

The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew

AARON D. HORNKOHL





<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

© 2023 Aaron D. Hornkohl



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the text; to adapt the text for non-commercial purposes 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, *The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew*. Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures 17. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0310>

Copyright and permissions for the reuse of many of the images included in this publication differ from the above. Copyright and permissions information for images is provided separately in the List of Illustrations.

Further details about CC BY-NC licenses are available at, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/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All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at 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.0310#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 17.

ISSN (print): 2632-6906

ISSN (digital): 2632-6914

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-80064-980-4

ISBN Hardback: 978-1-80064-981-1

ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-80064-982-8

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0310

Cover image: T-S AS 8.129. A leaf from a Cairo Geniza biblical codex containing Gen. 30.17–20 and showcasing Moshe Mohe's non-standard Tiberian pointing of the standard Tiberian pronunciation of *Issachar* (see within, ch. 4), courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.

Cover design: Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

6. THE 2MS ENDINGS

In the combined Masoretic biblical written-reading tradition, word-final *qameṣ* ($-\ddot{a}$) typically co-occurs with a *mater heh*, i.e., הֶּ-ֿ. This norm applies across a variety of categories, including

- (a) substantives with the feminine singular ending, e.g., אִשָּׁה ‘woman’, גְּדוֹלָה ‘great, large’;
- (b) the *qatal* 3FS verbal ending, e.g., נָתַתָּה ‘she gave’;
- (c) the *qatal* of 3MS III-y forms, e.g., הָיָה ‘he was’; and
- (d) adverbial endings of various sorts, e.g., עַתָּה ‘now’, אֶרֶץ ‘to the land/ground’.

Conspicuously exceptional in this regard are the 2MS nominal (i.e., object/possessive) suffix הֶ- and the 2MS verbal ending תָּ-, both of which routinely end in $-\ddot{a}$, but—anomalously—employ defective word-final orthography, regularly eschewing the respective *plene* alternatives כֶּ- and תָּה-¹. Correspondingly, note that the zero vocalisation of the *-t* of the 2FS *qatal* verbal ending and the 2FS independent subject pronoun תָּא are regularly represented by a written *shewa* sign, i.e., תְּ-, as are all voiceless final *kafs*, e.g., פְּ-; no other final voiceless consonants are so treated.

¹ Important discussions include Sievers (1901, §207); Kahle (1921; 1947, 95–102; 1959, 171–77); Torczyner et al. (1938, 37, 41, 51, 55); Tur-Sinai ([1940] 1987, 37–42); Cross and Freedman (1952, 53, no. 51, 65–67); Yalon (1952, טו–ר); Ben-Hayyim (1954); Kutscher (1963, 264–66; 1974, 446–47; 1982, 32–35, §46); Steiner (1979); Zevit (1980, 31–32); Blau (1982; 2010, 169–71); Barr (1989b, 114–27); Sáenz-Badillos (1993, 185); Gogel (1997, 155–64); Hutton (2013b, 966–67); Khan (2013a, 48–49; 2013b, 307; 2020, I:90); Aḥituv, Garr, and Fassberg (2016, 61); Qimron (2018, 265–67).

It may be that this glaring mismatch between spelling and pronunciation is a simple idiosyncrasy of the Masoretic tradition, whereby normal spelling practices do not apply in the vast majority of cases of 2MS affirmatives. In other words, standard \aleph - and η - and much rarer \aleph - and η - may be thought, no matter their orthographic differences, to reflect $-k\bar{a}$ and $-t\bar{a}$, respectively (e.g., Koller 2021, 18). The point of departure adopted here, conversely, is that the contrast between the spellings \aleph - and η -, on the one hand, and realisations $-k\bar{a}$ and $-t\bar{a}$, on the other, is linguistically significant, reflecting the merger of distinct pronunciation traditions: the written tradition with consonant-final forms and the reading tradition with vowel-final forms.

To put this in context, leaving aside instances of orthographic-vocalic disparity traditionally acknowledged via the *ketiv-qere* mechanism—including cases of *qere perpetuum*, e.g., יהוה realised as $\text{ʔ}\bar{a}d\bar{o}n\bar{a}y$ or $\text{ʔ}\bar{e}l\bar{o}h\bar{i}m$ (see above, Introduction, §1.0, and ch. 1)—the 2MS endings arguably represent one of the most common categories of phonic divergence between the written and reading components that comprise the combined Masoretic biblical tradition. If so, they constitute a major case of unacknowledged *ketiv-qere* dissonance within the Masoretic tradition.² This chapter seeks to explore this phonetic variety in ancient He-

² Note on terminology: throughout this chapter, \aleph -/ \aleph - are referred to as 2MS nominal endings, η -/ η - as 2MS verbal endings; the orthographies \aleph -/ η - are termed short spellings, \aleph -/ η - long spellings; the phonetic realisations $-k$ -/ $-t$ are designated consonant-final, $-ka$ -/ $-ta$ vowel-final; there is no presumption that the spellings \aleph -/ η - were originally intended as defective for vowel-final pronunciations.

brew morphology across dialects, chronolects, registers, and traditions as well as to plumb the historical depth of the variants.³

One further preliminary remark: though the cases of the nominal γ - $-k\bar{a}$ and verbal τ - $-t\bar{a}$ endings are similar, it is not assumed here that their respective orthographic and phonetic development proceeded in lockstep. Each ending merits its own study sensitive to similarities and differences, and potential analogous treatment. As such, in the present chapter a conscious effort is made to separate the relevant arguments and data.

1.0. Comparative Semitic Perspective

One similarity between the verbal and nominal affirmatives in question is that there is general agreement that both evolved from early Semitic forms that ended in some form of *a*-vowel, most likely long, though some argue for a short or anceps vowel.

In Comparative Semitic perspective, there is general agreement that the Proto-Semitic 2MS object/possessive suffix from which the various ancient Hebrew forms developed was some form of *-ka*, the precise quantity of the vowel of which remains unclear (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 15–18; Moscati 1964, 109, §13.23;

³ Other notable cases in which word-final *qameṣ* ($-\bar{a}$) goes orthographically unmarked in the Tiberian tradition include: (a) the 3FS object/possessive suffix יָהּ , e.g., אֵלֶיהָ ‘to her’, not אֵלֶיהָ* ; (b) נֶעֱר ‘girl’, eight times the *qere perpetuum* in Genesis (24.14, 16, 28, 55, 57; 34.3, 12)—note also the 13 cases of *qere* נֶעֱרָה for *ketiv* נָעַר in Deuteronomy (22.15, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 26, 27, 28, 29) against a single case of written-reading agreement in הַנֶּעֱרָה ‘the girl’ (Deut. 22.19); (c) the 2FPL/3FPL verbal endings (see below, ch. 9); (d) עַתָּה ‘now’ (Ezek. 23.43; Ps. 74.6).

Blau 2010, 169, §4.2.3.3.1; Huehnergard 2019, 54). The development of the consonant-final *-k* realisation is debated, with explanations involving variable (anceps) vowel length, Aramaic contact, and vernacular (perhaps RH) influence being suggested as factors (see Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 18, 59–64; Steiner 1979, 158–61; cf. Blau 1982).

The verbal ending, likewise, is thought to descend from a vowel-final proto-Semitic form with *-a*, *-ā*, or *-ã* (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 15–18; Moscati, 1964, 138, §16.41; Blau 2010, 55, §1.18.1n, 209, §4.3.3.4.3; Huehnergard 2019, 53).

As is made clear below, a number of factors complicate tracing the history of the two endings, including: widespread dissonance between the written and reading components of the Masoretic tradition; evidence of majority spellings and realisations side by side with minority alternants in both components of that tradition; evidence for the various options in other traditions of biblical material; and confirmation of contrasting orthography and/or phonology in extra-biblical material.

2.0. Diversity within the Tiberian Tradition

Turning to Tiberian BH, another point of similarity between the 2MS verbal and nominal affirmatives is that both exhibit some degree of diversity within Masoretic Hebrew. The nominal suffix has the short spelling in around 92 percent of its 2850 tokens. Likewise, the verbal suffix is written short in nearly 92 percent of its 1800+ occurrences. This means that in both cases, not insignificant minorities of the two affirmatives are written long, i.e., with *heh*.

A salient difference in this connection is that in some 200 instances of the nominal suffix, the spelling and vocalisation *agree* on consonant-final realisation. These consist of the 2MS pausal forms $\text{קָ}, \text{לָ}, \text{קָאָ}, \text{קָאָ},$ and קָאָ . As many pausal forms are thought to safeguard archaic phonology (Fassberg 2013, 54; cf. Blau 2010, §§3.5.8.8n, 3.5.12.2.5n, 3.5.13.4), in the case of the 2MS nominal suffix, they purport to preserve vocalic evidence of the consonant-final realisation that underlies the written tradition's standard ק- orthography. Similar consonant-final forms of the verbal ending are not known in the pronunciation tradition, though instances of the apparently masculine independent pronoun אָ realised as 'attā are attested in rare cases of *ketiv-qere* (1 Sam. 24.19; Ps. 6.4; Job 1.10; Qoh. 7.22; Neh. 9.6) and in still rarer cases of written-reading agreement on אָ (Num. 11.15; Deut. 5.27; Ezek. 28.14).

One way of looking at the apparent mix of vowel- and consonant-final forms in both the orthographic and recitation traditions is to see that the respective minority form in each corroborates the other's majority form Khan (2013a, 48–49).

Table 1: Majority and minority forms of the 2MS nominal suffix

<u>spelling</u>			<u>pronunciation</u>	
majority	ק-	↖	↗	$-\text{kā}$
minority	כה-	↗	↖	$-\text{ak}$

Thus, as can be seen in Table 1, the pausal realisation $-\text{ak}$ agrees with the majority written short spelling, whereas the long spel-

ling with *heh* agrees with the majority vowel-final pronunciation *-ka*.

Likewise, in the case of the verbal ending, as seen in Table 2, the minority long spelling with *heh* comes as apparently early confirmation of the majority vowel-final realisation *-ta* and the evidence for a 2MS independent subject pronoun *'at* supports the consonant-final short spelling with *ḥ-*.

Table 2: Majority and minority forms of the 2MS verbal ending

spelling		pronunciation	
majority	ḥ-	↗	-ta
minority	ḥה-	↘	2MS ḥא 'at (<i>ketiv</i>)

Accounts of the distribution of the minority long spellings vary in terms of explanatory power and comprehensiveness. James Barr (1989b, 114–19) judiciously discusses several of them. In the case of the 39 cases in which Tiberian 2MS written *כה־* and the realisation *-kā* coincide as the nominal suffix, proposed factors favouring the long spelling include graphic word length, a root consonant *-k* adjacent to the suffix, accumulation due to attraction, or some combination thereof (see §10.1 for citations). Prosodic factors may also be at work, as one-third of the long spellings occur with a major disjunctive accent. Of course, in most of these categories, *כה־* forms nevertheless comprise a small minority of the total.

The long verbal ending is especially common in certain weak verbs, e.g., *נתן* (64 of the 147 total cases of 2MS *qaṭal* forms end in *ה־*), III-y, hollow, geminate, and *hiḥ'il* I-n (Barr 1989b,

116–19, 124–24). It also exhibits a possible prosodic connection: in 19 cases הַח- correlates with a major disjunctive accent. Be that as it may, in most of these categories, the long spellings remain the minority option (see §10.2 for citations).

Interestingly, as far as accepted theories on diachrony and linguistic periodisation go, there seems to be no discernible chronological trend (Barr 1989b, 119). A possible exception in the case of the nominal suffix is apparent evidence of the late standardisation of spellings without *heh*, which emerges from comparisons of CBH passages with LBH parallels—though Barr (1989b, 119, 123–24) also notes the preservation of residual long spellings of the nominal suffix in the “higher and more solemn style” of prayers and divine speeches.

3.0. Kahle’s View

At this point, it is worthwhile to cite the forceful opinion of Paul Kahle (1921; 1947, 95–102; 1959, 174–77) on the subject. Kahle famously opined that the consonant-final pronunciations were original in BH, regarding the Tiberian *-kā̄* and *-tā̄* realisations as Masoretic innovations of the Islamic Period imported from Qurʾānic Arabic.

4.0. Diversity beyond the Tiberian Tradition

Kahle based his view not just on the dominant spellings in the Tiberian tradition, but on evidence from beyond that tradition as well. Consonant-final forms of the nominal suffix are found in transcriptional evidence in Greek (Ben-Hayyim 1954, 22–27; Kahle 1959, 171; Yuditsky 2016, 106; 2017, 104–6, §3.1.1.2.3)

and Latin (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 22–27; Kahle 1959, 171–72; Yudit-sky 2016, 106), the written and reading components of the Samaritan biblical tradition (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 37–39; 2000, 228–29, §§3.2.2–3.2.2.0; Kahle 1959, 172–73),⁴ non-biblical manuscripts with Palestinian vowel pointing (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 27–29; Kahle 1959, 173–74), RH (Breuer 2013, 736), and *piyyuṭ* manuscripts with Palestinian pointing (Kahle 1959, 172–73; see also Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 29–32). Conversely, the Babylonian biblical reading tradition mirrors the Tiberian with $-k\bar{a}$ and, in the case of certain particles in pause, $-\bar{a}k$ (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 32–37; Yeivin 1985, 749; cf. 421).

Turning to the 2MS verbal suffix, a consonant-final $-t$ pronunciation is found in the Greek and Latin transcriptions (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 43–46; Kahle 1959, 178; Yudit-sky 2016, 109–10; 2017, 112–13, §3.2.1.1) and Palestinian liturgical texts (though not *piyyuṭ* proper) (Kahle, 1959, 178–79). Not surprisingly, these traditions also tend to favour the consonant-final form of the related 2MS independent subject pronoun, אַת 'at (Yudit-sky 2016,

⁴ The Samaritan tradition, like its Tiberian counterpart, is composite, comprising written and pronunciation components. Of the 39 cases of *plene* 2MS כה- found in the Tiberian Pentateuch (see below, §10.1.1), the Samaritan written tradition has כה- just seven times (see §10.2.1). For its part, the Samaritan reading tradition shows even greater preference for the $-k$ realisation at the expense of $-ka$, even occasionally contradicting the spelling כה- in the Samaritan consonantal tradition, e.g., in the case of אִיכָה and יכָה (see §10.2.2). In the Samaritan reading tradition, this leaves only באָכָה $b\bar{a}ka$ ‘your coming’ (Gen. 10.30; 13.10; 25.18) with the 2MS $-ka$ suffix, though Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 228, §3.2.2) observes that the suffix was often otherwise interpreted.

109–10; 2017, §3.1.1). By contrast, joining the Tiberian reading tradition with a vowel-final ending are the Babylonian biblical reading tradition (Yeivin 1985, 427), the Samaritan reading tradition (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 103, §2.0.13),⁵ and the RH written and reading tradition.⁶ In all four of the traditions just mentioned, the dominant form of the 2MS independent subject pronoun is also *a*-final (Yeivin 1985, 1103; Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 225–26, §§3.1–3.1.2; Breuer 2013, 735; but see below).⁷ Significantly, in the case of the reading components of the Samaritan biblical tradition and of RH, the *a*-final verbal ending conflicts with the characteristic consonant-final nominal suffix.

⁵ From a purely arithmetic perspective, the Samaritan written tradition, with some 49 cases of תה-, is broadly comparable to the written tradition of the Tiberian Pentateuch, with some 44. However, the two frequently diverge on details. Nearly all of the differences appear to arise from levelling within the Samaritan tradition: on the one hand, in Samaritan, the 2MS *qaṭal* form of נתן is consistently (all 49 times) written נתתה(ו) in the absence of an object suffix, whereas spelling varies in the MT (30 cases if נתתה[ו] out of 49 potential cases); on the other, in contrast to the MT, no other Samaritan's verb's 2MS *qaṭal* form is written *plene*.

⁶ Regarding RH, in Codex Kaufmann, the vocalisation is nearly always vowel-final and the spelling is תה- in 103 of 144 cases.

⁷ Samaritan Hebrew knows no remnant of the 2MS independent subject pronoun את. In the Tiberian tradition of RH, אַתּ comprises a sizable minority, e.g., in Codex Kaufmann, the 2MS independent subject pronoun is usually אַתּהּ, but 2MS אַתּ comes in 23 of 138 cases. On the Babylonian RH tradition see Yeivin (1985, 1103 and fn. 6).

Important, but somewhat complicated evidence may also be adduced from the DSS and from Iron Age epigraphy, each of which corpora is treated in detail below (§§5.0; 7.0).

5.0. The Dead Sea Scrolls: General Picture

In the case of both the nominal and verbal affirmatives, DSS biblical texts and non-biblical material exhibit divergent tendencies. See Table 3 for a summary of the incidence of the two spellings of the nominal suffix.

Table 3: Short and long spellings of the 2MS nominal suffix in the DSS

	ך-	כה-
BDSS	1050	800
NBDSS	650	2000

In the BDSS, both the short and long spellings of the nominal suffix are common, short outnumbering long by a margin approaching 1050 to 800.⁸ The NBDSS present a different picture. Here, overall, for each instance of the 650 cases of the spelling without *heh*, there are more than three instances of the spelling with *heh*.⁹

⁸ Based on Abegg et al. (2009a). Accordance (v. 13.1.4) searches of Hebrew material returned the following counts: ך- 1050; כה- 792.

⁹ The totals are approximately, ך- 650 and כה- 2000. The figures are based on Accordance (v. 13.1.4) searches using Abegg (1999–2009) and excluding probable Aramaic material. Though uncertainty about the language of composition, broken cases, and ambiguity, *inter alia*, make precise counts elusive, the picture painted is sufficiently indicative for the purposes of this study.

Turning to the verbal ending, consult Table 4 for incidence of alternative spellings.

Table 4: Short and long spellings of the 2MS verbal ending in the DSS

	ת-	תה-
BDSS	180	160
NBDSS	40	493

In biblical material, the spelling with *heh* is common, but not dominant. Against some 180 cases of the short spelling, there are around 160 occurrences of the long spelling.¹⁰ Conversely, non-biblical material displays overwhelming affinity for the form of the verbal suffix with *heh*. Indeed, the long spelling, with 493 occurrences, is twelve times as common as the short one, with just 40.

The broad statistical picture just painted is simplistic. Drilling down reveals complexities that merit discussion.

5.1. Nominal Suffix

5.1.1. Biblical Material

As indicated above, in the BDSS both ת- and תה- are common, the ratio approximately 5 to 4 (1050 to 800). There is, however, striking disparity in the relative concentrations of the two options among the scrolls. See Tables 5–7.

¹⁰ An Accordance search of the Hebrew material in Abegg et al. (2009) returned figures of 262 for ת- and 165 for תה-. However, broken endings make 80 apparent cases of ת- ambiguous; the same is true for a few cases of תה-.

Table 5: BDSS Mss with high incidence of γ - (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	γ -	כה-	Manuscript (cont'd)	γ -	כה-
1QIsa ^a 1–27	101	18	4QSam ^a (4Q51)	37	2
1QIsa ^b (1Q8)	109	0	4QIsa ^b (4Q56)	27	0
1QPs ^a (1Q10)	11	0	4QDeut ⁿ (4Q41)	48	0
1QPhyl (1Q13)	17	0	4QJer ^a (4Q70)	10	0
4QGen–Exod ^a (4Q1)	13	0	4QJer ^c (4Q72)	12	0
4QpaleoGen–Exod ^l (4Q11)	18	0	4QPs ^b (4Q84)	14	0
4QExod ^c (4Q14)	15	0	4QPs ^c (4Q85)	20	0
4QpaleoExod ^m (4Q22)	38	1	4QPs ^g (4Q89)	17	0
4QDeut ^b (4Q29)	16	0	4QPhyl ^c (4Q130)	34	0
4QDeut ^c (4Q30)	66	0	4QPhyl ^g (4Q134)	22	4
4QDeut ^e (4Q32)	23	0	4QPhyl ^r (4Q145)	10	0
4QDeut ^f (4Q33)	25	0	5QDeut (5Q1)	17	0
4QDeut ^g (4Q34)	13	0	8QPhyl (8Q3)	64	1
4QDeut ⁱ (4Q36)	11	0	8QMez (8Q4)	20	0
4QpaleoDeut ^f (4Q45)	33	0	11QpaleoLev ^a (11Q1)	16	0
TOTALS				877	26

Table 6: BDSS Mss with high incidence of כה- (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	γ -	כה-	Manuscript (cont'd)	γ -	כה-
1QIsa ^a 28–54	20	212	4QPhyl ^a (4Q128)	0	24
4QLev ^g (4Q27)	0	23	4QPhyl ^b (4Q129)	1	23
4QDeut ^k (4Q38a)	0	10	4QPhyl ^j (4Q137)	0	37
4QSam ^c (4Q53)	0	11	4QPhyl ^k (4Q138)	0	23
4QIsa ^c (4Q57)	0	13	4QPhyl ^l (4Q139)	0	10
4QXII ^g (4Q82)	4	12	4QPhyl ^m (4Q140)	0	21
4QPs ^a (4Q83)	0	24	11QPs ^a (11Q5)	6	232
TOTALS				31	675

Table 7: BDSS Mss with mixed use of γ - and כה- (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	γ -	כה-	Manuscript (cont'd)	γ -	כה-
4QDeut ^j (4Q37)	8	7	4QPhyl ^h (4Q135)	4	6
TOTALS				12	13

Most scrolls show a discernible predilection for one form or the other. This includes a marked difference between the two halves of 1QIsa^a, cols 1–27 (see above, Table 5) and cols 28–54 (see above, Table 6; see Kutscher 1974, 564–66; Abegg 2010, 40–41). In two-thirds of the manuscripts listed above (29 of 45), γ - is the preferred variant. Nearly 600 of the approximately 800 occurrences of כה- in the BDSS are found in the selection of material comprised of the two large scrolls 1QIsa^a (γ - 121; כה- 230) and 11QPs^a (11Q5) (γ - 6; כה- 232), along with the phylacteries from Cave 4, 4QPhyl^a–4QPhyl^s (4Q128–4Q146) (γ - 91; כה- 164).¹¹ Among texts with ten or more cases of the nominal suffix, only 4QDeut^j (4Q37) and 4QPhyl^h (4Q135) show truly mixed usage, with no obvious preference for short or long spelling.

5.1.2. Non-biblical Material

NBDSS material presents a different picture. Here, overall, for each instance of γ -, there are more than three instances of כה-. See Tables 8–10.

Table 8: NBDSS Mss with high incidence of γ - (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	γ -	כה-	Manuscript	γ -	כה-
CD	20	0	4Q Non-Canonical Pss B (4Q381)	67	1
1QLitPr ^b (1Q34bis)	14	0	4Q Barki Nafshi ^d (4Q437)	12	2
4Q Narrative and... (4Q372)	13	0	11QapocrPs (11Q11)	20	1
TOTALS				146	4

¹¹ However, certain individual phylacteries in this group show a decided preference for γ -, as does 8QMezuzah (8Q4).

Table 9: NBDSS Mss with high incidence of כה- (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	כה-	Manuscript	כה-
1QS	1 28	4Q Instruction ^b (4Q416)	3 98
1Qsb (1Q28b)	0 74	4Q Instruction ^c (4Q417)	1 55
1QM (1Q33)	4 98	4Q Instruction ^d (4Q418)	6 192
1QHa (1QH ^a)	158 409	4Q Instruction ^e (4Q418a)	1 12
1QInstruction (1Q26)	0 11	4Q Instruction ^g (4Q423)	0 27
1QHymns (1Q36)	0 11	4QH ^a (4Q427)	0 16
4QRP ^a (4Q158)	0 10	4QH ^b (4Q428)	1 21
4QJub ^d (4Q219)	1 11	4Q Narrative Work... (4Q460)	0 13
4QpapJub ^h (4Q223–224)	1 11	4QM ^a (4Q491)	3 10
4QBer ^a (4Q286)	0 16	4QapocrLam B (4Q501)	0 11
4QBer ^b (4Q287)	0 10	4QpapRitMar (4Q502)	1 11
4QRP ^b (4Q364)	0 21	QpapPrQuot (4Q503)	0 21
4QPE ^{nosh} (4Q369)	1 22	4QDibHam ^a (4Q504)	4 91
4QapocrMoses ^a (4Q375)	0 15	4QPrFêtes ^b (4Q508)	1 9
4QapocrJoshua ^a (4Q378)	10 12	4QpapPrFêtes ^c (4Q509)	2 52
4Q pap paraKings... (4Q382)	1 24	4QpapRitPur B (4Q512)	0 28
4QRitPur A (4Q414)	0 14	4QBeat (4Q525)	4 30
4Q Instruction ^a (4Q415)	0 12	11QT ^a (11Q19)	1 138
TOTALS			205 1644

Table 10: NBDSS Mss with mixed usage of כה- and ט- (minimum ten cases)

Manuscript	כה-	Manuscript	כה-
4QTest (4Q175)	7 4	4QapocrJoshua ^a (4Q378)	10 12
4QTanh (4Q176)	5 8	TOTALS	22 24

Most texts strongly favour one option over the other, though co-occurrence of the two within a single text and/or line is not uncommon. The overall preference for כה- in the NBDSS is apparent, particularly in comparison to the preference for ט- in BDSS material. Beyond this, however, it is difficult to discern meaningful usage patterns. Focusing on texts with mixed usage (Table 10)—two of the three include verbatim biblical citations, but the ט-

and כה- spellings occur in biblical as well as non-biblical material, with no obvious correlation.¹²

5.2. Verbal Ending

5.2.1. Biblical Material

The 2MS *qatal* spelling תה- is common, but not dominant in BDSS material. Against some 180 cases of ת-, come around 160 occurrences of תה-. Tables 11–13 tally manuscripts with at least five total cases.

Table 11: BDSS Mss with high incidence of ת- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת- תה-	Manuscript	ת- תה-
1QIsa ^a	12 73	4QPhyl ^b (4Q129)	0 6
(1–27)	8 24	4QPhyl ^m (4Q140)	0 6
(28–54)	4 49)	11QPs ^a (11Q5)	0 10
TOTALS			12 95

Table 12: BDSS Mss with high incidence of תה- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת- תה-	Manuscript	ת- תה-
1QIsa ^b (1Q8)	13 1	4QDeut ^g (4Q34)	5 0
4QpaleoGen–Exod ^l (4Q11)	11 1 ¹³	4QpaleoDeut ^r (4Q45)	5 0
4QExod–Lev ^f (4Q17)	13 0	4QPs ^c (4Q85)	6 0
4QpaleoExod ^m (4Q22)	17 2	4QPhyl ^c (4Q130)	6 1
4QDeut ^f (4Q33)	9 0	5QDeut (5Q1)	5 1
TOTALS			90 6

¹² In 4QTest (4Q175) all eleven forms parallel MT forms with ת-; in 4QTanh (4Q176) the six forms that parallel MT ת- split evenly between ת- and כה- (these latter totals exclude instances of MT 2FS suffixes, in some cases of which 4QTanh (4Q176) has כה- or apparently 2MS ת-.

¹³ = MT Exod. 12.44.

Table 13: BDSS Mss with mixed use of ת- and תה- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת-	תה-	Manuscript	ת-	תה-
4QDeut ^a (4Q41)	4	4	4QSam ^a (4Q51)	2	5
TOTALS				6	9

By dint of its length, the Great Isaiah Scroll often skews statistical presentations of DSS material. Such is the case here, as 1QIsa^a accounts for just under half of the cases of both 2MS *qaṭal* forms in general (85 of 180) and 2MS תה- spellings specifically (73 of 160).¹⁴ Similar outliers characterised by the use of תה- are 11QPs^a and many of the Cave 4 phylacteries. If 1QIsa^a, 4QPhyl^{a-s}, and 11QPs^a are excluded from consideration, the ת- to תה- ratio is about 150 to 50 (compared to 180 to 160, as above).

As is evident from the tables, most manuscripts show strong preference for one form or the other, with only a few manuscripts exhibiting mixed usage. It is interesting to compare the preferences for *qaṭal* ת- versus תה- in Tables 11–13 with preferences for ׀- versus כה- above, §5.1.1, in Tables 5–7. Most scrolls that prefer ת- also prefer ׀- and most that prefer תה- also prefer כה-. For instance, 1QIsa^b is strongly partial to ת- and ׀-, whereas 11QPs^a is strongly disposed to תה- and כה-. Yet, there are a few surprises. For example, while 1QIsa^a exhibits high incidence of both תה- and כה-, the dominance of תה- over ת- (73 to 12) is far more pronounced than that of כה- over ׀- (230 to 120). Moreover, the striking difference between the two halves of 1QIsa^a concerning

¹⁴ While there is some disparity in the use of *qaṭal* ת- versus תה- between the two halves of the scroll (Table 11), they are far more similar in their usage of the 2MS verbal ending than in the case of the variants of the 2MS nominal suffix (§5.1.1 and Tables 5–6).

כה- and ך- (cols 1–27: 18 versus 101; cols 28–54: 212 versus 20) obtains in the case of תה- and ת- only in the second half of the scroll (cols 1–27: 24 versus 8; cols 28–54: 49 versus 4). While cols 28–54 show striking preferences for both תה- and כה-, cols 1–27 prefer תה- to ת- (24 versus 8) but not כה- over ך-, the latter far more prevalent than the former (כה- 18 versus ך- 101). Though involving far smaller numbers, a similar situation obtains in the case of 4QSam^a (4Q51), where ך- is far more common than כה- (37 to 2), but ת- is less frequent than תה- (2 to 5). Such differences are reminiscent of the situation in the Samaritan reading tradition and RH, all confirming the importance of independent analysis of the 2MS nominal and verbal morphology.

5.2.2. Non-biblical Material

DSS non-biblical material displays overwhelming affinity for 2MS *qatal* forms ending in תה-. Indeed, תה-, with 493 occurrences, is more than twelve times as common as ת-, with just 40.

Table 14: NBDSS Mss with high incidence of ת- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת-תה-	Manuscript	תה-ת-
4Q Non-Canonical Pss B (4Q381)	4	1	4
	TOTALS		1

Table 15: NBDSS Mss with high incidence of תה- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת- תה-	Manuscript	ת- תה-
1QpHab	0 5	4Q Barki Nafshi ^c (4Q436)	0 17
1QM (1Q33)	0 22	4QDibHam ^a (4Q504)	1 30
1QHa (1QH ^a)	2 159	4QPrFêtes ^b (4Q508)	1 4
1QDM (1Q22)	0 6	4QpapPrFêtes ^c (4Q509)	0 14
4QD ^a (4Q266)	0 7	4QShir ^b (4Q511)	0 7
4QRP ^b (4Q364)	1 7	4QBeat (4Q525)	0 6
4Q pap paraKings et al. (4Q382)	0 5	5Q Rule (5Q13)	0 6
4Q Instruction ^d (4Q418)	1 14	11QT ^a (11Q19)	1 71
4QH ^b (4Q428)	0 6	TOTALS	7 386

Table 16: NBDSS Mss with mixed use of ת- and תה- (minimum five cases)

Manuscript	ת- תה-	Manuscript	ת- תה-
4Q Barki Nafshi ^d (4Q437)	3 5	TOTALS	3 5

With so few cases of ת- in the NBDSS, one wonders about the possibility of conditioning factors, e.g., conventional spellings associated with biblical passages. For example, ושמחת בחגך אתה, ובנג 'and you will rejoice in your festival, you and your son' (4Q366 f4i.10) is an exact orthographic match for the same expression in MT Deut. 16.14. Additionally, the lone unambiguous case of ת- in the Temple Scroll ובערת הרע מקרבכה 'and you will purge the evil from among you' (11Q19 54.17–18) comes seven times in MT Deuteronomy with a ת- ending (and a 2MS ת- pronominal suffix) (but there may also be other factors at work in this example; see below).

Yet, biblical citation or allusion is certainly no guarantee of a ת- spelling. Consider מוצא שפתיכה תשמור כאשר נדרתה נדבה 'What passes your lips take care, as you have vowed a freewill offering with your mouth, to do as you have vowed' (11Q19 54.13) || מוצא שפתיך תשמר ועשית כאשר נדרת ||

לִיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נִדְבָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ בְּפִיךָ ‘What passes your lips take care of and do, as you have vowed to the LORD your God a freewill offering that you have spoken with your mouth’ (MT Deut. 23.24), where MT תָּ- is consistently paralleled by תה- (and ה- by כה-). By the same token, MT תה- occasionally parallels DSS ת-, as in ונתַתַּ [ונתַתַּ] וְנָתַתָּה הַכֶּסֶף || ‘and you will give the money’ (4Q364 f32.4) || וְנָתַתָּה הַכֶּסֶף (Deut. 14.26), despite the fact that the תה- ending is dominant in the MT in the case of 2MS *qatal* נָתַן.¹⁵

Concerns of space might have influenced spelling. The lone ת- ending in the Temple Scroll’s ובערת ‘and you will purge’ (11Q19 54.17) is line-final; as are a few—but not many—other cases of the short spelling (4Q435 f2i.5; 4Q437 f2i.12; 4Q438 f4ii.2). Even so, line-final תה- spellings are not uncommon.

It is reasonable to ponder the possible effects of prosodic and phonological factors, but it is difficult to assess them given the limitations and ambiguities of the available data.

5.3. DSS Summary

Most scrolls show a discernible predilection for one form or the other. And usually, texts that prefer the short or long nominal spelling also prefer the corresponding length of verbal ending. However, this is not true of the two halves of the Great Isaiah Scroll, where each half prefers either short nominal and long verbal 2MS morphology or vice versa. In the biblical material, a few individual scrolls, including 1QIsa^a, 11QPs^a, and the phylacteries

¹⁵ Though, in the present case, it might be argued that the first *heh* in a sequence of two consecutive *hehs* has simply dropped out.

from Cave 4, contain three-quarters of the long nominal spelling and nearly 70 percent of the long verbal spelling.

The regularity of the long spellings in some BDSS material is indisputable evidence that a vowel-final realisation similar to Tiberian *-ka* and *-ta* was in common use in the late Second Temple Period. It thus seems gratuitous to attribute the Tiberian *-ka* and *-ta* realisations to eighth-century CE Arabic influence.¹⁶

Conversely, short spellings are ambiguous. One option is to view them as straightforward evidence of consonant-final realisations.¹⁷ This is probably legitimate in a great many, if not most cases. However, caution is in order. The co-occurrence of the two spellings in the same text, and even in the same line,¹⁸ arguably

¹⁶ *Pace* Kahle (1959, 174–77), who maintains that the *-ka* suffix reflected in DSS orthography “was lost for centuries and was reintroduced with great regularity by the Tiberian Masoretes, ... and has therefore to be regarded as an innovation of the eighth century” (175), under the influence of Qurʾānic Arabic and the orthography of DSS manuscripts. Kahle could not have known the extent to which his formulation “a certain number of Hebrew manuscripts from the Dead Sea Caves in which an ending ה appears” (1959, 176) represented a gross under-representation of the frequency of כה- and *-ka* there, nor of the existence of Iron Age epigraphic evidence for *-ka* (see below). However, the limited data did not prevent other scholars from proposing sounder approaches, e.g., Cross and Freedman (1952, 67); Ben-Hayyim (1954).

¹⁷ This was obviously Kahle’s view (1921, 234–35; 1959, 171–77). Khan (2013b, 307) seems to imply that the DSS ט- and כה- spellings represent distinct phonetic realisations. Kutscher (1974, 446–47), Reymond (2014, 35–36, 39, 156, 226), and Qimron (2018, 265–66) all to varying degrees view the issue as purely orthographic.

¹⁸ Outside of 1QIsa^a, where co-incidence of 2MS ט- and כה- in a single line is encountered 45 times, intralinear co-occurrence is chiefly, but

points to the possibility that some cases of the short spellings are defective representations of vowel-final realisations under the influence of classical biblical spelling practices.¹⁹

Given the strong evidence for the Second Temple Period coexistence of consonant-final and vowel-final variants of the 2MS sufformatives in sources representative of registers both formal and vernacular, the most prudent hypothesis would seem to be that DSS short spellings reflect both consonant- and vowel-final realisations. The one possible exception is the short spelling of the verbal ending in the non-biblical scrolls, the rarity of which might indicate that this is consistently conservative spelling for a vowel-final pronunciation. A plausible reading of the evidence is that the DSS mixture of forms reflects both competing archaic and contemporary spelling practices as well as opposing diachronic, dialectal, and registerial phonetic realisations.

not exclusively, limited to phylacteries: 4QPhyl^f (4Q133) f1.1 (|| MT Exod. 13.11–12); 4QPhyl^g (4Q134) f1.20 (erasure) (|| MT Deut. 5.14), 24 (suspended *heh*) (|| Deut. 5.16); 4QPhyl^h (4Q135) f1.11 (|| Deut. 6.2–3); 8Q3Phyl (8Q3) f1–11i.22 (|| Exod. 13.15–16); 11QPs^a (11Q5) 20.12 (|| Ps. 139.20–21); XHev/SePhyl (XHev/Se5) f1.7 (|| Exod. 13.15–16).

¹⁹ This is in line with Barr's (1989b, 123) observation regarding apparent Second Temple levelling of the perhaps once more prevalent תה- and כה- to ת- and ך-, respectively, in the Masoretic consonantal tradition. In the precious few cases of diachronically separated parallel passages, there is a tendency to replace the former with the latter according to late scribal norms. See Barr (1989b, 125) on broader textual possibilities.

6.0. Aramaic

Given the influential role attributed to Aramaic in several theories of the development of the Hebrew 2MS object/possessive suffix, it is fitting to focus briefly on the situation in Aramaic itself. Beginning with the nominal suffix, in Masoretic BA, the spelling τ - (with 99 cases) occurs to the total exclusion of כה- and it coincides consistently with consonant-final vocalisation (though there are 18 cases of *ketiv-qere* dissonance involving vocalic realisation before the suffix).

In the Aramaic of the DSS, there is greater variety, but consonant-final spellings still dominate. Thus, in biblical DSS Aramaic material, the counts are τ - 11 versus כה- 3,²⁰ while in non-biblical DSS Aramaic the totals are τ - 200 versus כה- 40. In the Genesis Apocryphon alone, the totals are τ - 74 versus כה- 1 (מנכה) ‘from you’ 1Q20 20.26 and one erasure in {א} לב ‘to you’ 1Q20 5.9). Of course, while כה- is phonetically transparent, τ - may conceivably represent a consonant- or vowel-final realisation. Even so, it is clear that neither Aramaic, in general, nor BA and QA, specifically, are uniform regarding the realisation of the 2MS object/possessive suffix. Elsewhere in Aramaic of the Judaean Desert, in Syriac, and in later Aramaic dialects consonant-final forms dominate.

²⁰ The three cases of disparity between Masoretic BA and DSSBA all come in the same scroll, 4QDan^b (4Q113), which preserves only these three cases: אבֹּוּךָ ‘your father’ (Dan. 5.11) || אבוכה (4Q113 f1–4.3); *ketiv* עלִיךָ *qere* עֲלֶיךָ ‘about you’ (Dan. 5.16) || עליכה (4Q113 f1–4.14); אֱלֹהֶיךָ ‘your God’ (Dan. 6.21) || אלהכה (4Q113 f7ii–8.18).

In the case of the verbal suffix in Aramaic, variety ensues. Masoretic BA shows the following pattern of incidence: תִּ- 6, תָּ- 16, תָּה- 3. The related 2MS independent subject pronoun likewise shows deviation from uniformity: according to the *ketiv*, it is אַנְתָּ 1, אַנְתָּה 14; according to the *qere*, אַנְתָּ all 15 times. In DSSBA, all six 2MS suffix conjugation forms end in תִּ-, but the 2MS independent subject pronoun is thrice אַנְתָּ and twice אַנְתָּה. And in non-biblical QA, vowel-final forms of both the 2MS verbal ending and the 2MS independent subject pronoun prevail—verbal ending: תִּ- 15; אַתָּה/-תָּה- 23; pronoun: 0 אַנְתָּ; 26 אַנְתָּה. Short spellings are standard in Aramaic documents from elsewhere in the Judaean Desert, as well as in Syriac and later forms of Aramaic. As in the case of the 2MS nominal suffix, it seems that early diversity eventually gave way to later preference for short spellings, whatever their phonetic realisation.

7.0. Iron Age Inscriptions

A fundamental question involves the historical depth of the Hebrew vowel-final *-ka* and *-ta* realisations. The earliest unequivocal attestation usually proffered consists of the dominant DSS long spellings. As noted above, this firmly anchors vowel-final pronunciations like those of the Tiberian reading tradition in the Second Temple Period. The affinity between the Tiberian pronunciation tradition and Second Temple written evidence is not a coincidence, as there are many salient commonalities between the Tiberian vocalisation and Second Temple Hebrew material (LBH, DSS), where both appear to deviate from the linguistic testimony of the Masoretic written tradition of CBH material. Cru-

cially, though, in many cases where it seems that the Tiberian reading tradition reflects relatively late secondary standardisation of a feature, the feature itself proves to have far earlier roots. This also applies to the 2MS affirmatives under discussion here, as is evident from Iron Age inscriptional material.

Regarding the nominal suffix—in Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy, the short spelling ך - dominates. In view of the normal use of *mater heh* to mark final *-a* (Cross and Freedman 1952, 57; Zevit 1980, 14–15, 24–25, 31–32; Gogel 1997, 59; Hutton 2013b, 966–67), this spelling is probably generally indicative of the consonant-final *-k* realisation of the 2MS nominal suffix. There are, however, a minority of inscriptional forms bearing כה- :

- (1) לשנותכה
‘to change/recount to you’ (Ḥorvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 2; Hutton 2013, 967b; cf. Aḥituv 2008, 173–74)
- (2) זרעתיכה
‘your arms’ (Ḥorvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 11; Hutton 2013b, 967;²¹ cf. Aḥituv 2008, 173–74)
- (3) קב[ר]כה
‘your tom[b]’ (Ḥorvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 12; Aḥituv 2008, 173–77²²)
- (4) וקברכה
‘and your tomb’ (Ḥorvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 13)

²¹ This is Cross’s reading according to Beit-Arieh (1993, 64); cf. Beit-Arieh (1993, 61).

²² This is Lemaire’s (1995) reading according to Aḥituv (2008, 176).

- (5) אלהיכה
 ‘your God’ (Khirbet Beit Lei Cave Inscription 1.1; see Gogel 1997, 158; Aḥituv 2008, 233)

In this connection, mention should also be made of the orthography of *יברך* in the following instances

- (6) *יברך/ך יהוה / ישרמך*
 ‘**may Yhwh bless you** (?), keep you’ (Ketef Hinnom 1.14)
- (7) *יברך / יהוה / ישרמך*
 ‘**may YHWH bless you** (?), keep you’ (Ketef Hinnom 2.5)
- (8) *ברכתך. ליהוה תמן / ולאשרתה. יברך וישמך*
 ‘I have blessed you to YHWH of Teman and to his Ashera.
May he bless you (?) and keep you’ (Kuntillet ‘Ajrud 2.4–7)

If the forms written *יברך* are to be interpreted as including an object suffix, as in MT *יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁמְרֶךָ* in *יְבָרְכֶךָ* ‘may the LORD bless you and keep you’ (MT Num. 6.24)—and not as simple *יְבָרְךָ* in a cataphorically elliptical *יברך יהוה וישמך* ‘may YHWH bless and keep you’, with no 2MS suffix on the first verb—then the omission from *יברך* of the expected *ך*-suffix is most plausibly explained as a result of assimilatory gemination,²³ which process presupposes

²³ An alternative explanation, namely, that the omission is due to scribal lapse, seems implausible, given that it assumes the mistake was made all three times the phrase was written in two separate corpora. Further, note that in only one case is the end of the word line-final.

a vowel-final form.²⁴ This is far from certain, however, and there are alternative views.

In summary, Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy presents up to eight cases of the vowel-final nominal suffix *-ka*, the most secure of which is example (4) above. Though not the majority spelling or, probably, the majority pronunciation, the inscriptional long spellings confirm the antiquity of the relevant spelling and pronunciation in the DSS and of the standard Tiberian pronunciation.

Turning to the verbal ending—as is often the case, Iron Age Hebrew epigraphic material is important as pristine evidence, but problematic due to the phonetic ambiguity of its orthography—even the most *plene* Hebrew spelling is characterised by partial vocalic ambiguity, and the spelling in Iron Age epigraphy is more defective than in most Hebrew writing. Be that as it may, the epigraphic evidence, though somewhat ambiguous, is sufficiently transparent to confirm the antiquity of a vowel-final realisation.

²⁴ For Aḥituv (2008, 53) the writing of a single \daleth - might be a labour- and/or space-saving strategy, whereby it serves double duty, like the *yod* in חיהוה 'as surely as YHWH lives' (Arad 21.5) and וביאמר 'and because (my lord) says' (Lachish 3.8–9). In ביאמר *ky'mr* for בי יאמר *ky y'mr*, -כ is defective for כ and cliticised to the following word beginning with consonantal *yod*. In the cases of חיהוה *hyhwh* for חי יהוה *hy yhwh* and יברך *ybrk* for יברכך *ybrkk(a)*, the relevant double-duty letters presumably signal geminated consonants. Cf. Aḥituv, who postulates two phonetic options without gemination: *yěbārēk^oka* or *yěbārēka*. The first is arguably a poor candidate for double-duty spelling with \daleth -, because the *k* consonants are separated by a reduced vowel. The second goes one step further, assuming gemination followed by degemination (and a fricative *k*!). Regardless, both assume a *-ka* realisation of the 2MS suffix.

The extant inscriptional corpus includes twelve relevant examples. Some of the cases provide unequivocal evidence of ת- as the spelling of the 2MS *qaṭal* sufformative. While this spelling is phonetically ambiguous, in light of the routine usage of *matres lectionis* for final vowel sounds in the corpus (Gogel 1997, 59; Hutton 2013b, 965), they are commonly taken as evidence of a consonant-final *-t* phonetic realisation. Consider examples (9)–(14):

- (9) וְהַסְבִּיבְתָּ מָחָר
 ‘and you will make the rounds tomorrow’ (Arad 2.5–6)
- (10) וְאִם עוֹד חֶמֶץ וְנִתְּ לָהֶם
 ‘and if there is still vinegar, you will give (it) to them’
 (Arad 2.7–8)
- (11) וְצִרְרִיתָ אֹתָם בְּצֶקֶ
 ‘and you shall bind them’ (Arad 3.5–6)
- (12) וְלִקַּחְתָּ מִשְׁמַחַת 1 שֶׁמֶן
 ‘and you will take therefrom 1 (unit of) oil’ (Arad 17.3–4)
- (13) וְהִשְׁבִּיבְתָּ אֶת [בגד ע] בְּדֶכְ
 ‘[and] you [will retu]rn the [garment of] your [se]rvant’
 (Yavne Yam 14)
- (14) מִי עֶבְדְּכֶם בְּלֶבֶת [כִּי] שְׁלַחְתָּ אֵל עֶבְדְּכֶם אֶת [ת] הַסְּפָרָה כֹּזֵא [ת]
 ‘Who is your servant (but) a dog [that] you have sent to
 your servant the letters like this? (Lachish 5.3–6)²⁵

²⁵ Against the spelling שלחתה reconstructed by some scholars, see Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 320–21); but cf. Gogel (1998, 83, 86). As-

In other cases, the spelling תה- appears. This spelling is also often ambiguous and, as such, is variously interpreted. Consider the alternative renderings in examples (15)–(20):

(15) [ו] /כתבתה לפניכי

‘and you will write before you’ – or –

‘and you will write it before you’ (Arad 7.5–6)

(16)] והנידעתה

‘And behold, you knew/know...’ – or –

‘And behold, you knew/know it...’ (Arad 40.9)

(17) ...דבר-אשר לא-ידעתה

‘anything that you do not know’ – or –

‘anything that you do not know it’ (Lachish 2.6)

(18) ועת-הפקח/[נא] אַתְּ אִזְנִי עֲבַדְכָּ לְסַפֵּר-אֲשֶׁר/שְׁלַחְתָּהּ אֲדֹנָי לְעִבְדְּךָ אָמֵשׁ

‘And now, please open the ear of your servant to the letter that you sent, my lord, to your servant yesterday’ – or –

‘And now, please open the ear of your servant to the letter that you sent it, my lord, to your servant yesterday’ (Lachish 3.4–6)

(19) כתבתי על הדלת ככל/אשר שלח[ת]ה אלי

‘I have written upon the door according to all that you have sent to me’ – or –

‘I have written upon the door according to all that you have sent it to me’ (Lachish 4.3–4)

suming a correct reconstruction as above, a 2MS *qaṭal* form with *heh* would be strong evidence of *plene* spelling of *-ta*.

(20) וְכִי אָמַר אֲדֹנָי לֹא יִדְעֶתָהּ / קְרָא סֵפֶר

‘and because my lord said, “**You do not know** (how) to read a letter” – *or* –

‘and because my lord said, “**You do not understand it**. Call a scribe!” (Lachish 3.8–9)²⁶

Scholars are divided on the interpretation of such forms: are they reflections of a vowel-final 2MS *qaṭal* ending *-ta* (as in the Tiberian reading tradition) or consonant-final *-t* with a 3MS or 3FS object suffix? Persuaded by the unambiguous cases of ת- in examples (9)–(14), above, some scholars take all cases of 2MS תה- in the relevant corpus as incorporating an object suffix (Parunak 1978, 28 [on Arad]; Cross 1985, 43–46; Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 23, 73, 307, 311; Rollston 2006, 62, fn. 42; Hutton 2013b, 967–68). But as Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 23, 73, 307, 311) repeatedly make clear, these judgments are based on a balance of probability, not certainty. In other words, because the Arad and Lachish evince unequivocal cases of ת-, it is reasoned that ambiguous תה- should be regarded as *-t* + object suffix. But this seems to assume a degree of orthographic and phonological consistency arguably foreign to Iron Age epigraphic Hebrew. Consider the presentatives ‘behold’ הן (Arad 21.3; 40.9) and הנה (Arad 24.18; Jerusalem 2.2; Lachish 6.5, 10). Or, perhaps more relevant, consider forms of the 1CS *qaṭal*: most cases end with י- (Arad 16.4; 24.18; 60.1; 88.1; Lachish 3.12; 4.3; 12.4; Yavne Yam 11), but several end with ת- (Kuntillet Ajrud 18.1; Meṣad Ḥashavyahu 8; Murabba‘at 1.1). It was clearly not impossible for scribes (or a

²⁶ Similarly, some render the words וְכִי אָמַר אֲדֹנָי לֹא יִדְעֶתָהּ / קְרָא סֵפֶר ‘**you do not understand it**—call a scribe!’ (see below).

single scribe) to utilise orthographic and/or phonetic variants that differed in terms of final spelling and/or phonetic realisation.

While examples (15)–(16) are truly ambiguous, in (17)–(20) there are linguistic factors that appear to favour interpretation of the spelling תה- as *plene* for a vowel-final *-ta* realisation with no pronominal object suffix.

In the case of examples (17)–(19), the pertinent considerations are grammatical and pragmatic. Wholesale interpretation of the long spelling תה- as *-t* + pronominal suffix entails positing three cases of relativising אשר followed by 2MS *qatal* and a resumptive accusative object pronoun. As Holmstedt (2008, 5, 13–14) shows, such structures are rare in BH—the combination אָשֶׁר + 2MS finite verb + (את) resumptive accusative pronominal suffix comes in, e.g., Gen. 45.4; Lev. 23.2, 4; Num. 34.13; Deut. 33.8; Josh. 2.10. Neither are they the preferred structure in inscriptional Hebrew. The formulation ועת ככל אשר-שלה-אדנִי ‘and now according to all that my lord sent’ (Lachish 4.2) is a 3rd-person parallel for examples (18) and (19) above, but shows no resumptive accusative pronominal suffix after אשר; cf. שלחה (your servant) has sent it’ (Lachish 3.21). Also relevant is כָּל־הַאֲתָת־אֲשֶׁר נתנו/אֲדֹנִי ‘according to all the signs that my lord gave’ (Lachish 4.12)—again with no resumptive accusative. It would certainly be surprising for such a rare grammatical structure to appear twice in the limited corpus presented by the Lachish letters. Further, it is altogether suspicious that the purported instances are limited to 2MS cases of תה- that are amenable to alternative readings.

Holmstedt (2008, 5, 13–14) provides an explanation for the rarity of the structure discussed above as well as an argument for why the assumed cases thereof in the Lachish letters are best explained otherwise. He applies Keenan and Comrie's (1977, 66) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (NPAH)

Subj > DO > IO > Oblique > Gen > Obj of Comparison

Holmstedt (2008, 6) explains that it strongly predicts the positions in which a language may use resumptive pronouns, i.e., first and more often for less accessible positions farther to the right on the hierarchy. He (2008, 14, fn. 12) elaborates as follows:

There are many examples of RC [relative clause] resumption in the Hebrew Bible and, as the NPAH leads us to expect, the great majority are in the genitive/NP-internal and oblique (object of preposition) positions within the RC. Resumption in the object position occurs less frequently and its use is highly constrained: it is used (1) to disambiguate verbal semantics in cases when a verb taking an accusative or oblique complement results in distinct meanings, or (2) to signal that the object carried focus pragmatics within the RC.

In agreement with Holmstedt, neither of the verbs in examples (17)–(19) requires semantic disambiguation based on meaning differences with accusative versus oblique complements. Nor does either seem a good candidate for argument focus. There is thus no grammatical or pragmatic motivation for resumption of the accusative after relativising אֲשֶׁר in examples (17)–(19).

Turning to example (20)—again, the conviction that תה must include a pronominal suffix seems to have led a number of

scholars to render לֹא־יִדְעֵתָהּ/קָרָא־סִפֵּר as ‘**you don’t understand it—call a scribe!**’ (Lachish 3.8–9). While the consonantal string סִפֵּר is ambiguous, representing something along the lines of Tiberian סִפֵּר ‘scribe’ or סִפֵּר ‘letter’, Schniedewind (2000b, 160) is correct to problematise the semantic elasticity assumed for the verb יָדַע by those who render it ‘understand’ (*pace* Cross 1985, 43–46; Rollston 2006, 62, fn. 42). In this case, too, then, the long spelling תָּה- seems merely to indicate a vowel-final 2MS realisation *-ta*.

This means that the spelling of 2MS *qaṭal* תָּה- in four of the six ostensibly equivocal cases listed above is more likely to represent *-ta* with no object suffix than *-t* with an object suffix. This supports the theory of probable phonetic variety in 2MS verbal morphology in Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy (in agreement with Zevit 1980, 19, 28; Gogel 1998, 83–88; Schniedewind 2000b, 160; Holmstedt 2008, 13–14; Aḥituv, Garr, and Fassberg 2016, 61), similar to that characteristic of various other forms of ancient Hebrew, including the combined written and reading Masoretic tradition.²⁷

²⁷ Zevit (1980, 31–32) and Rainey (Aharoni 1981, 22) raise the possibility that the distinction between 2MS verbal ת- and תָּה- is somehow related to the well-known stress distinction between *qaṭal* and *weqaṭal* in Tiberian BH. The proposal, however, has not been well received (see, e.g., Pardee 1985, 69; Gogel 1998, 83–84; Hutton 2013b, 967–68). First, early *qaṭaltá* would be expected to result in Tiberian *qaṭaltá̃* (as in the 2M/FPL forms); the preservation of a full vowel in the antepenultimate syllable is evidence that the rules that resulted in the distinction between Tiberian *qāṭáltā̃* and *qaṭaltém* were no longer operative when *wəqāṭaltá̃* came into being. Second, given the BH stress distinction, one would expect תָּה- to coincide with the stress in *wəqāṭaltá̃*, but the pro-

8.0. Conclusion: Historical Depth of 2MS ף- and ן- in the Tiberian Reading Tradition

In summary, though the Tiberian vocalisation tradition's dominant vowel-final 2MS \bar{a} nominal and verbal endings likely differ from the prevailing consonant-final endings that the Masoretic consonantal spellings are probably intended to represent, there is substantial evidence indicating that vowel-final 2MS morphology was in use in the Second Temple Period. There is also evidence, albeit arguable, of minority vowel-final 2MS morphology in First Temple sources, including apparently pre-exilic biblical consonantal material and, of special importance, Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy. Vowel-final 2MS morphology thus qualifies as a departure of the Tiberian reading tradition from its written counterpart involving the secondary standardisation of an early minority linguistic feature.

posals is for the opposite. Third, there appear to be inscriptional *qaṭal* forms ending in ן- and *weqaṭal* forms ending in ןׁ-, so the most that can be said is that there is a preference for distinct spellings, not full consistency. Fourth, even if the spelling distinctions are generally characteristic, there is no certainty that they represent phonological distinctions. Finally, the Second Temple crystallisation of the Tiberian reading tradition provides a context for the secondary development of disambiguating stress, as there is mounting evidence that the proto-Tiberian reading tradition included the implementation of orthoepic strategies to preserve the precise realisation and safeguard understanding of the biblical text (Khan 2018b; 2020, I:99–105).

9.0. Appendix: Further Consideration of Complexities

While the significance of the early attestation of the long spellings כה- and תה- is obvious, the import of the ך- and ת- spellings—whether merely orthographic or phonetic—is ambiguous in many Hebrew traditions. In this section, the discussion centres on various complicating considerations regarding the nominal suffix.

For example, central to Kahle's (1921; 1947, 99–100; 1959, 175–76) argument for the secondary nature of Tiberian ך- was the view that the prevailing ך- spelling of the Masoretic consonantal tradition represents dominance of a classical, high-register *-k* realisation. Yet, in other corpora *-k* is considered representative of the vernacular and/or due to late Aramaic influence. Consider the words of Cross and Freedman (1952, 66–67):

The longer form of the suffix was native to old Hebrew, and survived in elevated speech and literary works. The shorter form developed in the popular speech at a very early date (with the dropping of the final *ā*, which is to be regarded as *anceps*). The present Massoretic [*sic*] text represents a mixture of these forms, both of which have been extended throughout the Bible. The short form is preserved in the orthography, the long form in the vocalization. The orthography was standardized, clearly on the basis of manuscripts in which the short form predominated. The vocalization, however, was based on manuscripts in which the long form was common.

It is a testament to the complexity of the problem that Cross and Freedman are compelled to make several counterintuitive claims. First, in this connection they consider the Masoretic consonantal

tradition, with the spelling ט-, more innovative than the Tiberian reading tradition, which preserved the $-k\bar{a}$ of “elevated speech and literary works.” Such a view runs counter to common scholarly attitude regarding the diachronic relationship between the Masoretic written and reading traditions, whereby the reading tradition is generally considered the more evolved of the two. Second, they argue that in this case it is the consonantal tradition that reflects the form associated with “popular speech,” the vocalisation reflecting a conservative manuscript tradition. Again, while not impossible, this is at odds with the usual linking of the Tiberian reading tradition to Second Temple vernacular conventions, especially as seen in RH.

Khan (2020, I:90) responds to Kahle’s privileging of Palestinian material, discussing the ‘vernacular’ or ‘popular’ character of multiple Second Temple traditions, including in connection to the 2MS $-k$ variant:

The distinctive features of Palestinian pronunciation, which are particularly discernible in the non-biblical manuscripts with Palestinian pronunciation, have close parallels with what is known about the vowel system of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic [Fassberg 1991, 28–57]. Unlike Tiberian and Babylonian, the Palestinian biblical reading is unlikely to be a direct descendant of the proto-Masoretic reading, but rather it has its roots in other traditions of reading that were current in Palestine in antiquity. The Greek transcription in Origen’s Hexapla (the middle of the third century C.E.) reflects a reading that has even more evidence of influence from the Aramaic vernacular, especially in the pronominal suffixes, such as the 2ms suffix $-akh$, e.g. $\sigma\epsilon\mu\alpha\chi$ ‘your name’ (Tiberian $\text{ךָ}\text{ךָ}$ Psa. 31.4) [Brønno 1943, 110, 196–200]. This is also a feature of the

Samaritan tradition, e.g. *yēdāk* ‘your hand’ (Tiberian 𐤓𐤕) [Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 228]. Some of these features, such as the Aramaic type of pronominal suffixes, appear in medieval non-biblical texts with Palestinian vocalization. In the second half of the first millennium, however, it appears that the popular biblical reading converged to a greater extent with the prestigious Tiberian tradition. As a result, the Aramaic type of suffixes were eliminated in the biblical reading [Yahalom, 1997, Introduction].²⁸

If the orthography 𐤕- and the realisation *-k* are early, then perhaps even in RH they might be considered a retention rather than an innovation. After all, despite its overall late character, RH is thought to preserve individual archaisms (Pérez-Fernández 1999, 7–9; cf. Cook 2017, 5 and fn. 3). Most scholars, however, attribute RH *-k* to late Aramaic influence (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 62–64; Kutscher 1963, 264–66; Sáenz-Badillos 1993, 185; even Pérez-Fernández 1999, 5). For his part, Breuer (2013, 736) sees the conditioned distribution of RH *-k* (after consonants) and *-ka* (after vowels) in contrast to *-ak* alone in Aramaic as evidence that RH *-k* is a secondary development, but not one of Aramaic origin.

The difficulty in definitively characterising the use of *-k* and *-ka* in the DSS should now be evident. It was proposed above that the *spelling* 𐤕- should sometimes be considered a retention. But what of the *realisation* *-k*? Is it to be considered an archaic phonetic retention, in line with the classical BH realisation presumed to underly MT 𐤕- and assumed by some to be preserved in Tiberian pausal *-āḱ*? Or is it rather to be deemed an innovation due to contact with Aramaic and/or the influence of a late vernacular

²⁸ See also Blau (2010, 171, §4.2.3.3.5).

in the line of RH? Is only the DSS spelling כה- to be considered innovative and popular, but the *-ka* realisation it surely reflects conservative and prestigious? The intersection of various considerations to do with orthography, phonology, chronolect, dialect, register, and transmission within various traditions complicates the discussion.

Bauer and Leander (1922, 30) and Cross and Freedman (1952, 66) consider the widespread reduction of *-ka* to *-k* a very early phenomenon. Steiner (1979, 162 and fn. 9) agrees that it “must be dated to a time when Hebrew was still a living language,” but that

the evidence for Aramaic influence adduced by Ben-Hayyim [1954] and Kutscher [1963] makes it difficult to accept the suggestion of Bauer and Leander (1922, p. 30) that the development in question had already taken place during the Biblical period, in a dialect different from the one which formed the basis of the Masoretic vocalisation.

However, given (a) the regularity of final *-a* marked by ה- in the case of non-2MS morphology in both Iron Age inscriptional Hebrew and all traditions of BH, (b) the regular absence of ה- in cases of the 2MS suffix in Iron Age inscriptional Hebrew and the Masoretic consonantal tradition, and (c) the usual affinity between Iron Age inscriptional Hebrew and the Masoretic consonantal tradition, a relatively strong case can be made for routine Iron Age realisation as *-k*. Indeed, in both the inscriptions and the Masoretic consonantal text, it is the כה- spelling—the only unequivocal evidence for the *-ka* realisation—that constitutes the decisive minority.

It is likely that, as time passed, the original variation became further complicated, whether due to dialectal, registerial, or mixed factors. Aramaic was almost certainly a factor, both for τ - and $-k$ (RH, the DSS, the transcriptions) and thereagainst (BH reading traditions, the DSS).²⁹ Second Temple vernacular registers, such as that later documented as Tannaitic RH, must also have played a role, again, both for τ - and $-k$ (RH, the transcriptions) and against them (the DSS).³⁰ So, too, if Steiner is correct about pausal forms, elevated reading practices must also have played a part (in BH, RH, and the DSS). From this perspective, it is interesting that among the DSS the τ - spelling, while overall the minority form, is comparatively more common in biblical than in non-biblical material, though, as Qimron (2018, 266) notes, כה- occurs in DSS biblical material “even where other phases of Hebrew use the apocopated form, e.g., with the prepositions לכה, בכה, אתכה, עמכה in pausal position....” Whatever pronunciation DSS τ - represents, adherence to classical spelling

²⁹ While bilingual readers may have conflated Hebrew and Aramaic suffixes, the more careful among them may have made an effort to prevent the penetration of Aramaic features into the classical Hebrew tradition (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 61).

³⁰ Here it seems fitting to acknowledge Schniedewind’s (1999; 2000a; 2021) theory of Qumran Hebrew as an anti-language; cf. Tigchelaar (2018). It may also be worth considering in this connection two Qumran compositions the Hebrew of which is often considered uniquely representative of contemporary vernacular traits. In the Copper Scroll (3Q15; on the language of which, see Wolters 2013), all three cases of the 2MS suffix are τ -; in 4QMMT (comprising 4Q394–397, 4Q399; on the language of which, see Yuditsky 2013a), there are four cases of τ - (all in 4Q399) and five of כה- (all in 4Q397).

norms seems to have been more common in biblical than in non-biblical sources. As for the DSS כה- spelling and *-ka* realisation—the regularity of the *orthography* is clearly a late phenomenon, but as the related phonetic realisation tallies with the minority Iron Age inscriptional orthography, there seems no reason to doubt a genetic link between the two involving *-ka*, which until the late Second Temple Period, seemingly by chance, enjoyed only sporadic orthographic representation.

Circling back to the combined Tiberian written and reading tradition, it is possible to summarise. To begin with, if the *-ka* affinity between First and Second Temple extra-biblical material (inscriptions and DSS) is organic, then *-kā̄* in the Tiberian reading tradition likely also has genuinely old roots—even if anti-Aramaic and anti-vernacular concerns may have contributed to its preservation. Second, while RH *-k* is probably rightly considered a late vernacular feature, this does not mean that Tiberian consonantal *ך*- and its presumed *-k* realisation are not, along with the Tiberian reading tradition's *-kā̄*, authentic Iron Age phenomena.³¹

³¹ In an Iron Age Hebrew dialect with 2MS *-k*, it is not clear how related and complementary morphology would be realised. For example, forms similar to the Tiberian reading tradition's 2MS independent subject pronoun *'attā̄* are the norm in the Masoretic consonantal text (where 2MS *אַתָּה* 'you' [Num. 11.15; Deut. 5.27; Ezek. 28.14] and cases of *ketiv* *קִרְיָה* read as *qere* *הַקִּרְיָה* [1 Sam. 24.19; Ps. 6.4; Job 1.10; Qoh. 7.22; Neh. 9.6] are rare), the Babylonian reading tradition (Yeivin 1985, 1103), the DSS (Qimron 2018, 260), Ben Sira, SH (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 225–26, §§3.0–3.1, 3.1.2), the Secunda [normally *αθθα*, just once *αθ*] (Yuditsky 2013b, 811), Jerome (*attha*, *ath*); RH, though *קִרְיָה* occurs in a sizeable minority of cases (Breuer 2013, 735). Obviously, users of some forms of Hebrew

In terms of detailing the merger and explaining things as they now stand, Barr's (1989b, 123–25) view is an attractive place to begin. The Hebrew Bible's oldest material probably exhibited greater spelling (and, thus, phonological) variety, i.e., a larger number of cases of כה-. But early Second Temple scribes, copying and composing during the period of LBH, standardised the spelling כ־, leaving only a tiny remnant of כה- (a spelling that certain factors helped to preserve). This standardisation may well have been influenced by a dialect and/or register in which the use of *-k* had largely pushed out that of *-ka*, whether due to convergence with Aramaic, diffusion of liturgical or vernacular apocope, or some combination of these. Crucially, however, the scribal process responsible for depiction of the 2MS suffix in the Masoretic *written* tradition did not dictate a matching realisation in the

tolerated a difference in the realisation of a vowel-final 2MS independent pronoun and a consonant-final 2MS object/possessive suffix. (My thanks to Ben Kantor for the forms from Jerome.)

Finally, it is also interesting to consider the 2FS object/possessive suffix. As is well known, in the Tiberian reading tradition the pausal form of the 2MS suffix is identical to that of the 2FS suffix in the case of certain particles. This evinces toleration of a certain degree of ambiguity, also characteristic of various forms of the corresponding Samaritan suffixes. On the assumption that the Masoretic consonantal text regularly reflects 2MS *-ak*, the standard Tiberian 2FS *-ēk* would have been sufficient for gender disambiguation; other 2FS alternatives include RH and Aramaic כ־ *-ik* and the variously represented כ־ *-ki*, which is sporadic in the Tiberian written and reading traditions and rare in DSS orthography—though Qimron (2018, 267–68) posits *-ki* as the majority (defectively spelled) DSS realisation—but well attested in Aramaic dialects (including the Syriac written tradition) and Deir 'Alla.

proto-Tiberian *reading* tradition. Here, too, there was a process of levelling, but in this case $-k\bar{a}$ became the standard (except in pause in the case of a few forms)—perhaps out of resistance to the very factors that led the expansion of γ - and $-k$ in the written tradition. Of course, much of this proposal is conjecture, neither verifiable nor falsifiable, but it arguably fits the facts and is somewhat reminiscent of other cases of dissonance between the Masoretic written and pronunciation traditions examined in this monograph.

At any rate, the picture painted by the combined evidence is one of diversity as far back as the evidence goes, extending back into the late Second Temple Period and beyond. The consonantal-vocalic dissonance in the combined written-reading Masoretic tradition concerning γ - appears to be the artificial result of the merging of divergent pronunciation traditions. The anachronism lies not in the spelling γ - for $-k$ or the realisation $-k\bar{a}$ reflected in כה—as each of the respective orthographies and realisations reliably represents a genuine First Temple variant—but in the standardisation of one or the other in each component of the tradition.

The BDSS evidence points to the conclusion that $-k$ and $-ka$ were contemporary options for the realisation of the 2MS object/possessive suffix in the late Second Temple Period.

What this all means for the literary Hebrew of the early Second Temple Period, to say nothing of the Iron Age, has been a matter of some controversy. Kahle (1959, 174–77) downplayed the historical relevance of the DSS spelling כה- for the question of the dissonance between the Tiberian vocalisation and conso-

nantal text. Barr (1989b, 117–18) seems to imply that Kutscher (1982, 32–35, §46), or his followers, were guilty of overstating the importance of DSS כה-:

the discovery of Qumran texts with *-ka* written plene as כה-, many times, was hailed as proof that the ancient form had been, as the Masoretic tradition had it, *-^eka* or the like. This, however, was to claim too much: the Qumran texts which so spell prove only that in Qumran times some people *thought* that this was the pronunciation, they do not prove that it had always and universally been so. Indeed, the very fact of these writings at Qumran could be taken as an indication that opinion on the matter was divided and that efforts were then being made to induce the community to use the pronunciation *-^eka* or the like.

Though Kutscher's (1982, 32, §46) proclamation of the defeat of Kahle's hypothesis—"The discovery of the DSS... sounded the death knell of this theory"—can be interpreted as a simplistic rejection of Kahle's evidence and arguments, Kutscher's earlier (1974, 446–47) discussion in the context of 1QIsa^a shows his awareness of the possibility of multiple realisations at Qumran and in Second Temple Hebrew more generally. From this perspective, it now seems superfluous to insist on Islamic Period Arabic influence on Tiberian *-k^ā*. On the other hand, Kutscher's insistence that *-k* realisations were due to "the influence of the substandard (= Rab. Hebr.) on the standard" suggests that he considered *-ka* the standard, classical, biblical form, which may not do justice to the complexity of the situation.

10.0. Citations

10.1. Tiberian Biblical Tradition

10.1.1. Cases of the *Plene* 2MS Nominal Suffix

In order of frequency, the 39 instances according to L involve *yiqtol* forms of הָכָה ‘strike’ (8x: Deut. 28.22, 27, 28, 35; 2 Sam 2.22; Isa. 10.24; Jer. 40.15; Ps. 121.6), the infinitival expression בָּאֲכָה lit. ‘your coming’ (6x: Gen. 10.19, 19, 30; 13.10; 25.18; 1 Kgs 18.46), the prepositional forms לָכָה ‘to, for you’ (3x: Gen. 27.37; 2 Sam. 18.22; Isa. 3.6) and בָּכָה ‘on you, in you, because of you’ (3x: Exod. 7.29; 2 Sam. 22.30; Ps. 141.8), the direct object particle אֶתְכָה ‘you’ (2x: Exod. 29.35; Num. 22.33), *yiqtol* forms of בָּרַךְ ‘bless’ (2x: Gen. 27.7; Ps. 145.10), the preposition כְּמוֹ ‘like’ (2x: Exod. 15.11, 11), and single cases of אֵינְכָה ‘where are you?’ (Gen. 3.9), הִנְכָה ‘here you (see)’ (2 Kgs 7.2), יָדְכָה ‘your hand’ (Exod. 13.16), כֹּחְכָה ‘strength’ (Prov. 24.10), כַּפְּכָה ‘your hand’ (Ps. 139.5), יִמְצְאוּכָה ‘they could (not) find you’ (1 Kgs 18.10), אֶנְסֶכָה ‘I will test you’ (Qoh. 2.1), חִנְּפָרְכָה ‘(understanding) will guard you’ (Prov. 2.11), עִמְכָה ‘with you’ (1 Sam 1.26), יַעֲנוּכָה ‘they will (not) answer you’ (Jer. 7.27), יַעֲצָרְכָה ‘(the rain) will (not) stop you’ (1 Kgs 18.44), the infinitive construct הִרְאוּחָה ‘(in order to) show you’ (Ezek. 40.4), בְּשִׁמְכָה ‘in your name’ (Jer. 29.25). This list differs slightly from Barr’s (1989b, 116, 127), in that his includes two cases of חֵלְכָה ‘helpless’ (Ps. 10.8, 14), despite his own doubts on their relevance (Barr 1989b, 115; cf. also BDB, 319; HALOT 319), and excludes אֶלְכָה ‘(Why) should I strike you?’ (2 Sam. 2.22).

10.1.2. Cases of the *Plene* 2MS Verbal Ending

In order of frequency, the most salient categories are: נִתְתָה(ו) – 64x (Gen. 3.12; 15.3; Exod. 21.23; 25.12; 26.32, 33; 27.5; 28.14, 24, 25, 27; 29.12, 20; 30.6, 36; 40.5, 6; Num. 3.9, 48; 7.5; 27.20; 31.29, 30; Deut. 11.29; 14.25, 26; 15.17; 26.10, 12, 15; Josh. 15.19; 17.14; Judg. 1.15; 1 Sam. 1.11; 1 Kgs 8.36, 36, 40, 48; 9.13; Jer. 29.26; Ezek. 4.1, 2, 2, 3, 9; 43.19, 20; Ps. 4.8; 18.41; 21.3, 5; 39.6; 60.6; Ezra 9.13; Neh. 9.15, 20, 36, 37; 2 Chron. 6.25, 27, 30, 31, 38; 20.10); III-y – צִוְּתָה(ו) (Gen. 45.19); אֶרְאִיתָ(ו) (Num. 27.13; 2 Sam. 18.21; Ps. 10.14; 35.22; Lam. 3.59, 60); אֶצִּוְּתָה(ו) (Num. 27.19; Jer. 32.23; Ps. 119.4; Lam. 1.10); וְהִיִּיתָ (Judg. 11.6; 2 Sam. 10.11), פָּצִיתָ (Judg. 11.36); עָשִׂיתָ (1 Sam. 14.43; 15.6; 24.19, 20; 2 Sam. 3.24; 12.21; 16.10; Ezek. 35.11); וְהִכִּיתָ(ו) (1 Sam. 15.3; 2 Kgs 9.7; Jer. 5.3); גָּלִיתָ (2 Sam. 7.27); בָּנִיתָ (1 Kgs 9.3); וְהִשְׁקִיתָ (Jer. 25.15); וְחִטִּיתָ (Jer. 38.17); נִדְמִיתָ (Obad. 5); פָּדִיתָ (Ps. 31.6); הִרְאִיתָ (Ps. 60.5); strong verbs – נִקְסַפְתָה (Gen. 31.30); וְהִזְרַתָה (Exod. 18.20); וְיִשְׁבַּחְתָה (Deut. 17.14);

וְהִפְרָתָהּ (Deut. 23.14); וְזָנְתָהּ (Josh. 13.1); וְאַסְפָּתָהּ (Judg. 18.25); וְהִחְרַמְתָּהּ (1 Sam. 15.18); וְיָדַעְתָּהּ (2 Sam. 2.26); וְשָׁבַתָהּ (2 Sam. 14.13); הִתְחַנְנָתָהּ (1 Kgs 9.3); וְנִפְלְתָהּ (2 Kgs 14.10); גִּטְשָׁתָהּ (Isa. 2.6); וְשִׁמְטָתָהּ (Jer. 17.4); וְעָמְתָהּ (Zech. 1.12); בְּגִדְתָהּ (Mal. 2.14); כּוֹנְנָתָהּ (Ps. 8.4); הֶעֱמַדְתָּהּ (Ps. 30.8); סִפְרָתָהּ (Ps. 56.9); הִרְעֵשְׁתָּהּ (Ps. 60.4); אֲמַצְתָּהּ (Ps. 80.16); מִגְרָתָהּ (Ps. 89.45); הִסְכַּנְתָּהּ (Ps. 139.3); II-*w/y* – 15x גִּרְתָּהּ (Gen. 21.23); וּמְלָתָהּ (Exod. 12.44); הֶעֱדָתָהּ (Exod. 19.23); וְהִמָּתָהּ (Num. 14.15; 1 Sam. 15.3); בְּאִתָּהּ (2 Sam. 3.7); וְנִסְתָּהּ (2 Kgs 9.3); הִרְיָמוּתָהּ (Isa. 37.23); רִצְתָּהּ (Jer. 12.5); וְהִכְיִנְתָּהּ (Ezek. 4.3); וְמָתָהּ (Ezek. 28.8); הִבְאִתָּהּ (Ezek. 40.4); שָׁתָהּ (Ps. 8.7); הִבְשָׂתָהּ (Ps. 53.6); בְּנָתָהּ (Ps. 139.2); geminate – 6x הִרְעֵתָהּ (Exod. 5.22); וְקָעָתָהּ (Deut. 25.12); וְהִפְרָתָהּ (2 Sam. 15.34); סִבְתָּהּ (Ps. 140.8; Lam. 3.43, 44); *hiʿil* I-*n* – 4x הִגְדָּתָהּ (Judg. 14.16); הִבְיָתָהּ (וְ) (1 Sam. 15.3; 2 Kgs 9.7; Jer. 5.3); II/III-^ו – 4x גִּשְׂאִתָּהּ (Num. 14.19); מְאִסְתָּהּ (Judg. 9.38); מְאִסְתָּהּ (1 Sam. 15.26); גְּאִרְתָּהּ (Ps. 89.40); III-*t* – 1x הִצְמַתָּהּ (73.27); miscellaneous – 1x תָּתָהּ (2 Sam. 22.41). Groves–Wheeler (1991–2010, v. 4.14) counts 148, but mistakenly tags as 2MS the 3FS וְחַיְתָּהּ ‘and (your soul) will live’ (Jer. 38.17). Barr (1989b, 116, 125–27) lists 146, omitting צִוִּיתָהּ (Gen. 45.19) and נִתְתָּהּ (Neh. 9.15), while including *ketiv* שַׁתָּהּ *qere* שַׁתָּהּ (Ps. 90.8).

10.2. Samaritan Biblical Tradition

10.2.1. Cases of the *Plene* 2MS Nominal Suffix in the Written Tradition

איכה *ika* ‘how!’ (Gen. 3.9); באכה *bāka* ‘your coming’ (Gen. 10.30; 13.10; 25.18); יככה *yikkāk* ‘(the LORD) will strike you’ (Deut. 28.22, 27, 35).

10.2.2. Cases of the *Plene* 2MS Nominal Suffix in the Reading Tradition

איכה *yikkāk* ‘(the LORD) will strike you’ (Deut. 28.22, 27, 35; cf. יכך SP Deut. 28.28 || MT יִכְכֶּךָ); MT באכה is twice entirely unparalleled in SP Gen. 10.19; SP וואברכך || MT וְאַבְרַכְכָּה ‘that I may bless you’ (Gen. 27.7); SP וּלְכָה || MT וּלְכָה ‘and for you’ (Gen. 27.37); SP וּבְךָ || MT וּבְכָה ‘and on you’ (Exod. 7.29); SP יָדֶיךָ ‘your hands’ || MT יָדְךָ ‘your hand’ (Exod. 13.16); SP כְּמוֹךָ || MT כְּמִכָּה ‘like you’ (Exod. 15.11 [2x]); SP אַתְּךָ || MT אַתְּכָה ‘you’ (Exod. 29.35; Num. 22.33). Though SP איכה (Gen. 3.9) has כה-, the realisation *ika* is identical to that of rhetorical איכה || MT אִיכָה ‘how?’ (Deut. 1.12; see Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 319, §6.3.7).