

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All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at 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

11. HIFILISATION

As part of the broad morphosemantic shift in ancient Hebrew away from the G-stem in favour of morphology perceived to have greater semantic transparency, a number of *qal* verbs shifted to *hif'il*. The phenomenon is variously manifested: (a) certain apparently *qal* verbs with ambiguous forms analysable as *hif'il*—especially certain morphologically weak and semantically stative verbs—secondarily developed unambiguous *hif'il* forms; (b) hifilisation affected *qal* consonantal forms amenable to *hif'il* pronunciation, resulting in suppletive *qal-hif'il* paradigms—including the occasional *hif'il* vocalic realisation of consonantal forms ill-suited to *hif'il* reinterpretation; (c) hifilisation was exploited for purposes of semantic and/or grammatical disambiguation. Individual examples of the phenomenon were noticed early on by the likes of S. D. Luzzato (1827–1828, 125) and F. Böttcher (1866–1868, II:279–80, 436). Yalon's (1971, 43–54) treatment remains an excellent source of examples, discussion, and bibliography.

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

Hif'il forms are by no means rare in Tiberian CBH and there is abundant morphological continuity between CBH and LBH. Even so, LBH reveals unmistakable signs of the advancement of the process of hifilisation vis-à-vis CBH.

1.1.1. *Hif'il* Innovations in Late Biblical Hebrew

This is especially clear in the case of *qal* verbs that are joined or replaced in LBH by *hif'il* synonyms (Moreshet 1996).¹

qal זָנַח > *hif'il* הִזְנִיחַ 'reject'

The only remarkable aspect of the *qal*'s distribution is that it is absent from LBH (Hos. 8.3, 5; Zech. 10.6; Ps. 43.2; 44.10, 24; 60.3, 12; 74.1; 77.8; 88.15; 89.39; 108.12; Lam. 2.7; 3.17, 31), while the *hif'il* form occurs only in LBH (1 Chron. 28.9; 2 Chron. 11.14; 29.19).²

qal לָעַג > *hif'il* הִלְעִיג 'mock'

The *qal* (2 Kgs 19.21; Isa. 37.22; Jer. 20.7; Ps. 2.4; 59.9; 80.7; Job 9.23; 11.3; 22.19; Prov. 1.26; 17.5; 30.17) occurs alongside the *hif'il* (Ps 22.8; Job 21.3) in CBH texts and/or diachronically ambiguous material, but LBH proper knows only the *hif'il* alternative (Neh. 2.19; 3.33; 2 Chron. 30.10), with no obvious difference in meaning from the *qal*.

qal בָּזָה > *hif'il* הִבְזִה 'despise'

The *qal* occurs throughout CBH and LBH (Gen. 25.34; Num. 15.31; 1 Sam. 2.30; 10.27; 17.42; 2 Sam. 6.16; 12.9, 10; Isa. 49.7; Ezek. 16.59; 17.16, 18, 19; 22.8; Mal. 1.6; Ps. 22.25; 51.19;

¹ Cf. Yalon (1971, 43–54), who argues that many of the apparent *hif'il* prefix conjugation forms are actually of the *qal* stative *yaqtel* pattern.

² Excluded from this discussion is the form הִהָאֲזִיחוּ '(canals) will become foul' (Isa. 19.6) on the grounds that it represents a separate lexeme. Cf. והאֲזִיחוּ (4Q56 f10–13.11) || והִזְנִיחוּ (1QIsa^a 15.10).

69.34; 73.20; 102.18; Prov. 14.2; 15.20; 19.16; Est. 3.6; Neh. 2.19; 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Chron. 36.16), whereas the apparently synonymous *hif'il* infinitive לְהִבְזֹת comes in BH only in Esther (1.17).³

qal רָעַד > *hif'il* הִרְעִיד 'tremble'

No derivation is common in BH, but the distribution pattern reflects LBH preference for *hif'il* (Dan. 10.11; Ezra 10.9) over *qal* (Ps. 104.32).

qal שָׂחַק > *hif'il* הִשְׁחִיק 'laugh'

If the *hif'il* in 2 Chron. 30.10 has the meaning 'laugh', then this comes in place of the CBH *qal* form with that meaning.

1.1.2. *Qal* > *Hif'il* Movement in the Case of Stative and Inchoative Verbs

Another result of hifilisation is the shift from *qal* to *hif'il* in the case of verbs with stative or inchoative semantics. The alternation of *qal* צָלַח and *hif'il* הִצְלִיחַ 'succeed, prosper (intr.)' is illuminating in this connection. Observe Table 1.

³ The shift of transitive semantics from *qal* to *hif'il* evidently opened the door to the innovation of middle semantics for the *qal*, as in וַיִּבְזֶה בְּעֵינָיו לְשַׁלֵּחַ יָד בְּמֶרְדֵּכַי לְבַדּוֹ 'but it was disdainful in his eyes to send his hand against Mordechai alone' (Est. 3.6).

Table 1: *Qal* and *hif'il* of צל"ח in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

	<i>qal</i> + רִנָּה	trans.	intr.			<i>qal</i> + רִנָּה	trans.	intr.	
		<i>hif'il</i>	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i>			<i>hif'il</i>	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i>
Gen.	0	6	0	1	Ezek.	0	0	5	0
Num.	0	0	1	0	Amos	0	0	1	0
Deut.	0	1	0	0	Ps.	0	2	1	1
Josh.	0	1	0	0	Prov.	0	0	0	1
Judg.	3	1	0	0	Dan.	0	0	1	4
Sam.	5	0	1	0	Neh.	0	2	0	0
Kgs	0	0	0	2	Chron.	0	1	0	12
Isa.	0	2	2	0	LBH	0	3	1	16
Jer.	0	0	5	3	TOTALS	8	16	17	24

Excluding from consideration the specific *qal* idiom צָלְחָה רִנָּה ‘the spirit of the LORD came over’ along with transitive usages of *hif'il* הִצְלִיחַ, one is left with apparently synonymous *qal* and *hif'il* forms vying for the intransitive sense of ‘succeed, prosper’. It would seem that the process of hifilisation began rather early, since both the *qal* and the *hif'il* are attested in CBH material (as well as in texts of ambiguous date), and was quite advanced by the Second Temple Period, as LBH shows preference for *hif'il* over *qal* by a margin of 16 to 1.

Similar encroachment of *hif'il* verbs into the stative or intransitive semantic domains originally occupied by *qal* include the following:

qal הִשְׁמֵן* > *hif'il* הִשְׁמִין ‘become fat’

The classical, semantically predictable combination of stative *qal* (Deut. 32.15, 15; Jer. 5.28) and transitive *hif'il* (Isa. 6.10) contrasts with the late stative *hif'il* in LBH (Neh. 9.25).

qal רָשַׁע > *hif'il* הִרְשִׁיעַ 'be wicked, commit wickedness'

Stative/intransitive *qal* and transitive *hif'il* הִרְשִׁיעַ 'condemn' represent a typical classical combination. Occasionally, the *hif'il* seems to intrude into the semantic space originally occupied by the *qal*, with most of these in LBH (Ps. 106.6; Job 34.12; Dan. 9.5 [cf. 9.15]; 11.32; 12.10; Neh. 9.33; 2 Chron. 20.35).

qal גָּדַל > *hif'il* הִגְדִּיל 'grow, become great'

Common in CBH are stative *qal* גָּדַל 'grow, become great' and transitive *hif'il* הִגְדִּיל 'magnify'. While the poetic idiom *על* הִגְדִּיל 'act arrogantly against, taunt' is common, *hif'il* forms with no direct or indirect object, whether interpreted as 'act arrogantly' or 'grow, become great' are restricted to later material (Lam. 1.9; Dan. 8.4, 8, 11, 25).

1.1.3. Hifilisation of *Qal* II-y Verbs

בִּינ

A different manifestation of hifilisation particularly (though not exclusively) characteristic of Tiberian LBH has resulted from the formal identity of the prefix conjugation forms of *qal* and *hif'il* II-y verbs, e.g., בִּין 'he understands, will understand'. Consider, in Table 2, the distribution of unequivocal *qal* forms, ambiguous *qal/hif'il*, and unequivocal *hif'il* forms.

Table 2: *Qal* and *hif'il* of בִּי"ן in the MT (see §5.1 citations)

	<i>qal</i> ambiguous <i>hif'il</i>				<i>qal</i> ambiguous <i>hif'il</i>		
Deut.	1	1	0	Job	0	13	2
Sam.	0	2	0	Prov.	1	13	9
Kgs	0	0	2	Dan.	3	7	11
Isa.	0	7	5	Ezra	0	1	1
Jer.	1	1	0	Neh.	0	2	6
Hos.	0	2	0	Chron.	0	0	9
Mic.	0	0	1	TOTALS	10	57	55

Unambiguous *qal* forms are rare in the MT, while unambiguous *hif'il* forms are over five times as common. What is more, an argument can be made that, in view of the complete absence of unambiguous *qal* forms and the frequency of unambiguous *hif'il* forms in certain texts, some of the ambiguous forms, especially those in Isaiah and Job, should be considered probable cases of *hif'il*. While the few *qal* forms are distributed throughout all historical phases of biblical literature, and while there are no grounds for characterising the *hif'il* as distinctively late, it seems significant that early unequivocal *qal* forms are limited to poetry. A plausible supposition is that rather early on in the history of BH, analysis of original *qal* בִּינָה and the like as *hif'il* led to the secondary development of forms like הִבִּינָה and לְהִבִּינָה, which are certainly the norm in LBH, but may already have been dominant in CBH, too (Nöldeke 1904, 34–47; Blau 2010, 255, §4.3.8.7.2.8; cf. Bergsträsser 1918–1929, II:153, §28t).

דִּי"ן

The case of forms of the root דִּי"ן ‘act arrogantly’ is similar. There are unequivocally *qal* forms (Exod. 18.11; Jer. 50.29) and forms amenable to both *qal* and *hif'il* analysis (Exod. 21.14; Deut. 1.43;

17.13; 18.20), with unequivocally *hif'il* forms limited to LBH (Neh. 9.10, 16, 29).⁴ Unambiguous *hif'il* forms are also attested in the NBDSS, BS, and RH.

שי"ם

Likewise, *hif'il* analysis of the ambiguous prefix conjugation of *qal* שָׂם-שָׂם-יָשָׂם 'put' led in the BH written tradition to rare unambiguous *hif'il* forms, such as suffix conjugation וְהָשַׁמְתִּי יְהוָה 'and I will make him' (Ezek. 14.8), imperative הָשִׁימִי 'set (FS)' (Ezek. 21.21), participle מְשִׁים 'someone (MS) who regards' (Job. 4.20). The *hif'il* form is known also from BS (SirA 4v.22 || Sir. 11.30), and RH (Sifre Devarim; Tosefta; Yerushalmi; Bavli). This has been cited as the reason for the secondary development of *qal* יָשָׂם (Blau 2010, 255, §4.3.8.7.2.8). For the potentially *hof'al qere* וַיִּשָּׂם for *ketiv qal* passive וַיִּשָּׂם (Gen. 24.33)—the latter a match for the *qal* passive וַיִּשָּׂם (Gen. 50.26) (Blau 2010, 97, §3.4.3.3, see below §2.0).

לִי"ן, רִי"ב, and קִי"א

Clear *qal*, *hif'il*, and equivocal derivations of קִי"א 'vomit', רִי"ב 'quarrel', and לִי"ן 'scoff' also seem to compete in the Tiberian written tradition. For קִי"א unambiguous *hif'il* forms come in Proverbs (23.8) and the Mishna (Para 9.3). In the case of רִי"ב and לִי"ן, it may be significant that the apparently earliest unambiguous *hif'il* morphology is limited to participles with nominal semantics, while the more transparently verbal forms הִלִּיצְנִי 'the inso-

⁴ Excluded here on semantic grounds is the morphologically ambiguous וַיִּזְדַּק 'and (Jacob) cooked' (Gen. 25.29).

lent) have derided me’ (Ps. 119.51), ולהליץ ‘and to deride’ (4Q184 f1.2), and להריב ‘to contend’ (4Q390 f2i.6) all come in acknowledged late material.

Leaving behind hollow roots, similar distributional patterns are known for other verbs. Consider נח"י ‘lead, guide’ in Table 3.

נח"י

Table 3: *Qal* and *hif'il* of נח"י in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

	<i>qal</i>	ambiguous	<i>hif'il</i>		<i>qal</i>	ambiguous	<i>hif'il</i>
Gen.	1	0	1	Isa.	2	1	0
Exod.	4	0	0	Ps.	6	12	0
Num.	0	1	0	Job	0	3	0
Deut.	0	1	0	Prov.	0	3	0
Sam.	0	1	0	Neh.	0	0	2
Kgs	0	2	0	TOTALS	13	24	3

While the evidence arguably reflects a state of early mixed usage, the only LBH forms, both infinitives, are unequivocally *hif'il*. *Hif'il* infinitives are also attested in the NBDSS (1QS 9.18 || 4Q256 18.1 || 4Q259 3.16) and in the Tiberian reading tradition’s pointing of the ostensibly *qal* infinitive in Exod. 13.21. Significantly, three of the four *hif'il* cases in the Tiberian Torah have consonantal forms more fitting for *qal* (Exod. 13.21) or equally suitable to *qal* and *hif'il* analyses (Num. 23.7; Deut. 32.12).

י"ס

Another interesting case is that of *qal* י"ס versus *hif'il* הוסיף ‘add, repeat’. See Table 4.

Table 4: *Qal* and *hif'il* of ה"י in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

<i>qal</i> ambiguous <i>hif'il</i>				<i>qal</i> ambiguous <i>hif'il</i>			
Gen.	2	12	0	Nah.	0	0	1
Exod.	0	7	1	Zeph.	0	1	0
Lev.	7	3	1	L. PROPH.	8	11	18
Num.	3	5	0	Ps.	0	1	7
Deut.	4	8	3	Job	0	5	6
PENT.	16	35	5	Prov.	0	6	7
Josh.	0	0	2	Ruth	0	0	1
Judg.	2	8	3	Qoh.	0	0	5
Sam.	5	17	9	Lam.	0	0	3
Kgs	2	4	7	Est.	0	1	0
F. PROPH.	9	29	21	Dan.	0	1	0
Isa.	6	4	10	Ezra	0	0	1
Jer.	2	0	1	Neh.	0	0	1
Ezek.	0	3	0	Chron.	1	2	8
Hos.	0	2	1	WRITINGS	2	14	39
Joel	0	1	0	LBH +	1	4	15
Amos	0	0	4	TOTALS	35	89	83
Jon.	0	0	1				

A CBH situation of mixed usage, with apparent *qal* dominance in the Pentateuch and apparent *hif'il* dominance in the Prophets and Writings, gives way to striking *hif'il* supremacy in LBH. See below, §2.0, on the Tiberian reading tradition.

ה"י

Related to the late extension of *hif'il* was exploitation of C-stem morphology for disambiguating distinct nuances originally subsumed within the *qal*, for example the use of *qal* ה"י for the procreative act associated with both mother ‘bear’ and father ‘beget,

sire’ (Driver 1882, 209; Joüon 1920, 359; Hendel 2000, 38–42⁵). Consider Table 5.

Table 5: *Qal* and *hif’il* masculine finite verbs and active participles of יָלַד in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif’il</i>		<i>qal</i>	<i>hif’il</i>
Gen.	12	42	Ps.	1	0
Num.	0	2	Job	1	1
Deut.	1	2	Prov.	4	0
Judg.	0	1	Ruth	0	9
Kgs	0	1	Qoh.	0	2
Isa.	3	4	Dan.	1	0
Jer.	2	2	Neh.	0	4
Ezek.	0	2	Chron.	7	83
Hos.	1	0	TOTALS	35	154
Zech.	2	0			

Again, the figures appear to indicate that hifilisation was well underway already in CBH, but that it was not until LBH that *qal*

⁵ Hendel (2000) focuses on this issue in a discussion of the dating of Pentateuchal sources. On the one hand, he argues that “the complementary distribution of *yālād* (*Qal*) for ‘beget’ in the J source and *hōlîd* (*Hiphil*) for ‘beget’ in the P source is attributable to a diachronic development in Classical Hebrew Biblical” (Hendel 2000, 42), i.e., not diachronic development between CBH and LBH. On the other hand, he dates P to the exilic or early Persian Period (Hendel 2000, 46). Hendel’s figures differ from those given above, because he focuses on genealogies, whereas the figures here are mechanical, including metaphorical usages. For example, one of the cases of *qal* in Jeremiah should probably be considered a counterexample of the semantics ‘father, sire’ for *qal* יָלַד. Consider the verse שְׁאַלְנוּ נָא וְרָאוּ אִם־יִלְד זָכָר ‘Ask now, and see, **can a man bear a child?**’ (Jer. 30.6). While technical genealogical usage of *qal* יָלַד ‘father, sire’ is still found in LBH, the form had become especially associated with female agency prior to LBH.

בָּלַדְתִּי ‘beget’ was effectively supplanted. Outside of LBH proper and Qohelet, the figures are *qal* 27, *hifʿil* 66. In LBH proper and Qohelet combined, they are *qal* 8, *hifʿil* 90. Moreover, six of the eight LBH *qal* cases come in texts borrowed from the Pentateuch (1 Chron. 1.10, 11, 13, 18, 18, 20 || Gen. 10.8, 13, 15, 24, 24, 26).

In sum, the picture that emerges from the Tiberian LBH written tradition involves a trend in favour of forms that either can or must be read as *hifʿil* replacing one of mixed *qal-hifʿil* or dominant *qal* morphology.

1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

The BDSS show relatively little evidence of hifilisation beyond that also exhibited in the Tiberian written tradition. Where the BDSS have parallels to the MT involving the verbs discussed above, §1.1, they show nearly the same distribution of morphology, whether *qal*, ambiguous, or *hifʿil*, with mixed usage in CBH material and *hifʿil* concentration in LBH.

The lone exception in this regard is the verb represented by *qal* יִסְּפוּ and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיפוּ. In the case of this verb, there are several instances in CBH material in which an unequivocal DSS *hifʿil* parallels a MT *qal* or ambiguous form:

- (1) יִסְּפוּ ‘they will (not) continue’ (4Q30 f24.2) || MT הוֹסִיפוּ ‘they will (not) continue’ (Deut. 13.12)
- (2) יוֹסִיף ‘will add’ (4Q35 f1.9) || MT יִסְּף ‘will add, is adding’ (Deut. 1.1)

A few such cases centre on Deut. 5.25:⁶

- (3) מוֹסִיפִים '(we) co]ntinue' (4Q37 3.7) || MT אִם-יִסְפִּים 'if (we) continue' (Deut. 5.25)
- (4) מוֹסִיפִים 'if (we) c[ontinue' (4Q129 f1R.13) || MT אִם-יִסְפִּים 'if (we) continue' (Deut. 5.25)
- (5) מוֹסִיפִים '(we) co]ntinue' (4Q135 f1.4) || MT אִם-יִסְפִּים 'if (we) continue' (Deut. 5.25)
- (6) אִם מוֹסִיפִים 'if (we) continue' (4Q137 f1.30–31) || MT אִם-יִסְפִּים 'if (we) continue' (Deut. 5.25)

Though textual factors should also be considered, these cases of *qal* > *hif'il* movement in acknowledged Second Temple scribal products tally with the process of hifilisation described above, in general, and in the case of the root יס"פ, more specifically.

1.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Less anchored within the biblical text, NBDSS material exhibits more pronounced effects of hifilisation than the BDSS. This is manifest in (a) the use of *hif'il* verbs with biblical distribution limited to LBH (בז"י, לע"ג, זג"ח), (b) the replacement of stative/intransitive *qal* verbs with *hif'il* cognates, as in LBH (צל"ח, רש"ע), (c) the employment of unambiguous *hif'il* forms of originally *qal* verbs with ambiguous prefix conjugation forms (בי"ן, שי"ר, יס"ף, נח"י, לי"ן, רי"ב, זי"ד), and (d) exploitation of morpholog-

⁶ In examples (3)–(6), the potential sequences of both אִם יספִּים in מ-י and אִם מוסיפִים in מ-מ-ו would have been vulnerable to graphic and/or phonetic corruption.

ical distinction between *qal* and *hif'il* for semantic differentiation (יל"ד). Table 6 provides a quantitative summary.

Table 6: Frequency of *qal* and *hif'il* of select diachronically significant verbs in the NBDSS (see §5.2 for citations)

<i>qal</i> <i>ambiguous</i> <i>hif'il</i>				<i>qal</i> <i>ambiguous</i> <i>hif'il</i>			
(a)	זנ"ח	0	2	3	(c)	בי"ן	3 36 69
	לע"ג	0	0	1		זי"ד	1 2 2
	בז"י	9	2	1		רי"ב	4 11 1
(b)	רע"ד	0	1	0		לי"ן	1 0 2
	שח"ק	2	7	0		נח"י	1 0 3
	צל"ח	1	4	1		יס"ף	2 7 29
	רש"ע	1	2	10	(d)	יל"ד	0 0 7
	גד"ל	1	1	0			

Sometimes, the NBDSS fail to exhibit clear-cut cases of the diagnostically late *hif'il* verbs (רע"ד, שח"ק, גד"ל) or appear to favour the more classical alternative (רי"ב, בז"י). In other cases, the characteristically late *hif'il* usage is conspicuously dominant (רש"ע, יל"ד, יס"ף, בי"ן).

1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

A scriptural corpus embodying related but semi-independent written and reading components, the Samaritan biblical tradition has roots extending at least as far back as the Iron Age, but at the same time shows clear signs of late development. Morphological shifts from G- to C-stem in the Samaritan tradition, though noted, have not generally been discussed as part of a grammatical trend. Indeed, they go unmentioned in Ben-Hayyim's discussion of regular stem shifts (2000, 222–24, §§2.15.4–7), relegated to a few examples in a paragraph that begins “Other alternations between

stems do not display general tendencies, but each individual verb must be explained separately, so that discussion of them belongs in a lexicon, not a grammar” (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 224, §2.15.8). As the ensuing discussion demonstrates, the applicability of this statement to hifilisation in the Samaritan tradition may be questioned, as the phenomenon is both more pervasive in SH than Ben-Ḥayyim implies and exhibits affinities to the same process in other Second Temple traditions. The relevant verbs may be divided into several categories.

1.3.1. Hifilisation of שׁי"ר ‘sing’ and טמ"ן ‘hide’

First are those verbs for which *qal* is standard in both Tiberian and Samaritan Hebrew, but which have undergone partial hifilisation in the latter, sometimes in line with trends seen in other manifestations of Second Temple Hebrew. An illustrative example is the Samaritan counterpart to Tiberian שָׁר ‘sing’. It has an unambiguous *qal* imperative (Exod. 15.21), ambiguous *yiqtol* forms (Exod. 15.1a; Num. 21.17), and an unambiguous and synonymous *hif'il* imperative according to the combined testimonies of the written and reading tradition: אֲשִׁירוּ *āšīru* ‘sing (PL)!’ || MT אֶשְׂרֶה ‘I would sing’ (Exod. 15.1b), which has also been tentatively read, with causative force, in the NBDSS: מִלֵּיהֶם בַּמִּשְׁקָל תִּכֵּן ‘their words by weight he apportioned and **caused them to sing** like flutes’ (4Q434 f1i.9).

Similarly, while Tiberian *qal* טָמַן is twice paralleled by its Samaritan *qal* counterparts, in the prefix conjugation (Exod. 2.12) and the passive participle (Deut. 33.19), on another occasion, MT *qal* וַיִּטְמֵן || SP וַיִּטְמַן *wyātmān* ‘and he hid (tr.)’ (Gen. 35.4),

with no obvious distinction in meaning separating the *qal* and the *hif'il* (also in the Masada BS material, RH, and the Tiberian CBH reading tradition; see below, §§1.4–5; 2.0).

1.3.2. Hifilisation of יל"ד 'bear (a child); beget, father, sire'

In the case of יל"ד, like Tiberian Hebrew, SH generally distinguishes between *qal* ילד 'bear (a child)' and *hif'il* הוליד 'beget, father, sire'. On occasions where the MT presents a *qal* form that denotes 'beget, father, sire', SH does not tolerate the polysemy of the *qal*. Instead, the same morphosemantic shift observed above with regard to יל"ד 'father, sire' in Tiberian BH (§1.1) and the NBDSS (§1.2.2) also obtains in SH, albeit inconsistently. On three occasions where the MT has *qal* ילד in the meaning 'beget, father, sire', the combined written-reading Samaritan tradition resorts to a *hif'il* instead: Gen. 6.4; 10.8; 22.23. Hifilisation is not, however, the preferred Samaritan solution to the problem in the case of יל"ד. A more common strategy for distinguishing the male procreative act from the female act denoted by the *qal* is the reading of forms that refer to the male as *pi'el* (see ch. 12, §1.3.1).

1.3.3. Hifilisation of יס"ף 'add, repeat, do again'

In one further case of partial hifilisation relative to the Tiberian tradition, the combined Samaritan written and reading tradition testifies to increased use of unequivocal *hif'il* forms of יס"ף. There is one case in which an unambiguous MT *qal* || SP *hif'il* and 14 cases in which an MT form of ambiguous stem || SP unambiguous *plene hif'il*. The opposite situation obtains just twice (see §5.3 for citations). Indeed, the situation in SH is one of orderly, if compli-

cated, suppletion: all 3rd-person *qaṭal* forms and all participles are *qal*;⁷ all 1st- and 2nd-person *qaṭal* forms are *pi^cel*; all *yiqtol* forms and infinitives are *hif^cil*.⁸

1.3.4. Extensive Hifilisation

More extensive shifts are also known. Consider the Tiberian *qal* verb רָצָה 'accept, be pleased, make amends for'. On six occasions, most involving consonantly ambiguous *yiqtol* forms, the SP has a *hif^cil* (Gen. 33.10; Lev. 26.34, 41, 43, 43; Deut. 33.11), and on five more occasions, a *nif^cal* in the MT is paralleled by a passive *hif^cil* in the SP (Lev. 7.18; 19.7; 22.23, 25, 27).⁹ The Samaritan treatment of the Tiberian *qal* verbs חָבַשׁ 'wrap, saddle' and יָקַד׳ 'light, kindle' can also be analysed as one of wholesale hifilisation.¹⁰

⁷ Some apparent SP *qal qaṭal* forms of יָסַף *yāsaf*, especially those parallel to Tiberian *weqaṭal* forms, are arguably interpretable as secondary *hif^cil yiqtol* forms

⁸ According to Ben-Ḥayyim (1977, 123, 193), pronunciation of the *yiqtol* forms reflects derivation from both יִסֵּף and יִסֵּף.

⁹ In the remaining three cases, all consonantly unambiguous, the MT and SP agree on a *nif^cal* (Lev. 1.4), *hif^cil* (Lev. 26.34), and passive *qal* participle (Deut. 33.24).

¹⁰ See Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 224, §2.15.8) on יָקַד׳. Regarding חָבַשׁ: one form is unambiguously *hif^cil* according to the reading component of the Samaritan tradition, while the remaining three are analysable as either *pi^cel* or *hif^cil* (Ben-Ḥayyim 123, §§2.2.1.2.2–3).

1.3.5. Hifilisation and Levelling

In other cases of apparent wholesale hifilisation, the result may be due partially to grammatical harmonisation, whereby an aberrant form was regularised in conformity with the majority. For example, in the MT *צל"ח* is normally represented by *hif'il* forms whether the sense is transitive 'cause to prosper' (Gen. 24.21, 40, 42, 56; 39.3, 23; Deut. 28.29) or intransitive 'succeed' (Gen. 39.2), and these are all paralleled in the SP by *hif'il* forms; on the one occasion where the MT has a *qal* intransitive, the SP reads it as a *hif'il* (Num. 14.41). Likewise, the MT's internal *qal-hif'il* diversity in (7), is paralleled in the SP by *hif'il* consistency (8):

- (7) ...וַתִּצְפְּנֵהוּ שְׁלֹשָׁה יָרֵחִים: וְלֹא-יָכֻלָּה עוֹד הַצְּפִינָהּ...
 '...and she hid him (*qal*) three months. And she could no longer hide him (*hif'il*)...' (Exod. 2.2–3)
- (8) ...וַתִּצְפְּנֵהוּ שְׁלֹשָׁה יָרֵחִים: וְלֹא יָכֻלָּה עוֹד הַצְּפִינָהּ... ...*wtāṣfinē'u*
šēlāša ye'rīm. wlā yākāla ūd āṣfinē'u...

While this may well be due to the Samaritan version's penchant for levelling, and though the orthography of *הַצְּפִינָהּ* prevented harmonisation in favour of *qal*, the hifilisation in question is consistent with that seen in other Second Temple chronolects, such as BS and RH (see below, §§1.4–5). Similar situations of grammatical levelling arguably took place with *נז"י* 'sprinkle', *רפ"י* 'leave, slacken', and *שמ"ט* 'drop, release'.

1.3.6. Hifilisation in the Case of Rare Verbs

Finally, there are rarely occurring verbs in the Pentateuch that are *qal* in the MT and *hif'il* in the SP, some representative of

broader hifilisation patterns: חש"ך 'be/become dark' (Exod. 10.15; cf. RH, CBH), עו"ק/ק"ע 'advise' (Exod. 18.19; Num. 24.14; cf. Aramaic C-stem אַמלִיךְ), נפ"ח 'blow' (Gen. 2.7; cf. BH), עק"ד 'bind' (Gen. 22.9), צפ"י 'observe' (Gen. 31.49).

1.3.7. Hifilisation Resulting in Suppletion

Qal-hif'il suppletion is comparatively more common in SH than in the Tiberian Torah. The suppletive paradigm of נח"י characteristic of the MT (§§1.1.3; 2.1) is also found in the SP. Consider also consistently *qal* Tiberian הָנֵן 'show mercy'—in the SP, conversely, it is generally *qal* where required by consonantal spelling (Gen. 33.5, 11), but otherwise *hif'il* (Gen. 43.29; Exod. 33.19, 19; Num. 6.25; Deut. 7.2; 28.50), including a *hif'il* reading in opposition to *qal* spelling: *wā'inti it ēšār ā'n* || MT וְהָנֵנִי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר אֶחָן 'and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious' (Exod. 33.19a). Various suppletive patterns obtain in the case of בא"ש 'stink' (*qal* Exod. 7.18; *hif'il* Exod. 7.21; 8.10; 16.20), גמ"ל 'repay, bear (fruit)' (*qal* Gen. 50.5, 17; *hif'il* Num. 17.23; Deut. 32.6), דו"ף < דו"ף 'thrust' (*qal* Num. 35.20; *hif'il* Num. 35.22; Deut. 6.19; 9.4), גנ"ש 'oppress' (*qal* Exod. 3.7; 5.6, 10, 13, 14; *hif'il* Deut. 15.2, 3), סג"ר 'close' (*qal* Gen. 19.6, 10; 14.3; *hif'il* Gen. 2.21; 7.16), ער"ך 'arrange' (*qal* Exod. 40.4; Lev. 1.7, 8; 6.5; *hif'il*¹¹ Gen. 22.9; Exod. 27.21; 40.23; Lev. 1.12; 24.3, 4, 8), and

¹¹ Ben-Hayyim (1977, 217) analyses the SH forms ויערכו *wyārreku* (Gen. 14.8) and ערכתי *arrikti* (Num. 23.4) as *pi'el*. The former is alternatively analysable as *hif'il*, which is indeed the analysis given in Ben-Hayyim (2000, 375a, cf. 375b).

שׁ 'crawl' (*qal* Gen. 1.21, 26, 28, 30; 7.8, 14, 21; 8.17, 19; Lev. 11.44, 46; Deut. 4.18; *hif'il* Gen. 9.2; Lev. 20.25).

1.3.8. Hifilisation and Semantic Disambiguation

Finally, SH seems to exploit hifilisation for purposes of distinguishing semantic nuance.

רח"ק 'distance'

In the case of רח"ק 'distance', the MT and SP agree on *qal* forms in the context of distance with no movement (Deut. 12.21; 14.24) and on *hif'il* forms when agency and movement are involved (Gen. 21.16; 44.4; Exod. 8.24, 24; 33.7). Mismatch between MT *qal* and SP *hif'il* obtains in the case of the metaphorical MT מִדְּבַר-שֶׁקֶר תִּרְחֹק 'keep far from a false charge' || SP תִּרְחֹק *tā'rēq* 'distance yourself (?)' (Exod. 23.7), where there is agency, but the matter of stasis versus movement is ambiguous.

שב"ר 'buy/sell food'

SH also uses morphology to distinguish distinct senses of שב"ר 'buy and sell food' left indistinct in Tiberian Hebrew. Whereas the MT is content with a *qal* verb שָׁבַר meaning both 'buy food' (Gen. 41.57; 42.2, 3, 5, 7, 10; 43.2, 4, 20, 22; 44.25; 47.14; Deut. 2.6) and 'sell food' (Gen. 41.56), it also has a *hif'il* form meaning 'sell food' (Gen. 42.6; Deut. 2.28). SH more strictly observes the morphosemantic distinction, reading Joseph's action in וַיִּשְׁבֶּר

‘and he sold (grain to Egypt)’ (Gen. 41.56) as *hifʿil* וישביר *wyāšbār*.¹²

1.4. Ben Sira

Moreshet (1996) lists a number of verbs in BS that reflect hifilisation. Those relevant to Tiberian BH include:

- ‘weep’ (SirA 5r.19 || Sir. 12.16)
- ‘hide (tr.)’ (Mas1h 3.17 || SirB 11r.7 || Sir. 41.15; see above, §1.3.1)
- ‘be sufficient’ (Mas1h 5.4 || SirB 12r.9 || Sir. 42.17)
- ‘arrange’ (SirB 9r.3 || Sir. 39.17; SirB 19v.12 || Sir. 50.18)
- ‘tremble’ (SirB 8v.15 || Sir. 38.25; see above, §§1.1.1; 1.2.2)
- ‘put’ (SirA 4v.22 || Sir. 11.30; see above, §1.1.3)¹³

To Moreshet’s list may be added:

- ‘travel’ (Mas1h 5.23 || SirB 12v.7 || Sir. 43.6)
- ‘prevail’ (SirB 9v.7 || Sir. 39.34)

¹² It is unclear why the same *qal-hifʿil* mismatch between MT and SP occurs in MT אָכַל תִּשְׁבְּרוּ מֵאֲתָם בְּכֶסֶף ‘food **you will buy** from them for money’ (Deut. 2.6) || SP אכל תשבירו מאתם *ākal tašbīru miyyētimma afkāsaf* ‘food **you will buy** (?) from them for money’, unless it is due to local ‘contamination’ from אָכַל בְּכֶסֶף תִּשְׁבְּרֵנִי ‘food for money sell to me’ (Deut. 2.28), which has a *hifʿil* in both the MT and SP, or the *hifʿil* has a nuance of ‘actively trade’.

¹³ He also lists הוִיץ ‘reprove’ (SirA 4r.25 || SirB 1v.12 || Sir. 11.7), which seems to reflect hifilisation relative to RH and Aramaic G-stem גוּץ.

- הזיד ‘act arrogantly’ (SirA 1r.8 || Sir. 3.16; see above, §§1.1.3; 1.2.2)
- החריף ‘reprove, stir up the wind’ (Mas1h 6.10 || Sir. 43.16)
- הלעג ‘mock’ (SirB 4v.4 || Sir. 31.22; see above, §§1.1.1; 1.2.2)
- העריך ‘arrange’ (SirB 9r.3 || Sir. 39.17; SirB 19v.12 || Sir. 50.18; cf. above, §1.3.7)
- הצפין ‘hide’ (SirA 1v.12 || Sir. 4.23; SirC 2a.3 || Sir. 20.31; SirC 2a.4 || Sir. 20.31; SirB 11r.7 || Sir. 41.15; SirB 11r.7 || Sir. 41.15)
- הקנה ‘buy’ (SirB 7v.2 || Sir. 37.11)
- הקשיח ‘become hard’ (SirB 3r.4 || Sir. 30.12)
- השעה ‘look’ (SirB 13v.11 || Sir. 44.8)

Several of the above are variants with non-*hif'il* counterparts. In a few cases, the semantics of the *hif'il* may be argued to differ from those of the *qal*,¹⁴ but the general trend is clear.

Beyond these, BS's Hebrew sides with Second Temple Hebrew on additional hifilisation trends, e.g.,

- consistent *hif'il* treatment of בִּי"ן—all clearcut forms (Mas1h 5.11 || Sir. 42.21; SirA 1v.2 || Sir. 4.11; SirA 3v.18 || Sir. 10.1; SirA 4v.5 || Sir. 11.15; SirB 7r.1 || Sir. 36.24; SirB 7v.7 || Sir. 37.13; SirB 8r.10 || Sir. 38.4; SirB 12r.15 || Sir. 42.21);

¹⁴ In context, העריך can be understood in its classical meaning of ‘estimate’, whereas הרעיד is open to a causative interpretation.

- exclusive use of *hif'il* הוֹלִיד rather than *qal* יָלַד in the sense of ‘father, sire’ (Mas1h 3.10 || Sir. 41.9; SirA 4v.26 || Sir. 11.33; SirB 10v.18 || Sir. 41.9; SirB 10v.18 || Sir. 41.9;
- dominance of *hif'il* הוֹסִיף to the exclusion of *qal* יָסַף (SirA 1r.16 || Sir. 3.27; SirA 1v.25 || Sir. 5.5; SirB 8r.5 || Sir. 37.31; SirB 13r.12 || Sir. 43.27 [?]; SirC 2r.7 || Sir. 5.5; SirC 1b.10 || Sir. 3.27; SirD 1v.20 || Sir. 37.31);
- comparatively frequent incidence of intransitive הִצְלִיחַ (Mas1h 2.25 || Sir. 41.1; SirA 3v.11 || Sir. 9.12; SirB 8v.1 || Sir. 38.13; SirB 9r.4 || Sir. 39.18; SirB 10v.8 || Sir. 41.1; though possible cases of the *qal* are also attested: SirA 3r.18 || Sir. 8.10; SirA 4v.7 || Sir. 11.17; SirB 8v.2 || Sir. 38.14; SirB 13r.11 || Sir. 43.26).

1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

Moreshet (1996) divides his lists of RH *hif'il* innovations into several categories. Given below are those with greatest relevance to BH.

1.5.1. RH *Hif'il* || MT Transitive *Qal*

יָטַח ‘hide’

The BH *hif'il* ‘hide (tr.)’ is rare (2 Kgs 7.8, 8), but becomes common in RH, though the *qal* is still frequent, especially as a participle.

יָמַד ‘draw, extend’

In BH the *qal* is normally transitive, with *nif'al* serving for intransitive (Isa. 13.22; Ezek. 12.25, 28), though the *qal* can also be

intransitive (Judg. 20.37; Job 21.33; Neh. 9.30 [?]); the same is generally true in RH, but a transitive *hif'il* has also appeared.

נשא 'raise (a signal flare)'

In Tannaitic Hebrew, the *qal* is common and the *hif'il* is normally causative ('marry off, allow to marry'), but one also finds it used for the raising of a signal flare (m. Rosh haShana 2.2, 3; t. Rosh haShana 1.17), for which cf. the *qal* forms in Jer. 6.1 (BH has *hif'il* forms in Lev. 22.16; 2 Sam. 17.13).

שחט 'unfasten, remove, cancel (debt, oath)'

Qal in BH (on the apparent *hif'il* in Deut. 15.3, see §§1.3.5); in RH the *qal* continues in literal senses ('unfasten, remove'; cf. its *nif'al* passive/intransitive), while the *hif'il* is reserved for cancellation of debts (m. Shevi'it 10.1–3) and oaths (m. Shevu'ot. 7.8) and for letting fields lie fallow (Sifra, BaHar, parasha 2, ch. 3 [p. 107, col. 3]).

1.5.2. RH *Hif'il* || MT Intransitive *Qal*

חכם 'be/become wise'

In BH the *qal* is stative 'be wise' (e.g., Deut. 32.29; Prov. 23.15) and inchoative 'become wise' (e.g., Prov. 6.6; 9.9; 19.20), the only *hif'il* being causative (Ps. 19.8); in RH, the *hif'il* can be inchoative (m. Bava Batra 10.8; m. 'Avot 2.5).

ספ"ד 'mourn'

The BH *qal* 'mourn' never takes a direct object (2 Sam. 3.31; internal object in Gen. 50.10; it takes -ל, e.g., Gen. 23.2, or על, e.g., 2 Sam. 11.26), though *nif'al* is clearly passive (Jer. 16.4; 25.33); RH also has an intransitive *qal* (m. Yevamot 16.5) and passive *nif'al* (m. Shabbat 23.4), but adds a *hif'il* either transitive (m. Mo'ed Qatan 1.5) or intransitive (m. Megilla 3.3).

תמ"ה 'be surprised, astonished, wonder'

The predominantly BH *qal* intransitive 'be surprised, astonished, wonder' persists in RH, but is joined by a synonymous *hif'il* (Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmael, Sifre Devarim, Mekhilta deRabbi Shim'on ben Yoḥai).

1.5.3. RH *Hif'il* || MT Transitive and Intransitive *Qal*

טב"ל 'immerse'

In BH the *qal* is usually transitive 'immerse' (e.g., Gen. 37.31), with a *nif'al* intransitive (Josh. 3.15), though an intransitive/reflexive *qal* (2 Kgs 5.14) is also attested; RH knows *qal* transitives (e.g., m. Shabbat 5.1) and intransitives (e.g., m. Shabbat 6.1), as well as a *hif'il* transitive (e.g., m. Shabbat 2.7).

רח"ץ 'wash, rinse'

BH *qal* forms dominate, with both transitive (e.g., Gen. 18.4) and intransitive/reflexive (e.g., Exod. 2.5) meanings of 'wash, rinse' (there are also rare *qal* passive [Ezek. 16.4; Prov. 30.12] and *hitpa'el* forms [Job 9.30; Dan. 3.28]); the RH *qal* is typically in-

transitive/reflexive (e.g., m. Shevi'it 8.11) or transitive/reflexive with body parts (e.g., m. Yoma 8.1), while the *hif'il* functions in both of the latter senses (e.g., Sifra, Nedava, parasha 11, ch. 1 [p. 10, col. 4]; 'Emor, parasha 4, ch. 2 [p. 96, col. 4]) and more prototypically transitive senses (e.g., m. Shabbat 9.3).

1.5.4. RH *Hif'il* || Rare BH *Qal*

חמ"ץ 'ferment, be/become leavened'

BH form knows the intransitive *qal* 'ferment, be(come) leavened' (Exod. 12.34, 39; Hos. 7.4); in RH both the *qal* and *hif'il* can have intransitive meaning (e.g., respectively, Mekhilta deRabbi Ishma'el, Paskha, parasha 14 [p. 49]; m. Terumot 3.1).

טע"י 'load'

BH has the transitive *qal hapax* meaning 'load (a beast of burden)' (Gen. 45.17); in RH cf. the *qal* (e.g., m. Bava Qama 9.1) and the synonymous *hif'il* (e.g., Sifre Devarim, 343 [p. 396]).

שח"כ 'become thin'

The sole BH *qal* comes in the intransitive sense 'become thin' (Ps. 109.24); this sense occurs in RH in the *hif'il* (e.g., t. Bava Qama 3.5, 5), as well as in *qal* (e.g., t. Bava Qama 7.17).

עפ"ש/פס"ע 'step, march'

The BH *qal hapax* means 'step, march' (Isa. 27.4); in RH the root is normally עפ"ש, with the *qal* continuing and the innovation of a synonymous *hif'il* (e.g., y. Berakhot 1.1).

רח"ש 'express'

Assuming that the BH usage in Ps. 45.2 means 'express', RH exhibits persistence of the *qal* (e.g., y. Berakhot 2.1) and innovation of a synonymous *hif'il* e.g., (y. Berakhot 4.1).

שח"ר 'darken'

A BH *hapax qal* meaning 'darken (intr.)' (Job. 30.30); cf. RH *hif'il* (e.g., m. Nega'im 1.5, 5) and *hof'al* (m. Sukkot 4.9).

1.5.5. RH *Hif'il* Innovations

Moreshet also lists *hif'il* RH root innovations: הגדיש 'heap, stack', הגלילד 'form a crust, scab', החזיר 'return (intr.), repeat', הכבין 'hide (tr.)', המתין 'wait', הסדיר 'arrange'.¹⁵

1.5.6. RH Hifilisation Features in Common with Other Second Temple Hebrew Types

RH also exhibits the following Second Temple Hebrew hifilisation tendencies discussed above:

- strong preference for *hif'il* ביל"ח;
- occurrences of *hif'il* שיל"ח (t. Gittin 7.13; Sifre Devarim 315; y. Sanhedrin 1.1; frequently in the BT);

¹⁵ From this list, several roots cited by Moreshet have been omitted due either to absence of the *hif'il* form from the authoritative RH manuscripts cited on the *Ma'agarim* site of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, e.g., חל"ם 'prune', חל"י 'become ill', טר"ד 'disturb, drive away', פנ"י in the passive sense 'free, empty', שט"ן 'accuse', or to semantic remoteness relative to the BH *qal*, e.g., פש"ק/פס"ק 'cease'.

- strong preference for *hif'il* הוֹלִיד over *qal* ילד with masculine subjects, in the sense of ‘father, sire’;
- dominance of *hif'il* הוֹסִיף to the near exclusion of *qal* יסֵף;
- dominance of *hif'il* intransitive הִצִּילִיח.

2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

When it comes to hifilisation, like other traditions rooted in the biblical text, the Tiberian reading component generally adheres closely to the parallel orthographic component. This is not surprising, as (a) the two are related components of a composite tradition and (b) development of each component was to some degree influenced and constrained by its association with the other. Even so, apparent cases of dissonance occur, some centring on hifilisation. In the case of CBH material, the reading component of the composite Tiberian tradition reflects a linguistic stage more chronologically advanced than the written component. In LBH material, the two components exhibit greater correspondence. This is consistent with the view that a significant degree of the crystallisation of the Tiberian reading tradition took place during the Second Temple Period.

2.1. נה"י ‘lead, guide’

The root נה"י ‘lead, guide’ is represented in Tiberian BH by a paradigm that is largely suppletive. Consider Table 7.

Table 7: *Qal* and *hif'il* forms of נָחַ"י according to the Tiberian reading tradition (see §5.4 for citations)

	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i>
suffix conjugation	8	2
imperative	4	0
infinitive construct	0	2
prefix conjugation	0	17

When it comes to the suffix conjugation and the imperative, the dominant morphology is *qal*. Against this background, it is telling that there are no *qal* prefix conjugation forms in the 17 potential cases. This is even more suspicious when one considers the fact that one of the infinitive construct forms realised according to the reading tradition as a *hif'il* has the orthography of a *qal*, namely, לְנַחֵם 'to guide them' (Exod. 13.21). Lacking the expected *heh* of a *hif'il* infinitive, it seems likely that the consonants presuppose *qal* לְנַחֵם*, in line with the aforementioned *qal* suffix conjugation and imperative forms. Interestingly, the only other infinitive construct with this root is the unambiguous *hif'il* לְנַחֵם 'to guide them' (Neh. 9.19) in an LBH allusion to this very verse. It is also to be noted that one of the two unequivocally *hif'il* suffix conjugation forms (Neh. 9.12) comes in LBH (on the other, see below, §3.0). According to a plausible reading of the data, early stem diversity characterised verbs with the root נָחַ"י. This is to say, the process of hifilisation was underway well before the era of LBH. Yet it was by no means complete. If so, however, why according to the reading tradition are *qal* forms restricted to imperatives and *qatal* forms? Surely, given the apparent early incidence of *qal* imperatives and suffix conjugation forms, one might expect at least some incidence of *qal* infinitives and prefix conju-

gation forms, rather than consistent *hif'il* vocalisation. Here, again, the reading tradition appears to have extended an ancient feature in line with Second Temple preference for the C-stem. Where *hif'il* could be read without undue deviation from the consonantal orthography, i.e., in *yiqtol* forms, it was so read. The *hif'il* analysis was extended even in opposition to the consonantal spelling of infinitival לְהַנְחִיֵם 'to guide them' (Exod. 13.21), because this was considered close enough phonetically to the expected לְהַנְחִיֵם*.

2.2. ט"מ 'hide, bury'

Next, consider Tiberian verbal representatives of the root ט"מ. Most evidence points to an active-middle stem arrangement involving *qal* טָמַן 'hide, bury (tr.)' (21x) (with passive participle טָמוּן 'hidden' [7x]) and *nif'al* נִטְמַן* 'hide (intr.), bury oneself' (1x). In a single verse in the book of Kings, however, one encounters two cases of *hif'il* הִטְמִין* 'hide (tr.)' (2 Kgs 7.8), with no apparent semantic difference from the *qal*. Since the orthography in both forms—טמנו—is ambiguous as far as stem identity goes, it may be that the *hif'il* vocalisation here reflects 'drift' toward Second Temple morphology (as seen in SH, BS, and RH; see above, §§1.3–5). It must be noted, though, that other consonantly ambiguous forms, all *wayyiqtol* (Gen. 35.4; Exod. 2.12; Josh. 2.6; Jer. 13.5), are read as *qal*.

2.3. *Hof'al* of II-w/y Verbs as Evidence of Hifilisation

While the Tiberian reading tradition is opaque with regard to the analysis of finite II-y *yiqtol* verbal forms, i.e., whether they are

qal or *hif'il*, this is not the case with *hof'al* forms. Based on regular sound changes (for which see Blau 2010, 97, §3.4.3.3), for the verb שָׁם 'put', the expected *qal* passive *wayyiqtol* form is וַיִּשָּׁם 'and it was put' (Gen. 50.25). This is precisely the orthography one finds in the *ketiv* וַיִּשָּׁם (Gen. 24.33), but the corresponding *qere* וַיִּשָּׁם 'and it was put' is a *hof'al*. This reflects two diachronic developments: the well-known decline of the *qal* internal passive (see ch. 10, §§2.2; 3.2) and, since *hof'al* represents the internal passive of *hif'il*, hifilisation. In other words, a realisation such as *qere* וַיִּשָּׁם implies the existence of *hif'il* וַיִּשָּׁם, as seen occasionally in the Tiberian written tradition (Ezek. 14.8; 21.21; Job 4.20) and more commonly in late antique extra-biblical Hebrew (Ezekiel; Job, see above §1.1.3; BS, see above, §1.4; RH, see above, §1.5.6).

2.4. The Preservation of Archaic *Hif'il*-like *Qal* Forms

While the preceding paragraphs detail departures of the Tiberian reading tradition from the pronunciation tradition implied by the consonantal text in line with Second Temple linguistic developments, it is important, for the sake of balance, to highlight conservatism, even archaism, in the reading tradition. One relevant phenomenon involves *qal* verbs with prefix conjugation forms in the *yaqtel* pattern (Yalon 1971). Consider, for example, forms representative of the root לָחַם: the suffix conjugation form וַיִּלָּחֶם 'and I will defend' (2 Kgs 19.34 || Isa. 37.5; 2 Kgs 20.6 || Isa. 38.6) and the infinitive absolute לָחֵם 'protecting' (Isa. 31.5b) are unambiguously *qal*, whereas the prefix conjugation יִלָּחֵם 'will protect (3MS)' (Isa. 31.5a; Zech. 9.15; 12.8) is alternatively *qal yaqtel* or *hif'il*. Since there are no unambiguous *hif'il* forms in BH, and

since the *qal* infinitive absolute occurs alongside the equivocal prefix conjugation in the same verse (Isa. 31.5), the verb is plausibly analysed as uniformly *qal* in BH (Blau 2010, 222–23, §4.3.5.2.3.2). This contrasts with orthographically unequivocal RH *hif'il* forms, such as הִגֵּן (e.g., 'Aravit, fourth blessing, ln. 4), מִגֵּן (e.g., Mekhilta deRabbi Ishma'el, Beḥodesh [Yitro], parasha 1 [p. 204]), לִהְיוֹן (e.g., y. Pesahim 7.12 [p. 35b]).¹⁶

In a similar way Yalon (1971, 46–47) explains such forms as וַיִּדְרְכוּ in וַיִּדְרְכוּ אֶת־לְשׁוֹנָם כְּשֶׁתָּם שֶׁקֶר 'they bend their tongue like their bow for deceit' (Jer. 9.2; otherwise דָּרַךְ כְּשֶׁת consistently *qal*); וַיִּדְבְּקוּ in וַיִּדְבְּקוּ גַם־הֵמָּה אַחֲרֵיהֶם בַּמִּלְחָמָה 'they too pursued them in the battle' (1 Sam. 14.22) and וַיִּדְבְּקוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים אַחֲרֵי שָׁאֻל 'and the Philistines pursued Saul and his sons' (1 Chron. 10.2), and even וַיִּדְבִּיקוּ in וַיִּדְבִּיקוּ אֶת־בְּנֵי־דָן 'they overtook the people of Dan' (Judg. 18.22)—the latter on the assumption that the *i* so reminiscent of *hif'il* results from a lengthening of the original short *i* vowel of the *qal yaqtel* pattern.¹⁷ It is from *qal* forms with *yaqtel* prefix conjugation forms, opines Yalon, that many unambiguous *hif'il* forms developed. Basing himself partially on the likes of Barth (1889; 1891, 117, 147, 119–20, 136, 285–86, 305), Böttcher (1866–1868, II:436), and Brockelmann (1908–1913,

¹⁶ Perhaps also in 4Q403 f1i.25; 4Q405 f3ii.17 (see the *Ma'agarim* website of the Academy of the Hebrew Language), but these are also interpreted as instances of the noun מָגֵן 'shield' (Abegg's 1999–2009 QUMRAN module for Accordance).

¹⁷ Cf. the causative *hif'il* in הִדְבִּיקְתִּי אֶל־מִתְנֵי־אִישׁ בֵּן הַדֶּבֶק בְּקִרְתִּי... כְּאִשׁוֹר יִדְבֵּק הָאִזּוֹר '...as a loincloth **clings** to a man's waist, so **I have made** the whole house of Israel... **cling** to me' (Jer. 13.11; cf. Deut. 28.21; Ezek. 3.26; 29.4).

I:548),¹⁸ Yalon argues for the preservation of *qal yaqtel* and/or related infinitival or imperatival forms representing such roots as, גל"ל, בי"ן, אמ"ן, אצל"ל, אס"ף, אמ"ר, אב"ל, אט"ם, אח"ז, אב"ל, אב"ד, ית"ר, יש"ר, יצ"ב, יס"ף, טמ"ן, חל"ק, חל"ל, זק"ן, זל"ל, זי"ד, הפ"ך, הל"ל, גג"ן, סת"ר, נש"ך, נש"י, נפ"ל, נס"ך, נח"י, נט"י, נג"ש, מת"ק, מר"י, לע"ג, בת"ת, שי"ם, רצ"ן, רו"ח, קר"ב, קה"ל, צפ"ן, צל"ל, צב"י, עת"ק, עש"ר, עמ"ד, עז"ר, ש"מ"ט, ש"מ"ע, ש"מ"י, ש"ק. Many of these have apparently suppletive *qal-hif'il* paradigms, on the basis of which it may be postulated that unequivocal *hif'il* forms secondarily arose.

An illustrative case showcasing the combination of conservation and development that characterises the Tiberian reading tradition centres on *qal* and *hif'il* forms of יס"ף (Huehnergard 2005). Nearly full *qal* and *hif'il* paradigms can be adduced, with no obvious semantic distinction between the two stems.

Table 8: The paradigms *qal* יס"ף and *hif'il* הוסיף

	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i>
Suffix conjugation	יס"ף	הוסיף
Active participle	יִסֵּף	מוֹסִיף
Prefix conjugation	יִסֵּף (וְיִסֵּף)	יֹוֹסִיף (וְיֹוֹסִיף)
Imperative	יִסֵּף*	הוֹסִיף*
Infinitive construct	סִפֹּת/לְסַפֹּת < סִפֹּת (לְסַפֹּת)*	הוֹסִיף (לְ)

The assumption of synonymous *qal* and *hif'il* paradigms resolves certain grammatical problems, such as what must otherwise be explained as the rather frequent use of jussive forms where indic-

¹⁸ Yalon (1971, 43) also adduces opinions among Jewish interpreters, such as Ibn Janah, Rashi, and Samuel David Luzzatto. Cf. Bergsträsser (1918–1929, II: 80, 82, 127), who for many of the forms suggested by Barth rejects a *qal yaqtel* explanation, adopting instead the view that the vocalisation is simply wrong.

ative alternatives are expected (e.g., Gen. 4.2; Lev. 5.16, 24; 37.31; Num. 5.7; 22.19; Deut. 13.1; 18.16) and the apparent use of the 3rd-person jussive where the participle is expected (Isa. 29.14; 38.5). It entails the assumption that the *qal* I-y infinitive construct לִסַּפַּת in the Mesha^c Stele (KAI 181.21) was realised as if it were a III-y form in the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition. Such a situation of parallel paradigms presumably evolved from an original *qal*, whose *yaqtel* < PS *yaqtīl* prefix conjugation spurred the secondary formation of unambiguous *hif'il* forms. The diachronic character of the process is manifest in the distribution of unequivocal consonantal *qal* and *hif'il* forms as well as forms with *matres* or vocalisations that unambiguously identify the *binyan*.

Table 9: Distribution of *qal* and *hif'il* forms of יִסַּף according to the various layers of the Tiberian biblical tradition

	unequivocal consonantal		prefix conjugation vocalisation			
	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i>	<i>qal</i>	<i>hif'il</i> defective	<i>plene</i>	ambiguous jussive/ <i>wayyiqtol</i>
Pentateuch	13	1	8	11	4	4
Prophets	15	3	3	11	36	1
(Former	9	3	0	6	18	1)
(Latter	6	0	3	5	18	0)
Writings	1	7	0	3	30	6
(non-LBH	0	1	0	3	22	5)
(LBH +	1	6	0	0	8	1)
TOTALS	29	11	11	25	70	11

When it comes to the distribution of forms of *qal* יִסַּף and *hif'il* הוֹסִיף, the various Masoretic corpora exhibit conspicuous differences that appear to have diachronic significance. Thus, in MT LBH +, there is virtually no dissonance between the three types of evidence: *hif'il* morphology predominates to the near exclusion

of *qal* in unequivocal consonantal forms; vocalisation of *yiqtol* is exclusively *hif'il*; and *hif'il* prefix conjugation vocalisation is consistently matched by exclusively *plene hif'il* orthography.¹⁹ The morphological harmony among consonantal text, vocalisation, and *matres lectionis* in Persian Period material tallies with other evidence confirming a special affinity between the Tiberian vocalisation and the period in which LBH+ texts were composed.

The rest of the MT is characterised by more or less conflicting totals. Consider the Pentateuch: unequivocal consonantal forms are nearly all *qal*—with the problematic לְהוֹסִיף (Lev. 19.25) the single arguable exception²⁰—but *yiqtol* vocalisation is divided—eight *qal* and fifteen *hif'il*. Intriguingly, however, only four of the fifteen *yiqtol* forms with indisputable *hif'il* vocalisation have equally unambiguous *plene hif'il* spelling. This situation obviously contrasts with the one described above for LBH+ texts. Whereas there is consonantal, vocalic, and orthographic har-

¹⁹ The relevant distribution in the non-LBH+ Writings seems similar, but the dearth of unequivocal consonantal forms precludes certainty.

²⁰ In the passage's context of harvesting, 'gather' is at least as apposite as 'add'. Vulgate *congregantes* reflects the former; LXX πρόσθεμα, TO אֲזַיְתֻם, and the Syr ܐܘܡܢܐܬܐ the latter. The Samaritan evidence is varied. The ST has למכנשה 'gather' against the SAP's لِيضَاعَفْ 'multiply'. For the meaning 'gather' one expects *qal* הָאֵסַף in Samaritan as well as Tiberian Hebrew; indeed, the *hif'il* is otherwise unknown. Also, the Samaritan pronunciation *lisaf* reflects neither הָאֵסַף nor הִלְאֵסַף, but seemingly הוֹסִיף 'bring to an end'. Cf. MT תִּסְיֶפֶן || SP תוסיפון *tūsifon* (Exod. 5.7), where, again, the context is amenable to both 'continue' and 'gather'. Similar cases of possible conflation occur within the Tiberian tradition: הָאֵסַף and הוֹסִיף (Jer. 8.13; Zeph. 1.2), הָאֵסַף and הוֹסִיף (1 Sam. 18.29; 2 Sam. 6.1); see Ben-Hayyim (2000, 143, 213).

mony in LBH+, striking dissonance obtains in the Pentateuch. Unambiguous *qal* consonantal forms and the rare incidence of *plene* orthography with *mater yod* to signal *hif'il* morphology contrast with rather common *hif'il* vocalisation. The complexity of the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition in the Pentateuch is further manifested in the preservation of archaic *qal yaqtel* prefix conjugation morphology, according to which forms like non-jussive קָטַל are to be analysed as cases of the indicative *qal yaqtel* prefix conjugation, not as short jussive *hif'il* forms.

Apparently occupying a sort of intermediate position between the Pentateuch and LBH+, the books of the Prophets exhibit significant discord between preservation of *qal* in the case of unequivocal consonantal forms and development of *hif'il yiqtol*, but noticeably greater affinity than in the Pentateuch between *hif'il* vocalisation and *plene* orthography in the prefix conjugation. A further point of contrast with the Pentateuch is the infrequency in the Prophets of archaic *qal yaqtel* vocalisations.

Focusing on the relationship between the vocalisation and the orthographic tradition regarding hifilisation of *qal קָטַל*, the statistics constitute arguable evidence of linguistically significant development in orthographic practice within the MT. Concentrating on *yiqtol* forms where a long *i* vowel might be expected, we find that explicit *hif'il* spellings constitute a minority in the Pentateuch, come in three-quarters of the cases in the Prophets, and are the norm in the Writings, including LBH+, where *hif'il* orthography is employed to the total exclusion of potential *qal* spellings. Crucially, the *plene* percentages reflect various degrees

of agreement between the orthographic and vocalisation components of the combined Tiberian tradition.

Whenever the various constituent texts were composed, the written form of the Masoretic Pentateuch seems to reflect a stage in orthographic development in which the spelling of *(way)yiqtol* was largely still amenable to *qal* morphology. Beyond the Pentateuch, there is a strong and increasing tendency to utilise *(way)-yiqtol* spellings exclusive to *hif'il*. It is reasonable to assume that such spellings in LBH accurately reflect the post-exilic *hif'il* usage common to Second Temple Hebrew material noted above.

How to account for the high degree of *hif'il yiqtol* forms in CBH outside the Pentateuch is a more complicated question. It may be, of course, that the relatively high incidence of *hif'il* spellings in non-Pentateuchal CBH is due partially to the anachronistic application of late linguistic conventions to this material—an enterprise from which the Pentateuch was (partially) exempted due to its relatively early compilation and/or special venerated status.

A reasonable hypothesis for historical development might run as follows. An early situation of dominant *qal* morphology gradually gave way to one of increased *hif'il* usage due in part to *hif'il*-like *qal yaqtel* forms. This second stage was characterised by the continued use of both consonantly unambiguous and ambiguous *qal* forms as well as by an increase in consonantly and orthographically unambiguous *hif'il* forms. Depending on the realisation and spelling of ambiguous forms, various manifestations of suppletion might have obtained.

Intriguingly, the sorts of suppletion encountered in the Masoretic corpora described above show a certain diachronic progression. The clearest situations are in LBH+ and the Pentateuch: whereas LBH+ texts show virtually no suppletion—*hif'il* dominant according to all components of the tradition—much of the suppletion in the Pentateuch seems to be secondary—*qal* dominant both consonantally and orthographically, *hif'il* restricted chiefly—though not exclusively—to vocalisation. The nature of the suppletion in the Prophets is more difficult to interpret. It may be largely organic—there being a mix of unambiguous *qal* consonantal forms together with *hif'il* forms on which vocalisation and spelling with *mater yod* agree. Alternatively, of course, the greater use of *mater yod* for unequivocal *hif'il* spelling in the Prophets vis-à-vis the Pentateuch may be due to a secondary spelling revision that impacted non-Torah CBH material more than the Torah. Limited support for such a theory emerges from the fact that, in comparison to the Pentateuch, the Prophets show increased incidence of *plene* spelling with both *yod* and *waw* in the relevant (*way*)*yiqtol* forms of יִקְטֹל and יִקְוֹל . What is clear is that, whatever its origin, there is more in the way of *qal-hif'il* suppletion to deal with in the Prophets than in either the Pentateuch or LBH+.

3.0. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

The foregoing sections have focused mainly on the secondary and late character of hifilisation in various ancient Hebrew corpora and traditions. Such a characterisation is correct, but also poten-

tially misleading, as it is not the whole story. It must be emphasised that no historical phase of Hebrew—biblical or extra-biblical—is devoid of consonantly unambiguous *hif'il* forms.

Second, while many of the instances of hifilisation discussed above represent innovations restricted to Second Temple times, in several cases *hif'il* harbingers—sometimes, but not always, minority forms—predate the post-exilic period. This is true of *hif'il* forms of such roots as בִּי"ן, יל"ד, יס"ף, לי"ץ, נח"י, צל"ח, and רי"ב, all of which, to varying degrees, show *hif'il* distribution earlier than LBH (see §5.1 for citations). Indeed, in some cases, like that of הולִיד ‘father, sire’, *hif'il* usage is dominant throughout all historical stages of ancient Hebrew according to the consonantal tradition. In the case of לי"ץ and רי"ב, whose *hif'il* verbal forms are limited to demonstrably late material, it may be that hifilisation began in participial forms with nominal or adjectival semantics, since these are the only relevant *hif'il* forms that crop up in pre-LBH material (for a similar phenomenon in the process of nifaliation, see above, ch. 10, §3.0).

The case of *qal* יסֶף versus *hif'il* הוֹסִיף exemplifies several important points. First, though the vocalisation in the Pentateuch and the Prophets is probably somewhat anachronistic—involving the *hif'il* reinterpretation of a number of apparently original *qal* forms in line with Second Temple tendencies unambiguously evidenced in late consonantal evidence—in no part of the Hebrew Bible, including those parts considered the most ancient, is the vocalisation tradition the lone witness to hifilisation of יס"ף.

Second, in its use of unambiguous *plene hif'il* spellings for יס"ף, specifically, and for *hif'il* forms, more generally, the ortho-

graphic tradition itself evinces several chronological windows on the hifilisation process—considerably less advanced in the Torah, nearly complete in LBH, and at an intermediate stage in the Prophets. Seen from a different perspective, since orthographic evidence for the hifilisation of ה"י comes substantially earlier than the advent of the Tiberian vocalisation signs, it is clear that the hifilisation shift reflected in the medieval Tiberian reading tradition significantly predates medieval times, extending back to the Second and First Temple Periods.

4.0. Conclusions

With regard to the process of hifilisation, the historical depth of the Tiberian vocalisation tradition finds confirmation in unequivocal *hif'il* evidence found in MT LBH +, the biblical and non-biblical DSS, the SP, BS, RH, and, to some extent, the Tiberian consonantal tradition of different sections of the Hebrew Bible. The combined evidence shows clearly that the *qal* > *hif'il* shift reflected in the vocalisation of the Tiberian reading tradition had already by Second Temple times profoundly impacted morphology, so that apparent cases of dissonance between the written component of the Tiberian biblical tradition and its reading counterpart should be considered differences in degree rather than kind. Clearly, hifilisation began early on in ancient Hebrew, and scholars are afforded a series of snapshots in the process by the orthographic tradition of various parts of the Hebrew Bible, by the Tiberian reading tradition, and by other Second Temple biblical traditions and extra-biblical material.

5.0. Citations

5.1. The Tiberian Biblical Tradition

Table 1

ח"ל: *gal* + ח"ל—Judg. 14.6, 19; 15.14; 1 Sam. 10.6, 10; 11.6; 16.13; 18.10; *gal*—Num. 14.41; 2 Sam. 19.18; Isa. 53.10; 54.17; Jer. 12.1; 13.7, 10; 22.30, 30; Ezek. 15.4; 16.13; 17.9, 10, 15; Amos 5.6; Ps 45.5; Dan 11.27; **transitive hifil**—Gen. 24.21, 40, 42, 56; 39.3, 23; Deut. 28.29; Josh. 1.8; Judg. 18.5; Isa. 48.15; 55.11; Ps. 37.7; 118.25; Neh. 1.11; 2.20; 2 Chron. 26.5; **intransitive hifil**—Gen. 39.2; 1 Kgs 22.12 (|| 2 Chron. 18.11), 15 (|| 2 Chron. 18.14); Jer. 2.37; 5.28; 32.5; Ps. 1.3; Prov. 28.13; Dan. 8.12, 24, 25; 11.36; 1 Chron. 22.11, 13; 29.23; 2 Chron. 7.11; 13.12; 14.6; 18.11 (|| 1 Kgs 22.12), 14 (|| 1 Kgs 22.15); 20.20; 24.20; 31.21; 32.30.

Table 2

ח"ל: *gal*—Deut. 32.7; Jer. 49.7; Ps. 5.2; 50.22; 94.8; 139.2; Prov. 23.1; Dan. 9.2, 23; 10.1; **ambiguous**—Deut. 32.9; 1 Sam. 3.8; 2 Sam. 12.19; Isa. 6.9, 10; 28.9; 32.4; 40.14; 43.10; 44.18; Jer. 9.11; Hos. 4.14; 14.10; Ps. 19.13; 28.5; 49.21; 58.10; 73.17; 82.5; 92.7; 94.7; Job 6.30; 9.11; 13.1; 14.21; 15.9; 18.2; 23.5, 8; 32.8, 9; 36.29; 38.20; 42.3; Prov. 2.5, 9; 7.7; 14.15; 19.25; 20.24; 21.29 *qere*; 23.1; 24.12; 28.5, 5; 29.7, 19; Dan. 9.22; 11.30, 37, 37; 12.8, 10, 10; Ezra 8.15; Neh. 8.8; 13.7; **hifil**—1 Kgs 3.9, 11; Isa. 28.19; 29.16; 40.21; 56.11; 57.1; Mic. 4.12; Ps. 32.9; 33.15; 119.27, 34, 73, 125, 130, 144, 169; Job 6.24; 28.23; Prov. 1.2, 6; 8.9; 14.8; 17.10, 24; 28.2, 7, 11; Dan. 1.4, 17; 8.5, 16, 17, 23, 27; 9.23; 10.11, 12, 14; Ezra 8.16; Neh. 8.2, 3, 7, 9, 12; 10.29; 1 Chron. 15.22; 25.7, 8; 27.32; 28.9; 2 Chron. 11.23; 26.5; 34.12; 35.3 *qere*.

Table 3

ח"ל: *gal*—Gen. 24.27; Exod. 13.17, 21 (לַחֲתֹם); 15.13; 32.34; Isa. 7.2; 58.11; Ps. 5.9; 27.11; 60.11; 77.21; 108.11; 139.24; **ambiguous**—Num. 23.7; Deut. 32.12; 1 Sam. 22.4; 1 Kgs 10.26; 2 Kgs 18.11; Isa. 57.18; Ps. 23.3; 31.4; 43.3; 61.3; 67.5; 73.24; 78.14, 53, 72; 107.30; 139.10; 143.10; Job 12.23; 31.18; 38.32; Prov. 6.22; 11.3; 18.16; **hifil**—Gen. 24.48; Neh. 9.12, 19.

Table 4

ה"ס: *gal*—Gen. 8.12; 38.26; Lev. 22.14; 26.18, 21; 27.13, 15, 19, 27; Num. 11.25; 32.14, 15; Deut. 5.22, 25; 19.9; 20.8; Judg. 8.28; 13.21; 1 Sam. 7.13; 12.19; 15.35; 27.4; 2 Sam. 2.28; 2 Kgs 6.23; 19.30; Isa. 26.15; 29.1, 19; 30.1; 37.31; Jer. 7.21; 45.3; 2 Chron. 9.6; **ambiguous**—Gen. 4.2, 12; 8.10, 21, 21; 18.29; 25.1; 30.24; 37.5, 8; 38.5; 44.23; Exod. 5.7; 8.25; 9.28, 34; 10.28, 29; 11.6; Lev. 5.16, 24; 27.31; Num. 5.7; 22.15, 19, 25, 26; Deut. 1.11; 3.26; 4.2; 13.1, 12; 17.16; 18.16; 19.20; Judg. 3.12; 4.1; 9.37; 10.6; 11.14; 13.1; 20.22, 28; 1 Sam 3.6, 8, 21; 9.8; 14.44; 18.29; 19.8, 21; 20.17; 23.4; 2 Sam. 2.22; 3.34; 5.22; 12.8; 18.22; 24.1, 3; 1 Kgs 16.33; 19.2; 20.10; 2 Kgs 6.31; Isa. 7.10; 8.5; 29.14; 38.5; Ezek. 5.16; 23.14; 36.12; Hos. 9.15; 13.2; Joel 2.2; Zeph. 3.11; Ps. 115.14; Job 27.1; 29.1; 36.1; 40.32; 42.10; Prov. 1.5; 9.9; 10.22; 19.19; 23.28; 30.6; Est. 8.3; Dan. 10.18; 1 Chron. 21.3; 2 Chron. 28.22; **hifil**—Exod. 14.13; Lev. 19.25; Deut. 25.3, 3; 28.68; Josh. 7.12; 23.13; Judg. 2.21; 10.13; 20.23; 1 Sam. 3.17; 20.13; 25.22; 2 Sam. 3.9, 35; 7.10, 20; 14.10; 19.14; 1 Kgs 2.23; 10.7; 12.11, 14; 2 Kgs 20.6; 21.8; 24.7; Isa. 1.5, 13; 10.20; 11.11; 23.12; 24.20; 47.1, 5; 51.22; 52.1; Jer. 31.12; Hos. 1.6; Amos 5.2; 7.8, 13; 8.2; Jon. 2.5; Nah. 2.1; Ps 10.18; 41.9; 61.7; 71.14; 77.8; 78.17; 120.3; Job 17.9; 20.9; 34.32, 37; 38.11; 40.5; Prov. 3.2; 9.11; 10.27; 16.21, 23; 19.4; 23.35; Ruth 1.17; Qoh. 1.16, 18; 2.9; 3.14; Lam. 4.15, 16, 22; Dan. 10.18; Ezra 10.10; Neh. 13.18; 1 Chron. 14.13; 17.9, 18; 22.14; 2 Chron. 10.11, 14; 28.13; 33.8.

Table 5

masculine ה"ס: *gal*—Gen. 4.18, 18, 18; 10.8, 13, 15, 24, 24, 26; 20.17; 22.23; 25.3; Deut. 32.18; Isa 49.21; 65.23; Jer. 17.11; Hos. 9.16; Zech. 13.3, 3; Ps. 7.15; Job 38.29; Prov. 23.22; 27.1; 1 Chron. 1.10, 11, 13, 18, 20; 2.48; **hifil**—Gen. 5.3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32; 6.10; 11.10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; 17.20; 25.19; 48.6; Num. 26.29, 58; Deut. 4.25; 28.41; Judg. 11.1; 2 Kgs 20.18; Isa. 39.7; 45.10; 55.10; 66.9; Jer. 16.3; 29.6; Ezek. 18.10, 14; Job 38.28; Ruth 4.18, 19, 19, 20, 20, 21, 21, 22, 22; Qoh. 5.13; 6.3; Neh. 12.10, 10, 11, 11; 1 Chron. 1.34; 2.10, 10, 11, 11, 12, 12, 13, 18, 20, 20, 22, 36, 36, 37, 37, 38, 38, 39, 39, 40, 40, 41, 41, 44, 44, 46; 4.2, 2, 8, 11, 12, 14, 14; 5.30, 30, 31, 31, 32, 32, 33, 33, 34, 34, 35, 35, 36, 37, 37, 38, 38, 39, 39, 40, 40; 7.32; 8.1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 32, 33, 33, 33, 34, 36, 36, 36, 37; 9.38, 39, 39, 39, 40, 42, 42, 42, 43; 14.3; 2 Chron. 11.21; 13.21; 24.3.

5.2. NBDSS

ה"ס: **ambiguous**—1QH^a 8.36; 4Q381 f46a + b.6 (תזונה [?]); **hifil**—1QH^a 17.7, 11; 4Q460 f9i.7. ג"ע: **hifil**—1QpHab 4.2. ה"ס: **gal**—CD 7.18; 1QpHab 4.2;

1QH^a 12.23; 13.22; 15.26; 4Q365 f6aii + 6c.1; 4Q396 f1–2iii.10; 4Q397 f6_13.9; 4Q434 f1i.2; 4Q437 f1.2; 4Q508 f21.2; **ambiguous**—1QpHab 4.5; 4Q285 f3.4; **hifil**—CD 9.4. רע"ד: **ambiguous**—1QH^a 11.36. ק"ש: **qal**—4Q266 f10ii.12; 4Q269 f11ii + 15.1; **ambiguous**—1QS 7.14; 1QpHab 4.4, 6; 4Q171 f1–2ii.12; 4Q259 1.13; 4Q380 f3.2; 4Q434 f7b.3. ח"ל: **qal**—4Q416 f8.1; **ambiguous**—1Q27 f1ii.5; 4Q219 2.29; 4Q221 f1.7; 4Q299 f2.1; **hifil**—CD 13.21; 11Q19 58.21. רש"ע: **qal**—CD 20.29; **ambiguous**—1QS 4.24; 1QH^a 5.33; **hifil**—CD 20.26; 1QS 1.25; 1QM 1.2; 1Q34bis f3ii.4; 4Q174 f1–3ii.3 (|| Dan. 12.10); 4Q184 f1.3; 4Q266 f3ii.6; 4Q267 f2.2; f3.3; 4Q387 f3.6. ל"גד: **qal**—4Q216 6.9 (= Jub. 2.10); **ambiguous**—4Q364 f18.2 (|| Num. 14.17). ל"ב: **qal**—CD 1.1; 4Q268 f1.9; 4Q413 f1–2.4; **ambiguous**—CD 1.8, 10; 13.8; 1QS 11.22; 1QH^a 8.13; 9.39; 20.30, 36; 22.30; 2Q27 f1.4; 4Q169 f3–4iii.4; 4Q256 23.1; 4Q264 f1.10; 4Q266 f2i.5, 14; f9ii.18; f9iii.5; 4Q268 f1.8; 4Q298 f3–4ii.9; 4Q372 f8.6; 4Q377 f2ii.2; 4Q381 f1.2; f3i.5; f45a + b.1; f76–77.8; 4Q382 f15.2; 4Q390 f1.6; f2i.7; 4Q397 f14–21.10; 4Q401 f16.4; 4Q418 f46.1; f77.3; f189.2; 4Q418a f8.2; 4Q421 f1aii–b.14; 4Q424 f3.2; **hifil**—CD 2.14; 8.12; 13.5; 19.24; 1QS 3.13; 4.22; 6.15; 1QSa 1.5; 1QH^a 4.33; 5.13, 14, 30; 10.20; 18.23; 19.31; fC3.4; 1Q34bis f3ii.3, 4; 4Q249a f1.2; 4Q267 f1.6; 4Q270 f2ii.21; 4Q298 f1–2i.2; 4Q299 f34.3; 4Q302 f2ii.2; 4Q303 f1.1; 4Q372 f2.5; f3.3; f8.4; 4Q379 f22i.4; 4Q381 f45a + b.1; f47.3; f49.2; f85.1; 4Q387 fA.4; 4Q398 f14–17ii.4; 4Q402 f4.14; 4Q408 f3 + 3a.7; 4Q415 f11.5, 6; 4Q416 f4.3; 4Q417 f1i.1, 14, 18; f1ii.10; 4Q418 f2 + 2a–c.7, 8; f17.2; f81 + 81a.15; f102a + b.3; f122i.5; f123ii.4, 5; f158.4; f176.3; f205.2; f221.2, 3; f227.1; f273.1; 4Q418a f7.2; 4Q423 f7.7; 4Q428 f10.6; 4Q443 f2.8; 4Q504 f1–2Rii.17; 4Q509 f4.4; f12i–13.3; 4Q525 f6ii.2; f14ii.18; 5Q13 f1.9. ד"ר: **qal**—4Q514 f1i.7; **ambiguous**—4Q364 f13a–b.2; 11Q19 56.11; **hifil**—4Q171 f3–10iv.15; 4Q511 f68.4. ר"ג: **qal**—1QS^a 1.13; 4Q176 f1–2i.2; 4Q299 f62.2; 4Q417 f2i.14; **ambiguous**—1QS 4.23; 1QH^a 17.23; 25.15; 1Q36 f2.1; f10.1; 4Q175 1.15; 4Q185 f4ii.3; 4Q251 f4–7i.2; 4Q299 f59.2, 7; 4Q418 f81 + 81a.7; **hifil**—4Q390 f2i.6. ל"ץ: **qal**—4Q468i f1.1; **hifil**—1QpHab 8.6; 4Q184 f1.2. ח"ג: **qal**—4Q408 f3 + 3a.7; **hifil**—1QS 9.18; 4Q256 18.1; 4Q259 3.16. יס"ף: **qal**—4Q252 1.19, 20; **ambiguous**—4Q252 1.16; 4Q416 f2ii.10; 4Q417 f2i.18, 20; 4Q418 f137.2; f199.2; PAM43685 f48.2; **hifil**—1QS 2.11; 6.14; 1QpHab 6.1; 8.12; 11.15; 1QH^a 9.37; 1Q14 f8–10.7; 4Q265 f4ii.3; 4Q266 f6iv.8; 4Q286 f7i.8; 4Q298 f3–4ii.5, 6, 7, 8; 4Q299 f6ii.18; f30.5; 4Q416 f2iii.6; f2iv.7; 4Q418 f81 + 81a.17; f162.3; f221.3; 4Q420 f2.3; 4Q436 f1a + bi.2; 4Q502 f3.1; 4Q503 f15–16.10; 4Q525 f1.3; 11Q19 54.6; 56.18; 61.11; ש"ר: **hifil**—4Q427 f7.18 (Qimron 2010, I:102, fn. 18). יל"ד: **hifil**—1QS^a 2.11; 4Q180 f1.5; 4Q225 f2i.8; f2ii.11; 4Q226 f7.3; 4Q338 2.1; 3.1.

5.3. Samaritan Hebrew

י"ט: **MT** *qal* || **SP** *plene hif'il*—Deut. 20.8; **MT** *ambiguous* || **SP** *plene hif'il*—Gen. 8.21, 21; 37.5, 8; 44.23; Exod. 5.7; 9.28; Deut. 3.26; 4.2; 13.1, 12; 17.16; 18.16; 19.20; **MT** *plene hif'il* || **SP** *ambiguous*—Deut. 25.3, 3.

5.4. The Tiberian Reading Tradition

י"ט: **qal**—Gen. 24.27; Exod. 13.17; 15.13; 32.34; Isa. 7.2; 58.11; Ps. 5.9; 27.11; 60.11; 77.21; 108.11; 139.24; **hif'il**—Gen. 24.48; Exod. 13.21; Num. 23.7; Deut. 32.12; 1 Sam. 22.4; 1 Kgs 10.26; 2 Kgs 18.11; Isa. 57.18; Ps 23.3; 31.4; 43.3; 61.3; 67.5; 73.24; 78.14, 53, 72; 107.30; 139.10; 143.10; Job 12.23; 31.18; 38.32; Prov. 6.22; 11.3; 18.16; Neh. 9.12, 19.

