

The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew

AARON D. HORNKOHL





<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

© 2023 Aaron D. Hornkohl



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

Aaron D. Hornkohl, *The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition of Biblical Hebrew*. Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures 17. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0310>

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

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

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at 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

Updated digital material and resources associated with this volume are available at <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0310#resources>

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

Semitic Languages and Cultures 17.

ISSN (print): 2632-6906

ISSN (digital): 2632-6914

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

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

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

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0310

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

Cover design: Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

15. HA-QATAL

It is well known that in BH the definite article -ה is commonly prefixed to participles as a relativising particle.¹ Indeed, with participles -ה is a far more common relativiser than אֲשֶׁר .² Only irregularly does relativising -ה occur with finite verbs, specifically the suffix conjugation. Most of the biblical cases of *ha-qatal* appear to be late, secondary, or both.

1.0. Relativising -ה with *qatal* in the Tiberian Biblical Tradition

1.1. Post-classical Biblical Hebrew

While relativising -ה + participle is found throughout the Hebrew Bible, a peripheral post-classical feature involves extension of the definite article's relativising role to finite verbs, specifically

¹ GKC (§116o); JM (§138c(2)); Williams (1970, §539); Holmstedt (2016, 69–73). Cf. WO (§19.7b), who reject the classification of -ה with participles as relativising on the grounds that participles can have a relativising function without -ה . Of course, on this logic, neither does אֲשֶׁר qualify as a relativiser, since *qatal* and *yiqtol* forms can also be subordinated in asyndetic relative clauses with no need of an explicit relative particle. The potential for asyndetic relative clauses in no way negates the relativising function of either אֲשֶׁר or -ה .

² There are over 1600 cases of -ה + (active or passive) participle. Even if more purely adjectival participles are excluded in such a way as to leave only verbal participles, these dominate the mere 36 cases of אֲשֶׁר + (active or passive) participle.

qatal forms.³ Consider the acknowledged cases of ה- + *qatal* from TBH and LBH compositions in examples (1)–(12).⁴

- (1) הֲלוֹא אַתָּה־הִיא הַמַּחֲרִיבֶת יָם מִי תְהוֹם רַבָּה הַשְּׁמֶה מַעֲמִיקִים דָּרָךְ לַעֲבֹר גְּאוּלִּים:
‘Are you not she, who dries up the sea, the waters of the great deep, **who made** the depths of the sea a way for the passing of the redeemed?’ (Isa. 51.10)
- (2) וְאַל־יֹאמַר בֶּן־הַנֶּכֶד הַנִּלְוָה אֶל־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר הַבְּדֵל יַבְדִּילֵנִי יְהוָה מֵעַל עַמּוֹ...
‘And let not the foreigner **who has joined himself** to the LORD say “The LORD will surely separate me from his people.”...’ (Isa. 56.3)
- (3) ...אֵיךְ אֲבִדְתָּ נֹשֶׁבֶת מִיָּמִים הָעִיר הַהִלָּלָה אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה חֻזְקָה בַּיָּם...
‘...How you have perished, you who were inhabited from the seas, O city **which was praised**, who was mighty on the sea...’ (Ezek. 26.17)
- (4) וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ שְׁלֹשָׁתָּה | רֵעֵי אֵיּוֹב אֵת כָּל־הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת הַבָּאָה עָלָיו...
‘And Job’s three friends heard about all this calamity **that had come** upon him...’ (Job 2.11)

³ GKC (§138i–k); Lambert (1931, §295); JM (§138c(2)); Williams (1970, §539); WO (§19.7c); Holmstedt (2016, 69–73).

⁴ The linguistic periodisation of most of the verses in the lists presented in §§1.1 and 1.2 is uncontroversial. On the post-CBH status of Isaiah 40–66 see Paul (2012) and Arentsen (2020) (cf. Rooker 1996); on that of the narrative framework of Job see Hurvitz (1974) and Joosten (2014) (cf. Young 2009). Ruth’s date of composition is debated; while it contains several non-standard features, a few with late affinities, most of these can be attributed to factors other than late provenance, and the composition’s overall linguistic style is classical. Whatever the case may be, its periodisation, whether early or late, does not materially affect the present argument.

- (5) בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְמַלְכוּת בִּלְשַׁצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזֹן נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֲנִי דְנִיָּאל אַחֲרֵי הַנִּרְאָה אֵלַי בַּתְּחִלָּה:

‘In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar, a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after **that which had appeared** to me previously.’ (Dan 8.1)

- (6) (וּאִשְׁקוּלָה) וְאִשְׁקָלָה לָהֶם אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף וְאֶת־הַזָּהָב וְאֶת־הַכֵּלִים תְּרוּמַת בֵּית־אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַהִרְיָמוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיַעֲצָיו וְשָׂרָיו וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַנִּמְצָאִים:

‘And I weighed out to them the silver and the gold and the vessels, the offering for the house of our God **that** the king and his counsellors and his lords and all Israel there present **had offered**.’ (Ezra 8.25)

- (7) ...וְכָל | אֲשֶׁר בָּעָרֵינוּ הַהִשִּׁיב נָשִׁים נְכָרִיּוֹת יָבֵא לְעֵתִים מְזֻמָּנִים...

‘...and let all in our cities **who have taken** foreign wives come at appointed times...’ (Ezra 10.14)

- (8) ...וַיָּבֹאוּ בְּכָל אֲנָשִׁים הַהִשִּׁיבוּ נָשִׁים נְכָרִיּוֹת...

‘And they came to the end of all the men **who had married** foreign women...’ (Ezra 10.17)

- (9) וְכָל הַהִקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוּאֵל הָרֹאֶה וְשָׁאוּל בֶּן־קִישׁ וְאַבְנֵר בֶּן־נֵר וְיֹאב בֶּן־צְרוּיָה...

‘And all **that** Samuel the seer and Saul the son of Kish and Abner the son of Ner and Joab the son of Zeruiah **had dedicated**...’ (1 Chron. 26.28)

- (10) ...וְעַתָּה עִמָּךְ הַנִּמְצָאוּ־כֹּה רָאִיתִי בְּשִׂמְחָה לְהִתְנַדֵּב־לָךְ:

‘...and now your people, **who have been found** here, I have seen, joyously offering freely to you.’ (1 Chron. 29.17)

- (11) אָבָל אָרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים הָעֵלָה דָּוִד מִקִּרְיַת־יְעָרִים בְּהַכִּיֵּן לוֹ דָּוִד...

‘But David brought up the ark of God from Kiriath-jearim **wherein** David **had prepared** for it...’ (2 Chron. 1.4)

(12) וַיִּשְׂמַח יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ וְכָל-הָעָם עַל הַחֲכִי"ן הָאֵלֶּהִים לָעָם...

‘And Hezekiah and all the people rejoiced over **what** God **had prepared** for the people...’ (2 Chron. 29.36)

In a few cases above, the written tradition is ambiguous, possibly reflecting relativising *-ה* prefixed to a participle. In these instances, it is not unreasonable to entertain the possibility that the *-ה* + *qatal* syntagm reflected in the reading tradition is due to secondary reinterpretation. In the case of the II-w/y *qal* forms in examples (1) and (4)—הַשְׁמָה and הַבָּאָה—this would involve no more than a shift from ultimate stress in the relevant FS participles to penultimate stress in the 3FS *qatal* forms. In the 3MS III-y *nif'al* forms in examples (2) and (5)—הַנִּלְוָה and הַנִּנְרָאָה—it presupposes a shift from the MS participle’s expected *segol* to the *qatal*’s *qameṣ* in the final syllable. Even so, in the majority of the cases—eight of twelve: (3), (6)–(12)—the written tradition’s consonantal form and the vocalisation tradition unambiguously agree in their testimony regarding a *-ה* + *qatal* sequence—the forms הַהִלָּלָה, הַהִרְיָמוֹ, הַהִשְׁבִּיבוּ, הַהִקְדִּישׁוּ, הַנִּמְצָאוּ, and הַבְּהִכִּין cannot be read as anything other than *qatal* forms prefixed with relativising *-ה*.

Though such frequent agreement between the LBH written tradition and the Tiberian vocalisation does not guarantee the authenticity of the reading tradition’s *-ה* + *qatal* interpretation in the four aforementioned consonantally ambiguous forms, it is clear that the explicit understanding of equivocal structures as relativising *-ה* + *qatal* sequences in no way contradicts, but in-

deed lines up with the linguistic character of the written tradition as witnessed in consonantal evidence.⁵

1.2. Classical Biblical Hebrew

Of course, the phenomenon of relativising *-ה* prefixed to *qatal* forms is not limited in the Masoretic tradition to post-classical texts, but also shows up in apparently pre-exilic CBH material; see examples (13)–(20).

- (13) אֶרְדֶּה-נָא וְאֶרְאֶה הַכַּעֲקֻתָּהּ הַבָּאָה אֵלַי עָשׂוּ | כָּלֵה...
 ‘I will go down to see whether they have done altogether as the outcry **that has come** to me...’ (Gen. 18.21)
- (14) וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָהָם אֶת-שְׁם-בְנוֹ הַנּוֹלֵד-לּוֹ אֲשֶׁר-יָלְדָהּ-לּוֹ שָׂרָה יִצְחָק:
 ‘Abraham called the name of his son **who was born** to him, whom Sarah bore him, Isaac.’ (Gen. 21.3)⁶
- (15) כָּל-הַנִּפְשׁ לְבֵית-יַעֲקֹב הַבָּאָה מִצְרַיִם שְׁבַעִים:
 ‘...All the persons of the house of Jacob **who came** to Egypt were seventy.’ (Gen. 46.27)

⁵ The form הַנִּמְצָא in הַנִּמְצָא אֶת־אֲבָנִים נָתַנוּ לְאֹצֶר בֵּית-יְהוָה... ‘And those with **whom** precious stones **were found** gave them to the treasury of the house of the LORD...’ (1 Chron. 29.8) is ambiguous. Here it is considered a participle; cf. JM (§145d).

⁶ The *qatal* analysis of the verbal form in הַנּוֹלֵד (Gen. 3.21) is arguable. Though its Tiberian vocalisation with *pataḥ* is characteristic of the *nif'al* suffix conjugation, the form is alternatively analysable as a participle, with *pataḥ* rather than the expected *qameṣ* due to the closed, unstressed status of the syllable before *maqṣef*. See WO (§19.7d), who cite JM (§145e), though the latter do not list the verse in question. Cf. Bauer and Leander (1922, §32e).

- (16) ...וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל-כָּל-אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-קַצִּינָיו אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה
הַהִלְכֹּתָא אִתּוֹ...

‘And Joshua summoned all the men of Israel and he said to the chiefs of the men of war **who had gone** with him...’
(Josh. 10.24)

- (17) וַיִּתְאַנֶּף יְהוָה בְּשִׁלֹמֹה כִּי-נָטָה לְבָבוֹ מֵעַם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַנִּרְאָה אֵלָיו
פַּעַמַּיִם:

‘And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart had turned away from the LORD, the God of Israel, **who had appeared** to him twice’ (1 Kgs 11.9)

- (18) וַתָּשָׁב נָעֲמִי וְרוּת הַמּוֹאבִיָּה כְלֹתָהּ עִמָּה הַשָּׁכָה מִשְׁדֵּי מוֹאָב...
‘So Naomi returned, and Ruth the Moabite her daughter-in-law with her, **who returned** from the country of Moab...’
(Ruth 1.22)

- (19) ...נַעֲרָה מוֹאבִיָּה הִיא הַשָּׁכָה עִם-נָעֲמִי מִשְׁדֵּי מוֹאָב:
‘She is the young Moabite woman, **who came back** with Naomi from the country of Moab.’ (Ruth 2.6)

- (20) ...חֲלֹקֶת הַשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר לְאַחֵינוּ לְאֵלִימֶלֶךְ מְכָרָה נָעֲמִי הַשָּׁכָה מִשְׁדֵּי מוֹאָב:
‘...Naomi, **who has come back** from the country of Moab, hereby offers for sale the parcel of land that belonged to our relative Elimelech.’ (Ruth 4.3)

Additional cases are sometimes cited, but are excluded here.⁷

⁷ Some cite וְהַנְּבִיאִים יִהְיוּ לְרוּחַ וְהַדְּבָר אֵין בָּהֶם in ... as a case of relativising -הֵ with *qatal*, but according to the pronunciation tradition, this is a noun (Steiner 1992; Hornkohl 2013a, 294–27). JM (§145d, fn. 5) suggest the relevance of ostensibly corrupt cases in 1 Chron. 12.24 and 2 Chron. 15.11, in both of which the relativising -הֵ is

1.3. Diachrony within the Masoretic Tradition

There is a degree of similarity between early and late material in terms of the use of relativising -ה with *qatal*. However, the similarity is somewhat superficial and must not be allowed to mask significant differences.

1.3.1. Frequency and Diachronic Development

First, it should be noted that the relatively smaller TBH/LBH corpus exhibits a greater proportional incidence of relativising -ה with *qatal* than the much more extensive CBH corpus (a discrepancy that becomes even more pronounced if Ruth, here categorised as CBH, is assigned to the post-exilic category).

1.3.2. Ambiguous Consonantal Forms and the Case for Dissonance

Second, as mentioned above, eight of the twelve cases of relativising -ה with *qatal* in post-classical biblical material involve consonantly unambiguous *qatal* forms. By contrast, among the CBH cases just one of eight cases—example (16) above, הָהֵלֶכְיָא (Josh. 10.24)—has a consonantly unambiguous *qatal* form. Put differently, nearly all of the apparently classical cases of relativising -ה + *qatal*, along with a few of the later ones, involve consonantal forms amenable to analysis as participles.

missing. There is also one apparent CBH case of relativising -ה attached to a preposition: $\text{וַיִּרְם הַטָּבָח אֶת־הַשֹּׁק וְהָעֲלִיָּה...}$ ‘So the cook took up the leg **and what was on it...**’ (1 Sam. 9.24).

As observed above, only penultimate syllable stress distinguishes the 3FS II-*w/y qal qatal* forms—הַשְׁמָה, הַבָּאָה, and הַשְׁבָּה—from FS participles, the latter with ultimate stress, i.e., הַשְׁמָה, הַבָּאָה, and הַשְׁבָּה. The distinction between *qatal* and participle is perceptible in contrasting examples, e.g., (21) versus (22).

- (21) וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ שְׁלֹשָׁתָּה | רֵעֵי אֵיּוֹב אֶת כָּל־הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת הַבָּאָה עָלָיו...
 ‘And Job’s three friends heard about all this calamity **that had come** upon him...’ (Job 2.11)

- (22) יִתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה הַבָּאָה אֶל־בֵּיתְךָ בְּרַחֵל וְכִלְאָה...
 ‘...May the LORD make the woman **who is coming** into your house like Rachael and like Leah...’ (Ruth 4.11)

In the case of the 3MS *nif'al qatal* forms—הַנִּנְלָה, הַנִּנְרָאָה, הַנּוֹלֵד—differentiation from the corresponding MS participial forms lies in the final vowel alone, the respective participles being הַנִּנְלָה, הַנִּנְרָאָה, הַנּוֹלֵד. For contrastive examples, see (23) and (24).

- (23) בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְמַלְכוּת בִּלְשַׁצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזֹן נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֲנִי דְנִיָּאל אַחֲרֵי
 הַנִּנְרָאָה אֵלַי בַּתְּחִלָּה:

‘In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar, a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after **that which had appeared** to me previously.’ (Dan 8.1)

- (24) ...קוּם עֲלֶה בֵּית־אֵל וְשֹׁב־שָׁם וַעֲשֵׂה־שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לֵאלֹהֵי הַנִּנְרָאָה אֵלֶיךָ בְּבִרְחֶיךָ
 מִפְּנֵי עֲשׂוֹ אַחִיד:

‘...Arise, go up to Bethel and dwell there. Make an altar there to the God **who appeared** to you when you fled from your brother Esau.’ (Gen. 35.1)

The salient difference between the incidence of relativising $\text{-ה} + qatal$ in CBH, on the one hand, and post-classical BH, on the

other, can be formulated thus: while in the post-classical texts most instances of relativising *-ḥ* with *qaṭal* involve explicit agreement between unambiguous forms in the written (consonantal) and reading (vocalisation) traditions, in the more classical material the consonantal ambiguity that attaches to most of the relevant forms leaves room for a claim of dissonance between the written and reading traditions. It is certainly suspicious that such a large proportion of classical relativising *-ḥ* + *qaṭal* cases have consonantal forms amenable to interpretation as the far more common relativising *-ḥ* + participle sequence.

This possibility should be seen in the light of a long list of other features in which it has been argued that the reading tradition of classical texts deviates from that of the written tradition in line with late tendencies on which the written and reading traditions of Second Temple texts agree. If a significant proportion of the apparently early cases of relativising *-ḥ* with *qaṭal* are indeed due to dissonance between the written and reading traditions, then this would be another in such a series of features in terms of which the reading tradition wedded to classical biblical material resembles the combined written-reading tradition of late material. Such a situation is most readily explained by the theory that the reading tradition of CBH material, though reliably preserving much in the way of distinctively classical features, nevertheless drifted in the direction of post-classical Hebrew until crystallisation in the Second Temple Period, i.e., approximately when the LBH material was composed. This means that, on occasion, the vocalisation of CBH texts anachronistically departs from the phonic realisation intended according to the written tradition

in favour a post-classical standard. Such a hypothesis—which, again, applies in the case of a number of features discussed in the present monograph and elsewhere—accounts for the obvious disparity between Masoretic CBH and post-classical BH when it comes to the incidence of relativising $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$: in post-classical material there is widespread agreement between the written and reading traditions involving consonantally unambiguous forms, while in CBH the dearth of consonantally unambiguous forms regularly leaves the reading tradition's testimony regarding $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$ without corroborating testimony from the written tradition.

1.3.3. Versional Evidence

Given the ambiguity of the Tiberian CBH evidence due to the possibility of dissonance between its written and reading components, it is reasonable to solicit aid from other ancient textual witnesses. Upon examination, however, it becomes apparent that these provide only general and limited evidence. The DSS evidence is fragmentary and ambiguous. The Samaritan written tradition is accompanied by a reading tradition, but the latter does not discern between the *qat\aleph* and participle forms of the relevant verbs. The evidence from the rest of the versions is nearly complete, but ambiguous in its own way, since, as observed below, $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$ appears in contexts where the more frequent $\text{-}\aleph +$ participle can also be used and with similar semantic force. Thus, depending on the context, one might expect similar translations for the two. Table 1 (facing page) gives the equivalents of MT cases of $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$ in the BDSS, the SP, the Peshiṭta, the principal traditional relevant Targums, the Greek, and the Vulgate.

The first thing that can be seen is that, despite sporadic cases of non-equivalence—Gen. 21.3 in the Vulgate, Ruth 4.3 in the Peshiṭta—little to no textual doubt attaches to any of the cases. In other words, based on versional evidence, there is no widespread lack of equivalence interpretable as evidence for the frequent late insertion of relativising $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$ in the Masoretic tradition. Rather, in the majority of cases for which there is evidence, it would seem that the copyist or translator had at their disposal a consonantal text similar, if not identical, to the Tiberian consonantal text.

It is not obvious, however, that the relevant $\text{-}\aleph + \text{verb}$ syntagm was necessarily interpreted as $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$. In order to attempt to gain some clarity on this, it is useful to compare versional treatment of the $\text{-}\aleph + qat\aleph$ syntagm with treatment of the far more common $\text{-}\aleph + \text{participle}$ alternative. In light of the latter syntagm's semantic flexibility, it is unsurprising that renderings are by and large contextual. This is to say, a given version's translation of a specific instance is generally in line with the semantics of the context. It is important to emphasise, however, that the semantic ambiguity that attaches to a number of forms can occasion diversity among the translations. Be that as it may, renderings tend to fall on a continuum ranging from forms that denote the general present semantics of enduring characteristics (25), through those that convey imperfective past semantics for attendant, but not necessarily permanent, circumstances of varying persistence (26)–(27), to those expressing perfective past semantics for transitory unitary events (26).

- (25) ...וְשֵׁם הַנָּהָר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי חֲזָקָל הוּא הַחֲלִיץ קְדָמָת אַשּׁוּר ... (DSS: 4Q2
f1ii.1; SP הַחֲלִיץ *ḥalāk*)

‘...The name of the third river was Tigris—this is **the one that flows** east of Assyria...’ (Gen. 2.14)

...וַיִּשָּׂא מִן־הַנָּהָר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי חֲזָקָל לִפְנֵי אַשּׁוּר...

...וְשֵׁם הַנָּהָר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי חֲזָקָל הוּא הַחֲלִיץ לְמַדִּינַתָּא דְאַתּוּר

...καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τρίτος Τίγρις· οὗτος ὁ **πορευόμενος** κατέναντι Ἀσσυρίων.

...*nomen vero fluminis tertii Tigris ipse vadit contra Assyrios*

In the case of the MT’s active participle for a permanent characteristic in (25), all Semitic equivalents are active participles, the Greek is a present participle, and the Latin is a present-tense finite form.

- (26) ...וַיִּכּוּ אֶת־כָּל־שָׂדֶה הָעֹמֵלָקִי וְגַם אֶת־הָאֲמֹרִי הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּחֶצְעֵן תְּמָר׃ (SP
הַיֹּשֵׁב *ayyēšab*)

‘...and they defeated all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites **who dwelt** in Hazazon-tamar.’ (Gen. 14.7)

...וַיִּכּוּ אֶת־כָּל־שָׂדֶה הָעֹמֵלָקִי וְגַם אֶת־הָאֲמֹרִי הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּחֶצְעֵן תְּמָר׃

...וַיִּכּוּ אֶת־כָּל־שָׂדֶה הָעֹמֵלָקִי וְגַם אֶת־הָאֲמֹרִי הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּחֶצְעֵן תְּמָר׃

...καὶ κατέκοψαν πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας Αμαληκ καὶ τοὺς Ἀμορραίους **τοὺς κατοικοῦντας** ἐν Ασασανθαμαρ.

...*et percusserunt omnem regionem Amalechitarum et Amorreum qui habitabat in Asasonthamar*

Like the MT active participle with enduring past relevance in (26), the SP, Peshitta, and Targum use active participles, the Greek a present participle, and the Vulgate an imperfect past form.

- (27) וְגַם־לֹטֹט הֵהָלַךְ אֶת־אַבְרָם הָיָה צֹאן־וּבָקָר וְאֵהֳלִים: (SP *ālak* ההלך) 'And Lot, **who went/was travelling** with Abram, also had flocks and herds and tents' (Gen. 13.5)

[illegible]

וְאִם לִלְזוֹת דְּאֵזִיל עִים אֲבָרם הוּוּ עֵן וְתוֹרִין וּמִשְׁכָּנִין:

καὶ Λωτ τῷ **συμπορευομένῳ** μετὰ Αβραμ ἦν πρόβατα καὶ βόες καὶ σκηναί.

*sed et Loth qui erat cum Abram fuerunt greges ovium et ar-
menta et tabernacula*

The MT's active participle is semantically ambiguous, conceivably referring either to the initial point of Lot's accompaniment of Abram or to its continuation. The versions diverge: the Syriac suffix conjugation form seems to indicate a perfective past reading, while the Targum's active participle, the Greek's present participle, and the Latin's imperfect appear to reflect imperfective interpretations.

- (28) *annirra'î* (הנראה SP) ...וַיִּבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה הַנִּרְאָה אֵלָיו:
'...And he built there an altar to the LORD **who had ap-
peared** to him.' (Gen. 12.7)

...הבית הזה מוכן לזכר וזכר זה חלום.

...וּבִנָּא תִּמְן מִדְּבַחַא קִדְּם יוֹי דְּאַתְגָּלִי לִיה:

...καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν ἐκεῖ Ἀβραμ θυσιαστήριον κυρίῳ τῷ ὀφθέντι αὐτῷ.

...qui aedificavit ibi altare Domino qui apparuerat ei

In (28) the MT's *nif^{ca}l* participle seems to refer to a unitary past event. The versions likewise resort to various forms indicating perfective past tense semantics: the suffix conjugation in Syriac

and Aramaic, an aorist participle in Greek, and the pluperfect in Latin.

Of course, versional treatment of the $-\eta$ + participle syntagm is not without exegetical and stylistic variation. Even so, the foregoing examples may be considered broadly representative of common equivalencies. In the nature of things, the much rarer $-\eta$ + *qaṭal* syntagm that is the focus of this chapter has a far narrower semantic range. The versions, unsurprisingly, then, commonly resort to strategies consistent with past-tense interpretation. This is especially evident in the Peshiṭta, the Targums, and the Vulgate, which overwhelmingly opt for indicative forms with past-tense TAM semantics. Overall, the Greek renderings show a slightly greater degree of variation, mixing in comparatively more in the way of equivalencies arguably consistent with the reading of participles rather than *qaṭal* forms. The problem is that, as already mentioned, the common $-\eta$ + participle syntagm had such a broad semantic range and was given to such a variety of translation strategies, that it is difficult on the basis of translations to reconstruct a *Vorlage*'s specific syntagm.

Even so, it is intriguing that in the translations of clear-cut consonantal *qaṭal* forms in LBH material, there is near-unanimous past-tense translation. By contrast, cases of ostensible divergence between *qaṭal* and participle analysis nearly always involve a consonantly ambiguous form. Thus, the fact that the Tiberian reading tradition's הִכְצַקְתָּהּ הִכְבֹּאֲהָ אֵלַי 'whether... as the outcry **that has come** to me' (Gen. 18.21) is paralleled by suffix conjugation forms in the Syriac and Aramaic, but by a Greek present

participle and a Latin indicative present,⁸ may well indicate divergent analyses of consonantal הַבֵּא.⁹

Or not. Consider the apparently unequivocal *qaṭal* form in וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־קְצִיֵּי אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה הַהִלְכוּ אִתּוֹ ‘and he said to the chiefs of the men of war **who had gone** with him’ (Josh. 10.24): in this case, TJ renders with a suffix conjugation, but the Peshiṭta has an active participle, the Greek a present participle, and the Vulgate the bland imperfective *erant* ‘were’. The point is that, given both the semantic range of the ה־ + participle syntagm and stylistic freedom of choice on the part of translators, their renderings equivalent to MT ה־ + *qaṭal* cases must be considered rather shaky evidence for the reconstruction of translator analysis of the forms in question.

2.0. Relativising ה־ with *qaṭal* beyond the Tiberian Biblical Tradition

The relativising ה־ + *qaṭal* syntagm is rather peripheral in the Tiberian biblical tradition. It is evidently even rarer outside of

⁸ Assuming that the *e*-vowel in *venit* is short. I take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague, Ben Kantor, for his help in making sense of the Greek and Latin evidence.

⁹ While the Tiberian reading tradition draws a clear distinction between 3FS *qaṭal* בָּאָה and FS participle בֹּאֵה, this is by no means universal. They are read identically in the Samaritan tradition. Likewise, in Modern Hebrew, penultimate stress is standard in both the 3FS *qaṭal* and the FS participle, except when the latter is used adjectivally, e.g., השנה הבאה ‘next year’. It may be that some ancient exegetes recognised a single underdifferentiated II-*w/y qal* 3FS *qaṭal*/FS participle form, which they interpreted according to context.

Masoretic BH—though, admittedly, many potential cases are left ambiguous due to the lack of an explicit reading tradition. Even so, the complete absence or rarity of unambiguous consonantal forms has significance.

Codex Kaufmann of the Mishna presents at least one apparently certain case, and possibly an additional instance.

(29) ר' דוסתי בר' ינאי אומ' משם ר' מאיר כל השכח דבר אחד מ>מ< שנתו...
 'R. Dosti son of R. Yannai in the name of R. Meir says,
 "Whoever forgets a single thing from what he has
 learned..." (ʿAvot 3.8)

(30) מי שנזר והוא ב[[י]]ן הקברות אפילו הוא שם שלושים יום אין עולין לו מן
 המיניין ואינו מביא קורבן טומאה **היצא** וניכנס עולין לו מן המיניין ומביא
 ק[ו]רבן טומאה...

'He who vowed to be a Nazirite while in a graveyard, even if he was there for thirty days—they do not count for him toward the number [of days owing under the vow] and he does not bring an offering for his uncleanness [for being in the graveyard]. **He who went out** and re-entered [the graveyard]—they count for him toward the number [of required days] and he brings an offering for uncleanness.'
 (Nazir 3.5)

Neither case in the Mishna is entirely unambiguous, since the two apparent *qal* 3MS *qatal* forms could conceivably have been vocalised as such, but intended as *qal* participles.¹⁰ Moreover, the ap-

¹⁰ This is far more likely in the case of שכח than in that of יצא, since in Codex Kaufmann the participle שכח(י) is never written with a *mater waw* (see m. Pe'a 6.11; m. Shabbat 7.1) and the stative-like participle form

parent article in (30) has been crossed out. The resulting subjectless verbal forms in (30), while acceptable in Rabbinic style as a type of conditional, i.e., ‘if he went out and re-entered’, can also be read as a headless relative clause parallel to *מִי שֶׁנִּזְוַר וְהוּא* ‘he who vowed to be a Nazirite while he was...’

3.0. Discussion and Ramifications

3.1. Development

At some point in the history of ancient Hebrew a rather marginal syntagm consisting of relativising *-הַ* + *qatal* arose. JM (§145d, fn. 5) suggests alternative developmental scenarios for such a structure:

This phenomenon may have had its origin in the 3rd pers. sg. of the perfect in cases where the form was similar to that of the participle, e.g. *הִבָּא* and *הִנִּמְצָא*, and then it may have spread to the 3rd pers. pl. (and the 3rd fem. sg....). The evolution may have continued, but our texts do not show it. Alternatively, the phenomenon may have originated in a fairly common structure in which an indeterminate noun is qualified by a participial phrase with the definite article..., as in Jdg 16.27 *וַעֲלִיהֶנָּה כְּשֶׁלֶּשֶׁת אֲלָפִים אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה הָרָאִים בְּשָׁחוֹק שִׁמְשֹׁן* *and on the roof there were about three thousand men and women watching Samson’s show.*

While JM raises these scenarios as mutually exclusive alternatives, both could conceivably have factored into the development of relativising *-הַ* + *qatal*. Two further explanations JM (§145d,

שָׁחַ also occurs (see m. Miqva’ot 4.1, 1, 1), whereas the MS participle *יֹצֵא* is consistently (over 200 times) spelled *plene*.

fn. 5)—probably rightly—reject. Andersen (2000, 53), proposed that *qaṭal* with relativising $\text{-}\eta$ represents the preservation of *qaṭal*'s archaic use as a verbal noun (cf. the Akkadian form variously called 'stative', 'verbal adjective', 'permansive'). However, the fact that consonantally unambiguous cases of $\text{-}\eta$ + *qaṭal* occur with relative frequency only in LBH militates against the approach. Also, the proposed combination of a pre-classical use of *qaṭal* with the decidedly classical definite article seems improbable. Representing a different tack, Lambert (1931, §295 fn. 3) suggested that relativising $\text{-}\eta$ with *qaṭal* is the Hebrew cognate of the Akkadian relativiser *ša*. Cf. the Akkadian-Hebrew *š-h* interchange in the 3rd-person independent pronouns, *šaf^cel* versus *hif^cil*, and locative-directional *-iš* versus $\eta\text{-}\eta$.¹¹ The hypothesis does not enjoy wide support.

3.2. Historical Depth, Anachronism, and Preservation

While the mechanism for the emergence of relativising $\text{-}\eta$ + *qaṭal* may be satisfactorily explained, its chronology remains murky. A compelling accumulation of unequivocal consonantal evidence shows that writers had recourse thereto in the exilic and post-exilic periods. The majority of $\text{-}\eta$ + *qaṭal* forms in TBH and LBH are consonantally unambiguous. While ambiguous structures in contemporary sources vocalised and/or accented as cases of $\text{-}\eta$ + *qaṭal* may be analysed as secondary reinterpretations of $\text{-}\eta$ + *par-*

¹¹ More broadly comparable is the analogous development between Proto Indo-European and Greek represented by such Latin-Greek correspondences as *sex* versus *héks* 'six', *sub* versus *hypó* 'below', *super* versus *hypér*, and *salis* versus *hálas* 'salt'.

ticiples, there is no proof that the vocalisation deviates from the intended written form in such cases. On the contrary, the fact that the LBH written tradition lines up with the Tiberian vocalisation tradition in many cases in which the vocalisation tradition is at odds with the CBH written tradition points to special affinity between the written and reading traditions of late Masoretic biblical material.

The real question regards the extent of vocalic authenticity versus secondary analysis in CBH texts, where the majority of the apparent cases of relativising $\text{-} \text{ך} + qat\bar{a}l$ involve ambiguous consonantal spellings. As noted above, a degree of dissonance between CBH consonantal material and the Tiberian reading tradition with which it has been combined is known from analyses of numerous features. In such cases, the vocalisation anachronistically reflects Second Temple standards, often in contravention of the written tradition. This may well be the situation of the majority of the apparent CBH cases of relativising $\text{-} \text{ך} + qat\bar{a}l$. Indeed, one scholarly approach views *all* relativising $\text{-} \text{ך} + \text{verb}$ syntagms as cases of $\text{-} \text{ך} + \text{participle}$, unless the consonantal form unambiguously reflects $\text{-} \text{ך} + qat\bar{a}l$, no matter what the vowels and accents of the reading tradition indicate (e.g., GKC §138i–k).

It is important to note, however, that while anachronistic from the perspective of CBH norms as indicated by the orthographic tradition, the phenomenon is, by dint of its documentation in the late consonantal and vocalisation traditions, clearly biblical. Indeed, since the phenomenon is not characteristic of QH or RH, nor of Aramaic, it can only with difficulty be regarded as a post-biblical feature retrojected into BH. Rather, it tallies

uniquely with Hebrew literary conventions of the Persian, and perhaps Hellenistic Periods, and not with later Byzantine, much less medieval norms.

But the extent of the potential linguistic anachronism in question must be characterised with appropriate nuance. Beyond the fact that, overall, diachronic dissonances of this type are detectable in only a small minority of instances in BH, it is often the case that classical consonantal material presents authentic forerunners of diagnostically late features eventually to become more standard in later phases of the language, such as those reflected in the LBH written tradition and the Tiberian reading tradition. Again, such may be the case here. One could regard the Tiberian vocalisation of TBH and LBH $\text{-}\dot{\text{q}}$ + *qaṭal* cases as genuine, but doubt the authenticity of the vocalisation in apparent CBH cases.

While most of the apparently early cases of *qaṭal* with relativising $\text{-}\dot{\text{q}}$ involve consonantally ambiguous forms, הָהֵלְכוּ־א ‘who had gone’ (Josh. 10.24) is the notable exception. The consonantal form, though displaying a non-standard spelling (with final *’alef*) more typical of the DSS, can be read only as a *qaṭal* form. Possibly the only consonantally unequivocal classical case of *qaṭal* with relativising $\text{-}\dot{\text{q}}$, it merits brief discussion. In view of parallels in the ancient versions, no real textual doubt attaches to the form. Moreover, neither the immediate nor the surrounding context raises suspicion that the form is a product of late intervention. Finally—and of profound methodological importance—though the syntagm itself is *characteristically* late, one should resist the impulse to prejudge it as *exclusively* so. Other characteristically

late features are found sporadically in classical texts. While there may be various reasons to speculate on the secondary status of some such forms, it bears pointing out that no characteristically late linguistic feature went overnight from non-use to common use. Late currency often began with rare early usage. Logic, then, dictates entertaining the possibility of sporadic classical distribution followed by later characteristic usage. Consider, for example, such characteristically late features as מְלָכוֹת ‘kingdom, reign, rule’ (classical attestations in Num. 24.7; 1 Sam. 20.31; 1 Kgs 2.12; Hurvitz 2014, 165–70; cf. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, II:84–85); words sharing the root שָׁלַט ‘rule’ (classical attestation of שָׁלִיט ‘ruler’ in Gen. 42.6; Hurvitz 2014, 228–36; cf. Joosten 2019, 33–35); and נִכְסִים ‘possessions’ (classical attestation in Josh. 22.8; Hurvitz 2013, 330; cf. Schoors 1992–2004, II:257–58).

Similarly, it seems likely that the comparatively late proliferation of *qaṭal* with relativising -הָ was a development with (albeit rare) classical roots. But once this is admitted as a possibility, it carries with it the potential that any number of the consonantly ambiguous forms construed in the reading tradition as *qaṭal* forms are correctly vocalised—not just in late texts, but in early ones, too (in agreement with Holmstedt 2016, 71).

The argument can also be approached from another angle. Along with the apparently early consonantal evidence for relativising -הָ + *qaṭal*, there is evidence of nuance within the vocalisation of those CBH forms amenable to analysis as instances of -הָ + *qaṭal*. In other words, not every case interpretable as -הָ + *qaṭal*

was so read. Consider the contrast between examples (31) and (32), which consist of successive verses:

(31) כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַבָּאָה לִיעֲקֹב מִצְרֵימָה יֵצְאִי יְרֵכֹו מִלֶּבֶד נָשִׁי בְנֵי־יֵעֲקֹב כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ
שְׂשִׁים וְשֵׁשׁ:

‘All the persons belonging to Jacob **who came** into Egypt, who were his own descendants, not including Jacob’s sons’ wives, were sixty-six persons in all.’ (Gen. 46.26)

(32) וּבְנֵי יוֹסֵף אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָּ לוֹ בְּמִצְרַיִם נֶפֶשׁ שְׁנַיִם כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ לְבֵית־יֵעֲקֹב הַבָּאָה
מִצְרֵימָה שִׁבְעִים: פ

‘And the sons of Joseph, who were born to him in Egypt, were two. All the persons of the house of Jacob **who came** into Egypt were seventy.’ (Gen. 46.27)

Both instances of *הבאה* refer semantically to past events, but they are distinguished in the reading tradition: in (31) the form is accented as *-הֶ* + participle and in (32) it is accented as *-הֶ* + *qatal*. As each was conceivably given to either understanding, it is clear that the reading tradition cannot be accused of wholesale re-branding of *-הֶ* + participle as *-הֶ* + *qatal* wherever possible.

A similar argument can be made regarding the vocalisation of *הנראה* as *-הֶ* + participle in examples (33) and (34), but as *-הֶ* + *qatal* in (35).

(33) ...וַיִּבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה הַנִּרְאָה אֵלָיו:

‘...So he built there an altar to the LORD, **who had appeared** to him.’ (Gen. 12.7)

- (34) קוֹם עֲלֶה בֵּית-אֵל וְשָׁב-שָׁם וַעֲשֵׂה-שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לֵאלֹהֵי הַנִּרְאָה אֵלֶיךָ בְּבִרְחֶיךָ
מִפְנֵי עֲשׂוֹ אָחִיךָ:

‘...“Arise, go up to Bethel and dwell there. Make an altar there to the God **who appeared** to you when you fled from your brother Esau.”’ (Gen. 46.27)

- (35) וַיִּתְאַנֶּף יְהוָה בְּשִׁלְמֹה בֶן-נִטָּה לְבָבוֹ מֵעַם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַנִּרְאָה אֵלָיו
פַּעַמַּיִם:

‘And the LORD was angry with Solomon, because his heart had turned away from the LORD, the God of Israel, **who had appeared** to him twice’ (1 Kgs 11.9)

While such variation within the Tiberian reading tradition might be chalked up to inconsistency in the application of late norms to early texts, it might just as well reflect some degree of genuine preservation. Even so, the infrequency in CBH material of consonantly unambiguous *qaṭal* forms with relativising -ה should be accorded due weight.

There is one further perspective that merits consideration. Though, as mentioned, relativising -ה + *qaṭal* apparently fails to persist in any meaningful way in QH or RH, the Samaritan reading tradition exhibits a phenomenon worthy of consideration in this connection. The Samaritan equivalents of Tiberian *qal*, *pi^cel*, and *nif^cal* all have MS participles identical to the respective 3MS *qaṭal* forms (Ben-Hayyim 2000, §§2.12.2, 6, 9–10). This not infrequently results in cases of relativising -ה prefixed to forms identical to the Samaritan suffix conjugation, and this not just in places where the MT has relativising -ה with a form pointed as *qaṭal*. Perhaps the most striking come in D-stem, e.g.,

- (36) MT: ...וּתְקַרָא שֵׁם־יְהוָה הַדֹּבֵר אֵלֶיהָ אַתָּה אֵל רֹאִי...
 SP ...וּתְקַרָא שֵׁם יְהוָה הַדֹּבֵר (*addabbār*) אֵלֶיהָ אַתָּה אֵל רֹאֵה...
 ‘So she called the name of the LORD **who spoke** to her, “You are a God of seeing”...’ (Gen. 46.27)
- (37) MT: ...וְהָאֹכֵל מִנִּבְלָתָהּ יִכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד־הָעֶרֶב...
 SP ...וְהָאֹכֵל (*wākkāl*) מִנִּבְלָתָהּ יִכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְטָמֵא עַד הָעֶרֶב...
 ‘**and whoever** eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening...’ (Lev. 11.40)

Similar congruence between participle and *qaṭal* forms is noticeable in the case of, e.g., *qal* הִשְׁמַעַת (MT Gen. 21.6) || *qal* הַשְׁמַע (*aššāma* (SP Gen. 21.6); *nif^cal* הִנְרָאָה (MT Gen. 12.7) || *nif^cal* הִנְרָאָה (*annirrā’i* (SP Gen. 12.7); *qal* הַדֹּבֵר (MT Gen 16.13) || *pi^cel* הַדֹּבֵר (*addabbār* (SP Gen 16.13)).¹² It is not clear whether or how the broader Samaritan tendency to discard the distinction between participial and *qaṭal* forms might be related to the extension in the Tiberian tradition of relativising -הָ to the *qaṭal* form, but whether these were related or separate processes, the result was similar: late traditions in which relativising -הָ could be prefixed to forms indistinguishable from *qaṭal*.

4.0. Conclusion

To summarise: the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition in LBH texts and the Tiberian reading tradition wedded to CBH material constitute clear Second Temple evidence of authentic, if peripheral, use of the relativising -הָ + *qaṭal* syntagm. Most of the

¹² These are cited on the basis of Tal and Florentin 2010 (written tradition) and Ben-Ḥayyim 1977 (reading tradition).

CBH cases of the syntagm are consonantally ambiguous, but the single exception looks to be a genuine forerunner of a feature later to become more widespread. As such, it arguably validates the vocalisation of one or more of the ambiguous CBH and LBH cases pointed as relativising $-\text{ḥ} + qatāl$. Either way, with regard to the feature under discussion, there is no disputing that the vocalisation and accentuation of the Tiberian reading tradition line up with LBH consonantal evidence, thus reflecting a date no later than the Persian or early Hellenistic Period, and potentially preserve evidence of the rare Iron Age usage of the same feature.

If the Tiberian reading tradition departs from the CBH written tradition on this matter, it does so only by retrojecting onto the written tradition a more advanced stage of a process already seen to be underway therein and that is evidenced more explicitly in the combined LBH written and reading tradition. Of course, it is not impossible that the syntagm was as common, or nearly so, in CBH as it was in LBH, and that its preserved documentation is misleading. But, again, the ambiguity of the majority of the CBH cases of relativising $-\text{ḥ} + qatāl$, in conjunction with the comparative frequency with which unequivocal cases are found in the relatively more limited LBH corpus, arouses the suspicion that at least a portion of the CBH instances are secondary.