The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew

Aaron D. Hornkohl

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

14. *ṬƐRƐM QAṬAL*

The temporal particle טֶרֶם(בְּ/מְ) 'before' comes 56 times in BH. Occasionally followed by a noun or infinitive,[1] it most frequently—52 times—precedes a finite verb or verbal clause (see below). In 48 of these 52 cases, the finite verbal form in question is in the prefix conjugation *yiqṭol*. The focus of this chapter is the minority syntactic structure of טֶרֶם followed by the suffix conjugation, i.e., *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*.

1.0. The Majority Syntax: *Ṭɛrɛm Yiqṭol*

It is opportune to begin with a brief discussion of the dominant syntactic structure, טֶרֶם followed by the prefix conjugation, i.e., *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*.

1.1. *Ṭɛrɛm Yiqṭol* with Expected *Yiqṭol* Semantics

In some 27 cases of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, the prefix conjugation may be construed to have a TAM value consistent with its standard semantic range: (1) future or modal (i.e., prescriptive), (2) generic/ stative present, of (3) habitual past:[2]

---

[1] Noun: בְּטֶרֶם בֹּקֶר 'before morning' (Isa. 17.14); בְּטֶרֶם קַיִץ 'before summer' (Isa. 28.4); infinitive: בְּטֶרֶם לֶדֶת חֹק 'before a decree takes effect' (Zeph. 2.2a); מִטֶּרֶם שׂוּם־אֶבֶן 'before the placing of a stone' (Hag. 2.15).

[2] The TAM semantics of some cases of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, especially in poetry, are debatable.

(1)   כְּבֹאֲכֶ֣ם הָעִ֣יר כֵּ֣ן תִּמְצְא֣וּן אֹתוֹ֮ **בְּטֶ֣רֶם יַעֲלֶ֣ה** הַבָּמָ֖תָה לֶאֱכֹל֒...
'As soon as you enter the city you will find him, **before he goes up** to the high place to eat…' (1 Sam. 9.13; additional future/modal cases include Gen. 27.4; 45.28; Lev. 14.36; Deut. 31.21; 2 Kgs 2.9; Isa. 7.16; 8.4; 65.24; 66.7 [?], 7 [?]; Jer. 13.16, 16; 38.10; Ps. 39.14; 58.10 [?]; Zeph. 2.2b, 2c; Prov. 30.7; Job 10.21)

(2)   לֹ֣א כַנָּשִׁ֧ים הַמִּצְרִיֹּ֛ת הָעִבְרִיֹּ֖ת כִּֽי־חָי֣וֹת הֵ֑נָּה **בְּטֶ֨רֶם תָּב֥וֹא** אֲלֵהֶ֛ן הַמְיַלֶּ֖דֶת וְיָלָֽדוּ׃
'"Because Hebrew women are not like Egyptian women, for they are vigorous and **before** the midwife **comes** to them, they give birth."' (Exod. 1.19; additional generic present cases include Exod. 9.30; 10.7; Isa. 42.9 [?]; Prov. 18.13)

(3)   גַּם֩ **בְּטֶ֨רֶם יַקְטִר֣וּן** אֶת־הַחֵלֶב֒ וּבָ֣א׀ נַ֣עַר הַכֹּהֵ֗ן וְאָמַר֙ לָאִ֣ישׁ הַזֹּבֵ֔חַ...
'Moreover, **before they could burn** the fat, the priest's servant would come and say to the one sacrificing…' (1 Sam. 2.15; Ruth 3.14)

None of these usages of the prefix conjugation after טֶרֶם is unexpected or surprising, given that the *yiqṭol* form regularly encodes such semantic values even in the absence of טֶרֶם.

1.2. *Ṭɛrɛm Yiqṭol* with Unexpected *Yiqṭol* Semantics

In some 21 instances of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, however, the *yiqṭol* form in question appears to represent a completive eventuality temporally anterior to speech time, i.e., perfective past. In such cases, ancient and modern translations routinely (though not exclusively) resort to preterite or pluperfect renderings. Some scholars have thus concluded that the prefix conjugation in the *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*

structure has otherwise anomalous perfective past semantics (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 497–98, §31.1.1d, 501, §31.1.1f, 513–14, §31.6.3). To account for this, some even opine that the prefix conjugation in question is a vestige of short preterite *yiqṭol* (< PS *yaqtul*) (Arnold and Choi 2003, 60). Yet, while the eventualities depicted in the relevant cases of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* are indeed anterior to the moment of speech (i.e., past tense) and are in context aspectually completive (i.e., perfective), where a morphological distinction is perceptible, they consistently exhibit forms consistent with long *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtulu/a*), rather than short *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtul*) morphology expected for preterite semantics (Williams 1976, 30–31, §167).[3]

If so, notwithstanding the propensity for perfective past glossing in translations, the usage is unlikely to consist of a genuinely perfective past *yiqṭol*, whether short or long. Rather, it is most plausibly explained in light of *yiqṭol*'s rather common reference to relative future (Hendel 1996, 159–60; JM, 342, §113j and fn. 21; Cook 2012, 262–63; van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze 2017, 161, §19.3.2, 462–63, §41.8).[4] In past tense narrative context, a *yiqṭol* form can be used to express the prospective or posterior past, i.e., future-in-the-past. Consider the bolded *yiqṭol* forms in examples (4)–(5):

---

[3] Observe the long III-*y* forms in Gen 2.5a; 24.45; 37.18; 1 Sam. 3.3, 7b; Jer. 47.1; Ezek. 16.57; Ps. 119.67.

[4] On the notion of relative tense in BH, see Goldfajn (1998); Cohen (2013, 33–34 *et passim*).

(4)   וַיָּבֵא֙ אֶל־הָ֣אָדָ֔ם לִרְא֖וֹת מַה־יִּקְרָא־ל֑וֹ...

'and [God] brought [each animal] to the man to see what **he would call** it' (Gen 2.19)

(5)   וֶֽאֱלִישָׁע֙ חָלָ֣ה אֶת־חָלְי֔וֹ אֲשֶׁ֥ר יָמ֖וּת בּ֑וֹ...

'And Elisha became ill with the illness from which **he would die**...' (2 Kgs 13.14a)

The same future-in-the-past sense of *yiqṭol* can occur after the particle (אֲשֶׁר) עַד, as in (6)–(7), the latter of which includes a second example of the prefix conjugation for relative future in a subordinate clause after the particle מַה 'what'.

(6)   וַיִּדֹּ֨ם הַשֶּׁ֜מֶשׁ וְיָרֵ֣חַ עָמָ֗ד עַד־יִקֹּ֥ם גּוֹי֙ אֹֽיְבָ֔יו...

'And the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, **until** the nation **could take vengeance** upon its foes...' (Josh. 10.13)

(7)   וַיֵּצֵ֤א יוֹנָה֙ מִן־הָעִ֔יר וַיֵּ֖שֶׁב מִקֶּ֣דֶם לָעִ֑יר וַיַּעַשׂ֩ ל֨וֹ שָׁ֜ם סֻכָּ֗ה וַיֵּ֤שֶׁב תַּחְתֶּ֙יהָ֙ בַּצֵּ֔ל

עַ֚ד אֲשֶׁ֣ר יִרְאֶ֔ה מַה־יִּהְיֶ֖ה בָּעִֽיר:

'Jonah went out of the city and sat to the east of the city and made a booth for himself there. He sat under it in the shade, **till he should see what would become** of the city.

In (4)–(7) above, the relevant *yiqṭol* forms encode perfective eventualities anterior (i.e., past) in relation to speech time, but posterior (i.e., future) relative to narrative reference time, or, in Reichenbachian terms, $R < E < S$ (see Cohen 2013, 151–53). This would seem to be the same meaning that obtains in *yiqṭol* following טֶרֶם 'before', as in (8).

(8)   וּלְיוֹסֵף יֻלַּד֙ שְׁנֵ֣י בָנִ֔ים בְּטֶ֖רֶם תָּב֣וֹא שְׁנַ֣ת הָרָעָ֑ב...

'And to Joseph were born two sons before the year of the famine **would come**…' (Gen. 41.50; additional relative future/prospective past cases include Gen. 2.5, 5; 19.4; 24.46; 27.33; 37.18; Exod. 12.34; Num. 11.33; Josh. 2.8; 3.1; Judg. 14.18; 1 Sam. 3.3, 7b; 2 Kgs 6.32; Isa. 48.5; Jer. 1.5, 5; 47.1; Ezek. 16.57; Ps. 119.67)

In (4)–(8) above, the eventualities are past from the perspective of speech time and are most naturally given to completive interpretations, but *yiqṭol* is employed due to the relative future force in a subordinate clause. *Yiqṭol* dominates after טֶרֶם to the near exclusion of *qaṭal*, evidently because within narrative context, the standard relative future/prospective past force of the verbal form after טֶרֶם routinely (though not always; see below) overrides the call for explicit encoding of perfective past semantics, which are contextually inferred.[5]

Significantly, a relative future/prospective account of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* not only explains the otherwise anomalous use of *yiqṭol* in reference to perfective past eventualities, as in example (8), but is consistent with *yiqṭol* for future/modal, generic present, and past habitual force, as in examples (1)–(3), above. In all cases, the relationship between the eventuality conveyed by the prefix

---

[5] While the most natural rendering of relative future *yiqṭol* in many languages, including after טֶרֶם and עַד, is by means of a perfective past form, this is by no means universal. For example, JM (342, §113j and fn. 21) note that Jerome favoured a subjunctive alternative in the Vulgate. Whatever the case may be, analysis of BH verbal semantics should seek maximal Hebrew-internal semantic consistency.

conjugation following טֶרֶם is posterior (i.e., future) relative to the contextual reference time of the verb in the main clause, while other TAM values must be contextually construed.

A relative future/prospective past explanation for cases of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* where the prefix conjugation refers to a perfective past eventuality also justifies the explicit use of morphologically long *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtulu/a*), against the claim of some (see above) that the form in question derived from archaic preterite short *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtul*) the original length distinction of which was lost.

2.0. The Minority Syntax: *Ṭɛrɛm Qaṭal*

On four occasions in Masoretic BH a verb in a טֶרֶם construction referring to a perfective past eventuality comes in the *qaṭal* rather than *yiqṭol* pattern: Gen. 24.15; 1 Sam. 3.7a; Ps. 90.2; Prov. 8.25. Before a detailed treatment of each of these passages, it is opportune to take a step back for perspective on טֶרֶם constructions within and beyond BH.

2.1. Diachronic Considerations

First, it is worth noting that the four exceptional examples of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in BH do not congregate in any one portion of Scripture. Two are in narrative sections generally regarded as CBH (Genesis and Samuel), one is in poetry (Psalms), and one comes in Wisdom literature (Proverbs).

2.1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

None comes in LBH. Indeed, no Masoretic verbal construction employing טֶרֶם—with *qaṭal* or *yiqṭol*—is to be found in LBH.

2.1.2. Rabbinic Hebrew

The particle טֶרֶם is also absent from Tannaitic literature.

2.1.3. The Dead Sea Scrolls

More helpful are the data from the DSS. While in the BDSS verb forms after טֶרֶם match their Masoretic counterparts, in the NBDSS there is no trace of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* where the verb refers to a perfective past eventuality, against seven apparent cases of perfective past *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. Assuming the correctness of the readings, examples (9)–(15) appear to be instances of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*, though several are also interpretable as *ṭɛrɛm* + infinitive construct.

(9) ובטרם נוסדו ידע את מעשיהם
     '**before they were established**, he knew their deeds' (CD 2.7–8)

(10) ואלה אשר הכֹ֗[ינותה מקדם]עֹ֗ולֹ֗ם לשפוט בם אֹ֗ת כול מעשיך בטרם
     בראתם
     'And it is these which you pre[pared from ancient] eternity to judge, all your works **before you created them**' (1QHᵃ 5.24–25)

(11) ואדעה כי בידך יֹ֗צֹר כול רוח [וכול פעול]תֹו הכינותה בטרם בראתו
     'But I know that in your hand is the inclination of every spirit [and all] his [acts] you had prepared **before you created him**' (1QHᵃ 7.21–22)

(12) ובטרם בראתם ידעתה {כול} מעשיהם
     '**and before You created them** You knew {all} their works' (1QHᵃ 9.9)

(13) טרם הייתם

'**before you (**MPL**) were** (?)' (4Q176 f22.3)[6]

(14) כטרם בראם הכין פעולותֿ]יהם[7]

'Before he created them, he established [their] workings'
(4Q180 f1.2)

(15) בטרם בראם ידע מחשבֿ]ותיהם

'before he created them, he knew [their] design[s]' (4Q180
f2–4ii.10)

2.1.4. Ben Sira

To these examples should be added one from the concluding
poem of BS, preserved in 11QPs[a] (11Q5).

(16) אני נער בטרם תעיתי ובקשתיה

'I was a youth **before I wandered** and I found her.' (11Q5
21.11 = Sir. 51.13)

These are striking evidence of a late preference for *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*
over *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, perhaps to be explained—along with Hendel
(1996, 160, fn. 36)—as due to "the loss of the relative future (as
with the whole relative tense system) in LBH, where *ʾaz*, *ṭerem*,
and *ʿad* in the past frame are consistently followed by the *Pf*."[8]

---

[6] Cf. infinitival בטרם היותם 'before they were (lit. before their being)'
(1QH[a] 9.30).

[7] Cf. infinitival בטרם הבראֿם 'before their creation (lit. before their being
created)' (4Q215a f1ii.9)

[8] The comparison with עַד + verb in past contexts is apposite, but the
relevance of אָז + verb is questionable. Notwithstanding approaches
that lump together constructions composed of the particles טֶרֶם, אָז, and

Whereas in past contexts the particle (אֲשֶׁר) עַד is not followed by
yiqṭol in LBH (except where paralleled in SBH[9]), it is followed by
qaṭal.[10]

　　If Hendel is correct, then it is possible that Second Temple
Aramaic played a role in the post-exilic substitution of *qaṭal* for
yiqṭol after *ṭɛrɛm*. The typical Targumic equivalent of BH *ṭɛrɛm
yiqṭol* is עַד לֹא followed by the suffix conjugation.[11] The Syriac
equivalents are ܥܕܠܐ ܠܐ, consistently followed by the suffix con-
jugation, and ܥܕܠܐ, followed by prefix or suffix conjugation.[12] In
both structures, a particle meaning 'until' precedes a negated
verb, equivalent in English to 'as long as not…'; cf. Latin *necdum*

עַד followed by a verb referring to the perfective past (e.g., Hendel 1996;
Arnold and Choi 2003, 60), it is best to distinguish cases of relative
future *yiqṭol* after טֶרֶם and עַד from the past-tense use of *yiqṭol* after אָז
(JM, 341–42, §113i–j; Cook 2012, 262), which, despite notable at-
tempts at elucidation (Bergsträsser §7c, g; Rundgren 1961, 97–101;
Rabinowitz 1984; Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §31.6.3; Hendel 1996,
160), remains enigmatic. Also, while Hendel (1996, 160, fn. 36) is
broadly correct on the LBH loss of relative-future *yiqṭol* after עַד, Cohen
(2013, 151–53) identifies a few examples.

[9] 2 Chron. 21.10 (|| 2 Kgs 8.22).

[10] Dan. 11.36; 2 Chron. 9.6; 36.21.

[11] See TO to Gen. 2.5, 5; 19.4; 24.45; 41.50; Exod. 12.34; Num. 11.33;
TJ to Josh. 2.8; 1 Sam. 3.3, 7b; Jer. 1.5, 5. עַד לֹא + prefix conjugation
and עַד לֹא + infinitive are also attested. In BH עַד לֹא + *qaṭal* occurs only
here in Prov. 8.25 and in Deutero-Isaiah's Isa. 47.7, where the corre-
sponding text in 1QIsaᵃ 39.26 reads עוֹד לוֹא rather than עַד לֹא.

[12] ܥܕܠܐ ܠܐ: Gen. 2.5, 5; 19.4; 24.15, 45; 1 Sam. 3.3, 7, 7; ܥܕܠܐ + *qtl*:
Num. 11.33; Ps. 119.67; ܥܕܠܐ + *yqtl*: Gen. 37.18; 2 Kgs 6.32; Isa. 48.5;
Jer. 1.5, 5; 47.1; Ps. 90.2; Prov. 8.24, 26.

followed by a past-tense verb. Similar Hebrew עד לא constructions come in the NBDSS and other late sources.[13] The CBH *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* structure, by contrast, has no negative component, but can be analysed with the basic semantic value of 'before'. When followed by *yiqṭol,* the force is prospective, i.e., relative future 'before he would come'; when followed by *qaṭal,* the force is retrospective, i.e., absolute past 'before he came'. It is entirely possible that the diminished relative future use of *yiqṭol,* combined with the influence of Aramaic and Aramaic-like conjunctions including a negative and followed by suffix conjugation forms, were factors in the replacement of classical perfective past *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* with *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal.* As we shall see, however, the evidence is also consistent with the hypothesis of inner-Hebrew development already at work in CBH.

Evidence for some sort of logical connection between טֶרֶם and Aramaic/Hebrew עד לא and similar negative conjunctions may be gleaned from the apparent synonymy of the three טֶרֶם structures in Zeph. 2.2:

(17) בְּטֶ֙רֶם֙ לֶ֣דֶת חֹק כְּמֹ֤ץ עָבַר י֔וֹם בְּטֶ֗רֶם ׀ לֹא־יָב֣וֹא עֲלֵיכֶ֗ם חֲרוֹן֙ אַף־יְהוָ֔ה
בְּטֶ֙רֶם֙ לֹא־יָב֣וֹא עֲלֵיכֶ֔ם י֖וֹם אַף־יְהוָֽה׃

> '**before the delivery of** the decree, like chaff the day has passed, **when** the burning anger of the LORD **does not yet come** upon you, **when** the day of the anger of the LORD **does not yet come** upon you.' (Zeph. 2.2)

---

[13] CD 10.10 (with *yiqṭol*); 4Q300 f1aii–b.2; Mas1h 2.7 (‖ Sira 40.17; cf. SirB 10r.8). Significantly, other alternatives, also employing the suffix rather than prefix conjugation, likewise appear in late corpora, e.g., עֲדֶן לֹא (Qoh. 4.3), אדיין/עדיין לא (m. Yadayim 4.4), קודם עד שלא (y. Berakhot).

Here the initial טֶרֶם structure containing an infinitive construct has approximately the same meaning as the two subsequent טֶרֶם constructions with negated *yiqṭol* forms. These all have absolute future, rather than past, semantics, but the crucial point is that the standard future-oriented *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* construction with no negative connotation or particle, probably with the force 'before X will/does', has acquired negative morphology and semantics, apparently with the revised force 'when X does not yet'.[14]

In light of the evidence, it would seem that the particle טֶרֶם had become somewhat obsolete in Second Temple Hebrew and that when late writers employed it, they were more prone than their predecessors to opt for *qaṭal* over *yiqṭol* in reference to perfective past eventualities. Be that as it may, on the surface, the ostensible diachronic shift from *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* to *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* discernible when comparing BH (whether Masoretic or DSS) to the Hebrew of the NBDSS finds no confirmation in perceptible dia-

---

[14] Similar phenomena are known in Hebrew and crosslinguistically. For example, עוֹד 'while' versus עַד 'until' in Hebrew (cf. Job 1.16–18); postclassical ancient Hebrew עַד לֹא 'not yet' parallels Modern Hebrew עוֹד לֹא; in vernacular Italian, the construction *finché non* 'until' is routinely shortened to its logical opposite *finché* 'as long as'. French *avant qu'il ne vienne* 'before he comes' seems to include a superfluous negative particle. It has been suggested that 'before', with a basic sense of 'when still not', is inherently negative. Relatedly, in English 'before' licenses negative polarity items, e.g., 'before they saw anyone'. I am grateful to Ambjörn Sjörs for noting many of the above points. See Hetterle (2015, 131–51)—kindly referred to me by Christian Locatell—for crosslinguistic perspective on the intersection of tense, sspect, and negation in adverbial clauses.

chronic distribution within the MT, in that LBH exhibits no cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* (or of טֶרֶם more generally).

Even so, there may be evidence, albeit both limited and arguable, of the shift in question in cases of apparent dissonance between the written (consonantal) and reading (vocalisation) components of the Tiberian biblical tradition, the latter showing slight drift towards the purported Second Temple convention. Crucially, whereas in nearly all instances of perfective past *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, the consonantal text allows for no reading other than that of a prefix conjugation, in a tiny minority of cases, orthographic ambiguity allows for a secondary *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* reading. But such reanalysis accounts for only a portion of the *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* exceptions; it would seem that others are genuine classical outliers.

2.2. Secondary *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the Tiberian Reading Tradition

In two cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the Masoretic Hebrew Bible, a compelling argument can be made that the *qaṭal* forms reflected in the reading tradition are secondary. Both cases involve I-*y qal* verbs, the consonantal forms of which may well have been intended to represent more standard *yiqṭol* alternatives.

2.2.1. 1 Sam. 3.7

(18)   וּשְׁמוּאֵל טֶרֶם יָדַע אֶת־יְהוָה וְטֶרֶם יִגָּלֶה אֵלָיו דְּבַר־יְהוָה:
    'Now Samuel **did not yet know** the Lᴏʀᴅ and the word of the Lᴏʀᴅ **would yet be revealed** to him.' (1 Sam. 3.7)

This well-known example helpfully presents two instances of טֶרֶם + verb: the anomalous *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the first half of the

verse and the more common *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* in its second half. The grammatical mismatch is conspicuous. The accepted—and arguably most compelling—explanation for the instance of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* assumes secondary divergence of the recitation tradition from the tradition presupposed by the consonantal text, presumably under the influence of Second Temple Hebrew. As has been proposed by many (e.g., Driver 1890, 34), it is likely that the consonants ידע here were originally intended to represent a *yiqṭol* form expected to yield Tiberian יֵדַע, but were read—presumably in line with later grammar, like that of the NBDSS Hebrew cases cited above in (9)–(15)—as *qaṭal* יָדַע. Certainly, the conjectural *yiqṭol* יֵדַע is a better match than *qaṭal* יָדַע for the accompanying *yiqṭol* יְגַלֶּה later in the verse, as well as for the majority of other cases of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* in reference to perfective past eventualities.

An important consideration relevant to this example is that the proposed modification to the oral realisation would have been facilitated by the graphic identity of the I-*y qal qaṭal* and *yiqṭol* consonantal forms, in this case יָדַע and יֵדַע, respectively, so that the change would have occasioned no violence to the consonantal text. This is broadly characteristic of other cases of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition—secondary linguistic features standard in Second Temple Hebrew supplanted their First Temple counterparts where the ambiguity of the consonantal tradition made it amenable to substitute realisations. Indeed, not even was an explicit marking of *ketiv-qere* necessary.

A comparable phenomenon took place more generally in the case of I-*y qal wayyiqtol* forms in the Samaritan reading tradition, where Tiberian *wayyiqtol* forms, like וַיֵּרֶד 'and he went down' (Deut. 26.5), were re-analysed as perfective conjunctive *waw* + *qaṭal* forms, like וירד *wyå̄råd*. So pervasive was the penetration of *qaṭal* morphology, that it was applied even to feminine I-*y qal* forms, e.g., MT וַתֵּלֶד 'and she gave birth' (Gen. 4.1) || SP ותלד *wtå̄låd* (Khan 2021, 331; cf. Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 170, 173).[15] It is reasonable to assume that the Samaritan reading of original I-*y qal* forms in *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* might also have been along the lines of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, but this must remain conjecture, as the Pentateuch presents no cases of perfective past *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* with a I-*y qal* verb (likewise for perfective past I-*y qal yiqṭol* following אָז and עַד [אֲשֶׁר]).

In light of the morphological mismatch between טֶרֶם יָדַע and טֶרֶם יִגְלֶה in 1 Sam. 3.7, a local explanation for the anomalous use of the characteristically late *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* structure predicated on the Tiberian reading tradition's secondary divergence from the written tradition seems persuasive. Given this, one is primed for similar explanations in the case of the remaining tokens of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. However, while a similar explanation might hold for one other case, and while all could conceivably be chalked up to textual fluidity in the consonantal tradition, the possible authen-

---

[15] Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 173) accepts this explanation for 3MS and 3MPL *wayyiqtol* forms, but not for 2MS and 3FS *wayyiqtol* forms, which he sees as *yiqṭol* forms with an *å̄*-vowel preformative reflecting original *yafʕul*; cf. Khan (2021, 331), who sees SP forms like ותלד *wtå̄låd* as secondary forms that developed on the analogy of *qaṭal* for purposes of distinguishing preterite *yiqṭol* (e.g., *wtå̄råd*) from non-preterite *yiqṭol* (e.g., *téråd*).

ticity of one or more of the remaining three cases tallies with
early evidence of other secondary vocalisation features that rep-
resent standardisations of early minority options. In other words,
the fact that a single case of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* is compellingly explained
as a late secondary vocalic deviation from the presumed recita-
tion of the written tradition in line with Second Temple conven-
tions does not mean that all similar structures should be so
explained.

2.2.2. Ps. 90.2

Another case of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* occurs in the poetry of Ps. 90.2:

(19) בְּטֶ֤רֶם ׀ הָ֘רִ֤ים יֻלָּ֗דוּ וַתְּח֣וֹלֵֽל אֶ֣רֶץ וְתֵבֵ֑ל וּֽמֵעוֹלָ֥ם עַד־ע֝וֹלָ֗ם אַתָּ֥ה אֵֽל׃
   '**Before** the mountains **were brought forth**, or ever you
   had formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to
   everlasting you are God.' (Ps. 90.2)

The form יֻלָּ֗דוּ appears to be a *puꜥꜥal* form of the suffix conjugation,
internal passive of either *piꜥꜥel* or—more likely from a semantic
perspective—*qal*.[16] The *qal* internal passive is itself the focus of a
well-known case of divergence between the Tiberian consonantal
and reading traditions (ch. 10, §§1.1.2; 2.2; 3.2). Even if the mid-
dle-radical doubling in such forms can be explained as organic
secondary gemination for preservation of the characteristically
passive short *u* vowel, it is suspicious that such *qal* passives are
preserved chiefly where reinterpretation as alternative passive

---

[16] Since the *piꜥꜥel* form is used exclusively in BH as a substantive in the
meaning 'midwife': Gen. 35.17, 28; Exod. 1.15–21.

patterns (suffix conjugation *pu⁽⁽al* and prefix conjugation *hof⁽al/huf⁽al*) was possible,[17] but are otherwise realised as *nif⁽als*. Thus,

1. ostensibly *pu⁽⁽al* suffix conjugation גֻּנַּב pairs with *nif⁽al* prefix conjugation יִגָּנֵב (rather than יְגֻנַּב*);

2. *qal* passive participle (or ostensibly *pu⁽⁽al* participle without the expecting preformative -מ) אֻכַּל corresponds to *pu⁽⁽al* (i.e., *pi⁽⁽el* internal passive) prefix conjugation יְאֻכַּל (rather than יְיָאֻכַּל/יֵאָכֵל*);[18] and

3. ostensibly *hof⁽al* prefix conjugation יֻתַּן parallels *nif⁽al* suffix conjugation נִתַּן (rather than נֻתַּן*).

The problem is not the authenticity of alternatives for the *qal* internal passive, since, for example, consonantally unambiguous *nif⁽al* forms are sometimes documented alongside apparent *qal* passives in classically-worded texts (ch. 10, §3.0).[19] The issue is rather the near total absence of *qal* passive forms where the consonantal text permitted an alternative reading—a situation difficult to interpret as anything other than systemic dissonance in realisation between the pronunciation tradition presupposed by the consonantal orthography and that of the recitation tradition.

---

[17] Exceptions include *qal* internal passive participles, e.g., אֵינֶנּוּ אֻכָּל 'was not being consumed' (Exod. 3.2); לַנַּעַר הַיּוּלָּד 'to the child being born' (Judg. 13.8); אִם־תִּרְאֶה אֹתִי לֻקָּח מֵאִתָּךְ 'if you see me being taken from you' (2 Kgs 2.10).

[18] BH knows know *pi⁽⁽el* אִכֵּל; cf. *pi⁽⁽el* אכל in the Samaritan reading tradition and *pi⁽⁽el* עכל/אכל in Amoraic Hebrew, as well as *pu⁽⁽al* אכל in Tannaitic Hebrew.

[19] Consider the *nif⁽al* יִנָּקֵם (Exod. 21.20) and the *qal* passive (apparently *hof⁽al*) יֻקָּם (Exod. 21.21) both 'will be avenged' in successive verses.

The structure בְּטֶרֶם׀ הָרִים יֻלָּדוּ in Ps. 90.2 presents opposing diachronic tendencies. On the one hand, as noted above, the *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* syntagm appears to have late affinities. On the other hand, *qal* passive יֻלָּד is characteristically classical. Note that in terms of unambiguous consonantal spellings, forms of *qal* internal passive יֻלָּד (*qaṭal*) are confined chiefly to CBH, whereas forms of *nifʿal* נוֹלַד (*qaṭal*, participle, infinitive construct), though documented in CBH, appreciably accumulate in LBH.[20] Orthographically, the relevant *yiqṭol* forms, e.g., יולד, are generally ambiguous, but are consistently vocalised as *nifʿal*.[21] The lone exception is the subject of a *ketiv-qere* mismatch in 2 Sam. 3.2.

(20)   וַיִּוָּלְדוּ [וילדו] לְדָוִד בָּנִים בְּחֶבְרוֹן...

'And sons **were born** to David at Hebron…' (2 Sam. 3.2)

It is likely here that the *ketiv* וילדו reflects an original *qal* internal passive *wayyiqṭol*, along the lines of וַיֻּלְּדוּ* *wayyullədū*,[22] and that the synonymous *qere* וַיִּוָּלְדוּ is a secondary linguistic update in line

---

[20] *Qal* internal passive יֻלָּד *qaṭal*: Gen. 4.26; 6.1; 10.21, 25; 24.15; 35.26; 36.5; 41.50; 46.22, 27; 50.23; Judg. 18.29; 2 Sam. 3.5; 21.20, 22; Isa. 9.5; Jer. 20.14–15; 22.26; Ps. 87.4–6; 90.2; Job 5.7; Ruth 4.17; 1 Chron. 1.19; *nifʿal* נוֹלַד *qaṭal*, participle, infinitive construct: Gen. 21.3, 5; 48.5; 1 Kgs 13.2; Hos. 2.5; Ps. 22.32; Qoh. 4.14; 7.1; Ezra 10.3; 1 Chron. 2.3, 9; 3.1, 4–5; 7.21; 20.6, 8; 22.9; 26.6.

[21] The dominant spelling with *waw* certainly facilitated *nifʿal* reinterpretation. However, even in the case of a I-*y* *qal* internal passive *yiqṭol*, the spelling with *waw* is expected, e.g., יולד, as in יוכל and תוקד, resulting from contraction of the diphthong *uw*, i.e., *yūlad* < *yuwlad*.

[22] The lack of the expected *mater waw*, though rare, is more common in forms with suffixes, e.g., the plural here.

with the Second Temple preference for *nifʿal* over *qal* internal passive in the case of the prefix conjugation.

How does this shed light on the spelling ילדו in Ps. 90.2 in example (19)? Obviously, as spelled, it was not amenable to simple re-analysis as a *nifʿal yiqṭol*, i.e., without resorting to overt signalling of a *ketiv-qere* mismatch. So, then, why was the *ketiv-qere* mechanism left unexploited here? A plausible explanation is that the spelling ילדו in Ps. 90.2, following as it does the particle טֶרֶם, was originally intended as a *yiqṭol* form. However, unlike in 1 Sam. 3.2, where the *wayyiqṭol* form could not be reanalysed as a conjunctive *we + qaṭal* form, the *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* structure בְּטֶרֶם... יֻלָּדוּ in Ps. 90.2 was ripe for easy reanalysis, as both the prefix and suffix conjugation of the relevant *qal* internal passive verb could be written ילדו. Original *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* was simply reinterpreted as *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. The phrase בְּטֶרֶם ׀ הָרִים יֻלָּדוּ in Ps. 90.2 thus represents both secondary development—replacing classical *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* with *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*—and classical preservation—the incidental persistence of characteristically classical *qal* internal passive יֻלַּד in the face of the encroachment of *nifʿal yiqṭol* יִוָּלֵד or *qaṭal* נוֹלַד. To summarise: while the form יֻלָּדוּ as realised according to the Tiberian recitation tradition is analysable as a *qaṭal* form in the characteristically late *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* syntagm, its spelling may well represent that of a *yiqṭol* form in the classic *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* structure.

Regardless of the validity of the arguments laid out above, two further factors may have contributed to the *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* rather than *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* construction. First, the context is poetic. Though the poetry-prose linguistic distinction in ancient Hebrew is sometimes abused, it may help to explain the deviation from the stand-

ard *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* construction here. Second, it is important to note
that the syntagm employed in Ps. 90.2 is not precisely *ṭɛrɛm* +
verb, but *ṭɛrɛm* + X + verb. The interruption of the syntagm due
to the intervening constituent הָרִים may have facilitated variation
in the ensuing verbal form. Both factors—non-prose genre and
interruption of the syntagm—also apply to the case discussed be-
low, §2.3.1.

2.3. Original *Ṭɛrɛm Qaṭal* in the Tiberian Reading Tradition

While evidence for the late secondary character of the two forms
above may be compelling, there is no reason to reject the possi-
bility of the non-secondary use of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in BH. Indeed, de-
spite the decidedly minority status of the two following biblical
examples, and notwithstanding the fact that unambiguous ex-
trabiblical evidence for *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* is limited to Second Temple
sources (the NBDSS), there seems no reason *a priori* to question
the authenticity of the cases below or of the formulaic diversity
they represent.

2.3.1. Prov. 8.25

(21) בְּטֶרֶם הָרִים הָטְבָּעוּ לִפְנֵי גְבָעוֹת חוֹלָלְתִּי׃
    '**before** the mountains **were settled in place**, before the
    hills, I was given birth…' (Prov. 8.25)

Here, as in Ps. 90.2 (see above, §2.2.2), the noun הָרִים 'mountains'
follows בְּטֶרֶם and precedes a passive verb denoting their origin.
As has already been suggested, it is possible that the interrupted
nature of the *ṭɛrɛm* + verb structure facilitated the use of *qaṭal*

rather than *yiqṭol*. The literary and notional similarities between Ps. 90.2 and Prov. 8.25 are also evident. Whatever the case may be, accepting the text as is, הָטְבֵּעוּ clearly cannot be analysed as anything other than a form of the suffix conjugation, i.e., there are no grounds for claiming that the *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* structure here results from dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition.

There are several factors that may have contributed to the use of a non-standard syntactic structure here. Beyond the interrupted nature of the syntagm, there is also the question of genre. Wisdom literature, though different from biblical poetry, nevertheless exhibits its own non-prose traits. One noted feature, probably due in part to its pan-national Ancient Near Eastern character, is its affinity for forms redolent of Aramaic (Hornkohl 2013a, 17). Indeed, in the Hebrew Bible there are four contexts in which Aramaisms are expected: LBH, due to language contact during and after the Exile; poetry, due to, *inter alia*, the need for lexical variation between common and rarer words (the B-words often being characteristic of Aramaic); stories set in foreign contexts or featuring foreigners, in which Aramaic forms are employed for 'style switching'; and Wisdom literature (Stadel 2013). Regarding the specific construction under examination here, it is of crucial importance to point out that the language of Prov. 8 is replete with non-standard forms, a few especially characteristic of Aramaic.[23] Of special interest here is עַד־לֹא עָשָׂה אֶרֶץ וְחוּצֹות 'be-

---

[23] E.g., מִפְתָּח 'opening' (v. 6), אֹרַח 'way' (v. 20), מִפְעָל 'deed' (v. 22), עַד לֹא עָשָׂה 'before he had made' (v. 26), אָמֹון 'craftsman' (v. 30). The exclu-

fore he had made earth and fields' in the immediately following
v. 26, since עַד לֹא + the suffix conjugation is a common Targumic
rendering of BH perfective past *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* (see above, §2.1).

Finally, there is the factor of grammatical attraction. In the
immediate literary context, comprised of vv. 22–26, each verse
begins with the structure X *qaṭal*, where X is either subject or
adverbial. There are therefore multiple factors potentially con-
tributing here to the choice of the suffix conjugation rather than
the prefix conjugation after *ṭɛrɛm*, but little justification for
doubting the textual authenticity of the *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* syntagm.

2.3.2. Gen. 24.15

The only remaining case of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the Hebrew Bible comes
in Gen. 24.15.

(22)   וַיְהִי־הוּא טֶרֶם֩ כִּלָּ֨ה לְדַבֵּ֜ר וְהִנֵּ֧ה רִבְקָ֣ה יֹצֵ֗את...
     'And he was—**before** he **finished** speaking, and here Re-
     bekah… was coming out' (Gen. 24.15)

This instance comes in the narrator's description of Abraham's
servant's search for a wife for Isaac. Complicating any explana-
tion of the minority construction here is the near-parallel verse
with the majority *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* construction in the 1st-person ac-
count later in the chapter.

---

sive use of אֲנִי 'I', though not limited to Aramaic-like Hebrew, can also
be interpreted as fitting Aramaic patterns.

(23)   ...אֲנִ֞י טֶ֣רֶם אֲכַלֶּ֣ה לְדַבֵּ֣ר אֶל־לִבִּ֗י וְהִנֵּ֧ה רִבְקָ֣ה יֹצֵאתֿ

'**Before I would finish** speaking in my heart, and here was
Rebekah coming out…' (Gen. 24.45)

This case of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* shows some similarity to that in 1 Sam.
3.7 (above, §2.2.1), in that there is internal inconsistency with
an instance of *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* in the same context. And, indeed, it
has been suggested that the *qaṭal* form כִּלָּה in Gen. 24.15 should
be considered an error for יְכַלֶּה (GKC 1910, §107c). There are
also, however, differences between 1 Sam. 3.7 and Gen. 24.15.
Because the crux in 1 Sam. 3.7 involves a I-*y* *qal* verb, the pur-
ported shift from *yiqṭol* to *qaṭal* there is limited to vocalic realisa-
tion. In Gen. 24.15, conversely, the written and reading
components of the Tiberian tradition agree on *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. What
is more, while the evidence of the Ancient Versions is, as is gen-
erally the case, opaque with regard to verbal form in this verse,
the combined Samaritan consonantal and recitation tradition
joins the MT in exhibiting the mismatch between *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in
Gen. 24.15 and *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* in Gen. 24.45—this despite the Sa-
maritan tradition's well-known harmonistic penchant. If טֶ֥רֶםֿ כִּלָּ֖ה
in Gen. 24.15 is a secondary development, it must be one of con-
siderable depth, predating the divergence of the proto-Masoretic
and proto-Samaritan traditions.

Assuming the genuineness of the structure in Gen. 24.15, it
is reasonable to ask if such a non-standard use can be explained.
Cook (2012, 262, fn. 96) argues that the difference centres on the
foregoing use of וַיְהִי:

In this case, the discourse וַיְהִי… sets the narrative deictic
center in the past (C_{pos1}) and the *qaṭal* in the past context
shifts the time back one step further (C_{RF}) to express a past-

in-the-past (past perfect): [$C_{RF} < C_{pos1} < S$]. The participle,
expressing a progressive event, is then indicated as inter-
secting the past perfect action by the adverbial טֶרֶם.

Even if Cook's rendering of וַיְהִי־הוּא as 'It happened' is accepta-
ble,[24] the claim that temporal ordering of pluperfect טֶרֶם כִּלָּה rel-
ative to simple past וַיְהִי־ is responsible for *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* is puzzling.
The temporal ordering of וַיְהִי־ and כִּלָּה לְדַבֵּר is irrelevant to the
narrative; the emphasis is rather on the order of רִבְקָה יֹצֵאת and
כִּלָּה לְדַבֵּר: while the progressive aspect of the former precludes use
of the pluperfect, the ordering is clear: 'before he finished
speaking… and here Rebekah was coming out', which could be
paraphrased as 'before he finished praying, Rebekah had already
appeared'. BH טֶרֶם 'before' explicitly signals the situation prior to
the ensuing verb, whether *yiqtol* or *qaṭal*. It also bears noting that
no other biblical or extra-biblical cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* are condi-
tioned by a preceding וַיְהִי. It thus seems that there is nothing
peculiar to the syntax of Gen. 24.15 that requires *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*
instead of *ṭɛrɛm yiqtol*.

Turning to another line of argumentation, in three separate
publications Alexander Rofé (1976; 1981; 1990) has argued, on
the basis of a series of non-standard, especially Aramaic, linguis-
tic usages, that Genesis 24 is a post-exilic composition. Though
ṭɛrɛm qaṭal is not among the Aramaisms he lists, given the con-
struction's comparative frequency in late extra-biblical sources,
as well as the late distribution of synonymous Hebrew and Ara-
maic constructions employing the suffix conjugation, an argu-

---

[24] Cf. Driver (1892, §165 Obs) on the Masoretic accentuation, which the
English glossing in (21) is intended to reflect.

ment involving the chapter's late provenance might neatly account here for *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal,* which could then be seen as an anachronistic deviation from the standard classicism *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* later in the same chapter.

Gary Rendsburg (2002; 2006) is sensitive to the non-standard linguistic features detected by Rofé, but interprets them differently. Since it is specifically the accumulation of *diagnostically late* Aramaisms, not the mere concentration of Aramaic(-like) features, that demonstrates post-exilic provenance (Hurvitz 1968; 2003), Rendsburg argues for a literary rather than diachronic explanation for these in Genesis 24—namely that the writer engaged in *style switching,* intentionally employing foreign-sounding phraseology to reflect the story's foreign setting. Rendsburg does not list טֶ֫רֶם כִּלָּה as a non-standard linguistic feature requiring explanation, but in light of the foregoing discussion, in which both diachronic and foreign factors have been mentioned, perhaps the syntagm bears reinvestigation. For if either Rofé or Rendsburg is correct, the construction in question, like the three cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* already discussed, could perhaps be considered a *conditioned exception* to the *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* norm—though the mismatch between vv. 15 and 45 is, admittedly, left unexplained.

While the considerations above might help to explain the appearance of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in Gen. 24.15, it is perhaps preferable here simply to accept the possibility of early grammatical diversity, in which case טֶ֫רֶם כִּלָּה is to be viewed as an early forerunner of the more prevalent use of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the NBDSS (see further, below).

3.0. Methodological Considerations

In BH, the use of relative future *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* is far more common than the use of absolute past *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. What is more, it seems that one or more cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* can be explained as either false positives or conditioned deviations from classical standards. Admittedly, though, the philological issues cited above as factors contributing to the use of *qaṭal* rather than *yiqṭol* after *ṭɛrɛm* are more convincing in some cases than others. The purported shift from טֶרֶם יֵדַע* to טֶרֶם יָדַע in 1 Sam. 3.7a (above, §2.2.1) is arguably the most compelling. Some of the other arguments ostensibly explaining the use of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* for *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* sound like special pleading. Of course, in the interests of grammatical consistency—i.e., *ṭɛrɛm* uniformly followed by *yiqṭol*—some might favour wholesale textual emendation of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* cases. In light of the extrabiblical (NBDSS) and extra-Masoretic (Samaritan) evidence for *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*, however, this seems gratuitous. Notwithstanding the repetition of patterns inherent to language, expectation of complete formulaic uniformity is unrealistic. For all their regularity, languages are non-static human products, prone to irregularity. Or, as Sapir (1921, 39) put it, "Unfortunately, or luckily, no language is tyrannically consistent. All grammars leak." There is no reason to expect that this should apply any less to an ancient language, like BH, representing diverse chronolects, dialects, registers, and genres and transmitted in various traditions, both written and oral, or even to a single unified component variety of BH. Even in the case of a modern homogenous language variety, one expects general linguistic regularity sprinkled with irregularity. Crosslinguistic tendencies may help to explain certain

phenomena, but philological approaches may also be relevant. Bringing all these considerations to bear on non-standard Tiberian *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* against the backdrop of standard *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol,* it is reasonable to conclude that certain cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* result from late, secondary discord between the written and reading traditions, while in other cases the two traditions agree on the early authenticity of the syntagm.

But if any early cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* are genuine, even if they might be contextually conditioned, these constitute precedent for potential later secondary shifts from *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* to *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal.* In other words, while *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* טֶרֶם יָדַע in 1 Sam. 3.7a is almost certainly the result of secondary reinterpretation of original *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol* טֶרֶם יֵדַע* in line with broader Second Temple trends, the early documentation of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* means that any case of late reinterpretation was not completely out of step with classical norms. As frequently obtains in such cases of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition, a feature especially characteristic of Second Temple Hebrew is foreshadowed by minority classical usage. Thus, if the apparently slight difference in extent of usage of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* between the Tiberian written and reading tradition is explicable as a result of secondary drift of the reading tradition in the direction of Second Temple linguistic convention, the shift does not involve wholly anachronistic innovation, but a slight extension in the use of a minority feature already documented in CBH. Indeed, given the plausible authenticity or one or more of the four cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* in the MT, it is not impossible, despite indications to the contrary, that *all* are authentic.

It is worth making one final point that also tallies with pre-exilic linguistic diversity. The purported early co-occurrence of majority *ṭɛrɛm yiqṭol*, encoding relative future, and minority *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*, encoding absolute past, is reminiscent of other CBH alternations between *yiqṭol* and *qaṭal*. Perhaps most relevant is the relative past usage of *qaṭal* for retrospective future (or future perfect, *futurum exactum*) versus the absolute future force of *yiqṭol* in parallel contexts. Compare the past-within-future *qaṭal* usages with similar future *yiqṭol* usages in the following examples.

(24a) ...בְּכָל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת֙ הַנִּשְׁאָרִ֔ים אֲשֶׁ֥ר הִדַּחְתִּ֖ים שָֽׁם...

'...in all the places where **I have driven them**...' (Jer. 8.3; cf. Jer. 29.14, 18; 32.37; 46.28)

(24b) ...בְּכָל־הַמְּקֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר־אַדִּיחֵ֣ם שָׁ֑ם:

'...in all the places where **I shall drive them**.' (Jer. 24.9)

(25a) וְאָכַלְתָּ֖ וְשָׂבָ֑עְתָּ וּבֵֽרַכְתָּ֙ אֶת־ה' אֱלֹהֶ֔יךָ עַל־הָאָ֥רֶץ הַטֹּבָ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֥ר נָֽתַן־לָֽךְ:

'And you shall eat and be full, and you shall bless the LORD your God for the good land **he has given** you.' (Deut. 8.10)

(25b) וְהָיָ֞ה כִּֽי־תָבֹ֣אוּ אֶל־הָאָ֗רֶץ אֲשֶׁ֨ר יִתֵּ֧ן ה' לָכֶ֛ם...

'And when you come to the land that the LORD **will give** you...' (Exod. 12.25)

(26a) אִ֥ישׁ אִישׁ֙ מִבֵּ֣ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל אֲשֶׁ֨ר יִשְׁחַ֜ט שׁ֥וֹר אוֹ־כֶ֛שֶׂב אוֹ־עֵ֖ז בַּֽמַּחֲנֶ֑ה א֚וֹ אֲשֶׁ֣ר יִשְׁחַ֔ט מִח֖וּץ לַֽמַּחֲנֶֽה: וְאֶל־פֶּ֜תַח אֹ֤הֶל מוֹעֵד֙ לֹ֣א הֱבִיא֔וֹ...

'If any one of the house of Israel kills an ox or a lamb or a goat in the camp, or kills it outside the camp, and to the entrance of the tent of meeting **has** not **brought it**...' (Lev 17.3–4)

(26b)אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל... אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲלֶה עֹלָה אוֹ־זֶבַח׃ וְאֶל־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד
לֹא יְבִיאֶ֫נּוּ...

> 'Any one of the house of Israel… who offers a burnt offering
> or sacrifice and to the entrance of the tent of meeting **does
> not bring it**…' (Lev. 17.8–9)

In cases such as these, involving the intersection of diverse
speech, event, and reference times, BH users could opt for tem-
poral encoding that centred on absolute tense posterior to speech
time (i.e., absolute future *yiqtol*) or retrospective relative tense
(i.e., relative past and perfect *qaṭal*). A similar choice seems to
have developed for verbs following טֶרֶם, though in early sources,
a relative future, prospective past *yiqṭol* seems to have dominated
the absolute past option *qaṭal*, the latter becoming more common
only in later sources.

4.0. Conclusion

The use the *qaṭal* form following טֶרֶם is rare in BH, but is com-
paratively more common in DSS Hebrew. While one or more
cases in BH may stem from the secondary recasting of I-*y qal*
yiqṭol forms as *qaṭal*, other cases are not so readily explained.
These latter may well be early grammatical deviations from the
norm, akin to other subordinate structures in which absolute past
qaṭal and relative future *yiqṭol* forms interchange. If any biblical
ṭɛrɛm qaṭal instances are original, this calls into question—though
does not entirely invalidate—the supposedly secondary character
of other cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal*. In any case, on the assumption that
some cases of *ṭɛrɛm qaṭal* are secondary, it is clear that such rein-
terpretations are in line with early minority usage.