Verbum hebraicum BAMA uel ΥΨΩΜΑ dicitur, id est excelsum, quod et in Regnorum libris et in Hiezechihel legimus, uel certe <<in quo>>, et eisdem litteris scribitur BETH MEM HE, ac pro locorum qualitate, si uoluerimus legere <<in quo>>, dicimus BAMMA, sin autem <<excelsum>> uel <<excelsus>>, legimus BAMA (*In Isaiam*, I.66.1–2).

the same time, however, we should not read too much significance into this passage, since it is entirely possible that Jerome's comments simply reflect a conception of words based on the consonantal spelling rather than lexical identity or vocalisation.

### 6.2.3. Ancient Conception of *Wayyiqtol* Forms

The final piece in the puzzle for explaining the gemination in *wayyiqtol* as *dagesh mavhin* concerns the conception of the form in late antiquity: How did users of Hebrew conceive of *wayyiqtol* with respect to its morphological elements? One of the essential characteristics of *dagesh mavhin* is that it is introduced into one of two homophonous forms that would otherwise not be distinguished, whether because two distinct lexemes are pronounced identically or because one individual lexeme is polysemous. In this case, we are arguing that when preceded by the conjunction *waw*, *yiqtol* was polysemous with past and non-past meanings. The gemination is not ultimately responsible for the past tense meaning, but serves merely to mark one of the two meanings already intrinsic in the *yiqtol* form (in a particular syntactic slot). There are other scholars, however, who argue that the gemination does indeed bear an intrinsic morphemic value, which in combination with the preceding conjunction serves to convey past semantics. What is at stake here between the two views is the question of which morphological element of the form would have been regarded as being responsible for the past meaning. Is the past tense to be found in the gemination (in combination with



the conjunction) or is it to be found in the *yiqtol* form itself? Presumably, only the latter would be consistent with the explanation of *dagesh mavhin*.

Remarkably, we find relatively consistent evidence for addressing such a question in the writings of Jerome, who happens to be the figure from late antiquity about whose Hebrew learning we know the most. If we survey every instance in which Jerome mentions a *wayyiqtol* form in his writings, we find a curious and consistent pattern. When Jerome quotes a full verse or passage in which a *wayyiqtol* form appears *in context*, it is vocalised as we would expect with the preceding conjunction *ua-* (Table 39). When he quotes a *wayyiqtol* form *out of context* to address the correct translation of the word, however, the verbal element *yiqtol* is transcribed by itself without the prefixed conjunction *waw* (Table 40) (**bolded** emphasis mine):

Table 39: *Wayyiqtol* in context

Gen. 4.15: <i>uaiomer</i> וַיֹּאמֶר
Before we speak regarding the question, we should enumerate the versions of each translator alongside the Hebrew itself, which will make the sense of the scripture easier to understand: <i><b>uaiomer</b> lo adonai lachen chol oreg cain sobathaim ioccamo</i> <sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> antequam de quaestione dicamus, rectum uidetur, ut editiones interpretum singulorum cum ipso hebraico digeramus, quod facilius sensus scripturae possit intellegi: *uaiomer lo adonai lachen chol orec cain sobathaim ioccamo* (Epistula XXXVI, 54.269.19–22).

Gen. 14.18–20: <i>uaibarcheu</i> וַיִּבְרַכְהוּ; <i>uaiomer</i> וַיֹּאמֶר; <i>uaiethen</i> וַיֵּתֵן
Indeed, because you affectionately ask and all that I know should be absorbed by faithful ears, I shall set before you the view of the Hebrews, and, lest your curiosity miss out on anything, I shall add the Hebrew words themselves: <i>umelchisedech melech salem hosi lehem uaiain, uhu cohen lehel helion: uaibarcheu uaiomer baruch abram lehel helion cone samaim uares: ubaruch hel helion eser maggen sarach biadach uaiethen lo maaser mecchol</i> <sup>40</sup>

In each instance above, the *wayyiqtol* form, which is transcribed with the prefixed conjunction *ua-*, is included within a larger context of a full biblical quotation. This reflects how the passage would have been read or recited. The situation is different when *wayyiqtol* forms are quoted as isolated transcriptions not within a larger context:

Table 40: *Wayyiqtol* out of context

Gen. 30.38 <i>iaamena</i> וַיִּחְמְנָה
But in this place, where it is written <i>in order that they would conceive among the rods</i> , in the Hebrew it has

<sup>40</sup> uerum quia amanter interrogas et uniuersa, quae didici, fidis auribus instillanda sunt, ponam et hebraeorum opinionem et, ne quid desit curiositati, ipsa hebraica uerba subnectam: *umelchisedech melech salem hosi lehem uaiain, uhu cohen lehel helion: uaibarcheu uaiomer baruch abram lehel helion cone samaim uares: ubaruch hel helion eser maggen sarach biadach uaiethen lo maaser mecchol* (Epistula LXXIII, 55.18.3–10).

<p><b>iaamena.</b> I cannot express the significance of the Hebrew words except in circular fashion. For <b>iaamena</b> specifically means the utmost degree of passion in sexual intercourse, in which the entire body convulses and the final moment for achieving pleasure is near.<sup>41</sup></p>
<p>Ezek. 8.1: <i>thephphol</i> תִּפְּלוּ</p>
<p>And instead of what we have rendered as: <i>the hand of the Lord fell upon me</i>, Symmachus has translated: <i>the hand of the Lord met me</i>, which in the Hebrew is realised as '<b>thephphol</b>'<sup>42</sup></p>
<p>Jonah. 1.3 <i>iered</i> יֵרֵד</p>
<p>'The LXX [has] <i>and he went up into it</i>... Or, alternatively, [one might read] <i>he went down into it</i>, as is specifically contained in the Hebrew—for <b>iered</b> means <i>he went down</i>, so that he might anxiously seek out hiding places as a runaway—, or <i>he went up</i>, as it is written in the Vulgate edition; so that he might arrive at wherever the</p>

<sup>41</sup> in eo autem loco, ubi scriptum est *ut conciperent in uirgis*, et in hebraeo habet **iaamena**, uim uerbi hebraici nisi circuitu exprimere non possum. **iaamena** enim proprie dicitur extremus in coitu calor, quo corpus omne concutitur et patranti uoluptatem uicinus est finis (*Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libro Geneseos*, 49.22–26) (translation in consultation with Hayward 1995, 68).

<sup>42</sup> et pro eo quod nos diximus: *cecidit super me manus domini*, symmachus transtulit: *incidit mihi manus domini*, quod in hebraico dicitur '**thephphol**' (*Commentarii in Ezechielem*, III.8.1).

ship was going, believing that he would have escaped if he could just leave Judaea.<sup>43</sup>

In each of these three cases, the *wayyiqtol* form, transcribed without the prefixed conjunction *ua-*, is quoted as an isolated transcription apart from the wider context of the verse. Moreover, in two of the three instances in which Jerome quotes a *wayyiqtol* form by itself (Ezek. 8.1 and Jonah 1.3), the *wayyiqtol* forms are explicitly rendered into Latin with the perfect tense, which indicates past perfective action. Especially instructive on this point are Jerome’s comments on Jonah, in which the individual word *iered* is explicitly translated as *descendit* ‘he went down’.

The singular exception to this rule occurs when Jerome quotes the titles of the books of Leviticus and Numbers, which also happen to be *wayyiqtol* forms (Table 41):

Table 41: *Wayyiqtol* in titles

Lev. 1.1 (or ‘Leviticus’ [title]): <i>uaiecura</i> וַיִּקְרָא
The first book among them is called <i>bresith</i> , which we render as Genesis; the second <i>hellesmoth</i> , which is called Exodus; the third <i>uaiecura</i> , that is, Leviticus; the

<sup>43</sup> LXX: ...*et ascendit in eam*... et uel: *descendit in eam*, ut proprie continetur in hebraico - *iered* enim *descendit* dicitur, ut fugitiuus sollicite latebras quaereret -, uel *ascendit*, ut scriptum est in editione uulgata; ut quocumque naui pergeret, perueniret, euasisse se putans, si iudaeam relinqueret (*Commentarii in prophetas minores, In Jonam*, 1.106).

fourth <b>uaiedabber</b> , which we call Numbers; the fifth <i>ad-dabarim</i> , which is entitled Deuteronomy <sup>44</sup>
Num. 1.1 (or ‘Numbers’ [title]): <i>uaiedabber</i> וַיְדַבֵּר
It is written in the final part of the volume of Numbers, which among the Hebrews is called ‘ <b>uaiedabber</b> ’ <sup>45</sup>

This is hardly an exception, since titles often become frozen forms, and, much like proper names, are not given to separation into morphological elements.

All of this evidence cuts against the idea that something inherent in the conjunction *waw* or the following gemination was what conveyed past semantics in the *wayyiqtol* form. For Jerome and/or his Jewish informants, it seems that the *yiqtol* verbal element itself was regarded as a polysemous form capable of carrying past semantics by itself, apart from the conjunction *waw* and following gemination, at least when occurring in the syntactic position under discussion. This is what we would expect if the gemination was introduced as a marker of one specific meaning of a polysemous form rather than as a past-orienting morpheme in itself. The conjunction *waw* and preceding gemination were not, at least conceptually, inherently connected to the past semantics of the form as late as the early Byzantine period. Thus,

<sup>44</sup> primus apud eos liber uocatur bresith, quem nos genesim dicimus; secundus hellesmoth, qui exodus appellatur; tertius **uaiecura**, id est leuiticus; quartus **uaiedabber**, quem numeros uocamus; quintus addabarim, qui deuteronomium praenotatur (*Prologus in libro Regum* [Weber 2007]).

<sup>45</sup> scriptum est in ultima parte uoluminis numerorum, quod apud hebraeos appellatur ‘**uaiedabber**’ (Epistula LXXVIII, 55.51).

the conception of the form in late antiquity supports the theory that the gemination is the result of a *dagesh mavhin* and not the addition of an independent morpheme.

#### 6.2.4. Conclusions: Summary of Developments

When attempting to draw solid conclusions from the evidence of the transcriptions, it must always be kept in mind that ancient Israel has been home to many different Hebrew dialects and reading traditions throughout the centuries. The Hebrew traditions reflected in the Secunda and Jerome's writings are not necessarily precursors to any of the medieval Hebrew reading traditions, but may have actually existed side-by-side with their precursors. Nevertheless, the transcriptional evidence examined in this paper is sufficient for making a number of general claims about the historical development of the *wayyiqtol* form.

In the Second Temple period, *\*yiqtol* in phrase-initial position immediately following the conjunction *waw* was a polysemous form, capable of indicating either past or jussive meanings. As the verbal system began to reconfigure during the Second Temple period, it gradually became less and less natural for Hebrew speakers to recognise *\*w-yiqtol* as a preterite form, interpreting it more naturally as a non-preterite form instead. In order to *distinguish* and *preserve* the preterite meaning of the polysemous *\*w-yiqtol* form, the conjunction *waw* gradually came to be pronounced distinctly, being vocalised with a full vowel and following gemination. We have suggested that the introduction of gemination into this form was a product of the reading tradition rather than the living language; it should be compared to the

phenomenon of *dagesh mavhin* attested in both Tiberian and Babylonian Hebrew.

From a diachronic perspective, three key pieces of evidence help to triangulate the absolute chronology of these developments. First, in the Hebrew tradition of the Samaritans, who split off from the rest of Judaism between the fourth and second centuries BCE, there is no distinction in pronunciation between the conjunction *waw* in preterite *\*w-yiqtol* and non-preterite *\*w-yiqtol*. Second, the evidence from the Secunda (ca. first–third c. CE) indicates that the introduction of the full vowel and gemination was underway, but still not universal in the mid- to late Roman period. Third, and finally, the transcriptions of Jerome (fourth/fifth c. CE) reflect the general standardisation of a distinct pronunciation of the conjunction *waw* before a preterite *yiqtol* form by the early Byzantine period. These developments may be summarised in the following chart (Table 42):

Table 42: Development of *waw* + preterite *yiqṭol* and *waw* + jussive *yiqṭol*

	<i>waw</i> + preterite <i>yiqṭol</i>	<i>waw</i> + jussive <i>yiqṭol</i>
First Temple	* <i>wa-yiqṭol</i>	* <i>wa-yiqṭol</i>
Second Temple I (6th–4th BCE)	* <i>w(a)-yiqṭol</i>	* <i>w(a)-yiqṭol</i>
Second Temple II (4th BCE–1st CE)	* <i>w-yiqṭol</i>	* <i>w-yiqṭol</i>
	↓	
	JEWISH TRADITIONS	
		↓
Roman (1st –4th CE)	* <i>w-yiqṭol</i> ; * <i>way-yiqṭol</i>	* <i>w-yiqṭol</i>
		SAMARITAN TRADITION
Byzantine (4th–5th c. CE)	* <i>way-yiqṭol</i>	* <i>w-yiqṭol</i>

6.2.5. Conclusions: History and Development of the Reading Traditions

This study has a number of important ramifications for our understanding of the development of the Biblical Hebrew reading traditions in late antiquity, with respect to both the historical



depth of 'reading-tradition' features and the relationship between the diverse traditions of antiquity.

There has been a tendency in Hebrew scholarship to associate linguistic innovation of the ancient period with the living language, on the one hand, and linguistic innovation of the medieval period with the reading tradition, on the other. In reality, this is not necessarily the case. Our findings have demonstrated that a particular morphophonological innovation's development within the reading tradition should not necessarily be attributed to the medieval Masoretes. Rather, the data from the transcriptions show that certain developments of the reading tradition may be as old as the Second Temple period. Naturally, this implies that there were different communities transmitting different reading traditions already in the Second Temple period. Such transmission, of course, continued into the Middle Ages. In fact, the regularity of the *dagesh* in *wayyiqtol* forms in both Tiberian and Babylonian points to a common origin in Second Temple period Palestine. It may very well be, then, that already at the time of the *Secunda* there existed a more careful and authoritative reading tradition in which gemination had already come to be regular in the *wayyiqtol* forms.

The linguistic division between the Jewish reading traditions (Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian) and the Samaritan reading tradition with respect to the treatment of the *wayyiqtol* form has been evident from the medieval and modern vocalisation data. What this study has done, however, is demonstrate that this linguistic division already existed in the mid- to late Second Temple period. It is probably not the case that the development of

*wayyiqṭol* is an isolated feature. Rather, it is most plausible that Samaritan Hebrew had split from Jewish Hebrew by this time as well. Also, because the presence of gemination in the *wayyiqṭol* form was an innovation of the reading tradition and not a natural development of the living language, the uniformity of the Jewish traditions with respect to this feature might suggest that they have a common ancestor reading tradition, or, alternatively, perhaps merely a common ancestral complex of general ‘reading-tradition’ features. It may be that certain such ‘reading-tradition’ features emanated from one particular tradition regarded as authoritative and influenced the others, but this is impossible to tell. The chronological and geographical relationship of such a hypothesised ancestor Jewish reading tradition both to the Hebrew traditions reflected in the ancient transcriptions and to the precursors of the medieval traditions is an intriguing area of research with much fertile ground still to be cultivated. The present study has managed to tend to just a small corner of this field.

In sum, this study has analysed the development of only one morphophonological feature in the reading traditions of late antiquity. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that the ancient transcriptions reflect an image, albeit a faint one, of the period in which many of the ‘reading-tradition’ features that come to be relatively standardised in the medieval traditions were still developing.

## 7.0. REFERENCES

- Adriaen, M. 1969–1970. S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars I: Opera Exegetica 6: Commentarii in Prophetas Minores. 2 volumes. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Andrason, Alexander. 2011. ‘Biblical Hebrew *Wayyiqtol*: A Dynamic Definition’. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11 (8): 1–58.
- Audet, Jean-Paul. 1950. ‘A Hebrew-Aramaic List of Books of the Old Testament in Greek Transcription’. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (2): 135–54.
- Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2016. ‘The Biblical Hebrew *Wayyiqtol* and the Evidence of the Amarna Letters from Canaan’. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 16 (3): 1–18.
- Ben-Hayyim, Ze’ev. 2000. *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions*. Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns.
- Blau, Joshua. 1984. ‘Review: ספר חדש על הטור השני במשואה של ’אוריגנס’. *Leshonenu* 48–49: 76–80.
- Brenner, J. 1986. ‘Egyptian Elucidation of the Hebrew Particle WA’. PhD dissertation, Yale University.
- Brønno, Einar. 1943. *Studien über hebräische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der Zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 28. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Eskhult, Mats. 2018. ‘Tense Forms and Time Frames in Qumran Hebrew Prose and Poetry’. In *The Reconfiguration of Hebrew*

- in the Hellenistic Period*, edited by Jan Joosten, Daniel Machiela, and Jean-Sébastien Rey, 16–29. Leiden: Brill.
- Florentin, Moshe. 1996. 'עיונים בתורת הצורות של עברית השומרונים: בידולים סמנטיים באמצעים מורפולוגיים'. *Lešonénu* 59: 217–41.
- . 2016. 'Samaritan Tradition'. In *A Handbook of Biblical Hebrew*, edited by Randall W. Garr and Steven E. Fassberg, 1:117–32. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Glorie, François. 1964. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars I: Opera Exegetica 4: Commentariorum in Hiezechielem: Libri XIV*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Goodblatt, David. 1982. 'Audet's "Hebrew-Aramaic" List of Books of the OT Revisited'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1): 75–84.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. 1957. 'Egypto-Semitica'. *RSO* 32 (= *Scritti in Onore di Giuseppe Furlani*) 269–77.
- Gryson, Roger. 1993–1999. *Commentaires De Jerome Sur Le Prophete Isaie*. 5 volumes. Freiburg: Herder.
- Hatav, Galia. 2004. 'Anchoring world and time in biblical Hebrew'. *Journal of Linguistics* 40: 491–526.
- Hetzron, Robert. 1969. 'The evidence for perfect \*Y'AQTUL and jussive \*YAQT'UL in Proto-Semitic'. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14: 1–21.
- Hayward, C. T. R. 1995. *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hilberg, Isidorus. 1910–1918. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*. 3 volumes. Vindobonae; Lipsiae: Tempsky.
- Huehnergard, John. 2005. 'Hebrew Verbs I-w/y and a Proto-Semitic Sound Rule'. In *Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff (Babel und*

- Bibel 2*), edited by L. Kogan, N. Koslova, S. Loesov, and S. Tishchenko, 459–74. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Janda, Richard D., and Brian D. Joseph. 2003. ‘Reconsidering the Canons of Sound-Change: Towards a “Big Bang” Theory’. In *Historical Linguistics 2001. Selected Papers from the 15th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, 13–17 August 2001*, edited by Barry Blake and Kate Burridge. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Janssens, Gerard. 1982. *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen’s Secunda*. Orientalia Gandensia 9. Leuven: Peeters.
- Jepsen, A. 1959. ‘Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments’. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 71: 114–36.
- Joüon, P., and T. Muraoka. 2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- Kantor, Benjamin. 2017. ‘The Second Column (Secunda) of Origen’s Hexapla in Light of Greek Pronunciation’. PhD dissertation, University of Texas.
- Kartveit, Magnar. 2009. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. Leiden: Brill.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 1991. ‘Morphological Markers of Individuation in Semitic Languages and Their Function in the Semitic Tense System’. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress: Band 2, Cushitic, Egyptian, Omotic, Semitic*, edited by Hans G. Mukarovsky, 235–44. Vienna: Afro-Pub.
- . 2013. *A Short Introduction to the Tiberian Masoretic Bible and Its Reading Tradition*. 2nd ed. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias.

- . 2018. 'How was the *dageš* in Biblical Hebrew בִּתְּיִם Pronounced and Why is it There?' *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (2): 323–51.
- de Lagarde, Paul, Germain Morin, and Marcus Adriaen. 1959. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars I: Opera Exegetica 1: Hebraicae Quaestiones in Libro Geneseos; Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum; Commentarioli in Psalmos; Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lambdin, Thomas O. 1971. 'The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article'. In *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, edited by Hans Goedicke, 315–33. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Loprieno, Antonio. 1980. 'The Sequential Forms in Late Egyptian and Biblical Hebrew'. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 7 (5): 1–20.
- Maag, V. 1953. 'Morphologie des hebräischen Narratives'. *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65: 86–88.
- Margolis, Max L. 1909. 'The Pronunciation of the Shewa according to New Hexaplaric Material'. *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 26: 62–70.
- Mercati, Giovanni. 1958. *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae*. Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana.
- . 1965. *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae, Osservazioni: Commento Critico Al Testo Dei Frammenti Esaplatari*. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Vaticana.
- Pat-El, Na'ama. 2009. 'The Development of the Semitic Definite Article: A Syntactic Approach'. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 54 (1): 19–50.

- Pummer, Reinhard. 2012. Review of *The Origin of the Samaritans*, by Magnar Kartveit. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 12: 592–99.
- Rendsburg, Gary. 1981. ‘Evidence for a Spoken Hebrew in Biblical Times’. PhD dissertation, New York University.
- . 1993. Review of *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive: Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran*, by Mark S. Smith. *Hebrew Studies* 34: 202–6.
- Revell, E. J. 1984. ‘Stress and the Waw “Consecutive” in Biblical Hebrew’. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104: 437–44.
- Smith, Mark S. 1991. *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Suchard, Benjamin. 2019. ‘Back to the Future: Reconsidering the Morphology of the Biblical Hebrew Consecutive Perfect (wqāṭaltî)’. Paper presented at the Conference on Hebrew Language and Linguistics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, July 8–10 2019.
- Steiner, Richard C. 2005. ‘On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes (\*Ḥ > Ḥ and \*Ġ > ʿ) and Greek Translations (2 Esdras and Judith)’. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2): 229–67.
- . 2007. ‘Variation, Simplifying Assumptions, and the History of Spirantization in Aramaic and Hebrew’. In *Sha‘arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, edited by Aharon Maman, Steven E. Fassberg, and Yochanan Breuer, 52–65. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.

- Torrey, Charles C. 1952. 'Ein griechisch transkribiertes und interpretiertes hebräisch-aramäisches Verzeichnis der Bücher des Alten Testaments aus dem 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr'. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77 (4): 249–54.
- Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson. 2007. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Yeivin, Israel. 1985. מסורת הלשון העברית המשתקפת בניקוד הבבלי. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.
- Young, Douglas W. 1953. 'The Origin of the Waw Conversive'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12 (4): 248–52.
- Yuditsky, Alexey. 2005. התנועות החטופות בתעתיקי הטור השני של 'המשושה'. *Lešonenu* 67: 121–41.
- . 2017. דקדוק העברית של תעתיקי אוריגנס. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.
- Ziegler, J. 1983. *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.