The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew

Aaron D. Hornkohl

https://www.openbookpublishers.com

Cover image: T-S AS 8.129. A leaf from a Cairo Geniza biblical codex containing Gen. 30.17–20 and showcasing Moshe Moḥe'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

12. PIELISATION

Complementing the shifts from G-stem to N-stem (nifalisation, ch. 10) and from G-stem to C-stem (hifilisation, ch. 11), part of ancient Hebrew's long, gradual, and partial shift away from *qal* involved shifts from G-stem to D-stem, i.e., pielisation. Due to the orthographic identity of most *qal* and *pi^{cc}el* forms in all but their respective active and passive participial forms, it can be difficult to detect *qal > pi^{cc}el* shifts, especially in ancient corpora without a recorded reading tradition.

Even so, evidence for pielisation across ancient Hebrew corpora and traditions, both biblical and extra-biblical, is extensive, especially when comparing late antique Hebrew with earlier material. The present chapter utilises as a springboard Fassberg's (2001) survey of Qumran, BS, the Samaritan reading tradition, Tannaitic and Amoraic RH, and Paytanic Hebrew, for which he collects examples from various ancient Hebrew traditions and cites numerous expert opinions. An effort is made here to augment previous studies by pointing out evidence hitherto unnoticed.

Conspicuously absent from several previous studies of pielisation in ancient Hebrew is a discussion of the trend as a sign of distinction between Tiberian CBH and LBH. If, however, scholars find substantial evidence of G- to D-stem movement in Second Temple material, it is also reasonable to expect at least a hint of this in Tiberian LBH when compared to CBH.

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Late Biblical Hebrew

In various ways and to varying degrees, use of the following *pi''el* verbs manifests LBH pielisation:

1.1.1. בֵּרֵר 'purify'

In Tiberian BH, the *pi''el* comes in Dan. 11.35. Elsewhere, synonymous *qal* (Ezek. 20.38; Eccl. 3.18) and *hif'il* (Jer. 4.11; 51.11) forms and middle/passive forms in *nif'al* (2 Sam. 22.27, 27; Isa. 52.11; Ps. 18.27) and *hitpa''el* (Ps. 18.27) occur. Significantly, probable *pi''el* forms are found in the NBDSS (1QS 1.12; 4.20; 1QHᵃ 7.23; 4Q369 f1ii.5) with likely cases in RH (m. 'Eruvin 4.5; m. Tamid 2.5). The verb has a D-stem Aramaic cognate.

1.1.2. גֵּאַל 'defile'

Most occurrences of verbs with this root are late in Tiberian BH. *Nif'al* forms come in historically questionable Zephaniah (3.1) as well as transitional or early post-exilic texts (Isa. 59.3; Lam. 4.14). The *pi''el* (Mal. 1.7), *pu''al* (Mal. 1.7, 12; Ezra 2.62; Neh. 7.64), and *hitpa''el* (Dan. 1.8, 8) are more characteristic of LBH proper, and apparently come in the NBDSS (see below, §1.2.1), as well. There is also a late noun גֹּאַל* in Neh. 13.29.

1.1.3. חִקֵּר 'investigate'

Qal חָקַר 'search, investigate, explore' occurs 22 times in the Hebrew Bible, while the *nif'al* נֶחְקַר (לֹא) '(un)explored, (un)measured, (im)measurable' comes five times; the *pi''el* appears only

in Qoh. 12.9. It has also been identified in the NBDSS at 4Q420
f1aii–b.3 (see below, §1.2.2).

1.1.4. טִלֵּל 'cover, overshadow'

טִלֵּל 'cover, overshadow' (Neh. 3.15) is evidently a borrowing
from Aramaic, where the verb is also commonly in the D-stem;
apparent Hebrew cognates include *qal* צָלַל 'become dark' (Neh.
13.19) and *hifʿil* הֵצֵל 'provide shade' (Ezek. 31.3).

1.1.5. מִעֵט 'be few, become few'

The stative meaning in Qoh. 12.3 is elsewhere covered in BH by
the *qal* מָעַט (cf. esp. Isa. 21.17; Jer. 29.6; 30.19; see also Exod.
12.4; Lev. 25.16; Ps. 107.39; Prov. 13.11; Neh. 9.32); cf. the com-
mon RH *puʿʿal* participle ממועט 'small, few' (e.g., m. Peʾa 8.4).

1.1.6. נִסֵּךְ 'pour out (a libation)'

Against the *piʿʿel* in 1 Chron. 11.18, there occur throughout Tibe-
rian BH apparently synonymous forms in *qal* (Exod. 30.9; Isa.
29.10; 30.1; 40.19; 44.10; Hos. 9.4; Ps. 2.6) and *hifʿil* (Gen. 35.14;
Num. 28.7; 2 Sam. 23.16; 2 Kgs 16.13; Jer. 7.18; 19.13; 32.29;
44.17, 18, 19, 19, 25; Ezek. 20.28; Ps. 16.4), with a *qal* internal
or *hofʿal* passive (Exod. 25.29; 37.16). In the Mishna, the *piʿʿel*
occurs to the exclusion of *qal* or *hifʿil* (e.g., m. ʿAvoda Zara 5.6;
m. Zevaḥim 13.6). The Targumic cognate is also D-stem.

1.1.7. נִתֵּץ 'tear down, break down'

Piʿʿel forms are found mainly, but not exclusively, in late texts
(Deut. 12.3; Ezek. 16.39; 2 Chron. 31.1; 33.3; 34.4, 7; 36.19);

however, consonantally unambiguous *pi‘‘el* forms are found only in Chronicles (2 Chron. 31.1; 34.4, 7; 36.19). Synonymous *qal* forms are the norm in BH, with some thirty cases (e.g., Exod. 34.13). Passives are vocalised as either *nif‘al* (Jer. 4.26; Nah. 1.6) or *qal* internal passive/*pu‘‘al* (Judg. 6.28). The *pi‘‘el* is also known from SH (Lev. 14.45 ∥ MT *qal*).

1.1.8. Related Phenomena

Disappearance of *Qal* Internal Passive

Additionally, one indirect result of pielisation in LBH (and other late antique Hebrew sources) noted by Fassberg (2001, 252–55) is the disappearance of the *qal* internal passive. While accepting the reality of phonetic and morphosemantic factors, Fassberg opines that the shift of **quṭal* forms to *quṭṭal* was facilitated by broader movement from *qal* to *pi‘‘el*.

Increased Usage of *Pu‘‘al* Participles

A not unrelated development in exilic and post-exilic Hebrew was increased usage of *pu‘‘al* participles in place of various classical alternatives. Focusing principally on the linguistic periodisation of Ezekiel vis-à-vis the Priestly Source of the Pentateuch, Hurvitz (1982, 27–30, 35–39; 1983) calls attention to the late distribution of such terms as מְחֻלָּל 'defiled', מְטֹהָר 'purified', מְטֻמָּא 'defiled', מְקֻדָּשׁ 'sanctified', and מְרֻבָּע 'square'. While rejecting the extreme position that such terms were necessarily coined in exilic or post-exilic times, Hurvitz (1982, 29–30) argues that their historical usage follows a clearcut chronological sequence, accord-

ing to which the *puʿʿal* participles dominate in the late period. More diagnostically characteristic of LBH proper are:

- מְלֻבָּשִׁים 'dressed' (1 Kgs 22.10 ‖ 2 Chron. 18.9; Ezra 3.10; 2 Chron. 5.12) – *qal* לָבַשׁ 'wear' comes over 60 times in the Hebrew Bible, joined by a causative *hifʿil* 30 + times, with no *piʿʿel*; use of the *puʿʿal* continues in RH (e.g., t. Shabbat 8.17).[1]

- מְפֹרָצֶת 'broken down' (Neh. 1.3; see also the *ketiv* המפרוצים, *qere* הֵם פְּרוּצִים Neh. 2.13) – in place of the expected פְּרוּצָה (Prov. 25.28; Neh. 2.13 *qere*; 4.1; 2 Chron. 32.5; and cf. the standard *qal* form—42 times—against zero *piʿʿel* forms).

- מְפֹרָשׁ 'made distinct' (Neh. 8.8) – פֹרָשׁ (Num. 15.34) is an-alysable as a *qal* internal passive on the basis of לִפְרֹשׁ 'to clarify' (Lev. 24.12); the *piʿʿel* is also attested in SH (§1.3.1) and RH (§1.5), the *puʿʿal* in the NBDSS (§1.2.2) and RH (§1.5).

1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls

Fassberg (2001, 245–46) collects examples of various categories of *piʿʿel* replacements of *qal* cited by scholars, e.g.,

- ונאלכה (=ונהלכה) 'that we may walk' (1QIsaᵃ 2.10) ‖ וְנֵלְכָה (MT Isa. 2.3)

---

[1] Possibly also to be read in 11Q17 9.7, but the context is broken and the reading questionable (see the *Maʾagarim* website).

- קו{{ו}}ישח '(they) mock' (1QpHab 4.6)[2] || יִשְׂחָק (MT Hab. 1.10)[3]

- הממכרת 'who sells, i.e., betrays' (4Q169 f3–4ii.7) || הַמֹּכֶרֶת (MT Nah. 3.4; cf. §1.3.1, below)

A Tiberian BH *qal* internal passive is twice replaced with *puᶜᶜal* in 1QIsaᵃ:

- וממורט 'polished' (1QIsaᵃ 14.25) || וּמֹורָט (MT Isa. 18.2)

- וממרט (1QIsaᵃ 15.1) || וּמֹורָט (MT Isa. 18.7)

A *puᶜᶜal* participle comes where a *qal* passive participle is expected in the case of:

- מגולי אזן 'with opened ears' (1QM 10.11); cf. גְּלָה אֹזֶן 'open the ear' (e.g., 1 Sam. 9.15) and וּגְלוּי עֵינָיִם 'and with opened eyes' (Num. 24.4, 16) (see below, §3.3)

To Fassberg's list of BDSS *qal* > *piᶜᶜel* shifts, the following may be added.

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

דִּבֶּר 'speak'

Though *piᶜᶜel* morphology prevails for this verb in the MT, significant *qal* vestiges remain (see below, §3.1, for details). Most cases of MT *qal* forms of דב"ר are paralleled by *qal* forms in the BDSS, with the following as a notable exception.

---

[2] The *waw* is marked for erasure by dots above and below.

[3] The citation of a parallel in MT Lam. 1.7 in Fassberg (2001, 245) is evidently an error.

- הול{{ו}}ך צדקות וידבר מישרים '(he) walks righteously and speaks uprightly' (1QIsaᵃ 27.16) || הֹלֵךְ צְדָקֹות וְדֹבֵר מֵישָׁרֵים (MT Isa. 33.15)

Here, whether due to textual or linguistic factors, or to a combination of these and/or other factors, 1QIsaᵃ presents what is most reasonably interpreted as a *piⁿel* prefix conjugation form, which arguably contemporises the language at the expense of the poetry (cf. the preceding participle).

רִנֵּן 'sing'

The MT knows common *qal* and *piⁿel* forms, as well as rarer *hifⁿil* and *puⁿal* ones, with no obvious difference in meaning (though there may well have been one). What is more, both the *qal* and the *piⁿel* persist in late biblical traditions. Crucially, however, in late non-biblical corpora, especially the NBDSS, but RH as well, *piⁿel* usage dominates markedly over that of *qal*. Thus, the following example from the Great Isaiah Scroll, may be part of a broad *qal* > *piⁿel* shift.

- ירננו 'they will sing; (1QIsaᵃ 52.20) || יְרֹנּוּ (MT Isa. 65.14)

Local Shifts *Piⁿel* > *Qal* in the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

In the interests of comprehensiveness, it may be noted that stem change between the MT and the BDSS involving *qal* and *piⁿel* does not always reflect the direction exemplified above, i.e., *qal* > *piⁿel*. Select cases of the reverse are also known, e.g.,

- וַיְסַקְּלֵהוּ 'and he destoned it' (MT Isa. 5.2) || ויסקולהו (1QIsaᵃ 4.13)
- סַקְּלוּ 'destone!' (MT Isa. 62.10) || סקולו (1QIsaᵃ 50.23)

- לְבַצֵּר 'to fortify' (MT Isa. 22.10) || לבצור (1QIsaᵃ 17.14)
- יְשַׁבֵּר 'he shatters' (MT Isa. 38.13) || ישבור (1QIsaᵃ 32.5)
- אֲשַׁבֵּר 'I will break in pieces' (MT Isa. 45.2) || אשבור (1QIsaᵃ 38.8)
- וַתְּחַשְּׁבֵהוּ 'that you consider him' (MT Ps. 144.3) || ותחושבהו (1Q5 23.15)
- לְלַקֵּט 'to glean' (MT Ruth 2.23) || לליקוט (2Q16 f5ii–6i.2)

In these cases, it may be that the DSS text preserves an ancient *qal* form that secondarily shifted to *piᶜᶜel* in the Tiberian reading tradition, presumably for purposes of semantic disambiguation, e.g., *qal* סָקַל 'stone (to death)' versus *piᶜᶜel* 'destone (a field, road); throw stones', *qal* בָּצַר 'harvest grapes, trim vines' versus *piᶜᶜel* *בִּצֵּר 'fortify', *qal* שָׁבַר 'break' versus *piᶜᶜel* שִׁבֵּר 'shatter, break into pieces', *qal* חָשַׁב 'think' versus *piᶜᶜel* חִשֵּׁב 'consider, calculate'. On the other hand, since the *qal* form in these cases is often the more common alternative, it may be that the technical *piᶜᶜel lectio difficilior* was inadvertently replaced bwithy the better-known form. In the specific case of לְלַקֵּט (MT Ruth 2.23) || לליקוט (2Q16 f5ii–6i.2), there also seem to be local textual factors at work. In the MT generally and in MT Ruth more specifically there is a mix of *qal* לָקַט and *piᶜᶜel* לִקֵּט, the *qal* with perhaps a more generic sense of 'gathering', the *piᶜᶜel* referring specifically to 'gathering by the less fortunate at harvest time'. As MT Ruth has both *qal* and *piᶜᶜel* infinitive construct forms, it may be that the tradition preserved in 2Q16 reflects secondary harmonisation of the original *piᶜᶜel* in Ruth's actions in Ruth 2.23 to match the *qal* of Boaz's instructions in Ruth 2.8. Whatever the case may be, the difference between these examples and the examples of the *qal* > *piᶜᶜel* shift dis-

cussed above is that while the latter appear to be part of a broad trend, the former seem to be more case-specific in nature.

1.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Fassberg focuses chiefly on acknowledged differences between Tiberian BH and DSSBH, but also observes the following probable instance of *qal > pi‘‘el* movement in the NBDSS:

- מרוגלת 'attached' (1QM 5.13); cf. RH רגול 'bound' (m. Shabbat 5.3)

To this list it is possible to add further examples.

גאל 'defile'

Alongside *pi‘‘el* [ם]מגאלי 'defiling' (4Q513 f13.3; perhaps also 4Q274 f1i.6; 4Q284a f1.7; 11Q19 47.13) and *pu‘‘al* יגאולו ('that) are desecrated' (CD 12.16) the *hitpa‘‘el* also occurs (1QM 9.8; 4Q379 f3i.5); for the Tiberian biblical distribution, see above, §1.1.2.

דחק 'charge'

ומדחק 'and charging' (4Q223–224 f2iv.13) is clearly *pi‘‘el*. Verbs with this root are rare in the MT, occurring only in *qal* in the sense 'press'; the Aramaic G-stem serves in a similar meaning in the Targums, though D-stem forms are comparatively more common in the Jerusalem Targum (i.e., Targum Jerusalem).

חבא 'hide'

In Tiberian BH, the transitive form is *hif‘il* (6x), while the middle (reflexive/intransitive) sense is typically encoded with *nif‘al*

(16x) or *hitpaᶜel* (10x). A *hofᶜal* passive is known (Isa. 42.22), as is a possible *puᶜᶜal* or *qal* internal passive in MT חֻבָּ֫אוּ 'are hidden' (Job 24.4). The NBDSS have the clearcut *puᶜᶜal* participle מחובאים 'hidden (things)' (1QHᵃ 16.7, 19; see also, perhaps וחבא 1QS 4.6).

חקר 'seek, investigate'

מחקר 'seeking' (4Q420 f1aii–b.3) may be a *piᶜᶜel* participle in line with the LBH *piᶜᶜel* form seen above (§1.1.3), but the syntax may just as well point to a nominal form or to an Aramaic-style infinitive.

נדב 'commit'

Tiberian BH shows *qal* and *hitpaᶜel* usage (the latter with specifically late semantics in LBH; see Hurvitz 2014, 179–81), one or both of which are also evidenced in SH, RH, and BS; RH and the NBDSS also add *nifᶜal* forms. Against the MT's transitive *qal*, the NBDSS passive *puᶜᶜal* form המנודבים 'those who are committed' (4Q501 f1.3) seems indicative of pielisation.

סכך 'confine'

The context of וכמסככה 'and like a confined (woman)' (4Q179 f2.7) arguably indicates a *puᶜᶜal* participle. In Tiberian BH, the relevant forms are *qal* and *hifᶜil* (though *qal yaqṭel* morphology may also be conjectured for some prefix conjugation forms), not *piᶜᶜel* or *puᶜᶜal*. *Piᶜᶜel* forms are common in RH, especially in the context of the *sukkah* (e.g., m. Sukkah 1.4).

פחד 'fear'

In the MT, against 22 *qal* cases come just two cases of *pi*^{cc}*el*. In both Isa. 51.13 and Prov. 28.14, the *pi*^{cc}*el* occurs with the adverbial תָּמִיד 'always', once with כָּל־הַיּוֹם 'all day' (Isa. 51.13). It is conceivable that the biblical *pi*^{cc}*el* began with a more intensive (pluractional/iterative) meaning than the *qal*, but that the two forms eventually became virtual synonyms.[4] An active participle with no accompanying pluractional/iterative adverb comes in 4Q381 f31.8 (see also 1QS 4.2; 4Q510 f1.4; 4Q511 f8.4; f48–49 + 51.2[5]); see also on BS (see below, §1.4.3).

פרש 'clarify'

Tiberian BH attests active *qal* (Lev. 24.12) and passive *qal* (or *pu*^{cc}*al*) (Num. 15.34) and *nif*^{c}*al* (Ezek. 34.12), with the only explicit *pu*^{cc}*al* in LBH Neh. 8.8 (see above, §1.1.8). Like LBH, the NBDSS have explicitly *pu*^{cc}*al* מפורשים 'made distinct' (4Q177 f1–4.11); cf. the *pi*^{cc}*el* in SH (see below, §1.3.1) and the *pi*^{cc}*el* and *pu*^{cc}*al* in RH (see below, §1.5).

---

[4] Modern Hebrew knows a quasi-suppletive paradigm not dissimilar from the paradigm in Tiberian BH (see https://hebrew-academy.org.il/2011/07/08/פוחד-ומפחד/).

[5] In several of the potential NBDSS examples, the consonantal form is ambiguous, i.e., is analysable as *qal* or *pi*^{cc}*el*, and some take the meaning of the *pi*^{cc}*el* to be causative (as in early Paytanic Hebrew, on which see Rand 2006, 190).

פרשׂ 'spread (a net)'

In the Hebrew of the NBDSS, one encounters מפרשי רשת 'net-spreaders' (1QH[a] 21.24 || 4Q427 f11.2 || 4Q428 f13.7–8 [?]). In Tiberian BH, cases of *qal* פָּרַשׂ 'spread' outnumber cases of the synonymous *pi''el* by a margin of 54 to 9, though it is important to note that this applies to all biblical chronolects and that the *pi''el* is absent from LBH proper. However, collocations involving פר"שׂ and רֶשֶׁת come nine times in BH, always employing a *qal* verb (Ezek. 12.13; 17.20; 19.8; 32.3; Hos. 5.1; 7.12; Ps. 140.6; Prov. 29.5; Lam. 1.13), which makes the NBDSS shift to the *pi''el* in this collocation especially conspicuous. It may be significant that the *qal* > *pi''el* shift applies specifically to cases of the active participle with substantival (nominal/adjectival) semantics, a category that excludes the biblical tokens.

רחץ 'wash, bathe'

Against the single NBDSS case of *pu''al* מרחצים 'washing, rinsing (tr.)' (11Q19 34.10), in Tiberian BH the verb is consistently *qal*, whether reflexive, e.g., לִרְחֹץ עַל־הַיְאֹר 'to bathe by the Nile' (Exod. 2.5), weakly transitive, e.g., וְרַחֲצוּ רַגְלֵיכֶם 'so you (MPL) may wash your (MPL) feet' (Gen. 18.4), or strongly transitive, e.g., וְרָחַצְתָּ אֹתָם 'and you (MS) will wash them (i.e., Aaron and his sons)' (Exod. 29.4) (the apparent *pu''al* forms in Ezek. 16.4 and Prov. 30.12 should arguably be analysed as *qal* internal passives). This is generally the case in the NBDSS, too. However, compare Tiberian BH וְרָחַצְתָּ קִרְבּוֹ וּכְרָעָיו 'and you must wash its entrails and its legs' (Exod. 29.17; see also Lev. 1.9, 13; 8.21; 9.14; Isa. 4.4) with NBDSS ומרחצים את הקרבים ואת הכרעים 'and washing the entrails and

the legs' (11Q19 34.10–11). The *piʿel* also occurs in Amoraic Hebrew (y. Shabbat 9.3).

שנא 'hate'

Tiberian BH forms of שׂנ"א reflect a basically *qal* paradigm: שָׂנֵא-שָׂנְאָה-יִשְׂנָא-שֹׂנֵא(לִ)/שְׂנָא-שָׂנוּא-שָׂנֵא*, verbal passive נִשְׂנָא*. The exception is the *piʿel* participle with substantival semantics מְשַׂנֵּא 'enemy', which appears 15 times throughout biblical literature. Of particular interest is the term used for a less-favoured wife, viz. the *qal* passive participle שְׂנוּאָה (Gen. 29.31, 33; Deut. 21.15, 15, 16,17; 2 Sam. 5.8; Isa. 60.15; Prov. 30.23). Against this contextual background, one may consider the NBDSS *puʿal* participle משונאה 'unloved, despised, hated' (4Q179 f1ii.3). Though the context is broken, it appears that the MT passive *qal* participle has been replaced in the Qumran text with a *puʿal* participle. Cf. BS for a *yiqṭol* form of the *puʿal* (see below, §1.4.4).

1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

While the Samaritan written tradition largely resembles its Tiberian counterpart when it comes to the distribution and semantics of verbal stems, the Samaritan reading tradition exhibits systematic deviations away from the *qal* in favour of *nifʿal* (see above, ch. 10), *hifʿil* (see above, ch. 11), and *piʿel*. Indeed, in comparison not just to the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition, but to recognised Second Temple Hebrew biblical and non-biblical corpora, the Samaritan reading tradition exhibits an advanced stage of pielisation. This manifests in two main ways: wholesale or partial movement to standard D-stem

piᶜᶜel/puᶜᶜal, with expected gemination of the middle radical (§1.3.1); wholesale or partial movement to *piᶜel B/puᶜal B*, i.e., D-stem with singleton middle radical (§1.3.2). A potentially related phenomenon is the development of *qal* B prefix conjugation forms, whose patterns resemble that of *piᶜel* B (§1.3.3). Given the extensiveness of pielisation and related shifts in the Samaritan reading tradition, no attempt at exhaustiveness is made in the following treatment.

1.3.1. *Qal > Piᶜᶜel*

מכר 'sell': Comprehensive Shift

Relative to the Tiberian biblical tradition, the SP shows comprehensive G- to D-stem shifts in the case of the verbs גלל 'roll', חנך 'dedicate, educate', מכר 'sell', ענש 'punish', פרש 'explain', and קרע 'tear'. As the most common of these, מכר 'sell' serves as a useful example. The dominant Tiberian active-passive *qal-nifᶜal* arrangement is mirrored in the SP by an active-passive arrangement consisting of *piᶜᶜel-nifᶜal B* (i.e., *nitpaᶜᶜel* with assimilated *tav*), e.g., *piᶜᶜel* מכרתם *makkertimma* 'you (MPL) sold' (Gen. 45.4) and *nifᶜal B* ונמכר *wnimmakkar* 'then he must be sold' (Exod. 22.2). The Samaritan D-stem extends even to active participles without the characteristic preformative -מ, as in מכר *makkər* 'is selling (MS)' || MT מֹכֵר (Lev. 25.16). For historical context, it is worth noting that a D-stem form of מכ"ר occurs in the NBDSS: הממכרת 'who sells, i.e., betrays' (4Q169 f3–4ii.7) || הַמֹּכֶרֶת (MT Nah. 3.4). It may also be relevant that the Aramaic equivalent זבן 'sell' is also D-stem (cf. G-stem זבן 'buy').

דבר 'speak': Unification of a Mixed Paradigm

In other cases of apparent Samaritan pielisation vis-à-vis *qal* use in the MT, the SP presents a unified *piʿʿel* conjugation against a mixed Tiberian paradigm. The Tiberian arrangement sometimes involves a semantic distinction between G- and D-stem, as in the case of זרה 'winnow', לקט 'collect, gather, glean', and קבץ 'gather, collect, assemble'. An alternative Tiberian arrangement is that of dominant *piʿʿel* morphology with vestigial *qal* forms, as in the well-known case of דבר 'speak'. In this case, against the MT's 1000 + *piʿʿel* forms and forty apparently synonymous *qal* participial (active and passive) and infinitival forms (and *nifʿal* passives), the Samaritan paradigm is comprehensively *piʿʿel*, including *piʿʿel* active participles without the characteristic prefix מ-, e.g., דברות *dabbērot* 'speak (FPL)' (Num. 27.7; see also Gen. 16.13; Exod. 6.29; Num. 32.27; 36.5; Deut. 5.1; 15.9) (see below, §3.1).[6]

משח 'anoint': Formal and Semantic Suppletion

Finally, Samaritan pielisation can result in suppletive paradigms, whether formal or semantic/grammatical. Consider the case of משח 'anoint'. Against a consistently *qal* Tiberian paradigm (with corresponding *nifʿal* medio-passive), the SP preserves *qal* mor-

---

[6] In the case of MT *hitpaʿʿel* מִדַּבֵּר || SP *piʿʿel* מדבר *amdabbər* '[the voice] speaking' (Num. 7.89; cf. Ezek. 2.2; 43.6), the Samaritan D-stem is likely more original, with the Tiberian tradition exhibiting a secondary shift to *hitpaʿʿel* as part of the broad Second Temple trend of avoiding anthropomorphisms of the deity (see, especially, the Targums; Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 218, fn. 189; see below, ch. 13, §2.2.4).

phology in the *qaṭal* (13x, e.g., משחת *māšatta* Gen. 31.13), passive participle (5x, e.g., משחים *māˈšīm* Lev. 2.4, with *qā̆ṭīl* rather *qā̆ṭūl* morphology), and infinitive construct (משחו *māšāˀu* Lev. 7.36). In six of seven cases of the *yiqṭol*, conversely, a *pi͑͑el* form obtains (e.g., תמשח *tēmašša* Exod. 30.30). The distinction between the dominant *pi͑͑el yiqṭol* forms and the lone *qal yiqṭol* exception ימשח *yimša* (Lev. 16.32) may be explicable in terms of pluractional-ity—all cases of the *pi͑͑el* involve multiple objects,[7] whereas the verb in Lev. 16.32 has a single object. Beyond Samaritan Hebrew, D-stem משח is not known from ancient Hebrew. However, the relevant Aramaic form is D-stem רבי (e.g., TO Num. 35.25).[8]

בכה 'weep; mourn': Semantic/Grammatical Suppletion

Semantic and/or grammatical suppletion obtains when different cognate stems have diverse semantics and/or valency. Especially illustrative is the case of בכה 'weep; mourn'. In the Tiberian BH tradition, *qal* morphology is nearly exclusive (112x), with just two *pi͑͑el* participle exceptions (Jer. 31.15; Ezek. 8.14). Rare D-stem forms in the face of far more common G-stem morphology are known from Tannaitic RH, QA, and Syriac (*Maˀagarim*, s.v.; *CAL*, s.v.). For its part, SH is characterised by a complex situation of suppletion involving *qal*, *pi͑͑el*, and *qal B* forms (see below,

---

[7] This includes Lev. 8.12, where, notwithstanding the singular gram-matical object in the immediate context, it is clear from Lev. 8.10–11 that multiple objects are anointed.

[8] Formal suppletion occurs in the case of גרש 'drive away, divorce' (ves-tigial *qal* use in Tiberian), יסף 'add, do again' (partial *qal* > *hifˁil* shift in Tiberian), נטש 'allow, leave, forsake', שלח 'send'.

§1.3.3). The suppletion appears generally to involve both grammatical and formal factors. All infinitives construct are *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* (Gen. 23.2; 43.30), and other than the infinitive at Gen. 43.30, *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* forms consistently take a direct object, i.e., have the meaning 'mourn (trans.)' (6x: Gen. 23.2; 37.35; 50.3; Lev. 10.6; Num. 20.29; Deut. 21.13; 34.8). For their part, intransitives are characterised by formal suppletion: *qal* suffix conjugation forms (2x: Gen. 45.14; Num. 11.18) and active participles (3x: Exod. 2.6; Num. 11.10; 25.6) and *qal B* prefix conjugation forms (16x: Gen. 21.16; 27.38; 29.11; 33.4; 42.24; 43.30; 45.14, 15; 46.29; 50.1, 17; Num. 11.4, 13, 20; 14.1; Deut. 1.45).[9]

ילד 'bear (a child); beget, father, sire'

SH, like Tiberian Hebrew, generally distinguishes between *qal* ילד 'bear (a child)' and *hif⁽ᶜ⁾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*. In a few instances, disambiguation is achieved via hifilisation of verbs that refer to the act of the male (see ch. 11, §1.3.2), but this is far less common than the alternative strategy, namely, pielisation. On nine occasions, the SP has *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* ילד *yalləd* 'he fathered' parallel to MT *qal* יָלַד 'he bore, i.e., fathered' (Gen. 4.18, 18, 18; 10.13, 15, 24, 24, 26; 25.3) and on one occasion *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* ילד *yalləd* 'he fathered' parallel to MT *qal* passive יֻלַּד 'was born (M)' (Gen. 10.21). This approach achieves the formal disambiguation of distinct semantic values that would otherwise be subsumed under the same

---

[9] חשב 'consider, calculate', ילד 'beget, sire, father; midwife', עבד 'work, serve; worship', עבר 'pass, cross', and פרע 'let loose, go wild'.

form, but it also results in a *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* form with two distinct meanings separated by gender: masculine 'beget, father, sire', feminine (active participle) 'serve as midwife' (Gen. 35.17; 38.28; Exod. 1.15, 17, 18, 19, 19, 20, 21). Clear contextual and formal differences evidently made the association of such diverse semantic values with *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* more tolerable than the original association of diverse meanings with the *qal.*

1.3.2. *Qal* > *Pi*ᶜ*el* B

Alongside the standard D-stem, SH knows a less frequent, though by no means rare, D-stem form without middle radical gemination, which Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 113–15, §§2.1.3.5–7) labels *pi*ᶜ*el* B. Though most of the relevant verbs are II-guttural, the frequency in this stem of select non-II-guttural verbs—namely, כבד 'honour', כפר 'atone', and ספר 'tell, recount'—confirms the heuristic validity of the *binyan*.[10]

---

[10] Cf. Tiberian Hebrew, where, due to the rarity of non-II-guttural D-stem forms with singleton middle radicals, it is more parsimonious to include II-guttural D-stem forms in the standard *pi*ᶜ*el* category and to account phonologically for the lack of gemination. In his discussion of D-stem forms without gemination, Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 114, §2.1.3.6–7) adduces parallels from Babylonian RH, TO, and Babylonian and Tiberian BH. The examples of כפר with *peh rafa*, all from the Sifra, are compelling (Yeivin 1985, 515). Of the alleged Tiberian BH examples, מְלָשְׁנִי 'slanderer' (Ps. 101.5 *qere*) seems pertinent, but the additional examples listed by Ben-Ḥayyim, viz. מְאָסְפָיו 'its (M) gatherers' (Isa. 62.9) and תְּרָצְחוּ 'you (MPL) murder' (Ps. 62.4), are variants that bear more conventional vocalisation in L and A: מְאַסְפָיו and תְּרָצְּחֽוּ, respectively.

The mixed nature of the *pi'el B* template is most evident in the morphology of the active participle, which forms occur both with and without the standard prefix -מ, e.g., מצחק *amṣā̊ʾəq* 'play, joke, mock' versus שאל *šā̊ʾəl* 'ask, borrow'. Indeed, on the basis of examples like the latter, a reasonable hypothesis is that some II-guttural *pi'el B* verbs began as *qal* statives with PS *qaṭil* morphology. The broader process of pielisation and the more restricted simplification of *pi''el*'s originally geminate middle radical seem to have converged, with the result that statives like שאל *šā̊ʾəl* 'ask, borrow' and אהב *ā̊ʾəb* 'love' could be analysed as *pi'el B*.[11] This was facilitated by the fact that the standard Samaritan *pi''el* participle requires no prefix -מ. On this basis, *pi'el B* prefix forms in *yēqā̊ṭəl* could be secondarily generated. It should be noted, though, that Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 109, §2.1.1.7) accounts for generation of the very similar *qal B* prefix conjugation pattern *yēqā̊ṭål* on the basis of purely phonological shifts to the standard *qal yiqṭål* template, i.e., *yēqā̊ṭål* < **yiqᵃṭål* < **yiqṭål* (see below, §1.3.3)—which could conceivably equally apply to the *pi'el B* prefix conjugation, too. Alternatively—or complementarily—the broad process of pielisation may have been a significant factor in the secondary development of *yeqā̊ṭəl* and *yēqā̊ṭål* prefix conjugation forms.

---

[11] Cf. the remnants of stative pronunciation of these verbs in the Tiberian tradition, e.g., אָהֵב 'he loved' (Gen. 27.9), שְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ 'I asked him' (Judg. 13.6).

גאל 'redeem': Comprehensive Shift

As a comprehensive shift from *qal* to *piˤel B*, consider the case of גאל 'redeem'. The Tiberian biblical paradigm is *qal-nifˤal*. SH preserves the *nifˤal* (Lev. 25.30, 49, 54; 27.20, 27, 28, 33), but all MT *qal* forms are paralleled by *piˤel B* forms in the SP (28x), e.g., MT וְגָאַלְתִּי 'and I will redeem' ‖ SP וגאלתי *wgā̊ʾilti* (Exod. 6.6), MT יִגְאַל 'will redeem (3MS)' ‖ SP יגאל *yēgā̊ʾal* (Lev. 25.33). Significantly, this includes the participle (13x), e.g., MT הַגֹּאֵל 'the redeeming (angel)' ‖ SP הגאל *aggā̊ʾəl* 'the redeeming (king)' (Gen. 48.16). The latter are clear evidence of the *qal > piˤel B* shift. The Samaritan pielisation of this verb seems unique, as the D-stem is otherwise unattested in late antique Hebrew and Aramaic traditions, though the corresponding Aramaic פר"ק has occasional D-stem derivations (see *CAL*, s.v.).[12]

אחר 'tarry, delay, stay': Unification of a Mixed Paradigm

In other cases, consistent Samaritan *piˤel B* morphology parallels mixed G-/D-stem morphology in the MT, e.g., אחר 'tarry, delay, stay'. Most of the 16 cases in the MT are *piˤˤel*. Qal exceptions are וָאֵחַר 'and I remained' (Gen. 32.5) and *ketiv* וייחר *qere* וַיֹּאחֶר 'but he exceeded (the deadline)' (2 Sam. 20.5). In the Samaritan tradition, all parallels to Tiberian *piˤˤel* forms and the single *qal* exception are *piˤel B*.[13]

---

[12] Similar cases are געל 'loathe, detest', מאס 'reject', מהר II 'pay a bride price', מחץ 'strike, shatter, crush', נאף 'commit adultery', פעל 'do, make', צעק 'cry out', and שאב 'draw, pull'.

[13] Similar cases include אחז 'take, grasp, seize; possess', לחך 'lick', לחץ 'press', נאץ 'spurn, despise', פקח 'open (eyes)', and צחק 'laugh, play, per-

1.3.3. *Qal > Qal B*

In SH, certain verbs have prefix conjugation forms with a *yēqā̊ṭål* pattern, not dissimilar from the *yēqā̊ṭəl* pattern of the *piʿel B* (seen above, §1.3.2). Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 109, §2.1.1.7) groups such forms under the label *qal B*. Though the *yiqṭol* pattern of strong verbs of this type can be explained as a result of sound shifts in the standard *qal* prefix conjugation pattern—namely, *yiqṭål* > **yiqᵃṭål* > *yēqā̊ṭål* (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 109, §2.1.1.7)—its similarity to the *piʿel B* pattern (*yēqā̊ṭəl*) and, for that matter, to the standard *piʿʿel* pattern (*yēqaṭṭəl*), may also be attributed, even if partially, to the overall expansion of D-stem and D-stem-like vocalism.

It is to be noted that *qal B* forms are limited almost exclusively to verbs III-*r* and III-*y* (< III-ʾ).[14] The most common verb is זכר *zā̊kår* 'remember' with prefix conjugation יזכר *yēzā̊kår*. Against the contention that this (along with other III-*r* forms) might be more parsimoniously classified as *piʿel B*, attributing the shift of *ə* > *å* of the middle radical to the following *r*, one need

---

form, revel, jest, mock'. In most of the above, the Tiberian morphological diversity is semantically and/or grammatically explicable, though there are some cases, e.g., אחר 'tarry, delay, stay' and לחך 'lick', where there is no obvious semantic or grammatical difference between the MT *qal* and *piʿʿel* alternatives.

[14] The relevant verbs, with example forms, are בטא 'speak rashly' *yēbēṭa*, בכה 'weep' *wyēbēki, wyēbēku*, בקר 'seek' *yēbā̊qår*, דקר 'pierce' *wyēdā̊qår*, זכר 'remember' *wyēzā̊kår*, פדה 'redeem' *tēfēdi*, פנה 'turn' *wyā̊få̄nu*, *wnēfå̄na*, פצל 'peel' *wyēfā̊ṣål*, פצר 'urge, press' *wyēfā̊ṣår*, פשה 'spread' *tēfēši, yēfēši*, ראה 'see' *wyēre, wyērēʾu, wtēre*, רעה 'shepherd, pasture, feed' *yēˈrū*.

only compare *piʿel B* ויספר *wyēså̄fər*, which occasions no such shift.[15] Likewise, in the case of III-*y* (and similar) verbs, though it may be tempting to view apparent *qal B* forms, such as ויבך *wyēbēki*, as mere *piʿʿel* allomorphs, the existence of genuine *piʿʿel* ויבך *wyēbakki* militates against this. So, too, does the apparent morphosemantic distinction between the forms of בכה, viz. intransitive *qal/qal B* 'cry, weep' and transitive *piʿʿel* בכה 'mourn' (see above, §1.3.1).

In sum, notwithstanding the apparent validity of the classification of *qal B* forms as a G-stem subcategory primarily reflecting processes of phonetic resyllabification, in a tradition characterised by various manifestations of pielisation, it is plausible to hypothesise that the morphological shift to D-stem was favourable to parallel phonetic developments.

1.4. Ben Sira

According to Fassberg (2001, 246), Ben-Ḥayyim (1958, 238) gives two examples of *qal* > *piʿʿel* shift in BS, both from the medieval MS B from the Cairo Geniza. One involves the substitution of *puʿʿal* participle משואל (SirB 16r.11 = Sir. 46.13) for the MT *qal* passive participle שָׁאוּל 'borrowed' (1 Sam. 1.28). The other is

---

[15] Perhaps relevant is Ben-Ḥayyim's (2000, 113, §2.1.3.4) contention made regarding the unexpected *å*, rather than *ə/ē*, vocalisation after the second radical in certain *piʿʿel* prefix conjugation forms:

> It is likely that in SH the identity of the second radical in the perfect and the imperfect is considered an obligatory feature, and so the vowel characteristic of the perfect was transferred to the imperfect in the few verbs preserving the original *a*-vowel.

ניבע (SirB 20r.8 = Sir. 50.27), which Ben-Ḥayyim interprets as a *piʿʿel* with the meaning 'poured forth' (cf. the *qal* in Prov. 18.4).

To these may be added further examples of *qal* > *piʿʿel* movement.

1.4.1. יאש 'be weary, despair'

All but one of the MT's six forms are *nifʿal* intransitives in the sense 'become weary, despair'. The sole exception is the late transitive *piʿʿel* infinitive in Qoh. 2.20. BS's מֹיוֹאֵשׁ 'hopeless' (SirB 17r.18 = Sir. 47.23) is in line with the MT's late *piʿʿel* usage and seems to take the place of more classical intransitive *nifʿal*.

1.4.2. עטף 'cover, be enveloped'

The rare and poetic verb in the MT is *qal* עָטַף 'cover, be enveloped' (Ps. 65. 14; 73.6; Job 23.9). In one BS MS it comes as the *puʿʿal* participle במעוטף 'in being covered' (SirB 1v.3 = Sir. 11.4).

1.4.3. פחד 'fear'

In the MT, the dominant form is *qal* (22x), which is joined by a factitive *hifʿil* (Job 4.14) and a *piʿʿel* (Isa. 51.13; Prov. 28.14) limited to contexts of pluractionality/iterativity—note the use of the adverbials תָּמִיד כָּל־הַיּוֹם 'always, all day' (Isa. 51.13) and תָּמִיד 'always' (Prov. 28.14). BS material twice exhibits similar pluractional/iterative examples in usages similar to Prov. 28.14 (SirB 7v.5 ‖ SirD 1r.19 = Sir. 37.12). In the Masada MS, however, we confront the case of [   ] טוב רע איש מטוב אשה ובת מפחדת מכול חרפה 'It is better to harmed by a man than to be treated well by a woman, [ ] and a daughter who fears is better

than any reproach' (Mas1h 4.25 = Sir. 42.14). While the adjec-
tival use is not dissimilar from the pluractional/iterative biblical
use, the lack of an explicit adverbial signalling such is conspicu-
ous (cf. the active participle with adverbial in Prov. 28.14). This
is comparable to the less restrictive use of the *pi‘‘el* in the DSS.

1.4.4. שנא 'hate'

Tiberian BH knows the *pi‘‘el* stem for this verb, but only in the
active participle form, where it has the nominal semantics of 'en-
emy'. Like the NBDSS, which attest a *pu‘‘al* participle (see above,
§1.2.2), BS also knows a *pu‘‘al*, but it is the prefix conjugation
ישונא 'is [3MS] hated' (SirA 3v.18 = Sir. 9.18).

1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

Fassberg (2001, 247–49) provides a brief, but illuminating dis-
cussion of pielisation in Tannaitic and Amoraic Hebrew, ac-
knowledging various scholarly opinions on whether or not *qal*
and *pi‘‘el* forms are genuine synonyms or not (Yalon 1937; 1964;
Ben-Ḥayyim 1958; Kutscher 1972). From Ben-Ḥayyim (1958,
236) he lists בזה 'despise', דין 'judge', זנה 'fornicate', חסך 'spare',
יעץ 'advise', מחה 'wipe out; try to prevent', מתח 'stretch', עבר
'pass', עקר 'uproot', צוח 'cry out', and רקם 'form'.[16] He also cites
studies by Ben-Ḥayyim (1958, 235–36), Kutscher (1969, 64–65),
and Elitzur (1987, 84–87) on the relevance of *qiṭṭūl*-pattern ver-
bal nouns, such as איבול 'mourning', איסור 'prohibition', בירורין 'ar-

---

[16] Fassberg (2001, 247, fn. 25) also refers to Bendavid (1967–1971,
I:376, II:482–83) for additional examples, though one must be cautious
regarding the supposed semantic synonymy of some of the verbs listed.

bitration', גידול 'growth', גירומים 'extra, bonus', חיבוט 'beating', חיסום 'sharp edge', ישוב 'settlement', כיבושים 'admonition; conquest', לימודים 'taught, disciple; teaching', פיקודים 'charge, trust, account; (book of) Numbers', ציבור/ציבורים 'community, public', and שיפולי 'bottom of'. Illustrative examples from Tannaitic Hebrew include midrashic treatments of biblical passages in which RH *piꜥel* verbs (a) replace *qal* verbs (b), e.g.,

(1a) רבי עקיבא אומר מוכר הוא אם רצה ליעד **מיעד**

'Rabbi Akiba says, "the father sells her, and if the master wishes **to designate (espouse)** her, **he may do so**"' (Mekhilta, Mishpatim, parasha 3, ed. Horowitz-Rabin 257.7); cf.

(1b) אִם־רָעָה בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר־לֹא (K) לֹו (Q) **יְעָדָהּ** וְהֶפְדָּהּ לְעַם נָכְרִי לֹא־יִמְשֹׁל לְמָכְרָהּ בְּבִגְדוֹ־בָהּ:

'if she is displeasing in the eyes of her master who **designated her** for himself, then he shall let her be redeemed. He shall have no right to sell her to a foreign people, since he has broken faith with her' (Exod. 21.8)

(2a) ומי **שינה** במי אם ישראל קלקלו במקום או המקום **שינה** בהם... וכן הוא אומר כי אני לו **שניתי**

'And who **changed** his attitude toward whom? Did Israel rebuff God, or **did** God **change** his attitude toward Israel?... and thus he says, "**I have** not **changed**"' (Sifre Devarim, Haꜣazinu, pisqa שו, ed. Finkelstein 330.16–17); cf.

(2b) כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה לֹא **שָׁנִיתִי**

'For I, the Lord, **I have** not **changed**' (Mal. 3.6a)

From Amoraic Hebrew, consider:

(3a) אין לי אלא בזמן שב**יזה** דברי תורה

'I know that this applies only when **he despised** the teaching of the Law' (y. Sanhedrin 27d 10.4); cf.

(3b) כִּי דְבַר־יְהוָה֙ בָּזָ֔ה

'for the word of the LORD **he despised**' (Num. 15.31a)

(4a) ש**ימר** יעקב אבינו את השבת

'Jacob, our father, **kept** the Sabbath'" (Genesis Rabba 945.4); cf.

(4b) וְשָׁמְר֥וּ בְנֵֽי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּ֑ת

'**And** the children of Israel **will keep** the Sabbath' (Exod. 31.16a)

To the verbs listed in Fassberg's article, one may add the following from the discussions above: בכה 'weep; mourn' (§§1.3.1; 1.3.3), לבש 'dress, wear' (§1.5), מעט 'be few' (§1.5), סכך 'confine' (§1.2.2), פרש 'clarify' (§§1.2.2; 1.3.1).

For the sake of precision, it is worth noting that contemporary with the process of pielisation seen in RH specifically and in Second Temple Hebrew more generally, RH saw the disappearance of the *puᶜᶜal* in all but adjectival (i.e., participial) forms (Breuer 2013, 737–38). In verbal usage, it was largely replaced especially by *hitpaᶜᶜel/nitpaᶜᶜal*.

2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

As a form of Hebrew rooted in the Iron Age but orally transmitted by later generations, it might be expected that the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition of early texts should exhibit a degree of drift from G- to D-stem where the consonantal

text was amenable to such. And, indeed, there is evidence of limited pielisation in CBH texts in line with that documented above from Second Temple sources, especially LBH consonantal evidence.

2.1. מֵאֵן 'refuse'

Consider the verb מֵאֵן 'refuse'. The verb comes 46 times in the Bible, where there is usually no reason to question its *pi⁽⁽el* morphology, e.g., וַיְמָאֵן 'but he refused' (Gen. 37.35). On the five occasions when its participle occurs, however, the consonantal spelling conflicts with *pi⁽⁽el* analysis. In four of the five, the formulation is וְאִם־מָאֵן אַתָּה 'and if you (MS) refuse' (Exod. 7.27; 9.2; 10.4; Jer. 38.21), leading some to suggest that the expected prefix מ- of the *pi⁽⁽el* participle was elided between two other identical sounds (GKC §52s). Beyond the fact that just such a מ- is preserved in the similar string אִם־מְמִתִים אַתֶּם אֹתִי 'if you put me to death' (Jer. 26.15), the form הַמֵּאֲנִים '[this people] who refuse' (Jer. 13.10) cannot be so explained. Since it is not until RH that one finds unequivocal *pi⁽⁽el* consonantal forms, e.g., ממאנים (m. Yevamot 13.1, 1, 1, 4, 5; m. Ketubbot 11.6; m. ꜥEduyot 6.1), it seems worth entertaining the possibility that the Tiberian realisation of this verb reflects some degree of mixture of First Temple *qal* stative and Second Temple *pi⁽⁽el* morphology. It is also worth noting that the Aramaic translational equivalent סרב is commonly *pa⁽⁽el*. While suffix and prefix conjugation forms such as מֵאֵן and יְמָאֵן would on this view represent secondary vocalisations, since the original *qal* form may well have had stative morphology, the

MS participle and infinitive absolute form מָאֵן (Exod. 22.16) can be viewed as instances of preservation.

In SH this particular verb reflects a shift *qal > nifʿal* in the prefix conjugation (see above, ch. 10, §1.3.2) and a *qal > piʿel B* shift in the suffix conjugation. In the latter, the Samaritan lack of a requirement for prefix מ- on D-stem participles facilitated the reinterpretation of this and other apparent *qal* stative forms as *piʿel B* (e.g., אהב, שאל, §1.3.2).

If a *qal > piʿʿel* shift did occur in the case of this verb in the Tiberian tradition, notwithstanding the fact that the earliest un-ambiguous *piʿʿel* evidence is from the Mishna, it is conceivable that it took place early in the Second Temple Period, i.e., during the LBH period, though this is conjectural, because the LBH texts present no participles of this verb. It is also possible that the shift began earlier than LBH.

2.2. גֵּרֵשׁ 'drive out/away, expel, divorce'

A similar example is גֵּרֵשׁ* 'drive out/away, expel, divorce'. All consonantal forms amenable to *piʿʿel* analysis in the MT—suffix conjugation, prefix conjugation, imperative, infinitives—are so read (≈ 35x), with passives in *puʿʿal*, but *qal* forms obtain in the case of participles, both active, גֹּרֵשׁ '[Behold, I am about to] drive out' (Exod. 34.11), and passive, גְּרוּשָׁה 'divorced (FS)' (Lev. 21.7, 14; 22.13; Num. 30.10; Ezek. 44.22).[17] Unambiguous consonan-tal evidence of D-stem גרש comes in the DSS and RH in *piʿʿel* מגרש

---

[17] Likewise, in לְמַעַן מִגְרָשֶׁהָ לָבַז 'to cast it out for a prey' (Ezek. 36.5 KJV) the apparent Aramaic-style infinitive was not amenable to *piʿʿel* realisa-tion. Many, however, take מִגְרָשֶׁהָ here as a noun (cf. NIV, ESV, NET).

'man divorcing' (CD 13.17; m. Yevamot 3.7; 4.8; etc.) and *pu*ᶜᶜ*al* מגורשת 'woman being divorced' (m. Giṭṭin 7.4, 5; etc.). RH also shows pielisation of this verb in the verbal noun גירושין (m. Ye-vamot 3.8; t. Yevamot 13.5). Finally, the Aramaic equivalents for biblical גרש, namely תרד, תרך, and שלח commonly occur in D-stem. Again, it would seem that a once unified *qal* paradigm was secondarily made suppletive under the influence of Second Tem-ple morphological sensibilities, though a dearth of diagnostic forms in LBH makes it difficult to determine with precision when the shift began.

2.3. כִּבֵּס 'wash, launder'

Consider also the verb כִּבֵּס 'wash, launder'. Most active and pas-sive forms in the MT are *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* and *pu*ᶜᶜ*al,* respectively. The excep-tion is the *qal* participle *nomen agentis* that occurs in the toponym שְׂדֵה כוֹבֵס 'Washer's Field' (2 Kgs 18.17 || Isa. 36.2; Isa 7.3). In this case, the earliest clearcut consonantal evidence for *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* morphol-ogy is in post-exilic מְכַבְּסִים 'launderers' (Mal. 3.2), which be-comes common in RH as the verbal participle alongside nominal *qal* כובס; cf. *pu*ᶜᶜ*al* מכובסין (m. Miqwaʾot 10.4). Note also the post-biblical Hebrew knows two verbal nouns, i.e., כיבוס (CD 11.22; 4Q271 f5i.15; m. Zevaḥim 7.1; etc.) and כביסה (m. Miqwaʾot 8.1; t. Bava Metsiaᶜ 11.2), with respective patterns typical or *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* and *qal*. The Aramaic equivalents חור and צבע are also D-stem. It may well be that a significant number of biblical forms prior to LBH were originally *qal*, but were secondarily read as *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* where pos-sible, in line with Second Temple convention.

3.0. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

In the preceding section, the emphasis was on apparently late instances of pielisation within the Tiberian reading tradition. While it may be that the *qal* > *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* shifts discussed began prior to Second Temple times, the evidence of unambiguous consonantal *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* and *pu*ᶜᶜ*al* forms seems indicative of a late development in line with post-biblical conventions.

For a proper characterisation of pielisation within the reading component of the Tiberian tradition, however, one must take into consideration relevant developments rooted in the written component of the tradition as found in CBH texts. From the perspective of these, it becomes clear that the drift from *qal* to *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* seen above is, rather than a complete innovation, the continuation of an ancient process.

First of all, while Iron Age Hebrew and cognate epigraphy lack *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* participles and *pu*ᶜᶜ*al* forms in general, there is ample unambiguous biblical consonantal evidence of the use of D-stem morphology in the orthographic tradition of CBH texts. Among verbs with unequivocal classical *pi*ᶜᶜ*el/pu*ᶜᶜ*al* attestation, some have no cognates in other stems, e.g., בִּקֵּשׁ 'seek, request' (63x); others exhibit well-established semantic specialisation of the *pi*ᶜᶜ*el* form vis-à-vis the relevant *qal*, e.g., pluractional קִבֵּר* 'bury en masse' (Num. 33.4; 1 Kgs 11.15; Jer. 14.16; Ezek. 39.14–15;

Hos. 9.6) versus *qal* קָבַר 'bury'/*nifʿal* ‏*נִקְבַּר 'be buried'.[18] Clearly, D-stem morphology was an early option in ancient Hebrew.

Second, even when it comes to the drift from *qal* to *piʿʿel*—which, it was argued above (§2.0), resulted in the partial replacement of original G-stem morphology with D-stem morphology in line with Second Temple Hebrew trends—not all of the evidence is late. Rather, certain cases of early, well-stablished *qal-piʿʿel* suppletion responsible for apparently synonymous G- and D-stem forms seem to indicate the reality of early pielisation. It is to examples of this latter category that the discussion now turns. The early evidence of pielisation that they furnish shows that later results of pielisation, though secondary, were very much in a line of linguistic evolution long since initiated.

3.1. דבר 'speak'

Extremely common in BH, דִּבֶּר occurs in *piʿʿel* in all forms, making it clear that its D-stem morphology—which continues into Second Temple traditions—is of ancient pedigree. *Puʿʿal* forms, including a participle, also occur (Ps 87.3; Song 8.8). Alongside these, however, there occur vestigial *qal* forms: active participle דֹּבֵר 'speaker, speaking' (39x), passive participle דָּבֻר 'spoken'

---

[18] Given the proposed morphosemantic distinction, the form קֻבַּר 'was (were) buried' (Gen. 25.10) is to be analysed as a *qal* passive. Despite the reference to two corpses, the event here arguably involves Abraham's burial, Sarah having previously been buried (*qal*) in Gen. 23.

In the absence of consonantally unambiguous biblical evidence for *nifʿal* נִקְבַּר 'be buried'—for which all representative forms are in the prefix conjugation—it is possible that many, if not all, of the apparent *nifʿal* forms conceal original *qal* internal passives (see above, ch. 10, §2.2).

(Prov. 25.11), and infinitive construct בְּדַבְּרֶךָ 'when you speak' (Ps. 51.6). Since there is no obvious semantic distinction between ostensible *qal* דְּבַר* and *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* דִּבֶּר, the particular instance of pielisation in question may well have been driven by broader cognitive processes to do with morphosemantics, such as the D-stem's perceived active iconicity vis-à-vis *qal*'s perceived opacity. Whatever the case may be, given the widespread nature of unambiguous *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* morphology in CBH orthography, it this verb underwent a process of pielisation, it must have occurred relatively early on in the history of CBH. Even so, in light of the fact that the *qal* participle דֹּבֵר (39x) is as common in the MT as the *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* participle מְדַבֵּר (39x), while *pi⁽ᶜ⁾el* use persists and *qal* use decreases in post-exilic Hebrew (see Table 1), the Tiberian reading tradition's wholesale pielisation of prefix and suffix conjugation may arguably be characterised as anachronistic, influenced by Second Temple linguistic trends (note that the Aramaic equivalent מלל is also D-stem).

Table 1: Frequency of *qal* and *pi^{cc}el* participles of דב"ר 'speak' in select ancient Hebrew corpora[19]

	qal ד(ו)בר	*pi^{cc}el* מדבר
MT	39	39
MT LBH	2	8
NBDSS	2	6
Ben Sira	2	1
Mishna	1	23
SP	0	18

3.2. ברך **'bless'**

Like the verb דִּבֶּר, so too Tiberian בֵּרַךְ 'bless' appears at some point rather early on in its history to have undergone secondary pielisation, which eventually produced a predominantly D-stem paradigm with significant G-stem residue. Classical orthographic evidence of pielisation is seen in participles in *pi^{cc}el* (Gen. 12.3; 27.29; Num. 24.9; Isa. 66.3; Prov. 27.14) and *pu^{cc}al* (Num. 22.6; Deut. 33.13; Ps. 37.22; 113.2; Job 1.21; 1 Chron. 17.27), as well as in *hitpa^{cc}el* forms (Gen. 22.18; 26.4; Deut. 29.18; Isa. 65.16; Jer. 4.2; Ps. 72.17). Evidence of G-stem morphology comes primarily in the form of the *qal* passive participle בָּרוּךְ 'blessed' (71x) and in *nif^cal* forms (Gen. 12.3; 18.18; 28.14). The dominance of the *qal* passive participle over the *pu^{cc}al* participle may be con-

---

[19] As far as can be determined given the extant data, the MT and BDSS agree on the distribution and frequency of *qal* and *pi^{cc}el* participles of דב"ר 'speak'.

Regarding the SP—while there is no difference between the Samaritan and Tiberian orthographic traditions when it comes to participles of the verb in question, all Samaritan forms, whether with or without a prefix -מ, are analysed as D-stem (see above, §1.3.1).

strued as evidence of an early *qal* verb 'bless',[20] while the absence of any *qal* active participle arguably signifies very early pielisation of this verb. From this perspective, the *piᶜel* dominance outside of the passive participle seems less artificial and anachronistic than does *piᶜel* dominance in the case of דִּבֵּר above. Another difference between this case and that of דִּבֵּר, discussed in the foregoing section, is that the specific arrangement of a prevailing *piᶜel* paradigm with *qal* dominance restricted to the passive participle בָּרוּךְ vis-à-vis מְבֹרָךְ persists in post-exilic Hebrew, where the *puᶜal* participle never gains ascendency. This, however, is possibly due at least in part to the conservative contexts in which the forms are used, e.g., blessings, prayers, and other forms of liturgy. Regardless, if the verb in question was subject to pielisation, it is clear that the CBH written tradition reflects a time when the process was well advanced.

3.3. גלה 'uncover, reveal'

In the meaning 'uncover, reveal', the D-stem enjoys overall numerical superiority in the Tiberian tradition (*piᶜel* 56x, *puᶜal* 2x),[21] as well as in Second Temple extra-biblical sources (see

---

[20] Assuming the early existence of *qal* ברך 'bless', its shift to *piᶜel* may have resulted from a perceived need to distinguish it from *qal* בָּרַךְ 'kneel' (Ps. 95.6; 2 Chron. 6.13; related *hifᶜil* הַבְרִיךְ at Gen. 24.11).

[21] *Piᶜel*: Lev. 18.6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15, 16, 17, 17, 18, 19; 20.11, 17, 18, 18, 19, 20, 21; Num. 22.31; Deut. 23.1; 27.20; Isa. 16.3; 22.8; 26.21; 47.2, 2; 57.8; Jer. 11.20; 20.12; 33.6; 49.10; Ezek. 16.37; 22.10; 23.10, 18, 18; Hos. 2.12; Mic. 1.6; Nah. 3.5; Ps. 98.2; 119.18; Job 12.22; 20.27; 41.5; Prov. 11.13; 25.9; Ruth 3.4, 7; Lam. 2.14; 4.22. *Puᶜal*: Nah. 2.8; Prov. 27.5.

above, §2.0).[22] Yet, the evidence of G-stem morphology is not rare, especially in *qal* expressions with the nouns אֹזֶן 'ear', עַיִן 'eye', and סוֹד 'secret' (21x).[23] Passive *nifʿal* forms, also presupposing an active *qal* form, are even more numerous (32x).[24] Thus, in the sense 'uncover, reveal', D-stem active and passive morphology (58x) is just slightly more common the G-/N-stem morphology (53x). What is more, while unequivocal G-stem morphology is unambiguously evidenced—in forms such as the active participle וְאֵין־גֹּלֶה אֶת־אָזְנִי 'there was no one to tell me' (1 Sam. 22.8, 8) and the passive participle גְּלוּי (Num. 24.4, 16)—are relatively common throughout the Bible, unambiguous orthographic evidence for D-stem active and passive is rather restricted (Job 12.22; Prov. 11.13; 27.5). Notwithstanding the rather narrow list of expressions employing *qal* גל"י, the rather broader use of the *nifʿal* arouses the suspicion that certain orthographically ambiguous forms vocalised as *piʿʿel* might originally have been read as *qal*. Mismatches occur in the case of the nouns עַיִן (*qal* 2x; *nifʿal* 3x; *piʿʿel* 2x), סוֹד 'secret' (*qal* 2x; *piʿʿel* 2x), עֶרְוָה 'nakedness' (*piʿʿel* 24x; *nifʿal* 4x). While there is no reason to doubt the original authenticity of some or even many D-stem cases, there are grounds

---

[22] I am grateful to my Middlebury student, Rachel Kaufman, for her question on the mixed stem morphology of גל"י.

[23] *Qal*: Num. 24.4, 16; 1 Sam. 9.15; 20.2, 12–13; 22.8, 8, 17; 2 Sam. 7.27; Jer. 32.11, 14; Amos 3.7; Job 33.16; 36.10, 15; Prov. 20.19; Ruth 4.4; Est. 3.14; 8.13; 1 Chron. 17.25.

[24] *Nifʿal*: Gen. 35.7; Exod. 20.26; Deut. 29.28; 1 Sam. 2.27, 27; 3.7, 21; 14.8, 11; 2 Sam 6.20, 20, 20; 22.16; Isa. 22.14; 23.1; 38.12 (?); 40.5; 47.3; 49.9; 53.1; 56.1; Jer. 13.22; Ezek. 13.14; 16.36, 57; 21.29; 23.29; Hos. 7.1; Ps. 18.16; Job 38.17; Prov. 26.26; Dan. 10.1.

for suspecting a degree of movement form *qal* to *pi*^{cc}*el* in the case of this verb, a process from which *qal* active and passive participles were exempted due to their orthographic intransigence.

4.0. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing survey of examples of pielisation in ancient Hebrew, the following summary may be sketched. First, the shift *qal* > *pi*^{cc}*el* is unambiguously documented throughout the history of Hebrew, from CBH texts associated with the Iron Age on. Second, when compared to Tiberian CBH, Second Temple Hebrew—represented by Tiberian LBH, the DSS, the Samaritan biblical reading tradition, BS, and RH—exhibits a comparatively advanced stage in the pielisation process. However, a distinction should be drawn between the orthographic component of Tiberian CBH and the corresponding reading component, the latter sometimes showing evidence of secondary variance from the former in favour of *pi*^{cc}*el* morphology in line with late linguistic conventions. Though such secondary dissonance between the written and recitation components of the Tiberian biblical tradition inevitably entails the positing of a mixed tradition characterised by a degree of linguistic anachronism, the pielisation of a specific verb may not represent deviation from the normal path of BH grammatical development, but a typologically more advanced stage on a shared path.